

Stalin's Rise to Power: Political Maneuvering and the Construction of Soviet Totalitarianism, 1922–1929

Dr. Muhammad Ahmad¹, Dr. Adnan Tariq², Muhammad Shafi³

¹ Lecturer, Political Science Govt. Graduate College Township, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan Email: ahmadsheikhlahore@gmail.com

² Assistant Professor, Institute of Global and Historical Studies, GCU Lahore, Email: dr.adnantariq@gcu.edu.pk

³ Associate Professor, Government Shalimar College, Lahore. Email: Shafiisahib@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.63163/jpehss.v4i1.1634>

Abstract

The emergence of Joseph Stalin as the undisputed leader of the Soviet Union was neither inevitable nor solely the consequence of ideological commitment. Rather, it resulted from a complex process of political maneuvering, institutional control, and strategic exploitation of the Communist Party's organizational structure during the years following the Bolshevik Revolution. This article examines Stalin's rise to power between 1922 and 1929, emphasizing how his appointment as General Secretary enabled him to consolidate authority through bureaucratic expansion, patronage networks, and the systematic marginalization of political rivals. It argues that the succession crisis following Vladimir Lenin's declining health provided Stalin with unprecedented opportunities to transform an administrative office into the principal instrument of political domination. By analysing the interaction between party institutions, factional politics, and the legacy of the New Economic Policy, the study demonstrates that Stalin's dictatorship emerged through the gradual concentration of institutional power rather than through a sudden seizure of authority. The article contributes to broader debates on authoritarian state formation by highlighting the relationship between bureaucratic control, political succession, and the consolidation of totalitarian rule in the Soviet Union.

Keywords: Joseph Stalin, Soviet Union, Totalitarianism, Bureaucracy, Authoritarianism, General Secretary, Bolshevik Party, Soviet Politics

Introduction

The consolidation of Joseph Stalin's authority remains one of the most significant political transformations of the twentieth century. Although the Bolshevik Revolution established a revolutionary state founded upon collective party leadership and socialist ideology, the Soviet Union rapidly evolved into one of the world's most centralized political systems under Stalin. Explaining this transformation requires an examination not only of ideological developments but also of the institutional and political mechanisms through which Stalin accumulated power during the critical years following Lenin's final illness and death.

When Stalin was appointed General Secretary of the Communist Party in 1922, the office was widely regarded as an administrative position responsible for managing party affairs rather than directing state policy. However, Stalin recognized the strategic potential of controlling the party

bureaucracy. Through authority over appointments, promotions, and organizational structures, he gradually constructed an extensive network of loyal officials across the Soviet political system. This bureaucratic influence enabled him to dominate the Communist Party from within while systematically weakening rival leaders, including Leon Trotsky, Grigory Zinoviev, Lev Kamenev, and Nikolai Bukharin.

This article argues that Stalin's dictatorship was not the product of a single political coup but the culmination of a carefully orchestrated process of institutional consolidation between 1922 and 1929. The succession crisis following Lenin's declining health, together with the organizational expansion of the Communist Party under the New Economic Policy, provided Stalin with opportunities to transform administrative authority into political supremacy. By examining the interaction between party bureaucracy, factional politics, and leadership succession, the article demonstrates how Stalin laid the institutional foundations of Soviet totalitarianism before assuming undisputed control over the Soviet state. Understanding this process contributes to a broader appreciation of how authoritarian regimes emerge through the gradual concentration of political and bureaucratic power rather than through abrupt revolutionary change.

Stalin had to pass through a political struggle of succession out of which he not only get success but also got of such political incentives which enabled him to engineer a totalitarian system¹. Before Lenin died, Stalin started to assume more and more power by degenerating bureaucracy into an elite group of authority. Appointed as a General Secretary of the party shortly one year before the death of Lenin in 1922, he was supposed to run the administration as he was considered fit for it. This supposition enabled Stalin to have enormous freedom to manipulate every design of administration in his hands. From this strong administrative capacity within the party, Stalin gained aggrandized scale of control over the political apparatus from center to all the fields. Due to the New Economic Policy Lenin set about building the broad base, which Stalin was to exploit from 1929 to forward. The essence of the political story of Russian from 1922 to 1929 is the gradual process behind the scenes in which Stalin gradually became an absolute dictator².

In his last days, Lenin feared the emergence of the personal dictatorship of Stalin with the help of degenerated bureaucracy. Lenin had realized that Stalin was developing his position into one of the highest sole authorities fearing this recommended that the party must find a solution to remove Stalin. However, his desire could not be fulfilled due to two solid reasons. One reason according to Rostov, Lenin did not have in his mind any sort of political organization for the communist party and what he had in his mind was very ambiguous and structurally not clear so that was why he could not convince or organize the party opponents of Stalin to set out a plan for his ousting¹ and second reason was based on a political blunder caused by Trotsky³.

Lenin prepared some notes and documents, which concern with Stalin's efforts to arrange powers in his hand by bypassing rules and regulations. Lenin turned over all these documents to Trotsky to use them in party congress against Stalin. But Trotsky did not utilize these documents against Stalin in party meeting instead he sent these documents to Stalin demanding that he must bring a radical shift in his administrative policies. Thus Stalin gets enough time to promulgate his policies more tightly and ruthlessly⁴. Fearing opposing momentum in the party against himself Stalin prepared a Machiavellian strategy to oust every opposition figure from the party. He opted for this strategy by both means of politically ousting or physical termination. Lenin's resolution *Decree on party unity* was the ideological instrument that enabled Stalin to terminate his opponent within the party. He opted for this instrument first to politically eliminate and then by physically killing. By the time he was on the pace of gaining more and more absolutist powers. As a General Secretary, he enjoyed the authority to control the politburo agenda solely along with powers of appointment, promotion, and demotions of party members and functionaries of the high cadre. Soon he had opted for the elimination or termination of old guards of Revolution 1917. He replaced

them with his own loyal. Stalin promoted his loyal party officials by appointing them on government posts. Within six years of Lenin's death, the bureaucratic structure had degenerated as a result of the Stalinist policy of cooperation of careerist loyal to him. Stalin proved himself by executing policies as an unprincipled intriguer who subordinated every perspective to the accumulation and preservation of his power. He changed his theories and principle to yield more and more power.

This variation of principles and ideology was significant in his tussle with and ousting of a senior-most member of the Bolshevik party. In the soviet politics of the 1920s, Stalin was with the rightist program and the second most important figure Trotsky was with leftist leanings. Stalin utilized his rightist colleagues particularly Bukharin to form a body against Trotsky and his companion and successfully deprived all of them of their seats in the politburo and expelled from the party. Trotsky was exiled to Alma Ata and then deported from the country followed by his murder in 1940 in Mexico⁵. Then suddenly Stalin brought a shift in his ideology by once again reverting to the leftist agenda and started a series of policy initiatives aimed at the rapid transformation in all aspects of Russia. Ousting Trotsky and left opposition by 1928 Stalin was at ease to take steps away from Lenin's collective leadership and thus sidestepping inter-party freedom of expression. Stalin had taken major steps towards more personal rule in a totalitarian fashion. After 1928 Stalin had assumed more power over the party and state by abolishing the right opposition. He manipulated the Lenin cult and Lenin's *Decree on Party Unity* to get legal strength in his person². Stalin crushed every sort of opposition to gain autocratic power. Loyalty to Stalin's regime were the criteria. The Party patronage system was introduced by Stalin to maintain the mechanism of loyalty to his autocratic personality. It was a pyramids structure, which culminated at the top in the person of Stalin. Stalin started and established the political culture of receiving power and privilege in exchange for loyalty to his absolutist rule. Thus he merged successfully the Bolshevik party into centralized bureaucratic strata. Cultivation of a sophisticated monolith structure of the state was brought into effect by practicing a good deal of favoritism and nepotism.

Failure of N.E.P and industrialization plans

Russia was an agricultural country and the least developed country in the European continent. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was incapable of providing its masses with modern living standards on account of his backwardness³. There was a dire need for a comprehensive program, which could transform Russia into an industrial country. In the 1920s the Soviet regime faces two possible programs for economic development. One was to continue the NEP which was very slow and did not seem to reconciliatory with the required rapid socio-economic changes. NEP did not accumulate enough capital to support the development of industrialization⁴ and the second option was based on the abandonment of NEP and innovating something with a very radical approach. Thus Stalin launched the crash program of industrialization. The rapid industrialization program economic model was introduced by Stalin in 1928. This was the start of a five-year program that had to be implemented through centrally controlled machinery. This five-year program was not a new phenomenon to Russia because Peter the Great had made a five-year plan for the industry². This program was aimed at industrializing the economy of the U.S.S.R. to compete with the economics of the west. The operational policy to implement this program was centrally controlled and thus it further centralized the planned economy in the capacity of few under the control of a few individuals lorded by Stalin. Implementation of this policy required a merge of state and party to speed up the process. Industrialization policy was aimed at the complete transformation in the shortest possible period. All available material resources were to be used for the progression of the industry. In June 1930 after one year of a five-year plan's launching, Stalin commented on the

objective of his policy, he contended that “two points could identify the essence of this industrial transformation.

First, all schemes must be planed tightly from the center, and second, all the objectives and designs of this policy must prevail over the entire political and economic spheres of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.”⁶ This command economic model was associated with various features, for instance, the state-owned and controlled the economy (both macro and micro-level), all aspects of economic life were strictly related to the state, all industrial sectors were nationalized and controlled by the state monopoly and every sort of growth was oriented by goals, which were set by the government only. The operations of the economy were highly centralized and the only supervisor of these operations was bureaucracy. This Stalinist model of economic operation and command economy was determined for activating with the major credential of static machination solely. This industrialization process was directed towards developing such industrial sectors that only focused on heavy industry iron and steel and heavy machinery. This process of industrialization neglected the basic necessary ingredients of routine life. The U.S.S.R innovated and forged the modern world’s first centrally planned economy operations. This system was based on state ownership. Their centrally controlled economic operation was conducted and managed by three static institutions; The State Planning Commission, The State Bank, and The State Commission of Materials. This complex system was operated through the introduction of five-year plan in 1928. Politburo set basic guidelines for planning. Politburo determined the basic direction of every planning venture. Promulgation of this absolutely static planning was intended to bring uniformity. This characteristic of uniformity caused so many hassles during its implementation very particularly in the primitive regions of Russia. Instead of incorporating plural requisites state used coercion and hard regulation as means to drive forcefully these programs.ⁱⁱ Hectic industrialization made masses pay its price particularly the peasantry was the worst sufferer. Adequate food supply was one major rationale behind Stalin’s justification for the collectivization of the agriculture process. In 1929 when Stalin adopted a new policy of forced collectivization of agriculture it had opened a new chapter of the struggle between state and peasantry. This struggle resulted in the dominance of the state and further reinforcements of its Monolithic policies. Peasants were producing but not according to the requirement of the state. Stalin solved this grain shortage problem by launching an organizational change. According to this plan, the complete agricultural system was reorganized on a uniform pattern with the tight auspices of the state. Peasants were forced to be part of collective forms. The peasant who defied state authority was dealt very brutally. This collectivization process was not possible without the party organization under the strict control of Stalin. This factor provides strength to Stalin Monolithic Empire. However, the traumatic implantation of collectivization entailed disastrous consequences for the state and society.

State Terror

After overcoming all-significant opposition of significant political figures Stalin started the liquidation policy that was known as a Great Purge⁷. This policy aimed at the elimination of all old Bolshevik members from the party, army, and civil society including Artists, instinctual, painters, poets, and writers. Purge (cleansing) was not a new phenomenon for Russian. The purge campaign was launched by Lenin in the 1920s when the party conducted four major such cleansings of its party ranks to clean the party from undesirable and inefficient elements. However, the purge of Stalin’s era was different from previous initiatives because the previous purge was aimed at collective purification of the party while Stalin conducted his own “Terrorized version” of purge that was aimed at removing every such person which could passively or actively be a future threat to Stalin’s autocratic design. Thus the major objective of this entire episode was to

remove hurdles in the way of construction of the Monolith under the sole auspices of Stalin. With fully controlled instruments of power executions such as party organization, secret police, army, and state administration Stalin was going on to add more and more powers in his hands.

Therefore, Stalin by mid-thirties was able to grab all the powers in his hand. Both left and right-wing opposition was crushed. Stalin believed that any latent opposition to him could derive him out and could dismantle the apparatus established by him, so he resorted towards ousting and killing of leaders of old left opposition through trial and executions⁷. He mounted a region of Terror in the old Tsarist style. According to one estimate, more than one million people were executed and the entire population of Russia was terrorized. Therefore, Stalinist regime was bracketed with mass terror directed by the state to both the population and opposition voices of elite strata.⁶ The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was held together up to the mid-thirties by the revolutionary dictatorship which was justified by the totalitarian ideology with special reference on the priority of power aligned with Russian autocratic tradition. This priority of power was converted with the soviet ideological heritage of revolution and manipulated by Stalin who tried to impose his own program to design his totalitarian system of state⁸. Thus the revolutionary vitality and zeal associated with ideological heritage had been exhausted during the period of Stalin and replaced by culture of state terror by Stalin to solidify his authoritarian rule.

According to the 1922 constitution of U.S.S.R the union was declared as federal but this soviet federalism was annulled by centralism of the C.P.S.U. headed by Stalin. The Stalin regime combined the state terror and use of forces along with hierarchical party organization. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was apparently federal state but was operating through hierarchy of soviets lorded by the top most slot of Stalin, this system was run by party leadership. In such way Stalinism had brought back the tsarist autocracy. His politburo was narrowing minded and ignorant of pluralist realities and needs of the country and tried to suppress any dissenting voice. Thus the Soviet political system despite its federalist trappings ceased to function as a federal structure and for all the proposes it was transformed into a unitary system, though the Soviet leadership later continued to claim that the Soviet federal structure was premised on voluntary union of every Soviet republic. Theoretically a republic could secede but practically it was a crime and deviation from Marxism⁹.

Constitutional proclamation regarding autonomy was an illusion and all the powers were still retained by the central government practically. A central government with its terror tactics repressed any group that advocated autonomy or self-governance. The party remained the elite force. The successive purge campaign introduced a new cadre of leadership comprising careerist i.e. (who were desperate for their careers). This new political elite had nothing to do with the ideology of Stalin. It only owed loyalties towards Stalin. Stalin required loyalists to ensure support for his policies and program, on the other hand, needed security of these careerists. This reciprocal relationship further consolidated this monolithic setup. Lorded by Stalin, communists were designated to the key position of factory managers, collective form chairman, superintendent. This static structure was formed in a hierarchical style. All the cadres depended on the benevolence of Stalin. In this manner, Stalin was able to exert dominating control over the politburo. This led to the personalization of power. In 1929 since the launching of rapid industrialization and collectivization programs, he started to establish the whole structure of the state on monolith lines. Even the structure of the agrarian economy was regulated under a centralized political mechanism throughout the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Stalin could exercise his monolithic designs by consolidating his centralized grip over the socio-economic fabric of agrarian Russia¹⁰. This highly centralized Stalinist political setup was based on the interconnected structure of the party and state.

Conclusion

Stalin's rise to power demonstrates that the establishment of Soviet totalitarianism was the result of a gradual process of political consolidation rather than an abrupt seizure of authority. By exploiting the institutional powers of the General Secretaryship, controlling the Communist Party bureaucracy, and skillfully eliminating political rivals, Stalin transformed an administrative office into the centre of political power. The succession crisis following Lenin's death, together with the expansion of the party apparatus under the New Economic Policy, provided the institutional opportunities that facilitated this transformation. Consequently, Stalin succeeded in replacing the principle of collective leadership with a highly centralized and personal dictatorship. The study therefore concludes that Soviet totalitarianism emerged through the interaction of political maneuvering, bureaucratic control, and institutional manipulation, laying the foundations of one of the most centralized authoritarian regimes of the twentieth century.

References

- Bialer, S. (1989). *The Soviet paradox*. Free Press.
- Hammer, D. P. (1986). *U.S.S.R.: The politics of oligarchy*. Westview Press.
- Grenville, J. A. S. (1980). *A history of the world in the twentieth century*. Harvard University Press.
- Lorimer, D. (1997). *The collapse of communism in the U.S.S.R.* Resistance Books.
- Mackenzie, D. (1991). *History of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*. Wadsworth Publishing.
- Pares, B. (1960). *Russia: History, people, politics*. Vintage Books.
- Reiman, M. (1987). *The birth of Stalinism: The U.S.S.R. on the eve of the "second revolution"*. I.B. Tauris.
- Rostow, W. W. (1953). *The dynamics of Soviet society*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Stern, G. (1990). *The atlas of communism*. Facts on File.
- Web Sources (APA 7th Edition)
- Encyclopaedia Britannica*. (n.d.). **Great Purge**. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Great-Purge>
- History.com Editors*. (n.d.). **Joseph Stalin**. <https://www.history.com/topics/russia/joseph-stalin>
- BBC History*. (n.d.). **Leon Trotsky (1879–1940)**. https://www.bbc.co.uk/history/historic_figures/trotsky_leon.shtml