Russia & The Soviet Union III of IV Dr. Lawrence Davis

Post-1917 28 April 2025

Плачу на техно(кратии)

When Joseph Stalin died, so did the Soviet Union and the socialistic corpse it occupied. What began as a Marxist revolutionary project devolved into utter totalitarian rule and terror. His policies were not solely based on control, with measures like state-run healthcare, childcare, and education key tenets in enforcing the state's—and the father's—image. His successors were asked to perform nearly impossible tasks: the rehabilitation of a state built upon complete submission to the Party; one so far removed from the ideals that had borne it that the very people it once claimed to uplift were now bound to it by fear, surveillance, and force. The machinery of the revolution had long since rusted into a regime of preservation—preservation of power, not principle. Two leaders—Nikita Khrushchev and Leonid Brezhnev—headed this effort in a post-WWII world.

> *his broad face, his double chins, his enormous bald head, his large turned-up nose, and protruding ears could belong to any peasant from a central Russian village. . . . a thoroughly political man who had gone through fire and water and was capable of making the most abrupt changes.*
>
> *–One of Khrushchev's Personal Secretaries (Thompson 260)*

When Nikita Khrushchev assumed leadership of the Union in 1953, the mastermind of the totalitarian regime was gone, but the machinations of it were not. The mechanisms of centralized control, repression, and surveillance remained as alive as ever. While, in his famous "Secret

Speech" at the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956, he denounced Stalin's cult of personality and the atrocities committed during the Great Purge (Thompson 266–269; *The Khrushchev Era.ppt*, Slides 2, 7, 8), Khrushchev quickly found—or perhaps always knew—that the state he inherited could not be feasibly reformed. In this sense, Khrushchev's era mirrored, in a lesser but apparent way, the contradictions of Stalinist rule: promises of reform—or revolutions—from above, but enacted within the suffocating boundaries of the very political system they purported to transform.

Despite his rhetorical break from Stalinism, Khrushchev's de-Stalinization campaign was notably limited and carefully avoided anything that would threaten the Party's grip on power. Millions of those imprisoned under Stalin's purges were released from the Gulag system, censorship was modestly relaxed, and a cautious revival of cultural expression began (*The Khrushchev Era.ppt*, Slide 16; Thompson 270). In contrast to Stalin's rule of secrecy and terror, Khrushchev adopted a far more visible and personal leadership style, frequently traveling across the Soviet Union and abroad, presenting himself with an open, if at times crude, demeanor (*The Khrushchev Era.ppt*, Slides 13, 16). His physical appearance and informal mannerisms—his broad face, turned-up nose, and rough peasant speech—symbolized a deliberate break from Stalinist formality (Thompson 266).

Like Lenin, Khrushchev stressed persuasion over coercion. In contrast to Stalin's sporadic and secretive rule, Party Congresses resumed regular meetings, reestablishing a practice of more collective governance that had been abandoned during the height of Stalin's terror (*The Khrushchev Era.ppt*, Slide 16, 18). This emphasis on persuasion and public engagement rather than pure fear characterized not only Khrushchev's domestic politics but also became a defining

style of leadership recognizable in broader historical patterns. Leaders such as Ronald Reagan, Richard Nixon, and John F. Kennedy—or even today's Donald J. Trump—though emerging from vastly different ideological contexts, reflect this Leninist ideal of direct persuasion, personal connection, and continuous mass engagement over purely technocratic rule. However, as Riasanovsky notes, while Khrushchev's reforms altered the tone of Soviet governance, they never challenged the fundamental structures of Party domination, and political pluralism remained unthinkable (Riasanovsky 576).

This new song and dance came from the same old instruments, becoming clear in his economic and foreign policy changes. His attempt to decentralize industrial management through the creation of the regional economic councils (sovnarkhozy) fragmented administrative authority but bore little to no effective improvements, fostering bureaucratic complacency (Thompson 278; *The Khrushchev Era.ppt*, Slide 11), a recurring theme–superficial reform without systemic transformation would recur as a hallmark of the Soviet state's gradual decay and remains a cautionary feature of bureaucratic governance even today. Agricultural initiatives such as the Virgin Lands Campaign initially bolstered outputs but quickly faltered due to environmental mismanagement and unrealistic logistical expectations (Thompson 277-278; *The Khrushchev Era.ppt*, Slide 22, 23). Beginning with his public espousal of achieving true communism within a generation, Khrushchev's economic efforts consistently fell short, delivering only temporary gains in quality of life and failing to provide sustainable, long-term development beyond traditional profit-driven incentives. This inability to realize the promised economic transformation led to a steady erosion of his credibility among Party officials, ordinary citizens, and ultimately the ideological cause to which the Soviet state still publicly espoused.

Khrushchev's failures were not confined to the domestic sphere. Abroad, his leadership exposed the Soviet Union's rotted state, where promises of reform slowly dissolved under the pressure of revolt and rivalry. The first and clearest example came from the Hungarian Revolution of 1956. Despite initial signs of liberalization, when Hungarian leaders demanded independence from the Soviets, Krushchev retorted with an overwhelming military response– sending tanks into Budapest to crush the uprising and reaffirm the Kremlin's dominance in Eastern Europe (Thompson 276; *The Krushchev Era.ppt*, Slides 13, 19). The brutal suppression revealed that while the rhetoric of de-Stalinization had changed, it was only removed of Stalin in its figurehead; the underlying methods of Stalinist control remained–obedience, control, and fear–remained fully intact.

International humiliation followed six years later with the Cuban Missile Crisis. In the heat of the Cold War, Khrushchev authorized the secret deployment of nuclear missiles to their comrades in Cuba (Thompson 277; *The Khrushchev Era.ppt, Slide 21).* Other than the near-Soviet nuking of China's capital due to the Sino-Soviet split's ideological debates, this was one of the closest the world had ever gotten to all-out mutually assured destruction. While the US publicly won the stand-off, they did silently remove their nuclear arms from Turkey, but this did not matter. The resulting metaphorical bending of the knee to US dominance was a humiliation on the global stage that elevated Khrushchev to an unserious failure to the West and a traitor to the East, betraying the eternal revolutionary struggle of the proletariat against the capitalists.

By 1964, fervor for the jolly Russian had waned among the Party's upper ranks. His erratic policies, administrative reorganizations, economic disappointments, and foreign policy blunders combined to portray a leader increasingly out of touch with the system's real limits—or

necessities. In October 1964, he was quietly forced to resign, citing “health reasons,” but it was widely understood to be a response to his failures. Unlike the violent purges, terror, and arrests that had defined the Stalinist era, Khrushchev’s fall from power occurred without bloodshed. It marked the first peaceful and bureaucratic transfer of established power in Soviet history—a quiet ouster orchestrated by Party elites, signaling a return to collective leadership and a reversal of the tentative political openness that had briefly emerged (Thompson 279-281; *The Khrushchev Era.ppt*, Slide 22, 24).

Khrushchev retired to a state-provided apartment and pension—a modest fate that stood in sharp contrast to earlier send-offs, such as Leon Trotsky’s assassination in exile by NKVD agents two decades earlier (*The Khrushchev Era.ppt*, Slide 23). The material conditions of the Union now demanded something very different from any era before: not a reformer, not a revolutionary, but a stabilizer—someone who would promise neither upheaval nor transformation, but order. That man was Leonid Brezhnev.

New management offered no new direction. With Brezhnev’s rise, the Soviet Union shifted from uneasy reform to rigid preservation, carrying the quiet expectation that change would cease. Leonid Brezhnev, who rose to power in 1964, was not a visionary but a manager; a man selected not for innovation, but for predictability. His ascent reflected the Party’s desire to halt the reform distributions and reinforce collective control (Thompson 280). What followed was the Era of Stagnation, a period not of crisis or collapse, but of slow decay. Economically, state planning grew increasingly inert. Productivity lagged, innovation faltered, and instead of reforming, Brezhnev's administration doubled down—propping up heavy industry, expanding

subsidies, and fueling military budgets that strained the system further (Thompson 280–283; *Brezhnev in Power.ppt*, Slides 5, 7).

This strain locked the Soviet Union into a trajectory of terminal stagnation. His regime expanded social welfare programs and guaranteed employment, but without any corresponding increases in productivity or efficiency. The central planning system grew increasingly hardened; innovation stalling as bureaucratic quota fulfillment took precedence over technological advancement (Thompson 280-281, 291; *Brezhnev in Power.ppt* Slide 5, 7). What few technological advancements that came of the era came from the ideological and proxy battles with the capitalists in the West. Defense, space, and nuclear programs consumed nearly 30 to 40 percent of Gross National Product (*Brezhnev in Power.ppt,* Slide 9). Truthfully, the only thing that consistently rose during Brezhnev's reign was the rockets–both lunar and military–and the public's growing awareness of the system's deepening rot.

Despite the regime's outward stability, daily life in the Soviet Union under Brezhnev grew increasingly strained. Consumer goods were often scare, housing remained overcrowded, and the quality of services deteriorated even as state propaganda insisted otherwise (Thompson 287-290; *Brezhnev in Power.ppt,* Slide 14) The contrast between official media and the lived reality became increasingly obvious to a generation that was not only more educated than its predecessors, but also increasingly removed from the Stalin era. Some had even experienced the fleeting openness of Khrushchev's thaw–a period that, however brief, had raised expectations for reform and truth (Riasanovsky 606-614). The seeming passover of this promise fostered a sense of betrayal from a party that was already seen as imperfect and always fighting off deterioration. The return of censorship, bureaucratic rot, and ideological policing didn't just suppress dissent–it

came with an admission that the state no longer believed in its own future (*Brezhnev in Power.ppt*, Slide 15).

In the end, the Soviet Union did not fall to invasion or insurrection, but to a deeper collapse of belief (Thompson 291). What had begun as a revolutionary project to liberate humanity calcified into a bureaucracy whose only remaining goal was its own preservation. Khrushchev's attempts at revival—both genuine and limited—failed to restructure a system that was built for control, not renewal. Brezhnev's regime embalmed that corpse, offering stability in exchange for decay, predictability in exchange for progress. As daily life worsened, citizens no longer expected reform; they adjusted to shortages, to censorship, to corruption. Cultural expressions like the emerging Soviet disco scenes and the Berlin underground did not openly challenge the state—they existed in spite of it, offering fleeting private freedoms while public life remained stagnant. It is here, in the quiet adaptation to decline, that the most striking parallels to contemporary Western societies emerge: movements fueled less by utopian demands than by a growing recognition that the structures surrounding them are hollow. Like the Soviet citizens of Brezhnev's era, many today are not preparing for revolution; they are simply withdrawing their faith. The dissident movement was not the beginning of a new world—it was a mirror held up to a dying one.

Works Cited

Rjazanovskij, Nikolaj V., and Mark D. Steinberg. *A history of Russia*. Oxford University Press, 2011.

Thompson, John M. *Russia and the Soviet Union: A Historical Introduction from the Kievan State to the Present*. Westview Press, A Member of the Perseus Books Group, 2013.

Davis, Lawrence H. *The Khrushchev Era.ppt.* North Shore Community College, PowerPoint Presentation, 2025.

Davis, Lawrence H. *Brezhnev in Power.ppt.* North Shore Community College, PowerPoint Presentation, 2025.