DOI 10.21544/1809-3191.v24n3.p604-636

PACIFIC COEXISTENCE: STUDIES FOR THE HISTORY OF AN INTERNATIONALIST CONCEPT[1]

Renato Petrocchi[2]

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to recognize and evaluate different historical meanings of the concept of peaceful coexistence that became best known in international politics since the 20th CPUSSR Congress in 1956. The historical variations of this concept, permanently associated with the foreign policy of the former Soviet Union, paved the way for diverse internationally oriented appropriations within and outside the socialist world in a time arc that precedes and transposes the Cold War. This research is part of the search for the origins and transformations of a political-theoretical framework of the proposition of the concept of peaceful coexistence in one of the phases of Brazilian foreign policy, namely, the phase of Independent Foreign Policy conducted by Chancellor San Tiago Dantas between September 1961 and July 1962 (object of analysis of another study published in 2015, https://cartainternacional.abri.org.br/Carta/article/view/275/247). In our study, however, we investigate the variations of this polysemic historical concept in the foreign policy of the missing USSR as theoretical references for the Brazilian formulation of coexistence that was the basis of the country's international performance since the 1960s.
Keywords: Peaceful coexistence. History of concepts. Foreign policy.

"We have to learn to think in a new way"
Russell-Einstein Manifesto
London, July 9, 1955

[1] This article derives from an academic research on the internationalist thinking of San Tiago Dantas that I have been conducting with students of Scientific Initiation (PIBIC/CNPq) at the Institute of Strategic Studies of the Fluminense Federal University (INEST/UFF). This study continues the publication in the Carta Internacional, Volume 10, Number 2, July-December 2015, entitled "San Tiago Dantas: a política externa como instrumento de reforma social e de democracia." It also results from the participation in the round table Foreign and Internal Policy of Brazil during the Cold War of 09/25/2017 at the International Symposium Cold War: between the local and the global, held at the Block G Auditorium of the Gragoatá Campus at UFF between the 25th and the 28th of September 2017.

[2] Renato Petrocchi has a Master's degree in International Relations from IRI/PUC-Rio, a PhD in History from the UFF Postgraduate Program in History (the PPGH/UFF) and is an associate professor of Foreign Policy and International Relations at the Institute of Strategic Studies at the Fluminense Federal University (INEST / UFF).

INTRODUCTION: THE LIMITS OF A RUPTURE REFORM

On the night of February 24-25, 1956, after the end of official work during the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (the CPUSSR) and, in secret section, Nikita Khrushchev read a report denouncing, without any means, the crimes committed by Josef Stalin, portraying the former Soviet leader who died in 1953 as an unpredictable tyrant responsible for the regime of terror and mass repression unleashed since 1936, and for very serious mistakes made during the World War II. This denunciation, however, had important limitations because it placed at the center of his criticism only the "cult of personality" built around Stalin, an infallible genius as a military chief, political leader and theorist of scientific Marxism, discharging upon the absent despot "blames" that was shared by an entire group of leaders (including Khrushchev himself) and, actually, expressed the nature of the political system in place in the federation. The complaint came only from 1934 and, although it contained mention of the crimes carried out with the deportations of nationalities ordered in 1943 and 1944, the analysis focused essentially on the "many thousands of honest and innocent[3] communists" who died in the wake of the monstrous processes, built on confessions extracted through torture, but without formally rehabilitating the memory of the main victims (such as Nicolaj Ivanovic Bukharin[4]) and remembering the other victims who were outside the party, the errors and atrocities made with the collectivization of the camps[5]. In his memoirs alone, Khrushchev increased the scale of the great terror by referring to "hundreds of millions of

[3] Khrushchev on Stalin. Special to the New York Times, June, 5, 1956.

[4] Nikolaj Ivanovič Bukharin (1888-1938) was a member of the Bolshevik group of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers Party, founded in 1906. Member of the Party Committee, he became one of the most important theorists of Bolshevism. Although he moved away from Lenin's political positions during the Revolution with the Bolshevists defense of continuing the war effort to transform this pressure into a world proletarian revolution (as Trotsky defended), from 1921, he changed his position and came to align Leninist policies, encouraging the development program of the New Economic Policy. After Lenin's death, Bukharin became a member of the Politburo, the governing body of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and chairman of the Communist International (the Comintern) in 1926. At the beginning of Stalin's period, Bukharin began to be displaced from these positions of influence by the then-new Soviet leader, having been removed from the Comintern and expelled from the Politburo. Bukharin was arrested in 1937 on charges of plotting against the Soviet state and prosecuted in 1938 in the repression proceedings conducted by Stalin in this context, known as the "Great Purge."

[5] COURTOIS, Stephane, WERTH, Nicolas, PANNÉ, Jean-Louis, PACZKOWSKI, Andrzej, BARTOSEK Karel, MARGOLIN, Jean-Louis. O Livro Negro do Comunismo: crimes, terror e repressão. RJ, Ed. Bertrand Brasil, 1999.

people shot[6]."

The importance of this Report was enormous because, for the first time in the history of the USSR, the method of falsifying information was being used and an official truth was proposed, allowing a progressive transformation of the cultural climate in the country in a more dynamic and democratic direction[7]. Even before the twentieth Congress, the regime was already showing signs of easing by broadening the criteria for liberalization of the Gulags (abbreviation of *Glavnoe Upravlenie Lagerei* – Main Camp Administration) and, through formal de-Stalinization, a more consistent process of emptying the labor camps followed. In this line of relaxation, the regime granted the Chechens and the Ingush the right to take back their lands. The Secret Report never became an officially recognized document, but it was widely circulated beyond Soviet leaders and Communist party affiliates, both in the USSR and in the so-called "satellites" countries. Through reserved channels, and certainly with the consent of Khrushchev himself, this document reached the US Department of State, which on June 4, 1956 entrusted it to the *New York Times* for its worldwide dissemination. This disconcerting destruction of Stalin's myth among militants and Communist party leaders around the world may have generated a decisive and even unstoppable impetus for the revision of the history of the USSR and the way communism was historically realized. However, there was no easy way for Khrushchev, who, in addition to strong resistance expressed inside and outside the USSR, had to face the undesirable consequences of his revisionist policy, which would manifest themselves in the eastern bloc countries, producing difficulties for the new Communist leader himself[8].

Beginning in 1953, the Soviet Union provided the first signs of openness, allowing the Hungarian and Polish governments to liberalize some imprisoned Communist leaders in previous years. The events of most concern were the demonstrations in June of the same year in East Berlin and other cities in communist Germany. In these urban centers, the devastations caused by war were not only responsible for social and political contrasts. The imposition of a reconstruction based on the Soviet model of forced industrialization, with heavy labor rhythms and no counterpart to the improvement of the social standard of life, set off protests and workers'

[6] Khrushchev, Nikita. Memórias. RJ, Editora Artenova, vol. 2, 1971, p. 82.

[7] Guerra, Adriano. Il Giorno che Chruscev parlò. Dal XX congress alla rivolta ungherese. Roma, Ed. Riuniti, 1986.

[8] Medvedev, Roy. Khrushchev, Blackwell, New York, Oxford, Doubleday, 1983.

strikes that culminated in the strong repression led by Soviet troops and the drama of dozens of dead people.

The release of the Khrushchev Report led to eastern Europe a freer atmosphere for the manifestation of different moods, endorsed at the time of anti-Stalinists. These manifestations contemplated the remembrance of the acts of violence of the so-called *Sovietization* period and, therefore, did not prevent such movements from going beyond the limits of becoming anti-Soviet, nationalist and anti-Communist. The first country and nation to be carried away by this critical and reformist mood was Poland, where a workers' strike in Potsdam, which took place on May 28, 1956, turned into a real insurrection throughout the day with a quick repressive reaction from the government. The conflict developed in parallel within the Polish communist party, in which Wladislaw Gomulka, a detached leader and imprisoned since 1949, emerged victorious in power struggles and faced the daunting task of reconciling trade union tensions with suspicions about the country about his communist choice and relations with the Soviet Union. In October of the same year, Gomulka clashed sharply with Khrushchev who went to Warsaw with an elite of Soviet leaders. The Polish leader was able to negotiate a political line that encompassed the end of Soviet control over the national army, the dissolution of agrarian collectivization (85% of the land was returned to the control of smallholders), the right of Poles to freely profess the Catholic faith and the recognition of a prestigious position for clergy and ecclesiastical organizations.

Since 1955, a rather clashing political attempt to displace power had already begun in Hungary: from the Stalinist group to the communist leaders who had defended the country's autonomy and managed to survive the 1949 processes. In July 1956, N. Khrushchev removed from government by direct intervention Mátyás Rakosi, responsible for the elimination of the Magyar "Titoists", but it was only after the student-led demonstrations in Budapest — which took on an insurrection character by the strong national connotation — that the most radical changes occurred. With the Soviet consensus, two victims of Stalinism, such as Janos Kadar and Imre Nagy, were appointed, respectively, party secretary and head of government[9]. By now, however, the situation had escaped the control of both Hungarian leaders with intense clashes between the insurgents and the police to such an extent that they acquired the characteristics of a civil war, opposing Democrats and

[9] Le Breton, Jean Marie. La fin de Ceausescu: Histoire d'une révolution. Paris, L'Harmattan, 1996.

Nationalists on the one hand and Communists on the other, while the group of Soviet leaders arranged to send military contingents to restore order in the country.

Convinced with great difficulty by I. Nagy that the government was regaining control of the country, the Soviets began to withdraw on October 29, 1956, but on November 1 the direct troop movements over Budapest were again reinforced. I. Nagy responded quickly by proclaiming Hungary's departure from the Warsaw Pact and defending the country's neutrality by calling for UN help. After hectic international meetings and contacts, especially with Mao Tse-Tung and Tito, Soviet leaders maintained that an anti-revolutionary attempt was underway and convinced J. Kadár to resort to a new and more intense intervention of Warsaw Pact troops in November 4.

The suppression of the resistance movement, carried out by the USSR between November 4 and 8, was extremely violent and total, even though there is to this day, in the contemporary historical debate, strong disagreements about the number of victims. I. Nagy was arrested by the Soviets, subjected to a secret process, sentenced to death and executed in January, 1957. Khrushchev was cunning in using the Stalin Report as an instrument for affirming and legitimizing his reformist policy, but how could he not imagine the consequences of his denunciations in satellite countries, where important popular sectors were mobilized to overthrow the gigantic statues of the former dictator and tyrant of their nationalities? Almost inevitably, Khrushchev saw opposition grow among the old party leaders. The most decisive political confrontation took place at the Central Committee of June, 1957, when Khrushchev managed to defeat the group formed around Molotov and Malenkov, bringing down both opponents to secondary positions. In the following year this ascension trajectory of Khrushchev reached the summit with the appointment of the new leader to the post of Party Secretary and President of the Council of Ministers.

COEXISTENCE AND COMPETITION IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

In contrast to Stalin's thesis that as long as imperialism survived, war between the two systems would be inevitable, Khrushchev established in the 20th Congress that, *in the relations between socialism and capitalism war should be replaced by competition* and that socialism was able to win such a dispute in a context of *peaceful coexistence*, but that "the development of civilization

will inevitably lead to the liquidation of the capitalist system[10]." This line of action did not abandon the thesis of ideological incompatibility between the two fields, which actually limited the very possibility of *coexistence*. The great challenge of the strategy of *coexistence* was to overcome the scope of diplomatic-military relations and to develop lines of political cooperation with governments or with political and social movements that did not share full homogeneity in the field of ideas with the USSR[11].

Favored by the Korean War armistice, similar positions had been held by Khrushchev since 1954 and had made possible reconsiderations of the 1945/1946 peace treaties (Paris, Moscow, and London) that were suspended for eight years after the end of World War II. This brief moment from 1954 was the first to be termed "thaw" or "distension" by contemporary Cold War political analysts since the escalating tensions from 1947 onwards. The occupation by the four World War II winners (United States, Soviet Union, United Kingdom and France) of the city of Vienna and Austria itself ended in May 1955, the latter being recognized as a victim, very generously, and not accomplice of Nazism. From that date, Austria has adhered to a treaty of neutrality in competition between the two systems.

Khrushchev began his reformist policy by taking long alternate journeys, both within the Soviet Union and abroad: he was in China in 1954, Yugoslavia in 1955 reconciling with Tito, in India, Burma and Afghanistan also in 1955 with the clear signal of interest for the Bandung Conference, and finally in England in 1956, shortly after the 20th Congress. However, the journey of the new Soviet leader who most resonated with the distancing climate of coexistence was his participation in the Geneva Conference of the "Big Four": Khrushchev, Eisenhower, Antony Eden and Edgar Faure, held in July 1955 and, therefore, symbolically, ten years after the July 1945 Potsdam Conference. In Geneva, the debate between the big four developed around the future of Germany, peace and disarmament with fairly moderate and reasonable propositions, but the reached clauses were considered unacceptable by the different parties.

There was no agreement at the "Big Four" Meeting, but the

[10] Khrushchev, Nikita. Memórias. RJ, Editora Artenova, vol. 2, 1971, p. 83.

[11] That's what happened with San Tiago Dantas's democratic labor and the Independent Foreign Politics led by this Chancellor between September 1961 and July 1962, who appropriated the strategy of peaceful coexistence to universalize Brazil's trade and diplomatic relations autonomously with the Cold War alignments, as I tried to demonstrate in the article "San Tiago Dantas: a política externa como instrumento da reforma social e da democracia" Carta Internacional, vol. 10, number 2, juldez, 2015, pp. 81 to 96.

participating premiers managed to leave a very cordial and conducive atmosphere for future understanding. A continuation of this atmosphere was the trip to Moscow by West German Chancellor Adenauer. But there was no agreement on Germany's future on this trip either, because, for Adenauer, Eastern Germany (the German Democratic Republic, GDR) simply did not exist. The German Chancellor's visit to Moscow generated at least the result of the reciprocal recognition of the two countries. Following these distensible events, the restrictions that prevented new members from entering the UN were released: in December 1955, the United Nations entered Austria and 15 other States between former colonies and countries of central eastern Europe considered satellites of Moscow. Italy, Spain and Portugal also joined the UN. The restoration of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Japan, and the latter's entry into the United Nations also complemented the framework of the strains until 1956.

However, 1955 was an ambivalent year, with the rearmament of Germany and the promotion of the Warsaw Pact, but these events were inscribed in the logic of the division of Europe into two areas of political influence and the same reflection can be made for the suppression of the revolt in Hungary in 1956, which effectively caused much commotion but was also quickly forgotten. The second half of 1959 (September) was marked by Khrushchev's trip to the United States. President Eisenhower and the American public warmly welcomed the Soviet leader, while large shows on US and Soviet realities were held in Moscow and New York. This exchange of interests and attentions gave the impression that the Cold War was over.

The term *Cold War* was coined by Walter Lipmann in 1947 in the context of controversies over the non-acceptance of Marshall Plan resources by the Soviet Union and the countries of central-eastern Europe, and since then the term has received numerous definitions. However, if we evaluate the narrower meaning of this expression as a conflict that only prevented direct armed confrontation between the main containers, but did not prevent effective long, intensely bloody indirect wars, events around the 1954/1955 biennium suggested the end of the Cold War. The signs of distension of these years combined with the advent of a balance recognized by competing powers showed that the bipolar configuration did not necessarily have to trigger a "cold war". But a similar assessment might seem less true from another point of view. Between 1955 and 1961, the Cold War continued to be permeated by increasing resources to the threats of nuclear experiments, increasingly publicized by the media, and these prospects for an end-of-world conflict

peaked in 1961 and 1962 with the events related to the Cuban missile crisis.

But, after all, returning to our initial object of study, where did the policy of Soviet peaceful coexistence come from? What did it actually consist of and what were its different subjects and its various appropriations?

STUDIES FOR THE HISTORY OF A POLYSEMIC CONCEPT

The first observation to be made is that peaceful coexistence consisted of a permanent reference in the history of Soviet foreign policy. The origin of this expression dates back to the birth of the Soviet state, and its pioneering enunciation came from Vladimir Il'ič Ul'janov, better known by the pseudonym Lenin. *Peaceful coexistence* was also a kind of "doctrine", a system of coordinates for the lines of action of Soviet foreign policy. *Coexistence* was part of attempts to affirm new conceptions of international relations after the Great War of 1914-1918, in contrast to the traditional relations between the "old world" States, the Europe of the Napoleonic Wars and the Europe of the Holy Alliance, or even the international system of the "Age of Empires" that originated the world conflict itself in the early twentieth century.

The "birth certificate" of the conception of peaceful coexistence can be found in the Decree on Peace issued by the revolutionary government shortly after its constitution in October 1917. There is, in the specific historiography on the subject, sensitive interpretative divergences regarding this proposition. While Edward Hallett Carr underlines the "more Wilsonian than Marxist language" of the *Decree*[12], he identifies in this document the absence of the traditional themes of the Marxist doctrine of war and peace, with the conclusion that its political substance consists in the proposal for a *democratic* peace to be obtained through negotiations; Adam Bruno Ulam, in his study *Expansion and Coexistence*, highlights the new language in international diplomacy and individualizes this novelty in the "appeal to the peoples" which concludes the document which, in his assessment, would prove that the Bolsheviks were firmly convinced that, "if in the short run Soviet power was to be maintained thanks to the immediate cessation of hostilities, in the long run […] peace could only be ensured if the socialist revolution took place in other countries[13]."

This contradiction between the prospect of an immediate and

[12] CARR, Edward Hallett. La Revolución Russa: de Lenin a Stalin, 1917-1929. Madrid, Alianza Editorial, 1997, p. 53.

[13] ULAN, A. B. Expansion and Coexistence: a History of Foreign Policy, 1917-1967. London, 1968, p. 78.

negotiated peace and one to be won by exporting the revolution exploded with all its political force in Central Committee discussions during the Brest-Litovsk Treaty. In this extremely dramatic and unfavorable context of the new regime, there was no possibility for decisive choices between the alternatives of a "democratic peace" and a "revolutionary peace", and the differences expressed by the Bolshevik leaders were suspended.

It is worth following the development of certain analyses of Lenin in the face of political transformations, internal and external, to the new Soviet state between the end of the civil war (1920) and the well-known Genoa Conference (1922). In Lenin's speech on December 6, 1920, the Soviet leader, after assessing John Maynard Keynes's thesis in *The Economic Consequences of Peace*[14], proposed the hypothesis that economic reconstruction and the country's own electrification could take place within the framework of international cooperation, of a "positive building program" on a worldwide scale[15]. In this spirit, a decree on *concessions* was elaborated, which provided for "an impeccable economic program for the reconstruction of the world's economic forces through the use of all raw materials, wherever they may be[16]." However, Lenin seemed increasingly aware that the prospects for a long-term international collaboration where Russia would revolutionize and essentially play the role of supplier of raw materials generated strong reactions in his party, in which the Soviet leader was confronted with radical convictions, as well as consolidated traditions which he himself had first contributed to forming through his writings in recent times, convictions which had in fact persuaded the Bolshevik "chief". To convince his party mates of the need for "concessions" to foreign capitalists, he himself also made *concessions*. The New Economic Policy (the NEP), whose *concessions* were an integral part of the project, consisted for Lenin of a "new form of war" or "continuation of war" and even "a true and proper war[17]." This *concession* should not last indefinitely and, for the Bolshevik chief: "as long as capitalism and socialism subsisted, they could not live in peace: either will eventually win; the requiem will eventually be sung by the Soviet republic or, instead, by world capitalism." This was the core of the theme of the inevitability of war that Lenin developed

[14] KEYNES, John Maynard. As Consequências Econômicas da Paz. São Paulo, Imprensa Oficial do Estado, Brasília: Editora Universidade de Brasília, 2002 (Clássicos IPRI; v. 3).

[15] V. I. Lenin. "Reunión de Militantes de la organización del PC (b) R de Moscú". In: Obras Completas XXXIV (Octubre de 1920-mazo de 1921), Madrid, Akal Editor, Ediciones de Cultura Popular, 1978, pp. 163-164.

[16] Ibid. p.164.

[17] Ibid., p. 172.

in a later speech, also devoted to the problem of concessions: if it were true, according to Clausewitz's celebrated formulation that contemporary war was the "continuation of peacetime politics", the inverted formula was true also for Lenin, inserting politics in the continuation of war "in another form and by other means." This perspective of conflict applied not only to the relations between socialism and capitalism, but also to the relations between the imperial states themselves. The disagreements that opposed these actors/subjects were not occasional differences, internal to the parties for example, but deep and non-eliminable divergences of economic interests between the empires and powers in international politics, located on the ground of private ownership of land and capital, which they would lead to a line of permanent dispute, rendering sterile all attempts to join forces against Soviet power. On the basis of these beliefs, Lenin considered a war between the United States and Japan for Pacific rule to be "inevitable" and, more generally, identified the existence of inter-imperialist contradictions as the only guarantee of peace for the Soviet Union.

The contradictions manifested during the debate on the concessions became even more explicit when the idea of a long-cited international economic conference materialized and Soviet Russia was invited to participate. The correspondence between Lenin and the commissioner of foreign affairs, diplomat Georgij Vasil'evic Cicerin, during the Genoa economic conference, offers a very persuasive testimony about the development of the revolution leader's thinking. In a letter to GV Cicerin sent on March 14, 1922, Lenin, in addition to commenting on the Commissar's "pacifist program" which included traditional measures such as disarmament, compulsory arbitration and an international economic cooperation plan. It also sought to recall the program of the III International and to consider "our duty" as communists, but also "traders", to support the "other camp" pacifists, that is, to support the bourgeois, in order to contribute to the wider disintegration of the enemy. On the other hand, at a party meeting of March 6, 1922, Lenin openly expressed his reservations and his skepticism about the possibility of international cooperation under the aegis of pacifism: "the superstructure of political colloquia of all kinds, of assumptions and of projects" that occupied us so much in Genoa was precisely a "superstructure" and consequently needed to "understand that it was just a very often artificially constructed, invented, built superstructure built by those who have an interest in doing so[18]."

[18] V. I. Lenin, "La Situación Internacional e interna de la Republica Sovietica. Discurso en la Seción del Grupo Comunista del congreso di toda a Rusia de metalúrgica", in: Obras

Experts in Soviet history, particularly in Soviet foreign policy history, have discussed much in their analysis whether the term *sozitel'stvo* (conviviality) often used by Lenin was more or less equivalent to the term *sosuscestovanie* (coexistence). We propose to consider this issue, for the time being, of little relevance and to pay more attention to Lenin's political conception, which seemed to be aware of the initial need to guarantee to the country itself a period of "breath" in view of an inevitable future proof which, sooner rather than later, would be embarrassed to face. The Soviet leader conceived this "cohabitation" or, this "coexistence" essentially as a truce (*peredyska*), even if only a "provisional truce". Researchers who have examined Lenin's writings of this period and have become familiar with his pronouncements know today of the frequency and even of the intensity of the use of the term *peredyska*.

It has also been noted that the concept of truce found in Lenin's writings between 1920 and 1922 has a different and longer term meaning than the one that motivated the Brest-Litovsk treatise in 1918. One thing is a war truce conducted between Socialism and Capitalism as it occurred or was supposed to have occurred in early 1918 and during the Civil War; something else is a truce in a situation of war of position and stabilization in both internal and international relations. In the latter context, this truce is no longer a momentary necessity, a moment of "breathing" in the conflict, or even a necessary step backward for the momentum of a great leap forward, and has become, in Lenin's own words in his speech on December 1920: "a new phase in which our international existence in the network of capitalist States is a conquered fact[19]." Lenin's sense of *truce* from 1920, therefore, was no longer merely on relatively short-term dilation, but on a "long-term line of action."

The reflections and redefinitions initiated by Lenin in his later years tended to encompass the problems regarding the international insertion of the Soviet Union and, consequently, the themes of war and peace. Lenin's last writing, *"Mejor poco, pero mejor"* can be considered a point of arrival for these (re)assessments, and, for certain specialists in the revolutionary leader's thought, this text was a sort of second-will political testament. Although there is in this writing continuity of the discourse that international politics is

Completas XXXV (6 de marzo de 1922), Madrid, Akal Editor, Ediciones de Cultura Popular, 1978, p. 173.

[19] Lenin. "Informe del Comité Ejecutivo Central de Toda a Russia y del Consejo de Comissarios del Pueblo sobre la Politica Exterior e Interna". Obras Completas Tomo XXXIV, Ediciones de Cultura Popular, AKAL Editor, 1978.

going through a movement towards the world socialist revolution, the author also evaluates, and more realistically, that the imperialist states succeeded in splitting the world into two fields. Faced with the risk of isolation from revolutionary Russia and the East, Lenin glimpsed in a very long period of truce the chances of building a civil society in the socialist camp. The longer a truce, the greater the chances of strengthening Soviet society and winning over its rival. *Peredyska* thus ceased to be a momentary necessity, a pause in the revolutionary process to become a necessity, a goal to be pursued. *Peredyska* thus acquired a positive connotation and became the necessary condition for the construction of a new society and a new civilization. The prospect at this time of an inevitable long-term conflict between the counterrevolutionary, imperialist West and the revolutionary, nationalist East posed the challenge of resistance. The inevitability of war within the framework of a bipolar view of international relations and a substantially unilinear conception of history remained a closed point for many CPUSSR Bolsheviks, but Lenin left a legacy to his successors who understood the need to revise this kind of perspective.

Among those who engaged, before and after Lenin's death, in a process of reviewing and reworking Russia's international relations with the Western camp, the figure of Commissioner Georgij Vasil'evic Cicerin[20] may be highlighted, who was a relatively dissonant interlocutor of the revolutionary leader on the occasion of the Genoa Conference and to which the paternity of the expression *"peaceful coexistence"* is attributed. Studies conducted on the thought of this diplomat registered his interest in relation to the problems of political and economic interdependence of the world that emerged from the Great War of 1914-1918 and his influence on the traditional theme of mutual pacifism, perhaps due to his formation originated in the Tsarist regime. After all, the two Hague Conferences were the result of the initiatives of Russian diplomacy.

At this point, it is worth recalling the re(assessments) also by Nicolaj I. Bukharin. It was precisely this Party theorist who made the most progress in seeking a different approach to the traditional Bolshevik position on the problems of peace and war. As his performance and political thinking developed, his differences with the revolutionary leader, Lenin, became evident. Bukharin conceived a stronger tendency towards the "globality" of the time: in a world where interdependence seemed increasingly dominant, all wars, even national or liberation wars, carried the risks of degenerating

[20] See: Lorenzo Cerimele "Germania e Russia da Genova a Rapallo. Storia dei due paria nell'Europa post-guerra" in: Euroopinione.it, 05/11/2014.

into conflict of world proportions. The world revolution turned out to be unrealizable, the world was nonetheless interdependent, and the world war expressed a carnage, "a new catastrophe and an unpredictable conflict over its concrete form." In 1923, Bucharin wrote that, "if the war were repeated only in half the intensity of 1914-1918, the results would be much more exterminations and devastation." And he continued, "the duty of the Bolsheviks was to raise the anti-war flag and unite all the workers around it[21]."

Up to this point in the Party and *Comintern* debate, the current expression had been "fight against war", understood substantially as a new proposition of the tactic adopted by the Bolsheviks before and during the Great War of 1914-1918 with the political objective of turn the imperialist war into a civil war. Compared to "fight against war", "fight for peace" was distinguished and differentiated by defending and presupposing the conviction that the prevention of a "new 1914" — an expression of recurrent use also in the debates of the III International — it was an objective to be pursued on the condition that the convergence and collaboration of a plurality of political subjects exerting simultaneous and coordinated pressure on all governments was achieved. As it came from studies of the 1980s — the last decade of the Cold War — this slogan of the "fight for peace" was at the center of the *Plenum* (Plenary Meeting) discussions of 1926 and 1927, and Bukharin was one of your most ardent defenders[22]. This expression, however, did not prevail, and Bukharin's detachment from the Comintern summit definitely confirmed his defeat, interrupting a promising new policy making.

In place of "fight for peace", the slogan "fight against war" prevailed, and was gradually identified with *the USSR defense strategy* and as the only possible concrete form of peace defense. In practice, this change meant not only renouncing the war-prevention perspective — with its other face of strengthening the concept of war inevitability — but also the return to a more restrictive concept of *peredyska*.

During the 7th Congress of the Communist International, held in Moscow in August 1935, the effective slogan that remained was the defense of the Soviet Union, and the political objective effectively pursued was the expansion of a conflict deemed to be inevitable. Joseph Stalin gave an interview to US journalist Roy Howard in March 1936, a few months after the 7th Congress, identifying as the "main cause" of a world war that could

[21] Nikolai Bucharin. Proletraskaya revolyutsya i kul'tura. Moscow, Priboi, 1923.

[22] Reference to the chapter from A. Di Biagio "L'ultima battaghia dell'oposizione", in Studi di Storia Sovietica. Roma, Feltrinelli, 1981.

unexpectedly break out, not so much the "fascism" that occasionally appeared in his discourse, but "capitalism" and its imperialist and expansionist phenomena, factors that would have originated, for much of the original Bolshevik thought, the Great War of 1914-1918. On this occasion, Stalin made explicit reference to the concept of "peaceful coexistence", stating that "the American democracy and the Soviet system could live together peacefully".

With the coming of the War from 1939, the conflagration was used by Stalin as a way of confirming not only his analyses and predictions, but also as a reinforcement of Lenin's reduced or simplified positions. In his speech to voters on February 2, 1946, Stalin stated that World War II had not been a "copy" of the former, because the latter acquired "from the outset the character of an anti-fascist war", even if such recognition preceded the his claim that "the war had exploded as an inevitable result of world economic and political forces on the basis of contemporary monopolistic capitalism" and the division of this system "into two adverse fields." In Stalin's text, *"Economic Problems of Socialism of the USSR*[23]*"*, the allusion to the "antifascist" character of the war was set aside and only the claim that World War II was generated by the "general crisis of the world capitalist system" was maintained. The author even tried to make it particularly clear that this second great conflict "did not begin with a war against the USSR, but with the war between the capitalist countries[24]."

From the experience of World War II, Stalin did not merely highlight a confirmation of the correctness of his political line of action, but also claimed the lesson and a valid norm for the future, and also the conclusion that Lenin's theses, which "proved to be correct in the past" retained their validity, even in situations determined after the end of the second world conflict of the 20th century. As has been observed in many studies of the history of Soviet foreign policy of this period, one of the most salient points of Stalin's last intervention was the controversy regarding the positions of the other Party members and interlocutors who defended the thesis of *avoidance* of a new conflict, motivated by the transformations and innovations that the experience of World War II had introduced into the world political and economic system towards greater interdependence.

In Stalin's assessment, the postwar world indicated no substantial changes in relation to the "interwar" or "Twenty Years of Crisis" except the

[23] Joseph Stalin. Problemas Econômicos do Socialismo na URSS. RJ, Editorial Vitória, 1953.
[24] Joseph Stalin. Problemas Econômicos do Socialismo na URSS. RJ, Editorial Vitória, 1953, p. 42.

increase in the international prestige of the USSR. In his view, imperialist contradictions had become much sharper to the point of considering "the breakdown of the single universal market as the most important outcome of World War II[25]." For Stalin, the war deepened the general crisis of the world capitalist system, and the division of the world into two camps was no longer a disadvantage, as Lenin had estimated in his day. The "breakdown of the single universal market and the formation of two parallel and opposite world markets" should be regarded as an achievement and the possibility of a "periodic breakdown of raw materials and consumer markets" which "might" avoid a "war catastrophe", something unrealizable under the conditions of the time. In such a conceptual context, war became more than ever "inevitable" and the thesis that "eliminating the inevitability of war meant destroying imperialism" was gaining momentum[26].

The only innovation introduc introduced by Stalin in relation to traditional doctrine was represented by the specific observation that the inevitability of wars (plural) concerned, first of all, wars between capitalist countries whose contrasts "were revealed even during World War II, stronger than the contrast between the field of capitalism and the field of socialism[27]." It was from these assumptions that Stalin launched the idea of peaceful coexistence that appeared, as we have seen, in the interview with US journalist Roy Howard in 1936. In 1947, Stalin granted an interview to the American journalist Stassen, attributing the paternity of the expression, "peaceful coexistence" to Lenin. "He," according to Stalin's emphatic statement, "was the first to express the idea of the collaboration of two different systems" and "Lenin is our master" of which "as befits the disciples", "we have never distanced ourselves and we never will[28]."

Stalin's conception of "peaceful coexistence" proved, however, quite restrictive, not only because coexistence continued to be perceived as a truce whose duration, even if long term, depended on the hardly foreseeable complications of international rivalries, but also, and mainly, because this coexistence was alien to any element of political affinity. For Stalin, peaceful coexistence remained essentially confined to the diplomatic-military sphere, implying no degree of political affinity between the *coexisting* States, much less

[25] Joseph Stalin. Problemas Econômicos do Socialismo na URSS. RJ, Editorial Vitória, 1953, p. 50.

[26] Joseph V. Stalin. Problemas econômicos do socialismo na URSS. Editorial Vitória, Rio de Janeiro, 1953.

[27] Joseph V. Stalin. Ibid., p. 51

[28] Joseph V. Stalin. Problemi della pace. Roma, Feltrinelli, 1953, pp. 7 to 9.

foreseeing the possibility of their transformation into political collaboration or cooperation. "The current peace movement, understood as a peacekeeping movement [...] will lead to the concealment of a determined war, to postponing it for a while, to maintain a determined peace for a while", but "this is not enough to eliminate the inevitability of wars between capitalist countries[29]."

The peaceful coexistence thus conceived was a theory of separation; political separation between two opposing systems and also economic separation between two opposing markets. Coexistence as the theory of a suspicious Soviet isolationism towards all that was foreign, and an outward projection of the same suspicion that, for Stalin, constituted the rule of government, the assumption of the use of violence and mass terror.

The "thaw" that followed Stalin's death in 1953 paved the way for a set of political and theoretical reflections that also obviously reached the concept of peaceful coexistence. This debate took place through different articles in the *Pravda*, the *Kommunist*, and speeches in the Supreme Soviet from April 1953 between A. Nikonov, Malenkov and Evgeni Varga[30]. We emphasize the intervention of E. Varga, who was the main controversial target of the last text written by Stalin, retaking the argument that a possible World War III would constitute not only a threat to the capitalist system, but a threat of existence to all humanity. E. Varga not only confined himself to this finding, but also explored the proposition that peaceful coexistence was no longer just a possibility and became effectively necessary for the development of true and proper international collaboration, aimed primarily at fostering the development of underdeveloped countries.

The open political crisis in the Soviet ruling group after Stalin's death found its coagulation point at the 20th CPUSSR Congress, held in 1956. From what we have seen so far, the Khrushchev Report seemed like an attempt to pause and find a balance. This intervention also represented a starting point for a process of redefinition and revision that covered the whole period of Khrushchev. As this study also saw, the most controversial point of the political debate in the years 1954-55 was the nature and consequences of a nuclear conflict. After Khrushchev stated in the Report that there could be no alternative between peaceful coexistence and the "most devastating war in history" and, consequently, there was "no third way," the new Secretary kept

[29] Joseph V. Stalin. Problemas econômicos do socialismo na URSS. Editorial Vitória, Rio de Janeiro, 1953, pp. 50, 51.

[30] Evgeni Varga was a Russian Soviet economist from Hungary and leader of the third communist international.

a safe escape towards tradition, noting that "in the event that the capitalists *dare* to start a war, they would have a *strong response*." These oscillations that were part of the final document of the 20th Congress were not exempt from ambiguity components. Khrushchev's innovation, however, in the congress hall was the assertion that wars were not fatally inevitable. "There are today," as the Secretary noted, "powerful social and political forces that have remarkable means of preventing capitalists from unleashing the war, and if they dare to promote it, we will give a forceful response[31]." Thus, Khrushchev explicitly contradicted Stalin's thesis on *Economic Problems of Socialism*. Stalin also referred to "powerful popular forces" that might oppose the war, but in order to draw from this statement the opposite conclusion that they would not be able to prevent the outbreak of a conflict. On this subject, Stalin relied on Lenin's thesis that "imperialism inevitably generated war", and Khrushchev could not press such a controversy as to question the authority of the founder of the Soviet state. The new Party Secretary upheld Lenin's thesis that "as long as imperialism existed the economic base of war would remain." At the same time, this expression "economic base" was in keeping with Khrushchev's previous statement that "war was not an exclusively economic phenomenon." Although distanced from Stalin's thesis, Khrushchev's utterance at the Twentieth Congress seems to retain elements of ambiguity and impasse. In the final congressional resolution, the formula "the unavoidability of war" brought with it the contradictions of the need for a double-negation expression.

The principal instrument for pursuing "the unavoidability of war" was, of course, peaceful coexistence, which, at the 20th Congress definitively, entered the official lexicon with the dignity of a true and proper postulate. *Coexistence* was the general line of Soviet foreign policy and its fundamental principle. But what did peaceful coexistence really consist of? As the "general line" and "objective necessity", what distinguished this peaceful coexistence from the old tradition of *peredyska*?

First, what were the subjects of peaceful coexistence? In the Report of the 20th Congress, Khrushchev reconstructed an overview of the international situation where everything was resolved in the contrast between the two camps and the two markets. While the complex content remained in the characterization of the "two world economic systems," the document's attention was also directed to the "large group of states with populations of hundreds of millions of men actively operating against the war" and

[31] N. Krustchev. Informe Secreto al XX Congreso del PCUS. 25 de febrero 1956. https://www.marxists.org/espanol/khrushchev/1956/febrero25.htm

standing outside of blocks in international politics. Khrushchev mentioned India and Burma, which, as we have seen, he had visited before the 20th Congress. On China, the principle of peaceful coexistence had become "one of the cornerstones of this foreign policy." In this context, Khrushchev made explicit reference to the five points proposed by China and India, inserted in the Bandung Conference, indicating these points as the best form of reciprocal relations between States based on diverse systems", even celebrating the fact that these countries could become the basis of international relations between States around the world." These statements seem to express a conception of peaceful coexistence as a rule, a code of behavior for all, and therefore concerning not only the relations between the two blocks, but also the relations within the blocks themselves: thus, all States could be subjects of peaceful coexistence, and this policy would result from a sum of convergent efforts and, necessarily, of a multipolar configuration. More specifically, the reference to the Bandung Conference implied a recognition of the role played by countries not aligned with the purpose of maintaining and consolidating peace and, consequently, a more articulated view of international relations.

Khrushchev's statement about Bandung was taken up in the final document of the 20th Congress, but in a prudent manner. Reference to the Non-Aligned Conference was limited to "remarkable principles of international relations", coinciding with those of Bandung. However, this quote has become an isolated reference. In all successive documents, peaceful coexistence was conceived essentially as a bipolar relationship between the two fields or the two systems with the implicit consequence that, within the two fields or systems, other rules would apply. In this way, the concept of peaceful coexistence as a rule for all and collective construction increasingly emptied and consolidated, the relations associated exclusively with "the two main powers of the world[32]". And, from the moment imperialism continued to be defined as "the only cause of war", the only subject of peaceful coexistence was the USSR. The "peace zone" cited by Khrushchev at the 20th Congress, which comprised the signers of the Bandung document, was maintained as a huge rearguard driven to gravitate toward Soviet peace.

Associated with the topics of the subjects of peaceful coexistence is the problem of the content of this concept and even of its own definition. We also discovered many oscillations and ambiguities in this investigation. The definition contained in the program approved at the XX Congress was

[32] Nikita Kruschev. La politica dell' Unione Sovietica. Rapporto al XX Congresso del Pcus. Roma, Feltrinelli, 1956, p. 55.

constituted by a reference from the five points of the Bandung Conference. In reality, it was not a very accurate reference: peaceful coexistence was only one of Bandung's five points, more precisely, the fifth point and with little relief in the document. Much more relevant was the fact that, at the 22th Congress, this definition underwent significant modifications, such as the withdrawal of the reference to Bandung while the other points were similarly modified. While the first point, *mutual respect, the third point, nonintervention in home affairs, and the fourth, equal reciprocal advantages*, remained unchanged, the second point, nonaggression, was replaced by the principle of *"renouncing war as a means of decisions of disputes between states and their solutions through the mechanism of negotiations."* Finally, the fifth point, peaceful coexistence, has been replaced by the wording "developing economic and cultural collaboration on the basis of full equality and mutual advantage[33]."

We could continue to exploit this barren feat of official documents, but it does not seem useful to us because such a line of analysis has confirmed the impressions of uncertainty and the absence of a precise definition. One alternative was to explore the problem on the negative side, that is, by what peaceful coexistence is not. In this way, a very clear point was made: peaceful coexistence did not penetrate the terrain of ideology and was therefore incompatible with every concession in this sphere. The first formulation of this concept was expressed in the January 1960 *Plenum* and was reaffirmed on many other occasions. In the program approved at the 22th Congress, peaceful coexistence was endorsed as a "specific form of class struggle." Of the incompatibility between communist doctrine and capitalist ideology, Khrushchev had become convinced of what he had explicitly stated in his memoirs: "Peaceful coexistence is possible between different systems of government, but not between different ideologies[34]."

An ideological concession would clearly imply the possibility that peaceful coexistence would develop in political cooperation with governments or with political and social movements that did not share with the Soviets a full homogeneity of ideas. The idea of convergence signaled by the 7th Congress, as we have seen before, has not been taken up again, and the expression "fight for peace", which we often find in the official documents of the Khrushchev period, appeared, however, without due power and in a generic way. In other words, peaceful coexistence remained predominantly

[33] Nikita Kruschev. La politica dell' Unione Sovietica. Rapporto al XX Congresso del Pcus. Roma, Feltrinelli, 1956, p. 240.

[34] Khrushchev, Nikita. Memórias. RJ, Editora Artenova, vol. 2, 1971, p. 539.

confined to the diplomatic-military sphere rather than the economic realm, and thus this policy was subject to states, governments, and, of course, the Soviet government.

The Khrushchev period recorded, we may say, major innovations in coexistence policy, but such innovations were inscribed in a traditional coordinate system. The conception of history remained as a unilinear process that should inevitably conclude with the worldwide affirmation of a superior system of social organization. And the conception of war as a continuation of politics by other means also remained substantially intact.

The successive phase of Leonid Ilitch Brezhnev was characterized by a sharp fall in the reformist tone of Soviet policy in relation to the Khrushchev period. With regard to peaceful coexistence, references have become increasingly rare and protocolary, and their predominantly bipolar character is emphasized. Coexistence was established exclusively between the two systems and was neither applied to internal relations nor to relations between third States. Brezhnev adopted the conception of fight between the two systems and their respective worldviews that had taken root in history, and a certain integration between the two systems was, for the new secretary, simply impossible. According to this premise, peaceful coexistence was defined as, taking up the formula of the 22th Congress: "a specific form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism in the international arena." An element of novelty was represented by the statement that the policy of peaceful coexistence was a "compromise in the sense that it was based on the pursuit of a reasonable balance of interests and mutually acceptable agreements." Peaceful coexistence therefore tended to be identified at this stage with "distension." When we consult the official documents of the Congresses and the *Plenum*, we note that the two expressions often appeared associated and often even equivalent.

WE HAVE TO LEARN TO THINK IN A NEW WAY

Our interest in concluding this study temporarily, however, lies in the new conception of peaceful coexistence that the regime's official doctrine was unable to produce and that it was born of what we might call the 'culture of dissent'. Its manifesto was written by Andrej Dmitrievič Sacharov, *Progress, Coexistence and Intellectual Freedom*, June 1968[35]. A. Sacharov's intervention in

[35] Andrej Sacharov. Progresso, coexistência e liberdade intelectual. Lisboa, Ed. Don Quixote, 1976.

the debate on peaceful coexistence was indeed controversial in relation to the official conception, beginning with questioning the main assumption of the Soviet government: the bipolar perspective of the world. The author had stated at the very beginning of his manifesto: "the disunity of humanity is a threat to destruction for humanity itself[36]." What seems essential to us in Sakharov's thought was his conception of not interpreting the history and development of socialism as processes parallel or separate in relation to the history of humanity as a whole, but on the contrary, as an integral and integrated part of this complex. "Without socialism," wrote A. Sakharov, "bourgeois practicality and the selfish principle of private property have spawned 'the people of the abyss[37]'" described in a famous book by Jack London and, before this author, endorsed by Engels. For the Soviet physicist, only competition with socialism and working-class pressure made possible the social progress of the twentieth century, as well as the successive and inevitable process of approximation of the two systems. "Only socialism raised the meaning of work to the height of a moral enterprise. Without socialism, national selfishness generated colonial oppression, Nazism, and racism." Of course, the inverse proposition, for A. Sakharov, was true as well, namely: "without intellectual freedom", considered by the indispensable author, and without the freedom of circulation of ideas, 20th century social progress and socialism itself would not be realized.

What A. Sakharov challenged was not, therefore, ideologies and their roles in history, but the "predication of the incompatibility between ideologies and the nations of the world[38]." If we wanted to use the terms the author adopted, the proposal would be: "a truly human international approach," the only subject in history for this Soviet physicist was the human race as a whole.

Sakharov did not make it clear in his first published speech whether this process of convergence could be interpreted as an inevitable predisposition to the scientific technical revolution and the development of the productive forces or, if it was founded on the hope that there was "a world interest to overcome disunity", or yet, as it seemed most likely, if he had leaned on both at once. Because of these possibilities, he wrote about "a scientific-democratic approach to politics, economy and culture." The suffered events and persecutions may have influenced these ambiguities and the orientation

[36] Andrej Sacharov. Progresso, coexistência e liberdade intelectual. Lisboa, Ed. Don Quixote, 1976, p. 57.

[37] Jack London. O Povo do Abismo: fome e miséria do coração do Império Britânico. Uma reportagem do início do século XX. SP, Fundação Perseu Abramo, 2004.

[38] Ibid., p. 92.

of their activities in an increasingly democratic sense.

In the 1968 text, the "coexistence" in A. Sakharov's little libretto title was a radically different concept from the multiple versions and variants we have explored to date. This "coexistence" was neither alig aligned with Stalin's idea of "separation" nor with Lenin's sense of *peredyska*. Nor was it the *"deterrance"* of the 1960s and 1970s or, to adopt the author's own expressions, the "traditional method of a foreign policy that can be defined as 'empirical conjuncture'" which consisted of the "maximum improvement of positions" and "to the detriment of opposing forces." This method would be valid if politics were only a game of two in a bipolar world, but the refusal of this bipolarity, as we seek to demonstrate, was the starting point of Sakharov's thought.

Perhaps, among the various definitions of coexistence we have identified, the one that most closely matches those of A. Sakharov was Khrushchev's notion of "emulation", which the Soviet physicist defined as "brave" and an expression of "peaceful competition." The "possibility of capitalism, if not blindly conducted, not necessarily being constrained to embark on a military adventure" was also a conception of co-existence of the Khrushchev period, taken up and developed by Sakharov. According to the author, "the capitalist system and the communist system have the possibility of developing over a long period, mutually reaching the positive elements of each other and actually approaching each other in essential aspects." The differences between Sakharov and Khrushchev lay in the fact that the positive aspects of "reciprocity" and "coexistence" were privileged over those of "conflict", but the main innovation was the displacement of a perspective we call unilinear from history of the victory of one system over the other, replaced by the approach of a progressive approximation of the two models.

Sakharov's assessment of coexistence goes beyond the merely updated or developed conception of Khrushchev's "emulation" and "competition". The key idea of the 1968 manifesto was far broader and more comprehensive of "deepening peaceful coexistence down to the level of collaboration, ever deeper coexistence, and collaboration between the two systems and the two spheres. Or even more, of a truly universal cooperation[39]."

Conceived in this way, peaceful coexistence was no longer a policy confined to the diplomatic-military sphere. Sakharov's overriding goal was to prevent a nuclear conflict that posed a threat to the very existence of

[39] Andrej Sacharov. Progresso, coexistência e liberdade intelectual. Lisboa, Ed. Don Quixote, 1976, p. 58.

civilization and that overcame the Clausewitzian and Leninist doctrine of war. However, if this objective was a priority for the Soviet physicist, he did not consider it sufficient or satisfactory.

It was necessary for Sakharov not only to create limitations to prevent war but to make maximum efforts to eliminate its causes. By the year 1968, the themes of environmental preservation and the fight against hunger had not yet gained expression in the international policy agenda as in the contemporary conjuncture, but Sakharov's texts already devoted significant space to these issues. It was on the basis of a complex and articulate assessment of the state of humanity that the author elaborated in the second part of his book *Progress, Coexistence and Intellectual Freedom*, entitled "The Basis of Hope", a plan divided into successive stages that should culminate in the creation of a world government at the end of the second millennium[40]." Although such formulation may seem an abstraction and naivete like other earlier manifestations, recognized by Sakharov himself, this reference was not dissociated from the Soviet internal political debate. The idea of a "world government" had already been put forward by Bertrand Russell and Albert Einstein in a series of public texts and statements in the immediate post-WWII of the last century. In one of his texts, Einstein addressed the Soviet government directly and explicitly, expressing his sympathy for the USSR and soliciting interest in his proposal[41]. Zhdanov was in charge of responding to the German physicist through the report of the Cominform constituent meeting in September 1947. In this document, the Second Secretary General of the CPSU responds to Einstein, rejecting the idea of a "world government" and defining such a proposal as an attack on the principle of national sovereignty and "a means of pressure to ideologically disarm the peoples who defend their independence from the onslaught of American imperialism." Zhdanov referred to the "bourgeois intellectuals" who lent themselves to the role of preachers, however, with contents of "dreamers and pacifists[42]". After a few weeks, on November 26, 1947, the Soviet magazine *Novoe Vremja* published a letter signed by four Soviet scholars who, while paying homage to Einstein's intellectual honesty, resonated Zhdanov's arguments less harshly. During this period, Sakharov was working on the construction of the Soviet atomic bomb and had no doubt that the creation of this supermaterial would be of

[40] Andrej Sakharov. Progresso, coexistência e liberdade intelectual. Lisboa, Ed. Don Quixote, 1976, p. 96.

[41] Albert Einstein. Como Vejo o Mundo. RJ, Nova Fronteira, 1998, and Bertrand Russell, Autobiografia de Bertrand Russell, RJ, Civilização Brasileira, 1972.

[42] Andrei Zdanov. Politica e Ideologia. Roma, Edizioni Rinascita, 1949, p. 45.

vital importance to the regime. Thus, after years of detachment, the reflection on the problems of peace and humanity that Sakharov had begun after the death of Stalin and the 20th CPSU Congress reached full maturity, and the author of the father of the Soviet atomic bomb had changed into a political dissident of the regime, advocating the idea of a world government.

The Soviet domestic scientific and academic environment was most receptive to external stimuli and sought to dialogue with the ideas of authors such as Bertrand Russell and Alfred Einstein . An example of this predisposition was the article published in 1977 by the academic Markov in the Soviet magazine *Voprosy Filosoffi* with the title "Did we learn to think in a new way?" which literally resonated with a passage from the 1955 Einstein and Russell manifesto, "We Have to Learn to Think in a New Way." Markov's answer to the question proposed in the title of his article was substantially negative. There was acknowledgment of progress made in various fields and a reminder of the Helsinki accords, the apparent end of the cold war and the advent of distension, but, at the same time, the author stressed that, in the decisive sector of the arms race, no progress had been effectively implemented. On the contrary, the arms race continued and at an increasingly intense pace. The nightmare of extermination, possibly caused by human error, hovered more and more inevitably upon humanity. Men had not, therefore, learned to think in a new way, and had not heeded Russell and Einstein's appeals such as, "remember your humanity and forget all the rest". In turn, Markov asked, is it possible to "forget all the rest", to dispense with belonging to a nation, its own social condition, its own political beliefs and ideals? His answer to this harrowing question was that, if it was not possible to "forget all the rest," if it was not possible, in other words, to disengage from the weight of history and the past, it was, however, possible to act in such a way that the difficult path of the general movement toward peace on a road signposted with the following orientation: "here the representatives of mankind pass". If it was not possible to "forget all the rest," some things should be forgotten: the infinite variants of the *si vis pacem para bellum*, from Clausewitz to the balance of terror, the nationalism that, as the history of the 20th century has taught us, was a sudden epidemic disease. If some old things were forgotten, new things appeared that should be incorporated if there was a true desire to learn to think in a new way. First of all, it was necessary to learn to think in universal terms of the human race. Markov resumed Sacharov's theme: it was necessary to make peace a positive concept, conceiving it as a collective enterprise of humanity, understood not only as a prevention of war but as a

means of removing its causes.

If the subject of peaceful coexistence could not be anything other than mankind, this policy could not be conceived as different from a collective enterprise where everyone would be called to collaborate. This, in turn, implied that no one could claim his monopoly and that there could be — and indeed there were — various conceptions of peaceful coexistence. If the Communists were convinced that the progress of distension and peace constituted the premise and basis for the victory of socialism on a planetary scale, Willy Brandt in Germany was convinced that peaceful coexistence would allow the transformation of socialist countries into western democracies. San Tiago Dantas in Brazil also bet on coexistence policy as the best strategy to affirm the model of democracy with social reforms in the context of inter-American relations[43]. These were different perspectives, but they had in common the assumption that the historical disputes between those who sustained scientific communism in the past and their opponents could only be resolved on the basis of peaceful coexistence.

The final and at the same time reformulation and reopening phase of this process was that of Mikhail Gorbachev, who developed the following discourse and argumentation: "Such collaboration is necessary to prevent nuclear catastrophe in order for civilization to survive. This collaboration occurs to solve together and in the interest of each other other general problems, also, of the worsening humanity. The real dialectic of contemporary development is the combination of competition between the two systems and the growing interdependence of states in the world community. Precisely in this way, by clashing between opposites, in a difficult way and, to some extent, by mistakes and successes, a contradictory but interdependent, largely integrated world is formed[44]."

The concept of coexistence implicit in these statements appears remarkably different and new from all preceding official formulations: not only is this concept not limited to the diplomatic-military sphere, but as a dialectical combination of competition and interdependence, and, as a synthesis of opposites, this concept is no longer a choice of a particular State or field to become an objective tendency to which everyone can and is called to collaborate.

[43] See the previous study on the appropriate peaceful coexistence strategy by San Tiago Dantas in the period of Independent Foreign Policy. Renato Petrocchi "San Tiago Dantas: a Política Externa como instrumento de reforma social e de democracia". Carta Internacional (USP), v. 10, p. 81-96, 2015.

[44] Michail Gorbacëv. Ogni cosa a suo tempo. Storia della mia vita. Roma, Marsilio, 2013.

FINAL AND TEMPORARY CONSIDERATIONS

It is possible to distinguish, at first, three meanings of the expression "peaceful coexistence", formulation that became better known in the Cold War period after the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956, when the then Secretary of the CPSU, Nikita Khrushchev, announced this new line of action for USSR international policy. These three meanings of the policy of peaceful coexistence corresponded in turn to three distinct historical phases of the Soviet Union, each characterized by a particular way of conceiving the position of the socialist State and its projection as a superpower in the world system of international relations.

The policy of coexistence can be understood, in the first place, as a kind of "truce", a moment of maximum expression of the structurally conflicting dialectic between the country of socialism and the so-called imperialist States. It was a conception of coexistence that would have taken shape after the end of the Soviet civil war and remained substantially unchanged during all three Stalinist decades (1930, 1940 and 1950). Faced with variations in the international political conjuncture, there were different assessments about the duration of this truce, initially understood as a real configuration of the situation of Soviet socialism that quickly became an objective to be pursued, and acquired a positive connotation for the USSR. However, this political configuration remained a provisional situation, a kind of suspension of conflict, and was associated with the inevitability thesis of war and a conception of interstate armed conflict in the tradition of Prussian General Carl von Clausewitz of war as a natural continuation of politics.

The great news of the period following the death of Stalin (1953) were identified in the difficulties of affirming a view of nuclear conflict as a factor in the destruction of human civilization and in shifting the thesis of the inevitability of war by Khrushchev's formulation at the 20th CPSU Congress to stop conducting the confrontation between the two worlds — the socialist and the capitalist — as inevitable or as a historical fatality. The new policy announced by Khrushchev in 1956, however, did not abandon the thesis of ideological incompatibility between the two field, which, in fact, limited the very possibility of coexistence whose great challenge was to overcome the scope of diplomatic-military relations and develop lines of political cooperation with governments or with political and social movements that did not share with the USSR a full homogeneity in the field of ideas. With Khrushchev and the Soviet leaders of the time, not only the conception of ideological incompatibility between the two fields maintained, but also

the conviction that the best policy for guaranteeing peace would be the evolution of international relations in favor of the socialist camp. This legacy of the socialist past materialized most strongly in the Brezhnev government, translating into a more markedly conflicting conception of coexistence and highlighting the need for Soviet military superiority. Even more dramatically, in the Brezhnev period, the concern expressed initially by Khrushchev from the prospect of nuclear war as the end of civilization was alleviated.

The third meaning of the policy of coexistence would have originated outside the official culture of the Soviet regime, in the circuits of socialist dissent through the reflection of Andrei Sakharov and, later, acquired articulation from the new group of leaders who gathered around Gorbachev. This new sense of coexistence assumes that the socialist field should no longer be considered a parallel entity or as opposed to the rest of the world, but rather an integral part of humanity, thereby displacing the linear view of history as a process destined to conclude with the victory of one system over the other. In place of this traditional view, the idea of universal cooperation based on interdependence and reciprocity is expressed.

REFERENCES

BIAGIO, A. Di. "L'ultima battaghia dell'oposizione", in Studi di Storia Sovietica. Roma, Feltrinelli, 1981.

CARR, Edward Hallett. La Revolución Russa: de Lenin a Stalin, 19171929. Madrid, Alianza Editorial, 1997.

COURTOIS, Stephane, WERTH, Nicolas, PANNÉ, Jean-Louis, PACZKO-

WSKI, Andrzej, BARTOSEK Karel, MARGOLIN, Jean-Louis. O Livro Negro do Comunismo: crimes, terror e repressão. RJ, Ed. Bertrand Brasil, 1999.

EINSTEIN, Albert. Como Vejo o Mundo. RJ, Nova Fronteira, 1998.

GORBACËV, Michail. Ogni cosa a suo tempo. Storia della mia vita. Roma, Marsilio, 2013.

GUERRA, Adriano. Il Giorno che Chruscev parlò. Dal XX congress alla rivolta ungherese. Roma, Ed. Riuniti, 1986.

KEYNES, John Maynard. As Consequências Econômicas da Paz. São Paulo, Imprensa Oficial do Estado, Brasília: Editora Universidade de Brasília, 2002.

KRUSCHEV, Nikita. Memórias. RJ, Editora Artenova, vol. 2, 1971.

KRUSCHEV, Nikita. La politica dell' Unione Sovietica. Rapporto al XX Congresso del Pcus. Roma, Feltrinelli, 1956.

KHRUSHECHEV on Stalin. Special to the New York Times, June, 5, 1956.

LENIN, V. I. Obras Completas. Madrid, Akal Editor, Ediciones de Cultura Popular, 1978.

LÉVESQUE, JACQUES. La Russie et son ex-empire: Reconfiguration géopolitique de l'ancien espace soviétique, Paris, Presses de la Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques, 2003.

LÉVESQUE, JACQUES. L'URSS et sa politique internationale, de Lénine à Gorbatchev, Paris, Armand Colin, 1988.

MEDVEDEV, Roy. Khrushchev, Blackwell, New York, Oxford, Doubleday, 1983.

PETROCCHI, Renato. “San Tiago Dantas: a Política Externa como instrumento de reforma social e de democracia”. Carta Internacional (USP), v. 10, p. 81-96, 2015

RUSSELL, Bertrand, Autobiografia de Bertrand Russell, RJ, Civilização Brasileira, 1972.

SACHAROV, Andrej. Progresso, coexistência e liberdade intelectual. Lisboa, Ed. Dom Quixote, 1976.

SCHELL, Jonathan. O Destino da Terra. RJ, Ed. Record 1982.

STALIN, Joseph V. Problemas econômicos do socialismo na URSS. Editorial Vitória, Rio de Janeiro, 1953.

STALIN, Joseph V. Problemi della pace. Roma, Feltrinelli, 1953.

ULAN, A. B. Expansion and Coexistence: a History of Foreign Policy, 1917-1967. London, 1968.

ZDANOV, Andrei. Politica e Ideologia. Roma, Edizioni Rinascita, 1949.