

УДК 94(47):(4)

**GLASNOST, PERESTROIKA AND THE PEACE DIVIDEND:
THE GREAT THAW AND ITS LONG SHADOW OVER EUROPE IN 2026**

Christensen C.S.

Mikhail Gorbachev's reforms of Glasnost and Perestroika in the 1980s significantly contributed to the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, but they were not the sole causes. While these reforms aimed to revitalize the Soviet system, they exposed underlying economic weaknesses and fuelled nationalist movements, ultimately leading to the collapse of the Communist Party's control. The end of the Cold War was influenced by a combination of Gorbachev's policies, external pressures from the West, and the actions of Eastern European populations. In this paper, the author focuses on the effects of Glasnost and Perestroika in the USSR, but also on the aftereffects today in Europe and the rest of the world. Was the disintegration of the Soviet Union a good idea? And, furthermore, this paper examines how Glasnost functioned as an unintentional engine of Soviet disintegration. At last, we would assess how this disintegration, Perestroika and Glasnost maybe caused the instable political system in Europe in 2026, and the West's less-than-flattering role.

Keywords: Mikhail Gorbachev, USSR, Glasnost, Perestroika, Communist Party, Cold War, democratic reforms, Eastern Europe, fall of the Berlin Wall, collapse of Communism, Warsaw Pact, NATO, Ronald Reagan, Russia, USA, Baltic States.

**ГЛАСНОСТЬ, ПЕРЕСТРОЙКА И ДИВИДЕНДЫ МИРА:
ВЕЛИКАЯ ОТТЕПЕЛЬ И ЕЕ ВЛИЯНИЕ НА ЕВРОПУ В 2026 Г.**

Христенсен К.С.

Гласность и перестройка – реформы, проведенные Михаилом Горбачевым в 1980-х гг., в значительной степени способствовали распаду Советского Союза и окончанию холодной войны, но не были единственными причинами данных событий. Хотя эти реформы были направлены на оживление советской системы, они обнажили глубинные экономические проблемы и подстегнули

националистические движения, что в конечном итоге привело к утрате контроля со стороны Коммунистической партии. На окончание холодной войны повлияла совокупность таких факторов, как политика Горбачева, внешнее давление со стороны Запада и действия населения стран Восточной Европы. В этой статье автор сосредоточился на последствиях гласности и перестройки для СССР, а также на их влиянии на современную Европу и остальной мир. Был ли распад Советского Союза хорошей идеей? Кроме того, в данной статье рассмотрено, как гласность непреднамеренно способствовала распаду Советского Союза. Наконец, сделана попытка понять, как этот распад, перестройка и гласность могли привести к нестабильности политической системы в Европе в 2026 г., и какую не самую лучшую роль сыграл в этом Запад.

Ключевые слова: Михаил Горбачев, СССР, гласность, перестройка, Коммунистическая партия, холодная война, демократические реформы, Восточная Европа, падение Берлинской стены, крах коммунизма, Варшавский договор, НАТО, Рональд Рейган, Россия, США, страны Балтии.

Introduction: the reformer's dilemma

In December 1991, when the Soviet flag was lowered over the Kremlin Castle for the final time, the Soviet Union dissolved not with the bang of military defeat or the whimper of economic collapse alone, but through a process of internal fragmentation that Mikhail Gorbachev himself had inadvertently accelerated. The General Secretary, who had sought to revitalize socialism through *Glasnost* (openness) and *Perestroika* (restructuring), instead presided over the disintegration of the world's largest territorial state collapse driven not by external aggression but by the very forces of nationalist awakening his reforms unleashed. Especially Mikhail Gorbachev's tragedy and a little of the Soviet Union's, lay in a fundamental miscalculation: the belief that controlled liberalization could strengthen the system by exposing its pathologies for correction. Instead, Glasnost became what historian Mark Kramer has described as a Pandora's Box, releasing centrifugal forces that Moscow could neither contain nor control. The policy of openness, intended to

generate popular support for reform, instead fatally undermined support for the Communist Party and cultivated distrust and disbelief towards the Soviet government [4, s. 25-27; 10, p. 49].

This article examines how Glasnost functioned as an unintentional engine of Soviet disintegration. While the reform was not the sole cause of the USSR's collapse deep structural economic dysfunction, the burdens of the Cold War, and a legitimacy crisis all played crucial roles Glasnost acted as the critical catalyst that transformed latent grievances into organized independence movements. The policy fundamentally destabilized the Soviet centre-periphery relationship, empowered ethnic minorities to articulate long-suppressed demands, and provided the political space for nationalist movements to mobilize mass support. We will explore four interconnected dimensions of this process. First, Glasnost weakened the ideological and institutional ties between Moscow and the peripheral republics, accelerating the USSR's dissolution. Second, ethnic groups like the Crimean Tatars gained unprecedented self-awareness and organizational capacity to pursue separatist goals. Third, the Baltic states mobilized for independence under the protective umbrella of openness, culminating in the spectacular Baltic Way demonstration of 1989. Fourth, conflicts in the Caucasus intensified as Glasnost allowed suppressed ethnic tensions to resurface with devastating consequences. The argument advanced here is not that Glasnost caused the Soviet collapse in any deterministic sense. Rather, the policy created conditions under which the Soviet Union's multiple contradictions national, ideological, political, and economic could interact and amplify one another in a cascade of unintended consequences. Mikhail Gorbachev, a sincere communist seeking to reform the system, instead was to create his own opposition and inadvertently gave in to popular pressures in the periphery [11, p. 16; 7, s. 24-27; 10, p. 50].

Chapter I: Weakening the centre, the unravelling of Soviet authority

The ideological earthquake

When Gorbachev introduced Glasnost in 1986 he imagined a carefully managed transparency that would expose the abuses of the Stalin era while

preserving the legitimacy of the Communist Party and the Soviet state. What transpired instead was an ideological earthquake that shattered the base of legitimacy of the Soviet Union and cultivated distrust and disbelief towards the Soviet government. The revelations under Glasnost proceeded with frightening rapidity. Initially focused on the aftereffects of Stalinism, the new transparency soon expanded to encompass criticism of Lenin himself, effectively indicting the whole Soviet system. As historian William Taubman observed, Moscow in the late 1980s was like a huge seminar in which everyone was doing the reading, as Soviet citizens devoured newspapers and magazines exposing the malignant behaviour of the state, including the mass execution of Polish officers, criminal treatment of civilians in Eastern Europe and wilful ignorance of the German threat [7, s. 72-75].

This exposure of former historical acting had profound political consequences. The Communist Party's foundational claim, that it represented the vanguard of historical progress and the legitimate heir to Russia's revolutionary tradition, was severely undermined. As international journal analysis notes, the base of legitimacy of the Soviet Union was greatly shattered by these revelations, while the myth of party infallibility was publicly and rudely broken. The regime's legitimacy crisis was compounded by the exposure of contemporary corruption and privilege. Glasnost brought to light the stark disparities between the lives of party officials and ordinary citizens, revealing that party officials could obtain supplies of foreign or other goods unavailable to the public and access to special hospitals. One woman from Kharkov articulated this alienation in a letter reflecting widespread sentiment: "Why is it that people in authority have everything, flats, dachas, and money, and others have nothing? ... I used to believe in our government. Now I no longer believe" [3, s. 112-114; 10, p. 51].

The institutional demolition

Beyond ideology, Glasnost undermined the institutional structures that had held the Soviet state together. The 1989 elections to the new Congress of People's Deputies, while intended to demonstrate the regime's commitment to democratization, instead created a new, democratically elected group that Gorbachev

found he could not manage through the traditional mechanisms of Kremlin politics. The debates broadcast live on Soviet television spellbound the nation as deputies talked frankly about the problems facing Soviet society and openly mentioned previously forbidden facts about the past.

The political transformation strengthened decentralization and distanced the party apparatchiks, depriving Mikhail Gorbachev of a power base to support his reforms while simultaneously encouraging nationalist and independence movements inside and outside the USSR. In effect, Glasnost created new political actors and arenas that operated beyond the control of the Communist Party apparatus, while simultaneously alienating the party loyalists who might have defended the system. The relationship between Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin, the rising populist leader, exemplified this dynamic. Yeltsin's popularity derived in part from his willingness to operate within the new public sphere that Glasnost had created. As Taubman describes it, their conflict was a terrific Shakespearean conflict in which two men who should have been allies became enemies to each other. Yeltsin's position as the democratically elected leader of the Russian Republic gave him a legitimacy that Gorbachev, still operating within the discredited structures of the Communist Party, could not match [11, s. 36-38].

The nationalist surge

The most devastating consequence of Glasnost was its impact on the Soviet Union's nationalities. As academic analysis has shown, nationalism had always existed within the Soviet Union, but it had been suppressed and well concealed by previous rulers. The dual national strategy of the Soviet state, which combined recognition of national cultures with political control, worked relatively well to contain serious centrifugal nationalism if the whole Soviet political system remained under control. Glasnost fundamentally altered this equilibrium. The liberalized environment encouraged ethnic groups to air long-standing grievances and transformed nationalist feelings into organized nationalist forces. A proliferation of nationalist informal groups emerged under Glasnost and eventually coalesced into popular fronts in their respective republics, providing the organizational infrastructure

for mass mobilization. The scale and speed of this nationalist awakening took both the Soviet leadership and outside observers by surprise. As one analysis notes, by late 1990 all 15 republics had declared its sovereignty, a transformation from a situation in 1985 in which no crisis of nationalism threatened the Soviet peace. While the press remained under tight control on nationalist issues until 1988, by the fall of that year the dam had broken. The liberalized environment allowed nationalism to culminate and grow in the republics in ways that Gorbachev could not have anticipated and could not control [3, s. 360-362].

Chapter II: The Crimean Tatars: a people's internal dilemmas

Glasnost as liberation

Glasnost transformed the Tatars' situation from difficult to unorganized activism. In July 1987, in a watershed moment, the official Soviet news agency TASS declared that Stalin's wholesale eviction of the Crimean Tatars was not just. This statement represented more than historical revision; it provided official sanction for the Tatars' long quest for justice and their rights as a nation. The TASS statement, however, coupled recognition with caution. It warned that a wholesale return to Crimea might be difficult because the situation in Crimea is now totally different from the one before the war, with 2.5 million people of various nationalities now residing there. Authorities urged the Tatars to proceed calmly, with a sense of responsibility and balance, warning that all attempts to fan up passions, a desire to create a conflict situation can only impede the matter at hand. Despite these cautions, the 1987 TASS statement signalled a victory for Tatar activism and demonstrated the new possibilities created by Glasnost. The official acknowledgment of historical injustice legitimized demands that had long been suppressed, while the media attention generated by Tatar demonstrations, including an unprecedented 24-hour vigil at the edge of Red Square, forced the issue into public consciousness [1; 3, s. 9-11; 12].

The limits of openness

Yet the Tatar experience also revealed the limits of Glasnost. By July 1987, as Tatar protests intensified, Soviet authorities began taking steps to stifle renewed

public protests and appeared to have reached the limits of their tolerance. The regime's ambivalence was also evident in its response to Tatar declarations of sovereignty. In June 1991 a Declaration of National Sovereignty was also adopted by the protesting Crimean Tatars alongside the more formal declarations of the Crimean ASSR itself, creating a situation in which the peninsula was almost simultaneously claimed by three sides – the Crimean parliament, the Tatars and Ukraine. The declaration was supposed to serve as a legal basis for drawing up the Republic's Constitution, yet it also stated that Crimea was a legal democratic state within Ukraine, indicating the tensions between autonomy aspirations and the existing territorial framework. The Tatar case illustrates both the opportunities and the contradictions Glasnost created for ethnic minorities. On one hand, openness allowed them to articulate grievances, organize politically, and gain official recognition of historical injustices. On the other hand, the regime continued to police the boundaries of acceptable activism, warning against extremists and ultimately failing to resolve the fundamental question of territorial restitution. The Tatars' experience foreshadowed the more extensive nationalist mobilizations that would emerge elsewhere in the Soviet periphery [4, s. 180; 5, p. 172; 6; 12].

Chapter III: The Baltic Way and nationalism

The awakening of Baltic nationalism

The Baltic republics Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania represented perhaps the most vivid case of Glasnost's nationalist consequences. By the mid-1980s there had been small pockets of dissent across the three Baltic republics, but the feeling among the Soviet elite was that nationalism was largely (although perhaps not totally) under control. The National awakening that developed after 1985 took everyone by surprise, but reality is that 41 years later they have not found their own national identity yet. Glasnost provided the freedom, opportunities, and impetus needed Baltic nationalism to thrive once more. The Popular Fronts that emerged in each republic: Estonia's "Rahvarinne", Latvia's "Tautas Fronte" and Lithuania's "Sąjūdis" became mass movements capable of genuine political mobilization. Significantly, these movements initially backed by Gorbachev soon spearheaded a nationalist revival,

demonstrating how the regime's own reforms could be appropriated for anti-regime purposes [q.v.: 13; 14].

The Baltic national awakening rested on historical foundations that Glasnost made politically actionable. The Baltic States had maintained independent statehood between the world wars before being incorporated into the Soviet Union following the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939, whose secret protocols the Soviet Union had long denied existed. Baltic nationalists used the former historical events by the Soviet Union to gain support, also using the newly exposed Nazi Germany-Soviet non-aggression pact to question the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States. Thatching exposure of the secret protocols served to undermine Soviet claims that there were no occupations, and that Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania had all voluntarily sought to join the Soviet Union [q.v.: 13; 14].

The Baltic Way

The culmination of this nationalist awakening was the Baltic Way demonstration of August 23, 1989, the 50th anniversary of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. On that day, approximately two million people about a quarter of the Baltic population formed a more than 670-kilometer human chain across Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, linking the capitals Tallinn, Riga and Vilnius. The logistics of the operation were extraordinary. Organized in less than six weeks by the Popular Fronts, the demonstration required coordinating 50 sections along the route, with local councils managing the transport of people to their designated positions. The short preparation period was strategic: It left little time for the inert Soviet bureaucracy to respond, and indeed, there were no serious attempts by the local or Moscow authorities to stop the action. In a striking indication of the regime's paralysis, the Lithuanian communist authorities silently condoned the Baltic Way by refraining from interference, and even the Lithuanian radio, formally still under the authority of the Communist Party, played a crucial role in coordinating the action [q.v.: 13].

The timing of the demonstration was equally significant. Just days before, an extensive interview was published in "Pravda" newspaper, in which Alexander Yakovlev, the Soviet official chairing the commission investigating the Molotov-

Ribbentrop Pact, admitted that the secret protocols were real. This admission forced Moscow to drop its firm long-standing position that the pact's secret protocols did not exist or were forgeries, effectively validating the Baltic argument that their incorporation into the Soviet Union had been illegitimate [3, s. 412-414].

Consequences and legacies

The Baltic Way had profound consequences. It demonstrated to the world the depth and breadth of opposition to Soviet rule in the Baltic States, and it created a powerful sense of Baltic solidarity that transcended national boundaries. As one historian notes, there was organic communication among the Baltic movements from the very beginning once they decided to seek independence from the USSR, and the Baltic Way represented the culmination of this inter-republican cooperation. Politically, the demonstration accelerated the Baltic republics' trajectory toward independence. Estonia had declared sovereignty in November 1988, Lithuania in May 1989, and Latvia in July 1989 all before the Baltic Way. But the demonstration verified that these declarations had mass popular support and international legitimacy. As one participant recalled, what was needed was a unique action to shake the world, and the Baltic Way certainly achieved that goal. The Baltic experience also established the template for nationalist mobilization elsewhere in the Soviet Union. It showed that mass nonviolent resistance could challenge Soviet authority with relative impunity, and it demonstrated the power of coordinated action across republics. As one analysis concludes, the Baltic States were moving ever closer to the exit under the influence of Glasnost, and their success emboldened nationalist movements in other republics [6].

Chapter IV: The Caucasus – the resurgence of ancient hatreds

The unfreezing of frozen conflicts

Nowhere were the consequences of Glasnost more violent than in the Caucasus. As one analysis notes, Soviet authorities, using the threat of military reaction, had long controlled ethnic hatreds under the enforced "Friendship of peoples" policy used to pull diverse national groups together under the Soviet umbrella. But Glasnost unleashed still strong nationalist feelings, reviving the old

rivalries in one of history's most troubled regions. The underlying tensions in the Caucasus were both ancient and deep. The specific sources of tension that have brought the Soviet republics of Azerbaijan and Armenia close to civil war over the past two years are tangled in the complicated background of the Caucasus region, where control of that region, ancestral home of the Armenians, has been contested many times in the course of its history. The conflict combined nationalism, and linguistic and religious differences that go back to much of history. The Azerbaijan-Armenia dispute over Nagorno-Karabakh, a region surrounded by Muslim Azerbaijan but heavily populated by Christian Armenians, became the focal point of this resurgence. As one political scientist characterized it, the conflict was nothing less than the Soviet Union's version of the Lebanese conflict between Christians and Muslims, with each side regarding the other as a heretic who should be driven out [4, s. 175-178; 8, p. 267-268].

Glasnost and the Karabakh Crisis

Glasnost played a crucial role in bringing this conflict to the surface. In a November 1988 interview, Mikhail Gorbachev himself acknowledged the connection, stating that Perestroika and Glasnost had permitted the people to express their opinions on their well-being and on problems that have accumulated over the years. The ethnic unrest in the Caucasus was, from Gorbachev's perspective, a paradoxical expression of his reform policies: "You know, it's part of Perestroika ... Glasnost and Perestroika have permitted people to express their opinions on their well-being and on problems that have accumulated over the years. Armenian activists seized on the opportunities created by Glasnost to press their demands". In November 1988 Armenian legislators today rejected political changes sought by Gorbachev and demanded annexation of a part of Azerbaijan, with one activist stating that the deputies again demanded unification of Nagorno-Karabakh with Armenia and rejected the constitutional changes proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev. These actions represented a direct challenge to central authority, made possible by the political space Glasnost had opened [8, p. 274].

The failure of Soviet mediation

Gorbachev's attempts to mediate the conflict demonstrated the limits of Glasnost as a conflict resolution tool. In November 1988, Soviet leader said that leaders of the rival Armenian and Azerbaijani communities are being invited to Moscow for talks to calm ethnic unrest in the Caucasus. Yet his acknowledgment that the ethnic problem was an old problem that could only be resolved by cooperation did little to address the depth of the grievance. The Soviet parliament's decision in November 1988 to reaffirm Azerbaijan's control over the Nagorno-Karabakh region in a move strongly protested by Armenian delegates, demonstrated the regime's inability to satisfy either side. The decision followed months of rallies and strikes by the Azerbaijani Popular Front to force that republic's leadership to take a more aggressive posture, indicating how nationalist forces on all sides were able to mobilize under Glasnost. The CIA's analysis of the conflict, declassified in 1999, confirms the notion of "unrest" in the Caucasus that was already evident in 1988. The unrest had deep historical roots, but Glasnost made it politically explosive. As one scholar noted, greater freedom through glasses, the old restraints are off, is the best answer for why the conflicts have grown so out of proportion, so out of control. The Caucasus demonstrated that Glasnost could not only empower nationalist movements but also release destructive ethnic antagonisms that threatened the very fabric of the Soviet state [8, p. 276; 9].

Chapter V: Synthesis – the centrifugal logic of openness

The de-legitimization cascade

When considering the cumulative impact of Glasnost across the Soviet periphery, a pattern emerges that might be characterized as a de-legitimization cascades as a process in which revelations about the past, critiques of the present, and demands for the future interacted to undermine the authority of the centre.

First, Glasnost exposed the historical events of the Soviet regime, from Stalin's purges to the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact to the deportation of nationalities. These revelations greatly shattered the base of legitimacy of the Soviet Union and cultivated

distrust and disbelief towards the Soviet government. As one analyst puts it, the myth of party infallibility was publicly and rudely broken.

Second, Glasnost exposed contemporary corruption and privilege, revealing the vast disparities between party officials and ordinary citizens. This exposure discredited the upper layers of the government and the party and led to a widespread belief crisis in Soviet rule and underlined its fall.

Third, Glasnost created political space for opposition to organize and articulate alternative visions. The nationalist informal groups that emerged in the republics eventually merged into 'popular fronts' that could mobilize mass support. The Baltic Way demonstrated that nationalist movements could command the allegiance of millions of people and operate with relative impunity. These three processes, historical de-legitimization, contemporary de-legitimization and nationalist mobilization operated together in a mutually reinforcing dynamic. As historian Sam Leung notes, the exposure to the Soviet past cultivated distrust and disbelief towards the Soviet government while the liberalized environment allowed nationalism to culminate and grow in the republics. The cumulative effect was to pave the way for them to gain momentum to break out from the Union [11, s. 66].

The economics of fragmentation

The nationalist mobilizations facilitated by Glasnost interacted with the economic chaos of Perestroika to accelerate Soviet disintegration. As Gorbachev's reforms failed to produce economic improvement indeed, government spending soared leading to a massive deficit, inflation and food prices rose, and shortages of daily necessities became endemic the centre's authority diminished further. The material deprivation brought by perestroika further aggravated the distrust of Soviet citizens and made them more receptive to nationalist alternatives. The economic costs of nationalism also contributed to the Soviet collapse. Rail shipments into Armenia were crippled by the Azerbaijani Popular Front's actions during the Karabakh conflict. The disruption of economic ties between republics weakened the integrated Soviet economy, while nationalist policies threatened to dissolve economic interdependence altogether. By the early 1990s, Moscow's capacity to maintain

economic coherence across the vast Soviet territory was fatally compromised [4, s. 93-95].

The August coup and its consequences

The August 1991 coup attempt represented both the reaction against Glasnost and Perestroika and the moment of their ultimate triumph. The coup, led by hardliners who quickly grew wary of many of these changes, which weakened their own powerful positions and veered away from Communist orthodoxy, was an attempt to reverse the reforms and reassert central control. But the coup failed and further destabilized the Soviet system. In its aftermath, the power of the centre was fatally weakened, and the republics moved rapidly toward independence. The coup revealed the contradictions of Gorbachev's position. His reforms had alienated the hardliners who might have defended the system, while failing to satisfy the democrats who wanted more fundamental change. As one analyst notes, Gorbachev, to preserve his own power, had little alternative but to rely at least in part on existing Soviet structures, which prevented the evolution, which could have been critical for Russia's future. This balancing act left him with no stable base of support: the party apparatus distrusted him, the nationalist movements opposed him, and the Russian people had lost faith in the system he represented. By the end of 1991, the republics had all declared sovereignty, and the Soviet Union had effectively ceased to exist. By late 1990, all 15 republics had declared their sovereignty. The formal dissolution came in December, when the leaders of Russia, Ukraine and Belarus signed the Belovezh Accords, declaring the USSR dissolved and establishing the Commonwealth of Independent States. Gorbachev resigned on December 25, and the Soviet flag was lowered over the Kremlin for the last time [2].

The long shadow of Glasnost and Perestroika in 2026

In 2026, Europe finds itself in a precarious state, caught between the promises of the past and the hard realities of a new era of geopolitical competition. The visions of Perestroika and Glasnost, the hope that openness and restructuring would lead to a common European home, have been overshadowed by confrontation, rearmament and strategic confusion. The peace dividend has been absorbed by the costs of new

arms dynamic. The lessons of the Great Thaw of the late 1980s and the missed opportunities to build a true common European home, serve as a warning. The history of European security since 1989 is a history of missed opportunities, deepening divisions, and the steady erosion of cooperative institutions. In 2026, the question is not whether the post-Cold War order is over, but what will replace it. The current era demands a re-evaluation of the post-1989 settlement. Europe, in 2026, is still searching for a blueprint to prevent the next war, not just a military blueprint, but a political and diplomatic one. The spirit of Glasnost, openness, will require a new commitment to dialogue and mutual security. Perestroika, restructuring will require new institutions and a new architecture that can balance the legitimate security needs of all parties. The long shadow of Great Thaw is cast over a continent that has yet to fully learn its lessons. The hope for a Europe whole, free and at peace remains alive, but its realization is now more uncertain than at any time since the end of the Cold War. The path forward lies not in returning to the old divisions of NATO 1.0 or the complacency of NATO 2.0, but in building a NATO 3.0 that is truly European, truly secure, and truly able to build peace [2].

Conclusion: The ironies of reforms

The story of Glasnost is a story of ironies of reforms that undermined the system they were intended to save, of openness that exposed the regime's fundamental illegitimacy, of liberalization that unleashed forces beyond the system's control and of a sincere communist who inadvertently destroyed the communist project. The Soviet Union's collapse was over determined by multiple factors: economic decline, military overstretch, ideological exhaustion and systemic institutional rigidities. Gorbachev inherited a failing economy, ineffective governance, highly financed military and imperial overstretch. Structural conditions, including the inability to compete with the West's technological and economic dynamism, had long been eroding Soviet power. By 1985, only eight percent of Soviet industry was globally competitive, making it difficult for a country to remain a superpower when the world doesn't want 92 percent of what it produces. Yet the reforms of Glasnost and Perestroika played a crucial role in the timing and character

of the collapse. Unlike the dissolution of other multi-ethnic empires, the Soviet Union's disintegration was remarkably peaceful not because the reforms prevented violence (as the Caucasus demonstrated), but because the process of fragmentation was driven by political rather than military dynamics.

The Baltic Way, the popular fronts, and the declarations of sovereignty represented a political challenge that the Soviet state could not meet. The Soviet Union was not simply a territorial empire; it was also, and more importantly, an ideological project. Glasnost undermined the ideological foundations of the state by exposing the gap between Soviet rhetoric and Soviet reality. When the ideological legitimacy of the regime collapsed, the territorial integrity of the empire could not survive. As one analyst concludes, the impressive political transformation of the Gorbachev era encouraged nationalist and independence movements inside and outside the USSR by strengthening decentralization and distancing the party apparatchiks. The Soviet collapse thus reflects what political scientist Henry Hale called a centrifugal nationalism unleashed by the liberalized environment of Glasnost. The policy, as another analyst puts it, proved to be a license to grumble, and fatally undermined support for the Communist Party. By allowing criticism of the system, Glasnost created the conditions for the system's overthrow.

Glasnost was a policy of radical transparency that a closed system could not survive. The Soviet Union, like other authoritarian regimes, depended on control over information to maintain its power. When Gorbachev relaxed that control, he opened a floodgate that swept away the very structures he hoped to preserve. The centrifugal logic of openness that characterized Glasnost proved stronger than the centripetal forces of Soviet integration, and the USSR, like many empires before it, dissolved from within. The experience of the Soviet collapse offers sobering lessons for reformers in other authoritarian systems. Liberalization can destabilize rather than strengthen a regime, and openness can empower opposition forces that the regime cannot control. Gorbachev's tragedy was to believe that controlled liberalization was possible, that one could open the windows without letting the house collapse. The Soviet Union's fate suggests that such a belief is, at best, a gamble with the highest

possible stakes. So, viewed in the harsh light of hindsight, perhaps the Western world should not have pushed quite so hard, especially given that, by 2026, the breakaway Soviet republics had not yet found a genuine national identity that would definitively set them apart as independent states from their past.

Bibliography:

1. Eaton W.J. U.S. Prompted Tatar Protest, Soviets Say [Web resource] // Los Angeles Times. 31.07.1987. URL: <https://goo.su/ewzqQKW> (reference date: 01.10.2026).
2. Gorbachev Summons Rival Ethnic Groups to Moscow [Web resource] // Los Angeles Times. 25.11.1988. URL: <https://goo.su/nYU7U> (reference date: 01.10.2026).
3. Gorbatjov M. Glasnost: taler og interview. København: Forlaget Tiden, 1987. 447 s.
4. Gorbatjov M. Perestrojka. Een nieuwe visie voor mijn land en de wereld. København: Het Spectrum, 1987. 299 s.
5. Hewett E.A., Winston V. Milestones in Glasnost and Perestroika. Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 1991. 275 p.
6. Hussain E. And the Cold War continues [Web resource] // The News International (The News Sunday). 11.09.2022. URL: <https://goo.su/TmK5GOQ> (reference date: 01.10.2026).
7. Jacobsen K., Pedersen J.K. Bag om Perestroika. København: Lindhardt og Ringhof, 1988. 211 s.
8. Lambert M. American Classified Paper of 1988 and the Case of Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict [Web resource] // Between Peace and Conflict in the East and the West Studies on Transformation and Development in the OSCE Region: Studies on Transformation and Development in the OSCE Region / Ed. A. Mihr. Springer. Bishkek, 2021. P. 267-278. URL: <https://goo.su/ov9p> (reference date: 01.10.2026).
9. Lavrenin P. The ghost of Lenin: Why didn't Russia and Ukraine sort out their border issues when the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991? Stalin [Web resource] //

RT (Russia Today) 09.01.2023. URL: <https://goo.su/PV0Z01v> (reference date: 01.10.2026).

10. Leung S. Glasnost and the fall of the Soviet Union // *Historia Magister Vitae*, 2023. P. 48-56.

11. Mary D. Sovjetunionen under Gorbatjov: Glasnost, Perestrojka, Demokratisatsija. København: Sikkerheds- og Nedrustningspolitisk Udvalg, 1988. 92 s.

12. Nadler G. Kremlin says Tatars were unjustly evicted by Stalin [Web resource] // UPI. 24.07.1987. URL: <https://goo.su/RRvChnw> (reference date: 01.10.2026).

13. The Baltic Way to independence: 30 years since the landmark human-chain protest // LRT.lt. 23.08.2019. URL: <https://goo.su/okR9l6N> (reference date: 01.10.2026).

14. The Baltic Way: 35 years since 2 million protests for freedom from Soviets [Web resource] // ERR.ee. 23.08.2024. URL: <https://goo.su/1DWUivx> (reference date: 01.10.2026).

Data about the author:

Christensen Carsten Sander – Doctor of History (PhD), Independent Researcher (Billund, Denmark).

Сведения об авторе:

Христенсен Карстен Сандер – доктор истории (PhD), независимый исследователь (Биллунд, Дания).

E-mail: arroyoinfancia74@gmail.com.