
From Centralization to Collapse: Structural Weaknesses of the Soviet State

Dr. Adnan Tariq¹, Dr. Muhammad Mahboob Ahmad², Dr. Muhammad Ahmad³

¹ Assistant Professor, Institute of Global and Historical Studies, GC University, Lahore.

Email: dr.adnantariq@gcu.edu.pk

² Assistant Professor, Institute of English Language and Literature, GC University, Lahore. Email: mahboobahmad@gcu.edu.pk

³ Lecturer, Political Science Govt. Graduate College Township, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: ahmadsheikhlahore@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70670/sra.v3i1.2437>

Abstract

The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 was the culmination of long-term structural weaknesses rather than the consequence of a single political event or leadership failure. This paper examines the historical evolution of the Soviet state's monolithic political and administrative structure and analyses the institutional contradictions that gradually undermined its stability. It argues that the highly centralized system established under Joseph Stalin initially strengthened state authority and facilitated rapid industrialization, but over time it produced bureaucratic rigidity, economic stagnation, political alienation, and an increasing disconnect between the state and society. By tracing developments from the Stalin era to the reforms of Mikhail Gorbachev, the paper demonstrates that Perestroika and Glasnost exposed rather than created these structural deficiencies. The study concludes that the Soviet Union collapsed because its rigid institutions proved incapable of adapting to changing political, economic, and social realities, making systemic disintegration increasingly inevitable.

Keywords: Soviet Union, Monolithic State, Structural Collapse

Introduction

The dissolution of the Soviet Union remains one of the most significant political transformations of the twentieth century. Although the immediate collapse occurred in 1991, its origins lay in structural contradictions that had accumulated over several decades. The Soviet state was built upon a highly centralized political order in which the Communist Party exercised exclusive authority over government, the economy, and society. While this monolithic system enabled the Soviet Union to emerge as an industrial and military superpower, it also created institutional rigidities that restricted political participation, discouraged economic innovation, and weakened the state's capacity to respond to changing domestic and international conditions. This paper argues that the collapse of the Soviet Union should be understood as the outcome of long-term structural weaknesses embedded within the Soviet political system rather than as the direct result of Gorbachev's reforms alone. The institutional framework established during the Stalin period became increasingly incompatible with the demands of a modern and complex society. Successive leaderships attempted limited reforms, yet none fundamentally addressed the underlying

contradictions of centralized governance. By examining the historical development of the Soviet monolithic structure from Stalin to Gorbachev, this paper analyses how bureaucratic centralization, economic inefficiency, political authoritarianism, and widening state–society divisions gradually eroded the foundations of Soviet power. It further demonstrates that *Perestroika* and *Glasnost* accelerated an institutional crisis that had been developing for decades, ultimately leading to the disintegration of the Soviet state in 1991.

This paper focuses on factors behind the disintegration of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in context of the collapse of monolithic structure. Major Critical evolution will start from the Stalin period when this totalitarian structure was formulated. This paper intends to highlight the growing differences between the state and society which eventually led to this collapse. This paper highlights new social and political forces which made this monolithic structure incompatible and led to the collapse of the whole system. This attitude remained up to mid-eighties when Gorbachev arrived with his radical reforms. In this paper it is pinpointed that Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was not prepared for radical reform and the policies of Gorbachev precipitated the process of collapse.

The demise of U.S.S.R was the result of culmination of internal pressures, which were permeated in almost every sphere of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics since its inception. These pressures were resulted due to the social political and economic factors. All these problems were dominated by centralized economic system. To substantiate the causative background of this monumental catastrophic event, an analytical overview attributed to the key policies and characteristic of system in historical perspective is essential. It is almost very difficult to demarcate the rise, stagnation and down fall in clear cut lines. It seems that construction of prosperous and perpetual period of U.S.S.R was instituted with a lot of deficiencies also. These deficiencies had remained passive up to the phenomenal perpetuation and flourishing of state and with the stagnation these deficiencies started to activate and get on the stage. It is stated in earlier paper that Russia had very strong tradition of autocratic despotism. In autocratic system, beside historical deterministic factors, personally initiated policies caused significantly toward decline (especially in case of long duration of reign). Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, with dominant Russian precedent of despotism, also held this characteristic of revolution (change) from above (*Autocratic and Oligarchic*) so, that is why we would try to access the turning points in terms of leaders of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, however, with strong touch of historical surroundings, factors and immediate political change would also be considered.

Suppression of Democratic and Political Forces

Socialist democracy within and outside the party was suppressed brutally by Stalin. Stalin had formulated an absolutist system by possessing all powers within his hands. He negated every possible active and passive aspect of difference of opinion. Ruling elite under the absolute control of Stalin was committed to building their own version of socialism. This Elite group always seemed conscious of its limitation in terms of minority status in the soviet political system and in order to impose its own program over majority it had to crush every voice. If they allowed cracks in communist setup, the party would lose its main credential to rule.ⁱ Thus the major and very fundamental demerit was laid by Stalin himself while constructing super centralized state. Brute terror on mass level and extremely coercive measure were the instruments to execute this design. Strict policy to curb every sort of opposing view and introduction of uniformity in every sphere of Soviet polity caused to smash mosaic of pluralism. This feature of uniformity and monism was to be more dangerous within itself. However up to the death of Stalin, this super structure continued to survive due to its internal dynamics. The monolithic structure that was founded by Stalin was

of dynamic nature. This structure was formed according to the requisites of that time. This structure was come into being due to the challenge and response process. The pivot of this structure was the autocracy of Stalin. The success and strength of this system lay in the autocratic rule of Stalin and second was the long duration of his rule. Due to these two features all the policies initiated and launched by Stalin get enough time to achieve goals. Stalin had founded his ruling credential over Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with most particular reference of rural and agrarian cosmetics of Russia. Stalinist method of command system might have been successful in 1930's ,40's and 50,s because the landscape was rural, agrarian and poorly educated and was easily manipulated and exploited to get success and strength for the totalitarian regime.ⁱⁱ

But after the death of Stalin this monolithic superstructure lost its vitality. In post-Stalin era this system had exhausted its characteristic of self-adjustment with the emerging situation.ⁱⁱⁱ Stalin modified the ethnography of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to make this system workable. Through this system Union of Soviet Socialist Republics certainly gained enormously, though at very high cost of totalitarianism. Autocratic character of this monolith was no more in post Stalin period. Actually autocratic system had been in exercise even to the period of Gorbachev but there was a significant distinction between Stalinist and post Stalinist system and that was the transformation of absolute autocracy with oligarchic dictatorship of politburo^{iv}. Acknowledgement of this transformative difference is very important to make an understanding about the historical process which led to the stagnation and demise of whole system. Due to this transformative difference, historians divide the whole Soviet history into Stalinist and post-Stalin period. Many historians ascribed the collapse of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the stagnation and rigidity of Stalinist model and its inability to adopt new condition.^v The key characteristics of Stalinist system was its lack of economic self-generating and self-regulating mechanism. On the other hand, the Operation of this system was based on the exercise of absolute political power to conduct the decision making process. This model was designed to run the economy with the pre-decided objectives with brute and harsh measures.^{vi}

Post-Stalin period of this state structure had lost the feature of challenge and response, started to paralyze by confining this structure within a particular boundary, thus stagnated, and lost dynamism to apprehend the changing condition. This stagnation was confined to the monolithic circle and the economic structure designed by Soviet state. Soviet political system was very much based on economic policies. In fact, Soviet state was mostly concerned with economic policies by undermining every other feature of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics's polity. The political system and polity formulated during the course of Stalinist period, was orchestrated by economic policies. Thus the areas of stagnation were confining the state and its failure of economic policies while the natural progression of society organically remains active. This distinct feature of grudge between monolith state and multi-faceted society was gradually on increasing pace. This confinement of monolithic class held a dual character both of its perpetuation up to Gorbachev and of it passive decline because of potential loosing of its relationship with Union's society (societies). After Stalin's death collective leadership (oligarchy) emerged on the scale but without having the required competency to comprehend with system.^{vii} This deficiency resulted in their self-imposed confinement of ruling elite and had inhibited their exercise of power.^{viii} This deficiency was also one of the major institutional reasons about the paralysis of the state structure.

This political system of static affairs was beset by signs of stagnation and decay with the start of the post-Stalin era. On the other hand, the societal spheres of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics exhibited greater change as rural Russia started to convert in civic culture, urbanization process started very hectic. Thus the whole agrarian social fabric, on which Stalin had laid foundation of his static setup, started to transform into urbanization. The political static system remained

monolithic while society kept its progression in multi-faceted fashion. Against this historical change post-Stalin stakeholders of static setup could not realize the essential modification within their static setup.^{ix}Transformed socio-political landscape with the parallel industrialization process had changed entirely the ethnography but post-Stalin rigid system could not make adjustment with this changing phenomenal reality.^xThis stagnating superstructure had shaped the historical inertia, which created messy and complicated format to seek out the macro and micro static affairs. Therefore, that was why it seemed incapable to apprehend the changes.

Failure of Khrushchev's Policies

Realizing these entire undercurrent changes, Khrushchev tried to some, extents modify the mechanism. He started the policy of decentralization in economic spheres of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics because at local level a new breed of expert officials had been emerged. However, all of his policy initiatives were not only failed to provide required reformed results but further complicated the situation. At start, Khrushchev seemed to have radical design for change in policies. He began to pursue comparative open and flexible campaign with the objectives: to popularize the party in order to convert it into mass movement and preparation of organizational-administrative changes.^{xi} The restoration of party as a mass movement was aimed at to shake up the stagnant bureaucratic setup. He wanted to change the Stalinist system. His desired initiative intended to enhance the contact between leadership and masses.^{xii}So that the interaction and activities of all strata of society from top to bottom could well serve the objective to move ahead the course of communism successfully.

Nevertheless, all his policies unfortunately failed because functionaries of monolithic setup did not dare to smash their confinement as they considered it as loosening of their collective grip over monopoly of power. His campaign to re-structure the organization and administration raised basic question of his legitimacy to rule and were considered by his colleague as dangerous for the political system. Thus, his own policies proved to be reason of his ouster. In defense of Stalinist structural principles members of politburo deposed him. Failure of his policies and ouster from power was made possible due to the fact that politburo of Post-Stalin did not let emerge a leader with autocratic like Stalin as they were afraid of radical reform at the cost of their upheaval.^{xiii} Existing command political and financial setup had been serving their interest and they did not want such radical changes at the cost or their incentives both political and financial. Khrushchev episode shows not only the continuation of stagnating political system which was devoid of any essential and required changes to arrest the difference between state and monolithic setup but also forced the need to make appropriate arrangements to maintain their authority.

Pro-Military Bias of Brezhnev Policies

Brezhnev, the front man of politburo, restored Stalin's policies with harsher measure by surpassing any sign of acknowledging the rapidly changing society. Era of Brezhnev had dual character. On the one hand he tried his best to restore Stalinist lines very strictly and on the other side in late 60s his administration had decided to decentralize the industrial sector to get it out of stagnation.^{xiv} This dualism was resulted into further deterioration of economic sector. Due to the experiment of this controlled de-centralization, corruption and mismanagement trickled down to the local level state functionaries. When controlled devolution of authorities at the Soviet and district levels came into effect it further consolidated the authoritarian control of local level of bureaucratic strata which subsequently assumed the role of politburo for the local party organization. Hence corruption and mismanagement of center proliferated among various levels and caused further complication instead of bringing reform.^{xv} The major strain on the economy was caused by the

arms buildup during Brezhnev era. The military industrial complex was expanded as an essential requirement for the parity with western powers.^{xvi} Administration had started a broad based process of heavy military buildup. According to unofficial calculation, military spending up to the late 70s accounted estimated 25 percent of the total gross domestic product.^{xvii} The process of spending on military program was started at the time of need to seek out radical program to get the economy out of stagnation. It was a time with dire need to stop the declining economic growth and enhance the productive capacity not only in every sector of economy but also most particularly in consumerist circles. All such fundamental changes were not only required to be initiated but with enormous financial support to carry them out successfully. Unfortunately, Soviet administrative did not pay much attention and focused their attention over military buildup. The arms industry shaped the character of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics's economic sector in the Brezhnev era and all other sector became the victim of almost neglecting and was given the status of left over. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics did not invest in other fields, which might enable soviet government to generate new source to balance the cost of defense buildup. Therefore, the fault also lies in the non-acknowledgement of the real requirement posed by the changing circumstances. Since late 60s Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was faced with new economic challenges. However, Soviet monolithic superstructure could not realize this massive change.

Regimentation of Manufacturing Units

During the early 1950s the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had, success fully evolved a middle class, which was optimistic about the future of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and was ready to play its dynamic and vibrant role for the stakes in context of enormous incentives and prospects of prosperity. However, in the mid of Post-Stalinism, this expected scenario started to shadowed and then diminished by the stagnation in functioning. All this had changed by mid-sixties when socio-economic structure had to face enormous nasty problems. Gradually it had become more stagnant and oppressive. This economic crisis was more serious because it was outcome of out mooted technological and mechanical system. Soviet authorities miserably failed to capitalize the industry base infrastructure, developed under Stalin. Instead of further reforming the system and sensing the impulse of change by substituting it with more innovative and cost-efficient technologies they struck to old forms of industrialization. The maximum utility from sources and to get advantage of advanced technology, was possible only when this technology must be related to civil sector of economic operation and secondly technological development pertaining to civil sector of economic operation be prioritized and diffused over the entire industrial landscape.^{xviii} But this could not happen in Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This deficiency was based on two points. This failure was partly caused by the deficient system of management, which could not insert the technological instrument over the entire Union of Soviet Socialist Republics due to the lack of administrative coordination. This fault was caused also by the lack of coordination between the applied science and technological institution. Technology institution and economic ministries did not found a balanced and proper relationship to innovate and launch the required machines, technology and other instruments.^{xix} This gap between old mechanical setup and rapidly changing requirements continued to increase since the death of Stalin and up to the ending period of Brezhnev. The whole industry was operated with aged machine stocks of Stalin's era. These machine and technology was modern at the time of Stalin and had done a well job but with the passage of time central government could not revert towards the inevitable swift modifications.

The *second* most important reason behind the stagnation and backwardness in social sector economy was due to over emphasis on the development in the military industrial complex. The

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics's biggest customer for its manufacturing was this military industrial complex. Central government of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had deployed the intelligent minds and skillful technocrats in the progress of this military complex and heavy industries to the detriment of production for civil sector. Due to the soaring expenses of military space and missile program, military expenditure had risen up to more than 30 percent. This one sided emphasis had disastrous implication for the already stagnated economic sector.^{xx} Rate of investment in social sector of economy started to decrease. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics did not have enough resources to invest in the entire economic sector. In this strict situation Soviet government had to make tough decision on the allocation of capital, resources, raw material, labor force and technical expertise force.^{xxi} The sole loser of all such policies was Soviet consumer. Consumerist culture in Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was accustomed to steady improvements and living standards were rising slowly. But due to the administrative policies of ruling elite of military priority caused decline in economic growth in civil sector.^{xxii} The more soviet authorities concentrated on the progress and development in military industrial complex and heavy industries, the greater disastrous consequences these efforts entailed for economy. These growing contradictions and complexities became more intense towards the end of Brezhnev era and released in to institutional inertia. This situation had a demoralizing impact on soviet working class.

Effects on Soviet Society

Stagnation and then decline led to the creation of pessimism among masses. Particularly working class lost its vigor and solidarity due to this pessimism. They were being given goals which seemed irrelevant to their prosperity and far from their well beings. Cynicism, pessimism, and alcoholism were the ills that plagued the Soviet society at the end of eighties. The process of Brezhnev regime contributed towards the proliferation of corruption from top to bottom of functionaries. Social mechanism of economic progress was malfunctioned and did not ensure satisfactory results. A tendency of decline in the rate of growth of national income began to make itself phenomenally felt in the economy of U.S.S.R. Central planners could not realize the need for the sufficiently effective use of the labor and intellectual resources of multi-layered society of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Consequences of widespread skepticism about the efficiency of belief, economic performance and stagnation were potentially serious.

In fact, it was over centralization which eventually led to the collapse of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Due to the orders from above, real assessment of ground situation could not have made possible. Differences in ground reality and bird's eye view of high officials often resulted into sheer contradiction. Soviet macro planning was detached from the realities of grass root level of economic requirements. This defect produced poor standard of commodities.^{xxiii} While referring the deficiencies of central planning, *Ahmad Bashir* points to this important aspect that there was a necessary market of electric fans in warm lands of Uzbekistan but there had always been a shortage of fans on account of the deficient planning in Moscow where the planners preoccupied by the severe cold weather conditions. Thus Moscow failed to recognize the severity of summer in Uzbekistan.^{xxiv} The malfunctioning and deficiency of bureaucracy diminished economic system and caused delay in unusual completion of project. Some projects took fifteen years to get completion. Once a car manufacturing plant was imported from Italy in 1960 but when it was operationalized there remained no demand of these cars because of innovations in manufacturing technologies.^{xxv} Center was so much overburdened due to the stress of every decision that it started to proceed inefficiently in almost every matter. Above mentioned example is mere manifestation

of failing of central making policies and their reasons of failure lies only in the centrally controlled decision making process.

Deficiencies and stagnation within the functioning of bureaucracy during the last period of Brezhnev became more explicit even more than that of past years of Stalin thus created frustrated and resentment amongst an entire generation. This situation warranted urgent reforms and overhauling of all bureaucratic setup but every reform effort was sacrificed at the altar of bureaucratic expediencies. This system proved to be an impediment in the process of reform.^{xxvi}

Emergence of Black Market

Emergence of black market and underground operations of second economy were also important features of the failure of central planning. State centrally controlled economy barely catered to consumer's demands. Due to short sightedness of Kremlin, multiple and plural demands of consumerism could not be fulfilled. This non-fulfillment resulted into growing volume of surplus commodities which failed to create their demands as the later preferred diversification for their satisfaction. They wanted to have more capacity for the usage of money. But central government could not create diversity in consumerist market. This failure had stimulated the inevitable and informal black market. This black market constituted an almost 30 percent of total gross domestic product of Union.^{xxvii} Another reason behind the operations of this second economy was artificially determined prices of commodities. Determined by central authorities, prices did not reflect the actual cost of production therefore due to the absence of real price, planners usually ended up in investing in those sector of production which yielded low rate of return instead of making investment in those sector which offered prospects of high economic surplus. Tariq Ali, an acclaimed leftist intellectual, opines that another part of crisis associated with commanded planning was the measurement of enterprise performance in quantitative terms and achievement of material output within a narrow time period^{xxviii}. This method of production left no room for innovation in technological advancement to increase the quality of products along with quantity. This centrally controlled planning method as a technical economic mechanism for total management was far from perfect.

Russia was the second biggest exporter of agricultural produce but within seventy years of socialist domination it lost its position and descended to the 7th position. Paul Kennedy considered socialist collectivized methods as a sole reason for this decline.^{xxix} Agricultural sector was running very inefficiently and became victim of so many complexities. According to Paul Kennedy every problem and complexity concerned with agricultural sector was only due to the wrong policies of central authorities.^{xxx} Central policy makers could not realize the ground requirement for the maintenance of agricultural sector. Their main focus remained heavy industry. For more than 50 years their policy was based on the accumulation of capital obtained from the sources of agricultural sector, and investment of this capital in industrial and manufacturing sector. This policy resulted into chronic syndrome of slowdown in agricultural sector.^{xxxi}

Collectivization plan had smashed the individual motives of farmers. Enormous subsidies indeed played a role to bring down the prices in favor of farmers but disruption in demand and supply deteriorated the agricultural sector. Instead of farmers it was managers who used to decide that what should be produced and where should be produced etc. State bureaucracy could not understand that farmers had better and experienced know how about their field.^{xxxii} These state appointed managers had resorted toward rank experimentation in order to accrue gain maximum products from agriculture but all these efforts proved exercise in futility as these were outcome of bureaucratic initiatives. Inappropriate transportation network also precipitated food crisis. Food stock used to be spoiled due to the lack of proper transportation.^{xxxiii} Centralized administrative

system of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that was established by Stalin had its roots in agrarian cosmetics of Russia. But with the passage of time Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had gradually evolved into a new industrialized society. On account of these drastic changes, monolithic setup confronted new challenges and necessitated thorough changes to make it compatible with demands of industrialized society.^{xxxiv} The new industrialized Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was characterized with rapid urbanization, emergence of broad based middle class and world largest proletariat class which deeply resented with increasingly bureaucratic control and aspired for greater role in post-Stalinist Union of Soviet Socialist Republics polity and economy but repeatedly denied under this monolithic dispensation. Consequently, the gap between society and over centralized state kept widening. This grim situation required changes to alter the pattern of economic management and functioning of polity.^{xxxv} Even by that time Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was not confronted with the crisis of federalism it was only the crisis of effective governance. The newly emergent challenges required more innovative and pluralistic solutions but these could not be arrived at in the presence of monolithic structure. This made state incapable responding this crisis. Therefore, the utter neglect of the state authorities could wide spread resentment in the soviet society which was manifest in the rise of secessionist forces.

Conclusion

The collapse of the Soviet Union was not a sudden or isolated event but the culmination of long-term structural contradictions within its political and administrative system. The centralized model of governance that had initially ensured political stability and rapid industrial development gradually became a source of institutional rigidity, economic stagnation, and political alienation. Over time, the widening gap between the state and society reduced the system's capacity to adapt to new economic realities, social expectations, and global political changes. This paper has argued that the structural foundations of the Soviet monolithic state had begun to weaken long before the accession of Mikhail Gorbachev. His reforms did not create the crisis; rather, they exposed and accelerated the institutional failures that had accumulated over decades of centralized rule. The experience of the Soviet Union demonstrates that political systems lacking institutional flexibility and mechanisms for peaceful adaptation become increasingly vulnerable to systemic collapse. The disintegration of the USSR therefore represented the failure of an inflexible state structure to respond effectively to historical change, making the collapse of the Soviet monolith the product of long-term structural evolution rather than a single political decision.

References

- ⁱ Michael Dobbs, *Down With Big Brother* (New York, 1995), 183.
- ⁱⁱ Hedrick Smith, *The New Russians* (New York, 1991), 15.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Seweryn Bialer *The Soviet Paradox* (New York, 1989), 138.
- ^{iv} Darred P. Hammer, *U.S.S.R: The Politics Of Oligarchy* (London, 1986), 2.
- ^v Philip Longworth, *Russia's Empires: The Rise And Fall Of The Russian Empires From Prehistory To Putin* (London, 2005), 282.
- ^{vi} Seweryn Bialer *The Soviet Paradox* (New York, 1989), 137. 138.
- ^{vii} Moshe Lewin, *Russia U.S.S.R. Russia : Drive And Drift Within An Empire* (New York, 1995), 91. 92.
- ^{viii} *Ibid.*,
- ^{ix} Moshe Lewin, *Russia. U.S.S.R. Russia: Drive And Drift Within An Empire* (New York. 1995), 73. 74.
- ^x *Ibid.*,
- ^{xi} Seweryn Bialer *The Soviet Paradox* (New York, 1989), 9.
- ^{xii} *Ibid.*,
- ^{xiii} *Ibid.*, 16. 17.

-
- xiv Farooq Slahria, *Socialism se mukalma* (Lahore, 2005), 84.85.
- xv Ibid., 43.
- xvi Gerhard Simon, *The End Of The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics* (Zurich, 1996), 66.
- xvii Ibid.,
- xviii Seweryn Bialer *The Soviet Paradox* (New York, 1989), 60.
- xix Ibid., 61.
- xx Alec Nove, *An Economic History of U.S.S.R* (London, 1984), 386.
- xxi David Mackenzie, *History of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics* (California, 1991), 437.
- xxii Ibid.,
- xxiii Seweryn Bialer *The Soviet Paradox* (New York, 1989), 60.
- xxiv Ahmed Bashir, *Monthly Naya Zamana*, (Lahore, July), 11.
- xxv Farooq Slahria, *Socialism se mukalma* (Lahore, 2005), 84.
- xxvi Seweryn Bialer *The Soviet Paradox* (New York, 1989), 74.
- xxvii David Mackenzie, *History of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics* (California, 1991), 475.
- xxviii Tariq Ali, *Revolution From Above* (London, 1989), 70.71.
- xxix Paul Kennedy *Rise and fall of great powers* (Islamabad, 2002), 331.
- xxx Ibid.,
- xxxi Alec Nove, *An Economic History of U.S.S.R* (London, 1984), 371.
- xxxii Paul Kennedy, *Preparation For Twenty First Century* (Islamabad, 2002), 233.
- xxxiii Tanveer Qaiser Shahid, *Quami Digest*, (Lahore, 1992), 99.100.
- xxxiv Moshe Lewin, *Russia U.S.S.R. Russia: Drive and drift within an empire* (New York, 1995), 93.
- xxxv Ibid., 74.