

Julianne

Stalin

NOV. 14 2017

In multiple ways, Stalin is perceived as an effective leader regarding the advancement of Russia - both economy and military wise. However, his harsh dictatorship and lack of care and respect for his people implies just how ineffective he could be depending on the situation.

Stalin's highest priority was the heavy industry investment - in his eyes, the key to a rapid economic growth. His five year plan, resulted in a revolutionised industry and a stronger economy. The primary goal of this plan was to increase productivity in the Soviet Union, and ignored agriculture in favor of industry. Stalin was successful in taking the poverty stricken Russia and transformed the country into a major world power. He was able to bring unemployment to a negible level, and he drastically improved the industrial output. When considering the graph, it is evident that iron, steel, coal, and oil substances all doubled from 1928-33.

With a time frame of just nine years, the coal output alone increased greatly from 35.4 million to 128 million tonnes. Overall, under his rule, the annual economic growth was impressingly close to 13%. Approximately 4000 state farms had been created, and 90% of peasants were collectivised - all leading to a recovery of production of food. In addition, Stalin benefited Russia by providing more opportunities for skilled, higher paying jobs, increasing access to education, and improving the availability and affordability of universal health care. This proceeded to enhance the quality of Russian lives. In this sense, Stalin was an effective leader who was determined to establish the centralization of state power

Contributed to modernization of Russia longterm. He had a <sup>clear</sup> vision of how he imagined Russia which developed Russia positively. Through impressive economic reforms, this allowed USSR to defeat Germany and the collectivisation policies allowed important war materials to be manufactured.

Stalin's personality represents embodiments of modern evil, and his methods were both merciless and manipulative. Yes, he was able to get tasks done; however, the way he went about it was quite ineffective and damaging. While his absolute power created a modernized country, it came at a tremendous human cost. With Stalin in power, a catastrophic famine broke out. Millions of people died with forced collectivisation, and suffered from famine which an effective leader should and could have mitigated. The infamous Holodomor caused deaths of up to 7.5 million

view - effective  
use of facts  
to advance your  
position

Julianne

Stalin

NOV. 14 2017

In multiple ways, Stalin is perceived as an effective leader regarding the advancement of Russia - both economy and military wise. However, his harsh dictatorship and lack of care and respect for his people implies just how ineffective he could be depending on the situation.

Stalin's highest priority was the heavy industry investment - in his eyes, the key to a rapid economic growth. His five year plan, resulted in a revolutionised industry and a stronger economy. The primary goal of this plan was to increase productivity in the Soviet Union, and ignored agriculture in favor of industry. Stalin was successful in taking the poverty stricken Russia and transformed the country into a major world power. He was able to bring unemployment to a negible level, and he drastically improved the industrial output. When considering the graph, it is evident that iron, steel, coal, and oil substances all doubled from 1928-33.

With a time frame of just nine years, the coal output alone increased greatly from 35.4 million to 128 million tonnes. Overall, under his rule, the annual economic growth was impressingly close to 13%. Approximately 4000 state farms had been created, and 90% of peasants were collectivised - all leading to a recovery of production of food. In addition, Stalin benefited Russia by providing more opportunities for skilled, higher paying jobs, increasing access to education, and improving the availability and affordability of universal health care. This proceeded to enhance the quality of Russian lives. In this sense, Stalin was an effective leader who was determined to establish the centralization of state power

Contributed to modernization of Russia longterm. He had a <sup>clear</sup> vision of how he imagined Russia which developed Russia positively. Through impressive economic reforms, this allowed USSR to defeat Germany and the collectivisation policies allowed important war materials <sup>to be</sup> manufactured.

Stalin's personality represents embodiments of modern evil, and his methods were both merciless and manipulative. Yes, he was able to get tasks done; however, the way he went about it was quite ineffective and damaging. While his absolute power created a modernized country, it came at a tremendous human cost. With Stalin in power, a catastrophic famine broke out. Millions of people died with forced collectivisation, and suffered from famine which an effective leader should and could have mitigated. The infamous Holodomor caused deaths of up to 7.5 million

view - effective  
use of force  
to achieve  
p - sitic - n

Load  
use  
of  
documents

Soviet citizens. As seen in Source B, two innocent victims of this tragic event slowly sip from a small pot. Weak, bony, and stomachs bloated, they are well aware that eventually they will starve to death. Stalin and his followers were determined that these innocent Ukrainians would pay their lives in a slow, painful way for resisting his collectivization. He was always searching for someone to blame. In fact, he even enforced OGPU, a secret police, that would track down somebody who screwed up or would potentially be in the way of his plans. Similarly, Stalin targeted the kulak group, solely because they resisted his regime. Stalin declared anyone who tried to argue against him, "the enemy," and it always ended in a violent removal of his opposition. Source C depicts that Stalin's collectivization policy was "designed to smash the wealthy middle-class peasant." While Stalin is effective in <sup>finishing his mission,</sup> solidifying his role and crushing dissidents as they are as possible beyond cunning and malicious. In no way is this demonstrating leadership or decent morality. <sup>threat is</sup>

Terror was used as his principal motivation which defines Stalin as a tyrant. He minimizes any opposition or threat by murder. People are terrorized into silence and passive obedience. Stalin uses the propaganda to gain support, used to limited extent and in the wrong way. The propaganda is evidence that widespread fear resulted in limited ability to believe his promises. The propaganda is contended with a lack of technical skill. The stereotyped monotony of Stalin's declarative and simplistic slogans convincing Russian's about Russian's greatness and invincibility. In Source A, the poster is captioned "peasants can live like human beings." Ideally, this makes Stalin appear to be like a god figure, wanting equality for everyone. However, upon deeper reflection, it is obvious that Stalin views peasants as less than human beings to start, and in reality, they are not provided with the same rights as everyone else. Yet, looking at the poster with little educational knowledge, people would identify it as a positive slogan and support Stalin.

Therefore, Stalin was able to be an effective leader when modernizing Russia long term. However, in the process, he allowed people to suffer and millions died because of Stalin in power. He achieved many of his goals, and de  
noman,  
no problem"  
alin was

## Was Stalin Good or Bad for Russia? Hannah Mann

Under Stalin's dictatorship Russia had progressed rapidly, but at what cost? Joseph Stalin used brutal tactics to kickstart industrialization which resulted in the death of tens of millions of Russians. He may have been a benefit to the country in some ways, but overall another leader could've produced the same manufactured growth in a more humane way.

Stalin recognized how behind Russia was compared to other countries regarding industrial power. His two big ideas to change this were collective farms and the Five Year Plan. The collectivization was the "creation of huge state farms [that] drove peasants from the land into the factories". (source c) It took some time, but once the manufacture of tractors and harvestors increased numbers went up. The Five Year plan set high goals for coal, iron, steel and oil production. Oil was successful in the beginning, and from 1932-1937 all the other outputs doubled their targets. (graphs) This finally meant that Russia had surpassed Britain's iron and steel outputs and was close to meeting Germany's. Additional advantages were found in the lives of workers. They gained pension and sickness benefits along with free medical care. Their children were provided with an education that made illiteracy rates drop from 50% to 90%. (chapter questions 10 & 11). Stalin had quickly caught Russia up industrially, which was good for the country.

Both the Five Year Plans rise to industrial and agricultural power were corrupt. Men were worked to death to achieve Stalin's goals and sometimes lying about results to save themselves time before Stalin found out the truth. Hard workers were rewarded, while weak or absent men were punished severely. They were either sent to labour camps <sup>Hilroy</sup>

or unable to find work again which would lead to starvation (D pg. 58) Life on the farm wasn't much better. The richer peasants - Kulaks - refused to give up their land / livestock to the government and were forced to march to wastelands to die as a punishment (H pg. 60) Peasants who refused to work on these farms moved to the cities for factory work. Soon the cities became overpopulated. There was a clothing, food and living crisis amongst these workers.

The worst Stalin did, was the purges done by the NKVD, his secret police. Stalin would have anyone murdered who was even the slightest threat to him, he was a very paranoid man. He began by using his friends to help him gain political power then when he was the leader, would force them to commit crimes they hadn't committed and have them shot. After he had killed off all of the bolshevik leaders he began to kill off the army. A third of the army was murdered, the rest were destroyed by Germany in the war. Many died in labour camps (Gulags) that held prisoners for "having known the wrong people, for saying the wrong thing or not saying the right thing." (H pg. 135) Russians who weren't sent to the gulags, could be taken in the night to be killed as well. Stalin had many ways to dispose of innocent people, he wanted to be powerful and feared and he accomplished that.

Overall Stalin's wrongdoings triumphed the good. Sure, he worked the Russians hard to modernize Russia but so could any other competent leader, like Trotsky for example. His modern industrial advancements were forgotten and buried under the millions of Russians he murdered as a result.

Wow - Deep conclusion!

# Stalin's Russia

Nov 14

Jagdeep

During the reign of Josef Stalin, Russia experienced dramatic changes, in the directions of both good and bad. Russia in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century was a very back-wards country compared to other European nations at the time, Stalin would soon change that. Bringing the communist state of the USSR, up to snuff with other industrialized powers within the decade, drastically improving Russia's economic and military prowess. However, in contrast, millions upon millions would pay the ultimate price of their lives, to achieve this "Utopian view of society". Russia would be brought to the modern-age, and achieve gratification, from becoming a regional power, to a superpower, but the cost of such an endeavor was immense.

With Stalin in power, a massive reorganization of Russian Industry took place, resulting in a century of advancement, in a mere decade. "Emphasis was on state planning and the development of industry", in Stalinist Russia, and every industry became overencumbered to the limit. Introduction of Stalin's Five-year plans brought the economy under state control, to focus on certain key industries at a time. According to Stalin the plans failed. However, in reality, the target goals set for production were so unbelievably high, that it became near impossible to meet them. In the first five-year plan, concentrating on Heavy industry, oil was the only key resource to reach the target quota. On the industrial scale, this "failure" had only made Russia stronger. Many important resources, such as Coal more than quadrupled in production in just a decade, rising from 35 million tonnes<sup>in 1927</sup> to 128 million tonnes by 1937. Those 10 years led to other resources to atleast double in production capacity, considering Russia's agrarian centralized past, this was undoubtedly progress beyond compare. Russia did not forget about it's roots, however. Stalin knew that Russia's vast population was going to starve, without the implementation of a new, more efficient form of agriculture. "A new policy of collectivization [began]". Small privately-owned farms, were reorganized into huge state farms, which eventually boosted agricultural productivity. Called a "kolkhoz", groups of farms were required to work on the new public land, and were able to use ~~some~~ advanced machinery, some farmers didn't have. Extrordinarily, quality of life of the average industrial worker improved through Stalin's reign. Pension and sickness benefits were implemented in the new constitution of 1936, and free medical care became more widely available. Furthermore, the general Russian intelligence in as illiteracy was cut from 50% to 19% by 1939. Through these many achievemen

Creation of  
wider,  
transition words  
& elevated  
vocabulary  
to present  
your  
argument

brought Russia up to par with modernised countries at the time, but to every victory there is a cost.

Stalin, one of the most shrewd and strategic individuals in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, managed to consolidate himself considerable power, for which no one could challenge. With his immense power, Stalin pushed for his vision for Russia, at the cost of others. During his industrialization projects, large swathes of virtual slave labour was utilized, leading many to be worked to death or starve. In addition, to industry, kolkhoz's were originally very unpopular, and initially resulted in lower than normal production values, causing widespread famine throughout Russia. To keep cities fed crops would be seized leading many areas to "[die] by hunger", as seen in [source B]. Furthermore, overcrowding in cities led to further rationing of Russia's dwindling food supply. Even if, hunger didn't kill you something would. When Stalin seized control, he purged many high-ranking officials in the army, airforce, and navy, believing that they were too powerful, and were not loyal. This would lead to grave consequences at the outbreak of the war against Nazi Germany in 1941, as the Russian army would be rendered ineffective. Concomitantly, anyone thought to be an enemy of the state could be locked away for life in the woodlands of Siberia where there would be no escape. As Stalin's reign lengthened on the USSR, his grip would only tighten further, choking out many that did not avoid his path.

Wow!  
Masterful  
use of  
facts /  
Quotes  
to create  
a cogent  
argument

Bringing Russia from a agrarian feudal society, to a global superpower was no easy task. Millions of lives lost was the price the country paid to keep fighting in the future. Was Stalin necessary for Russia? Absolutely, Was he the best choice? Definitely not.