

East European countries are able to reap many of the advantages of the strategy of peaceful coexistence in its positive aspects, while avoiding serious involvement in those aspects which entail risks of conflict with the West, and specifically the strategy of wars of national liberation.

This is by no means the same as saying that the political unity of the Soviet camp has been seriously undermined. Neither the East European leaders nor the Soviet Union are prepared to allow that. The East European leaders seek to enlist for themselves the same support the regimes in the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia enjoy, through the same appeal to nationalist sentiment which those regimes can make....

Clearly...polycentrism in the Warsaw Pact area has not destroyed the cohesiveness or the essential Communism of the regimes. This is not surprising. The appeal to national sentiment was never intended to achieve this result. On the contrary, by attempting to strengthen the domestic position of the regimes, its basic aim was to consolidate their existing alignment....

### THREE PHASES OF SOVIET POLICY

The West, in general, is well content if countries in Africa and Asia remain independent and non-aligned. After a few disastrous experiences, the U.S.S.R. has decided that nothing is to be gained by direct attempts at Communization. Its policy has evolved in at least three distinct phases during the post-Stalin era. In the first four or five years up to 1959, the major thrust was toward the exploitation of anti-colonialism by direct external support of the new governments, without much concern about their domestic policies, in the belief that aid would have a decisive effect on their policies.

Anti-Communist measures taken in 1958-59, both in the U.A.R. and in India, were a clear demonstration that this would not work, and the sudden emergence of large numbers of independent African states in 1960-61 made it imperative to devise a new approach. This was that of the "national democracy", wherein the "most advanced section of the working class", i.e. the Communists, where they existed, should ally themselves and co-operate with the nationalist ruling party in order to press on with the revolution that had only begun with the achievement of political independence.

Unfortunately for this line, only one or two of those countries in which the nationalists displayed really radical militancy were equipped with Communist parties, and they showed no particular anxiety to accept the Communists, who, as in Algeria, had done little or nothing to contribute to the achievement of independence, as allies. The others were certainly not prepared to allow the formation of Communist parties which would tend to divide a national unity that was often hard-won. Accordingly, the policy changed again. The third phase, which emerged during 1963, after the outlawing of the Algerian Communist Party, was that of liquidationism - the decision that Communists should work from within to promote the economic revolution, put their countries on the "non-capitalist path", and eventually succeed to the leadership....

...Bound by their "scientific" world views, the Communists, whether Soviet or Chinese in orientation, are united in the view that non-alignment is an historical dead end. The U.S.S.R. holds that it is a way-station on the road from colonialism to Communism. The Chinese reject it out of hand as impossible. In practice this does not prevent them from welcoming the rejection of Western alignment which it entails, but they do so *faute de mieux*. The difference between the two is an aspect of their different approaches to the question of peaceful coexistence....

### PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

...We can probably take Soviet assurances at face value; in peaceful coexistence war *between states* is to be avoided. Other forms of war, namely national-liberation war, are not, and in fact form an integral part of the policy of peaceful coexistence. The reasoning behind this is that the power of the Soviet Union and its allies is now such as to deter any attack by the "imperialists" on them. The existence of this power, it is claimed, both encourages revolutionary forces elsewhere to struggle for their freedom and inhibits the deployment of the full strength of "imperialism" against them....

The strategy of national-liberation war is an integral part of peaceful coexistence, as the Soviet Union sees it. The success claimed for it justifies the policy whereby the Soviet Union can benefit from the advantages of a peaceful relation...with the West, while the cause of world revolution progresses more or less by its own momentum. The parallel with Stalin's policy, whereby the prime duty of all other Communists was to contribute to the defence and development of the U.S.S.R., comes readily to mind. There is no particular reason, however, to think that the U.S.S.R. has a consistent policy toward violent revolutionary outbreaks, or necessarily has a hand in them when they occur. This is a matter of tactics. Thus the support, measured though it is, which the Soviet Government has given to North Vietnam and the NLF of South Vietnam since the end of 1964 differs from the relative indifference shown by Krushchov before his fall, and differs again from the apparent reluctance of the Soviet Union to encourage armed insurgency in Latin America....

### WHY SOVIET BACKS REVOLUTION

It is reasonable to ask why the U.S.S.R. should want to tie itself to revolutionary movements in various parts of the world which it cannot always control and which might embroil it in conflicts with Western countries with which it is in its own best interests to cultivate normal relations.

...Having greater power than China, the Soviet Union is less dependent on the exploitation of such struggles to promote its objectives than is China. The constructive and skilful exercise of diplomacy at Tashkent advanced the Soviet Union's cause in a manner which does it credit....

...Official Soviet doctrine holds that, as a corollary of the decisive strength of the Communist world in the present stage of international relations, the "imperialist" world has gone over to the counter-offensive. Seeing their power inexorably slipping

(Continued on P. 6)