

Stalin

Stalin's Power Rising [40]

Lenin

Positive

- Promoted Stalin as a member of the **central committee** by 1912
 - "the wonderful Georgian"
 - he praised Stalin's organizing ability, insensitivity to suffering, and willingness to obey orders
 - the time when Stalin got into the central of the party
- Stalin Founded **Pravda** with Lenin's help
 - Pravda -> significant impact
 - for communications between communists
 - issued the important CP decisions
 - as an editor Stalin was the one who could control this media
- Promoted Stalin as **Commissar for Nationalities**
 - Lenin believed that Stalin's toughness well qualified him for this role
 - in charge of the officials in the many regions and republics that made up the USSR
- Lenin's ban on **Factionalism**
 - the policy frustrated any serious attempt to criticise Party decisions or policies
 - and hence it became extremely difficult to mount any form of legitimate opposition within the CPSU
 - helped him clear the path of him being power and acted as his weapon of attacking
- The **Lenin's Legacy**
 - Lenin became a god-like figure after his death

Negative

- Lenin learned from his wife, Krupskaya, that in a row over the Georgian question Stalin had subjected her to 'a storm of the coarsest abuse', telling her to keep her nose out of state affairs, and calling her 'a whore'
- Lenin's Testament
 - "Comrade Stalin, since becoming General Secretary of the Party in 1922, has concentrated enormous power in his hands; and I am not sure he always knows how to exercise that power with sufficient caution"
 - "to think about ways of removing Comrade Stalin from that position"
 - However, Lenin was **ill** so this didn't make a profound impact

How significant was Lenin for Stalin's rise to power?(40)

To begin with, Lenin was principally significant for Stalin's rise to power due to his promotion of the latter. Lenin used to appreciate Stalin's organizing ability, loyalty and resilience, and recommended him as a central committee member by 1912. At this time, Stalin had the opportunity to enter the central circle of the Bolsheviks, ensuring his power of discourse and giving him a chance to involve in the key policy-making process, which marked the start of his power rising. In addition, with the help of Lenin, Stalin founded the Party's newspaper Pravda. Being the only media of information within the party, Pravda was used by the Bolsheviks to communicate with each other in exile and, most importantly, acted as the only source of publicizing the Party's new policies and decisions to its broad members. As an editor, Stalin had the power to convey this vital information with his own interpretations by playing on words, which was inevitably significant in influencing how the party members would view the information, considering that Pravda was the only source of news. In other words, the Party members saw the information that Stalin wanted them to see and in a way that Stalin wanted them to perceive, and so Stalin could use this as a publicizing help for his power rising. Furthermore, after the Bolshevik's seizure of power in the October Revolution in 1917, Stalin was appointed as Commissar for Nationalities as Lenin believed that Stalin's toughness would qualify him for the role. Being in this position, Stalin was in charge of the officials in the many regions and republics. This gave Stalin huge power as these national minorities composited most of Russia, meaning that Stalin's influence was spreading over the countries, and he could use this as a way to gain popularity among the country and across the minorities. Therefore, Lenin was principally significant for Stalin's rise to power as he promoted Stalin to various important positions, including Stalin's entering the central committee, his founding of Pravda, and his position as Commissar for Nationalities.

Besides, Lenin was greatly significant for Stalin's rise to power due to his change of the Bolsheviks' organizational principles. Lenin introduced the "ban on factionalism" policy to prevent the Party from divisions due to the NEP. Under Lenin's denouncement, the Party members were discouraged from criticizing any Party decisions or policies, and hence any serious attempts to form oppositions within the party became difficult. Surprisingly, such a policy did help Stalin solidify his power and prevent political resistance to his power rise when he continued the policy after Lenin's death. This is because whenever criticism arose towards Stalin within the Party, regardless of from the Left or Right, Stalin would use the policy as a weapon and attack the critics as disobeying this early law put forward by the respected Lenin. Indeed, this brutal method saved Stalin from significant attacks of the Rights, who conformed to Stalin being not willing to be labeled as exercising "factionalism". Therefore, the "Ban on Factionalism" policy was significant for Stalin's power rising as it helped him create fear in his critics, who consequently were not daring to uprising, saving Stalin from attacks from other prominent members such as Trotsky and Bukharin. However, the policy was not that important for Stalin's uprising since, had Stalin not been a prominent member of the Party, his attacks using "factionalism" would have functioned much worse as he might not even have had the power of discourse, and nobody would care about his attacks. To conclude, Lenin's change of the Bolsheviks organizational principles did contribute to Stalin's success in power rising, but the effect was partially significant as it functioned based on the initially advantageous position of Stalin within the Party.

Furthermore, Lenin's failure to remove Stalin in his later life was also influential in Stalin's rise to power. Lenin's relationship with Stalin worsened in his later years, especially when Stalin abused his wife Krupskaya and told her to keep her nose out of state affairs. In addition, Lenin and Stalin also disagreed over the Georgian affair. Stalin insisted on Georgia joining the Transcaucasian Republic with Azerbaijan and Armenia and joined the USSR together as one federative republic. However, Lenin criticized it as an imposition of Russian nationalism upon non-Russian nationalities, but he was too weak to deter Stalin. These finally

stimulated him to overwhelmingly criticize Stalin in his Testament and denounce him as rude and should be removed. However, the fact that Lenin criticized all the five main communist party leaders in his Testament forced them to stop the Testament from releasing to the public, therefore, the public failed to catch this leaving passage Lenin, and he failed to remove Stalin. Overall, Lenin's failure to remove Stalin in his later life was somewhat significant for Stalin's power rising as considering that Lenin was a god-like and respected figure in USSR and hence had the Testament been spread out, Stalin would have lost his reputation in a blink of an eye and would have had no chance of gaining power. However, its significance was arguable as Lenin had already used such a long speech and harsh words to denounce Stalin and gave the communist leaders such a good opportunity to remove Stalin, but it was the leader's self-interests in saving their own reputation which stopped them from taking this chance to fight down Stalin. Therefore, Lenin's failure to remove Stalin was partially significant as it did prevent Stalin from being publicly blamed by a respected leader but it only occurred because the other leaders concealed the Testament for their own sake.

Stalin

- Build up his patronage system
 - Lenin's enrollment
 - General Secretary

On the other hand, there are other aspects, namely Stalin's own building up of his patronage system, which were highly significant to his own power rising. Between 1923 and 1925, the Bolsheviks, led by Lenin, called to enroll more members of the proletariat into the Communist Party and incite them to become active in party affairs. The proletariat was poorly educated and politically unsophisticated, but they were fully aware that their loyalty to their inviters was important for their privileges within the party. Being the General Secretary who was responsible for the procedure of recruitment, Stalin guided and helped many of the new-comers upon their arrival, which helped him to create a large group of supporters and added to his growing power of patronage. In addition, the position of General Secretary also allowed Stalin to place his own supporters in key positions while removing some members who were opposing him; this, again, forced people to stay near him and built up his patronage. Overall, his strong patronage was greatly significant as Stalin could count on their support in the voting in the various committees, and so he could successfully pass policies and decisions that were favorable for his power rising in a justified and democratic win. However, his opponent's, namely Trotsky's, weakness in votes was also worth mentioning. Despite being the founder of the Red Army, Trotsky paid no attention to building up his own supporter group and hence failed to compete with Stalin in committee voting, stimulating the latter's success in gaining power. Therefore, Stalin's own building up of his patronage system was highly significant as it could help him to win votings that were favorable for his power rising, but his contender's lack in voting was also mentionable for Stalin's success.

Besides, Stalin's political strategy of making alliances was also fundamentally significant for his rise to power. Using Kamenev and Zinoviev's resentment towards Trotsky, Stalin was able to ally with them and vote Trotsky out of the position of Commissar for war. Surprisingly, Kamenev and Zinoviev formed an opposition bloc with Trotsky as they had a common perception that the NEP should be abandoned. At this time, Stalin grouped up with the main defenders against the NEP, namely the Rights, to act against the opposition bloc, and dismissed Kamenev and Zinoviev while putting Trotsky in exile. However, Stalin soon turned his spearpoint towards Rights and grouped up with the majority, who welcomed a return to the hard-time policy, to remove the Right leaders from their influential positions. Therefore, by making alliances with different groups, Stalin was able to remove any other prominent members that had helped the Party and had profound reputations that might be welcomed as a new leader of the Party or resisted Stalin in

carrying out his promotions. This was significant as it left Stalin to be the most and only qualified and popular leader in the power centre, naturally shaping him to be the successor of the USSR. In addition, any other opposition towards Stalin could only be carried out in a low-level or low-power circle, as Stalin replaced the prominent members with his own alliances, and hence these oppositions couldn't do any serious harm to Stalin's position. However, it could be argued that without the underestimation of the Rights of Stalin's ambition, Stalin couldn't have made alliances and cleared his opponents, as Stalin was able to defeat the opposition bloc as he was supported by the Rights, who were not alerted on Stalin's potential danger to them and were hence beaten by the former. Therefore, Stalin's political strategy of making alliances was fundamentally significant for his power to rise as it cleared all his prominent political competitors, but it couldn't have been done without the contempt from the White.

Simultaneously, the ideological difference between Trotsky and Stalin was also mildly significant to Stalin's power rising. Disputes regarding NEP began after Lenin's death in 1924, at which Stalin took the chance to attack Trotsky, who opined that the NEP focused too much on the Nepmen and urged a tighter economic policy. While Trotsky advocated the left-wing "Permanent Revolution" policy, which sought a worldwide working-class revolution, Stalin put forward his right-wing "Socialism in One Country" policy, which aimed to modernize USSR and consolidate CPSU's power, to counter Trotsky. Indeed, the great contrast between Trotsky's ideology and Stalin's crucially portrayed the former as an enemy of USSR, who pursued such a vague notion of an international revolution that might finally damage the USSR as the European countries might be irritated by the fact that Russia was continuously exporting revolutions and attacked Russia. Whereas, Stalin was shaped to be a great patriot who aimed to make CPSU and USSR a better place, earning him reputation among the Party and the population, while further revealed Trotsky as irresponsible and ignoring the USSR's internal sufferings. Overall, it is undoubted that this ideological difference between the two potential successor was partly significant for Stalin's power rising as it gained reputation for Stalin while vilifying Trotsky, but its significance was to be deliberated, considering the effect it actually brought to Trotsky. Trotsky's reputation within the Party did lose, making him inferior in further Party congresses and hence Stalin might have a slight advantage towards his top competitor, but this reputation lose did not contribute to Trotsky's withdrawal from the prominent positions (e.g. The Commissar of War) and his exile. It was Stalin's later attacks together with the Rights that pushed Trotsky out from the power circle and finally became assassinated. Therefore, the ideological difference between Trotsky and Stalin was mildly significant to Stalin's power rising, but not to a large extent.

Trotsky

- His own attacks towards Stalin
 - Bureaucratization
- His attacks towards the NEP
 - Radical idea led to resentment
- Personality
 - Arrogant & Vacillated
 - Lenin's funeral & Georgian Incident
- Political testament

To begin with, Trotsky's failed political measures were partly significant for Stalin's uprising. Trotsky decided to fight back against the attacks upon him and chose bureaucratization as the issue. Trotsky criticized the formalism within the Party and the fact that the Secretariat made decisions without reference to ordinary Party members, which disobeyed the Party's principal intention. However, Trotsky's campaign for a return

to "Party democracy" ignored the fact that Bolshevik rule since 1917 had always been bureaucratic, and hence this campaign gained him nothing but refusal from the Party members, who enjoyed the privileges from bureaucracy and wanted to maintain it, and left Stalin unscathed. Furthermore, as disputes regarding the NEP began after Lenin's death in 1924, Trotsky openly expressed his political opinion to abandon the policy as it focused too much on the Nepmen above those of the Revolution and people, and urged a tighter economic policy. This gave Stalin the chance to undermine him and publicize that Trotsky had a deviant Marxist thinking, which partly destroyed Trotsky from his position in the Party. Such failures in Trotsky's political revenge and opinion were greatly significant to Stalin's power rising. This is because as a qualified and pivotal member within the Party, Trotsky's political influence was undeniable and would definitely have brought harm to Stalin had he successfully used it. But the fact that he failed in bureaucratization and NEP debate not only saved Stalin from being challenged, but also depreciated his own reputation, preventing Stalin from being resisted on his way to getting power and giving Stalin a weapon to clear his most competitive opponent. However, such a weapon due to Trotsky's political opinions wasn't that significant considering the fact that the issues regarding NEP and Bureaucratization had been a common perception throughout the Party, and therefore Trotsky's attacks wouldn't have been taken personally and seriously by the Party members. Thus, Trotsky's failed political measures were partly significant for Stalin's uprising.

Nevertheless, Trotsky's unfavorable personalities were also partly significant for Stalin's road to power. Overall, Trotsky was an arrogant man who refused to spend time on those who he regarded as stupid, and hence he was not able to build up his own patronage system as Stalin. This propelled Stalin's success as despite Trotsky's leadership and reputation for leading the Red Army, he utilized it to win votes neither in a country level nor in a local level, letting Stalin to democratically and justly put forward the policies that was beneficial for him. In addition, Trotsky's arrogance also made him disdain to involve in political struggles. For example, he had the opportunity to undermine Stalin's position when the latter's mishandling of the Georgian Incident angered Lenin, but Trotsky refused to do so. Similarly, he was able to publish Lenin's Testament, which strongly criticized Stalin, but he concealed it because Lenin also criticized him in the Testament, despite its mildness compared to Lenin's criticism on Stalin. Therefore, thanks to Trotsky, Stalin was able to survive under these two fatal situations when he was having a dispute with the Russia's god-like figure Lenin. Had Trotsky condescended and took the opportunities, Stalin would have been undermined severely considering Lenin's grand influences. Besides his arrogance, Trotsky was also an indecisive person. Despite the fact that Stalin cheated him on the date of Lenin's funeral, Trotsky did know the exact date but failed to attend. This gave Stalin the chance to deliver the major speech on the funeral yet most significantly, Trotsky would be labeled as disrespectful towards Lenin and his reputation would be harshly damaged. Therefore, Trotsky's unfavorable personalities, i.e., his arrogance and indecisiveness, led to him losing the golden chances of attacking Stalin and attending Lenin's funeral, which was significant as they not only harmed his reputation but also saved Stalin from mortal incidents. However, its significance wasn't major as Stalin's resistance to power also came from people other than Trotsky, and hence Trotsky's inferior personalities were partially significant for Stalin's power rising.

Stalin's Terror [10]

The Great Terror

Basic Intro

- 1934-1938
- a witch-hunt against enemies of the Communist Party and the Soviet State
- show trials and purges

Cilp

- 17th congress -> Bolsheviks disenchanted by Collectivization wanted to replace Stalin with Kirov
 - many were killed
- **Nikolaev**-> the murderer who killed Kirov
 - brother, sister and wife shot without trial
- **Zinoviev and Kamenev** -> to be blame
 - 1936: re-trial and executed
- **1st of December Law** -> gave him the power to shoot everyone
 - drafted within the two hours after Kirov's death
 - the foundation of the Great Terror
- **How Stalin organized the Great Terror**
 - secret police, renunciations and executions
 - People were killed for their potential sin to communism
 - killed people like industrial target
 - done by quotas and numbers, Stalin didn't care who was killed
 - 700,000 overall were killed
- **Troika** -> carried out the executions
- **Original Bolshevik leaders** -> were executed under the Great Terror
 - Bukharin
- **Connection with Trotsky** -> an accusation leveled against a victim
- **Nikolai Yezhov** -> scape-goat for the Great Terror

Other Part ABC

(a) Describe the Great Purge 1934-1938

Between 1934 and 1938, Stalin set up quotas given to the secret police (NKVD) to kill the ones who might "potentially harm the communist party". Stalin gained the power to shoot everyone thanks to the 1st of December Law, which was published after the murder of Kirov. The Great Terror was organized in the center and carried out by the secret police and Troika (mobile court by three people) with people's renunciations, and executions were implemented without trials. Overall, 700,000 people were killed within the years, including the original Bolshevik leaders such as Bukharin and Zinoviev. The Purge finally ended in 1938 with Nikolai Yezhov as the Scapegoat.

(b) Why, by 1928, had Stalin emerged as the main leader of the Soviet Union?

To begin with, Stalin emerged as the main leader of the USSR due to his position due to the indecisive personality of Trotsky. For example, when Stalin mishandled the Georgian incident and was having a dispute with Lenin, Trotsky refused to take this golden chance to undermine Stalin's position. Also, despite how harsh Lenin criticized Stalin in his Testament, Trotsky also refused to make the Testament public as it

also denounced him. Had Trotsky been decisive to attack Stalin on the Georgian incident and on Lenin's Testament, it would have been fatal for Stalin as he was criticized by Lenin, the most influential person and a god-like figure in the USSR then. However, Trotsky lost the chance, which saved Stalin from dangers and the latter could safely pursue power and became the main leader of the USSR.

In addition, the ideological difference between Stalin and Trotsky also contributed to Stalin's rise as the main leader of the USSR. While Trotsky advocated the left-wing "Permanent Revolution" policy, which sought a worldwide working-class revolution, Stalin put forward his right-wing "Socialism in One Country" policy, which aimed to modernize USSR. The great contrast between these ideologies shaped Trotsky to be a person ignorant of Russia's internal sufferings but sought the vague notion of exporting revolution, whereas Stalin was portrayed to be a great patriot. Hence, Stalin used this chance to profoundly damage Trotsky's reputation and position, which helped him to clear one of the most powerful opponent and made it easier for him to become the main leader of the USSR.

(b) Why did Stalin abandon the New Economic Policy? (6)

- NEP is a compromise to capitalism
- to put forward the industrialization scheme
- NEP cannot fulfill the Soviet demand for food
 - Peasants didn't want to sell food to the government
 - low-price sell & high-price purchasing the equipments (due to poor industrialization)
 - Hence, Ration & Grain requisitioning
 - -> just abandoned the NEP!

Evidence -> write about 5Ws

To begin with, Stalin abandoned the NEP because it could not fulfill the Soviet's demand for food. The Soviet government purchased the food at a low price, and hence as the NEP progressed, peasants became increasingly reluctant to sell food to the government, considering the high costs for them purchasing the manufactured goods thanks to poor industrialization in the USSR. Therefore, Stalin had to carry out ration in the cities and grain requisitioning throughout the villages to maintain an adequate supply of food to the city residents and the government. However, this totally abandoned what the NEP promoted and hence Stalin just abandoned the NEP to ensure the food supply from the villages.

In addition, Stalin abandoned the NEP because he wanted to promote the industrialization of Russia. Despite the economic growth brought by the NEP, it did not really solve the industrial backwardness of the USSR. NEP focused on a more loose economy with free trades between peasants and small factories producing consumer goods, the growth of which helped nothing with the industrializing level of Russia. High quality industrial goods were less produced in such a capitalist system due to their high costs and small markets. Instead, with a more centralizing economy with all resources being allocated to produce capital goods, Russia could indeed experience an industrial growth. Therefore, Stalin abandoned the NEP, a more mixed economy approach, to centralize the production for industrialization.

Furthermore, Stalin abandoned the NEP as it was inconsistent with the CPSU's official ideology. NEP allowed free trades between peasants and small businesses, which were the typical traits of a capitalist economy. However, the Party members were reluctant to such a compromise to capitalism, and most of them supported a return to the hard-line economic policy used before. This is because they believed that it was necessary to repress the peasants and deprive their personal interests (profits from selling the extra grain)

for the sake of the USSR's national interests (as the extra grain can be sold overseas to create export revenue and be transported to the cities to feed the workers so that they could better help with industrialization). Hence, Stalin abandoned the NEP as most of the Party members was reluctant to the idea.

(a) Describe collectivisation. (4)

Collectivisation was a land policy put forward by Stalin. Under collectivisation, the land was taken from the peasants and given to the state - which meant that peasants no longer farm for their individual interests but they pooled their efforts and received wages. Specifically, the farms were divided into state farms and collective farms, which were owned by cooperatives and states respectively. Stalin did this to create extra profits which would help with his industrialization scheme, and to deprive all the capitalist elements regarding the peasants.

a) What were the Five Year Plans? (4)

The five-year plans were a series of economic development initiatives implemented in the Soviet Union. The plans were designed to rapidly industrialize and modernize the Soviet economy, with the goal of catching up to and overtaking the capitalist economies of the West. The first five-year plan was implemented in 1928 by Stalin, setting ambitious targets for industrial and agricultural production, and were implemented through a system of centralized economy and collectivisation. However, the plan was implemented at a high costs with wide-spread famine, and repression and terror to enforce the plan.

(b) Why did Stalin want to modernise the USSR? (6)

To begin with, Stalin wanted to modernize the USSR to catch up the Western countries and decrease the USSR's dependency on them. The USSR was far behind the capitalist countries in the West in terms of industrialization, technology and productivity, and it depended on the food imports and equipments from the West to cover its agricultural backwardness. Hence, Stalin believed that in order for the USSR to survive and compete with the capitalist world, and made USSR less vulnerable to economic sanctions and embargoes from the capitalist countries, the USSR had to modernize and become self-reliant.

Furthermore, Stalin also aimed to modernize the USSR to increase its military capacities. It is undoubted that modernization would lead to an increase in the country's industrial production and productivity, so that more weapons, such as guns and tanks, could be created, and more resources could be extracted to help with the army, i.e. gasoline. In addition, industrial growth brought by modernization also allowed more advanced arms to be created with higher technological levels, which would greatly increase the combating strength of the army. Therefore, with modernization, the size and quality of the army would be increased, which would help Stalin to build a strong army that could defend the USSR from its potential invaders.

(b) Why was collectivisation opposed by many peasants? (6)

- Loss all lands, equipments & property
- Think that the efficiency is low
- It disobeys the
- Loss freedom...

One reason why many peasants opposed collectivization was that they lost all lands and equipment thanks to the policy. Under collectivization, individual plots of land were consolidated into large collective farms controlled by the state. This meant that peasants were no longer able to own or control their own land, and any equipment or tools they had were also taken away. This caused a significant financial loss for many

peasant families and left them without the means to support themselves. Additionally, this loss of land and equipment also meant that they had less autonomy and independence, as they were now dependent on the state for their livelihood. In many cases, peasants were not happy about this and saw it as a violation of their rights and traditional way of life.

In addition, numerous peasants objected to collectivisation due to their **lost of freedom**. As land was controlled by the state in collectivisation, peasants were **no longer able to make their own decisions** about how to use their land and how to farm it. This deprived the peasants' freedom as they were forced to work according to the government's plans and were **not allowed to keep any of the surplus production** for themselves. Before, the peasants were free-lancers abling to decide when to work hard and when to relax, following their own situations as they mastered the land. They even had more profits then as they could sell the extra. However, peasants became hard and restricted labours thanks to the policy, and they had to put in the effort as state's salary was the only medium of their income. Therefore, they thought that their freedom was harshly restricted and decided to oppose the policy.

(c) 'Stalin's Five-Year Plans brought misery to the Russian people.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. (10)

- Success
 - **industrial output**
 - propaganda success
 - **infrastructure**
 - dam, railways, roads
 - military industry
 - medical care and education
 - necessity and resources thanks to industrialization
- Failure
 - chaos in production
 - **living standard deteriorated**
 - harsh towards workers in production

To begin with, Stalin's Five-Year Plans did not bring misery to the Russian people thanks to its beneficial impact on the country's **industrial output**. Particularly under the first FYP, the **output of coal and iron and the generation of electricity surged by a high percentage - the amount even doubled**. The expansion of these heavy industries set the foundation for the development of upstream industries, boosting economic growth and modernization. This, in turn, led to the creation of **new jobs and higher wages** (due to derived demand), helping to improve the living standards for many Russian. In addition, the production of industrial goods became easier under industrial growth, and so state farms had more and **more advanced equipments for production**, which again helped with the **food production** that ultimately benefited the public.

In addition, the FYPs also boosted infrastructure in Russia, benefiting the Russian people as well. Stalin, under his FYPs, promoted the construction of **roads, canals and railways** for the Russian people. For example, the first FYP saw the construction of the **Volga-Don Canal**, which greatly improved transportation between the **western and southern parts** of the Soviet Union, and also the creation of the **Baikal-Amur Mainline**, a strategically important railway that linked Siberia to the Far East. These constructions in infrastructure were fundamental for the increase of general living standards of the Russian people, and

hence Stalin's FYPs did not bring misery to the Russian people.

Furthermore, the FYPs also boosted medical care and education, helping the Russian citizens too. The fact that industrialization requires a large and trained workforce stimulated Stalin to plan providing better healthcare and education to the citizens. Hence, schools, colleges and libraries were built (e.g. 50 schools and 3 colleges in Magnitogorsk in 1936), and Stalin also put forward the construction of "polyclinics", a network of primary care clinics, within local communities. Indeed, this investments in education and healthcare brought an increase to people's living standards under the FYPs, instead of bringing them miseries.

Nevertheless, Stalin's FYPs brought miseries to the Russian people due to the deteriorating living standards. Indeed, the plans placed no attention to the material needs of Russian people and had never been intended to raise living standards. Accommodation in the towns and cities remained sub-standard, and there were no rise to people's wages. In addition, the fact that many of the government's expenses were on defense or heavy industries neglected the output of light industries - industries that produced the consumer goods relating to people's living standards. People couldn't even feed themselves. Therefore, people's living standards actually decreased thanks to industrialization, bringing miseries to them.

Further, harsh treatments towards the workers in production also brought miseries to the Soviet people. Stalin set up unrealistic production goals in his FYPs, and factories or regions that did not meet these goals would be subjected to public trials as enemies of the Soviet state. In addition, Stalin blamed the poor quality and under-production of goods on managers and workers as "sabotage", people who "were not prepared to play their proper part in rebuilding the nation". Even the simplest error, such as being late for work, could lead to such change. Thus, thanks to the FYPs, workers were subjected to harsh rules during the production and became scapegoats of the state, which definitely could be considered as a misery.

Moreover, Stalin's FYPs succeeded due to their propaganda success. The plan succeeded in convincing the Soviet people that they were personally engaged in a vast industrial enterprise that, through their own efforts, the society could improve and achieve greatness. Such a propaganda stirred up enthusiasm and commitment of the citizens, especially the youngsters, and nearly a quarter of a million people came to Magnitogorsk during the first FYP, with three quarters came of their own free will seeking work and better conditions. Therefore, the FYPs did not bring miseries to the Soviet citizens but united them to work voluntarily for the industrialization scheme.

On the other hand, Stalin's FYPs did fail due to the chaos in production. Stalin set unrealistic production targets for each region, leading to fierce competitions between regions for the supply of materials - since if they failed to meet the quota, they might be put on a public trial and denounced as the enemy of the USSR. Therefore, there was hoarding of resources and a lack of co-operation within the economy, leading to over-production in some parts of the economy but under-production in others. Such Under-productions of a product often led to the whole production chain being held up, leaving machines idle and products not delivered, which ultimately brought miseries to the Russian people as they were insufficient in producing goods that they needed to use.

(b) Why did Stalin introduce collectivization. (6)

To begin with, Stalin introduced collectivization as it makes easier for food procurement. Despite some great harvests during the 1920s, the government suffered from severe food crises as the farmers were unwilling to sell their food to the government due to the low procurement price set up by the government. Stalin was tired of the yearly struggle to get grain and therefore he introduced collectivization. With collectivization, the output of the farms was totally controlled by the government, and hence Stalin could

procure as many grains as he wanted. Hence, Stalin could use the grain procured to feed the industrial workforce in the cities or to export the grain overseas to gain foreign exchange savings, which were ultimately beneficial for his industrialization scheme. Therefore, Stalin introduced collectivization to better procure the grain.

In addition, Stalin introduced collectivization to modernize the farms. Some small soviet farms, in the 1920s, were still backward and even used primitive methods in harvests, which were unproductive and labor-intensive. To solve this, Stalin introduced collectivization in which individual farms were merged into state/collective farms. This made it easier for him to introduce modern machinery and new methods of farming into the new collective farms as the state had more control over them. Even more, with more modernized and capital-intensive farms, people could be released from farming, which acted as a supply for the industrial workers in the cities, benefitting Stalin's industrialization scheme.

(c) 'The successes of collectivisation were greater than its failures.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. (10)

- Success
 - Demand for industrial goods
 - helping industrialization
 - increased food taken away by the government
 - Enforced migration *Released Labour*
 - Moving peasants from the countryside to cities
 - rural areas were incapable of withstanding such a growing population
 - relieved the pressure on land and increased the labour force
- Failure
 - Production decreased
 - peasants not able to produce the surplus food that the government & city needed
 - led to starvation and famine -> 10 and 15M peasants
 - level of production barely returned to that of the Tsar in 1913
 - Individual sufferings
 - chaos brought by resilience
 - De-kulakisation
 - peasants no longer have personal freedom on lands
 - they depended much on the government
 - they were set high production goals
 - that they had to meet

I personally disagree to a small extent that the successes of collectivization were greater than its failures.

To begin with, the collectivization succeeded due to grain procurement. More than 20 millions of tons of grains were taken away by the government in 1930, doubling the amount in 1929. Thanks to such a large amount of grain obtained, the government could feed the workers inside the cities and also attract more workers, which helped with the latter's productivity and boosted industrialization. In addition, the government was also able to export the grains, increasing its position in the international trade and also its foreign exchange reserve, which was beneficial for its industrialization as well. Therefore, the collectivization

was a success due to the boost in industrialization thanks to grain procurement.

In addition, the collectivization succeeded because of enforced migration. Since the 19th century, Russia was unable to provide enough land for the growing population of peasants to harvest, and only a major shift in the rural population to urban could solve the land crisis and transform the old agricultural society into an industrialized Russia. Thanks to collectivization, peasants were forced to move from the countryside to cities, relieving the pressure on the land and providing labour force to the cities, which, in turn, helped with the industrialization schemes, which were justifiable in an economic sense. Therefore, collectivization was a success due to the transference of the population.

However, the collectivization failed due to the decrease in production. Collectivization didn't improve the output of grain but decreased it. Peasants were reluctant to be forced to leave their own lands and their freedom and hence may eat the seeds and the produced food on their own. The system was also inefficient as farmers were not harvesting for their own living and so didn't have the incentive to work hard. Therefore, grain production dropped by 4 million during the first FYP and by 1939 the level of agricultural productivity barely returned to that of the Tsar in 1913. This led to starvation and famine within the country, causing striking deaths of 10 to 15 million peasants in the 1930s. Overall, This could be considered a great failure as the collectivization was meant to be an agricultural policy but in fact, it damaged agricultural production and caused an astonishing amount of deaths.

Furthermore, collectivization also failed because of **dekulakization**. Collectivization was carried out with the aim of "liquidating kulaks as a class", yet those people who were accused of "kulaks" were not necessarily the kulaks but efficient farmers who just had more cattle or equipment. Millions of people, or the so-called "kulaks", resisted being collectivized, leading to 30,00 arson attacks recorded for the period of 1929-1930, with organized rural mass disturbances increasing by one-third. The efficient and resisted farmers were regarded not as humans and were deported to the far side of the country, contributing to the decrease in agricultural output as there were no skilled farmers. Hence, collectivization failed due to dekulakization, which caused massive disturbances and human sufferings.

Overall, I disagree, to a small extent, that the success of collectivization was greater than its failures. Indeed, collectivization benefited Stalin's industrialization scheme as it made grain procurement, which supplied grain to the urban workforce and exports, easier and enforced migration that freed the pressure of rural land while providing a larger urban workforce. However, it was also collectivization that brought intense human agonies, particularly those in the villages that occupied a large portion of Russia's population. These people suffered from a great famine led by the decrease in production and from dekulakization.

(c) 'Misery for the Soviet people was the greatest effect of Stalin's industrialization policy'. How far do you agree with this statement?

I personally disagree with the statement that "misery for the Soviet people was the greatest effect of Stalin's industrialization policy".

To begin with, Stalin's industrialization policy brought misery to the Russian people due to the deteriorating living standards. Indeed, the policy placed no attention to the material needs of the Russian people and had never been intended to raise living standards. Accommodation in the towns and cities remained sub-standard, and there was no rise in people's wages. In addition, the fact that many of the government's expenses were on defense or heavy industries neglected the output of light industries - industries that produced consumer goods relating to people's living standards. People couldn't even feed themselves. Therefore, people's living standards actually decreased thanks to industrialization, bringing misery to them.

Nevertheless, Stalin's industrialization policy also had a great effect on Russia's infrastructure. Whilst focusing on expanding heavy industries, the second Five-year plan under Stalin's industrialization scheme also put attention on the construction of infrastructure, such as roads, railways, and canals. Under Stalin's promotion, the Moscow metro - an underground train system with a stunning station built on a grand scale - was constructed, together with the Volga-Don Canal, which greatly improved transportation between the western and southern parts of the Soviet Union. Indeed, the construction of infrastructure were fundamental for the increase of general living standards of the Russian people, and had a great effect on the Russian society.

Further, the harsh treatment of the workers in production also brought misery to the Soviet people. Stalin set up unrealistic production goals in his FYPs, and factories or regions that did not meet these goals would be subjected to public trials as enemies of the Soviet state. In addition, Stalin blamed the poor quality and under-production of goods on managers and workers as "sabotage", people who "were not prepared to play their proper part in rebuilding the nation". Even the simplest error, such as being late for work, could lead to such change. Thus, thanks to the FYPs, workers were subjected to harsh rules during production and became scapegoats of the state, which definitely could be considered as miseries for them and the Russian people as a whole.

However, Stalin's industrialization policy did see a rocketing increase in the country's industrial output. Particularly under the first FYP, the output of coal and iron and the generation of electricity surged by a high percentage - the amount even doubled. The expansion of these heavy industries set the foundation for the development of upstream industries, boosting economic growth and modernization. This, in turn, led to the creation of new jobs and higher wages (due to derived demand), helping to improve the living standards for many Russian. In addition, the production of industrial goods became easier under industrial growth, and so state farms had more and more advanced equipment for production, which again helped with food production that ultimately benefited the public.

To evaluate, despite the fact that Stalin's industrialization policy brought misery for the Russian people in the aspects of deteriorating living standards and harsh treatment towards workers, it can not be considered the greatest effect that the policy has brought. The policy also boosted the industrial output and infrastructure of Russian society, which were massively important as they helped everyone in Russian society and prepared Russia against the coming great war.