

Another article in the same journal stated:

Cooperation is possible where there are common interests. Are there such interests between socialist and capitalist states in the area of international relations? Certainly there are, and first of all concerning the preservation of peace.⁵²

The Khrushchevian concept of peaceful coexistence was clearly much less restricted than Stalin's. It connoted not just the absence of war but mutual co-operation to advance common interests.

Khrushchev was a tireless exponent of peaceful coexistence. He often referred to it more times in a single speech than Stalin did in several decades. He took what had previously been a minor element in Soviet doctrine and elevated it to a central place in Soviet conceptions of East-West relations, declaring it to be nothing less than the "general line" of Soviet foreign policy. The more that Khrushchev's conception of peaceful coexistence came under attack (from hard-line elements in the Soviet Union, such as Molotov, and from militant parties within the international Communist movement, such as China), the more Khrushchev and his spokesmen expanded and broadened its meaning. It was argued that the avoidance of war (rather than the promotion of revolution) was *the* central goal of contemporary Soviet foreign policy. Peaceful coexistence was said to consist not merely of the absence of war, but of the establishment of economic, political, and cultural links between East and West, and it was claimed that increasingly the main focus of East-West rivalry was shifting to the arena of peaceful economic competition between the two systems.

East-West conflict was thus no longer depicted by Soviet commentators as a zero-sum game. A new element which threatened to destroy the shared playing field, the danger of nuclear catastrophe caused by miscalculation or accident, had changed the game. In the

⁵² A. Beliakov, *et al.*, "God vydaiushchikhsia pobed sil mira i sotsializma," *Kommunist*, 1959, No. 18, p. 139.