

Vol. 8, Issue-II (April 2017)

ISSN: 0976-8165

THE CRITERION

An International Journal in English

Bi-monthly, Peer-Reviewed, Open Access eJournal



UGC Approved Journal [Arts and Humanities, Sr. No. 40]

Editor-In-Chief - Dr. Vishwanath Bite

www.the-criterion.com

About Us: <http://www.the-criterion.com/about/>

Archive: <http://www.the-criterion.com/archive/>

Contact Us: <http://www.the-criterion.com/contact/>

Editorial Board: <http://www.the-criterion.com/editorial-board/>

Submission: <http://www.the-criterion.com/submission/>

FAQ: <http://www.the-criterion.com/fa/>



ISSN 2278-9529

Galaxy: International Multidisciplinary Research Journal

www.galaxyimrj.com

Peaceful Coexistence as a Theoretical Concept and its Impact on International Communist Movement

Richa Mani

Ph. D. Research Scholar,
Centre for Russian and Central Asian Studies,
School of International Studies, JNU

Article History: Submitted-05/04/2017, Revised-24/04/2017, Accepted-25/04/2017, Published-30/04/2017.

Abstract:

Peaceful Coexistence as a theoretical concept during Khrushchev's era was not something novel to Soviet Union, the idea existed during his predecessors too along with the world revolution. The paper delves into the theoretical concept of peaceful coexistence and explores the implications of the theory not only for Soviet Union but also for International Communist Movement. The article investigates the role of peaceful coexistence behind the Sino-Soviet split and how it led to schism in the international communist movement during the second half of twentieth century.

Keywords: Soviet Union, Peaceful Coexistence, Communist Movement, Sino-Soviet Split.

Peaceful Coexistence as a Soviet Doctrine

The Soviet foreign policy since the very beginning comprised of two basic doctrines; one, *Peaceful coexistence* and the other, *World Revolution*. The two doctrines in spite of being conflicting to each other were never inseparable. There always remained a continuous interaction between the two. A close examination however informs that at any given period of time one doctrine has to be downgraded in order to facilitate the practice of the other. The early soviet years saw the simultaneous use of the two doctrines, but there always existed a contradiction.

Although the theory was there in the Soviet policy right from the beginning, it was only after 1956 (after the coming of Khrushchev to power) that Peaceful coexistence enjoyed an intensified promotion. During this period it took off from the Panchsheel, the five principles which had been proclaimed in the Sino-Indian pact of 1954 and explained in the Bandung declaration of 1955.

However, the idea of "Peaceful Coexistence" cannot be wholly attributed to Nikita Khrushchev. An examination into Soviet history informs that Lenin and Stalin also manoeuvred the doctrine. Thus, during the 1950s this doctrine was not something new to Soviet Union, it always existed as one of the basic principles of Soviet foreign policy.

Lenin Era

Lenin and Trotsky from very beginning had faith that the survival of the soviet regime was absolutely contingent upon the outbreak of proletarian revolution in west Europe and not on peaceful coexistence. According to their belief even to achieve *decree on peace*ⁱ workers of the world need to unite for a proletarian revolution. Thus, the priority to “World Revolution” over “Peaceful Coexistence” in the Soviet foreign policy was always unquestioned.

The first manifestation of Peaceful Coexistence came during the early period when Lenin came with “peace at any price”. Following his this idea Lenin decided to come out of the World War One. According to the treaty of Brest-Litovskⁱⁱ a state of Peaceful Coexistence was created between Germany and Soviet Russia. There always existed the view that the acceptance of the treaty was inevitable for Lenin and not guided by any ideological beliefs. The argument gets support by Lenin’s desire to supply revolutionary minded German workers with military assistance sensing a possible chance for a proletarian revolution in October 1918 (Lerner, 1964).

A precedence to world revolution was seen in March 1919, when Lenin formed the Communist International with an aim to overthrow the established non-communist governments across the world. This was seen as a crusade for World Revolution. The formation of the Communist International subsequently tarnished the image of the Soviet regime seeking co-existence.

To a great extent, the establishment of the Comintern was a manifestation of the Russian desire for a final solution to its civil war through world revolution. It was the prevalent civil war in Russia that guided the government to follow a policy of co-existence and peace with the outside world because it was for Russia to concentrate on internal issues first. The first attempt of this “World revolution” was seen in the Russo-Polish War in 1920. Taking advantage the Polish legions invaded Ukraine. This called for a re-evaluation of the Soviet foreign policy. The authenticity of peaceful coexistence was checked in the given circumstances. The Soviet State now needs to have a second thought and official view was now to go with the doctrine of “World Revolution”. The Russo-Polish war resulted to the treaty of Riga in 1921 for armistice.

With the Treaty of Riga (1921) the attempt of bringing about a “World Revolution” also failed. It is often believed that this failure again gave an impetus to pursue the policy of “Peaceful Coexistence” by the Soviet Union. This is clear by a speech of Lenin which he delivered on foreign policy in Moscow on October 2, 1920ⁱⁱⁱ:

If Poland had become Soviet . . . the entire international system built by the victors [of World War I] would have been destroyed. . . . However, it turned out that although events are moving inexorably toward the workers' revolution, they are still moving too slowly as compared to the rapidity of events in Russia.

Besides, not only the failure of the Russo-Polish war but also the role of Chicherin was behind the shift of the doctrine. Georgi Chicherin who served as the Peoples Commissar for Foreign affairs after Trotsky from 1918 to 1930 is said to be the chief practitioner of the doctrine of Peaceful coexistence during the time. He played an active role behind the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk (of which Trotsky was not supportive). Chicherin was a diplomat, he is said to have anti-British feelings because Britain at the time was curbing Russian expansion in Asia. Chicherin saw the economic possibilities in the west. It is said that Chicherin was close to Lenin and thus he could persuade him not to wreck the Genoa Conference. Chicherin participated in the Conference (1922) and signed the Treaty of Rapallo^{iv} with Germany. Chicherin was so successful “(...) in marketing the image of "peaceful coexistence" that by 1925 every major country in the world, with the notable exception of the United States, had extended diplomatic recognition to the Soviet regime. With some countries, notably Weimar Germany, Chicherin not only established peaceful relations but extensive trade contacts as well” (Lerner, 1964).

Simultaneously, the Communist International continued to pursue its objective, i.e. an active policy of world revolution. Although attempted, the decade of 1920 disappointed the hopes of communist revolution and thus the Soviet Union decided to be an isolated communist island in the capitalist world. It somehow seemed to be convinced that world revolution cannot be practiced by forces alone but it needs strategies as well. This was reflected in the various peace treaties by the Soviet Union and treaties concerning trade and non-cooperation with its neighbours and also with other capitalist system. The year 1921 is taken as the turning point in the relation of the soviet state with the outside world. The whole decade is characterised as the phase of “Reluctant Coexistence”. During the phase, on one side the communists curtailed the use of military force as the means of spreading communism (this was done in order to strengthen their regime) and on the other the capitalists ceased their active effort to overthrow the Bolshevik government. The mutual hostility between the two blocs was retained but they put halt to the armed conflict which both saw as a mean to strengthen themselves.

Stalin Era

After the death of Lenin all the leaders stipulated that Russia must not engage in revolutionary propaganda. Increasingly the idea was coming from Russian officialdom that they could do business better when they disassociate them from Communist International. Accordingly, the diplomats now sent out by the Soviet no longer were eminent revolutionists, but rather keen businessmen with an eye to bargain and a love for bourgeois tastes.

The theory of Socialism in One Country also inflicted the idea that nothing must be done by the Russians to jeopardize their chances for building socialism. Russia has already built up socialism; it is now in the position to inspire the entire world to emulate its example. Thus the Russians abandoned the conception of revolution. Marxism had taught that revolutions are made, not by the intellect, but by emotions and passions aroused by hunger

and need. Stalin began to teach that the world revolution could be attained simply by showing the world a perfect picture of the ideal.

The Stalin era (1924-1953) came up with the second major step in making peaceful coexistence a Soviet policy. This was the Stalin's introduction of the doctrine of "Socialism in One Country" in 1924. The theory of Socialism in One country held that given the defeat of all the communist revolutions in Europe during 1917–1921, the Soviet Union should begin to strengthen itself internally, i.e., building up the industrial base and military might of the Soviet Union before exporting revolution abroad. To this end, Stalin rescinded the NEP, began the collectivization of Soviet agriculture, and embarked on a national program of rapid, forced industrialization. That was a shift from the previously held Marxist position that socialism must be established globally, and was in opposition to Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution.

Khrushchev Era

To know about Khrushchev's "peaceful coexistence" main sources will be from Khrushchev himself; it is his article titled, "On peaceful Coexistence" (1959) that justifies his policy and explains the reasons for it. Khrushchev while talking on peaceful coexistence mentioned that there are only two ways by which different ideologies can live together on the same platform; one is through war and other through peaceful coexistence and he refutes the first way. As discussed before, Khrushchev mentions peaceful coexistence was part of Soviet policy even during his predecessors. To show this he quotes a sentence by Lenin "let the American imperialists not touch us. We won't touch them".

Clarifying the perception of the west that peaceful coexistence is a tactical method Khrushchev makes it clear that the socialist countries do not require expansionist policies as they have their own home market. The socialist country cannot favour war as the working class (ordinary people) do not demand war, as it results to death, devastation, misery, grief and tears. The difference in the principles guides the states to differ from each other. Whether it is accepted or not but one has to find a way out because different ideologies have to exist on the same planet.

Peaceful coexistence according to Khrushchev is in the interest of the mankind. It rejects isolation and advocates interaction and competition without war holding the truth that different ideologies will persist.

Further clarifying to capitalists on how Soviet Union can talk of peaceful coexistence when they speak about the fight for socialism. Khrushchev at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union made it clear that their intention is not to interfere in the internal affairs of the countries governed by the capitalist ideologies. He made clear that the ideological struggle must carry forward but without the use of arms.

With the ideological struggle kept alive the communists have the confidence that they will be ultimately victorious throughout the world. They believe that the system which is more

progressive ultimately triumphs. As feudalism was taken over by capitalism because it was more progressive, so will communism do as it is more progressive and equitable. To prove his idea that there is no third choice apart from war and peaceful coexistence and peace is the preferable option, Khrushchev mentions that not only the socialist states but many other Asian and African countries are advocating peace. Moreover peace policies have a wide support all over the world even in the capitalist states.

On the future of communism, Khrushchev writes that after the World War Two there is the expansion of the socialist ideology in men and material. In the future the only aim of the socialist states is to exclude war. This idea has not only a wide moral approval but also international recognition.

In respect to peaceful coexistence Soviet Union has been working right from the beginning, (1) U.S.S.R. adopted a "Law on the Defence of Peace" on March 12, 1951 stating: a) Propaganda for war, in whatever form it may be conducted, undermines the cause of peace, creates the menace of a new war and therefore constitutes the gravest crime against humanity. b) Persons guilty of war propaganda should be brought to court and tried as heinous criminals.

(2) Soviet Union in recent years has reduced its armed forces by more than 2,000,000 men. The funds released as a result have been used to develop the economy and further raise the material and cultural living standards of the Soviet people.

(3) The Soviet Union has liquidated its bases on the territories of other states.

(4) The Soviet Union unilaterally discontinued the tests of atomic weapons and refrained from conducting them further until it became finally clear that the Western powers refused to follow our example and were continuing the explosions.

The summary of Khrushchev's Peaceful Coexistence can be given under three points according to him; (Khrushchev, 1959)

- *Peaceful Coexistence can and should develop into peaceful competition for the purpose of satisfying man's need in the best possible way.*
- *The main thing is to keep to the positions of ideological struggle without resorting to arms in order to prove that one is right.*
- *It is necessary that everybody should understand the irrevocable fact that the historic process is irreversible.*

To establish relation between Soviet Union and U.S.A. a firm foundation of friendship is needed which can go only through peaceful coexistence. Khrushchev clearly mentions that the friendship does not only stand between Soviet Union and U.S.A. but it is between communists and capitalists. It is a hard fact though that there lie hurdles between these friendships, which Khrushchev believes, comes from the west. He stresses the idea that historical process is irreversible and thus Soviet system could not be brought to an end by

any chance. Therefore the idea of “rolling back” communism could not put an end to cold war. To put an end to cold war every nation has to make sure that they are on a continuous reduction of their military expenditure and are moving on a path of co-existence as “...consistent adherence to the policy of peaceful coexistence would make it possible to improve the international situation, to bring about a drastic cut in military expenditures and to release vast material resources for wiser purpose”. (Khrushchev, 1959)

What should be then the correct mean to pursue the policy of peaceful coexistence? “...peaceful coexistence receives a firm foundation only with increase in extensive and absolutely unrestricted international trade. ...there is no good basis for improvement of relations between our countries other than development of international trade.” (Khrushchev, 1959)

Despite the ideological differences Soviet Union aspire to establish trade relations with U.S.A. also as with Britain and other western countries. Soviet Union accepts that attempts to establish economic and trading relation has not been proposed to the west so far but they now are looking forward for such relations.

The proposal does not imply any hidden or special interest to the Soviet countries. Soviet Union believes in their (own) resources and possibilities. Their attempt for cooperation is in order to improve relation across the globe for which development of trade, economic and business contacts are necessary.

It is strongly advocated by Khrushchev that peaceful coexistence is the only way in the interest of all the nations during his contemporary period. Soviet Union does not want war. After going through the destruction of war the Soviet people want to be united and strong. They want mankind to get rid of war and hence they urge for the acceptance of peaceful coexistence.

Peaceful coexistence, it can be said was necessary for Soviet Russia. Isolation would have increased her economic difficulties. Peaceful coexistence was necessary for political stability along with the inflow of the foreign exchange. In addition to this it seemed that it could save Soviet Union from the huge expenses it was making on armament and military. Latter it was seen that America engaged Russia in Afghanistan which ended in the disintegration of Soviet Union in 1990.

Impact of Peaceful Coexistence on the International Communist Movement:

‘The Sino-Soviet Split’ and more

Soviet Union and China emerged as the two largest communist nations in the world. The “Sino-Soviet Split” refers to the worsening of the political and ideological relations between the Soviet Union and the People’s Republic of China during the 1950s and 60s, and between their respective Communist Parties. “Peaceful Coexistence” was one of the important aspects of the Sino-Soviet split which became an important episode during the cold war period. An ideological schism between these two states was obviously going to

attract attention. The clashes between the states resulted from their respective national interest and their different interpretations of Marxism: Marxism-Leninism in Soviet Union and Maoism in China. The outcome of which was two different lines of the communist movement.

Though the differences between the two states arose during the 1940s, the main factor behind the split remained the highly proclaimed “Peaceful Coexistence” theory by the Soviet Union during the 1950s and 60s. People’s Republic of China under Mao Tse-tung was opposed to the theory and advocated for a belligerent attitude towards the capitalist countries. He initially rejected the policy by calling it essentially Marxist revisionism.

It was during the second Sino-Japanese War (1937-45) that Mao developed some differences with Soviet Union. He ignored the political and military advice from Soviet Union (basically from Stalin who was the General Secretary at that time) and Comintern. He ignored the directions because he believed that there is practical difficulty in applying those traditional Leninist revolutionary theories to China. During the Second World War however Mao followed Stalin’s lead and established a coalition with Chiang Kai Shek on his direction (Stalin has already went into a treaty with the Nationalists in 1945). Gradually differences arose between Stalin and Chiang; Stalin turned to Mao and helped him in gaining Manchuria. Chiang failed to get any help from the United States and thus the Communist Party of China was able to attain victory over Kuomintang the Chinese nationalist party. The help from Moscow paved the way for the Moscow visit of Mao Tse-tung in 1949-50 and resulted to the signing of Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship. According to the treaty Soviet government provided \$300 million to China at low interest and 30 years military alliance.

Meanwhile, during the Chinese civil war Mao Tse-tung continuously made attempts to dislocate Moscow regime as the ideological icon of the International Communist Movement. Mao endeavoured to give Marxism an Asian form rather than European. He believed that Asia should emulate China’s model of revolution.

After coming to power Mao followed Soviet model of centralised economic development but by late 1950s he developed different plans for the attainment of communist stage of socialism by the mobilization of the working class which resulted to the idea of Great Leap forward (1958-61). Mao had a vision to make China a military, industrial and political power through Great Leap Forward. He was a supporter of Soviet initiative to make East Asia a nuclear free zone, but also publically stated that he desired People’s Republic of China to become a nuclear superpower and also asserted that U.S.- Soviet agreements would not apply to China.

Mao had clearly started moving on a path away from Russia. After the death of Stalin, the soviets tried to pacify the situation between China and USSR with an official visit by Nikita Khrushchev. During the visit it was decided to hand over the Port Arthur naval base to China. The Soviet Union also promised to provide technical aid in China’s first five year plan and to give her loans. But, slowly Khrushchev’s policies began to irritate Mao.

Mao has always supported Stalin ideologically and politically. When Khrushchev denounced Stalin with his “On the personality cult and its consequence” speech at the twentieth congress of the Communist Party of Soviet Union, Mao was surprised and became upset. Mao desired to build a more reliable form of Stalinist ideology as well as emancipate China from Soviet Socialism. When Khrushchev started the policy of de-Stalinisation it led to the liquidation of the Sino-Soviet Treaty (1950). Mao believed that Soviet system was retreating ideologically and militarily from the policy of World Revolution. Also, Soviet Union did not assist China in their war against America, therefore Mao has come to the conclusion that USSR was not to be trusted now. When Khrushchev following his policy of peaceful coexistence attempted to pacify relation with America by his visit there between 1953 and 1961, Mao commented, “Khrushchev was too appeasing with the west”. Khrushchev did not take any action against America aggression in China and thus resulted to protests against him in China and lost popularity.

The clashes got further aggravated by Khrushchev’s advocacy to peaceful Coexistence to strengthen relation between capitalist and communist states. This was a direct challenge to Mao’s “lean to one side” foreign policy adopted by China after the civil war (adopted sensing the threat of Japanese or American intervention) which resulted to an alliance between People’s Republic of China and Soviet Union.

In spite of the fact was that both needed each other (On one side, the advancement of Great Leap Forward required capital investment from Moscow. The other way the panorama of People’s Republic of China to become independent of the Soviet identity and form a newer version of socialism made Khrushchev anxious) both the states started criticising each other openly at visits and conferences.

In the Bucharest Conference of the world communists and Workers Party, Mao and Khrushchev criticised each other’s ideologies and their client states. USSR accordingly stopped Russian aid to Albania. Further, at the Romanian Communist Party Congress, Khrushchev insulted Mao by calling him a “nationalist”, an “adventurist” and “deviationist”. Mao reciprocated by calling Khrushchev “patriarchal” and “tyrannical”. Khrushchev gave an official response to Mao; he withdrew Soviet experts and technicians from China resulting to setback for the Great Leap Forward. The economic loss from the side of USSR was shocking for China as during the time it was essentially needed to ameliorate China’s famine and also to deal with the ongoing border crisis with India. In November 1960, Chinese argued with the Soviets and other communists parties at the congress of eighty one communist parties in Moscow yet managed to avoid any formal ideological split. Again in October 1961, at the 22nd congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union they went into an open confrontation.

Annoyed of these confrontations Soviet Union severed all the diplomatic relation from Albania in 1961 which escalated the ideological schism between Soviet Union and China. In 1962 there was complete withdrawal of the relations between the two states concerning international actions. Mao criticise Khrushchev from withdrawing from Cuban missile crisis (1962), also USSR sided with India against China in the Sino-Indian war. On August

5, 1963 Soviet Union signed a treaty with Britain and United States which Mao saw as an attempt to hinder China's advancement as a superpower. Going with his foreign policy Khrushchev was not dealing America aggressively and Mao was unhappy with it. Mao started writing openly against Khrushchev.

By now the Sino-Soviet alliance had completely collapsed and Mao had begun to turn his interest to other Asian, African and Latin American countries to develop newer, stronger alliances to further the People's Republic of China's economic and ideological developments. For this Mao started Cultural Revolution (1966-76) in order to prevent Russian style of Communism and helped in breaking China's political relation with USSR.

Over the time and after Mao's regime the Sino-Soviet split lost its political importance. China's decision in 1972 to develop trade relation with U.S. also saw china wisely adopting the policy of "peaceful coexistence". From there onwards China started developing its own coexistence concept. The schism was diluted further by the Gorbachev's visit to China in May, 1989.

Conclusion

International communist movement was certainly weakened by the middle of the twentieth century. Since the coming up of the communist party in Russia many of the countries developed the hope to establish communist governments, especially the countries of Asia and Africa who were under the control of the imperialist powers got fascinated to the communist ideology. The formation of communist international by Lenin in 1919 gave an impetus to their desire. Communist international and Moscow began to support the establishment of communist parties across the world. With the help of Soviet Union thus communist parties were established in the countries of Asia and Africa. One drawback which persisted in the formation of communist parties was that Soviet Union was not fully considering the problems of the respective nations. The socio-political problems of the colonies were different with that of the Russia. The communist parties of the various countries also started working on the directions given by the Comintern and Moscow, ignoring the problems within their own territory. It would be incorrect to mention that they were not aware of the domestic issues and problems. But they were so much abide to the Comintern that they did not take up the issues. Their strategies and methods were guided by the international events. Gradually it led to the weakening of the movement in the smaller countries and also led to either stagnation of the membership or decline in it.

The smaller communist nations and the newly formed communist parties across the world were initially not questioning the directions given by Soviet Union. But gradually when Mao in china started raising voice against the policies of soviet state and refused many of its direction calling it not practical for the Asian and African problems, some of the states took Mao's lead. Some communist parties completely agreed to Mao's idea that Asian and African nations need a revolution of the kind which china went through. The other nations had divergent views. The communist parties in the nations got fragmented into two segments - one continued to follow the traditional idea or method given by Comintern and

Moscow and other took Mao's ideas. Mao diverted from the ideas of Moscow which led to the political and ideological split between China and Russia. The different paths of the two biggest communist powers definitely weakened the international communist movement. Comintern (which was highly influenced by the soviet state) no more remained the only icon for the communist followers. Many of the Asian and the African countries began to follow the road given by Mao.

The united communist movement thus went through a setback during the 1950's and 60's. During this phase no world revolution could be achieved. It is said however that it was due to Khrushchev foreign policy that the international communist movement was weakened but analysing the events from the second decade of 20th century to the middle of that century it can be inferred that Khrushchev gave a highly proclaimed version of peaceful co-existence but the concept in Soviet Union existed even before him. Peaceful co-existence became intense from the time of Stalin. Here it has to be understood why the soviet leaders went on to accept this policy.

When soviet state came into existence it initially focussed on making Russia self-sufficient unit for which Lenin started NEP. Russia became a strong power by the time of Stalin. Over the time Russia had developed so much industrially that its home market failed to absorb its industrial production. There was a kind of stagnation in the home market. The adoption of peaceful co-existence was a tactical method to expand Russia's market which became necessary to keep the industries working and also to further the strength of Russia. It did not however mean that Soviet Union was shedding the ideology but in a disguised manner it aimed to strengthen the communist movement. A growing economy was needed expansion in market in order to maintain the strength and also to fund the communist ambition elsewhere. So it can be said that from the time of Stalin Russia deviated from the ideology of the international communist movement which became objectionable at the time of Khrushchev. Khrushchev period coincided with the rise of Mao who openly criticized and stood against the friendship between communists and the capitalists. Mao failed to understand the situation of stagnation in the Russian economy which has guided the acceptance of peaceful co-existence as the foreign policy of Russia. The soviet state during the first three decades of its establishment choose to be in isolation and gradually reached a level of stagnation which was difficult to carry forward and hence needed to be removed. China was following the initial policies of Soviet Union and could not understand the problems within Russian state. However later we find china also after two decades of establishment of CCP went on the path of peaceful co-existence for expanding its market.

Nevertheless, it is correct that International communist movement was weakened by the middle of the century and peaceful co-existence played an important role behind the schism in the movement however Khrushchev could not be solely blamed for the weakening of the movement because the necessity for the adoption of the policy started arising since the time of Stalin. Also, the acceptance of the policy of co-existence should not be taken as the only reason behind the weakening of the international communist

movement. It is the lack of explanation and unconvincing arguments given in support of peaceful co-existence that misguided the communist parties across the world. Competition through peaceful co-existence was an essential stage for any communist state which had to be pursued once the state has achieved the level of self-sufficiency as can be seen in Russia (later in china also) to absorb the industrial production and get out of stagnation.

The international communist perception was changed towards Soviet Union after the Sino-soviet split. In spite of the existence of various reasons behind Sino-Soviet split Khrushchev's promotion of peaceful co-existence played an immediate factor behind the split. When the Soviet Union accepted it as part of its foreign policy the communist states and parties were shocked and surprised. Soviet Union could have explained the necessity of the friendship between communist and capitalist state honestly, but it kept it implicit. The newly formed communist state and the communist parties of various nations could not justify this friendship and became apprehensive of Soviet policies. As a result of this their trust over Russia was weakened and which led to the "de-idolisation" of the soviet state. Many of the parties started following Mao who at that time was trying to make china strong on its own resources (along with the help of communist states rather than capitalist). This divergence in the communist bloc not only brought schism in the international communist movement but also resulted to the split in the communist parties of various nations, as in case of Communist Party of India.

Works Cited:

Blank, Stephen J. (2011), *Perspectives on Russian Foreign Policy*, USA: Strategic Studies Institute.

Blunden, A. (1993), *The Sino-Soviet Split. In Stalinism: Its Origins and Future*. U.S.A.: Heidelberg Press.

Griffith, William E (1966) "Sino-Soviet Relations", *The China Quarterly*, (25): 3-143.

Halpern, A. M. (1960), "Communist China and Peaceful Co-existence", *The China Quarterly*, (3):16-31.

Karpov, Victor P., "The Soviet Concept of Peaceful Coexistence and Its Implications for International Law", *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 29 (4): 858-864.

Khrushchev, Nikita S. (1959), "On Peaceful Coexistence", *Foreign Affairs*, 38(1): 1-18.

Lerner, Warren (1964), "The Historical Origins of the Soviet Doctrine of Peaceful Coexistence", *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 29 (4): 865-870.

Lipson, Leon (1964), "Peaceful Coexistence", *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 29 (4): 871-881.

Lee, Stephen J. (1999), *Stalin and the Soviet Union*, London: Routledge.

Luthi, L. M. (2008), *The Sino-Soviet Split: Cold War in the Communist World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mark, C. (2012), *Ideological radicalization and the Sino-Soviet split, 1958-64. In China and the World Since 1945: An International History*. London: Routledge.

McMahon, Robert J. (2003), *The Cold War: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Saull, Richard (2007), *The Cold War and After: Capitalism, Revolution and Superpower Politics*, London: Pluto Press.

Verdery, Katherine (1996), *What was Socialism and What comes Next?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

End Notes:

ⁱThe Bolsheviks after seizing power in Russia in November 1917, issued a Decree on Peace which called all participants of World War I to open immediate negotiations for the conclusion of peace.

ⁱⁱThe Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was a peace treaty signed on March 3, 1918, between the new Bolshevik government of Russia and the Central Powers (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey), that ended Russia's participation in World War I. The treaty was signed at Brest-Litovsk. The treaty was forced on the Soviet government by the threat of further advances by German and Austrian forces. By the treaty, Soviet Russia defaulted on Imperial Russia's commitments to the Triple Entente alliance.

ⁱⁱⁱThe armistice for Russo-Polish war was approved in September, 1920, the treaty was however signed in 1921

^{iv}According to the treaty Russia and Germany both renounced all territorial and financial claims against the other following the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and World War I. The treaty also agreed to “co-operate in a spirit of mutual goodwill in meeting the economic needs of both countries”.