

CPSU Analysis of the World Situation during Brezhnev Era

Dr. Ashutosh Kumar

Guest Faculty of Political Science, Rajdhani College, (NCWEB), Delhi University, Delhi (India),
PhD. Center for Russian and Central Asian Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi (India)

ARTICLE DETAILS

Article History

Published Online: 15 September 2020

Keywords

Brezhnev, CPSU, Proletarian
Internationalism, Correlation of
Forces, Balance of Power.

*Corresponding Author

Email: [ashutosh14021\[at\]gmail.com](mailto:ashutosh14021[at]gmail.com)

ABSTRACT

Concerned with achieving military rather than economic parity with the west, Brezhnev used ideology to segregate USSR from the mainstream developments in the world in a multitude of areas. This caused decadence in the internal development of the Soviet in the late seventies and early eighties. Foreign policy, in the Soviet Union, had always been considered as a means to an end set by the party. Changes, developments and new foreign policy doctrines were always vindicated in terms of Marxism-Leninism. This Paper analyses the Brezhnev foreign Policy in various aspects.

1. Introduction

The chief propensities which in the Soviet view impacted the Soviet view of international relations were: the snowballing of the general plight of capitalism (23rd, 24th, 25th, 26th congress), the 'historic' contention between socialism and capitalism and the struggle between the belligerent imperialism line and the tranquil socialist line (24th, 25th, 26th Congresses), the soaring role of the ever-strengthening world socialist system is impeding the bellicose imperialist plans, the change of correlation of forces in approbation of the world socialist system, the sharpening of class-struggle in the capitalist countries (24th Congress), the slackening of the sphere of imperialist domination (26th Congress), further disintegration of imperialist colonial empires (25th Congress), the growing role of the newly emancipated countries (25th, 26th Congresses), the Soviet Union's concerted endeavours to preserve and maintain peace and, consolidation of the principle of peaceful coexistence (25th Congress). It would thus seem that the Brezhnevian analysis of the world situation as done in the conceptual framework developed by Khrushchev's peaceful coexistence, avoidance of the war and promotion of peace, strengthening of world socialist system, cooperation with the national liberation movements and growing reliance on the strength and might of the USSR. The emphasis laid at any time on a specific facet of the analysis varied according to the existing situation. Numerous crucial doctrines like the 'correlation of forces' and the 'Brezhnev doctrine' were evolved to cope up with different situations.

2. Joint Anti-Imperialist Struggle Policy

Going ahead with the premise of imperialism being our 'class enemy', Brezhnev emphasized on the necessity for tackling "bourgeois ideology, revisionism, dogmatism and reformism". The ideological work of the Party had an undeviating bearing on "the moulding of the new man" ideological work which was to be closely concerned with the tasks in hand, e.g. communist construction, moulding of new man, development of individual etc. - Lest it should degrade into mere 'phrase-mongering'. Ideological work could not be forsaken as grave challenges were posed to the socialist unity

(e.g. Czechoslovakia, Poland) during the Brezhnev years. In the 1969 International Conference of Communists and Workers' Parties held in Moscow, the significance of ideology as a weapon in the struggle to fend off the forces of imperialism was accentuated. The Conference espoused a rigid stance on the ideological question by supporting the line taken by the Communist parties in 1957 and 1960. The document adopted at the conference affirmed:

"That the proposed action of joint anti-imperialist struggle needed that the ideological and Political role of the parties abiding by Marxist-Leninist principles in the world revolutionary process be strengthened and amplified and the Communists would strive to go on waging an unforgiving struggle against bourgeois ideology." (Brezhnev, 1969)

The conference adopted the line of the 24th Party Congress of the CPSU, held after the events of 1968 in Czechoslovakia, in which Brezhnev had said that they should never make any compromise in ideological matters.

3. Brezhnev Analysis of Imperialism

All through the course of the Brezhnev era, there was an acute emphasis on the analysis of imperialism, the 'class enemy'. Despite the fact that the general analysis was in the framework of the aggravating capitalist crisis and exacerbation of inter-imperialist contradictions as well as deepening of struggle between the two ideas in direct contention with each other, imperialism and socialism, a multitude of ideas were also rough-hewed during these years: imperialism debilitates socialism by suppressing national liberation movements and the Working people in capitalist countries; it employs armed struggle against socialism, anti-communist proclivities have become a guiding principle of the state policy of the imperialist countries.

By making use of military-political blocs and bases on foreign territory, economic pressures and trade blockades, and through armed intercessions imperialism creates a situation of sheer chaos in several areas across the world; fires on all cylinders to sabotage the unity of the world socialist system; it creates catastrophes and jars the world to a thermonuclear war; incapable of reversing the developments in the world

today owing to the strength of the socialist world, imperialism deploys the "positions of strength" policy to deal with socialism.

The Soviet theory displayed cognisance of imperialist strengths, which could not be disregarded. The headways made in the western countries in the economic and scientific-technical fields were explicated by the sheer reality that imperialism had displayed the proficiency of acclimatising itself to the new conditions. Brezhnev, in his speech at the 1969 conference of the Communist and workers' parties, touched on the strengths of imperialism, which could not be flat out disregarded. He averred that imperialism had an extremely developed powerful production mechanism; it fused monopolies with state apparatus, it could programme and forecast production; state financing or scientific research helped monopolies, there had been an improvement in the effectiveness of social production. (Myron Rush,1970: 331-332) The ascendancy of imperialism meant that it was a policy that would turn out to be even more 'reactionary aggressive'. An evident outcome of this was financial and political imperialist support to the "openly terrorist regimes of the fascist types". (Myron Rush,1970: 333)

During the Brezhnev years, the anti-imperialist struggle was considered one of the paramount principles as far as the Soviet foreign policy was concerned.

4. Revised Policy of 'Proletarian Internationalism'

In the anti-imperialist struggles waged by world socialism, the unity and cohesion of the world socialist system and relations with the socialist countries were extremely significant. It was avowed that the experience of the socialist world since 1947, its accomplishments and mishaps laid bare the principles which would dictate the socialist relations. 'Proletarian Internationalism', when applied to relations between socialist states, gave way to the idea of 'socialist internationalism', which successively subsumed the idea of 'socialist integration'. During the Brezhnev years, several forms and methods of relations between socialist countries were developed not just in theory and but in practice as well. WTO, CMEA and regular meetings between the leaders of the socialist countries bore great significance. The coordination of foreign policies cropped up as a recurrent theme in the Soviet proclamations on relations with the socialist countries. 'Brezhnev Doctrine' (a western term) and the 'theory of limited sovereignty' (another western term) were developed. The increasing role of international cooperation in attaining national goals was emphasized. 'Nationalism', on the other hand, was christened as narrow mindedness.

A number of 'objective laws' regulating the economic cooperation of socialist states were brought to light. Case in point, one such 'law', applicable to all the countries was about the intensification of the international division of labour and a historic propensity of further increasing the role and share of international economic relations in extending national reproduction of each socialist country. Yet another such deduction was that better organisation of external economic ties became an ever more significant function in the planning activities of the socialist state. (Senin,1966: 14) To put it a little differently, cooperation amongst socialist states became an equitable law dictating relations amongst the socialist states. The international and external factors of production were proclaimed to be in 'dialectical unity'. All this needed special

standards and rules guaranteeing national and international interests. (Senin,1966: 12) It was acknowledged that the operation of these laws, *i.e.* conditions for objectively determined mutual assistance and presupposed stable inter-state relations based on 'division of labour' which could be accomplished only by "ameliorating the system of treaty-based concerted plans". (Senin,1966: 17)

On the political side, 'socialist internationalism' dictated relations between the socialist states. Socialist internationalism, envisioning 'economic integration' and 'international socialist division of labour' was laid down in Article 30 of the 1977 Soviet Constitution. (Soviet Constitution,1977: 28703)

The events taking place in Czechoslovakia in 1968 elucidated the 'principles' governing the relations between the socialist states. An authoritative Tass statement of August 21, 1968, made it evident that the military aid provided to Czechoslovakia was at the plea made by the party and state leaders of Czechoslovakia. (This formula of intervention at 'request' was used later on in Afghanistan also). According to the Pravda editorial, the reason for this 'appeal' made by the Czech leaders, was to combat the counter-revolutionaries in Czechoslovakia. (Pravda,1968) The editorial described the 'disturbing' situation prevailing in Czechoslovakia before the military intervention as a progressive debilitation of the party, growth of the imperialist and bourgeois propaganda perilous to socialism and the "offensive against Marxist-Leninist ideology", whipping up of nationalistic passion and derogation of Soviet-Czechoslovakia friendship and cooperation, particularly the economic cooperation; strides made to re-formulate Czechoslovakia's political and economic policies towards the west. Such a situation was perceived as a menace not only to socialism but also "the foundation of peace in Europe". (Pravda,1968)

The military intercession in Czechoslovakia brought forth a number of questions related to the sovereignty of the socialist states. The primary task at hand, as maintained by Pravda, was the correlation and interdependence of the national interest of the socialist countries and their international responsibilities. (Kovalyov,1968: 1) The article above further went on to state that the military intervention in Czechoslovakia did not "run counter to the Marxist-Leninist principle of sovereignty and the right to self-determination". It reprobated the "abstract, non-class approach to the question of sovereignty and the right of nations to self-determination". (Kovalyov,1968: 1) The article castigated the standard of bourgeois law and 'formally juridical reasonings' on the question of sovereignty of nations and averred that 'in a class society' laws and legal measures were contingent on "the laws of class struggle, the laws of the social development". So, the sovereignty of the socialist state held a completely different denotation than perceived in the bourgeois international law. Therefore, military intervention was fully 'legal' and in congruence with 'laws' dictating the development of a socialist state.

The article also touched upon the norms governing the relations between the socialist states, which were dubbed as 'Brezhnev Doctrine' in the western media. The Pravda article mentioned that:

(i) a Communist Party was certainly accountable to its own people but not only to them but also to every socialist country in the world, to the entire communist movement

(ii) Marxist dialectics demanded that ...one or another state, staying in a system of other states constituting the socialist community could not be free from the common interests of that community.

(iii) The sovereignty of each socialist country could not be in contention with the interests of world socialism, of the world revolutionary movement.

The intervention in Hungary in 1956 and that in Czechoslovakia were vindicated in connection with claims of "counter-revolution" in these countries, thereby menacing socialism. In 1956, the Soviets initially acknowledged that the working class in Hungary had unfeigned grievances. The aftermath of events in Czechoslovakia witnessed emphatic methods and forms of inter-socialist state relations being developed. The other factors stressed posterior to the Czechoslovak episode was the shortcoming of sovereignty and the threat to Europe's security. The Czechoslovak chapter reasserted the viability of the 'new' sort of international relations that had emerged since the dawn of the world socialist system and its historic contention with the capitalist system.

Howbeit, it is conspicuous that despite how it was vindicated theoretically, the main reason of the intervention was the question of security in case Czechoslovakia drifted away from the socialist community and joined the 'imperialist' bloc.

The incidents that took place in Hungary and Poland in the fifties, and in Czechoslovakia in 1968, as well as complications with China concluding with military clashes, brought the question of conflicts and antagonisms within the socialist countries and methods to deal with them to the forefront.

The 1969 statement of the Communist Parties had discerned the likelihood of divergence within the socialist states owing to the difference in the level of economic development, in social structure, national distinctions etc. These differences could be settled if dealt with on the basis of 'proletarian internationalism, through comradely discussions and voluntary fraternal cooperation' (Light, 1988: 197)

The Soviet authors believed that this grave inequality could be eliminated by applying the "principle of equality under socialism". (Tsapanov 1972: 24). Such differences could lead to 'non-antagonistic' conflicts, which only served to augment mutual understanding. The non-antagonistic strifes could be done away with by 'comradely discussion' or by the method of 'criticism and self-criticism'- up to the extent that did not undermine socialism.

A concern to prove that the principles of socialist internationalism should be given due recognition in international law could be seen in the Soviet writings. If truth be told, Soviet authors have time and again stated that 'socialist internationalism' had already become a substantial principle of contemporary international law. All bilateral treaties between socialist states, the CMEA, the WTO etc. were predicated on 'socialist Internationalism'. (Sanakoyev 1974: 77) It was further averred that the proletarian internationalism or its application to relations between socialist Internationalism enhanced the general international law. For case in point, the principle of equality in general in the International law as it includes 'the

demand for actual equality and in some cases, ...inequality...in favour of less developed countries". (Usenko 1973: 51)

Likewise, it was held that under socialist internationalism, the respect for state sovereignty went far out with the principle of sovereignty in general international law. The whole of the socialist community stood guard over independence and territorial integrity of the socialist countries which aided in bolstering the sovereignty of each. (Usenko 1973: 51)

It can be argued that the Brezhnev years witnessed a bid to place relations amongst the socialist countries contingent on 'socialist internationalism'. This required accordance with special meanings to the traditional concepts of international law governing inter-state relations.

5. Détente and Association with Capitalist Countries

The emergence of detente between the socialist and the capitalist countries in the seventies did not require any new ideological innovations. The phenomenon of détente could very easily be explained by the stress on peaceful coexistence between different social systems. However, what requires scrutiny is the Soviet view of the factors which made détente possible.

Soviet theoreticians opine that the emergence of world socialist system and its augmentation which might lead to "changing the balance of forces between the two socialist systems", proved to be the conclusive factor in the 'fundamental restructuring of international relations' which détente implied. (Lebedev, 1976: 2) In his speech of June 14, 1975, Brezhnev propounded this idea, when he said that after appraising the overall balance of forces in the world, they had deduced that there was a real possibility of bringing about a basic change in the international situation a few years ago. This fundamental restructuring of the international situation meant the exclusion of war from the practice of universal life and the attainment of a just and lasting peace. It might be evidently observed that the basis of détente was based on the augmenting strength of USSR and "military-strategic parity" with the USA. If this parity were disturbed, détente would also be disturbed.

The basic restructuring of the international relations, in palpable terms, inferred that the development of bilateral relations with capitalist countries, unyielding repulses to any act of pugnacity and arbitrariness in international relations, disarmament, multilateral cooperation amongst a state in a diverse area. However, what this restructuring of the relations did not imply was the abandonment of class-struggle. In fact the Soviet theorists opined that the restructuring of international relations would carry forward "amidst mounted class struggle". (Lebedev, 1976: 13) Thus the actual political meaning of détente and the restructuring of international relations was the acknowledgement of the significance of the socialist world and its natural stakes in the world affairs and military parallelism with the west.

The détente also implied cooperation between the East and the west, but little did it mean the mitigation on the ideological struggle front. Brezhnev stressed that the alleviation of International tensions did not mean averting the struggle of ideas at all. This was referred to as an objective fact. (Pravda, 1975)

The Soviets reckon the Final Act at Helsinki (1975) as a significant stage of détente. The principle of interstate relations to which the Soviets agreed in Helsinki Final Act was:

“Sovereign equality, the non-use of force, the inviolability of frontiers, non-interference in internal affairs, respect for human rights and basic freedoms, equal rights and the right of peoples to be their own masters, cooperations between states and the conscientious fulfilment of obligations”. (Valentinov, 1976: 24)

However, they also heeded that in a number of countries like the USA there were forces which kept on being hostile to détente which was demonstrated in the steep soar in military expenditure in the USA and continued disaccord on the strategic forces of the two countries. The USA was equally held accountable for having squandered opportunities for promoting détente in having repudiated the Soviet disarmament proposals in 1977 and 1978. (Abarenkov, 1979: 6) By 1980, particularly after the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan, a fresh round of cold war had replaced the détente. In his report to the 26th party Congress in 1981, Brezhnev rarely mentioned détente and completely pinned the blame on the USA for infringement of the principle of détente. He inculpated the west of “line of disrupting detente, escalating arms race”. The primary reason for the downswing of détente, as put forward by the Soviet theorists, was the frenzied effort by the USA to unsettle the ‘military-strategic’ parity between the socialist and the capitalist camp and ‘the re-embarkation by the US on “the inefficacious course of establishing ‘military superiority’ over the USSR”. (Shurdeyev, 1981: 40) The Soviet Mezhdunarodniki denounced the ‘anti-détente’ sentiment in the western countries as manifest in such western notions of the day as ‘limited nuclear war’, ‘complimentary armament’, ‘collapse of détente’ etc.

6. ‘Correlation of Forces’ vs ‘Balance of Power’

It is noteworthy that the Soviets have been adamant in their opinion that detente became feasible because the ‘balance of forces’ inclined towards socialism and it withered because the west ventured to achieve ‘military superiority’ over the USSR and in the process denied it ‘equal and equitable security’. The Soviet theorists have universally castigated the Western concept of ‘balance of power’ and instead put forward the concept of ‘correlation of forces’ which they considered one of the leading factors in structuring international relations. The balance of power concept, basic to the western school of political-realism founded by Hans Morgenthau, was heavily lambasted citing the unequivocal fact that this approach completely brushed aside ‘the class essence’ of the international relations and the ‘class character of a state foreign policy’. (Sergiyev, 1975: 100) Even the more refined bourgeois concept of “political equilibrium” implying that a state sought by its foreign policy to ‘stabilise’ the system of international relations was castigated by the Soviet theorists for the reason that, by means of Marxism-Leninism, the international relations at any particular moment were characterised by ‘a definite correlation of the struggling classes and political forces’. (Sergiyev, 1975: 102)

The concept of ‘correlation of forces’ was a corollary to the Soviet world view of the struggle between the two camps, the emergence of world socialist system and the effect this had on the international relations and the foreign policy of individual

states. In its struggle with capitalism, socialism banked on the military as well as economic strengths and capabilities and also on all diverse political, social, economic forces and opportunities which seemed to bolster the anti-imperialist struggle. It was registered that the historical struggle between the two socio-economic systems carried on not just at the state level but also other, non-state, non-governmental forums. Fundamentally, the struggle against imperialism was a class struggle of which relations between states was only one integrant. Once the class struggle was recognized as the fundamental driving force of international relations, the “correlation of force”, i.e. “the correlation of class forces in the worldwide system of international relations” surfaced as a natural conclusion.

How did the phenomenon of ‘correlation of forces’ work in practice? Foreign policies of states were nothing more than just mechanisms to achieve the class interests. “Diverse classes and political forces... emerge in the world scene fully endowed with powerful and intricate means of foreign policy influence” (Sergiyev, 1975: 102) A multitude of states, parties and political forces ‘come together and form definite groups, systems of states, or political, economic or military coalitions forged upon common class and state interests.” (Sergiyev, 1975: 103) This meant that the unity, cooperation among socialist countries emerged as a crucial integrant in the correlation of forces on a worldwide scale. So WTO and CMEA, and ‘socialist internationalism’ had a first-hand bearing on the ‘correlation of force’. Similar to national liberation force, the significant force in international relations ended up being “natural allies” of the world socialist system.

Another significant consequence of this concept was the relations at non-state levels, which the Soviet Union retained with the diverse political groupings, parties, personalities in the numerous countries around the globe. This overt characteristic of the Soviet foreign policy played no less part in the west to project the ‘Soviet threat’ and the Soviet expansionism often in an overemphasised manner. The concept of ‘correlation of force’ vindicated and bolstered up the ‘new type’ international relations which the Soviets stressed after the emergence of the world socialist system.

7. Brezhnev Policy and Freedom Movement of Third World

Under Khrushchev, the Soviet took up an active role in extending solidarity to the third world countries, but ‘peaceful coexistence’ and relations with the capitalist countries as well as the development of inter-socialist state relations remained the prime occupation of the Soviet foreign policy theory and conduct. The Brezhnev years saw a significant amount of theoretical work being done in the Soviet Union on the National Liberation movements, and it was during these years that the Soviet registered some of the most remarkable success in the third world. The avid Soviet interests in the national liberation movements across the globe stemmed from the theoretical premise that national liberation movements, the unwavering corollary of decolonisation and the evident conclusion of inner contradictions of imperialism, were built in allies of the world socialist system in its anti-imperialist struggle. For the Soviets, even though the principal contradiction in the world was between socialism and capitalism (unlike for the Chinese who regarded imperialism vs national liberation movements as the primary contradiction) the enormous revolutionary potential of

the national liberation movements could be made use of in alleviating imperialism.

The Soviet theories on national liberation movements and the recently liberated countries dealt not only with the internal processes but also the foreign policies espoused by these countries.

A very crucial concept that evolved in the Soviet theory was that of 'National Democracy'. It had been brought up in the 1960 statement of the Conference of Communist and Workers Parties.

Those states which followed an economic programme of agrarian reforms creating a state sector in the economy following democratic policies internally, and, whose foreign policy favoured the socialist bloc especially the Soviet Union were 'National Democratic' states. (Saivetz and Woodby, 1985: 9) In 1963, a novel concept Non-Capitalist Path of Development (NCP) was stressed, which demonstrated a more 'methodical strategy' to solve the problems of the Third World. NCP was defined as that juncture of social (and) economic headways in which essential prerequisites for the progression of the construction of socialism were created by non-capitalist means. (Ulyanovski, 1963: 10)

The Brezhnev years witnessed the concept of NCP become more developed, and subsidiary conceptions of the "state of socialist orientation" and "mnogoukladnost society" (multilayered society) were evolved. The NCP put forward to underdeveloped countries a means to make a transition over to 'socialist construction' by bypassing certain historical stages of development. It was realized that in most poor countries the capital would not develop on the classical lines and, therefore, NCP was the sole answer. The NCP also put forward the question of substance and nature of state power in countries walking the non-capitalist path. This, however, depended upon the character of the ruling groups. Some Soviet academics approved of the notion of 'revolution from above' when they posited that in these countries the socialist basis was structured with the most active intercession from above. (Solodovnikov, 1970: 13) The specific national characteristics also bore immense significance in relation to a non-capitalist way. Existence of the state sector was of paramount importance when it came to a country taking the non-capitalist way.

No final view on these questions was evolved. While some eminent researchers were prone to flat out dismiss the NCP, others regarded NCP as identical to socialism and thereby admitted the likelihood of socialist upheaval without the dictatorship of the proletariat. These were some who beset the NCP with too many reservations and restrictions. (Tyaguneneko, 1970: 14) Some theorists mooted the question of consciousness that was being shaped in complex, multi-layered societies in these countries. Other questions considered by the Soviet theoreticians were concerned with the accurate identification of classes in the developing countries, and inter-class relations with notable citation of the mantle of the working class, peasantry, bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie. In the general run of things, it was discerned due to the pittance in the level of development in these countries, a significantly substantial working-class or a revolutionary bourgeois did not exist. As a matter of fact, the petty bourgeoisie was the most numerous class. The petty bourgeoisie had been deemed anti-revolutionary in European

countries, but as far as the developing countries were concerned, it could play a completely different role. The petty bourgeoisie led by the intelligentsia evolved under the patronage of the state and thus could play an increasingly progressive role in the non-capitalist path of development

The concepts of 'promezhutochny' or 'sredny sloi'¹ ("intermediate" or "transitional" section or stratum) were developed to elucidate class alignments in society adept of playing a progressive role. These intermediate levels were the coalescence of the petty-bourgeois, non-proletarian semi-proletarian elements along with the civil and military intelligentsia, civil servants, small traders, artisans etc.

These sophistications were imperative to report as to how the transition to socialism could transpire in these countries sans an authentic working class. In their considerations, the Soviet authors also examined the role of armies in third world countries. It was maintained that the armies and the military regimes could also play a progressive role in the same way as petty bourgeoisie has been assigned a progressive role.

While the internal processes in the developing countries exhibited several theoretical dilemmas to the Soviet academics, the question of the foreign policy adopted by the newly emancipated countries equally engrossed the Soviets.

The most substantial facet of their foreign policies was regarded as their attitude towards socialism. Brezhnev had made a note of the 'diverse' crowd that these countries presented at the 26th Party Congress. The Soviet theoretician identified a number of primary guidelines and directions. However, the revolutionary process posed a crucial conundrum, the question of the ability of a particular national liberation movement to combine in a flexible manner national and international factor. (Kim, 1971: 71)

The onset of detente, the increasing might of the socialist camp and the perception that it would alleviate chances of war, and general amelioration of international climate were regarded as the factors to have exerted propitious influence on the course of national liberation movements. The Soviet Union was regarded as the "key economic, political, ideological and military factor in the national liberation movements" (Kim, 1971: 72-74) Thus it can be conferred that the Soviet theoretician built a 'natural cause for pro-Soviet orientation in the foreign policies of these countries. The theme of socialist countries and the national liberation movements being the 'natural allies' was built up systematically, and specifically posterior to the Havana summit of the Non-Alignment countries in 1979 under the Chairmanship of Cuba.

8. Conclusion

Khrushchev's disbarment from power and Brezhnev's accession to it in October 1964 led to a reorientation of Soviet stances to the Third World regional conflicts. It goes without saying that a weak-kneed and diffident line was adopted towards these conflicts. Concerned with achieving military rather than economic parity with the west, Brezhnev used

¹ "Combination of petty bourgeois, semi-proletarian elements, together Defined as a nonproletarian and with the civilian and military intelligentsia, civil servants, small traders, artisans and handicraftsmen, the most radical section of this large group formed the revolutionary democrats" (Mirsky, 1976, p. 42)

ideology to segregate USSR from the mainstream developments in the world in a multitude of areas. This caused decadence in the internal development of the Soviet in the late seventies and early eighties. Foreign policy, in the Soviet Union, had always been considered as a means to an end set by the party. Thus, foreign policy had had an overtly close and

discernible link with the domestic policy which was conspicuously demonstrated when foreign policy and diplomacy had been employed to accomplish the goals determined by such priorities, i.e. 'building of Communism' under Khrushchev and developed Socialism under Brezhnev.

References

- [1]. Abarenkov, V. (1979) *Opponents of Disarmament and Détente* International Affairs Vol. 4 Pg. 6 London: OUP
- [2]. Communist Party of Soviet Union (1971), *Report of the CC, CPSU to the 24th Party Congress*, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- [3]. Communist Party of Soviet Union (1971), *Report of the CC, CPSU to the 25th Party Congress*, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- [4]. Communist Party of Soviet Union (1971), *Report of the CC, CPSU to the 26th Party Congress*, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- [5]. Brezhnev, L. I. (1977), *On the draft constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: A report delivered at the Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee on May 24, 1977* Moscow: Novosti Press Agency Pub. House.
- [6]. Brezhnev, L. I. (1977), *A historic stage on the road to communism*. Moscow: Novosti Press Agency Pub. House.
- [7]. Brezhnev, L. I. (1980), *Socialism, democracy and human rights*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- [8]. Report to the XIV Party Congress, December 18, 1925, in Myron Rush (1970), *The International Situation and Soviet Foreign Policy: Reports of Soviet Leaders* Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.
- [9]. Senin, M. (1966), Forms and Methods in Relation Between Socialist Countries *International Affairs* Vol. 5: 14.
- [10]. Pravda (22 August 1968) Moscow: Novosti Press Agency Pub. House.
- [11]. Pravda (26 September 1968) Moscow: Novosti Press Agency Pub. House.
- [12]. Light, M. (1988). *The Soviet theory of international relations, 1917-1982*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf.
- [13]. Tyagunenko V.L. (1970), The Theory and Practice of the Non-Capitalist Way of Development *International Affairs* Vol. 11: 4.
- [14]. Solodovnikov, V.G. (1970), The Theory and Practice of the Non-Capitalist Way of Development *International Affairs* Vol. 11: 13.
- [15]. E. Usenko (1973), *International Legal Principles of Relations Between Socialist Countries* International Affairs Vol 8: 51.
- [16]. Sergiyev, A. (1975), Leninism On the Correlation of Forces As a Factor of International Relations *International Affairs* Vol. 5: 100-103.
- [17]. Kim G. (1971), World Socialism and Present-Day National Liberation Movements *International Affairs* Vol. 8: 71-74.