UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_150163

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 327.47/K99P Accession No. 46612

Author Khrushchov, N. S.

Title Prevent war, Safeguard peace

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

N. S. KHRUSHCHOV

# PREVENT WAR, SAFEGUARD PEACE

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
Moscow

TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN

## PUBLISHERS' NOTE

*Prevent War, Safeguard Peace* is a collection of N. S. Khrushchov's speeches, talks and interviews of 1962 on Soviet foreign policy and the international situation. They appeared in the Soviet press or were delivered over the radio and television.

The collection contains a subject index and a diary of talks, interviews and receptions given by N. S. Khrushchov to foreign statesmen and public leaders.

CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Toast at New Year's Reception in the Kremlin, *January 1, 1962* . . . | 7 |
| Peace, Labour, Freedom, Equality, Fraternity and Happiness! Speech at a Meeting of the Electors of the Kalinin Constituency, Moscow, *March 16, 1962* . . . . . | 9 |
| Interview with the American Publisher Gardner Cowles, *April 20, 1962* | 38 |
| Speeches Made During the Visit of a Soviet Party and Government Delegation to the People's Republic of Bulgaria, *May 14-20, 1962* | 65 |
| Speech on Arrival in Sofia, May 14, 1962 . . . . . | 65 |
| Experience and Youth Make a Powerful Force. Statement to *Narodna Mladezh* . . . . . | 66 |
| Speech at a Meeting in Varna for the Soviet Party and Government Delegation, *May 16, 1962* . . . . . | 66 |
| Speech on Receiving the Title of Honorary Citizen of Varna, *May 16, 1962* . . . . . | 73 |
| Speech at a Friendship Meeting in Obnova Village, *May 18, 1962* | 76 |
| Speech at a Soviet Embassy Reception in Sofia, *May 18, 1962* . . | 92 |
| Speech at a Mass Meeting in Sofia, *May 19, 1962* . . . . . | 95 |
| Speech on the Departure from Sofia of the Soviet Party and Government Delegation, *May 20, 1962* . . . . . | 107 |
| Radio and Television Speech on the Visit of the Soviet Party and Government Delegation to the People's Republic of Bulgaria, *May 25, 1962* . . . . . | 109 |
| Speeches Made During the Stay in the U.S.S.R. of the Head of State and Chairman of the Government of the Mali Republic . . . . | 118 |
| Speech on the Arrival of the Head of State and Chairman of the Government of the Mali Republic, *May 21, 1962* . . . . . | 118 |
| Speech at a Reception Given by the Head of State and Chairman of the Government of the Mali Republic, *May 29, 1962* . . . | 119 |
| Speech at a Soviet-Mali Friendship Meeting, *May 30, 1962* . . . | 123 |

Speech on the Departure from Moscow of the Head of State and Chairman of the Government of the Mali Republic, *May 31, 1962* . . . . . 135

Speech at the Opening of the Italian Exhibition in Moscow, *May 28, 1962* . . . . . 137

Friendship For Ever! Speech at a Meeting of Soviet and Cuban Youth, *June 2, 1962* . . . . . 142

Speeches Made During the Stay in the U.S.S.R. of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Minister of National Defence of the Republic of Senegal . . . . . 159

Speech on the Arrival of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Minister of National Defence of the Republic of Senegal, *June 5, 1962* . . . . . 159

Speech at a Reception Given for the Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Minister of National Defence of the Republic of Senegal, *June 14, 1962* . . . . . 160

Speech on the Departure from Moscow of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Minister of National Defence of the Republic of Senegal, *June 15, 1962* . . . . . 162

Speeches Made During the Stay of a Soviet Party and Government Delegation in the People's Republic of Rumania, *June 18-25, 1962* 164

Speech on Arrival in Jassi, *June 17, 1962* . . . . . 164

Speech on Arrival in Bucharest, *June 18, 1962* . . . . . 165

Speech at a Dinner Given for the Soviet Party and Government Delegation by the Central Committee of the Rumanian Workers' Party, the State Council and the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Rumania, *June 18, 1962* . . . . . 166

Speech at a Meeting at the Krasnaya Grivitza Works, *June 19, 1962* 167

Speech at a Mass Meeting in the Oneşti-Borzeşti Industrial Complex, *June 20, 1962* . . . . . 176

Speech at a Meeting of Hunedoara Steelworkers, *June 21, 1962* . 181

Speech at a Rumanian-Soviet Friendship Meeting Called by the Miners of Jui Valley, *June 21, 1962* . . . . . 184

Speech at a Mass Meeting in Bucharest, *June 24, 1962* . . . . 189

Speech on the Departure from Bucharest of the Soviet Party and Government Delegation, *June 25, 1962* . . . . . 202

Radio and Television Speech on the Visit of the Soviet Party and Government Delegation to the Rumanian People's Republic, *July 2, 1962* . . . . . 203

Speeches Made During the Stay in the U.S.S.R. of the Federal Chancellor of the Austrian Republic . . . . . 213

Speech on the Arrival of the Federal Chancellor of the Austrian Republic, *June 28, 1962* . . . . . 213

Speech at a Luncheon Given for the Federal Chancellor of the Austrian Republic, *June 29, 1962* . . . . . 214

Speech at a Kremlin Reception Given for the Federal Chancellor of the Austrian Republic, *July 4, 1962* . . . . . 216

Speech on the Departure from Moscow of the Federal Chancellor of the Austrian Republic, *July 5, 1962* . . . . . 218

Speech at Reception Given by the Leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government for the Graduates of Military Academies, *July 5, 1962* . . . . . 220

General and Complete Disarmament Is a Guarantee of Peace and Security for All Nations. Speech at the World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace, *July 10, 1962* . . . . . 224

Interview with a Group of U.S. Journalists, *July 13, 1962* . . . . . 263

Speech at a Mass Meeting in Moscow on the Flight of Spaceships Vostok-3 and Vostok-4, *August 18, 1962* . . . . . 286

Vital Questions of the Development of the Socialist World System . 299

Speech at a Luncheon Given at the Embassy of the Republic of Finland, *October 16, 1962* . . . . . 334

Speeches Made During the Stay in the U.S.S.R. of the President of the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia and General Secretary of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia . . . . . 337

Speech on the Arrival of the President of the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia and General Secretary of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, *December 4, 1962* . . . . . 337

Speech on the Departure from Moscow of the President of the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia and General Secretary of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, *December 18, 1962* . . . . . 338

Speech on the Departure from Kiev of the President of the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia and General Secretary of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, *December 20, 1962* . . . . . 339

The Present International Situation and the Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union. Report to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., *December 12, 1962* . . . . . 342

Replies to the Editors of the *Daily Express* . . . . . 393

Diary of Visits, Talks and Receptions, *1962* . . . . . 401

Subject Index . . . . . 408

## TOAST AT NEW YEAR'S RECEPTION IN THE KREMLIN

*January 1, 1962*

Dear Comrades and Friends,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

One more year, 1961, is becoming history. People the world over are seeing out the old year. They are recalling the good and kind things that it brought them. They are thinking of the future. They hope and believe that the new year will be better and happier.

1961 has been a good year for the Soviet people. I daresay, it has been a very good year. It was the year of the Twenty-Second Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Party founded by Vladimir Lenin, a great man and a great Communist. Our Party Congress adopted the Programme of communist construction, the programme of our life and hope, of the labour and struggle of all Soviet people for a good future.

Since time immemorial, people turned to fairy-tales on New Year's Eve. They invented kind old Santa Claus who brings them presents. Santa Claus is a beautiful illusion for children. But adults know that the only way to win a better life, to win happiness, is to struggle for it, to work hard for it, to use their brains.

Soviet people have worked well in the outgoing year. Figuratively speaking, Santa Claus has brought them many wonderful gifts. Let me name just a few. Our industrial output increased more than 9 per cent last year. The collective and state farms sold the state 3,200 million poods of grain, which is 320 million poods more than the year before.

Eighty-two million square metres of housing, an equivalent of ten cities such as Gorky with its one million population, was built in the country in 1961. In one year we produced 160 times as much electric power as old Russia.

Just now, I should like to wish luck to the five million men and women who were married in 1961. Five million

little Soviet citizens born in the past 12 months are seeing in a new year for the first time in their lives. An accession of population such as we have witnessed in the Soviet Union in the last few years is unexampled in the history of our country.

How could I fail to mention our first spacemen, Yuri Gagarin and Herman Titov, who are here among us tonight? Those two heroes and all the people who created their spaceships have written one more glorious chapter into the history of our beautiful land, and of mankind.

Our brothers in the socialist countries have made fine progress, and we wish them new and greater victories from the bottom of our hearts in their grand mission of socialist construction.

We also heartily wish great success and happiness to the peoples who have flung off the colonial yoke. We are quite sure that the peoples fighting for their freedom and independence will win fresh victories in 1962.

We send fraternal greetings and best wishes to the working class, the working people of all countries!

We hail the peoples of all the world!

1961 has been a year of peace for the Soviet people. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have always followed and will continue to follow the Leninist foreign policy of peace and friendship among the nations. We shall do our utmost to prevent a new war and to safeguard peace.

Dear comrades and friends, I wish you a Happy New Year, lots of happiness and success!

A Happy New Year to all our esteemed guests!

Allow me to raise a toast to the continued prosperity of the great Soviet Union, to the glorious Soviet people, to the success of all the socialist countries, to the triumph of communism, to lasting world peace and friendship among nations!

*(The speech was heard with close attention and was repeatedly interrupted by stormy applause.)*

*Khrushchov also toasted the foreign ambassadors in the Soviet Union, and wished them success in their peace efforts.*

# PEACE, LABOUR, FREEDOM, EQUALITY, FRATERNITY AND HAPPINESS!

## SPEECH AT A MEETING OF THE ELECTORS OF THE KALININ CONSTITUENCY, MOSCOW

*March 16, 1962*

Dear comrades, I learned with profound gratitude that the people of the Kalinin Constituency of Moscow have again, as so many times before, nominated me to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

To begin with, I should like to thank you for it heartily, and through you all the people of the Kalinin Constituency. I want to assure you that I shall do my utmost to live up to your high trust. (*Stormy applause.*)

Allow me to thank all the comrades who have spoken here and said so many kind things about me. (*Applause.*)

Every Communist regards such confidence in him as an expression of the people's deep trust in and affection for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, under whose leadership they work and struggle for the triumph of our just communist cause. (*Prolonged applause.*)

For ages, working people the world over have longed for a society without oppressors and oppressed, where labour would make man's life dignified, prosperous and cultured. The communist teaching has become the banner of working people throughout the world. They put great hopes, their ideals, into this teaching.

Our country was the first to embark on socialist and communist construction. No longer is socialism a dream, an enticing but distant idea. It has become reality, it has become our life. It is not some time in the future, but today that socialism yields impressive material and spiritual benefits to the peoples of entire countries that have taken the new path of social development.

Comrades, the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. was not

a victory for only you and I. It was a victory of the Marxist-Leninist teaching, a victory for the working people of all countries who have always given, and give us fraternal support. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Our country has now entered a new stage of development. The Twenty-Second Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has adopted a programme of communist construction, known as the Communist Manifesto of modern time.

The Communist Manifesto written by Marx and Engels proclaimed that the spectre of communism was haunting Europe. Today, this "spectre" has grown into a powerful force—the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The world socialist system is expanding continuously. It is gaining strength and developing economically and culturally at a staggering pace. Figuratively speaking, it has become so imposing a reality that only the blind fail to perceive that communism is firmly established on earth, that the future belongs to communism, that communism will win! (*Prolonged applause.*) Those who could afford the luxury of not reading the first Communist Manifesto, of disregarding it in their appraisals of the world forces, are now studying our Programme closely, because the Communists have proved in practice that they mean every word they say.

Millions of working people all over the world, our friends and the followers of scientific communism admire the successes of communist construction and our magnificent plans of development. The enemies of communism, too, no longer regard our great teaching as a pipe dream, because communism has become a reality. Communism is a real threat to the forces of reaction, to those who would like to keep human society in a state of stagnation, to preserve in the capitalist countries the rule of monopoly capital, the exploitation of man by man. That is why they dread the power of attraction of communist ideas.

Comrades, the elections to the Supreme Soviet of the country, the highest organ of power in our state, are held every four years.

It is a popular holiday, a holiday that has become a fine tradition. The poll in the elections in our country is greater than in any of the capitalist countries. That is only natural, because the people elect their finest representatives to the organs of power.

The propagandists and ideologists of the bourgeois way of life in the United States make much of the fact that two candidates seek election to Congress in each of their constituencies. They present this as a supreme manifestation of democracy.

But what two candidates seek election there? What parties do they represent? They represent the two main bourgeois parties–the Democratic and the Republican. But Americans themselves say that there is virtually no difference between the two. Both express the interests of the exploiting classes. That is why there are feuds at the elections there between the various candidates, who represent the monopolies and factory owners, that is, the classes whose domination the Soviet people did away with back in 1917. (*Applause.*) The main difference between the Republican and Democratic parties of the U.S.A. is that the Republican Party has an elephant for its emblem, while the Democratic Party has a donkey. (*Laughter.*) So you can see how small is the choice of the American electorate. (*Animation. Applause.*)

I liked the speech a worker made during the election campaign. He said: "We, Soviet people, Communists and non-Party people, cast our ballots for just one, but the real representative of the people. That is much better than in the United States, where people are offered the choice of two candidates, of whom the one is no better than the other, because neither has anything in common with the people." (*Applause.*)

The candidates of the Communist and non-Party people's bloc nominated to the Supreme Soviet by millions of working people are workers at industrial enterprises and state farms, collective farmers, scientists, doctors, teachers, writers, engineers, agronomists, members of our country's Armed Forces, and Party and trade union functionaries. Every candidate is employed at some specific sector of communist construction and is inseparably connected with the life of the people. It cannot be otherwise, because the Soviets of Working People's Deputies are organs of true people's power to which the people elect their best sons and daughters, entrusting them with the fullness of power in the country.

It is different in the United States and other imperialist countries. There, representatives of monopoly capital constitute a majority in Congress, in the parliaments. True, the

monopolists themselves seldom consent to sit in parliament: To fool the working people more thoroughly they put th most loyal servitors of monopoly capital in the parliament: These servitors of capital are even more ferocious in defend ing the interests of their rich bosses, because they are pai for it. The capitalists have a knack of picking their servant and pay them generously for their loyal service.

We firmly and consistently carry into life the injunctior of the great Lenin that the venal and corrupt parliamentarism of bourgeois society should be replaced once and for all by "institutions in which freedom of opinion and of discussion does not degenerate into deception, for the parliamentarians themselves have to work, have to execute their own laws, have themselves to test their results in real life, and to account directly to their constituents." (*Collected Works,* Vol. 25, *The State and Revolution.*)

When Lenin set out this task in 1917 he relied on the experience of the immortal Paris Commune, whose memorable anniversary we and the working people of all the world shall mark on the day of the election to the Supreme Soviet. Thus, March 18 will, so to say, be a doubly festive day for us. (*Applause.*)

The Paris Commune, according to Marx, was a "working... body, executive and legislative at the same time".

The Soviets of Working People's Deputies are just such "working bodies", and their role is increasing still more now, in the period of the full-scale building of communism. The Soviets are known to combine the features of a state and a public organisation. They act increasingly as public organisations, and the masses take a broad and most active part in all their work.

The irrefutable fact that our socialist homeland has scaled new heights in its development in the past four years is an indication of the fruitful activities of the Supreme Soviet, whose term of office will expire with the election of new deputies. The outlines of communism, to which we are advancing and which we are sure to reach, comrades, are already clearly seen from these heights. (*Prolonged applause.*)

It is an honourable and responsible thing to be elected to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. and to represent therein Its Majesty the People. But, as the saying goes, much is demanded of those who are richly endowed.

Speaking before the people, candidates to the Supreme Soviet tell their thoughts to the electors honestly and frankly. None of us promise them milk and honey, and none proclaim election slogans which it would be impossible to carry into life.

The Soviet people are well informed about the state of affairs in the country. The whole life of our state, from the activities of the supreme organs to the lowest links in our machinery of state and the public organisations, is open and democratic. The Party and the Government always consult with the people. Together with the people, they work out plans for further advancement and map out the ways of fulfilling these plans. This is why, comrades, I would like to say again today that our victory in communist construction will not come of itself or, as people said in the old days, will not drop as manna from heaven.

The plans of communist construction framed by the Party will be fulfilled the more successfully, the better is the work done by every Soviet man and woman, every industrial enterprise, collective farm and state farm, every collective of working people. If everyone of us considers it his and her sacred duty to contribute duly to the fulfilment of the outlined plans, we shall reach our goal sooner. In the great cause of communist construction there are no quiet sectors or unimportant jobs. The work done even at the smallest sector of communist construction is often decisively important for all our work.

The elections to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. are held in our country at the very beginning of spring. It is a time when both nature and man acquire new strength and energy. Let us meet this spring of communist construction in a militant spirit, fully armed, as a good ploughman does, who welcomes the spring by sowing good seeds in the fields. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Comrades, you will remember that the previous elections to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. were held on March 16, 1958. Already at that time we were making good progress towards the goal defined by Lenin—to overtake and surpass the most advanced capitalist countries in economic development. But in these few years the scale and pace of our advance have grown still more.

Here are a few figures that say a lot. The average annual rate of growth of industrial output in the United States in

these four years was 2.2 per cent, whereas in the Soviet Union it was 10.1 per cent. During the same period the steel output in our country increased by 19,600,000 tons, or 38 per cent, whereas in the United States it dropped by 14,300,000 tons, or 14 per cent. The oil output in the U.S.S.R. increased from 1957 to 1961 by 67,700,000 tons, or 69 per cent, while in the United States it grew only by one per cent.

In the past four years the number of workers and office employees in our country increased by 12,900,000 or 24.2 per cent. It is years since unemployment has been wiped out in the Soviet Union. Every Soviet citizen has the right to work and is paid by society for his labour in accordance with the quantity and quality of his work. In the United States, however, the unemployed make up a vast army of five million. Besides, millions of Americans are partially unemployed.

The population in the Soviet Union has become so much younger in composition that we now have few people left who have a concrete notion of what unemployment is. To understand an unemployed, you have to be in his shoes, so to speak, and to experience the hopelessness of his position. He comes home to his expectant family, to his wife and children, but he has no hope of getting a job the following day and relieving their plight. And that sort of thing happens with a healthy man who is eager to work and at a time when there are things he could work on. But he gets no work, because there is overproduction in the country. Overproduction occurs not because everyone in the country is fed and clothed, but because the purchasing capacity of the population has dropped and many people are in needy circumstances and cannot buy even the necessities. That is why there is no demand for many commodities. That is the vicious circle of capitalism, whose essence was described so well by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

The capitalists cannot drop this system. You cannot talk a tiger into eating grass. It cannot do so, because it is carnivorous. (*Animation. Applause.*) It is impossible to convince a monopolist, a capitalist, that communism is better than capitalism. What do we mean here by the word convince? We mean to convince him to drop his capital, to make over to the people the enterprises that he calls "mine" so that workingmen would call them "ours".

Where will you find a capitalist who abandons all his riches of his own free will?

Only the working class which, having organised itself into a friendly family, takes power into its own hands, can achieve it that riches pass to the people. In order to achieve this successfully, the working class needs a party capable of organising it and leading it along the right road. Experience shows that the Communist Party is the only party that can do it. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*) Then and only then is the victory of the working class possible, the victory that is bound to come, that is quite sure to come! (*Prolonged applause.*)

Neither prayers nor handouts will deliver the capitalists from the victory of communism! It is only a question of time.

Our work, the building of communism in the Soviet Union, is the yeast that makes dough rise. You know how it is with a good housewife when she makes pancakes. If her yeast is good, the dough rises singingly. (*Animation. Applause.*) The successes of socialism and communism in our country and others are paving the way to new socialist victories.

The activities of our Communist Party, of the fraternal Communist Parties, and our communist construction, to put it figuratively, is a kind of yeast expediting new victories for communism. (*Stormy applause.*)

Journalists from bourgeois countries are present here, and they are sure to write that Khrushchov is calling for world revolution and world communism, and that hence there can be no peaceful coexistence, and the like.

Gentlemen, you can write whatever you wish. What you want is victory of world capitalism. So why do you want to deprive me of the same right to advocate world communism? What about equal opportunities? (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Comparing figures which mirror the state of the economy in our country and in the most developed country of the capitalist world one is bound to feel proud of our socialist system. It enables the people to rapidly develop all branches of national economy, and advance irrepressibly towards the sparkling summits of communism.

Our Programme proclaims solemnly that already by 1970 we shall have surpassed the United States both in gross industrial and agricultural production, and in per capita

production as well (*applause*), and that by 1980 we shall have left the current American level far behind. Only recently many people in the West did not believe that this is feasible. They went so far as to make fun of our intentions. But times change, and now not only American scientists and businessmen, but President Kennedy too, admit that we are developing faster than they. Now they only argue about the time when we shall surpass them. Well, let them argue. Life will show who was right–we do not have long to wait for that. (*Applause.*)

When you and I adopted the Seven-Year Plan, a hue and cry was raised in the West. They called it "a fantastic plan!", "a propaganda plan!" But three years have elapsed since then, and what do we see? During these three years just the industrial output over and above the plan was approximately equal to the total Soviet industrial output of 1937. (*Applause.*)

Comrades, our Party Programme proclaims that communism will be built in the main in the Soviet Union in 20 years. Today we can see what has already been done by the heroic labour of the Soviet people in the brief period since the Twenty-Second Congress.

In the last four months alone (November 1961-February 1962) industrial output in our country was nearly double the output of the entire First Five-Year Plan, or more than of the whole of 1950. (*Applause.*)

During these four months, steel production, for instance, totalled 24,000,000 tons, or almost six times as much as in 1913.

Oil production was 58,000,000 tons or almost double the annual output of the U.S.S.R. on the eve of the Great Patriotic War.

Power output in the four months was about 122,000 million kilowatt-hours, or 150 per cent more than in pre-war 1940, and more than the total for 1952.

That is the gigantic rate at which the Soviet people are advancing towards communism.

It must be said to the credit of the Muscovites that they are making a big contribution to the country's industrial development. Moscow's industry is on the whole successfully fulfilling and overfulfilling the plan. The working people of Kalinin District have also fulfilled last year's plan ahead of schedule. (*Applause.*) As your candidate, I am pleased to

note that Kalinin District holds first place among the districts of the capital and that it won the Red Challenge Banner in the socialist emulation movement in honour of the Twenty-Second Party Congress. (*Applause.*) The January and February plan of this year has been successfully fulfilled. Permit me to wish you the same success in your future work too. (*Prolonged applause.*)

However, I must say that the Muscovites could have produced even more if all the enterprises had fulfilled their plans. Unfortunately, this is not yet the case. Last year, 39 Moscow enterprises did not fulfil their production plans. Things were even worse this January and February: 75 Moscow factories did not fulfil their industrial production plan.

Some may think that I, as your nominee, prudently address these words to all the Muscovites and not to you, my voters. (*Animation. Applause.*) But let me tell you in confidence that this concerns you, too. (*Laughter.*)

Let us, comrades Muscovites, set our house in order. It is unbecoming for us to advance towards communism like a column of poorly trained men—the strong in the van and the weak straggling behind. It is much easier and more cheering to march along the road to communism in serried ranks!

Comrades, big successes have also been achieved during these years in agriculture. Thanks to a number of highly important measures, such as the increase in procurement prices for farm produce and the reorganisation of the machine-and-tractor stations, whereby the collective farms acquired the necessary machinery, and thanks to the devoted labour of the collective farmers, the state-farm workers, and all workers in agriculture, gross agricultural output in the country has climbed substantially, and the cattle herd has increased.

I have already said recently that last year's grain harvest, for instance, was 8,380 million poods, or 66 per cent greater than in 1953; the production of meat (slaughter weight) has soared to 8,800,000 tons, or 50 per cent; the butter output was 894,000 tons, or 80 per cent higher than in 1953; and milk production was 62,500,000 tons, or 71 per cent higher than in 1953.

In the last four years state meat purchases went up 45 per cent, and milk purchases—38 per cent. All this, of course, is good. But our rate of agricultural growth cannot satisfy us any longer.

Firstly, we cannot disregard the fact that the population of the U.S.S.R. has increased by 15,000,000 during these years, and, secondly, that the cash incomes of the population have risen by 33 per cent. It turns out that the marketable meat and milk resources have increased only slightly more than the cash incomes of the population.

You know that the Party's Central Committee held a Plenary Meeting recently. I think there is no need for me to speak at length about the work of the Plenary Meeting, since its documents were published in the press. The Plenary Meeting has made a thorough examination of the state of affairs in agriculture and has outlined concrete measures for the successful accomplishment of the great programme of communist construction in agriculture, too. But to achieve this, we shall have to work hard.

More than once, I have had to speak of the decisive importance of the productivity of labour, which is the yardstick of progress and a most important source of improvement of the living standard of the people. As you know, during the 20-year period the overall volume of material production in our country is to increase about fivefold, or by 400 per cent. Yet the number of employees will increase only by 40 per cent.

In what way then, shall we be able to increase the volume of material production fivefold? Only by increasing the productivity of social labour! Our scientists and economists have made the necessary computations and have come to the conclusion that the planned increase in labour productivity in industry (4-4.5-fold) and agriculture (5-6-fold) is quite feasible, for it is secured by the unprecedented advance of science and technology, the considerably greater skill of the personnel and the more rational use of manpower.

The task will be facilitated by the fundamental change in the Soviet peoples' attitude to labour. Increasingly, labour is becoming something the Soviet citizen cannot do without. This new attitude to labour has already been graphically demonstrated by the mass drive for communist work teams, workshops and enterprises.

Comrades, as we approach the new election to the Supreme Soviet, the Communist Party, its Central Committee, and the Soviet Government are giving an account to the people on the fulfilment of the plans of raising the living standard. In

the four years, the national income has increased 38 per cent, or 29 per cent per head of population. During the same period the national income in the United States went up only 9 per cent, or only 2 per cent per head of population.

The increase in the real incomes of the working people is based on the rise of the national income. During this period the wages of factory and office workers were adjusted in various branches of the national economy. This involved an increase in the wages of factory and office workers, especially in the lower-paid brackets. Already more than 40,000,000 factory and office workers are working on the new terms. By the end of the Seven-Year Plan period, minimum wages will be increased to 50-60 rubles a month; moreover, wages will be increased not only for the lower-paid brackets, but also for the medium brackets of factory and office workers.

Collective farmers' incomes have also increased considerably during these years.

Parallel with the rise in the wages of factory and office workers and in the cash incomes of collective farmers, the incomes of the population have also been greatly enhanced through the public funds. All the benefits and grants made by the state, such as pensions, allowances, grants, free tuition, free medical services, etc., totalled 26,400 million rubles in 1961, or 30 per cent more than in 1957.

One of the major social measures effected during these years was the conversion of factory and office workers to a seven- and six-hour working day. As a result, the working week was reduced by six and a half hours. It is noteworthy that, far from declining, the wages of factory and office workers have in many cases even increased.

Big successes have been achieved in expanding the production of consumer goods. All Soviet people feel this. The task now, coupled with their increasing production, is to achieve a sharp improvement in the quality and range of consumer goods.

Housing construction in our country is increasing from year to year. In the last four years alone, the new housing built in the towns and workers' estates totalled 315,000,000 square metres, or about 9,000,000 flats with all conveniences. That is almost double the total housing stock in tsarist Russia in 1913. During the same period collective farmers and the rural intelligentsia built 2,600,000 cottages in the

countryside. In the last five years 50,000,000 Soviet people, or almost a quarter of the population, have moved into new houses.

Take our capital, Moscow. More flats were built there in the last four years than it had before the Revolution. It should be borne in mind, too, that modern flats are incomparably better than the old dwellings, which did not have the elementary conveniences.

This tremendous pace of housing construction is possible only because the Party and the Government pay close attention to home building and organise it on a modern industrial basis.

The Soviet people are very pleased with the outstanding achievements in the development of our science and technology. They rejoice at the further cultural advance in the country. We have every reason to be pleased, comrades.

In the last four years, for instance, our higher educational establishments and specialised secondary schools graduated 3,300,000 specialists, which amounts to 550,000 more than in the previous four years.

One cannot mention without a sense of pride that the enrolment in the general schools of the U.S.S.R. has increased by 8,500,000 in the period under review. The meaning of this is strikingly accentuated by the fact that the school enrolment in pre-revolutionary Russia was 9,700,000. It turns out that in the last four years almost as many pupils were admitted to the schools as there had been in the whole country before the October Revolution.

The creative achievements of Soviet science and technology were crowned by such history-making feats as the launching of the world's first artificial earth satellites. I had already told you during Academician A. Y. Ishlinsky's speech here that one more sputnik was launched at 3 p.m. today, and that it is now orbiting the earth. (*Applause.*)

We have launched the first man-made planet, produced by man's genius and effort, and also the first spaceships, on which our heroes, Yuri Gagarin and Herman Titov, made their immortal flights round the globe. All this, as well as many other great achievements, have for ever become part of the golden fund of world science and engineering. (*Applause.*)

Glorious and honourable is the work of the Soviet people's

intelligentsia in the life of our society. And we shall do our utmost for science and engineering, and the socialist culture of the people, to advance at the same swift pace, showing mankind what exploits a great people that is building communism is able to perform. (*Prolonged applause.*)

In working out the new Programme, our Party based itself on the laws governing social development that were discovered by Marx, Engels and Lenin. Marxists-Leninists are great revolutionary reorganisers of the world. To begin with, they are materialists in their world outlook and are building their policy upon their profound understanding of the vital interests of the masses and the economic conditions of their life.

Marx made a revolution in science, in the understanding of world history, by pointing to the obvious fact that people must first of all eat, drink, and have houses, that they must work before they can go in for politics, philosophy and religion. He demonstrated that capitalist society is unable to create a prosperous life for the popular masses, and that the overwhelming majority of mankind is inevitably doomed to slave labour and a wretched existence under the rule of the exploiters.

The Marxist teaching equipped the international working class with a correct understanding of the prospect of social development and indicated the right way to socialism, communism—the most just social system. Marx, Engels and Lenin were the first to show that only under socialism, through a planned organisation of production as a whole, is it possible to increase the productive forces of society and the amount of goods they produce to such an extent as will enable people to satisfy their reasonable requirements on a constantly growing scale. Only a free people—the true maker of history—can build such a society. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Loyal to Lenin's behests, our Party sees the sense of all its activities in realising his great ideas—in building communist society, securing durable and just peace, and satisfying in full all the material and spiritual requirements of the people.

It is to this noble goal that the specific plans outlined in our Programme for the building of the material and technical basis for communism, the development of industry and agriculture, science and culture, are dedicated, so that a higher

living standard than in any capitalist country may be secured on this basis in the Soviet Union. (*Applause.*)

It is a pleasure and a joy to note that the Soviet people gave their wholehearted approval to the grand Programme of the Leninist Party, in which the Marxist-Leninist teaching was further creatively developed. The whole nation lost no time in tackling the Programme, so as to bring nearer the great victory of communism. This is added and convincing proof that the cause of the Party and the cause of the people are inseparable. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Dear comrades, our achievements in economic and cultural construction are not difficult to evaluate: the quantity and quality of goods produced, building, the standard of living, and culture and education—all this is fittingly expressed in the precise language of facts and figures. It is, apparently, more difficult to find a gauge whereby to express as graphically and accurately the achievements in international affairs. But in that sphere too, we have indisputable indications.

The main achievement of our foreign policy—and the Soviet people may be just as proud of it as of the successful fulfilment of economic plans—is the peace that accompanies the full-scale construction of communist society in our country. (*Prolonged applause.*)

True, the situation in the world is still complicated and tense. The aggressive groups of the imperialist powers, frightened by the successes of the socialist countries, have not abandoned the idea of resorting to arms. But gone are the days when they could do whatever they wished on the international scene without restraint. Now, the imperialists have to be circumspect. No longer do they hold the monopoly in nuclear weapons and other types of up-to-date arms. The Soviet Union has all that in sufficient quantities. What is more, our means of delivering nuclear weapons, our powerful inter-continental rockets, are better. (*Applause.*) In our time none but a lunatic would start a war against the socialist countries. A step like that would be suicide for the imperialists, because we have sufficient means to destroy any aggressor. The imperialists have to reckon with the might of the socialist camp, with the peace-loving forces of the world.

The Soviet Union, all the peace-loving peoples press insistently for a consolidation of peace and for a settlement

of the cardinal international problems. The attention of the peoples is focussed on these problems, and primarily on the question of a German peace treaty, the problem of general and complete disarmament, and the question of abolishing colonialism in all its shapes and forms.

Conclusion of a German peace treaty and a settlement on this basis of the West Berlin question is an important, I might say, a commanding height that has to be captured on the way to durable peace.

The position of the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic and other socialist states striving for a normalisation of the situation in Central Europe, is absolutely clear. We proceed on the strength of the situation that took shape after the defeat of nazi Germany–the existence of two sovereign German states and the frontiers established after the war.

We understand very well and actively support the struggle waged by our ally, the German Democratic Republic, for strengthening its international positions and consolidating its sovereignty. It may be said with satisfaction that substantial successes have already been scored in this tense struggle. Today, many Western politicians are compelled to reckon more and more with the historical fact that there are two German states, one of which is and will be developing along socialist lines.

The protective measures taken by the G.D.R. Government last August along the borders with West Berlin were of particularly great importance to the consolidation of the sovereignty of the German Democratic Republic. The G.D.R. Government thereby exercised its sovereign right of safeguarding the security of its frontiers. At the Brandenburger Tor the workers and peasants of socialist Germany showed the West German revanchists and militarists, the West Berlin provocateurs, once again that the way to the East is closed to them once and for all. (*Prolonged applause.*) It was an important achievement, thanks to which the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic and all the other socialist countries could continue their struggle for a peace treaty from still more solid positions.

As you know, the Soviet Government has declared that it does not adhere to any fatalistic deadlines with respect to the conclusion of a German peace treaty. The Soviet Government has made this plain in order to create better conditions

for an exchange of opinions and for negotiations on the German question. We would like to settle the questions left over from the Second World War, to conclude a German peace treaty and to turn West Berlin into a free demilitarised city on this basis, abolishing the occupation regime there. We would like to do this in concert with all the countries that fought against Hitler Germany. It would be a big contribution to the common struggle of the peoples for an easing of international tension and for world peace. Such a settlement would handcuff the West German militarists craving for revenge and would to a certain degree help to restore the spirit of co-operation between the former allies in the past war.

That is why the Soviet Government is not sparing time and effort to persuade the Western Powers to take part in a German peace settlement. But it ought to be said plainly that those who hope to put off a solution of this important problem endlessly are badly mistaken. The matter has to be solved, and it will be solved. (*Applause.*)

Contacts have been maintained between the Soviet Union and the United States for quite some time on questions pertaining to a German peace treaty. It cannot be said that the American representatives, and the NATO allies of the U.S.A. who seem to be invisibly present during these contacts, hold a reasonable view of the matter.

I should not like to go into the details of the current exchange of opinion, because it has not yet been completed. I will only say that it is evidently not enough, as the Russian saying goes, to eat a peck of salt, in order to find a common language with our partners. Here is how our talks proceed.

We say: "If you do not want to conclude a German peace treaty together with us, which would have been the best solution, the Soviet Union and other states will be compelled to sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic."

Our opposite numbers reply: "Wait; we agree to search with you for a solution of the problems that have to be settled through the conclusion of the German peace treaty, although we shall not be direct parties to it. When an agreed solution of these problems is found, you, that is the Soviet Union, will sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic and will record in it the understanding we have reached."

Well, one may say, this approach could be acceptable as a last resort. But as soon as our conversations come down to brass tacks, our partners' field of vision shrinks visibly Instead of the well-known set of problems involved in the peace settlement, which includes recognition and respect of the sovereign rights of the German Democratic Republic, our partners see nothing but the question of access to West Berlin. That is indeed a case of not seeing the wood for the trees.

Among the assets of Soviet foreign policy we have every reason to include the fact that in the last few years the Soviet Union never abandoned the initiative in the search for a solution of the disarmament problem. Of course, the road to disarmament is not an easy one. But if the idea of disarmament has taken firm root in the minds of hundreds upon hundreds of millions of people, this is to be credited mostly to our country, which presented a programme for general and complete disarmament two and a half years ago and has since been vigorously promoting it. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The monstrous destructive force of the modern nuclear devices, the possibility of delivering them to any point in the world are today such convincing arguments that human reason cannot but demand the earliest solution of the disarmament problem.

Can an understanding be reached on disarmament? Yes, it can. The Soviet position is well known to world opinion: we are in favour of general and complete disarmament under the strictest international control.

However, the Western policymakers, and above all those of the United States, those, on whom a disarmament agreement depends, have not evidently grasped all the dangers of the arms race and the implications of a war in the contemporary conditions. The United States and its allies were victors in two world wars. But in these wars the United States sustained minimum losses. American industry fattened incredibly on the military contracts, and the monopolies made fabulous profits. It seems that the American monopolists have not abandoned their intention of profiting on another war. This prevents them from correctly understanding the sinister role they are playing.

It should be said that the population of the United States did not in the past century experience the hardships of war in its territory, and that is why the bulk of Americans are

still only vaguely conscious of what will happen if war should break out and what a terrible calamity it will be to all the peoples, including the American people.

The times are long over when the United States could regard itself invulnerable in a war behind the protection of vast expanses of ocean separating it from the theatres of war operations on other continents. In the contemporary conditions, the United States is just as vulnerable as all the other countries of the world.

The situation is changing still more now. Our scientists and engineers have developed a new inter-continental rocket, which they called global; this rocket is invulnerable to anti-missile weapons. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The United States militarists wanted to erect a barrier to a Soviet retaliatory blow. They developed a system of radar and other facilities in order to try and intercept rockets flying approximately across the North Pole, i.e., along the shortest route. The new global rockets can fly round the globe in any direction and strike at any set target. (*Prolonged applause.*) The precision of the calculations is borne out by the flights of the Vostok-1 and Vostok-2 spaceships. (*Applause.*)

Thus, the tremendous funds spent by the United States in developing a radar system and other warning facilities, have been spent in vain. It has all lost its importance now, because rockets can reach the United States from an entirely different direction than the one on which these devices are placed. (*Applause.*)

Obviously, it was no accident that the American U-2 spy plane piloted by Powers flew from Pakistan to Sverdlovsk to inspect that area, thinking that our inter-continental rocket bases were situated there. The Americans figured this to be the shortest line for bombarding the territory of the U.S.A. with inter-continental rockets. But even if we assume that the U.S. military were right in their calculations, these calculations are now worthless. We can launch the rockets not over the North Pole, but in the reverse direction. (*Animation. Applause.*) As the saying goes, you expect him through the door, but he comes through the window. (*Laughter.*)

Global rockets can fly in from the oceans or from other directions where warning facilities cannot be installed. Now that we have global rockets, the warning system is generally of

no use at all. Global rockets cannot be detected early enough to take any measures against them. And, in general, the funds spent in the U.S.A. on building anti-rocket systems are wasted money, as Robert S. McNamara, the U.S. Defence Secretary, said rightly, because they defeat their purpose. I am just telling you what McNamara said. (*Animation.*)

Therefore, the most sensible way of preventing war is disarmament. Nothing could be more sensible than to understand the interests of the peoples and to realise that a disarmament agreement is necessary and that it has got to be signed. (*Applause.*)

I repeat, the most realistic way to prevent mass extermination in the inferno of nuclear war is an agreement on disarmament, on ending the arms race and destroying the tremendous stockpiles of weapons. The Soviet Union has exerted, and will exert, every effort to achieve this. Now, more than ever before, a realistic approach is necessary in the relations between states in order to avert the disaster of a thermonuclear war.

The trouble is, comrades, that in the capitalist world they think he who is rich is clever and he who is poor is stupid. The monopolists of the United States are indeed rich and strong, and therefore they are not accustomed to talking with anyone on an equal footing. They are accustomed to killing some and bribing others, and it was taken for granted in the capitalist world that whatever the U.S. monopolists said was law. But then the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries came on the scene with their independent policy. Yet the monopolists want to think in old terms: the Soviet Union, they reckon, is the same bast-shoe Russia that it was, and we did not recognise it for 16 years after the October Revolution.

But we have long since sent our bast-shoes to the museum. Our spaceships were the first to reach outer space. Ours is not a bast-shoe Russia any more, but twentieth-century Russia. It is a socialist power with advanced science and technology. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

The U.S. monopolists refuse to understand that. They say: We are all-powerful, we showed that in the last war. We can tell these gentlemen: Dear sirs, in the past war the United States suffered comparatively small losses in manpower.

The U.S. imperialists always tried to pay their way with money, with capital. We want you to know, gentlemen–I

am speaking to those who make U.S. policy–that in the present conditions there is no difference between a city situated on the border of a country with which you want to fight, and a city situated at the other end of the country. Distance does not count with inter-continental rockets. They will hit exactly where a man aims them.

Why do I say this? We realise very well how dangerous the arms drive is for mankind, and therefore we say to the leaders of the Western countries: Let us disarm! Many U.S. statesmen do not yet understand that. We shall have to be very patient to reach an agreement on disarmament. We have patience as you know. Our nerves are strong. We can match anyone in that respect.

But, comrades, the main thing is your labour, the labour of the entire Soviet people. The speakers here said: See what sort of a man Khrushchov is! Comrades, neither Khrushchov nor Ivanov, nor anyone else could do anything without being backed by such a people as you, a people whom we all represent. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

The 18-Nation Disarmament Committee has embarked on its job in Geneva. But it is no more an 18-Nation, but rather a 17-Nation Committee. We should like to hope that unlike all earlier committees, commissions and subcommissions on disarmament, the work of this Committee will be crowned with success. The Soviet Government will exert every effort for the success of the Disarmament Committee.

However, one cannot disregard a fact that is casting a cloud on the prospects of the Geneva talks. On the eve of the convocation of the 18-Nation Committee the President of the United States announced that he had resolved to hold a series of atmospheric nuclear tests. That is the sort of accompaniment the U.S. Government has devised for the disarmament talks! The President's decision was received all over the world as a painful blow aimed at the 18-Nation Committee, as one more token of the aggressive U.S. foreign policy.

American political leaders and the U.S. press have stopped talking about the harm of nuclear testing, about radioactive fallout undermining the health of people. Just a short time ago, Western propaganda did not stint words to denounce nuclear weapons tests, but today all these arguments are forgotten and the Western papers have struck up a different

tune. Nuclear tests, they say, are necessary to bolster the defences of the United States and its allies.

The Central Committee of our Party and the Soviet Government are responsible to the Soviet people for the security of our homeland, and we see to it all the time that the defences of our socialist land are at the proper level. It should be clear that if the United States holds another series of experimental explosions in the atmosphere, and it is already making underground explosions, the Soviet Union will be compelled to reply to this by holding its own tests. (*Applause.*) Thus, the United States Government will not achieve any military advantage by holding nuclear weapons tests. But there is one thing it will indeed achieve–it will usher in a new stage in the arms race and thus earn the censure of the peoples who want the Soviet Union and the United States to compete peacefully, and not in the manufacture of increasingly terrible weapons of destruction.

We regret the decision of the United States Government to resume nuclear tests. It has thereby assumed a serious responsibility before the peoples of the world. But I should like to assure you, comrades, that this decision of the United States Government, far from weakening our efforts in the struggle for disarmament, including a nuclear test ban, will, on the contrary, redouble them. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The Soviet Government has proposed a sound foundation for a nuclear test ban agreement. We have proposed that national means of detecting nuclear explosions, which the states already possess, should be used for control. The Western representatives allege that national facilities are inadequate to control a nuclear weapons test ban. But this contradicts universally known facts. The nuclear explosions held in the United States were registered in the Soviet Union and the explosions made in the Soviet Union, as one may judge from the statements of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, were recorded by American national control facilities.

Hence, there can be no secret tests of nuclear weapons, for every explosion is, in effect, controlled not only by the U.S.S.R. and the United States, but also by other countries, including neutral ones, many of which also have devices for the detection of nuclear explosions. Yet, a so-called international control system is being foisted upon us, one that would be located in our territory and would engage in espionage

and military intelligence under the pretext of control. We shall never accept this. (*Applause.*)

The President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain acknowledged in one of their joint statements that national facilities were quite adequate to control the cessation of nuclear tests in the atmosphere. Yet it is claimed that secret tests of nuclear weapons can be carried out underground.

Let me tell you a secret, comrades. We knew that it is scientifically possible to detect underground nuclear explosions by national means of control. The underground nuclear explosions made in the United States, for example, were registered by Soviet scientists and scientists in other countries. We decided to prove that the Western representatives lie when they claim that it is impossible to detect underground explosions.

We used the well-known popular device to determine whether a person is feigning deafness. Here is how it is done: Ivan is told: "Give me!" He pretends not to hear. Then he is told: "Take it!" He hears that perfectly well. (*Laughter.*)

We decided to use this popular device, and we succeeded.

Recently an underground nuclear explosion was made in the Soviet Union, although formerly we did not make such explosions. What was the result? Almost the same day, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission announced that the United States had detected an underground nuclear explosion in the Soviet Union. (*Animation.*) Hence, those who sought to prove it was impossible to register underground explosions, those who insisted that the ban on underground nuclear tests should on all accounts be put under international control, were not guided by any desire to achieve agreement at the earliest possible date.

This proves once again that the banning of nuclear weapons tests is blocked not by the elaboration of a control system, but by Western reluctance to reach an agreement on outlawing nuclear tests.

Comrades, we are striving to solve the disarmament problem, because we know perfectly well what a burden the tremendous arms expenditures are to the peoples, and what horrible consequences the arms race may cause. What joy the peoples would feel if all the resources now spent on manufacturing weapons of destruction were employed to

raise the material welfare of people, to develop science and culture and to do peaceful constructive work! But the monopolists have long turned the production of lethal weapons into a source of enrichment, of profit. They do not conceal their dread of the "peace threat", of disarmament.

The U.S. monopolists widely circulate "theories" that disarmament agreement may wreak havoc in their country's economy and finance, that disarmament would deal an irremediable blow to the American economy. The ideologists of imperialism contend with straight faces that the production of weapons of mass annihilation is a boon to the workers themselves, because it provides them with jobs and enables them to feed their families. They are trying to make people believe that if weapons production is discontinued, more millions of unemployed will appear, unable to find jobs in the peaceful branches of industry. That is monstrous deceit of the masses. For the sake of profit, the monopolists want to perpetuate a situation in which the manufacture of weapons of mass annihilation, designed for the destruction of peaceful cities and villages, is a source of livelihood for many millions of workers. This shows that capitalism is enmeshed in insoluble contradictions and that it has exhausted itself as a social system.

The Soviet Union sincerely wishes a disarmament agreement, and is working for it perseveringly. We are strongly opposed to the man-hating ideology of imperialism, because communism brings Peace, Labour, Freedom, Equality, Fraternity and Happiness to all peoples of the earth. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The ideologists of imperialism describe our struggle for disarmament as a tactical ruse and declare that a disarmament agreement would benefit none but the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and that it would inflict damage to the United States and its allies. In the economic competition of the two social systems, they say, the U.S.S.R. would make still fuller use of all the possibilities for developing its economy if it transferred the funds now spent for military purposes to the peaceful branches.

In saying this, the ideologists of imperialism evidently overlook the fact that this admission is a severe indictment of imperialism, the senile capitalist system, which compels the masses to waste their energy and vast resources not on

human progress, but to the detriment of progress. Communism brings the peoples the joy of creative labour and bright prospects of peaceful development.

We regard the programme for general and complete disarmament as the brief of the Soviet people, as the brief of the electorate to the leaders of the Party and Government. You may rest assured that we shall not relax the struggle for its fulfilment. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The Soviet Government has instructed our delegation to the 18-Nation Committee to work energetically for an agreement on concrete measures in the sphere of disarmament. Yesterday, on behalf of the Soviet Union, Foreign Minister Gromyko submitted the draft Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament Under Strict International Control. This draft offers all grounds for reaching agreement on this problem.

But, comrades, we must assess the situation soberly. The masses in capitalist countries such as the United States, Britain, France, West Germany and others, have not, apparently, grasped the dangers of the armaments race. In those countries, a comparatively small number of people has so far embarked on a resolute struggle against atomic death. Naturally, most people do not agree with the arms race policy, but they are not as yet pressing with enough vigour for a renunciation of that policy. Some hope to buy their salvation somehow, to find refuge and sit it out in shelters which Rockefeller and other monopoly capitalists are dangling before them.

There is only one salvation from nuclear war—it must be prevented. It is essential that the peoples rise in a single powerful surge and demand a stop to the arms race. The peoples must see to it that leaders who oppose disarmament are replaced by such men who really understand the interests of the people and are willing to pursue a policy of peace and international co-operation. Vigorous action by the masses is the key to peace. (*Prolonged applause.*)

There are people who either misinterpret or deliberately distort the Soviet stand on disarmament. They allege that our disarmament call is harmful, even dangerous, because, they say, it does injury to the peoples struggling for liberation from colonial oppression, and peoples that have already gained political independence but have not yet fully freed

themselves from the domination of foreign monopoly capital. These peoples, they aver, should arm rather than disarm, in order to combat the danger emanating from the imperialists.

We have always considered, and now consider, that the peoples who have not yet cast off the fetters of colonialism can achieve their liberation only in struggle, including armed struggle. As for those peoples that have already liberated themselves, they, too, can maintain their independence solely in struggle, only by arming to repel the colonialists, the imperialists, who are armed to the teeth. What is more, we do not merely say so, but also render considerable economic assistance, including help with weapons, to the countries which have asked us to support their struggle against the imperialists, the colonialists, the struggle for consolidating their independence.

When we call for disarmament and work for it, we mean that all countries must disarm, and above all those who possess nuclear weapons, the most lethal of all arms. We are convinced that general and complete disarmament would be a great service to the peoples waging a just struggle against the colonialists and imperialists. Is it, not clear that one of the main reasons why the imperialists reject disarmament is that they would not, if it were realised, have the equipment to keep other peoples in subjection? Disarmament would benefit not the stranglers of the peoples' freedom, but the peoples waging a just struggle for liberation. (*Applause.*)

We rejoice over the achievements of the world national liberation movement which is sweeping out the remnants of the colonial system and undermining the pillars of imperialism. More than 1,500 million people who have cast off the fetters of colonial slavery, dozens of states that have gained political independence–such is the truly staggering result of the post-war national liberation struggle of the peoples.

We are quite certain that soon it will be possible to add fresh achievements to these successes of the national liberation movement. The heroic Algerian people are about to win freedom and national independence. After a bloody seven-year war the French Government has been compelled to agree to official negotiations on a cease-fire and the terms for Algeria's self-determination. We hope that the current talks will lead up to the fufilment of the just aspirations of the Algerians and the establishment of peace in that region.

(*Prolonged applause.*) This would be a great victory for the Algerian people and at the same time a relief for France herself.

The national liberation movement of the peoples of some other colonial countries, too, has entered a decisive stage. It is evident that more than one freedom-loving state will join the family of independent countries.

The fact that the national liberation movement has been able to lean, and now leans, on the might of the socialist system, that the Soviet Union and the other countries of the great socialist camp have become a reliable shield for the peoples fighting for their independence, has been an important factor which facilitated the great achievements of that movement.

History has proved that in our time the peoples cannot completely smash the colonial fetters without the support they get from the socialist camp. At the same time, the independence struggle of the oppressed peoples strengthens the international positions of socialism. The interaction of all the revolutionary trends—socialism, the national liberation movement, the class struggle of the world proletariat, and their merging into one powerful torrent that is washing away the foundations of imperialism—makes possible the historical regeneration of the world upon the principles of freedom, democracy and socialism, a process of which we are witnesses and participants. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Life, however, reminds us every minute that the struggle of the colonial and dependent peoples for their national freedom is far from completed. On the other side of the barricades is a strong and experienced enemy who has no intention at all of surrendering his positions, who does not stop at any crime to suppress the natural urge of the peoples for freedom and restore his former domination wherever he can.

The Portuguese colonialists are trying to drown the national liberation movement in Angola in streams of blood. They are ravaging the towns and villages of that country with fire and sword.

The intrigues of international imperialism in the Congo are getting to be more and more insidious.

Just look how petulantly the Dutch colonialists reacted when the Indonesian Government lawfully demanded that they abandon the historically Indonesian West Irian.

For some years now, the United States has been interfering quite candidly in the domestic affairs of South Vietnam. The American militarists no longer rely on their protégés, and have involved themselves in an undeclared war against the Vietnam patriots working for the peaceful unification of North and South Vietnam.

Many are the seats of tension and unrest that spring up due to the imperialist attempts of obstructing the peoples fighting for national independence.

The American imperialists say that they favour an independent Laos which would pursue a neutral policy. Yet it was after the Laotian Government announced that Laos would follow a neutral policy that the U.S. Government organised actions by the reactionary forces, who started a war against the lawful Government of Laos. The United States has created a so-called rebel government; it armed the reactionary forces, and is giving them support at present.

There is no doubt in our minds that the intrigues of the imperialists are doomed to failure. The people of Laos will win and will set up a government pursuing a policy consistent with the interests of the people, and not the interests of the imperialists. (*Applause.*)

The imperialists are no longer able to steer the destiny of the peoples. The peoples of all countries, whether big or small, are entitled to an independent existence, to the choice of the social system they wish to establish in their country. Nothing, therefore, can justify the aggressive policy of the United States towards Cuba. Unquenchable greed is prompting the U.S. monopolists to criminal acts against the freedom-loving people of Cuba, to open interference in Cuba's internal affairs. But the Cuban people will win no matter how much the imperialists rave and rant, because they are fighting for their freedom and independence. (*Prolonged applause.*) The people of Cuba have the sympathy and support of all the socialist countries, all the freedom-loving peoples. The Soviet Union has given every possible support to the just struggle of the Cuban Republic, the Cuban people, and will continue to do so. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Comrades, the Soviet Union has always followed and will follow a consistent, active and flexible foreign policy. The Soviet Union will always work for a solution of the vital international problems. It will always stand guard over the

peaceful life of the peoples and promote greater friendship and co-operation between the states. This policy multiplies the glory and grandeur of our land!

The Soviet Union stands together with the other socialist countries. The friendship and cohesion of the socialist countries is a powerful weapon, the source of our strength. It is a dependable guarantee of good progress, a most important condition for the preservation of world peace. (*Prolonged applause.*)

* * *

Comrades, on March 18 Soviet people will go to the polls to vote for the candidates of the bloc of Communists and non-Party people. Beyond doubt, the elections will again demonstrate the unbreakable unity of Party and people. This unity is a powerful source of Soviet strength, a source of the successes of the land of communism in the making. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Beyond doubt, at this election, as at the previous one, Communists will vote in unison for both the Party and non-Party nominees, while the non-Party people will vote just as wholeheartedly for both the non-Party nominees and the Communists. (*Applause.*)

The peoples of the Soviet Union are approaching this election as one family, knowing perfectly well that fraternal friendship is the source of their strength and that the successes achieved in the development of the country as a whole, and of every republic in particular, are the result of joint efforts by the whole multinational family of Soviet peoples.

We must continue to strengthen and safeguard the fraternal friendship of the peoples in every way, remembering all the time that this friendship is one of the greatest of our gains, a powerful source of our socialist country's strength and invincibility. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union believes that it must strengthen still more its bonds with the people, express and realise the people's vital interests, and always act as the militant vanguard of the Soviet nation. This has always been so, because the Party exists for the people and serves the people. The Soviet people considers the Communist Party to be its militant and tested vanguard. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Long live our great homeland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live the Soviet people, the builder of communism! (*Stormy applause.*)

For Peace, Labour, Freedom, Equality, Fraternity and Happiness! (*Stormy applause.*)

On to the victory of communism under Lenin's banner, under the leadership of Lenin's Party! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Ovation. All rise. Cheers. Shouts of "Long live the great Soviet people!", "Long live the Communist Party!", "Long live the Soviet Government!", "Long live the Leninist Central Committee of our Party!", "Long live communism!"*)

# INTERVIEW WITH THE AMERICAN PUBLISHER GARDNER COWLES

*April 20, 1962*

On April 20, 1962, in the Kremlin, N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., received Gardner Cowles, a prominent American publisher, and had a conversation with him, in the course of which he answered questions put by Cowles and his assistant, Edward Korry.

At the beginning of the interview Gardner Cowles wishes Khrushchov many happy returns of the day and the best of health in connection with his recent birthday.

*Khrushchov*: Thank you. But it is customary with us to celebrate only the round figures: the fiftieth birthday, and so on, every ten years. So I must "wait" another two years. If we celebrate birthdays every year, no time will remain for work: there will be anniversaries without end!

*Cowles*: Allow me to be absolutely frank. I think that would be useful.

*Khrushchov*: Please do. I like frankness.

*Cowles*: To begin with, I should like to raise the question of disarmament.

It seems to me that you are one of the foremost of the statesmen to realise the horrors of nuclear war and the need of an agreement on stopping the steadily growing arms race. In this connection, I should like to ask you the following question: are you optimistic about the current Geneva negotiations?

*Khrushchov*: You have defined my position correctly, and I am grateful to you. Perhaps I do indeed realise more concretely and realistically than certain other statesmen how terrible a thermonuclear rocket war would be if we fail to prevent it. As a head of government, I have to deal with questions of defence, and, consequently, questions of modern means of warfare. I have occasion to attend the tests of these

weapons. This is why I have a perfectly clear idea of what they can do.

But that is not all, of course. The point is that we are Communists, and all genuine Communists are against aggressive wars. It is sometimes said, and quite wrongly, that the Communists have a vested interest in starting wars because revolutionary goals may allegedly be attained in that way. That is incorrect. It is a perverted notion about the Communists.

We Communists are deeply devoted to the ideas of Marx and Lenin, and we believe that these ideas will triumph, that sooner or later communism, being the most progressive system, will win everywhere. But we believe that communism must attain victory not by way of a war between states, but by demonstrating the advantages of the communist system and by the natural development of the contradictions inherent in the capitalist system, in capitalist society. We are sure that all the peoples will reject the old bankrupt system and prefer the new, communist system after they see that communism is better than capitalism.

As for aggressive wars, they are characteristic of imperialism, of monopoly capital. That was the way it implanted its rule in the past, and it has kept this habit to this day. We Communists, therefore, who look at things realistically, say: So long as there is imperialism, there may be wars. But let the imperialists bear in mind that the times have changed. The peoples would not forgive them if they unleashed a new aggressive war and would definitely turn their arms against those who started it, just as we did in 1917.

Yet we still wish to believe that our opponents have enough common sense not to start a war, and to take the path of peaceful competition between the two systems-capitalism and socialism.

This is our point of view on the questions of war and peace. As you see, we are against aggressive wars.

Now for the second part of your question, concerning my view on the chances of a disarmament agreement. I would like to be an optimist. But, whatever you say, optimism should be built on real facts. To be sure, I believe that sooner or later sensible people, the representatives of all states, will agree among themselves and come to the conclusion that disarmament is necessary. But are the present conditions ripe

enough for an agreement? It is too early to say so, because there are still mighty forces in the United States which are working against disarmament.

It is not my wish to forecast failure in these negotiations, but I feel some reserve as to the chances of concluding a disarmament agreement already at this time at the Geneva Conference.

I should like to say a few more words about the attitude of Communists to wars, so that you would understand me correctly.

As I have said, we oppose aggressive wars, but we consider defensive and national liberation wars to be lawful, even necessary. What wars are these? A defensive war is a war fought by a country attacked by an aggressor, when it has to defend itself, when it is compelled to defend itself; a national liberation war is a war fought by a people oppressed by colonialists, when it resorts to arms to win freedom.

An oppressed people is entitled to do it. Not only is it entitled to do it, but sooner or later it will rise to fight for its liberation. If the colonialists resist, as in Algeria, for instance, the peoples are compelled to rise and resort to arms.

Indeed, what other alternative have they? The U.N. General Assembly has passed a resolution on the granting of independence to all the colonial peoples, but the colonialists refuse to fulfil it. What are the oppressed peoples to do? Should they put up with club rule and suffer silently? No, they do not wish to suffer slavery any more, and embark on armed struggle against the oppressors. And they are perfectly right. That is the only way they will secure freedom and independence. It is this sort of wars that we regard as wars of liberation. We are in sympathy with such wars.

Briefly, what we regard as a just war is a war of the type once waged by the Americans against the British, when fighting for their liberation.

*Cowles*: Mr. Chairman, I have read your reply to Prime Minister Macmillan's message very carefully, and must say I can appreciate your viewpoint, your apprehensions that inspection in connection with disarmament may be a kind of "fishing expedition" to see what weapons remain and where they are.

But I should like to ask you the following question: Do you see any difference between inspection and verification

in the sense that verification is undertaken solely if an event has taken place which a competent international authority presumes to be a nuclear blast? In no other case but this would a commission be entitled to come and make sure what has really taken place—a nuclear blast or an earthquake.

Do you see any difference between inspection and this sort of verification?

*Khrushchov*: There is a difference, but only a slight one; it is more a difference in name than in substance. Let me give you an example from my own life. During the Civil War I served with the Red Army. Once I was sent to a division fighting in the Kuban region. I came to a village where the division had its headquarters, and was quartered at the priest's house. He was a sly man. He obviously favoured the whiteguards, and opposed us, but did not betray this in his conversation and behaviour.

When I came to the headquarters, I was told that the situation was grave: General Wrangel's landing force, deployed against us, was disembarking and had already engaged our troops. The priest had apparently been informed of this, but did not show it. However, he was so impatient to verify through me how things were shaping up at the front that he invited me to the samovar in the garden—it was in summer—and spoke to me of this and that. Suddenly, he cupped his hands to his ear, and said:

"Do you hear it? I seem to hear machine-gun fire."

I said:

"No, I hear nothing."

"Oh, but it sounds like a machine-gun."

There was, naturally, no sound of any machine-gun fire because the place where the Wrangel troops had landed was far from the village and the sound of machine-gun fire could never have reached us from there. But the priest could not wait to obtain a confirmation or denial from me. Now, that was also a verification!

Surely you know that earthquakes and volcanic shocks of varying degree and force occur on earth all the time, and it is therefore always possible, if one wishes, to find a pretext for disputes, because the instruments will indicate that there really has been some sort of tremor.

But those will be contrived arguments. Scientists have proved that nuclear shots anywhere in the world can be

pinpointed by instruments we already have. That is why those who insist so vociferously, in spite of this, that there should be inspections and verifications, expose themselves unwittingly, as did the village priest who had tried to find out from me during our tea how the fighting was proceeding against the whiteguards.

I do not, in fact, see any great difference between verification, inspection and intelligence or, as you put it, a "fishing expedition". As the Ukrainians say, "Danila did not die—the plague got him."

*Cowles*: Mr. Chairman, you often say that you have no confidence in the intentions of the United States. I think that the Soviet Union would itself like to have some kind of inspection and verification with regard to our country. Or do you trust us so implicitly that you will not want to verify or inspect the U.S. if a disarmament agreement is reached?

*Khrushchov*: No, you have misunderstood me. So far we have been talking about inspection and verification connected with nuclear weapons tests, and not disarmament.

Inspection connected with general and complete disarmament is an entirely different matter, and in that respect we ourselves demand not only verification, but also the strictest and most thorough inspection. We consider that if a disarmament agreement is reached, all countries will have to undergo most rigorous inspection and control. And that is not merely a question of trust or mistrust. We must have a system where every country would be sure that other countries are complying scrupulously with their undertakings and that they have really destroyed, or are destroying the armaments subject to destruction.

This is why we must have our inspection in the United States and other countries, while the United States and other countries should have their inspection in our territory and the territory of other countries party to the agreement on general and complete disarmament. I repeat, it is not a matter of trust or mistrust. There must be an established system: the strictest verification, exhaustive and comprehensive control over disarmament.

*Cowles*: Tell me, Mr. Chairman, do you consider encouraging the proposals submitted in Geneva in the past 48 hours by the so-called neutral members of the Disarmament Committee?

*Khrushchov*: We have already stated our attitude to these proposals. The Soviet Government believes that they can be used as the basis for further talks concerning a nuclear test ban agreement. We have stated our view through our representative at Geneva.

*Cowles*: I should like to ask you now whether you think it useful from the standpoint of speeding the work of the Geneva Conference for a summit meeting to be held in the near future, or whether, say, you should invite President Kennedy to the Soviet Union to discuss matters with him. Could this, perhaps, also be useful?

*Khrushchov*: You know my opinion and the opinion of our government: we have always believed and believe now that contacts between heads of state or government are useful, and that such meetings not only can, but should be held from time to time. And I would be prepared to meet President Kennedy to exchange views once again on the pressing issues. The conversations I had with your President in Vienna left a favourable impression on me. True, we differed with him in our appraisal of the situation and did not reach agreement on questions which call for a solution. But, at any rate, as a result of that meeting, we now, apparently, understand each other better, and have a clearer picture of the questions it is necessary to settle.

Therefore, I am in favour of such meetings. Where such a meeting could be held, on whose territory—whether on neutral soil, as was the case in Vienna, or in Moscow—is not the main point, in my opinion the main thing now—I agree with the U.S. President on this score—is that our meeting should not prove sterile. When we met in Vienna, it was, so to speak, a kind of a probe of our respective positions, a first acquaintance. And we differed, and differed rather sharply, on the questions that call for a solution.

If we shall meet again, and with the same result, neither the President nor I will, of course, get any satisfaction out of such a meeting. What is more, it will be a sore disappointment to people who desire a positive solution of the urgent problems in order to achieve a relaxation of international tension.

It seems to me, therefore, that we should first reach some agreement on the questions that require a joint decision in order to avoid a conflict and war. And a meeting at the

summit would perhaps be the culmination of such an agreement. This would be the best way.

But I do not rule out another possibility: should the international situation become even more complicated–which we, of course, do not want and are doing our best to prevent–urgent efforts by the leaders of the Great Powers may be required to prevent the spark that may cause an armed flare-up. In such a case I do not rule out a summit meeting to avert that sort of outcome.

As to inviting the U.S. President to our country now–I would very much like to invite him, and we would like to receive him with all the honours due to so distinguished a guest. Unfortunately, there is still an obstacle to this, which arose through no fault of ours. I mean the incident on the eve of Eisenhower's visit to the Soviet Union. It stirred our feelings.

You remember, no doubt, how it happened. We were preparing to receive Eisenhower, and would have received him fittingly. But he sent a reconnaissance plane on a spy mission over our territory. This soured our hospitality. Words fail me to express how the Soviet people felt about that breach of faith. It was simply incredible!

The Soviet people were deeply insulted by the way the then U.S. President replied to our hospitable invitation. They have not forgotten it. The wound has not entirely healed yet, as they say. Therefore, if we invited President Kennedy to the Soviet Union now, without any tangible improvement in our relations, we would put our guest in a difficult position, for his reception would not be what his rank entitles him to.

*Cowles*: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get a better idea of your views on the problems that divide our countries.

Do you think that the problem of disarmament, or, to put it the other way round, the arms race, is the Number One problem causing tension in the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union?

*Khrushchov*: Well, if we take the inter-state relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, then, leaving aside the basic contradictions between socialism and capitalism–those are contradictions of social development and I shall therefore omit them in this case–we actually have no cause for any serious disputes. Our interests do not clash directly anywhere, either in territorial or economic matters.

Both the Soviet Union and the United States are amply provided with natural resources, both have big populations, developed industries and science. It would seem, therefore, that we could coexist perfectly well.

As to socio-political questions, we have always regarded and regard them as internal issues, and stand for non-interference in others' affairs. The Americans themselves must decide what socio-political system America is to have. We may favour a certain system, but the people in each country decide these questions for themselves.

As to the disarmament question, which you raised, it is indeed the question of questions, and it concerns not only the Soviet Union and the United States, but all the countries of the world. We believe, therefore, that it would be a great joy for the peoples of our two countries and the peoples of all the world if this problem were solved. Seeing that the United States and the Soviet Union now possess the most developed economy and are able to create the most up-to-date weapons, while many countries do not have this opportunity, both our nations should exert every effort to find the road to disarmament.

In this context, I agree with you that it can be said that for the U.S.S.R. and the United States the disarmament problem is problem Number One. But I should also like to mention one more question that is seemingly associated with disarmament, but is itself, probably, an issue of cardinal importance. I mean the question of Germany, the question of concluding a German peace treaty.

To us this question is the touchstone, as it were, on which we test the blade of the razor. Why? Because it is the factor that raises or lowers tensions. It provides the main impulse. Why do we think so? Because we fought shoulder to shoulder with America and other nations against Hitler, because our country suffered tremendous losses in that war, because it lost millions of people. The war destroyed immense riches, material and cultural values. In the end we defeated Hitler. And so we say: Let us write *finis* to the Second World War, let us formalise its results in a peace treaty and knock the idea of fighting out of the heads of the revenge-seekers once and for all.

Nearly seventeen years have passed since the war, however, and we still have no peace treaty. Why? It is said Chancellor

Adenauer does not want it. We deeply regret that the Americans, our former allies, take their cue from Chancellor Adenauer and support his dangerous policy of preserving the survivals of the Second World War. What, we ask, does America, the American people, need it for.

What is our purpose in raising the question of the peace treaty so insistently? All we want is to consolidate peace and create a solid foundation for it.

We are told: Let the two republics—the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany—reunite first. But this is a question that concerns the two German states. It is within the competence of the Germans themselves, and neither we nor you have anything to do with it. We shall not object in principle if the two German republics reach an understanding and reunite. But we are realists, and we understand that this solution is impossible at present, because the two republics hold diametrically opposite positions: one of them stands for socialism, while the other stands for capitalism. So how can they be reunited?

Consequently, those who advance such an impracticable proposal are striving to preserve that most dangerous seat of war, to preserve the smouldering ashes in order to set off a new conflict, which is quite liable to be of a military nature, at the suitable moment.

That is why we attach so much importance to the German peace treaty, and hence to the problem of West Berlin. We have proposed that the occupation regime in West Berlin be ended. It would appear that everyone should know that we are not laying any claims to West Berlin. It would, indeed, be silly to suspect us of it. What good is West Berlin to us? It has a population of only 2.5 million, and even those 2.5 million have begun to melt away like a glacier in the sun, and if the situation continues, the time is probably near when much less people will remain there. If the German peace treaty is not signed, life in West Berlin will die down more and more.

So we have made an absolutely unselfish and clear-cut proposal: let us sign a peace treaty, declare West Berlin a free city, guarantee unobstructed access to it and withdraw the occupation troops. But what was the response to this proposal? No, was the response, that is impossible, because this

would impair the prestige of the United States, Britain and France.

But in this case talk about prestige is nothing but eyewash. It is not a matter of prestige, but of the United States, Britain and France wanting to retain their armed forces in West Berlin. However, now these forces are no longer occupation troops, as I said to Mr. Macmillan in my message, but forces of the NATO nations with absolutely definite designs against the socialist countries. We are naturally alarmed by these designs, and cannot put up with them.

Two questions must be solved, therefore, to improve the international atmosphere and create normal conditions for peaceful coexistence—I am not linking them directly, but in substance they are closely connected: one is the question of disarmament, and the other is the German peace treaty. Solving either one would greatly improve relations between our two countries. I think, by the way, that it would be easier to solve the German issue first. This would create greater confidence and a better atmosphere for a disarmament agreement.

Those are the problems Number One and Number Two. I do not lump them together, but they are very closely related.

I should like to add a few more words. The most aggressive, revenge-seeking forces in West Germany are trying to make us, the Soviet Union and the United States, collide over the German issue, over the peace treaty issue. They do not want this peace, because they are still dreaming of restoring with the help of the United States of America the German borders that existed prior to the Second World War. They are naturally aware that this is impossible without a war, and are therefore quite deliberately leading matters up to a conflict.

I am sure that this goal and these interests are contrary to the interests of the American people. If the statesmen shaping U.S. policy realised what road they are being urged to take by the West German revenge-seekers, if they assumed their own position, consistent with their own national interests in this question, we could reach agreement quickly and sign a peace treaty.

This is one question. Now the other one. They say that the U.S., British and French forces are stationed in West

Berlin in the interests of the West Berlin population. But the very reverse is true.

What does the West Berlin population need today? It needs a calm situation, confidence in the future, it needs conditions in which the West Berlin economy could develop normally. That is the only basis that will ensure the welfare of the West Berlin population. But what confidence can West Berliners have in the future if foreign troops, who hold endless military exercises and rattle their weapons, are stationed there?

It should be clear to all that we will not rest and will not cease working for a peace treaty, abolition of the occupation regime and withdrawal of occupation troops from West Berlin until this legitimate goal is achieved. Hence, to persist in obstructing it will only add to the strain and the tension. Yet greater strain and tension will only create a still greater lack of confidence among the West Berlin population.

Those who shape Western policy know it perfectly well, but are deluding world opinion and the people of West Berlin.

*Cowles*: Mr. Chairman, I have the impression that the talks on this score in Washington are proceeding quite well and that a fairly good chance has appeared for agreement, at least an interim one. Is that also your impression?

*Khrushchov*: I think that there is a glimmer of hope for agreement. But the main question remains. We cannot agree to the presence of Western occupation forces in West Berlin. Agreement cannot be considered practicable, until this question is solved.

*Cowles*: The wall built in Berlin roused public opinion in the United States. Was this wall really necessary?

*Khrushchov*: All states have their frontiers, and guard them carefully. Every state is entitled to guard its frontiers dependably, and the German Democratic Republic did no more and no less than what any sovereign state does to fortify its frontiers. What the Government of the G.D.R. did last August was necessary, and, in our opinion, even imperative in the conditions that existed at the time.

*Cowles*: Mr. Chairman, I would now like to recall a past incident. I want to recall it, because I think that at times the language barrier between us creates certain difficulties. You once said something that was translated into English as "we shall bury you". In America these words were interpreted as

a military threat. I should, therefore, like to ask you what you meant by "we shall bury you"?

*Khrushchov*: I think that people who translate things from one language into another, and especially those who disseminate and interpret them, should always do so very punctiliously and honestly. What you refer to happened because some unscrupulous persons deliberately distorted a phrase I had spoken, a perfectly clear statement that capitalism will be buried in the course of the historic development of mankind, that communism will inevitably come to replace it. In saying this I meant that the development of society follows definite laws: it changes all the time, the old dies and the new emerges and develops.

America was at one time a colony of Britain, but finally the American people rose up, took arms and freed themselves from British oppression. The American people, if I may say so, buried Britain as the colonialist of America, and achieved independence.

There was a time when the feudal system reigned supreme in most countries of the world. In its time, the time when this system was only burgeoning, it was more progressive than the slave system. Better conditions for the development of the productive forces of society gradually developed within the feudal system. The day came when feudalism had exhausted itself. Capitalism, a more progressive system than feudalism, was born within it. Capitalism buried, or interred feudalism. True, feudal relations still exist in some countries, but generally speaking we might say that feudalism, as a system, has been buried, interred. Furthermore, the countries that were the first to "bury" feudalism, gained from it in their economic development. Russia, which remained somewhat longer in the stage of the feudal landowner system, fell behind the other Western countries in the development of its economy.

But capitalism gave rise to irreconcilable contradictions. A new, progressive social system—communism, with entirely new social relations between people, different from those under capitalism, has come to replace it. We are convinced that communism will win, because it creates better conditions for the development of the productive forces and provides conditions for the fullest and most harmonious development of society in general and every individual in particular.

Capitalism fights against communism, but it is impossible to arrest the development of mankind. Sooner or a little later, communism will win everywhere in the world. Hence, communism will bury capitalism.

That is what my statement meant. It is not a question of someone burying someone physically, but of a change of social system in the course of the historical development of society. When we say that communism will bury capitalism we do not mean that the Soviet people, the Communists of the Soviet Union, are going to inter the capitalists of the various countries. No, communism is winning in the Soviet Union, and many other countries have embarked on the road of communist development. Communism arises from the dedicated labour and struggle of the peoples of the socialist countries for a new and better, the most just, constructive way of life on earth. That is what the facts, the lessons of history, teach us: a more progressive social system comes inevitably to replace a system that is going to seed, a progressive system buries a moribund one.

That is how we regard the historical process of social development. I have spoken of it time and again, and I spoke of it in the United States, too, when I visited your country. We do not impose our communist convictions by force on anybody. We believe that in America, too, powerful forces will grow. They already exist there, and are growing and developing all the time: these progressive forces, which are maturing within the American people itself, will ultimately win. In place of capitalism, which rules in America today, the American people will itself establish a new social system, and this system will be communist.

It may be said that one system, the one that asserts itself, buries another system, the one that outlives its time. It is not that one people buries a section of another people. This would be monstrous. It would mean war between states. The victory of one social system over another hinges upon the class struggle. The new class, the class that is developing and gaining strength today–the working class, the people itself–will, properly speaking, reign in the world, including the United States of America.

*Cowles*: Mr. Chairman, I come from the farming state of Iowa. You may recall that my paper, the *Des Moines Register,*

was the first to propose that Soviet farm specialists should come to Iowa to study methods of corn growing.

Today, some of our American farm experts are wondering whether communist society is able to develop truly efficient agriculture. Tell me, please, are you sure that you will achieve progress in farm production?

*Khrushchov*: Agriculture is a very interesting problem, which always occupies me.

Yes, I remember that it was your newspaper which displayed the good initiative of inviting Soviet agricultural specialists to the United States, and we are grateful to you. You have done a very good thing. It has been, and will be, a fine contribution to the improvement of Soviet-American relations and better mutual understanding.

We are glad that now you have come to our country. You probably know that a group of U.S. farmers is now visiting in the Soviet Union. That is fine. We would gladly send another group of our farm specialists to the United States to study U.S. farming. The standards of American agriculture are very high.

Let me tell you confidentially that I, too, would be glad of a chance to travel in the United States, to visit the American farmers, for instance Mr. Garst. But without an escort, especially an escort of policemen and other officials, without an outcry. Paste on a moustache or a beard, or both, and not be Khrushchov, but, let us say, Ivanov, so as to see all the interesting things and to study agricultural production in the United States. But, to be sure, that is impossible for me.

*Cowles*: Is agriculture domestic problem Number One for your country?

*Khrushchov*: No, I would not say so. We believe that definite proportions should be maintained in the development of branches of the national economy, including industry and agriculture. Agriculture should keep pace with the growing requirements of the country's population due to the growth of our economy as a whole.

All in all, our agriculture is meeting the demand. All in all, it is providing industry and the population with all the various products. But our national economy is progressing all the time. The requirements are growing substantially and it is necessary to satisfy these growing requirements of the population more fully with both manufactured goods and the

products of all branches of agriculture. However, our farming is not keeping pace with the rest of our national economy at present. It is not keeping pace with industry. Yet we want it to keep in step.

Now, let me reply to the substance of your question of whether or not communist society can build up really efficient agriculture. Of course, it can. Furthermore, we already possess such an agriculture, and are striving to raise it to a higher level of development.

The United States has achieved high farming standards on the capitalist basis. We rank second in the world as regards the aggregate output of farm products. But the Soviet Union is developing its agriculture along socialist lines. Our agricultural output is lower than that of the United States. This is due to a number of reasons.

What did we start with in our agriculture? Old Russia had mainly a household system. Its technical equipment was primitive. It consisted of the wooden plough and the wooden harrow. The peasant consumed whatever he produced. In the old-time village the peasants even wove and sewed their own clothing.

It is true, tsarist Russia also had capitalist farms. But even some of the landowners ran a household system. Figuratively speaking, Russian agriculture did not get as extensive a capitalist schooling and polish as that of the Western countries.

The peasants of old Russia were not in the habit of keeping accounts: it did not occur to them to see which crop was of greater advantage. They wanted to have a little of everything: they raised flax and hemp, oats and barley, potatoes and sugar beet.

Moreover, farming in old Russia was terribly scattered and small-scale. Millions of peasants could not even dream of doing better on the tiny scrap of land they owned.

In the United States, agriculture is built along different lines. The decisive factor in it is the question of production cost and expenditure of labour, as, indeed, it should be on a farm producing for the market. The thing that matters to the American farmer is profit.

In our country the development of socialist agriculture proceeded largely in circumvention to the capitalist period of development. To be sure, capitalism had made some head-

way in the agriculture of old Russia, but it was then still in an early stage of its development and not as clearly expressed as in the United States and other advanced capitalist countries.

What prerequisites do we have in our country for a continued upswing of agriculture? We have carried through collectivisation a long time ago, that is, we have reorganised agriculture along socialist lines. This provided the basis for doing away with scattered agricultural production and building up large-scale mechanised farms. This gave us an opportunity to employ the most up-to-date farm machinery. Organisationally, our agriculture is now run on a far larger scale than the American. Our conditions are more favourable for the use of highly efficient farm machines than in America. Already now, our tractors are more powerful than the American, but we have decided to increase their power even more.

What do we lack? I would say, we lack the proper training. Many of our agriculturalists still have insufficient economic knowledge and organisational know-how to manage large-scale farms. Due to many reasons, which I shall mention further on, we lingered too long after collectivisation at the stage when insufficient attention was paid to the training of personnel to head collective farms: the managers were mostly peasants who had grown up and learned on the backward small-scale individual farms. For a long time, they overlooked the matter of accounting, organisation, labour productivity and labour outlay per unit of the raised product. Today, we are having to pay for this.

On the farms where the personnel are properly trained and understand these questions, the standards are the same and sometimes higher than on the good farms in the United States.

Consequently, we are now faced chiefly with an organisational task. At the March Plenary Meeting of our Party Central Committee we have decided to select and train personnel, and even re-educate some of them. Not only must they master agricultural knowledge and study plant-growing and livestock breeding. They must also learn to handle organisational and economic matters.

I have read the interview on Soviet agriculture recently given by Mr. Garst to an American magazine. I agree with many of the things he said about our farming. True, I cannot agree with him in all respects. He is a capitalist, and does not therefore understand all the fine points of socialist

construction. That is beyond his reach so far. But he is an intelligent man, he knows his business, and he understands farming well. There is a lot we can learn from him.

What else do we need? At present, we must energetically tackle the building of livestock premises, because they are rather primitive on some farms. We must introduce electrification and mechanisation on a still wider scale. It is necessary to build plants for the production of mineral fertilisers. We produce very little mineral fertilisers and herbicides and too little of the various growth stimulants and antibiotics.

In brief, we know what we need and what we still lack.

*Cowles*: Do you intend to abolish the plots in the personal use of the collective farmers?

*Khrushchov*: No, we do not. That is not the main thing, although I think that in time the plots will be abandoned by the owners themselves. But it will not happen until the commonly-owned estates will be developed to a degree that will meet the requirements of the collective farmers in full. They will then lose interest in their small subsidiary plots. We mete out rigorous punishment to the managers who are too zealous in abolishing such plots. We must not overreach ourselves with administrative methods.

We Communists say that the building of communism calls for definite economic prerequisites. If we attempt to establish communism while the productive forces are still insufficiently developed, we will have pauperism instead of communism. Communism, as we understand it, means abundance. At one time, there were people in this country who wanted communism to be proclaimed when the material conditions for it had not yet been created. But if communism is proclaimed while there is, say, just one pair of trousers for every ten persons, and these trousers are divided equally into ten parts, all of them will go about without trousers. We reject such trouserless communism. It would be a distortion.

So let the collective farmers keep their subsidiary plots so long as abundance has not been created. The plots do not contradict the development of socialism and communism, and for a certain time they supplement the basic incomes derived from collective farming.

I am convinced that our agriculture will soon make rapid headway. But this calls for investment, and that is what we are working on now. We have decided to further expand

farm machinery production and to build plants for the manufacture of mineral fertilisers, chemical growth stimulants, herbicides and insecticides.

In questions of animal husbandry, however, we believe we still have a lot to learn from America which has big achievements to its credit.

We are satisfied with our position in the scientific work of selection. Plant-breeding is also of a good standard in our country. We have our own very good strains of wheat and maize. As far as maize is concerned, we can compete successfully with you and even beat you, perhaps. Mind you, I use the word "beat" in the sense of winning the competition, and do not think that we want to beat you in the sense of burying you. Please note, how cautious I am in my choice of words.

To be sure, it is not enough for a plant-breeder to develop a new strain. This new strain has still to be put to use extensively in practical farming. And the most important thing is for the managers in agriculture, the heads of the collective and state farms, to realise that it is necessary to use high-grade seed. Not all of them realise this so far. I have had conversations like this with some of them:

"Do you plant maize?" I ask.

Everybody knows that I am a maize enthusiast, so the man hastens to reply:

"Yes, yes, of course!"

"What strain?"

The man hems and haws. So I ask him again:

"What strain?"

He replies uncertainly:

"... Kharkov."

I say:

"There is no such strain. Different strains of maize may be grown in Kharkov, and the word "Kharkov" merely indicates the place where the maize was grown, but not its strain."

Unfortunately, many of our people lack agrotechnical knowledge. They must brush up on it. But we shall solve this problem. We are a match for it. We have a far-flung network of courses and schools. It is not an easy thing, of course. It will be hard work, but we shall manage it.

Some wishful thinkers among our ill-wishers keep saying that there is a crisis in our agriculture. But a good reply to

these slanderers was given by your fellow countryman, Mr. Garst: There is no agricultural crisis in the Soviet Union.

I would put it thus: We are now passing through a period of growing pains. If we compare what we have in agriculture now with what we had in 1953, we shall see that our progress has been great. But this is no longer enough. We must scale new heights and are therefore applying strenuous efforts to develop our agriculture even more rapidly.

We are now paying for Stalin's incorrect approach to agriculture. He had a primitive notion of farming. When I was working in the Ukraine, he asked me one day: How are things? I said: Too little grain for the livestock.

"What is the grain for?" he asked.

"To feed the pigs and the poultry," I said.

"Why feed the pigs? Let them run loose and find their own food." In Georgia, Stalin said, they put a sort of yoke on a pig so it would not get past the stakes in the fence into the kitchen gardens. It runs where it wants and finds its own food.

It is quite true that pigs are still kept that way here and there in Georgia. But we cannot develop agriculture with such pig-farming and meet the growing requirements of the population.

Ignorant of the farming problems, Stalin maintained a policy of unjustifiably low procurement prices for farm products. For instance, the collective farms were paid so little for their potatoes that the receipts were not enough to pay for their transportation to the city. So who would grow potatoes if it was unprofitable?

Sheer enthusiasm is not enough. Talk about communism will not fill the belly. A man must eat, he must have clothes and housing, and all the other things without which it is impossible to live.

Stalin's incorrect approach to agriculture had many harmful consequences. We have done a lot to eliminate these consequences, but it seems we have not done everything. The deeper we probe the farming problems, the more attention and money their solution requires. Our efforts are yielding good results.

I am quite sure the time will come—I cannot name the exact year as yet—when our yields will be so high that we shall have to reduce the crop area, as it is being done in America

now. But you are doing it on a capitalist basis with the result that the farmers suffer badly from it, while in our country the cultivated areas will be reduced according to a plan—no one will suffer, and everybody will gain. We shall obtain greater amounts of products on smaller areas, and with less labour.

*Cowles*: May I ask you a question from an entirely different field?

We in the capitalist world are in the habit of thinking that communism always speaks in one voice, the voice of Moscow. But lately we have come to hear different communist voices, from different countries. We ask ourselves what this means. Is it a rift in the communist world or just a sign of envy in some quarters because the Soviet Union is developing much faster than some other parts of the communist world?

*Khrushchov*: I think it is entirely wrong to put the question this way. The basic Marxist-Leninist ideas are common to all who have communist convictions, who adhere to the communist teaching and take guidance in it in their actions. But different peoples have attained different levels of economic development. Each people has its own historical course of development, its own culture, its own national traditions and its own features. They cannot all be made to conform to a common standard. No single pattern of any kind may be established for all the peoples which embark on the building of socialism, on the building of communism.

Moreover, the peoples profit by the experience of other peoples and take their experience into account in their own development. Had we, for instance, accomplished the October Revolution now, and started the construction of socialism, it is likely—and not just likely but certain—we would avoid some of the things that occurred here in the past, and would have solved certain problems differently. We could then have availed ourselves of the experience of socialist construction in other countries. But when the Soviet people were building socialism there was no such experience and we often had to grope in the dark.

Even the individual traits of the leaders are important in the determination of how to solve a problem. Yes, even they matter. We had Lenin, the great theorist, the leader and founder of our Party and of our state. It would be a waste of breath to speak about his deep devotion to communism. He is one of the great founders of scientific communism. Then we

had Stalin. Is there anyone who doubts that Stalin was a Communist, that he was devoted to communism? If there is, it is someone who does not understand anything. Stalin was devoted to communism with all his being, and he did everything for communism. Yet Lenin wrote about Stalin that he was becoming intolerable as General Secretary, that he was too rude and wilful, and might abuse his power.

Lenin's words proved to be true. Stalin did indeed abuse his power unforgivably. That was what we denounced him for.

But it would be quite wrong to consider Stalin's negative features as negative features of communism. Communism has nothing to do with it. It was Stalin's personal qualities that are to blame. After Stalin's death we eliminated the consequences of the intolerable distortions he had made by deviating from the Leninist standards of Party and government life.

Now, many countries have taken the road of socialism, and in the future their number will continually increase. I cannot tell exactly when the time will come for the American people, too, to embark on this road. Clearly, when the Americans start building communism in their country, they, too, will act upon the main principles of the Marxist-Leninist teaching. But the United States has its own national features, its own traditions, its own culture and its own economy. And the Americans will take all this into account when building communism in the United States. The United States will make use of our experience too. It will not copy us, however, but take our experience into account.

That is what the other socialist countries are doing now. And we have nothing against it. On the contrary, we consider this policy to be absolutely right.

Of course, it happens sometimes that someone takes a wrong decision and is then obstinate and refuses to correct it. Well, even then one can say that people learn from experience.

In real life it happens that when a child's powers of perception begin to develop it is set on experiencing many of the things itself. A mother may tell a child: This is hot and that is cold. But the child will not understand these words properly until it feels with its finger and learns from experience what is hot and what is cold.

Theory is verified in practice. Sometimes, people know theory, but depart from it in practice. Sometimes, they apply

theory with good sense, in a creative way. Sometimes they decide to go their own way, but it turns out to be the wrong way and they burn their fingers. They try, blow on their fingers, shake them, and know what is hot from then on.

*Cowles*: And China tried to rise too quickly?

*Khrushchov*: Not at all. What has China got to do with it? The People's Republic of China has its own policy and takes its own possibilities into account. We Communists–Chinese, Russian, or the others–believe that we should not indulge in wishful thinking. The desirable should be subordinated to the practicable. That is, in the construction of socialism, of communism, we must act not only on our subjective wishes, but on our objective possibilities.

Subjectively, I would want us already to have communism in our country. That would mean an abundance of material and spiritual benefits. But today our economy cannot as yet ensure this. This would therefore be nothing but wishful thinking, without a realistic basis. That is why we say: We need 20 years to create the material and technical basis for communism. Of course, in order to complete the construction of communism we shall have to develop our economy further, in excess of the level that will be achieved in 20 years, because the material and spiritual requirements of people increase continually, and the economy must ensure satisfaction of these growing requirements.

I am sure the same view is held by all the Communist Parties, including the Communist Party of China.

*Cowles*: Mr. Chairman, earlier in our conversation you said that wars of liberation to free the colonial peoples were desirable. But could there be a situation where a liberative war would have to be fought for the liberation of the territory of a communist country whose leaders had gone astray? To be specific, I mean Albania.

*Khrushchov*: You are confusing altogether different things. It would follow from what you say that since you are capitalists and we are Communists, we should start a war to liberate the American people from capitalism, and vice versa. That would be foolish and dangerous. It would have nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism.

Speaking about wars of liberation, it should be stressed that we have never tried, nor try to impose upon other peoples the laws of conducting wars of liberation.

We recognise the right of the people of the various countries to wage wars of liberation against foreign oppression. What does this mean? It means that the Communists recognise the right of, say, the Algerian people to wage a war of liberation, that they sympathise with this struggle and with the struggle for freedom and independence waged by other peoples.

The political development of a state is an entirely different matter. We adhere firmly to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other states and consider that problems of the internal development of any state should be left to the people of that country to decide. That has no relation to a war of liberation, but concerns the solution of internal problems.

Who is to judge what is right and what is wrong in a country? None but the people of that country. No one has the right to interfere in the internal affairs of other states.

As for Albania, you know that our views and those of the leaders of the Albanian Party of Labour diverge on certain questions. We argue with them on these questions, but Albania's internal political development is the domestic affair of the Albanian people themselves, and, as always, we strictly observe the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other peoples, including the Albanian people.

*Korry*: Let me take advantage of your hospitality and ask one more question. May I?

*Khrushchov*: Please do.

*Korry*: Many of us in the West are concerned over the fact that the 700 million Chinese, a nation that is growing very rapidly, experience difficulties in meeting their requirements. Won't you tell us whether there is any ground for such concern?

*Khrushchov*: What are the motives behind the concern you speak of? Is it sympathy for the Chinese people, or perhaps the very opposite?

The Chinese people have suffered many years of colonial exploitation. Then they won independence and are now building their life along socialist lines. The Chinese people have scored very great successes on this road. Every people is, of course, liable to encounter difficulties at this or that stage of their development, and the Chinese people are evidently

having some difficulties at present, mentioned in the communiqué of the Third Session of the National People's Congress. But we are absolutely sure that the great Chinese people will soon overcome these growing pains, elevate their economy to a higher level, achieve new successes in their cultural development—and the culture of the Chinese people is very ancient—and will satisfy their material requirements to a greater degree.

That is why we do not feel the anxiety you speak of. The people of China are very able and highly gifted people. Great opportunities have arisen for the Chinese people and they are making good use of them.

Every nation is liable to have difficulties. Our difficulties were incomparably greater forty years ago than they are now, but today, too, we still have our difficulties and problems, although these are different from the ones we had then. The People's Republic of China, too, has its difficulties. But the conditions in our country in the early years after the October Revolution were clearly much more difficult than those of the Chinese people today. Yet we surmounted our difficulties. We are certain that the great Chinese people have bright prospects of further development.

*Cowles*: Mr. Chairman, what date can you predict for a Soviet manned flight to the Moon and back?

*Khrushchov*: I cannot give any date. We have not set any date. Your President, the head of a state where, as you put it, everything is ruled by private enterprise, has already announced his plan for sending a man to the Moon. But we, who have a planned socialist economy, have not decided this yet.

A manned flight to the Moon involves many different problems. The resources required to fly to the Moon and back are very great.

*Cowles*: Would you like it to be a joint project by the Soviet Union and the United States?

*Khrushchov*: We would welcome that. The Soviet Union has no aims of conquest in general, and particularly with regard to the Moon. In principle, we could pool our efforts—material, technical and scientific—and jointly develop a ship for the flight to the Moon. Our scientists are, of course, working in this field. I had a talk with them. They have good ideas and calculations.

*Cowles*: Do you see any obstacles to an agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States for the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes?

*Khrushchov*: I see no insuperable obstacles to this. Two stages will apparently have to be passed. First, we shall have to settle the question of mutual exchanges with regard to the use and exploration of outer space on a national basis. Second, we shall have to pool the material, technical and scientific resources for a joint solution of the various problems in order to proceed from competition to joint efforts in the conquest of outer space.

It is in this second matter that difficulties appear. The rocket is today at once the principal means of space conquest and also the principal weapon of war. And with our countries ranged against each other and competing in the refinement and stockpiling of these weapons, it is only natural that both you and we are eager to keep secret our equipment, our scientific achievements in this field. If we settled the problem of general and complete disarmament, this would eliminate the main obstacle—the question of secrecy with respect to the scientific and technological achievements in the development of rocket engines and of the rockets themselves.

Thus, the conclusion of a German peace treaty and the abolition of the occupation regime in West Berlin would reduce international tensions, increase trust between our states and create favourable conditions for a disarmament agreement. A disarmament agreement would create splendid opportunities for all-round co-operation in the use of scientific achievements.

*Cowles*: Mr. Chairman, when do you think will it be possible for my magazine, *Look*, or my paper, the *Des Moines Register*, to be sold freely in the Soviet Union?

*Khrushchov*: It is difficult for me to say when exactly this will become possible. The press is a vehicle of national policy. Yet at present we not only speak different languages, but also view many questions in a different way. This hinders free exchanges. But I am convinced that this is temporary. I cannot say how many years it will take, but in time conditions will change. The policy of our government is pursuing that very aim: the free exchange of ideas.

*Cowles*: Mr. Chairman, you have been very generous to us with your time. I am very grateful.

*Khrushchov*: I owed it to you in a way. It was on your initiative, after all, that our people were first invited to America to study her agriculture. That was a fine initiative. I think I have now repaid this debt to some extent.

*Cowles*: You have repaid it very generously.

*Khrushchov*: We appreciate your initiative highly. True, in time people will say: What was so unusual about somebody inviting somebody? But every action should be judged in the context of time and specific conditions. Indeed, what is so unusual about inviting people? But at the time when you invited the Soviet farm specialists, it was extremely significant; it took a certain amount of courage and, I would say, foresight.

*Cowles*: Mr. Chairman, just one more political question.

*Khrushchov*: Certainly.

*Cowles*: I understand that under your Constitution your government is to resign next week and a new one is to be appointed. Tell me, Mr. Chairman, have you any apprehensions about not being appointed?

*Khrushchov*: Shall I tell you the truth? I have not.

*Cowles*: In that case we can congratulate you now.

*Khrushchov*: No, that would be premature. You see, my hopes, my confidence is one thing, and the decision of the Supreme Soviet is another. I am convinced that the Supreme Soviet will authorise me to form a government. But then it may not. It is not I who decide this, but the Supreme Soviet.

In your country people do not always correctly understand our political structure, our Constitution. There has developed a strong moral and political unity of Party and people in our country, but it should always be borne in mind that a Constitution is a Constitution, and that the people always enjoy the rights given to them by the Constitution. Anyone who takes it for granted that he will be supported tomorrow just because he was supported yesterday, may be due for a sore disappointment one day.

Here is an example. Take 1957. The anti-Party group which opposed me and other comrades, opposed the line of the Central Committee of our Party. It consisted of people who had become too big for their boots. They were certain that their names could not be rejected. Molotov, Kaganovich, Voroshilov and Malenkov thought themselves all-powerful. True, Malenkov was not of the stature of the first three, who had in the past done quite a few good things. But they fell

behind the times, they misunderstood the situation and misjudged the prospects. We said: Things cannot and must not continue the way they were under Stalin. They replied: So it has been, so it will continue. We said: So it has been, but so it will not continue. Then they said: We shall remove you. But our Party, our people removed them instead, because they interfered with the efforts of the Party and the people to rectify all the wrong and all the harm done by Stalin and by them at the time of the personality cult. This is what our Constitution means.

*Cowles*: Thank you very much for the interview. We wish you good health.

*Khrushchov*: Thank you, too. Good-bye. I wish you success.

*NOTE*: The questions and remarks by Messrs. Gardner Cowles and Edward Korry were retranslated from the Russian.

# SPEECHES MADE DURING THE VISIT OF A SOVIET PARTY AND GOVERNMENT DELEGATION TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA

*May 14-20, 1962*

## SPEECH ON ARRIVAL IN SOFIA

*May 14, 1962*

Dear Comrade Todor Zhivkov,
Dear Comrade Dimiter Ganev,
Dear Comrade Anton Yugov,
Dear comrades and friends, dear citizens of glorious Sofia, capital of the People's Republic of Bulgaria!

As we step on the soil of fraternal Bulgaria, we should like, first of all, to express our profound gratitude to you and to all the people of Bulgaria for inviting a Party and government delegation of the Soviet Union to your wonderful country.

Dear comrades, allow me to convey to you, and through you to all the working people of Bulgaria, the fraternal greetings of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

We are moved by the warm reception you have given us, ambassadors of the Soviet people. Thank you very much, dear comrades, for your fraternal hospitality. This moving reception confirms strikingly once again that the Bulgarian people have deep-seated friendly sentiments for the peoples of our country.

We are glad of this chance to visit the People's Republic of Bulgaria once again, to meet you, our brothers, and to see the wonderful progress you have made in the building of socialism. The Soviet people follow your creative labour with close attention and rejoice heartily over your achievements.

Dear comrades and friends, the relations between our countries and our parties are very, very cordial. We are pleased to note that there has always been, and continues to be, complete mutual understanding and an identity of views between our parties and governments on all questions.

Both our parties are doing their utmost to add to the strength, unity and cohesion of all the countries of the powerful socialist camp and the whole world communist movement. The relations between our peoples and parties were, are and will always be truly fraternal and of the very best.

May the fraternal People's Republic of Bulgaria and its glorious, hard-working and heroic people thrive and prosper!

Long live the mighty socialist camp!

Long live the eternal and unbreakable Soviet-Bulgarian friendship!

## EXPERIENCE AND YOUTH MAKE A POWERFUL FORCE

STATEMENT TO *NARODNA MLADEZH*

A special correspondent of *Narodna Mladezh (People's Youth)*, the Bulgarian youth newspaper, approached N. S. Khrushchov at Haskovo airport and asked him to say a few words to the youth of Bulgaria. The Bulgarian Telegraph Agency reported that Khrushchov addressed the Bulgarian youth as follows:

You, the young generation, are our future. All of us have one goal—all of us, young and old, are building communism. Youth is your asset. Ours is age and experience. Be proud of your youth, but do not get too big for your boots.

Remember: you cannot get along without us, the old people, just as we cannot get along without you. So learn from us and bear in mind: the combination of experience and youth make a powerful, insuperable force.

That is what I want to say to the glorious, fraternal youth of Bulgaria.

## SPEECH AT A MEETING IN VARNA FOR THE SOVIET PARTY AND GOVERNMENT DELEGATION

*May 16, 1962*

Dear Comrade Todor Zhivkov,

Dear Comrade Anton Yugov,

Dear Comrades and Friends,

Allow me to greet you heartily on behalf of our delegation, and through you all the workers, peasants and office

employees, all the working people of the sunny and beautiful city of Varna and Varna District. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Allow me, on behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Government and the whole Soviet people, to convey warm greetings to you and, from the bottom of our hearts, to wish you big new success in your great work, in your labour and in your life. (*Prolonged applause.*)

We should also like to convey hearty greetings and best wishes to the working people in the towns of Haskovo, Stara Zagora, Sliven and Yambol districts, where we were so warmly and cordially received yesterday.

The Soviet Party and government delegation has spent just two days in fraternal Bulgaria, but those two days were long enough for us to sense your kindness and hospitality, which have touched us deeply. Whenever we meet you, we always feel your cordial warmth, your ardent affection for the Soviet people.

The Soviet people are proud to have such loyal friends as the working people of Bulgaria. It is a pleasure to work, struggle and win together with them. But friendship is not just handshakes and affectionate words. Real friendship is mutual assistance and mutual support.

Real friendship is shown not only on holidays and jubilees, but chiefly in the everyday affairs, in our common labour, in our common effort of building socialism and communism. True to the principles of this friendship, Soviet people take every success you score close to their hearts.

After their historic victory over the monarchical-fascist regime in September 1944, the Bulgarian people scored scintillating victories in socialist construction. We rejoice with you that the edifice of socialism is rising so rapidly, so steadily and enduringly for the good of the working people of Bulgaria, the Soviet Union and the socialist camp as a whole. (*Stormy applause. Audience scans, "Vechna druzhba!" "Friendship for ever!"*)

One cannot help admiring Bulgaria's beautiful landscapes, its picturesque fields, mountains, orchards and vineyards. But today our gaze is drawn to yet another, no less striking, new industrial landscape of Bulgaria.

The beauty of this landscape speaks conclusively of the diligence and talent of your people. There is purpose and

energy wherever one turns, and tremendous enthusiasm, which the Bulgarian people show in developing their wonderful land, transforming it and adorning it fondly, so that life, good as it is, should be still better, still more attractive.

We may say with a sense of deep satisfaction, dear comrades, that the Bulgarian people have achieved outstanding successes in their economic and cultural development and in the improvement of their well-being since the Seventh Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party. Bulgaria's iron and steel industry, its power engineering and, especially, its machine-making industry, have advanced greatly. The chemical industry, electrical engineering and Bulgaria's food industry, renowned for its fine products, have made further progress.

In the Stara Zagora District we visited the Maritsa-Vostok power complex, and here, in Varna, we have seen the shipyards that make large modern vessels. What is more, those are not the only shipyards you have.

I shall not enumerate all your achievements in industrial, scientific and technical development. You know them better than I. But I cannot help expressing my admiration of the immense successes you have attained.

What capitalist country of Bulgaria's size and population can boast of such rapid industrial development, that powerful source of prosperity for any state?

On our trip, we have also had a chance to see the new villages of your country. There were many things we liked about them—the houses, the amenities and the cultural and service establishments. The appearance of the villages is an excellent show window for the state of the country's agriculture. The attractive, well-built houses and the prosperous households are a sure sign of the success enjoyed by the Bulgarian peasant co-operatives.

The Bulgarian peasant never dreamed of such life in the past. It was only under the socialist system, only through conscientious collective labour, only with the support of the working class, that the peasants were able to fashion for themselves a life of plenty, of spiritual beauty and happiness.

We are pleased to see that the co-operative plan worked out by the great Lenin, that his immortal ideas about the alliance of the working class and the peasantry put into

practice in the Soviet Union, have now also triumphed in Bulgaria and in many other European and Asiatic countries.

Your country is considered relatively small. It is quite true that, looking at a map, this appears to be so. But one gains an entirely different impression as one travels across your land, visits its towns and villages, its factories, building sites, farm co-operatives and its various landmarks, as one speaks to its people and delights in their labour. Bulgaria is not so little a country at all! (*Animation. Applause. Shouts of "Hear, hear!"*)

After all, area and population aren't all that matters. They are not the only criteria of a country and a nation. The main thing is what the nation has accomplished, how well it has worked, and how it utilises the favourable opportunities of the new system, how sensibly and effectively it exploits the natural, economic and other resources of its land.

The people of Bulgaria, the workers and peasants, and the people's intelligentsia are creating and multiplying the wealth of their land with immense energy and purpose under the leadership of their Communist Party and its Central Committee, headed by Comrade Todor Zhivkov. (*Prolonged applause. Meeting scans, "B.C.P.!", "B.C.P.!"*)

Your people have been very successful in all the fields of economic and cultural development. You have changed the face of your country. Your experience, your accomplishments in industrialisation, in the reorganisation of agriculture, in cultural development and in the field of political and social transformations indicate that the Bulgarian people led by their Communist Party are wonderfully adept at socialist construction.

Dear comrades, I should like to refer specially to your part of the country, the Black Sea shore, and to your labour.

What was Bulgaria's seaboard like in the past? There was poverty in the villages and towns, which seemed to be cut off from the mainstream of life. Today, Varna and Burgas are Bulgaria's big sea gates, and all sorts of cargoes stream in continuously through them for the country's building projects and factories, and machinery for its farming.

Products of Bulgarian make are exported from here to dozens of countries. Your land is now famous for its shipbuilding, its chemical products, machines, cement, textiles,

sugar and many other items. Briefly, life is bubbling over, a joy to behold if the eye is unprejudiced, if it sees things as they really are.

The health resorts, those modern spas for the workingman, create a very pleasing impression. When we visited here four years ago, Comrade Zhivkov took us along the shore north of Varna. At that time, as you know, there were just a few hotels and sanatoria. Beyond them was a bare, but truly golden beach (I believe that is what you call it!). Blue waves washed the beach, and a hot sun shone overhead. It was truly a heaven on earth. Yet the place was almost deserted.

Comrade Zhivkov noticed my consternation and remarked: "We are planning to build vacation facilities here."

I thought that a very good idea. I said a wonderful place like this should not go to waste. An excellent international holiday resort could be built, which would benefit people from different countries, coming on their vacations, and the Bulgarians, too, who built this wonderful resort.

I have again visited the place this time, and did not recognise it. Attractive and comfortable hotels have arisen on what was once a deserted beach. Whatever you had here before was a gift of nature, or, as people used to say, a gift of God. What you have here now has been created by the Bulgarian workers, engineers and technicians, the fine Bulgarian architects, the people. The buildings are well built, in good modern taste and, what is very important, they are economical. (*Applause.*)

You have done a good thing not only for yourselves. Thousands of people from other socialist countries come to your holiday resorts for their vacations.

It is a striking fact that this once deserted place has turned into a kind of centre of attraction after socialism won in Bulgaria, and people from all over Europe, from other parts of the world even, come here. Even the capitalists have grown curious: "What have the Communists done there?" (*Animation.*) Well, there really is a lot to see in socialist Bulgaria for all the well-intentioned people who want to view the accomplishments of the Bulgarian working people.

Comrades, Bulgaria's seaboard is really and truly a pearl. I would say that the entire Black Sea basin with its shores, its warm water and mild climate is an exceptionally bountiful region of the world. As you see, I praise your land and at once

relish the goodness of our own Black Sea shore. (*Animation. Applause.*)

But the Black Sea washes the shores of not only the Soviet Union, Rumania and Bulgaria, but other shores as well.

The Black Sea has served for years, and well at that, as a means of communication between the Soviet Union, Rumania and Bulgaria. Why should not all the countries of the Black Sea basin take the fullest advantage of this gift of nature, and why not establish lasting economic, cultural and other contacts among themselves and thereby remove suspicion and anxiety? The Black Sea should be a sea of peace and friendship among the peoples. Do not the people, and even the businessmen of, say, Turkey stand to gain from this? Turkey's economy and culture are stagnant and backward, and its people are poor. It is no accident that we see political upheavals every now and again.

It is high time for the ruling circles of Turkey and of other neighbouring countries to realise the futility of their policy of isolation from their neighbours—a policy which subordinates their national interests to those of foreign monopolies and senseless military preparations. Would it not be better if the shores on which NATO has set up its war bases and nuclear launching pads were made into areas of peaceful labour and prosperity?

The imperialists, the NATO chiefs, know surely that the people of Turkey are depressed by the arms burden imposed on them by NATO. The imperialists are trying to mollify some groups in Turkey and other countries with all sorts of handouts and promises of economic assistance. But it is quite clear that this so-called economic assistance is far from selfless. It is dragging Turkey more and more deeply into the meshes of the NATO war alliance, adding thereby to its burdensome expenditures for the maintenance of an oversize army and for armaments. These expenditures are literally draining the people's wealth and the country's economy, which cannot be improved by any handouts.

To shake off the heavy military burden and thereby eliminate unproductive expenditures, to prevent a third world war, the peoples must compel the ruling circles to dissolve the war alliances, to shut down the military bases and to carry through general and complete disarmament.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are doing

their utmost to promote the growth and consolidation of the peace forces throughout the world, the Balkans included. It is our purpose to join efforts in the struggle for peace with all countries and all peoples that favour peaceful coexistence and want lasting world peace. *(Prolonged applause.)*

At one time the relations between us and Yugoslavia were strained. At present we can note with satisfaction that our relations with that country, one of the biggest on the Balkan Peninsula, have improved. The peoples of Yugoslavia waged a heroic struggle against the German-fascist invaders and have won great respect among the peoples by this struggle. We have normal, I would even say good relations with Yugoslavia now. Our standpoints coincide on many international issues related to the safeguarding and strengthening of peace. We are sincerely eager to see our common work for lasting world peace, for international security, follow one direction.

We also have good relations with Yugoslavia in the field of trade. We hope that the mutually advantageous economic relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia will continue to develop. We are prepared to strengthen and develop relations between our countries in the fields of culture and science, to exchange delegations in all fields, because this is in the interests of the peoples, in the interests of lasting peace.

The Soviet people believe that in spite of divergent views on some political and ideological questions, we, a country building communism, should do our utmost to have fruitful co-operation with Yugoslavia and thereby help its peoples gain a firmer footing in socialism. Not only will this promote better relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, but it will also benefit all countries building socialism, communism. (*Applause.*)

Acting upon the will of the Soviet people, with their unanimous support, with the support of the Bulgarian people and the peoples of the other socialist countries, our Communist Party and the Soviet Government will persevere in their policy of peace, friendship and co-operation among nations, and continue to work for the banning of nuclear weapons and for world disarmament. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Look at our land, our villages and our towns! They are full of life and creative labour. The peoples do not think of death, but of life, of how to make it better and more attractive. People want to live in peace and friendship, they want to fashion

their happiness and raise their children, and we shall do everything we can to prevent a destructive war from breaking out. (*Stormy applause. Meeting scans, "Druzhba, mir!" "Peace and friendship!"*)

With the support of all the peace-loving peoples the socialist camp now has enough strength and enough resources to bridle the aggressors. We appeal insistently to the statesmen of all countries, regardless of their social system; the question of war and peace is a question of life and death. Let us look in concert for the ways and means to achieve lasting peace! Let us do everything we can to make a new destructive war impossible!

Dear friends, as we leave your wonderful city, we shall never forget your heartfelt hospitality, your deep sense of friendship for the Soviet people.

Allow me to thank you once more from the bottom of my heart for your warm reception and to wish you new successes and happiness. (*Prolonged applause. Meeting scans, "Vechna druzhba!" "Friendship for ever!"*)

Long live the unbreakable Soviet-Bulgarian friendship! (*Prolonged applause. Cheers.*)

Long live world peace! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Meeting scans, "Druzhba, mir!" "Peace and friendship!" Cheers.*)

(*The speech was heard with close attention. Khrushchov's concluding words were engulfed by an enthusiastic ovation, which lasted several minutes.*)

## SPEECH ON RECEIVING THE TITLE OF HONORARY CITIZEN OF VARNA

### *May 16, 1962*

N. S. Khrushchov came up to the microphone and expressed his gratitude for the honour conferred on him by the citizens of Varna. He said:

Dear Comrades,

Dear Brothers and Sisters,

Let me thank you most sincerely for the high honour you have done me by making me an honorary citizen of Varna. (*Stormy applause. Cheers.*)

I toured your city today, and have told you of my impressions in my speech. But I did not know as I toured the city that I would be made an honorary citizen of it. (*Merriment.*)

If I had known it, I would have looked the city over still more closely–not only what is usually shown; I would have tried to see what visitors are not shown, but what I, as your citizen, needed to see. (*Merriment. Applause.*)

I took the liberty of making this joke, because I hope you will not misunderstand your fellow citizen. But if you do not like something I say, I expect you will forgive me, for I am a newly fledged citizen of your city of Varna. (*Merriment. Applause.*)

You have a fine city, comrades. I am sure that everyone who is made an honorary citizen of Varna, will consider it a great honour to be a citizen of this wonderful city, to be a fellow citizen of the wonderful people who built it and who adorn it with their labour, who work in its factories. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Now that I am a citizen of Varna I rejoice with you over its successes and share your sense of responsibility for it. But I shall be here a bit and then leave, while you stay on. This will produce a kind of division of labour: I shall speak my hopes, my recommendations, and you will have to do the work to realise our common hopes and recommendations. (*Merriment. Applause.*)

Surely you will not think that you are going to work, while I go to play golf. (*Merriment.*) No, I work as well, and will continue to work, and I hope my work will benefit not only the Soviet people, but also our common Soviet-Bulgarian interests. Our interests in labour, in the struggle for peace coincide with the interests of all the socialist countries, of the peace-loving peoples of the whole world. *(Stormy applause.)*

But we should always remember that the work of statesmen, politicians and Party workers will not be fruitful unless the factories work at their full capacity, unless the collective and state farms work at their full capacity and unless the peoples of the socialist countries develop their economy, culture and science farther and farther each day. The work of statesmen and politicians yields no satisfaction, unless this is so. Only then does the work of statesmen and politicians help to add to the increasing forces of socialism and communism, which are shaking the imperialists. *(Stormy applause.)*

Dear comrades, brothers and fellow citizens (*animation, applause*)–fellow citizens of Varna, of course! (*Applause.*) Comrade Yugov spoke so well before me, and Comrade Zhiv-

kov spoke wonderfully today at the meeting in the shipyards. But they will stay here in Varna a little and will then go to Sofia, while you and I, being the citizens of Varna, have to bear the brunt of responsibility for the well-being of the city. (*Merriment. Applause.*) For things to go well, we have to work, work and work!

Our Party has adopted a programme of communist construction. This Programme shows the ways and means of building communism, of building communist society in our country. But the only way to realise this Programme, to build communism, is to work. I say to you what I say at home, in the Soviet Union, and I say it to you, because I am now a citizen of your city and because we have the same sentiments and a common sense of responsibility for the future. The future of the peoples of the Soviet Union, of the citizens of Varna and of the whole Bulgarian people is the same: it is communist construction. I am certain, comrades, that the citizens of Varna, of all Bulgaria, will embark on the path now followed by the Soviet Union. (*Merriment. Applause.*) Don't you think I am right? Comrade Zhivkov says that I am—Bulgaria will follow, is already following, this path!

Comrades, I am making jokes, but these jokes contain unadulterated 100 per cent truths, because it is impossible to build anything without work. If I happen to read in the Bulgarian newspapers after I leave that the Varna factories are behind their plan, that the Varna co-operatives are not working as well as those in other districts, do you think I will enjoy being an honorary citizen of your city? Put yourself in my place. Remember that my position will not be tenable unless you work well at your factories and co-operatives. (*Animation. Stormy applause.*)

Dear comrades, newspaper correspondents from capitalist countries are present here. Some of them have accompanied me from the Soviet Union. I have met them today. They came up to me. Some of them write in a fashion all their own: they hear one thing and write another. (*Merriment.*) They are not to blame. The system which produced them is to blame. They do not understand the simple things which are quite ordinary for you and I. For example, they cannot understand that we want to build socialism and communism, and, what is more, that we *are* building it. We *are* building it, gentlemen. (*Stormy applause. Cheers.*)

We may say to these correspondents: By writing inaccurately you are casting a shadow upon a cloudless sky. To be sure, that way you do not help us, but through your ignorance you are also cutting the bough on which you are sitting. Because the tree of communism is the tree of life, and all people will thrive upon its fruit.

Come to your senses before it is too late, gentlemen of the press, and try to grasp the historic processes now underway, with one-third of the world population firmly embarked on socialist and communist construction. (*Stormy applause.*) Assist this process with what you do! And so much the worse for you if you will not assist it, because we are going to carry on all the same. As for you, some day you will be ashamed to look your grandchildren in the eyes. They will ask you what you were doing when the Russians, Bulgarians, Chinese, Rumanians, Yugoslavs and the peoples of other countries fought for the victory of the new system. You will have to blush, because you were busy maligning all these people building socialism and communism. I am sorry that you will have to blush before your grandchildren. Come to your senses, gentlemen, and take the path of those who are fighting for a better future for all mankind. (*Stormy applause. Cheers.*)

I thank you once more, dear comrades, for the honour you have done me. I wish you, my fellow citizens of Varna, new success in your work, in socialist construction for the good of the Bulgarian people, for the good of all peoples struggling for happiness, for socialism, for communism, for world peace. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Meeting scans, "Druzhba, mir!" "Peace and friendship!" Cheers.*)

## SPEECH AT A FRIENDSHIP MEETING IN OBNOVA VILLAGE

*May 18, 1962*

Dear comrades, I ask for your permission to let me speak with my hat on. Please do not take it as a sign of disrespect: it is due to my conflict with your scorching sun. (*Merriment.*)

Dear comrades, friends, dear Bulgarian brothers, *drugari* and *drugarki*, allow me, on behalf of the Soviet people and on behalf of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its Central Committee to thank you most sincerely for the

affection you show towards our people and our Communist Party. Allow me to thank you for your lavish hospitality on my own behalf and that of all the comrades on the Soviet Party and government delegation which has come to your thriving country on the invitation of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and the Government of the Bulgarian People's Republic. *(Stormy, prolonged applause.)*

Comrade Traikov has spoken very well here about the building of socialism, the role of the Bulgarian Communist Party as the guiding force, and about the peasants, their road and place in the struggle for the victory of socialism. Yes, dear comrades, a struggle is in progress now between the old and the new, or, to be more accurate, between the new and the old. This class struggle has been going on for a long time, but it has grown more acute and is waged still more vigorously in the capitalist countries now that capitalism has come to its monopolist, imperialist stage of development. Its proportions vary, but it goes on continuously.

The imperialist groups, the monopolists who own the press, radio and television–all the means for the spiritual enslavement of the working people–are trying to prove that Marx and his teaching are out of date, that history has not confirmed the theoretical conclusions of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Some ideologists of imperialism aver with a know-all look that if Marx had lived in our time he would not have written his *Capital,* or that he would have written it differently, seeing that the facts have not allegedly borne out his theoretical conclusions.

Some "wits", whose witticism is not clever at all, but stupid and false, ascribe to the wife of Karl Marx words to this effect: Karl Marx worked for many years and produced his great *Capital,* but it would have been better if he had not written the book *Capital,* but left a capital for his children.

As I have said, this is a crude lie, because the wife of Karl Marx was always at Marx's side in everything he did, sharing his joys, of which he had only too few, and his sorrows. His work on his historic *Capital,* in which he proved that socialism would inevitably win, was the greatest joy Marx had.

The ineffectual critics say that Marx's theory has not been confirmed in fact. But what else is the Soviet Union if not theory translated into reality on the basis of the teaching

created by Karl Marx? And what are the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the other socialist countries? Are you blind or deaf, you lackeys of imperialism? No. You want to fence yourselves off from the truth; you want to convince yourselves that *Capital*, the great teaching of Karl Marx, will not make headway in your countries. But it has already made headway there, it has made headway in all the countries of the world, and no NATO, CENTO or SEATO, no military blocs and no rockets will stop the immortal ideas of scientific communism. Wherever man exists, wherever life exists, the great Marxist-Leninist theory created by Marx, Engels and Lenin exists and thrives too. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*) You ineffectual critics are not fit to judge this greatest of theories created by those giants of revolutionary thought, Karl Marx, Frederick Engels and Vladimir Lenin! To put it bluntly, the men who criticise Karl Marx know no more about his theory than swine know about oranges. (*Animation. Prolonged applause.*)

We Communists rejoice at the fact that not only the present, but also the future of mankind lies with communism. The red banner of Marxism-Leninism, the banner of labour, will fly over the whole world, and if we reach out to other planets, we shall raise this victorious banner there as well. (*Merriment.*) We have already delivered a pennant of the Soviet Union to the Moon. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Comrades, the bourgeoisie, the imperialists counted on the peasants, because, owing to the conditions prevailing in farming, the peasants were downtrodden and less organised than the working class and were slower in accepting the theory of Marxism-Leninism. In our country, too, the bourgeoisie banked on the peasants and tried to take advantage of the wavering of the peasants after the victory of the October Revolution, when we had to fight a long civil war against the counter-revolutionary forces, the reactionaries, the landowners and the capitalists, all the exploiting classes smashed by the Revolution.

Yet it was the bourgeoisie, the imperialists, who helped us overcome the wavering of the peasants. The imperialists sent their landing parties and supplied the whiteguards, the sons of the bourgeoisie and the kulaks, with uniforms and weapons. When the Red Army retreated, and the interventionists and whiteguards occupied a village, they lost no time to seize

the land the Bolsheviks had given to the peasants, and to hand it back to the returning landowners. This worked to the advantage of Marxism-Leninism: the Bolsheviks said the land should belong to the tillers, that is, the peasants, while the bourgeoisie was waging a war to maintain the old system, so that the land should belong to the exploiters, the landowners and capitalists, and the peasants should slave on, doing back-breaking work from morning to night on land owned by someone else, for the landowner or kulak.

The peasants of Russia, who had not read Karl Marx, came to understand what Marxism-Leninism meant. At the time of the Civil War the peasants had not grasped as yet that the Communists and Bolsheviks were the same people. They would say: We are against "communia", but we are for the Bolsheviks. (*Merriment.*) They backed the Bolsheviks because the Bolsheviks, the Communists, expressed and fought for the vital interests of the working people, the interests of the working peasantry. (*Stormy applause.*)

I recall how during the Civil War the whiteguards published all sorts of lies in their gutter sheets about the Red Army, about the Bolsheviks. Some people believed those wild falsehoods. But all this slander dispersed rapidly like smoke. Ill-fed and ill-clad, the workers and peasants of the Soviet land defeated the bourgeoisie, routed the interventionists and drove the American, German, French, British and Japanese imperialists out of our land. In a word, they drove out all the interventionists who had come to restore capitalism in the Soviet land. The peoples of our country defeated all their enemies and our banner flies high, and is rising higher and higher! (*Stormy applause.*)

Before the Second World War we were encircled by capitalist countries. Hitler, and Mussolini too, apparently thought that they were destined to save capitalism from communism. At first they announced the establishment of a "Berlin-Rome Axis", and then projected this axis to include Tokyo. But where is this axis today, and where are its makers?

And where is communism today? Communism has spread out. Only recently, the Soviet Union was the only socialist country on earth. Today, the socialist camp has pushed apart its frontiers. It has brought together the many socialist countries of Europe, the People's Republic of China, the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Democratic Republic

of Vietnam in one fraternal family. Post-war Europe is short of many capitalist countries. Today, the socialist banner flies proudly over Cuba. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Mankind has suffered great losses in the grim war against Hitler and his bloody hordes. But by way of compensation many nations have won freedom and have embarked securely on the road of socialism and communism.

Today, the imperialists are racking their brains how to hold up and roll back mankind's development. The late John Foster Dulles had set his mind on "rolling back" the forces of progress. But the facts, the natural course of events, rolled him back instead. To be sure, Dulles still has many followers in the world. Take Chancellor Adenauer. Although he is old, he is very active in combating the new and the progressive. He talks and does a lot. (*Merriment.*) In America, too, the monopolists are very eager to retard the victory of the new. But wishes are one thing, and opportunities are another. (*Applause.*)

The countries that have hoisted the red socialist banner are lost to capitalism for good. What is more, with the new successes we score in our development as the years go by, the socialist ideas will win the minds of all the peoples. The example of our countries is bringing it home to them more and more clearly that socialism and communism alone can bring real freedom and happiness to people.

The ideologists of capitalism go to great pains to convince the people in the reverse. They are out to prove that the capitalist world is a world of freedom. We have freedom, they say, while the socialist countries do not.

Yes, we are proud that there is and will be no freedom in our countries for the exploiters, for those who plunder the people, for the exploiting capitalists and monopolists. (*Stormy applause.*) There is and always will be freedom for the working people in our countries, so that the people themselves can consolidate their state, build up their strength, develop their economy and advance their culture. The socialist countries provide every citizen with the opportunity to work, learn, improve his or her knowledge and to develop science and culture. In this respect there is complete freedom for all citizens in our countries. Not only has this freedom been legally proclaimed. It is practised in life. The state allocates immense sums for this purpose. It provides free education and main-

tains a large network of general and technical schools and higher educational establishments, and a big army of teachers and professors. As they say, it is not just the intelligent who study, but also the shirkers, for it is difficult to evade learning, because all Soviet society wants everybody to study. (*Stormy applause.*)

That, gentlemen of the capitalist world, is freedom—real, and not sham freedom. Everybody can see how much the Soviet Union has grown, what it has become, this once impoverished tsarist Russia, this illiterate peasant land ridiculed by the West. It has shown the imperialists where they get off! (*Merriment.*) It delivered a pennant carrying the hammer and sickle emblem to the Moon. A space rocket built by the Soviet people flew round the Moon for a whole day and made the first pictures in history of its reverse side, invisible from the Earth. Our country launched the Vostok spaceship, which orbited the Earth 17 times, while the wealthiest capitalist country made only three orbits. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Each year the Soviet Union graduates three times as many engineers as the United States. And the future belongs to those who have knowledge! When the capitalists realised that the Soviet Union could not be crushed, they consoled themselves with the following notion: Let the Soviet Union have more and more educated people each year, but when all Soviet society is more enlightened, people will want to change the system.

What can we say to this? We have a saying: he thinks of killing a horse with hay! You, too, Messrs. imperialists, want to kill the Soviet Union with knowledge and education. Really, that is a case of people losing the last shred of their common sense. It is the limit! Very well, we agree: Wait for whatever you are waiting for, while we show you what the educated people of the socialist countries can do. They will show you a lot more than what you've seen so far! That is Marxist-Leninist theory in action, that is Karl Marx and the "failure" of his teaching!

Comrades, the peasants' road to socialism lies through the co-operatives. Our great teacher Lenin, devoted much thought to the peasants. He looked for the right way of leading them to socialism. Lenin showed the way—he worked out the co-operative plan.

It is hard to lead the peasants along the socialist road. I know peasants well and the psychology of peasants, too. It calls for simply incredible effort on the part of a peasant to hand over to a co-operative his skewbald mare, though it isn't really worth much, and he feels the same about handing over a cow or something else to a co-operative. It is mine, he thinks, and in a co-operative it will be common property. This psychology is deeply rooted in his mind and his daily life. It was very difficult to convert the peasants to the socialist way, the way of commonly-owned farming.

But acting on the teaching of the great Lenin we have accomplished it, and are pleased that Bulgaria has been the first of all the socialist countries after the Soviet Union where the co-operative system has won. She has embarked firmly on the co-operative path and reorganised her agriculture along socialist lines. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*) Great credit for this goes to the Bulgarian Communist Party, to its Central Committee, to the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and to Comrades Zhivkov, Yugov and other Bulgarian comrades. I would like to note the special role of Comrade Traikov, who heads the Agrarian People's Union of Bulgaria. He is not a Communist, while I am, but we see eye to eye with him in the matter of socialist construction. God grant us more such non-Communists. (*Merriment. Applause.*)

It is a great thing, comrades, that the peasant party, the Agrarian People's Union of Bulgaria, has realised its right place in the reorganisation of the life of the Bulgarian people and recognises the leadership of the Communist Party. None but the Communist Party, the vanguard of the working class, is able to direct the people correctly and be their leader in the struggle for socialism and communism.

What else should I say? One can keep scolding capitalism endlessly, because it does many foolish things.

While in Bulgaria, I learned that U.S. President Kennedy has ordered a troop landing in Thailand. What does this show? It shows, of course, that the U.S. Government has made an unwise decision, one that will lead to bloodshed rather than peace in that part of the globe. The Thai people have fought a long time against foreign invaders. It is hardly to be expected that they will welcome the U.S. marines. The press announced that U.S. troops were landed in Thailand under an agreement between the U.S. Secretary of State and

the Foreign Minister of Thailand. We would like to ask, however, who authorised this minister to sign the agreement? An agreement of this sort could not have been signed on the authority of the people. It must have been signed on behalf of the landowners and capitalists, who fear the new, who fear they will not be able to retain power. It was they who authorised the agreement, hoping the United States will prop up the forces that continue to exploit the Thai people. Ministers do the signing now, but the time will come when the people will replace their own signature for that of the ministers. (*Stormy applause.*)

The latest events show that the lessons of the revolutionary, national liberation struggle of the working people have been lost on the imperialists.

The Vietnamese fought the French colonialists for seven years and routed them. After the hostilities, Vietnam was divided into two parts. A life of peace reigns in the North, where the people are working hard to build a new, happy life. But what do we see in the South? The blood of the people is being shed there. Who is responsible for this bloodshed? It is the American imperialists. They claim they have sent military advisers there. But under the guise of advisers they have sent troops there, and these are fighting against the Vietnamese people in order to save the henchmen of the imperialists, whom the people will drive out in any case sooner or later.

The French made war in Vietnam for seven years. The Americans will perhaps fight even longer. But one thing is clear: they will have to leave, and the people will be the masters of the situation. We are deeply convinced of this! (*Stormy applause.*)

One might even say that they will not leave, but will be made to leave. They will be driven out of the land which is not theirs. That is only a question of time.

These days, the imperialists talk a great deal about Laos, the small Laotian nation. But they are afraid of losing their positions not only in Laos, but also in Thailand, in the whole of that geographical region. The Soviet Government maintains that the most sensible thing would be to adhere to the already agreed course in settling the Laotian question, that is, to establish a coalition government under Prince Souvanna Phouma.

The American imperialists have gone into Thailand. They have landed marines there. Well, let them have a taste of jungle fighting. The peoples of South-East Asia will show their fighting capacity. It would be best for the United States to stop acting the policeman, to stop acting the international gendarme.

The Statement of the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties points out that the U.S. imperialists have assumed the role of international policeman. We see capitalism, monopoly capital, shake in its boots. The capitalists of other countries hope the United States will save them. But no, U.S. monopoly capitalism is also shaking in its boots and will itself collapse some day under the blows of its own working class, which will hoist the banner of communism. We believe in this, and I told the Americans about it confidentially when I visited America. So, gentlemen of the foreign press, it is not news if you write about it now. I am repeating a well-known truth, and shall continue to repeat it as long as I live. (*Stormy applause.*)

We are for peace, for communism. War among states is not necessary for communism to triumph. What communism needs is work and more work, and organisational activity among people in each socialist country.

We do not think it right for the liberation of a people to come from outside. We stand for strict adherence to the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other countries. It is up to the people to decide what socio-political system they want in their country.

We recognise and approve wars of national liberation. We bless those who take up arms against the colonialists, against their exploiters, for freedom and independence. This was why we hailed the Algerians when they fought the French colonialists, why we hailed the Vietnamese when they fought the French colonialists, and why we hail the Indonesian people who have set out to liberate West Irian from the rule of the Dutch colonialists. We hail the peoples of South-East Asia who are struggling against the forces that wish to perpetuate the colonial regime or to alter it only a little. The U.S. troops landed in Thailand will serve as a kind of catalyst for a popular revolutionary upsurge in that region of the world; the whole thing will act as a stimulant, a call to battle for

the men and women who want to win genuine independence and freedom.

Our sympathies are always with those who struggle for their freedom, for independence, for liberation. (*Applause.*)

Some people abroad say: Khrushchov professes to be for peace, but is really calling for war. This is a crude distortion of our views. We are for peace among the states, but we are for class struggle, we are for struggle against the colonialists, we are for wars of national liberation. The peoples languishing in colonial bondage have no other way out than to struggle for their liberation. What do you do with a robber who brandishes his knife over you? Will you go down on your knees and beg him for mercy, will you plead with him? Your pleading will not save you. The robber will knife you all the same. What to do? Seize the robber by the hand and wrest the knife away from him. That is the situation of the colonial peoples.

At the U.N. General Assembly the Soviet Union proposed that an end be put to colonialism. The proposal was passed. Even the delegates of the colonial powers voted for it. What came of it? The proposal was accepted, but the blood of the oppressed peoples is still being spilled. The colonialists of Spain, of Portugal, France, the Netherlands and other states are acting as brutally as before against the peoples struggling for freedom and independence. I speak specifically of the colonialists, not the peoples of France, Portugal, the Netherlands and Spain. Those are quite different things.

What are the exploited peoples to do? The imperialists, the colonialists are making war against them. But is there not the right of self-defence? There is such a right. The working class has it, the peoples struggling against colonialism have it too. No people should be deprived of this sacred right to defending their freedom and independence. More than that, it is the sacred duty of every people, if they can, to assist this struggle for freedom and independence. We have been supporting, and will continue to support, such peoples in their struggle to the best of our ability. (*Prolonged applause.*)

But I repeat, we are for peace among the peoples, we are for disarmament. We are participating in the Geneva talks where, unfortunately, more tea is drunk than business is done. It is common sense that the states should reach agreement on disarmament, but it seems that the U.S. monopolists

have not yet arrived at this conclusion. However, they are compelled to manoeuvre! They know that the peoples of all countries want peace. They cannot but take part in the disarmament talks, although the French Government went to the length of simply refusing to attend the Geneva talks. The diplomats of other countries take part and negotiate. But diplomats have tongues, they say, to hide their thoughts. (I do not mean our diplomats; our diplomats are quite different.) So they talk on and on in Geneva, and that is very sad, we deplore it.

The U.S. Government has even begun nuclear tests, evidently with a view to fortifying its positions.

The U.S. delegates tried to justify the resumption of tests, but were befuddled by their own explanations. They say: The United States is the strongest nuclear power in the world; we only need to blow, and the Soviet Union will vanish. It would seem that we exist solely by the grace of imperialism. But that is a tale for simpletons, because if the imperialists only could, they would do their utmost to have no socialist countries in the world. We are so firmly rooted that we cannot be blown off; those who try to blow us off will be sent flying themselves. The main force is the force of communism, the forces of the peoples that do not want a new world war. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Some American delegates have indeed lost their bearings. They are in a pickle: they cannot bring themselves to say that as a result of tests the Soviet Union has become stronger. They cannot say it, because it will frighten those who count on the strength of the United States. But if they say the United States is stronger, people will wonder why they need the nuclear test blasts. Their plight may be described thus: extricate the tail, the nose gets stuck; extricate the nose, the tail gets stuck. (*Merriment.*)

What can we do about it? What logic can imperialism have? None but the logic of strength. Acting on this logic, they try to pursue a policy from positions of strength. The late John Foster Dulles was very frank about it.

The U.S. Government does not want to sign a treaty banning tests of thermonuclear weapons. It has started new tests. I have said repeatedly that we stand firmly for the prohibition of nuclear weapons tests and are prepared to sign a treaty to that effect, provided control over its fulfilment is

effected on a national basis. We want none of your spies, gentlemen, and do not want to send ours to you.

Control over the nuclear test ban is made much easier these days by the achievements of modern science. When the French Government exploded an atomic bomb underground in the Sahara, the Americans registered the blast at once. When we made an underground explosion, the Americans announced it the next day, too. It is not difficult, therefore, to control a test ban these days. What other control do you wish, gentlemen?

You refuse to sign a nuclear test ban treaty. We cannot help that. You will explode bombs, and we shall have to make tests too. Regrettably, that is the lot of the socialist states, for they are compelled to reckon with the existence of capitalism, of aggressive monopoly capital. To accept the conditions of the imperialist states means to put oneself at their mercy. Yet we did not surrender in October 1917, when the socialist state had just come into being and the imperialists crusaded against the Soviet country. Our people gave them a proper rebuff. It is not for us to be afraid of the imperialists! As the song says, is it for our legions to fear the ghostly power of the tsars? (*Applause.*)

Ours is not a ghostly, but a very real and colossal power today. The U.S. President told me himself that our military power is equal. I did not object, although we are really stronger than imperialism, because our forces include not only the socialist states, but also all progressive and peace-loving forces on earth, all the people who cherish peace. These peace-loving forces are superior to the forces of imperialism, the forces of war. (*Prolonged applause.*) The socialist countries devote all their powerful forces to the cause of peace. We have said more than once, and say again that we are prepared to sign at any time a treaty for general and complete disarmament under strict international control if the delegates of the imperialist countries agree to do so.

So much for the international situation. How to sum it up? Is it good or bad? We believe the situation is not bad, even good. But, of course, it must be borne in mind that as long as imperialism exists, the war danger exists as well.

What is good about the present situation? Just this: if you are attacked by a pack of wolves and you have neither a stick nor a gun, your situation is bad. But it is quite different

if you are well armed. You can even make a fur coat from the skins of the wolves. Incidentally, flyers know this well, the best fur boots for flying are made of wolfskin. (*Laughter. Applause.*) So you see, our situation is good because we now have sufficient strength to defend our land, the whole socialist camp. We do not want to attack anyone, but we are prepared for defence and for crushing retaliation. (*Applause.*)

You may say: It would be good if the international situation were still better. That would indeed be good, but try and come to terms with the imperialists about improving the situation. We want to, but they do not. They have a vested interest in maintaining international tension. There is nothing we can do about it. The socialist countries and the capitalist countries live in one world, on the same planet. Our planet is small, so we coexist as the circumstances permit.

Our circumstances are not bad, they are good, and they will be better every year. Our economy and culture are on the upgrade, science is flourishing and the welfare of the working people is improving. That is the main thing. What we need is to work well. I say this in my own country, and I repeat it in yours, comrade Bulgarians!

Nothing but work, strenuous work for the good of society can give man strength, can give strength to society. Therefore, we must work well on the collective farms and in the factories, because we are working for ourselves, and not for capitalists, not for robbers. True, the capitalist says: I am not a robber. I come by my money honestly. Clever chap! He earns thousands and tens of thousands of dollars every day, although he does not work himself. The working man's sweat never dries on him, but all he earns barely suffices for his breakfast and dinner. What is this lucrative work done by the capitalist? It is not work, it is deception and robbery. We know what kind of people the capitalists are. In our country, we abolished the exploiting classes long ago, and we no longer have such people. We work for ourselves, for our society, for our future. It is joyful work, comrades! (*Applause.*)

I have been working from childhood. My record as a worker is not a long one, because the Revolution took me away from the field of manual labour. But I went to work at a very early age. Whenever I see shepherds watching their flocks, I recall my own childhood. I remember how I herded

sheep. But I was not a full-fledged shepherd; I was of lower rank. The shepherd would say: Run along, Nikita, and turn the sheep back. I ran along and turned them back. (*Animation. Applause.*) I herded calves too, in the village. It is easy to herd sheep, you know, but whoever tries to herd calves will soon find out how troublesome that is. When the sun grows hot the gadflies appear and sting the calves; the calves raise their tails and run into the corn to get away from them. You have to run after them. A calf has four legs; all you have is two. (*Laughter. Applause.*)

That was in my childhood. But I must say that it did not impair my physical strength. Afterwards, I worked in factories, in mines, in damp pits. Quite frequently, I came out of the pit soaking wet in winter, and had to walk three kilometres to my home. The capitalists did not build any showers or cloakrooms for us. Such were the working conditions. So now I am not afraid of the devil, or any plague. (*Merriment.*)

It is easier to work in our time, comrades, for tractors work the fields. The peasant looks at a horse differently these days; he wants a machine. Comrade Zhivkov and I went to look at the fields. He says the co-operatives have shortcomings, because there are not enough machines. This was a hint to let Khrushchov know that Bulgaria is short of machines. I understood the hint, and I agree that you need more machines. That is true. (*Animation. Applause.*)

I am coming to the end of my speech. You have been standing long enough in the hot sun. I hope you will forgive me my long speech. But this is the first time we meet on the land which, as Comrade Traikov pointed out rightly, has been drenched with the blood of Bulgarians and Russians in the struggle against Ottoman Turkey. Soviet people remember those battles well. They remember Plevna and Shipka, and the other historic places where the Russian army and the Bulgarian volunteers scored victories. That was when our peoples created their fraternal alliance.

This militant alliance gained added strength in the struggle against fascism. I have seen many monuments here of the fighting for Bulgaria's liberation. Soviet soldiers under the command of Marshal Tolbukhin, my good friend, with whom I fought together at Stalingrad (he was in command of the 57th Army and I was a member of the Front Military Council), did a lot, too, to cement the friendship of

the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Bulgarian people. I am sure that this friendship, tempered in the struggle against the common enemy, cemented by the blood shed in battle, will develop and grow stronger down the centuries! (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

We, as your sincere friends, rejoice over your successes and wish you, comrades, fresh achievements in developing economy, culture and science, and in strengthening the unbreakable alliance of the working class and the peasantry. We wish success to your government, to all your fine people. That is interconnected: the activities of your government, I know this from personal experience, cannot be successful unless they are based on the selfless work of the people. The strength of the leaders lies in their bonds with the people; the people can do everything.

We want to, and will promote our friendship in future. The Soviet Government has good relations with the Bulgarian Government headed by Comrade Yugov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers.

Very good relations exist between the Bulgarian Communist Party and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. When I was going on my visit to Bulgaria, the bourgeois press said: Khrushchov is making the trip to smooth over differences. But this was wishful thinking. Gentlemen, you may see your wishes come true in your dreams, but when you wake up and rub the sleep out of your eyes and take a wash, you will see that things are not what you want them to be. (*Animation. Applause.*)

In fact, our relations with Bulgaria are of the best. Our relations with the Bulgarian Communist Party could not be better. We welcomed Comrade Zhivkov's election as First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party. To be sure, it is an internal matter, and I am not interfering in your domestic affairs. But you are Communists, and so are we, and we can express our opinions to each other on equal terms. I can express my opinion, but naturally, it is not binding. I believe that much has been accomplished in normalising and improving the situation both in the Party and in the country since Comrade Zhivkov assumed leadership as First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bulgaria. This is an important matter.

Rectification of the consequences of the personality cult is of exceptionally great importance. We condemn Stalin for the personality cult, for the distortions in state and Party life. You may recall, comrades, that in Pushkin's tragedy, *Mozart and Salieri,* Mozart says genius and villainy are incompatible. These words reached Salieri's heart. He had thought himself a musician of genius. But after he poisoned Mozart he realised that he was not a genius, because he had become a villain. The same holds true in political matters. Genius and villainy are incompatible. A Marxist-Leninist, a Communist, must be true to his class, to the working class, to all the working people. He must be true to the Marxist-Leninist teaching, he must serve his people, the communist cause, in good faith.

Take artillery: cannon are powerful weapons, and very useful in battle, but only when they fire at the enemy, over the heads of their own soldiers. If the shells fall on their own soldiers, the artillerymen are no good and should be severely punished. They should fire on the enemy, and not on their own men. (*Applause.*)

Our opponents may seize on my words and say that Khrushchov denounces Stalin not for his severity in general, but for cruelty to honest Soviet people. Yes, that is quite true! Lenin stood for the dictatorship of the proletariat. The first proletarian state was organised under his direction, and an Extraordinary Commission was set up, because it was impossible to defeat the enemies of the revolution without such a body. Dzerzhinsky was put at the head of the Extraordinary Commission, and people said at the time that he was the sword of the Revolution, defending the proletarian state and smiting the enemies of the working class, the enemies of Soviet power.

It was necessary. We recognise it. Far from condemning Lenin for it, we glorify him. But we denounce Stalin, we denounce him because he unsheathed and aimed the sword against his own class, against his own Party.

But enough of that. The whole world is listening to us, and in a way I am giving away secrets. But we have revealed these "secrets" before, and if they are properly understood, our policy, too, will be properly understood. This will be beneficial to us, and to those who are against us. They will realise that we are relentless in our advance. We do not want

to interfere in the affairs of other states, but shall not tolerate interference in our own internal affairs. Keep your snouts out of our socialist garden. Have the Bulgarians such a saying?

*Voices*: Yes, they have!

*Khrushchov*: All the peoples probably have such a saying.

In conclusion, I should like to repeat that we have the best of relations with the Bulgarian Communist Party, the best of relations with its Central Committee and with Comrade Zhivkov personally. We rejoice over the successes achieved by the Communist Party of Bulgaria in uniting its ranks, over the fact that your Central Committee exercises proper, Marxist-Leninist leadership.

For our part, we shall do all we can to safeguard the best, fraternal relations between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Bulgarian Communist Party, between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Bulgaria. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Long live eternal friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Bulgarian people! (*Stormy applause. Audience scans, "Vechna druzhba!", "Friendship for ever!"*)

Long live the Bulgarian people, the builders of socialism! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live the Bulgarian Communist Party, leader and organiser of the Bulgarian people! (*Stormy applause. Audience scans, "B.C.P.! B.C.P.!"*)

Long live the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, headed by Comrade Todor Zhivkov! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers.*)

Good-bye, comrades! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Shouts of "Good-bye!"*)

## SPEECH AT A SOVIET EMBASSY RECEPTION IN SOFIA

*May 18, 1962*

Dear Comrade Zhivkov,

Dear Comrade Ganev,

Dear Comrade Yugov,

Dear Comrades and Friends,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

For the first time during our stay in Bulgaria we appear at this reception not as guests, but as hosts in the hospitable

land of our hosts. As guests of our Bulgarian friends and as hosts at this reception, we are doubly pleased to cordially welcome all those present.

We have just returned from a tour of your country. We have been to Stara Zagora, Varna, Pleven and Tolbukhin; we have visited industrial enterprises, co-operative farms and research establishments. We have had the friendliest of meetings with the working people of your country.

We have come to Bulgaria not only as the personal friends of the Bulgarian leaders. Yet it is certainly true that we are fellow Marxists and comrades of Todor Zhivkov, Dimiter Ganev, Anton Yugov and all the other Bugarian leaders, and that we set a high price on these friendly relations.

But there is something infinitely greater than personal friendship between us leaders: it is the fraternal alliance and unity between the Bulgarian and Soviet peoples. The friendship and cohesion of the peoples is one of the most wonderful gains of socialism. It is in the socialist environment that the friendship of the peoples ascends to a higher rung and is filled with new content.

The new social system eliminates the social roots of hostility and mistrust between the working people of different states and clears away the capitalist refuse which hinders a true coming together of the peoples. This does not mean, however, that socialism need only gain a footing and the coming together of the peoples will proceed of itself. Victory of the new system offers the working people vast scope for friendship, mutual support and assistance. The friendship of the peoples does not grow stronger by itself. Mistrust and strife, induced by capitalism, do not disappear without a struggle against them by our parties and by all the class-conscious working people.

Capitalist society has the eternal problem of relations between large and small states. And this is understandable, because in the capitalist world relations between states hinge on the principle of the strong beating the weak, and of one riding the other. We can proudly say that no such problem exists in the socialist world. Relations between the socialist countries do not depend on their size, on their population and their economic strength. They are based on complete equality, mutual respect, fraternal assistance and support. In

our socialist family everyone is equal, everyone enjoys independence and has an equal say.

The cohesion of the socialist countries, the unity of the Communist and Workers' Parties, are a wonderful gain that multiplies our strength in the struggle for communism. Our unity is based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, which are expressed in the Declaration and Statement of the fraternal parties, those programme documents of the world communist movement. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its Central Committee consider it their supreme internationalist duty to work for the unswerving implementation of the collectively framed policy of the communist movement.

The relations between the C.P.S.U. and the Bulgarian Communist Party, the friendship between the Soviet and the Bulgarian peoples are a striking example of the unity of the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties. We are very pleased with the way our relations are developing, both in Party and in state matters. The manifold contacts between our countries and their economic, scientific and technical co-operation are steadily expanding and growing deeper. Thousands of Soviet and Bulgarian citizens pay visits to each other every year and see each other's achievements, pick up know-how and exchange ideas.

May our friendship, which has grown into fraternity, flourish from day to day, and may nothing ever overcast it! May our friendship continue to promote the prosperity of our peoples, of all the socialist countries and the strengthening of world peace!

Allow me to propose a toast to the industrious Bulgarian people who are steadily advancing along the road of socialism.

Here is to the eternal and inviolable friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Bulgaria!

Here is to the Bulgarian Communist Party, the fighting vanguard of the Bulgarian people, to its Central Committee headed by Comrade Todor Zhivkov!

Here is to the Presidium of the National Assembly of Bulgaria headed by Comrade Dimiter Ganev!

Here is to the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria headed by Comrade Anton Yugov!

Here is to the faithful ally of the Bulgarian Communist Party, the Bulgarian Agrarian People's Union and to its Secretary, Comrade Georgi Traikov!

Here is to the National Council of the Fatherland Front and to its Chairman, Comrade Encho Staikov!

Here is to the monolithic unity of the countries of the socialist community!

Here is to world peace!

## SPEECH AT A MASS MEETING IN SOFIA

*May 19, 1962*

Dear Comrade Todor Zhivkov,

Dear Comrade Dimiter Ganev,

Dear Comrade Anton Yugov,

Dear Comrades and Friends,

On my own behalf and on behalf of the comrades on the delegation, I would like to express our profound joy over this meeting with the working people of Sofia, the Bulgarian capital.

To begin with, let me thank you sincerely for giving me the freedom of the city of Sofia. It is a great honour, which I accept primarily as a token of the fraternal feeling of the working people of the Bulgarian capital for our country and all the Soviet people. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

I express special gratitude for the exceptionally great confidence in our country and our Communist Party shown by the Bulgarian people, by the people of the Bulgarian capital, the city of Sofia, manifested in the presentation of the key to your city to me, a representative of the Soviet people. (*Stormy applause.*) For this key is presented to one whom you trust as a real friend. It is never given to those who are not trusted, even if they demanded it. I take it as a symbol of special trust in the Soviet Union that you have presented the key to me and express the profound gratitude of the peoples of our country for this. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

This key will be a symbol of your confidence in us, and at once a symbolic warning to our common enemies: let them not dream of a march on Bulgaria, or any other socialist country! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers.*)

We have brought you, the entire Bulgarian people, warm words of greeting from the Soviet people, your friend, your loyal ally, your brother! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Audience scans, "Vechna druzhba!", "Friendship for ever!" Cheers.*)

Now, as a citizen of Sofia, I beg you to consider my position as a speaker: you are doing the cheering, but later on you will blame me for making a very long speech and taking up your time. (*Merriment.*) I shall, therefore, keep account of the time it takes to make my speech, and you will assume responsibility for the time spent on cheering. So do not accuse me of having spoken too long. (*Merriment. Applause.*)

The Soviet delegation has come to you as to its very good and very close friends. Here, on Bulgarian soil, this feeling of friendship has become still stronger in each of us. The Bulgarian people have showered us with signs of great attention and care wherever we have managed to go in these few days.

We are deeply grateful to the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, headed by Comrade Todor Zhivkov, to the Government of People's Bulgaria, headed by Comrade Anton Yugov, to all the leaders of the Party and Government of fraternal Bulgaria and to all the working people of Bulgaria for their heartfelt fraternal reception. (*Stormy applause.*)

I visited Bulgaria in 1958. Only four years have passed. But the changes that have taken place in your country are staggering. What wonderful successes have the Bulgarian working people scored in the building of socialism!

The bourgeois press often says that the European socialist countries have made little economic progress after the establishment of people's power. These gentlemen ought to be told: Take a look at the map of the Balkan Peninsula.

States with different social systems—socialist and capitalist—are situated on it. But which of the capitalist countries bordering on Bulgaria can boast of successes such as have been achieved in the conditions of socialism by the Bulgarian people?

Before the war, the Western capitalists said scornfully that Bulgaria imported everything down to nails. This was said by people through whose fault Bulgaria lagged in its economic development, by people who raked in immense profits by

exploiting the natural wealth of Bulgaria and who plundered your people wherever they could.

The imperialists wanted Bulgaria to stay an agrarian country for ever. To please their foreign masters, the rulers of old Bulgaria even made up a "theory" that it was Bulgaria's destiny to be a backward country, that it did not have the necessary natural wealth for economic development. This was said about such a wonderful country as Bulgaria!

The Bulgarian people flung off the yoke of the hated exploiters and established the most progressive social system in their country. They began boldly to remake their land. A little more than fifteen years have passed, and nothing is left of the "theories" that doomed Bulgaria to misery.

By Bulgaria's example history has demonstrated convincingly once again that, having taken power into their own hands, the working people can outdo the capitalists and generate a high pace of economic, scientific and cultural development entirely beyond the capacities of the exploiter classes.

Old, tsarist Bulgaria could not even dream of the achievements attained by the Bulgarian workers and peasants in the years of socialist construction. In all probability, its lot would have been the same as that of Turkey and Greece, whose economy is in a state of perpetual stagnation. Socialist Bulgaria has not only outstripped its backward neighbours, but is also competing successfully with some of the economically developed countries of Europe. Before the Second World War Bulgaria ranked among the last in Europe for output of electricity. In 1960 its power stations produced 592 kilowatt-hours per head of the population, as against 276 kwh in Greece and 104 kwh in Turkey. And in 1961 your country produced 693 kwh per head of the population.

In the years of people's power industrial output in Bulgaria increased 14-fold. A strong, highly productive agriculture has been built up, great progress has been made in scientific and cultural development, and the standard of living has risen considerably. People's Bulgaria has grown into a developed industrial-agrarian land, it has become a genuinely independent country and holds a worthy place in the mighty socialist community. Such are the successes achieved by a people building socialism!

I have read that the eight-millionth citizen was born in

Bulgaria recently. That is very good news. It is very good that the country's population is running into the ninth million—not counting myself as a new citizen of Sofia. (*Animation. Applause.*) Shakespeare once said the world should be populated. Doubly so should our socialist world, where everything is being done for the good of man, be populated by healthy and happy people.

We wish success and happiness to the eight-millionth Bulgarian citizen and to all the people of your remarkable country. May he bask in the generous Bulgarian sun, may he grow strong on the fertile Bulgarian soil and may he develop into an inspired fighter for the victory of communism! He will live in a country where communism will have won!

The socialist system creates all the conditions for man to live joyfully and happily. There is no task more lofty for Communists than to see to the people's welfare.

In order to scare the philistines, the defenders of capitalism portrayed us Communists as destructive elements hampering progress, as people who would trample down the achievements of human civilisation. But now, the peoples led by the Communists have come to power, first in Russia and then in a number of other European and Asian countries, and the world sees how absurd these contentions are. Yes, the Communists do uproot the rotten stumps that held up the old system of oppression and violence. But that is only our first task. The main thing for us is not destruction, but creation, the building of a bright and spacious edifice in which man would lead a decent and happy life.

Take a look at the socialist countries, at our cities and villages. You will see building under way wherever you look. Building sites are the most typical element of the landscape in all the socialist countries.

But one builds for a variety of purposes. The Egyptian pharaohs were also avid builders. Giant pyramids tower on African soil to this day as a reminder of the epoch of inconceivably hard slave labour. What were the Eastern slave drivers after when they built those pyramids? They wanted to perpetuate their names, to win personal glory and immortality. They scorned the labour and the lives of people, who died by the thousands in the act of erecting those useless and dead immensities of stone.

Take the capitalists. War and destruction is not all they

engage in. They build, too, quite prodigiously, and often quite well. But what is the purpose behind their building? Do they do it for the sake of man? No, they do not. They regard man merely as a tool, an object of exploitation, a means to their selfish ends.

The only motive force behind all the activities of the capitalists is their covetous itch for profit, wealth and power. Creation and progress in the capitalist environment, therefore, exacts a terrible price, the enslavement and spiritual degeneration of the individual. Everything turns into its opposite, as it were, Marx said. "Machinery, gifted with the wonderful power of shortening and fructifying human labour," he said, "we behold starving and overworking it. The newfangled sources of wealth, by some strange weird spell, are turned into sources of want. The victories of art seem bought by the loss of character.... Even the pure light of science seems unable to shine but on the dark background of ignorance."

Marx seems to have spoken these words today. In our time, too, they resound as a severe indictment of the whole capitalist system.

Human genius has made so scintillating a discovery as atomic fission. But to what purpose did the imperialists at once turn this grand achievement of modern science? Did they use it to lighten labour and improve the living conditions of their peoples? No. They used it to develop atomic bombs and then dropped those bombs on the peaceful population of Japanese cities.

Indeed, in the capitalist environment progress is much like the heathen idol who drank nectar only out of the sculls of the killed.

We Communists are moved by other motives. Our struggle and everything we do is focussed on but one goal—to build, to create and to work, so that people will live in a better, more attractive world.

The labour feats of the builders of the new socialist world will not earn their glory by pyramids and frightful means of destruction. No, they will earn it by building a prosperous and joyous life for the millions who are forging their happiness with their own hands. We join the fine Soviet poet Mayakovsky, and say: May the socialism we built in battle be a bright monument to us! (*Prolonged applause.*)

Every step forward made by socialism demonstrates more and more graphically and strikingly all its wonderful advantages over capitalism. I should like to refer to the example of the Soviet Union. You know perfectly well that what we inherited after many centuries of tsarist and landowner rule was a pauperised, ruined and backward country. Today, 45 years after the October Revolution, the Soviet state is a mighty power with a highly developed industry and an advanced and progressive agriculture.

Now, the Soviet people have set themselves grand new tasks. The Programme of the C.P.S.U. adopted at the Twenty-Second Party Congress has mapped out a clear and concrete plan of struggle for the building of the foundations of communism in the Soviet Union. Once this Programme is realised, we shall have the material and technical basis for communism and the world's highest living standard.

Our Seven-Year Plan is being fulfilled successfully. Let me name just a few figures. In the three years since the plan was begun, the aggregate industrial output increased 33 per cent, instead of the 27 per cent we had planned. Our industrial production increased an average 10.1 per cent annually, instead of the 8.3 per cent stipulated in the plan. Those are good indications. They speak of our big successes of today and of our wonderful outlook for the future.

As concerns agriculture, you probably know that our Party and the Soviet people as a whole are carrying through measures which will enable us to achieve a further steep rise of farm production.

Soviet people regard the building of communism in the Soviet Union as their internationalist duty to the world communist movement and all progressives. We are blazing new, untrodden paths. And we are happy in the knowledge that our labour will lighten and speed up the advance of the peoples of the other socialist countries, of all mankind, towards the sparkling communist future.

The international situation is favourable at present, but it is at once very complicated. The world socialist system has entered a new stage of its mighty development. The reactionary forces are aware of the tremendous progress made by the socialist countries and dread these successes. They realise that our rapid advancement, our economic, scientific and cultural achievements, act as a kind of magnet, a potent force

of attraction which is irresistibly drawing all the peoples on to the socialist path, and among them the peoples that have only recently liberated themselves from colonial oppression or are still fighting for their liberation.

People of advanced views know perfectly well that none but the socialist path will bring their countries to genuine freedom and progress in the shortest time. Nothing but elimination of the exploitation of man by man, conversion to the socialist mode of production, with the factories, the land and the natural wealth owned by all society, will secure a rapid flowering of the national economy and culture. That is the only path on which the peoples can achieve happiness.

All this is a self-evident truth for the adherents of Marxism-Leninism. But unfortunately, these truths, which are quite obvious to us, Communists, are not always understood by many leaders of the national liberation movement. The national bourgeoisie, to which many leaders of the newly free countries belong, has a dual nature. It has not yet lost its progressive role in the present conditions. However, as contradictions continue to accumulate between the working people and the propertied classes, it tends increasingly to gravitate towards agreement with the forces of reaction.

There are many good people among the leaders of countries that have embarked on the road of independent development, people ready to give every ounce of their strength to the fight for the freedom and happiness of their nation. Many of them fought and continue to fight selflessly against imperialism, conscious of the great danger it represents to the free development of the peoples.

But for all this, we cannot help seeing the weak sides of their policy. Many leaders of the newly independent countries are trying to pursue a kind of intermediate policy, which they call supra-class, and to ignore the class structure of society and the class struggle that exist in their countries.

It was not we Communists who divided society into classes. Their existence is an objective result of historical development. The Marxists only recorded this fact and drew the proper conclusions from it for our struggle for the revolutionary reorganisation of society. Since the time of Marx and Engels history has dozens of times confirmed the correct conclusion that the oppressed masses can win their true freedom solely under the leadership of the working class, and

that victory of socialism can be achieved solely by way of the class struggle.

A number of Asian and African countries that have cast off the chains of colonialism claim now that they are building socialism. We can only rejoice over the fact that the liberated peoples are pinning their future on socialism, and that they have rejected the bankrupt capitalist way of development. It is also indicative that in our day many leaders of the liberated countries regard socialism as the only way to overcome centuries of backwardness in a short period of time.

But what socialism do they have in mind? What do they mean by it? What forces do they intend to rely on in the building of socialism?

We are convinced of one thing: the march of time and history will confront the former colonial countries with the choice of following the road of either capitalist or non-capitalist development. The peoples themselves will decide which path to follow. The leaders who really hold dear the interests of the people, of the masses, will sooner or later have to realise that the only way to achieve victory and correctly solve the fundamental social problems is to lean on the working class, as the most consistent and most revolutionary class of society, in alliance with the peasantry and with the support of all the progressive forces. They will either have to understand this, or other people will come on the scene with a better understanding of the demands of reality.

The national liberation movement is gaining momentum. It is sure to score a final victory in the fierce struggle against imperialism.

In dread of their future, the imperialists are banking on coercion and are creating a threat to peace and the security of the peoples. The imperialists fear the liberation movement of the masses, they fear the working class. They need weapons and armed forces in order to suppress the peoples and stamp out the people's longing for a new and happy life.

That is why the imperialists are sabotaging the negotiations for general and complete disarmament in every possible way. They oppose a serious discussion of the Soviet proposals which envisage rejection of armaments under strict international control, including a ban on the testing of thermonuclear weapons.

The imperialists are manoeuvring and dodging the issue in order to evade the Soviet Union's clear-cut proposals. But they cannot afford to say openly that they do not want an end to the arms race. That is why they are trying to mislead people inexperienced in politics and to shift the blame for the breakdown of the negotiations on the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. However, it is quite safe to say that they will not succeed. The peoples will see that it is the socialist countries which are doing their utmost to achieve general and complete disarmament and block the way to a new world war.

The members of the most pugnacious imperialist circles have not yet realised, it appears, that the time of undivided rule by the imperialists is gone for good, seeing that a mighty socialist system has come into being and grown strong. The socialist camp has scaled new heights in economic and cultural development. It has all the necessary means for defence and is able to curb any aggressor. (*Stormy applause.*) The spokesmen of capitalism cannot help admitting that the socialist system is not inferior in strength to the imperialist camp. It may be recalled that the U.S. President himself declared that the forces of the Western states and the socialist countries are now equal. We received this realistic appraisal with satisfaction, although we consider that in our time the forces standing for peace exceed the forces of aggression and war. (*Stormy applause.*)

Later, to our regret, President Kennedy failed to resist the temptation of embarking on the dangerous road of his predecessors and resorting to threats against the Soviet Union. He did not even hesitate to say that in some circumstances the United States might take the initiative in a nuclear conflict with the Soviet Union, in other words, that it might be the first to strike a blow at the Soviet Union.

True, the President later tried to take the edge off what he had said. But a spoken word is no sparrow, and, once out, cannot be caught again.

We are compelled to bear in mind what Mr. Kennedy said, because it injects a new element into the relations between our countries. I wonder whether the President's statement signifies that he wants to prompt me, the head of the Soviet Government, to compete with him as to who "pushes the button" first?

We are against such competitions. It should be clear to every level-headed person how dangerous, inhuman and unwise that would be. Aware of the aggressive nature of imperialism, we must keep our powder dry and always be militarily prepared. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

The President of the United States made an unwise statement. Is it wise to threaten anyone who is at least as strong as you are? Pushing the button and taking the initiative in a nuclear conflict with the Soviet Union would be suicide. (*Applause.*) Anyone who dared start that sort of military conflict would suffer crushing retaliation involving all the most up-to-date means of warfare. (*Prolonged applause.*) The socialist camp, the Soviet Union, has these means in ample numbers. (*Stormy applause.*)

The arms race policy of the imperialist states is creating high tension in international affairs. The imperialists are forcing a hard, uneasy life on the peoples of all the countries of the globe, for with the existence of these modern types of arms there is no spot in the world that will escape the flames of the next war.

The nations must not put up with the dangerous policy that may lead the world to a thermonuclear catastrophe. It should be understood that peace on earth depends primarily on the unity and determination, the active efforts of millions of ordinary people.

We greatly appreciate the efforts of the Bulgarian Government to stabilise world peace and peace in the Balkans, and to normalise political, economic and cultural relations with its neighbours, particularly Greece. It is a source of alarm that the Greek ruling circles flount the security of their own people and persist along the dangerous road of aggravating international tension in that area. This was borne out by the recent Athens session of the aggressive NATO military bloc, whose decisions served to intensify the arms race throughout the world, including the Balkans. The anti-popular domestic and foreign policy of the Greek reactionaries is rousing the lawful indignation of the people of Greece and of all who cherish peace and progress. It is time for the Greek rulers to realise that their course is likely to lead the country to the brink of national disaster.

The vital interests of the Greek people demand the unconditional scrapping of that reactionary policy. They

demand an end to the arms race, abolition of foreign military bases on Greek territory, establishment on the Balkans of a zone free of nuclear and rocket weapons and the development of friendly good-neighbour relations between all the countries of the peninsula.

The world socialist system is a reliable bulwark of peace. Our strength derives not only from our economic and military power, but also from the monolithic unity of our ranks. For us Communists that is a most trustworthy weapon. So let us strengthen and sharpen that weapon tirelessly and augment the unity of our communist ranks, the friendship of the peoples of the socialist countries! (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Dear comrades and friends,

When I left your wonderful country four years ago, I said we were taking home in our hearts the warmth and affection of the Bulgarian people for the Soviet people. Our friendship has grown still stronger in the intervening period.

The friendship of our peoples has traditions of many centuries. Many were the times when our peoples fought side by side against a common enemy. Russian troops and Bulgarian volunteers fought together for the liberation of Bulgaria from the yoke of the Turkish empire.

I would also like to stress the historical bond between our cultures, whose roots go back a thousand years. Cyril and Methodius, the fathers of modern Slavonic letters, and their disciples in Bulgaria created the Cyrillic alphabet, the alphabet still used by the peoples of our countries today. (*Prolonged applause.*)

A spiritual bond linked the great Russian and Bulgarian educators and revolutionary democrats. Pushkin and Luben Karavelov, Chernyshevsky and Christo Botev expressed the progressive ideals and daring aspirations of the finest people of their time. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The revolutionary struggle of our peoples is also closely connected. Dimiter Blagoyev and Georgi Dimitrov are as well known in our country as in yours. (*Stormy applause.*) The finest sons and daughters of the Soviet Union and Bulgaria fought side by side against the fascist invaders.

Our friendship flowered to the full after September 9, 1944, when the Bulgarian working people embarked on the

road of socialist development. Soviet-Bulgarian friendship has become truly nation-wide, and no force on earth is now able to destroy it. (*Stormy applause. Audience scans, "Vechna druzhba!", "Friendship for ever!" Cheers.*)

Relations between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Bulgarian Communist Party, between the Soviet and Bulgarian peoples, are truly fraternal and cordial. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Audience scans, "C.P.S.U.-B.C.P.!" "C.P.S.U.-B.C.P.!"*)

We appreciate highly the great contribution of the Bulgarian Communist Party to the consolidation of the indestructible unity and solidarity of the Soviet and Bulgarian peoples, of the world communist movement and the strengthening of the socialist camp. (*Prolonged applause.*)

We Soviet people cherish our friendship with the Bulgarian people and the Bulgarian Communist Party. (*Stormy applause.*) You may rest assured, dear comrades, that the Soviet Union will always be a true and reliable friend to the Bulgarian people! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Audience scans, "Vechna druzhba!", "Friendship for ever!" Cheers.)*

Permit me once again, dear friends, to wish you on behalf of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and all the Soviet people further outstanding achievements in your glorious work. (*Stormy applause. Audience scans, "C.P.S.U.!" "C.P.S.U.!" Cheers.*) We are sure that under the tried leadership of the Bulgarian Communist Party and its Central Committee, led by the true son of the Bulgarian people and the wonderful fighter for the communist cause, Comrade Todor Zhivkov, the working people of Bulgaria will continue to march in the front ranks of the nations building socialism and communism. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Audience scans, "B.C.P.!" "B.C.P.!"*)

Long live the Bulgarian people–the true friend and brother of the Soviet people! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live the indestructible Soviet-Bulgarian friendship! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live the mighty socialist camp! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live world peace! (*Stormy, prolonged ovation. Audience scans, "Druzhba-mir!", "Peace and friendship!" "C.P.S.U.-B.C.P.! C.P.S.U.-B.C.P.!" Cheers.*)

## SPEECH ON THE DEPARTURE FROM SOFIA OF THE SOVIET PARTY AND GOVERNMENT DELEGATION

*May 20, 1962*

Dear Comrade Zhivkov,
Dear Comrade Ganev,
Dear Comrade Yugov,
Dear Comrades and Friends,

The stay of the Soviet Party and government delegation in the People's Republic of Bulgaria has come to a close.

Our tour of Bulgaria has been not only interesting, but also very instructive for all of us. The striking picture of prosperity in your country, the tremendous enthusiasm of its people, their readiness to stint no effort in multiplying their gains—all that is a graphic example of what a people can achieve under the new social system.

The speeches we have heard and the talks we have had with the Bulgarian working people noted without fail that the people of Bulgaria owe all their successes most of all to their leader, their organiser and source of inspiration, the Bulgarian Communist Party. (*Applause. Audience scans, "B.C.P.!" "B.C.P.!"*) This is an appraisal by the people of the activities of their Party.

The Bulgarian Communist Party is truly a party of the Leninist type. It has fine revolutionary traditions and has done great historic services to its own people and to the world communist movement as a whole.

The Bulgarian Communist Party matured in the liberative struggle of the Bulgarian people for people's power and the victory of socialism under the leadership of Georgi Dimitrov, that great son of the Bulgarian people.

The Soviet people fondly revere the memory of Georgi Dimitrov, that heroic fighter against fascism and war, for the unification of all progressive and democratic forces in the struggle for peace and social progress. We think highly of the big contribution he made not only to the liberative struggle of the Bulgarian people, but also to the world communist and working-class movement. Georgi Dimitrov was a great friend of the Soviet people, a champion of the unbreakable unity and friendship between the Bulgarian and Soviet Communists.

We are highly pleased that the Bulgarian Communist Party and its Central Committee, headed by Comrade Todor Zhivkov, are following in Georgi Dimitrov's footsteps and are doing their utmost to strengthen their fraternal friendship and close co-operation with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet people, the peoples of all the countries building socialism and communism. (*Applause.*)

The Bulgarian Communists have travelled a glorious and militant path and have led their country to the victory of the socialist system. At present, the Bulgarian Communist Party is leading the people unswervingly towards the completion of socialist construction.

It is a great credit to the Bulgarian Communist Party that it has managed to unify all the finest forces in its country and overthrow the fascist monarchy. It has succeeded in rallying the Bulgarian people, all the foremost forces of society, and has led them into battle for the victory of socialism in Bulgaria. The Fatherland Front founded by the Party has become a powerful mass organisation of the Bulgarian people.

The co-operation of the Bulgarian Communists with the Agrarian People's Union is doing a lot to strengthen people's power in Bulgaria. It is a wonderful example of joint action by the Communist Party and other parties and organisations of working people in the interests of successful struggle for socialist construction.

We note with satisfaction that the Bulgarian Communist Party, like the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, adheres firmly to the Declaration and Statement of Communist and Workers' Parties, that it defends the purity of the great Marxist-Leninist teaching against any and all revisionist, dogmatic and sectarian perversions, which are impairing the socialist and communist cause. (*Applause.*)

Yesterday, we signed a joint statement on the stay of the Soviet Party and government delegation in Bulgaria. It affirms the complete identity of views of the Central Committees of our two parties and our two governments in all questions concerning Bulgarian-Soviet Party and government relations, our identity of views concerning the contemporary international situation and the tasks of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Bulgaria for the promotion of lasting peace on earth.

Our delegation is going home. Allow me once more to express our sincere gratitude to the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, the Government of Bulgaria, the whole Bulgarian people, for this extremely warm and fraternal reception. (*Prolonged applause.*)

We wish you from the bottom of our hearts, dear Bulgarian brothers and sisters, great success in socialist construction. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Good-bye, dear friends. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers.*)

## RADIO AND TELEVISION SPEECH ON THE VISIT OF THE SOVIET PARTY AND GOVERNMENT DELEGATION TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA

*May 25, 1962*

Dear comrades, a few days ago the Soviet Party and government delegation returned from a visit to the fraternal People's Republic of Bulgaria, and I should like to set forth my impressions of our trip.

We went to Bulgaria on a return visit at the invitation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Government of the Republic. It will be recalled that in 1957 a Party and government delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria visited our country, and the Bulgarian friends then invited a Soviet delegation to visit their land.

Our visit to Bulgaria was interesting and useful in every respect. Our impressions were many. They were vivid, unforgettable impressions. I am at a loss for words to convey the extreme cordiality, warmth and affection which the working people of Bulgaria and their leaders showed for our delegation during our stay in that wonderful country.

Everywhere we went, the working people of Bulgaria asked us to convey their fraternal greetings to the peoples of the Soviet Union and their wishes of great success in the building of communism. The same was asked by the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, Comrade Zhivkov, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Comrade Yugov, the President of the Presidium of the National Assembly, Comrade Ganev, members of the

Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and of the Government. I should like to fulfil this request, and to convey to you, dear comrades, the cordial greetings and best wishes of our Bulgarian friends.

Our visit has again convincingly demonstrated that the Bulgarian people, their Communist Party and the leaders of Bulgaria are loyal and sincere friends who are ready, as Comrade Todor Zhivkov said, to march with the Soviet Union always toward the complete victory of communism!

There are no controversial questions between the Communist Parties and the governments of our countries. What is more, there are no questions even on which our views would differ.

It was easy to represent our people and our Party in Bulgaria. And if there was anything "hard" about the mission, it was the sun which beat down mercilessly. After the cool weather we had in Moscow and the quick plane flight it was not easy to get accustomed to the other weather. But this, too, was made easier by the extremely cordial hospitality accorded us by the Bulgarian people wherever we went.

During our stay in Bulgaria we expressed our heartfelt gratitude for this on more than one occasion. Permit me to express once again, in the name of our delegation, the Soviet Government, the Central Committee of our Party, in the name of the Soviet people, the most sincere and heartfelt gratitude to the leaders of the Bulgarian state and the Communist Party, to the entire Bulgarian people, for the unforgettable hospitality they showed us, the envoys of the Soviet people, of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Certain people in the West spread all kinds of fabrications about our visit to Bulgaria, claiming, for instance, that Khrushchov went to Bulgaria to iron out misunderstandings, to "paper over the cracks" in Soviet-Bulgarian relations. But, as so often happens with bourgeois press hacks, they again fell flat on their faces. The imperialists are looking for quarrels where none exist and can exist.

The unbreakable friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Bulgarian people has deep roots which go back to the distant past. It is cemented by blood shed in joint struggle against common enemies. During our stay in Bulgaria we visited Pleven and other heroic battlefields, where every inch of ground breathes the glory of the sons of our peoples who fought against Ottoman Turkey.

It was gratifying to see the great care and affection with which the people tend the monuments erected in many parts of Bulgaria to honour the Russian soldiers who fell in the common struggle against the Turkish oppressors, and the Soviet soldiers and Bulgarian patriots and partisans who fell in fighting the German fascists in the Second World War.

But it is not only history that unites our peoples and makes them kin. Now that Bulgaria follows the road of socialism, our friendship has acquired new lustre and is filled with new profound meaning. The noblest ideals for which the best sons of the Soviet and the Bulgarian peoples fought are now being realised in our joint accomplishments.

It was a pleasure to visit the towns and villages, the factories and agricultural co-operatives, and a research institute. We had friendly conversations with workers, peasants and intellectuals, and saw the results of their dedicated work. We gained the best of impressions from what we saw and from these cordial talks.

We all know that Bulgaria has once been a backward agrarian country. After the yoke of monarchy and fascism was thrown off, in the years of people's power, the country has built hundreds of industrial enterprises. The face of the Bulgarian countryside has changed thanks to the co-operative movement on the farms. Big progress has been made in the development of science and culture.

We visited enterprises of the Maritsa-Vostok power complex, a shipyard, a nitrogen fertiliser plant and a few other Bulgarian establishments. They were all created by the labour of workers, engineers and technicians, by the efforts of the gifted Bulgarian people. We met with wonderful representatives of the working class of Bulgaria—the leading force of the Bulgarian people in the struggle for the victory of socialism.

Our Bulgarian comrades have accumulated instructive experience in the socialist reorganisation of the countryside. In old Bulgaria, as formerly in the other People's Democracies, the peasant worked all his life on a small plot of land. The peasants were the poorest and most downtrodden class in tsarist Bulgaria.

People's power has helped the Bulgarian peasant to change his mode of life. The working class of Bulgaria and its militant vanguard, the Communist Party, have shown the Bul-

garian peasants the way to new, collective labour, and to a prosperous life. It is noteworthy that the co-operation of peasants was carried through in a planned and organised way and was accompanied by a rise in agricultural output.

We saw good, strong co-operatives with good new farm buildings and homes. What is most important, we saw the new Bulgarian peasant, the master of his land and an active builder of socialist Bulgaria.

The reorganisation of agriculture owes its success to the close co-operation which has existed for many years between the Bulgarian Communist Party and the Agrarian People's Union of Bulgaria.

The experience of Bulgaria, like the experience of the other socialist countries, refutes the fabrications of the enemies of socialism that after the establishment of people's power the Communists allegedly refuse to co-operate with the other parties of the working people. The joint harmonious work of the Communists and members of the Agrarian Union under the leadership of the Communist Party has done much to strengthen people's power and promote the success of socialist construction. This is of great importance not only to Bulgaria. It is a valuable contribution by the Bulgarian people to our collective experience. Collective experience is an inexhaustible source which enriches all of us and which gives us ever new strength in the struggle for the victory of socialism and communism.

We have the same goal. We follow the same road in the building of socialism and communism. To be sure, Bulgaria has its distinctive national and historical features. Using the experience of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries, our Bulgarian friends are skilfully applying Marxism-Leninism to the specific conditions in their own country.

The Bulgarian people owe their historic victories largely to the Bulgarian Communist Party. We have seen the immense prestige and deep respect it enjoys in the country. The working people of Bulgaria are fond of their Party primarily because it is closely connected with the people and serves the people loyally. The strength of the Bulgarian Communists lies in that they adhere firmly to Marxism-Leninism. Acting upon the behests of the great son of the Bulgarian people, Georgi Dimitrov, the Bulgarian Communists are successfully resolving the complex questions of socialist construction, and

follow unswervingly along the road of proletarian internationalism, cementing the friendship and unity of the peoples of the socialist countries.

Having preserved all the finest elements of the national liberation and revolutionary struggle of their people, the Bulgarian Communists have rallied and organised all the forces of the people for the solution of the historic tasks of socialist construction.

We discussed with our Bulgarian comrades many questions related to the practical construction of socialism and communism. Properly speaking, the working people of Bulgaria and we, too, face the same problems; they concern the development of various branches of industry, agriculture, science and culture. Take agriculture. In Bulgaria, as in our own country, the problems of farming concern greater crop yields and the productivity of animal husbandry, greater output of grain, industrial crops, vegetables, meat, milk and wool, and the introduction of more progressive organisational methods, better utilisation of machinery, etc.

The Bulgarian comrades and we, too, want to make the fullest use of all the wealth of our countries, to press this wealth into the service of the peoples. The same questions evidently face the other socialist countries. True, their practical solution depends on the specific conditions and on time in every individual country. But there is one indispensable condition common to all–it is labour, dedicated intensive labour, which produces all material and spiritual values.

To have good cities and villages, to have comfortable homes, to develop spiritual life, to have the people eat and dress well, to give children schooling and a higher education, it is necessary to increase material production all the time. All this is secured by the labour of the working class and peasantry, the labour of the people. And the higher the productivity of labour, the more machinery we create to replace manual labour, the more material and spiritual benefits we shall be able to provide for the people. That is the main task, comrades.

Labour ennobles and elevates man. That is why we keep saying: work, work and work.

We exchanged opinions on questions concerning the relations of the Bulgarian Communist Party and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. We noted with deep satis-

faction that our parties have always maintained relations of fraternal co-operation. They are based on the Declaration of the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1957 and the Statement of the Meeting of fraternal parties in 1960. Our parties have always stood for unity, close co-operation and fraternal mutual assistance among the socialist countries on a basis of equality, non-interference in internal affairs and proletarian internationalism. Our parties consider it their sacred duty to fight for the purity of the great Marxist-Leninist teaching, against revisionism, dogmatism and sectarianism, to fight for the unity of the entire communist and working-class movement, and to support to the utmost the national liberation movement of the peoples.

Both our parties hold that questions which unite us and cement unity should be pushed to the fore in the relations between fraternal parties. We, for our part, have always done our utmost for the questions arising between parties to be solved in a comradely spirit on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Every party should contribute to the cohesion of the communist and working-class movement and to the strengthening of the unity of the socialist countries. In approaching these matters, it should be conscious of the responsibility that devolves on every party for the cohesion and unity of the entire international communist and working-class movement.

Comrades, in the course of our meetings with the Bulgarian leaders we discussed many questions concerning the relations between our two countries. The talks revealed a complete identity of views on all matters, including international matters, and this has been put down in the joint statement of the Party and government delegations of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

It is needless to repeat what that document says concerning the present international situation in general, and the key international problems on which the future of the world largely depends and which are long awaiting a solution. This applies primarily to such problems as the German peace treaty and the question of West Berlin, disarmament and the discontinuation of nuclear tests.

I shall not restate our position on all these questions. It has been set forth in sufficient detail in statements by Soviet

officials and in the press. The position of the Western Powers on these questions is also well known.

It should be said that in all these matters the Western negotiators are intractable and reluctant to settle vital issues peacefully. They do not understand or do not want to understand the change in the balance of forces in the world over the last few years, and are still trying to pursue a policy from "positions of strength" in dealing with us.

The author of this wild doctrine has died, as you know, but the doctrine has not, and the present leaders of the Western Powers are on no account willing to renounce it. Yet the policy "from strength", which yielded no laurels to its maker, will yield no success either to those who try to continue it in our day. It is doomed to failure. Now that the might of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp has grown immeasurably, it is not wise, to say the least, to indulge in threats.

You have probably read in the Statement on the Soviet-Bulgarian talks that our delegation exchanged opinions with the Bulgarian comrades on the situation in South-East Asia. Recent events demonstrate that our analysis of the situation has been correct. We are convinced that in that part of the world, as elsewhere, the colonialists will ultimately have to renounce colonial policies not in words alone, but in their deeds.

In our discussion of the state of affairs in South-East Asia with the Bulgarian leaders we could not naturally overlook the situation in Laos. All progressives cannot but feel concern over the events which have occurred there recently.

The Soviet Government has been doing everything in its power to bring about an end to the war in Laos, which was started by the reactionary forces led by the rebel General Phoumi Nosavan with the support of U.S. militarists. The Soviet Government adhered firmly to the view that a coalition government headed by Prince Souvanna Phouma should be set up in Laos. We believed that such a solution of the question would ensure peace in that country and give satisfaction to the Laotian people.

At one time the normalisation in Laos seemed to be within stone's throw. Meetings took place between the three princes representing the main political forces in Laos. They

reached an understanding to entrust the formation of a coalition government to Prince Souvanna Phouma.

But this solution did not, evidently, suit the reactionaries. For this reason, Phoumi Nosavan and another member of the reactionary forces, Boun Oum, began to sabotage the agreement. The effect is rather strange: Boun Oum and Nosavan are sabotaging the cease-fire agreement in Laos, while the United States says it would like to, but is unable to exert an influence on the rebels. Yet it is common knowledge that Boun Oum, Phoumi Nosavan and the other Laotian reactionaries exist solely due to U.S. support.

A new provocation of the reactionaries in Laos at Nam Tha has come to light lately, which arouses strong suspicions of far-reaching aims. It is very likely that this provocation was designed to reincite large-scale military operations in Laos and thus furnish the United States with a pretext for intervening more actively on the side of the reactionary forces. Those were far-reaching designs, but the man who was to play first fiddle in them, Phoumi Nosavan, apparently overplayed his hand and failed to hit the note he was told to. Some of the units under his command and the population of the district refused to participate in this dirty scheme. The provocation was thus frustrated and boumeranged against its initiators.

This is a noteworthy fact. It is a serious warning to the Laotian reactionaries, and to those who support them. If Phoumi Nosavan and his clique persist in their policy of provocation and blackmail, this may add to the tension in Laos. It should be said that the decision of the United States Government to land American troops in Thailand is a serious obstacle to a settlement of the Laotian problem.

Some Western politicians seek to extricate themselves from the unenviable position in which they landed by supporting the reactionary forces in Laos, and blame the Soviet Union and other socialist countries for the recent events in that country. These gentlemen could be told: The reasons for what is going on in Laos lie in your own policy, in your supporting Boun Oum, Phoumi Nosavan and their like. Unquestionably, such a policy, if continued, is doomed to complete failure.

It may be noted with satisfaction that Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma, and the Pathet Lao leader, Prince Sou-

phanouvang, reaffirmed recently that they are abiding steadily by the agreement on the establishment of a coalition government of Laos reached at the meetings of the three princes. This accords with our views, and the Soviet Government will therefore, as before, abide by the positions set forth at the Geneva Conference on Laos and in the talks with President Kennedy in Vienna concerning the establishment of a neutral and independent Laos. We shall strive to prevent a war from flaring up in Laos and support the legitimate aspirations of the Laotian people.

Dear comrades, during the visit of our delegation to Bulgaria we saw once again how rapidly the material and spiritual forces of socialism are growing and gaining in strength. The socialist system creates the conditions for a people quickly to square its shoulders and become a veritable giant. Now, the peoples of the world are beginning to understand more and more that the truest way to happiness and prosperity is the socialist and communist way.

We shall always remember the meetings we had and the warm reception accorded to our delegation by the Bulgarian people. We rejoice sincerely over the achievements of the working people of Bulgaria. While visiting Bulgarian cities and villages we said, and would like to repeat now: We wholeheartedly wish the Bulgarian people, the Bulgarian Communist Party, its Central Committee headed by Comrade Todor Zhivkov, the Bulgarian Government headed by Comrade Anton Yugov, new and great success in their fine cause of socialist construction.

Together with our Bulgarian brothers we say: Soviet-Bulgarian friendship is strong and unbreakable. Our countries, our peoples, are on the right road. We are deeply convinced of the complete triumph of our cause, the great communist cause bequeathed to us by Vladimir Lenin.

Thank you, dear comrades, for your attention.

# SPEECHES MADE DURING THE STAY IN THE U.S.S.R. OF THE HEAD OF STATE AND CHAIRMAN OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE MALI REPUBLIC

## SPEECH ON THE ARRIVAL OF THE HEAD OF STATE AND CHAIRMAN OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE MALI REPUBLIC

*May 21, 1962*

Dear Mr. President,
Dear Gentlemen,
Dear Friends,
Comrades,

I greet you cordially, Mr. President, the Ministers who have come with you and all the other members of your party on behalf of the peoples of the Soviet Union, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., the Soviet Government and myself.

It is with a sense of great joy that we welcome today in the Soviet Union the envoys of the Mali Republic, a young African state: the outstanding statesman, the fighter against colonialism, for the freedom and independence of the peoples, the Head of State and Chairman of the Government of the Mali Republic, Modibo Keita, and his comrades-in-arms.

Dear friends, in your person we welcome the freedom-loving people of Mali, who have regained the independence robbed from them in the past by the colonialists, at the price of great effort and sacrifice, and who are now building a new life in their country. We know and appreciate the noble aspirations of the people of Mali and the serious tasks they confront.

The Soviet people believe strongly in the prodigious creative capacity of the Mali people, who have flung off the trammels of colonialism for ever, and we wish them success from

the bottom of our hearts in consolidating the independence of their state and in the building of a new life.

We are pleased that good, friendly relations have developed between the Soviet Union and the Mali Republic, that our countries are both fighting against imperialism and colonialism, for universal peace and for friendship among the peoples.

The Soviet people are with the peoples of Africa body and soul—with those that have already flung off colonial slavery and with those, too, that are still fighting for their freedom and independence.

We believe strongly that in spite of all imperialist attempts to protract the existence of the hateful colonial system, the final remnants of that disgraceful system of oppression and enslavement will soon be destroyed once and for all. No inch of soil on the vast expanses of the great African continent will any longer be trampled upon by the colonialists, by the boots of foreign invaders.

You may rest assured, Mr. President, that you will meet millions of sincere friends in the Soviet Union, who heartily wish the young Mali Republic every success in consolidating its independence and sovereignty, in developing its national economy and culture, and in the further enhancement of its international prestige.

May our friendship flower still more, may it yield abundant fruit for the welfare and happiness of our peoples, for the good of peace and progress on earth.

Mr. President, dear guests, welcome to our country!

## SPEECH AT A RECEPTION GIVEN BY THE HEAD OF STATE AND CHAIRMAN OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE MALI REPUBLIC

*May 29, 1962*

Dear President, Comrade Modibo Keita,

Dear Guests from the Mali Republic,

Comrades, Friends,

Dear guests, you have visited important and interesting regions of our country. After Moscow, you have visited Uzbekistan, which was a backward and oppressed area of Russia before the Revolution, and you have seen how that

republic has flowered under socialism. You have visited Leningrad, the cradle of the October Revolution, and have spent a day on the Black Sea shore in Sochi. We hope that some day you will again have an opportunity of visiting our country and seeing various parts of the Soviet Union. We regret that your visit is coming to a close.

Dear President, we were very happy to hear what you said about our country and the policy of the Soviet Government. You noted the efforts of our government in the struggle for the abolition of colonial slavery, of the disgraceful colonial system. You understand our policy correctly. The Soviet Union will fight on tirelessly with all the means at our disposal against those who wish to preserve colonial domination in the African and other countries until that domination is abolished.

The colonialists do not want to leave the countries they have enslaved. The imperialists will no more voluntarily give up exploitation of man by man and colonial domination than a tiger will learn to feed on grass. It is impossible to achieve liberation from the colonial yoke without a hard struggle. We have always struggled, and will continue to struggle for the complete abolition of the colonial regime. And we are sure that it will come.

[N. S. Khrushchov goes on to say that some two years before the United Nations passed a resolution on the abolition of the colonial system.]

The colonialist delegates did not oppose this resolution too strongly. Not because they liked it, for the resolution was aimed at liberating the colonial peoples from their rule, but because they realised that it is impossible in our time to retain the colonial system in its old form.

But although this anti-colonial resolution has been passed by the United Nations, the colonial system continues to exist. The blood of the peoples is still being shed in Angola, South Vietnam and other regions of the world where the colonialists want to maintain their rule over people and keep them enslaved. Although they have won formal independence, many African, Asian and Latin American peoples continue, in effect, to bear the colonial yoke. The newly free peoples and those who are in the act of liberating themselves from the colonial yoke must, therefore, be vigilant

and conscious of the fact that the imperialists, the colonialists are not letting the grass grow under their feet.

When the February bourgeois revolution occurred in our country in 1917, Khrushchov goes on to say, I remember everybody pouring out into the streets with red ribbons, shouting: "Long live the Revolution, down with the tsar!" It was very hard to tell a friend from an enemy at that time.

A similar situation is arising now with respect to the abolition of the disgraceful colonial system. Country after country is liberating itself from colonial oppression. The colonialists, too, who plundered, killed and planted poverty in those countries, are shouting their heads off today that colonialism should be abolished, that they oppose the colonial system, that they stand for civilisation. But the peoples of the enslaved countries have paid dearly for the "civilisation" sown by the colonialists. During the time the colonialists ruled the Congo, for example, its population shrank to less than half. That is the sort of legacy the colonialists have left behind. Yet they have the temerity to say that they brought the peoples civilisation.

[Khrushchov goes on to say that for many years the ideologists of the bourgeoisie have been predicting the downfall of Marxism. In our time, too, some of them say that Marxism has lived out its time.]

One may reply to them thus: Why do you fret so if Marxism has lived out its time? The imperialist ideologists say so to simpletons. They know perfectly well that Marxism-Leninism is winning the minds of the peoples more and more, and that its ideas have become a great force. In the past, these ideas were theory, whereas now they have taken on body and have been translated into practice in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, in the world communist and working-class movement, in the downfall of the colonial system and in the other developments which occurred and are occurring in the way Marxism-Leninism predicted.

[Khrushchov dwells on the tremendous successes of socialist construction achieved by the Soviet people. He speaks at length about the policy of the colonialists and about the struggle of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries against monopoly domination.]

The British, French, Portuguese, Dutch and other colonialists are rich, because they have for centuries plundered

the peoples inhabiting the vast colonies and cling to these colonies to this day. The colonialists plundered the Indians, Africans, Arabs and other peoples, yet now they say that they want to help them. But rather than talk of help, they should simply return to the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America whatever they took from them during the years of colonial exploitation.

[Khrushchov stresses that the Soviet Union did not interfere in the domestic affairs of peoples who are flinging off the oppression of capitalism. Soviet people are deeply convinced in the advantages of the socialist system, but do not impose their convictions on anyone.]

We are pleased to hear you say, Comrade President, Khrushchov goes on to say, that the people of Mali have embarked firmly on the socialist path of development, and we heartily wish you success in your fine undertaking of building a new, free life for the peoples.

The only solution for mankind is to abolish capitalism and imperialism. The means of production should belong to the people. All the values produced by people should belong to the people. That is what the Communists are working for.

Just picture what there would be if peace and socialism triumphed in all countries, if all the people abolished capitalism and embarked on socialist construction. The armies would be disbanded and the vast funds now spent on armaments would be spent on developing peaceful economy. If all the funds spent on armaments were to be channeled into satisfying the material and spiritual requirements, mankind would in some 10 or 15 years turn our planet into a paradise—not a heavenly one, but a real paradise on earth.

Dear Comrade Modibo Keita, our dear Mali friends, let me assure you on behalf of the Soviet Government and the Soviet people that they nourish sentiments of cordial friendship for the people of the Mali Republic. I dare say you will not find such friendly, truly fraternal feeling anywhere outside the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. We are your brothers.

Allow me to propose a toast to the Mali Republic, to its people, who fought selflessly against the colonialists and achieved freedom and independence!

To the Government of the Mali Republic, headed by Comrade Modibo Keita!

To the members of the delegation of the Mali Republic and all our Mali guests!

To successful socialist construction by the people of Mali.

## SPEECH AT A SOVIET-MALI FRIENDSHIP MEETING

*May 30, 1962*

Dear President, Comrade Modibo Keita,

Dear Mali Guests,

Comrades, Friends,

It is a great pleasure to welcome the distinguished guests from the young African state—the government delegation of the Mali Republic, headed by that outstanding statesman of new Africa, Comrade Modibo Keita, the President of the Mali Republic and Chairman of its Government. (*Prolonged applause.*)

We assume that during your tour of the Soviet Union you have familiarised yourselves with our economic, cultural and scientific achievements, that you have seen how the Soviet people are living and working and felt how deep their friendly feelings are for the Mali people and for you, their worthy envoys. You have seen how enthusiastically the Soviet people are working to fulfil the great programme of communist construction in our country. All this is being done for the sake of man, for the sake of peace and happiness on earth. (*Applause.*)

I believe that what our Mali friends have seen in our country was instructive and interesting. The Soviet Union is the first country in the world to have accomplished a socialist revolution. We have traversed a glorious path under the Marxist-Leninist banner, built socialism and already entered the period of the full-scale construction of communism. (*Applause.*)

The achievements of the Soviet Union are now acknowledged even by our enemies. They can no longer deny them, or hush them up as they did in the past. Soviet achievements cause fear among the enemies of communism. They see that no obstacles can stop our advance.

More than once war was made against us, and all sorts of attempts were undertaken to hold back our progress. After the October Revolution the Soviet people were forced to

fight a civil war, to repel the armed intervention of 14 imperialist states and to combat sabotage by the remaining beaten landowner and capitalist elements. The Soviet people gained a great victory over the German-fascist invaders. In spite of all enemy intrigues, they advanced steadily toward their goal.

Having visited our towns and villages, you have had a chance to see for yourselves how far once backward and semi-literate Russia has advanced in the period of socialist construction. The Soviet people are proud of their economic, scientific and cultural achievements.

The socialist system offers the people extensive opportunities for free creative endeavour and feats of daring. Is this not borne out by the fact that the Soviet people, the pioneers of the new social system, had the honour of being the first to launch their ships into outer space. (*Applause.*) The historic flights of our spaceships with Yuri Gagarin and Herman Titov crown the creative efforts of the Soviet people. How can we fail to be proud of this? (*Prolonged applause.*)

Intent on belittling the achievements of the Soviet Union in the eyes of other peoples, our ideological opponents often declare that the Communists make propaganda about their scientific and technological achievements and the exploration of outer space, while they have not yet eliminated shortcomings in their home, in their land.

What can we say about statements like this? We see both our achievements and our shortcomings. Not only do we see them, but we speak openly about them, and rally the people to overcome them.

We are not advancing to communism along a well-trodden path. We are blazing new trails, overcoming difficulties and obstacles, and combating the survivals that inevitably make themselves felt during the transition from one social system to another.

The social system changes only through resolute struggle by the new against everything old and outmoded, and against those who cling to the old. Especially great effort and time is required to alter the psychology of people, to make them think and build their life along new lines.

It would be a mistake to think that it is enough to proclaim, "We are for socialism", and then be able to lie down in the cool shade of a tree and expect everything to arrange

itself. No, a people building socialism must show much energy, persistence and diligence. But this diligence will more than pay for itself. The fruits of this labour will benefit the people, they will benefit society. (*Applause.*)

We would like our Mali friends to see and understand the complexity of the tasks that arise in the building of a new society.

The people of Mali, who have recently won national independence, are now at the crossroads, as it were, faced with the choice of which road to follow.

Naturally, all peoples want a happy life. But which way to it is better and truer?

The peoples of our country were the first to blaze the trail to socialism. We have been followed by the peoples of many other countries. The population of the socialist countries exceeds a third of the world population.

The choice of the further trend of development is of cardinal importance for every people. In the past, when capitalism reigned supreme, the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America had no chance, in substance, of settling this matter in their own interests. But with the present balance of forces in the world, when a realistic possibility exists of obtaining powerful support from the world socialist system, the peoples that have thrown off the chains of colonialism can follow whatever road they choose.

Liberated Africa presents a rather motley picture. Most of the nationalities inhabiting the continent–the Mandingo, Ewe, Fulbe, Nilotes, Ashanti, Arabs, Berbers, Bantu and others–have won national independence. But some countries have achieved genuine independence and can themselves decide what to do and how to do it, while others have so far won no more than an illusory independence. Juridically, they are independent states. They do not hang out the British or French flag now, but their own national flag. They have their own national anthems and some other attributes of statehood. But things there are much as they were under the colonialists who have saddled them with their own people in the guise of various advisers: political, economic and, most often, military. One can easily imagine what is left of "independence" if a country's economy, armed forces, even the police, are, in effect, controlled by former colonialists.

It is only natural that the peoples of these countries still

have a big struggle ahead of them for their rights, for genuine independence. It will be a hard and strenuous struggle because the old never gives place voluntarily to the new. In some cases it may be very acute, and even develop into an armed struggle despite national independence being already won.

This is best seen by the example of the Congo Republic, which achieved independence nearly two years ago. The colonialists make use of the local reactionary forces, commit the foulest of crimes and persecute and kill progressive Congolese leaders. They have killed the great Congolese patriot, a fighter for the freedom of all Africa, Patrice Lumumba. Chairman of the Senate Joseph Okito, Defence Minister Maurice M'Polo, Premier of Orientale Province Jean Pierre Finant, State Minister Jacques Lumbala and many other champions of genuine Congo independence have been killed by them. The Vice-Premier and associate of Lumumba, Antoine Gizenga, on whom is focused the hatred of the colonialists, has been thrown into prison.

As you see, the colonialists do not hesitate to employ cruelty. They do not shrink from crime in the effort to retain power and the opportunity to go on exploiting and plundering the peoples mercilessly.

Africa also has states where responsible offices are held by people handpicked by the colonialists and accustomed to handouts. Their skin is of the same colour as that of their fellow countrymen. But they have acquired their morals and habits in the service of the colonialists. When the colonial administration ruled supreme in their country, these people were accustomed to making their fortune on the sweat and blood of the people. After independence, too, they remain the henchmen of the colonialists and become even more dangerous for their people.

Tshombe is a typical specimen of this breed of traitors to national interests. But he is not the only one. Other African states, besides the Congo, have their own Tshombes. They have other names, and are perhaps more cunningly camouflaged, but keep on serving their old masters. The peoples are waging and will wage a struggle against them. They will advance new leaders from their own midst, honest and incorruptible, willing to give all their strength in the name of genuine national freedom. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Centuries of rule have taught the capitalists the most refined means of enslaving working people. They corrupt the upper section of the working class, split the trade unions and bribe the men they need. This is done not only through direct bribes, but frequently through all sorts of handouts. In short, the capitalists have many methods of corruption and bribery. Nor is it always the scoundrels that they bribe, but sometimes also honest but vacillating people, making them serve the interests of monopoly capital rather than the interests of the people.

The imperialists use the same foul methods in the young liberated countries. Through their paid agents they are trying to nullify the independence won by the peoples and to preserve the rule of the colonialists.

What the imperialists are practising in Africa and other regions is really the same policy of plunder practised at the time of the so-called classical colonialism. To be sure, in our times the imperialists cannot, as before, conquer peoples with gunboats and colonial troops. They are forced to disguise their policy by, so to speak, sweetening the pill and camouflaging their imperialist designs.

Missionaries and priests usually arrived before the colonialists in the past, and paved the way for capital with the cross and the Bible. The missionaries were followed by merchants, capitalists and, lastly, by the troops who completed the occupation. The situation has changed in many respects. In our time, the imperialists are forced to use other methods, to press entirely different people into their service, so as to pave the road to new markets and sources of raw materials. For this purpose they unscrupulously exploit the aspirations of the peoples in the economically underdeveloped countries for knowledge and economic progress.

The U.S. Government has recently established the so-called Peace Corps, the soldiers of which are engineers, doctors, teachers and students. The imperialists know perfectly well that it is impossible at present to keep people under their influence with nothing but the Bible and troops. Besides force, the imperialists seek to retain domination in the former colonial countries through an ideological indoctrination of the population and through economic means of enslavement. But these tactics, too, will not save them from failure. It is

clear that the so-called Peace Corps, or the Alliance for Progress in Latin America, are imperialist tools.

The winning of political independence by the former colonies is a very important step on the road to their full liberation from all kinds of dependence and exploitation by the imperialist monopolies. But the facts show that the winning of political independence does not yet bring about the elimination of the rule of finance capital in the economy of the liberated countries. Imperialism is looking for new means of attaining its colonialist goals. It is set on launching a collective onslaught on the young national states. Of late, the imperialist monopolies are pinning very great hopes on the so-called Common Market.

The ideologists of imperialism are praising this organisation to the skies, extolling the blessings it allegedly holds out to its member states. But these claims are far removed from reality. The Common Market is, in fact, a state-monopoly agreement by the financial oligarchy of Western Europe, which is a menace to the vital interests of all peoples, to universal peace, since the aggressive imperialist circles use it to strengthen NATO and step up the arms race.

The Common Market is also aimed against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. But our countries are now so powerful a force that we have nothing to fear from any Common Market. (*Prolonged applause.*) It is different for the young states of Asia, Africa and Latin America, which have only recently gained political independence and are not yet economically independent.

One of the main purposes of the Common Market is to hitch some of the liberated countries to the economy of the imperialist states and retain control over them. This goal is naturally veiled with resounding talk about "aid" to the peoples of the backward countries, the advantages of selling their products duty-free in the Common Market, and the like.

But what do we see in practice? The imperialists make the countries that associate themselves with the Common Market retain the old, warped colonial structure of their economy. Here is how it is put: you produce cocoa or ground nuts. So keep on producing them and supply Europe with them at a cheap price. As for the other commodities, especially manufactured goods, open your market to European-made goods duty-free and buy them at prices fixed by the monopolies. If

you try to build up a national industry—nothing will come of it, for the duty-free European commodities will stifle and totally destroy the sprouts of national production.

The imperialists know that industrialisation is the key to the independent development and economic progress of the young states, to the consolidation of their independence. This is precisely why the architects of the Common Market are raising insurmountable obstacles to the establishment of national industry.

Through the Common Market the imperialists want to swamp the African countries with their manufactured goods, and, of course, the newly founded industries of those countries are as yet unable to compete against them. At the same time, the imperialist monopolies want to create all kinds of barriers to the young independent states' selling their farm produce in the West European and American markets.

Subordination of the young sovereign African states to the Common Market is tantamount to their consenting to be agrarian and raw material appendages of the former metropolitan countries. But this was not what the African peoples fought for in their sacred struggle against colonialism. They have learned much in this struggle. They have accumulated considerable experience in political struggle. Their desire to maintain and strengthen their independence, for which they paid so heavily, is becoming ever more irresistible.

The peoples have leaders now who are vigilant with regard to the designs of the imperialists. President Modibo Keita expressed the sentiments and aspirations of the people of Mali and the other liberated countries of the African continent quite rightly in his speech to Mali journalists on March 17 when he said that Africa had been a preserve of the big powers, an appendage to their economic system of exploitation, and that the Mali Republic refused to be an appendage to their economic system of exploitation. He stressed the need to prevent a return to an economic system that would make it possible to retain colonial domination. (*Prolonged applause.*)

An antidote can, indeed, be found for every poison. Many of the young independent countries are introducing a system of strict government control over foreign trade and currency transactions. They are taking steps towards the establishment of a government monopoly on foreign trade. They are

planning to establish their own regional economic and trade associations independent of, and opposed to, the imperialist monopolies.

The time is gone when the imperialists could at will drive the peoples of underdeveloped countries into a hopeless impasse and doom them to enslavement. It is much easier now for the peoples that have cast off the colonial yoke to fight against imperialism. The world socialist community acts as a dependable shield for the peoples that are fighting for freedom and progress. The capability of the socialist countries to assist these peoples is increasing steadily. (*Applause.*) Furthermore, now that the newly free peoples are becoming the masters in their own home, favourable prospects are arising for them to apply their natural wealth, their material resources and manpower, all their internal opportunities to the attainment of full independence. Good prospects have arisen for the national revival of those countries. International economic relations of a new type, free from monopoly diktat, are taking root.

The basic interests of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples call for a radical improvement of the system of world trade. It is high time to eliminate from the practice of international trade all such methods as help the strong to line their pockets through trade with the weak. Yet it is these very vicious methods that constitute the essence of the Common Market policy with regard to the young national states.

The Soviet Government believes that the United Nations should not stand aloof from a question of vital importance to hundreds of millions of people. It considers as desirable to convene an international conference on problems of trade, which would discuss the establishment of an international trade organisation embracing all regions and countries of the world without any discrimination. (*Applause.*)

The idea of such a conference will undoubtedly be supported by many countries that oppose the policy of restricted economic alignments pursued by the Western Powers. Such a conference would be a way for the economically underdeveloped countries to protect their interests and stand up to the international union of capitalist monopolies.

The Soviet Union is striving consistently for equal, mutually advantageous international trade relations.

It is willing to conclude long-term trade agreements with the African countries. These agreements will give access into our country to commodities produced in African countries and will create a constant, stable market for them. At the same time, the African countries will be able to purchase on mutually acceptable terms the manufactured goods they need for the expansion of their economy, the advancement of the national industry and the consolidation of economic independence.

We are convinced that the socialist states and the freedom-loving independent countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America can jointly repel the plans of collective colonialism, which the imperialists are eager to enforce through the aggressive Common Market policy.

Some statesmen of the young African states consider the amount of credits granted or, as one now says, the amount of aid, as a criterion of the attitude of other countries. But this does not yet reflect the real attitude of the giving country. There is aid and aid.

It is one thing when the socialist countries render help to young independent states. It may be smaller than the amount promised by others, but it is disinterested aid. Its aim is to strengthen national independence. It helps friendly peoples to rise to their feet and to build their life as they want it. (*Applause.*) The Soviet Union, for example, has rendered considerable aid to India in the building of an iron and steel mill in Bhilai, and of other industrial enterprises. Why did we do this? It was not because we had a surplus of equipment for such mills. We sent India machine tools and equipment we could have used to advantage in our own economy. Yet we saw fit to meet India's urgent request, for she could not develop her national economy and strengthen her independence without her own steel and engineering industries. What other countries, save the socialist, would have done so, and rendered such disinterested help? (*Applause.*)

Monopoly capital acts on different motives. It likes to parade its "aid" to former colonial countries, depicting it as a show of concern for the underdeveloped countries. But these countries are economically underdeveloped because the imperialists, the colonialists plundered their peoples for many decades.

The imperialists profess to be helping these countries on humane grounds. They send lecturers and doctors. Sometimes, they build hospitals and roads, especially where they can use the latter to cart out valuable raw materials and plundered riches. But they see to it most zealously that the funds appropriated for so-called aid are not spent on industrial development, and that these countries do not process the raw materials they extract. The monopolists want to obtain in these countries the raw materials they need and to export them to their own countries for processing.

This is the substance of the colonialist policy of the imperialist countries. They create the appearance of caring for the needs of the underdeveloped countries, but are really concerned solely about their own purse, about increasing their capital, and are doing all they can to keep those countries under their thumb. The capitalists never give anything, not one dollar or mark, if there is no profit in it. Sometimes the monopolists know the profits will not roll in at once, and act with an eye to the future. This should be borne in mind, too. They set out to win the trust of an underdeveloped country, to hitch its economy to their own, and will then seize it with their tentacles like an octopus and feed on its blood. This should always be kept in mind.

Why is this so? Because exploitation of man by man is the very substance of the capitalist system, even in its embryo. Capitalism will not develop unless it extracts surplus value, as demonstrated by Karl Marx, the founder of scientific socialism, in his great works. Capitalism cannot exist in an environment where the exploiters are unable to appropriate surplus value. Merciless exploitation is the economic foundation of capitalist society, and its commandments are "man is to man a wolf" and "might is right". This is why the capitalists cling tenaciously to "private enterprise" and other so-called freedoms, which enable them to rob peoples, to rob those who work with impunity.

The monopolists, those "kindly gentlemen", render aid and provide credits not to help people out of a difficulty, but to make them work harder and to pocket the fruits of their labour. If, for all this, some of the representatives of the young states agree to unequal deals with the monopolists, they do so, apparently, because the capitalist way is more to their liking, and, besides, they hope to get a piece of the

pudding for themselves. They could not care less that their peoples are as oppressed as before, and that their states are enmeshed in unequal treaties due to such deals. However, in the long run the peoples of these countries will expose leaders of that sort and will embark on a truly independent road.

Some African countries have already made substantial progress in building up their statehood and advancing their economy and culture. This is largely due to the fact that men loyal to the interests of their peoples, schooled in the severe struggle against imperialism and colonialism, have assumed leadership in those countries.

We are pleased to note that the Head of State and Chairman of the Government of the Mali Republic, the esteemed Modibo Keita, said in his speeches and talks that the only right thing to do for the peoples liberated from colonial bondage is to realise the brilliant idea, the idea of socialism (*applause*), which triumphed in the Soviet Union as a result of the October Revolution and which is asserting itself day in and day out in the whole world. (*Prolonged applause.*) Dear President, in your message to the Mali people on the eve of the New Year of 1962 you said: "We have chosen socialism.... Mali has embarked on the road of revolution." The Soviet people can only welcome this decision. (*Stormy applause.*)

To be sure, the choice of the trend of development is the business of the peoples themselves. Ever more people in the world are coming to the conclusion that the socialist road is the only correct road. This has been borne out not only by the scientific theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin, but also by practice, by the living experience of the peoples of the Soviet Union, of great China, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Rumanian People's Republic and the other socialist states. (*Applause.*)

Dear Mali friends,

The Soviet-Mali friendship is not of long standing. As recently as four or five years ago, artificial obstacles raised by the imperialists separated many African peoples from the Soviet Union and from the other socialist countries. But our friendship grew and gained sinew in joint struggle against imperialism and colonialism. This friendship has been beautifully expressed by our guest, a member of the Mali delegation, the poet Mamadou Gologo:

*Uniting our efforts,*
*We shall build a canal of great friendship.*
*And its solid banks*
*Will be as firm as our loyalty.*
*It will unite the mighty waters,*
*of all the fraternal rivers–*
*from the Niger to the Volga,* (applause)
*It will unite your birch groves*
*with our sultry savannas;*
*and the throbbing heart*
*of the Mali people*
*with the tireless and truthful heart*
*of the people building communism.*
(Prolonged applause.)
*The day will come and*
*the mighty wing of the*
*indomitable eagle of freedom*
*will glitter in a cloudless sky at dawn,*
*and pass just sentence*
*on the world of evil,*
*greed,*
*lies,*
*and violence,*
*eaten by rust.* (Prolonged applause.)

Dear comrades,

There is a good saying: "If you have no friend, look for one, and when you find him, keep him." (*Applause.*) The Soviet Union has many friends all over the world, and it has found many friends in the new independent Africa. We treasure this friendship as the apple of our eye. We regard it as a common treasure of the peoples, growing year after year. The people of the Republic of Mali may rest assured that the Soviet Union will always be its true friend. (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live the friendship between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Mali! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live the freedom of the peoples of Africa! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live world peace! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. All rise.*)

## SPEECH ON THE DEPARTURE FROM MOSCOW OF THE HEAD OF STATE AND CHAIRMAN OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE MALI REPUBLIC

*May 31, 1962*

Dear President, Comrade Modibo Keita,
Dear Mali Guests,
Comrades, Friends,

Allow me to say a few words of parting before you leave our country.

To begin with, I must say that we sincerely regret having to part with you, Comrade President. I am sure that this feeling of regret is experienced by all the Soviet representatives present here, by all Soviet people who have had the privilege of meeting you and getting to know you.

We hope that you have noticed the warmth and sincerity of the friendly feelings which the Soviet people have for the people of Mali. We would like you to convey these feelings to the people of Mali. May every Mali know that he has millions of loyal Soviet friends on this other continent, thousands of kilometres away from his country.

We in the Soviet Union know how to prize friendship. The friendship of the peoples of our country has become a powerful source of the strength of Soviet society. The foreign policy of our country is imbued with the ideas of friendship and co-operation among the peoples of all countries. This is why we are happy that a strong friendship has developed between the Soviet Union and the Mali Republic in the few years since its establishment. This friendship is based on an enduring foundation of mutual respect and confidence, on the joint struggle for peace and for the freedom of the peoples.

The activities of your Government indicate that the Government and people of Mali know their real friends from those who merely parade as friends.

The common interests of our countries, the identity of views on many important international issues give us good reason to say that there is a firm basis for the further development of sincere friendship and broad, fruitful co-operation between the Mali Republic and the Soviet Union. This

has been reaffirmed in the joint Soviet-Mali communiqué signed yesterday.

We were very happy to meet you in person, the leader of the Mali state, a distinguished statesman of the new Africa, and to meet the prominent statesmen and public leaders of the Mali Republic who have come here with you. We wish sincerely that the personal contacts established during your visit should continue to multiply for the good of our countries, in the interests of peace and friendship among all nations.

I beg you, Comrade President, on behalf of all Soviet people, to convey to the people of the Mali Republic cordial greetings and wishes of success in their creative labour and the building of a new life.

From the bottom of our hearts we wish you health, happiness and fresh success in your activities.

Happy journey, dear friends! Until we meet again!

# SPEECH AT THE OPENING OF THE ITALIAN EXHIBITION IN MOSCOW

*May 28, 1962*

Please excuse me, Mr. Ambassador, for asking you to let me speak. I know it was not envisaged in the plan of the opening ceremony, but after hearing your speech and the speech of Mr. Piero Savoretti, the Director-General of Novasider, which represents the 60 Italian firms that sent their products to the exhibition in Moscow, after hearing the speech of Comrade Patolichev, the Minister of Foreign Trade of the U.S.S.R., I, too, have a desire to speak in connection with this Exhibition.

To begin with, allow me to express our gratitude to the Italian business world for taking part in this Exhibition. Your Exhibition is not a government-sponsored affair, but an exhibition of Italian firms, an exhibition organised by businessmen, by the industrialists of Italy. It gives us special pleasure to note that many Italian businessmen hold a realistic view on the improvement of economic relations between countries, and that they are showing their realism by having organised this Exhibition in order to display their products in Moscow. This indicates that they appreciate the prevailing situation in the world, and, if you like, it speaks of their courage and vision. (*Applause.*) This is why we express our gratitude to them.

We are also pleased to note that the commercial turnover between the Soviet Union and Italy has increased more than eightfold between 1953 and 1961, and that trade with the firms here represented has increased tenfold in the last few years. Trade is just the thing to improve relations between countries, something all people want. It should be said that this expansion of trade occurred in spite of the pressure which, as we have learned, was exerted on the Italian industrialists to make them curtail, rather than develop, commerce with the Soviet Union. But they ignored this pressure. (*Applause.*)

That was sensible. It promotes better relations between countries and strengthens peace, in which all people have a vested interest.

We should look at things realistically, of course, and understand the fact that this is not a matter of generosity on the part of either the Communists or the capitalists, and that trade between our countries is a mutually advantageous operation. If Italy's businessmen trade with us, if they sell us good machines, which we need, they are not doing it for our good looks, but because there is a profit in it. When we buy the good commodities, the good machines produced by the Italian workers at factories owned by the capitalists, we, too, do not pursue the purpose of supporting capitalism in Italy. When the Italian capitalists sell us their machines, they do not pursue the purpose of supporting the communist movement and the Soviet Union, which, as it were, is considered the leader of world communism.

No, the deals are prompted by a realistic appraisal of the prevailing conditions. There are socialist and capitalist countries in the world. They exist on the same planet. We want normal trading relations and scientific and cultural contacts to develop between these countries, we want them to transact mutually advantageous deals and thereby strengthen what we call peaceful coexistence. (*Applause.*)

The rabid anti-Communists oppose trade with the Soviet Union. They say that such trade supports communism, that it promotes technical and scientific development in the socialist countries. But it is now clearly evident from the heights of outer space that such views are nonsense. In spite of various bans on trade instituted against us by certain groups in the Western countries, the Soviet people broke through into outer space earlier than members of the capitalist world. It follows that those who tried to stamp out trade between the capitalist countries and the Soviet Union have made a mess of it, and we soared into space and still retain priority in space exploration. The United States now also has two spacemen, but our own Yuri Gagarin was the first man in space, and Herman Titov has orbited the globe 17 times, which is more than anybody else has done.

I congratulate Scott Malcolm Carpenter, the American spaceman specially, because he has really shown great courage. If his courage had failed him, he may have been fried

alive in his spaceship. The press reported that he had been advised from Earth to drink more water and thus combat the high temperature in the capsule. I am glad that the courageous spaceman kept his nerve in a difficult situation and completed his flight safely.

I repeat, the main thing now is to trade. It is clear to everybody by now that the attempts to isolate the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in matters of trade have failed.

It would be a good thing if those who make policy in the West realised what the Italian industrial and business groups have realised: buy and sell if it is profitable, and do not buy or sell if it is unprofitable. That is not a formula of our own invention. It is a general rule.

If the people we trade with were to adhere to this rule, it would benefit both sides. We would probably never have designed or produced many of the machines now being manufactured by Soviet industry, and would have employed the services of the foreign firms that had already launched the output of these machines. That would have been profitable both for us and for the countries and firms that make these machines. We buy equipment for entire factories in Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Japan, Britain, Sweden and other countries. Our economic relations with Italy are especially good. We hope that these relations will prevail and develop in the future.

The opponents of economic relations with socialist countries are concentrating their efforts on the creation of the so-called Common Market of European countries and of other exclusive economic associations. These pursue not only economic, but also political aims. The Soviet Union has existed for almost 45 years. All sorts of measures have been taken in these years to retard our development, but every time their organisers suffered defeat. The same will happen to the European Community if it acts against the socialist countries, and that is exactly what it is designed to do. That tree will wither before it ever produces any good sprouts.

It just occurred to me that three years ago an exhibition of a certain foreign country was held on these grounds. A small house was built here, and in the kitchen of that house I had to engage in a dispute which was widely discussed. Incidentally, the kitchen was called the kitchen of the future.

There are no other kitchens like it in the world. The representatives of the country which exhibited this kitchen said they were not so foolish as to build such kitchens.

The purpose of that exhibition–I shall not name the country, because we respect its people–was quite obvious: to stun Soviet people with the unusual kitchen and other window-dressed domestic utensils. The exhibition created an unenviable impression on Soviet people, because it was nothing but propaganda. We, too, as the saying goes, are old hands at propaganda. (*Merriment. Applause.*)

To be sure, the "kitchen" has done its job: the man who extolled it seems to have singed his wings in it. He was defeated in the presidential elections of his country.

Today, we are especially pleased to examine specimens of Italian make into which Italy's workers, engineers and scientists have put their work. This is a good place for a dispute, too, but not of a propaganda nature. One might wonder how best to use this or that machine, to see, as is the Russian custom, whether it is well made, to weigh whether its price is suitable, and whether it is worth buying. That is a business-like approach. (*Applause.*)

We welcome those Italian businessmen who treat trade with our country seriously. We respect that sort of approach.

I take this opportunity to express our gratitude to Mr. Pietromarchi, the former Italian Ambassador to the U.S.S.R. He has done a good deal to promote economic relations between Italy and the Soviet Union. Let me reveal a "secret". When Mr. Pietromarchi was leaving his post and you, Mr. Straneo, were appointed to replace him, we wondered what the new Ambassador would be like, what his attitude would be towards the Soviet Union, and to the development of business and other contacts between our countries, whether it would be as favourable as the previous Ambassador's, or not?

I must say that we are highly satisfied that Mr. Straneo views the necessity of developing economic relations between our countries with the same understanding as the previous Ambassador. We are grateful to you for this. (*Applause.*) I cannot express any greater praise, because when I, a Communist, praise an official of a bourgeois state, I never know whether it is going to be good for him. (*Merriment.*)

I should like to express our gratitude to the Prime Minister of Italy, Mr. Fanfani, for helping to arrange this Exhibition.

Although it is an exhibition of individual firms, it appears that Mr. Fanfani, unlike many shortsighted leaders of the NATO countries, took a neutral attitude to some extent. This indicates a desire to develop good relations. I do not know, perhaps I have even gone too far, saying good things about Mr. Fanfani. I hope he will not misunderstand me. Perhaps what I said does not reflect his attitude to this matter. But what I state here is my own understanding and my own attitude.

Attending this opening ceremony, I thought: If there were some force to induce the Italian Government to follow a neutral policy, the Italian people and other nations would win so much from it. (*Applause.*)

I shall not say any more on this subject, so as not to involve you in a political dispute. Here, it is much better to stay within the bounds of business and to open the Exhibition of the achievements of Italian industry.

We shall look at the exhibits with pleasure. We shall be ready to buy everything that is of interest to the Soviet Union with respect to the technical merits of the machines, their reliability and fair price. (*Merriment.*) We shall say: This is a thing we want to buy, and will issue the Minister of Finance the instruction to pay up. (*Applause.*)

Thank you. I wish your Exhibition success. (*Applause.*)

# FRIENDSHIP FOR EVER!

## SPEECH AT A MEETING OF SOVIET AND CUBAN YOUTH

*June 2, 1962*

Dear Comrades,

Our young Cuban friends,

Allow me to welcome you on behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

A very good idea was expressed by Comrade Fidel Castro—he was the first to say that it was necessary for a thousand young Cubans to go to the Soviet Union, and for the Soviet young people to go to Cuba, so that the young Cubans would work here and acquire professional knowledge and, which is the main thing, live among our youth, among our people. It has also been useful for our young people to go to Cuba, to share their knowledge with our Cuban brothers, to work among the Cuban people and obtain a better feeling of the revolutionary spirit that has covered the Cuban people with glory in the struggle for their freedom, their independence, against the tyrants of Cuba—Batista and the other placemen of the American imperialists. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

A year has passed before you even noticed it. I shall not describe here how you worked, lived and made friends, because I know this only by hearsay, while you did the work yourselves, and you yourselves made friends with our young people.

We are very pleased with your stay in the Soviet Union, and I see that you are also pleased. Now, we are giving you a festive send-off. You will come home not as holiday-makers. Hard, persevering work and struggle lie ahead for you. The revolution demands that you be staunch and deeply aware of the developments now under way in Cuba.

Armed struggle against the enemy is a difficult struggle. But this difficult armed struggle is better understood by the broad sections of the people, because the enemy is right there,

on the other side of the barricade, and one can tell it not even with one's brain, but with one's heart. He fires at you, and you must fire back if you want to win, if you want to survive.

Much more difficult conditions for a nation, for the young people, arise after the enemies are defeated in battle. The enemies are beaten, but they remain among the people. A concealed struggle ensues in place of an open armed struggle. This is a more difficult struggle, and it calls for a deeper understanding, for greater revolutionary experience, for skill in spotting the camouflaged enemy. The enemy no longer appears with a rifle in his hand, he may be dressed in the same sort of worker's jacket that you wear yourselves. No longer does he act in the open, no longer does he call openly for acts against Fidel Castro, against the revolution. He creeps into your ranks like a snake, striving to disrupt the unity of the Cuban revolutionaries, the Cuban people, in order to pave the way for your overseas enemies. The latter are waiting for this.

To many Cubans this calls for an explanation. Cuba has defeated its enemies, but Cuba also has its difficulties. The wisdom and strength of the revolution lies in that it successfully surmounts difficulties. When our Revolution had won under Lenin's leadership, the peoples of the Soviet land had to wage a fight against the forces of counter-revolution. After the whiteguards and the interventionists from 14 countries were routed, difficulties arose that were not less than those of the Civil War. We had to restore the factories and the mines, we had to mine coal and develop production, because the requirements were growing and had to be satisfied. The only way to satisfy them was to increase production, creating new values for the benefit of the people.

Those were difficult tasks. I recollect my youth, the first years of the Revolution, the Civil War. It was much easier to talk to the Red Army men during the Civil War than to explain the new tasks when I returned from the Civil War and worked at the mines, the same mines where I worked before the Revolution. You and many others will have to go through this.

Our people rebelled against tsarism and capitalism, because they were poor, oppressed and robbed. But wealth does not increase at once after the people win. After the revolution wins and power is seized, the people have to build an

industry, advance farming and work very hard before they get what they fought for in the revolution, what they shed their blood for, what they gave their lives for.

Other tasks arise in these conditions. The shooting is over, because the enemy is smashed. It is time to pick up the shovel and work. Sweat may stream down your face, but you have to work and work. Furthermore, while you work you receive little for it, because too little wealth has yet been created, and the state cannot satisfy all the requirements of the people. Some people will begin to say: What is happening, Fidel Castro called for a revolution, and we followed him. We smashed Batista, but now there is not enough meat, not enough rice and not enough milk—what sort of a revolution is that? (*Animation.*)

For this reason, the situation calls for more than heroism, than the ability to meet the enemy with arms in hand, or even flinging oneself on the enemy, on his machine-guns. What you need is a high sense of purpose, an understanding of the situation. It would appear, since we won and there is peace and no war, there should be meat and sugar cane—produce sugar and feed everybody. (*Animation.*)

Yes, comrades, this may look simple on the face of it. But to achieve this, a long and difficult road has to be traversed. Factories have to be built, machines have to be made, culture has to be advanced, all people have to be educated, and all that takes effort and quite a lot of time.

It calls for an appreciation of the fact that the work you do today is required for life to be better tomorrow.

I was a miner before the Revolution, and my father was one, too. Before the First World War a worker was better off than during the Civil War and in the first period after the whiteguards and interventionists were beaten. Yes, he was better off. Why? Because, though tsarist Russia was backward, its people worked, the workers and peasants created material values. During the Civil War the country's economy was devastated. We had to create these values anew. The mine where I worked before the Revolution produced a lot of coal, and it was sent to different parts of the country. But when I returned to it from the Red Army, it produced so little coal it could not even provide for the needs of its own power station.

The situation was very difficult in our country. In those days, it was up to us to realise that those were temporary

difficulties, that the people had to unite and organise in order to surmount the difficulties, to develop industry and agriculture, and to promote science and education. It was up to us to realise that once all this was done, the free people would create values they never dreamt of before. But to do all this, the people had to be deeply aware of the tasks confronting them; it called for great tenacity.

When you return to Cuba, you will also encounter some difficulties. They are not like the difficulties we had to face in the first few years after the Revolution, but they are inevitable. You, fighters, must show political and ideological tenacity in order to achieve still greater unity under the leadership of your Party, under the leadership of that wonderful Cuban, Fidel Castro, the fearless Fidel Castro, the pride not only of Cuba, but of the whole revolutionary world. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers for Fidel Castro.*)

As you see, instead of the poetic words of greeting which you probably expected to hear, I am speaking a harsh prose, because you have to prepare yourself now for work and struggle, for work and struggle! (*Stormy applause.*)

Cuba is a free country which has won its independence and driven out the placemen of U.S. imperialism. But you are next door to the mightiest imperialist power. The imperialists will not reconcile themselves to the Cuban flag, hoisted by the people of Cuba under the leadership of Fidel Castro, fluttering victoriously over free Cuban soil. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Your task is somewhat easier than the one we had to tackle in our time, because we were the first and our country was the only socialist country for many years. You could come to the Soviet Union, live and work among us for a year, and, so to say, experience the enthusiasm of communist construction at first hand. Besides, we are helping Cuba in a few other ways, too: arms and other things. In the future, too, we promise to help you. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

But support, even help with arms, is useful on the sole condition that these arms are held firmly by those who are given them to defend their freedom and independence. That depends on the unity of the people, and unity depends on the maturity of the people.

Therefore, young friends, I call on you to be true soldiers of your revolutionary Party, your people, your government,

so you will march forward under the leadership of Fidel Castro—that man who is supremely loyal to the revolution, to the people—hearing his voice and responding to his appeals with the right kind of deeds, marching forward in serried ranks to surmount difficulties under the leadership of the Party and the Government. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

The building of socialism, the building of communism, comrades, calls for keen political consciousness, intelligence and hard work. It is more than 44 years since we, Soviet people, began building socialism. Now, we are building communism. We have done a great deal and have achieved a great deal. We were the first to launch artificial Earth satellites. Our spacemen were the first to penetrate into space. I see everybody is looking at Yuri Gagarin and Herman Titov. We welcome our heroes, the cosmonauts! *(Stormy, prolonged applause. All rise and give a standing ovation to Yuri Gagarin and Herman Titov.)*

We have built up a huge industry and keep on developing it. We have advanced our agriculture. We have re-equipped it technically and done away with the wooden plough. You have worked here yourselves and have had to deal with tractors, harvester combines and other elaborate machines.

From 1953 to 1961 the gross output of agriculture increased in our country by 60 per cent. The grain output in this period climbed from 5,036 million to 8,422 million poods. Today, our country satisfies in full its requirements in grain for food. Meat output in this period grew from 5,800,000 tons to 8,800,000 tons, that of milk from 36,500,000 tons to 62,500,000 tons and sugar from 3,434,000 tons to 6,085,000 tons. In the same space of time, that is since 1953, the sale of meat and meat products through the state-operated shops increased from 1,757,000 tons to 4,033,000 tons, the sale of milk and milk products from 1,980,000 tons to 9,393,000 tons, the sale of butter from 330,000 to 632,000 tons and the sale of sugar from 2,410,000 tons to 4,550,000 tons.

Those are very high achievements, comrades. But in spite of them we are still experiencing difficulties; not small difficulties either. While increasing production, we have also increased pensions, raised the wages of the lower-paid factory and office workers, and carried out other measures. As a result, the cash income of the population has grown considerably in the last few years. We are therefore having

difficulties, because the people have more money than there are commodities available, produced by our industry and agriculture. Material values are produced by the people themselves, and not by the government. The government only guides and directs, while the people create everything.

A situation has arisen where we, a socialist country, the Soviet Union, the Soviet Government, the Central Committee of our Party, had to adopt the decision announced yesterday. Of course, this decision is being well received by the collective farmers who will now be able to sell their livestock at a higher price. Such increases are always applauded. This does not call for a high level of political consciousness.

The response of the urban population, who will buy the meat and meat products at higher prices, is different. The people understand why this decision is necessary, but I would not say that it is pleasant for them. The people understand that it is doubly unpleasant for the Central Committee and the Government. It would have been much easier for me, the Secretary of the Central Committee and Chairman of the Council of Ministers, to sign a decision saying: Give everything to everybody and ask nothing from anybody. (*Animation. Applause.*) It could be done. I could then have gone around and said: Look, the people are welcoming this, all are satisfied, because we are giving things away to everybody. But it is different when you have to sign a decision whereby you give to one category of people, and tell the others: Please understand that these difficulties are no more than temporary, but you will have to face up to them. Of course, they face up to them, and sometimes say: How good it would be, if we had no difficulties to face. (*Animation. Applause.*) I know, too, that it is better not to have difficulties.

Comrades, when I and the other comrades were examining this question, we recalled how Lenin acted when he encountered difficulties. I remember the end of the Civil War. We had routed the whiteguards and the interventionists. We had won. Soon after that, Lenin, the Central Committee of our Party, passed a decision: to introduce what was known as the New Economic Policy, NEP. What was this policy, what did it mean? The New Economic Policy gave some leeway to the capitalist elements inside the country. But it acted upon the need of strengthening the positions of socialism in the country. Lenin said: It has to be done, NEP has to be adopted. He

even went so far as to grant concessions to foreign capitalists if they wanted such concessions in our land.

We had fought, and had beaten the whiteguards, smashed all our internal enemies and the foreign interventionists, and were celebrating our victory. At that hour Lenin said that, perhaps, we would have to give concessions, give some leeway to the capitalist elements. It had been difficult, comrades. Some Party members did not understand the need for such a policy. They pulled out their Party cards and said: I am resigning from the Party.

I was secretary of a district Party committee at the time. One ex-Red Army man decorated with the Order of the Red Banner turned in his Party card, rented a flour mill and began grinding flour. Why? He decided to make money. He took the New Economic Policy to mean that the Communists were retreating and flinging open the door to private capital. He believed one had to adjust oneself and not miss the bus. (*Animation.*) But he went bankrupt, and was ashamed of himself for not having controlled himself. He fought at the front, fought against the enemies of the revolution in open battle, but when the open enemy was routed, and when it was necessary to show great courage and political consciousness, to follow Lenin through the years of NEP, just like he charged the enemy at the fronts, under Lenin's banner, this former Red Army man lost his spirit.

But the Party discarded such people and went its own way. With the help of NEP, Soviet power raised the country's economy and improved the agricultural situation. In the years that followed, as you know, socialism won a complete victory in our country and at present our people are successfully building communism. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

But we have difficulties, too; there is not enough meat and not enough butter. It must be said, comrades, that in our country the butter output per head of population is greater than in the United States, the richest country of the capitalist world. But in America there is any amount of butter in shops, while we are experiencing a shortage of it. Why is that? In capitalist countries the shops are full of good things, but only people who have the money can buy them, and there is only a limited number of such people. In the United States there are 4 to 5 million unemployed, and in addition many people who work a short day. Millions of peo-

ple there are deprived of the opportunity to enjoy the wealth of their country. In America, against a background of capitalist wealth, great numbers of working people suffer from unemployment, poverty and hunger.

Things are different here. We undertook to reconsider the system of wages, in order to increase them for many brackets of factory and office workers. This was the right thing to do; we knew that a certain part of the working people earned little, and that their wages had to be increased. We did it with the best of intentions. But agricultural production could not keep pace with the growth of the requirements of the population. It did not fulfil the plans, and the result was that people had much more money than opportunities to satisfy the demand for meat and butter. Therefore, queues grew in the shops.

What was to be done to remedy this situation? We decided that, first of all, it was necessary to increase the procurement prices for livestock produce paid to the collective farms and state farms. Why? At present, the meat on many collective and state farms—the breeding of cows, pigs, sheep and poultry—costs more than we pay for it. We cannot let this go on. If I were to say in my speech, come on, comrades, buck up, increase the output of meat, they would listen and think—what is he telling us to do? After all, we know that the more cows and pigs the collective farm raises, the more of them it sells to the state, the greater its losses. Could a production increase be expected in those circumstances? Of course not.

Frankly, it was not easy for us to take this decision. What to do? What is the way out? We decided to tell the truth to the people, to the Party. We are sure that the Party and the people will today understand this decision correctly, though it is not popular, but it is necessary to create better conditions tomorrow for the growth of material values in our country. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Who can we, the Central Committee and the Government, ask for advice? None but our people, our Party. We must tell them the truth and indicate the right way of overcoming the existing difficulties. We have done so, we have written it candidly in our Appeal to the people.

I do not know whether the Cuban comrades have read this Appeal, whether their Soviet friends have read it to

them, but all our young people present here have certainly read it. In our Appeal we described the prevailing situation and outlined the measures for increasing the output of livestock products.

To be sure, our enemies, the enemies of the socialist system, would prefer some other solution. There could have been a different solution. What solution? To assign additional big allocations for the development of animal husbandry at the expense of industry, by curtailing capital investments for the country's defence. That is the kind of solution our enemies would prefer. But, comrades, such a solution would act as a brake on our industrial development; it would undermine the country's defensive potential. We would thus have created the conditions our enemies are itching for. We cannot do this—no Communist, no politically conscious worker, no politically conscious farmer, no politically conscious office worker or intellectual will ever agree to our reducing expenditures on the country's defence in the present conditions. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

In our country every citizen, every family knows what war is like. The Second World War affected nearly every family—nearly every family had someone killed or wounded—but that was the past war, comrades. This time, if we are going to be weak, the imperialists are liable to start a new war, a thermonuclear war, which will involve millions upon millions of victims all over the world. The tank used to be the most powerful weapon, but in the context of nuclear weapons and rockets it is no longer the mighty weapon it was. When an atomic bomb explodes, the man in the tank has not even a chance to fire; he dies instantly.

Therefore, comrades, we—the Central Committee, the Government—put at the helm by the will of the Party, the will of the people, know the times we are living in; we know how eagerly our enemies, the enemies of communism, are waiting for a chance to wipe the socialist countries off the face of the earth. So we say to them: No, Messrs. imperialists, you will never succeed! Why? Because we have become stronger. The economic and defensive potential of the Soviet Union, of all the socialist countries, has increased. In this lies our strength. To prevent a war, therefore, we must work, economise, distribute our resources properly and always see to the country's defences. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Comrades, a year or two will go by and you will see that our decision to help agriculture will have a beneficial effect on the entire economy of the country. Agriculture will develop rapidly. Besides this decision, we have also taken other measures to assist agriculture: to provide the collective and state farms with more tractors, to build more factories making mineral fertilisers, to provide agricultural machinery and other resources. Measures are being carried through to furnish more incentives to collective farmers and state-farm workers, which will stimulate the farmers' interest in the results of their work. Now, we have the machinery, we have the material resources, we have experienced personnel, properly trained and educated. We shall increase the output of agricultural produce substantially, and will see to it that the population's requirement in these products is fully satisfied. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.)*

To solve this task more successfully, it is necessary to reorganise the management of agriculture. We are now carrying out this reorganisation.

Not only our young Cuban friends have come to this hall; our hosts—the young Muscovites—are here, too. This hall seats 6,000. One thousand of you are Cubans. This means that five thousand comrades here are Muscovites.

We wish you, comrade Cubans, a happy journey and success in your work. We wish you determination and courage. Your courage will depend on your understanding of the developments, on your loyalty to the people, to the cause of the revolution.

I have read the speech Fidel Castro made when he was being tried by Batista judges. It reads like a poem. He was at the mercy of his enemies. He did not think his life would be spared. Yet he did not behave like a defendant, but rather like a judge. He denounced Batista, he denounced Batista's regime, he had boundless trust in the Cuban people, he believed in their victory. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

People may ask where he acquired this trust? This unbending confidence that he was right stemmed from his loyalty to his people, from his belief in victory. This trust, this correct understanding of the tasks facing the people, gave him the strength to struggle against the enemies even when the imperialist placemen were planning to sentence him to death.

Many other examples are available of such courage and contempt of death in the struggle for the people's cause. You know that the eldest brother of Vladimir Lenin, Alexander, who participated in the preparations to assassinate Tsar Alexander III, was seized by the tsarist satraps and hanged. This was a great grief for the Ulyanov family.

Vladimir Lenin was a young man at that time. On learning of his brother's execution he did not abandon the struggle against tsarism, against capitalist oppression. He said that it was impossible to fight for the people's cause single-handedly. He said there was another way. In the struggle for the people's cause one must seek support in the masses, rally the people to the struggle, and never act alone. It is necessary to rouse the most revolutionary part of the people–the working class, to create a mass revolutionary party that would be the vanguard of the working class and the people as a whole, to organise and lead the working class, the entire people into the struggle, and to show them the right road. Vladimir Lenin said that it is impossible to struggle with tsarism and capitalism single-handedly. However brave the hero may be, he will be unable to win alone. But the working class, the people are sure to win if a mass party is created–the vanguard, the progressive section of the people, this party would rally the people and head its struggle. We have won, comrades!

There you see Lenin's great courage, his understanding of the revolutionary Marxist teaching which shows the working class and the people the only correct way to achieve victory, to overthrow the rule of the exploiting classes, to expropriate the means of production and set up the power of the people.

Allow me to cite yet another wonderful example of courage and conviction in the justice of the great cause of communism. This example was set by Georgi Dimitrov. Recently, I reread the book about the Leipzig trial in order to refresh in my memory the events of the heroic struggle of the great son of the Bulgarian people, Georgi Mikhailovich Dimitrov. At Leipzig he was in a cage of tigers. You cannot help feeling a sense of excitement over what Georgi Dimitrov said there. He spoke as if he was not the defendant in Leipzig; he spoke as a judge, passing judgement on Goering, Goebbels, Hitler, the fascist ringleaders and monsters, the fascist regime. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Where does this courage come from? From conviction! He did not think he would ever escape the grasp of the fascist monsters. But, fearless of death, he denounced his enemies, the enemies of the working class, the enemies of progressive humanity, and he did it courageously.

Now this cause for which Vladimir Lenin, Georgi Dimitrov and other leaders of the people worked, for which hundreds of thousands, even millions of fighters gave their lives or shed their blood that the teaching of Marxism-Leninism might live—this cause has won and the banner of socialism is proudly flying over many countries of Europe and Asia. Vladimir Lenin rests in the Mausoleum in Red Square of Moscow, and as the President of Mali, Modibo Keita, said aptly, people of all countries of the world stretch out to him, as to a spring from which to imbibe strength and courage for the struggle for the happiness of the peoples. Georgi Dimitrov lies in the Mausoleum in Sofia, and an endless stream of people go to him. The grateful generations will glorify their names through the ages as those of fearless fighters for the freedom and happiness of the peoples, for the communist cause. (*Stormy applause.*)

Where are those who fought against Lenin, against Dimitrov? Where are those who tried Dimitrov? Where is Goebbels? He poisoned himself. Where is Goering? He also poisoned himself. Where is Hitler? He shot himself, and a good thing, too, for he spared us this unpleasant business. (*Animation. Stormy applause.*)

Hitler wanted to conquer the whole world. But when the Soviet troops approached Berlin, he said, as his coadjutants report: I have no choice. I have to commit suicide, because if the Russians catch me they will put me in an iron cage and exhibit me as the most beastly animal. He was probably right, and it is a pity he reached this decision so late. (*Animation. Stormy applause.*)

Comrades, one must always be brave and uncompromising in the struggle for the people's cause; one must always be with the Party, with the people, and never neglect their interests. One must remember that the enemies have always capitalised on our difficulties, and will do so again, that they have tried and will go on trying to make our situation more difficult, to retard our advance and to crush us if they get the chance. We must always remember this, comrades!

We have to be brave, to adhere firmly to the Marxist-Leninist teaching which has always been and always will be the main source of our strength, of the moral strength of revolutionaries—of fearless fighters for the people's cause. I urge you to be like that. (*Stormy applause.*)

Having once rallied to the revolutionary banner, one must press on to the end, overcome all obstacles, until full victory is won. I wish you this, Cubans. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Please convey wishes of good health to our friend and your leader, Fidel Castro. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers.*) It does not seem that he requires wishes of good health: he is absolutely healthy. (*Animation, applause.*) But good health is no burden, even to a healthy man.

Please convey our best wishes to the whole revolutionary collective ranged behind Fidel Castro, which has fought a glorious fight, achieved victory and is now successfully working for the reorganisation of Cuba's national economy along socialist lines. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Please convey our best wishes to the Cuban people—the workers and peasants, and the people's intelligentsia of Cuba—so that all the sound elements in Cuba should rally even closer round the banner of the revolution, round Fidel Castro and the party of Cuban revolutionaries. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

I should like to say a few words to the Young Communist League, to our own young people, whose representatives are present here, to thank them, for the Young Communist League, for the young people are always loyal and militant assistants of our Party. Every time the Party needed help and support in a difficult hour, the Young Communist League, the young people responded and always marched together with the Party. We cannot help admiring our youth! (*Stormy, prolonged applause, cheers for the C.P.S.U.*)

Comrades, when we conversed with Comrade Fidel Castro in New York, I remember saying: You know, I can hardly wait for the day I leave this place; it is so stuffy here, so humid; it is so difficult to breathe here. I wish I were back in Moscow, back home. He said: I also feel bad here; it is so cold in this place, and I am longing for Cuba's warmth, looking forward impatiently to the day of my departure from here. (*Animation, applause.*)

It is always difficult to be away from one's habitual climate.

You ought to know this very well, because here you have had a taste of freezing cold and hot sunshine. And our youth, too, apparently finds it hard to bear the climate in Cuba. The best time for Europeans to come to Cuba, they say, is November, December and January, while in summer one will do better not to go to Cuba because of the tropical heat.

Even in our country, young Soviet people have to live in difficult climatic conditions. Responding to the appeal of the Party, hundreds of thousands of Soviet young men and women undertook to develop the eastern regions of our land. They went to the virgin land, to the building sites of factories, railways and hydroelectric stations in Siberia. Do you happen to know what Bratsk is like? No, you have no idea as yet what Bratsk is like. (*Animation.*) If you would go there in January, when the temperature is fifty degrees Centigrade below zero, you would soon find out what Bratsk is like. (*Animation. Applause.*) Our young people work there and sing songs.

Soviet young men and women do not go to Siberia on a picnic. They go to the taiga—to places whence the bears have only just been driven out, to use a figure of speech. (*Animation. Applause.*) Many amenities are missing there. At the outset people often live in tents. You cannot choose there between warm modern toilets and outhouses. (*Animation.*) There is nothing but the endless Siberian taiga all around.

The need to develop virgin land arose a few years ago. This land was a semi-desert, with practically no population at all. We discussed what to do, and decided: let's call on the young people. The youth responded enthusiastically to the call of the Party and set out for the virgin land areas. They arrived with tents, and, as you know, tents have few comforts. But when our people fought against the German fascists, they also had to live in tents, and sometimes even without tents—in dugouts and trenches. The young people went to the virgin land development areas, taking tractors and harvester combines along, instead of tanks. What the tsars failed to do over many centuries—to develop and populate the virgin lands—the Soviet people did in a matter of three or four years. Who did it? Our fine young people! Our glorious Young Communist League! Our people! (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

This is why, comrades, when we passed the very responsible

decision published yesterday, we did so with deep faith in the Party, the Komsomol, in our people. We trusted that they would understand rightly that this measure is necessary. We decided to take this step today in order to create better conditions for tomorrow. Our people must therefore surmount the present difficulties and understand the situation. Not only must they understand it themselves, but they must explain it to the people who have not grasped it. Such people exist, comrades.

I appeal to the Party, to the members of the Party, to the Young Communist League, to the working class, to the collective farmers and to the intellectuals. It is easier to address the collective farmers, because they have received a rise. I express thanks on behalf of the Party and the Government for this decision being correctly understood as a necessary and important measure. Not only must people understand this measure correctly themselves, but should explain its necessity and importance to others, and combat the antisocial elements who obstruct our advance. Such elements exist. We still have profiteers, loafers, even criminals. The keen political consciousness, good organisation and unity of the Soviet people is the great force which will help us overcome all difficulties.

We are proud of our country, the first to embark upon socialism. Soviet people will not let anyone undermine its high prestige.

I have been told about an incident that occurred at one of the Moscow institutes some eight years ago. Many young men and women came from fraternal socialist countries to study at this institute. Among them was a fine Rumanian girl, evidently brought up on revolutionary romance. She came to the Soviet Union and spoke about all Soviet people in an exalted way. One day, in a tramcar, her purse was stolen by a pickpocket. (*Animation*). She came to the institute, cursing all Soviet people. This is a socialist country, she said, so how come there are pickpockets in the tram?

Unfortunately, comrades, the good and progressive alternates all too often with the evil and moribund. Our people are a fine people. They accomplished the revolution and built socialism. But there were also people who joined the counter-revolution, and we had to fight against them for four years during the Civil War. Consequently, not everyone was for the

revolution. Some people opposed it, such as the capitalists, landowners, merchants and kulaks, and also the hooligans, thieves and other criminals.

As for the present, our young people are sound and strong, but there are still individuals among them who behave like ordinary profiteers: the more the better; today he grabs as much as he can, and could not care less for tomorrow.

This is why we Communists, Komsomols and non-Party people must display not only personal courage, but also deep appreciation of the interests of the people as a whole, of all society, of the cause we serve. We must influence those who do not understand how necessary the measures are which the Party and the Government took in the interests of the people. It is essential that everybody should rightly understand that if such a measure as increasing the purchasing price of meat is not carried out today, the shortages of these products will also be in evidence tomorrow, and there will be queues for meat. To overcome this, we were compelled to take this decision, which is paving the way for a rapid increase in the output of livestock products.

It may be said: But cannot wages be raised simultaneously? But what would be the result of that? We would raise the prices and wages simultaneously, meaning that the quantity of cash would increase, but the demand for meat would not decrease. Yet we do not have the required quantity of meat. The more money there is, the longer will the meat lines in the shops grow, unless the output of meat is increased. This must be understood and explained to others. Those who do not understand it, or refuse to understand it, should be called to order. I repeat, it should be explained to people, but wherever necessary, individuals who need it should be called to order. That is unavoidable.

In conclusion, I want to assure you, my dear friends, that we shall do our utmost for the Soviet land to develop and grow stronger, to multiply its wealth. Our Leninist Party, our great people are carrying out the decision of the Twenty-Second Congress, the decision inscribed in the Programme of the C.P.S.U.–the present generation of Soviet people will live in communist society! Communism shall be built! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers.*)

Comrades, all the people of the world want peace. All of them, save a handful of monopolists. But the monopolists

wield great influence, great strength, in the imperialist countries. The peoples of the socialist countries must therefore be vigilant with regard to imperialist intrigues and strengthen their revolutionary unity. As the saying goes, God helps them who help themselves. Unity is a good thing. If a socialist country has a strong economy, plus good arms for the army, this has the best possible effect in bringing those who think of starting a new war back to their senses. We have these means, and shall do our utmost to safeguard peace on earth. We are ready to accept disarmament. If our opponents, the bosses of monopoly capital, agreed to general and complete disarmament, it would be a happy day for all people. Firstly, because there would be no war. Secondly, because immense forces and means now engaged by the armies and employed in the production of armaments, would be set free. All these forces and means would be used in peaceful creative fields, for the good of the peoples.

You know very well, comrades, that this does not depend on us alone. We are ready to disarm, but the ruling groups in the imperialist countries are not. They are afraid of disarmament. Therefore, we must step up our struggle for peace, for friendship among all nations, pursue the policy of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, strengthen our socialist countries, develop their economy and maintain our armed forces at the desired standard. That is just what we are doing. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Long live the glorious Cuban people! (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Long live revolutionary Cuba and its leader Fidel Castro! (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Long live the friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Cuban people! (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Long live friendship among all the peoples! (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Long live world peace! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. All rise. Shouts of "Long live the Communist Party of the Soviet Union!", "Long live our Soviet Government!", "Long live the eternal friendship between the Soviet and Cuban peoples!" Everybody scans, "Lenin is with us!", "Lenin is with us!", "Fidel-Khrushchov always together!", "Fidel-Khrushchov!" "Fidel-Khrushchov!" Cheers.*)

# SPEECHES MADE DURING THE STAY IN THE U.S.S.R. OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS AND MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEFENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF SENEGAL

## SPEECH ON THE ARRIVAL OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS AND MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEFENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF SENEGAL

*June 5, 1962*

Dear Mr. Chairman of the Council of Ministers,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

On behalf of the Soviet Government, and on my own behalf, I bid you and your party welcome, Mr. Chairman, in Moscow, the capital of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Government wants good relations to develop between our country and the young African countries. We want these relations to be based on complete equality, non-interference in each other's domestic affairs and mutual respect of sovereignty.

Acting upon these principles, which the Soviet Government holds as the only acceptable principles in relations between states, we are prepared to develop good relations and fruitful contacts with all the African countries that may wish it. We favour co-operation in business, useful contacts, and greater confidence and friendship between all peoples and countries.

Mr. Chairman, allow me to express the hope that your visit to the Soviet Union and the recent Soviet good will mission to the Republic of Senegal will help to establish and develop mutual understanding between our countries.

We shall do our best to let our guests from Senegal acquaint themselves with the life of the peoples of our multinational state, the peaceful labour of the freedom-loving Soviet people, their economic, scientific and cultural

accomplishments, and their successes in the building of communism.

Mr. Chairman, allow me to welcome you and your party once more on your safe arrival in Moscow and to wish you a pleasant and useful stay in our country.

We bid you welcome!

## SPEECH AT A RECEPTION GIVEN FOR THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS AND MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEFENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF SENEGAL

*June 14, 1962*

Dear Mr. Chairman of the Council of Ministers,

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

Dear Comrades,

Allow me to welcome Mr. Mamadou Dia, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Senegal, and the Senegal statesmen accompanying him.

We are happy that our esteemed guest from the Republic of Senegal and his party have been able to tour our country, to visit different towns and districts of the Soviet Union, and to see the Soviet people, who are engrossed in peaceful creative labour, in the building of communism.

In Uzbekistan and Azerbaijan our guests have seen the achievements of the peoples of those two republics in the field of socio-economic progress and the development of their national culture. They could see that all the peoples of our multinational country enjoy equal rights. The equality of Soviet citizens, irrespective of their nationality and race, in all spheres of economic, political and cultural life, is a great gain, achieved by our peoples under socialism.

During their stay in the Soviet Union our guests from Senegal have, of course, noticed that Soviet people are kindly disposed towards the peoples of other countries, and that they have a sense of sincere friendship and respect for the people of Senegal, for all the peoples of Africa.

The struggle of the courageous people of Senegal and of the other peoples of Africa against the colonialists has always had the understanding and warm sympathy of the Soviet people. The Soviet Union has always opposed, and will oppose colonialism and imperialism, and national oppression and has

always worked for complete equality and respect of the sovereign rights of all nations.

That is why the Soviet people sincerely hailed the proclamation of the independence of Senegal, whose people have suffered the ordeal of colonial oppression and merciless exploitation by foreign conquerors.

We also appreciate the difficulties you have surmounted and which the people of Senegal still have to surmount in developing their national economy and culture and in consolidating their country's independence and sovereignty. Mr. Chairman, you have said in your speech on your arrival in Moscow that if the structure inherited from the colonial regime will remain in your country, the people of Senegal will not be really independent. You have also said that Senegal still faces a hard struggle for national development. We wish sincerely that Senegal become a flourishing state, contributing to the strengthening of peace on the African continent and throughout the world.

It is no secret that during their domination in Africa the colonialists artificially isolated the African peoples from the outside world. They took special pains to curb the wish of these peoples to communicate with the Soviet Union and went out of their way to spread slander and misinformation about the world's first socialist state. The colonialists hindered the African peoples from learning about the life of our country, about its staggering economic and cultural progress.

Abolition of the colonial regime offered the peoples of the young African countries extensive opportunities to learn about the peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union and about the achievements of our multinational country.

In its foreign policy, the Soviet Union adheres firmly to the principles of peaceful coexistence, mutual respect of sovereignty, non-interference in domestic affairs, equality and mutual advantage. In developing business relations and economic, cultural, scientific and technical co-operation with the newly free countries we want no exclusive advantages for ourselves and set no conditions that would affect or violate their sovereignty. Acting upon the Marxist-Leninist teaching, we only want that the support and assistance of the Soviet Union to the African countries should help them consolidate their independence and serve the interests of their independent national development.

This policy of the Soviet Union has won broad recognition and respect among the African peoples. We may note with a sense of deep satisfaction that we have good relations with many independent African countries. We value these relations and are doing our utmost to strengthen them still more.

The Soviet Government favours the development of friendly relations also with the Republic of Senegal and believes that this would accord with the interests of the peoples of our countries. We note with satisfaction, therefore, that an understanding has been reached on the establishment of diplomatic relations and exchange of embassies between our countries. It is also important that agreements have been concluded on the development of trade and on economic and cultural co-operation between Senegal and the Soviet Union.

All this gives us cause to say that the visit to the Soviet Union of Mr. Mamadou Dia and the other statesmen of the Republic of Senegal will benefit the development and strengthening of friendly relations between our countries.

I propose a toast to the friendship between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Senegal!

To the health of the President of the Republic of Senegal, Mr. Senghor!

To your health, Mr. Chairman of the Council of Ministers!

To the health of our esteemed guests from Senegal!

To the successes of the people of Senegal in the construction of their independent national state!

## SPEECH ON THE DEPARTURE FROM MOSCOW OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS AND MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEFENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF SENEGAL

*June 15, 1962*

Dear Mr. Chairman of the Council of Ministers,

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

Comrades,

In a few minutes our guests from Senegal will leave Moscow.

We were pleased to meet Mr. Mamadou Dia, to discuss in a candid spirit questions of mutual interest to the Soviet

Union and the Republic of Senegal, and to exchange opinions on the major international problems. Our conversations proceeded in a good, well-meaning atmosphere and revealed an identity of views, recorded in our joint communiqué, in relation to a number of important problems.

We believe, Mr. Chairman of the Council of Ministers, that your visit to our country has been fruitful. An understanding has been reached on the establishment of diplomatic relations between our two countries, and we have concluded a trade agreement, an agreement on economic and technical co-operation and a convention on cultural co-operation. All this has created a reliable foundation for the further strengthening of our relations on the principles of peaceful coexistence and for the development of co-operation in various fields.

The Soviet Government is prepared to do everything it can to make this co-operation effective and consistent with the interests of the peoples of our two countries.

The Soviet people have sincere sympathy for the peoples that have for long been oppressed by the colonialists and have now won their national independence. Our people consider it their duty to support them in their struggle for the final abolition of the painful consequences of the colonial past, for the consolidation of their independence and the development of their national economy.

Mr. Chairman, in bidding good-bye to you and the officials in your party, we ask you on behalf of the Soviet people to convey friendly greetings and wishes of happiness, prosperity and consolidation of national independence to the people of the Republic of Senegal.

Happy voyage, dear guests!

# SPEECHES MADE DURING THE STAY OF A SOVIET PARTY AND GOVERNMENT DELEGATION IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF RUMANIA

*June 18-25, 1962*

## SPEECH ON ARRIVAL IN JASSI

*June 17, 1962*

Dear Comrade Bodnăraş,

Dear Comrades and Friends,

In this exciting hour of my first meeting with the fraternal Rumanian people allow me, first of all, to express to the Central Committee of the Rumanian Workers' Party, the Government of the People's Republic of Rumania and all Rumanian working people our heartfelt and sincere gratitude for inviting us to visit your wonderful country. We are happy to step on the soil of your beautiful socialist land.

Dear comrades, the fraternal friendship and all-round co-operation between the peoples of the socialist countries, between the Soviet and Rumanian peoples, is growing stronger and broader from day to day. We are advancing to the cherished goal of socialism and communism in the close-knit family of socialist nations, shoulder to shoulder, as brothers of like mind. There are no obstacles that our peoples, led by their Marxist-Leninist parties, are unable to overcome.

The Party and government delegation of the Soviet Union is looking forward with deep interest and pleasure to seeing the staggering successes achieved by the hard-working and gifted people of the Rumanian People's Republic in the years of people's power. We are certain that the visit of the Soviet delegation to your country will further still more the friendship and cohesion of our fraternal peoples and parties.

Long live the indestructible friendship of the Soviet and Rumanian peoples!

Long live the fraternal friendship of all the countries of the world socialist system!

Long live world peace!

## SPEECH ON ARRIVAL IN BUCHAREST

*June 18, 1962*

Dear Comrade Gheorghiu-Dej,

Dear Comrade Maurer,

Dear comrades and friends, dear citizens of Bucharest, the capital of fraternal Rumania!

Allow me to convey to you and through you to all the working people of the Rumanian People's Republic the warm and cordial greetings of the Communist Party, the Government and the peoples of the Soviet Union, and let me thank you from the bottom of my heart for this hospitable reception.

The Party and government delegation of the Soviet Union has come to your wonderful country on the invitation of the Central Committee of the Rumanian Workers' Party, the State Council and the Government of the People's Republic of Rumania. We thank you from the bottom of our hearts for this invitation.

Soviet people are well informed about the outstanding achievements of the fraternal Rumanian people in the building of socialist Rumania. We rejoice sincerely at the successes achieved by the working people of your country in the building of a new life under the leadership of their tested vanguard, the Rumanian Workers' Party and its Central Committee headed by our good friend, Comrade Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej.

All-round co-operation between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Rumania is growing stronger and developing year after year. Our Marxist-Leninist parties and the peoples of our countries are linked by common goals and the tasks of socialist and communist construction, and are rendering each other fraternal assistance and support. This assistance is selfless, it comes from the heart and is a triumph for the principles of socialist internationalism.

We may assure you, dear comrades and friends, that the Soviet people will continue to do their utmost for the

strengthening and development of Soviet-Rumanian friendship and co-operation.

Long live the People's Republic of Rumania and the fraternal Rumanian people!

Long live the Rumanian Workers' Party and its Central Committee headed by Comrade Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej!

Long live the indestructible friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Rumanian People's Republic!

## SPEECH AT A DINNER GIVEN FOR THE SOVIET PARTY AND GOVERNMENT DELEGATION BY THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RUMANIAN WORKERS' PARTY, THE STATE COUNCIL AND THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF RUMANIA

*June 18, 1962*

Dear Comrade Gheorghiu-Dej,

Dear Comrade Maurer,

Dear Comrades and Friends,

It is a pleasure and joy to foregather with real friends. We are deeply moved and grateful for the warm and friendly reception accorded us by the working people of Bucharest today. The fraternal sentiments showered upon us here are an expression of the great friendship of the Rumanian people towards the Soviet peoples and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. I can assure you, dear friends, that the working people of our country have the same deep and sincere sense of fraternal friendship for the people of Rumania.

The relations between the Rumanian People's Republic and the Soviet Union, between the Rumanian Workers' Party and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, between the governments of our two countries, could not be better. The friendliest of relations, one might say truly fraternal relations, have also arisen, and are growing stronger, between the leaders of our two socialist states. There has always been unity between us, and we have always held the same views on all questions.

The Communists of the Soviet Union hold the heroic struggle of the Rumanian Communists in deep respect and admire their creative organisational activities in socialist construction and the outstanding contribution made by the Rumanian

Workers' Party to the consolidation of the unity and cohesion of the fraternal Communist and Workers' Parties and of the great socialist camp. We heartily wish the fraternal Rumanian Workers' Party, which has always been loyal to the teaching of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, fresh outstanding success in the fulfilment of its historic tasks.

We hope that the visit of the Soviet Party and government delegation to the Rumanian People's Republic will promote and further extend the contacts between our parties, between the governments of our two countries, that it will promote still greater friendship and extend co-operation between the Soviet Union and the Rumanian People's Republic in all fields.

Allow me to make a toast to the glorious Rumanian Workers' Party and its Central Committee headed by our good friend, Comrade Gheorghiu-Dej!

To the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic and to its head, Comrade Maurer!

To the eternal and indestructible fraternal friendship between the Soviet and Rumanian peoples!

To the Marxist-Leninist teaching, to proletarian internationalism, the battle-standard of the world communist movement!

## SPEECH AT A MEETING AT THE KRASNAYA GRIVITZA WORKS

*June 19, 1962*

Dear Comrades,

Allow me to greet you on behalf of the Soviet people and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and to wish you success and happiness. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

It is a pleasure for me and for the rest of the Soviet Party and government delegation to be among you. It is a pleasure to visit your works and come among the Rumanian workers who fought so bravely against their oppressors, and won. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Among the correspondents I see one who is probably an American judging by his reaction to the speeches. Am I right?

*Voice*: Yes, I am American!

*Khrushchov*: You see! I noticed that it is difficult for you to understand us. (*Laughter.*) I make this remark because he shook his head negatively when I said you fought so bravely against your oppressors and won. Whether he shakes his head or not, it is a fact all the same that the working class, the working people of Rumania defeated their class enemies. It was done by the working class and the people of Rumania under the leadership of their Communist Party and its Central Committee headed by that wonderful son of the Rumanian people, Comrade Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, who organised and led the heroic Grivitza strike in 1933. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Audience scans, "R.W.P.-C.P.S.U.!", "R.P.R.-U.S.S.R.!"*)

It may be recalled that in the past Rumania was ruled by landowners and capitalists, and by boyars, with the king at their head. Where are they now? The Rumanian people swept them out like rubbish. (*Stormy applause.*) Was that not a victory? Yet the American correspondent has the temerity to shake his head. (*Merriment. Applause.*) He shakes his head like a mechanical toy—wind it, and the head will shake. (*Burst of laughter. Applause.*)

Yes, the Rumanian working class, and the peasants, led by their Communist Party, headed by Comrade Gheorghiu-Dej, won a historic victory. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Dear comrades, we should like to thank you, to thank all the Rumanian comrades, who are receiving us so warmly wherever we go, most deeply and heartily. The minute we crossed the frontier into the Rumanian People's Republic we have been conscious of the fraternal warmth of feeling which the Rumanian people nourish for the peoples of the Soviet Union, whom we represent. (*Cheers, prolonged applause.*)

Bourgeois journalists sometimes write in their newspapers: So what, the people were led into the streets and made to cheer. It is all as simple as that, they implied. (*Merriment.*) I would ask those correspondents why the same was not done with, say, the Japanese people when an envoy of the U.S. President in Japan was met with turbulent protest demonstrations and shouts of "Get out", "Get out of Japan!" rather than cheers. The Japanese Government, after all, wanted the presidential envoy to be welcomed with applause by the Japanese. But the people of Japan had their own view of the matter. It may be possible, perhaps, to assemble peo-

ple for a reception, but it is impossible to make them smile. For someone to smile, he must have an inner urge to do so. A man's emotions are mirrored in his face.

The Rumanian people are welcoming our delegation warmly and heartily. They are expressing their fraternal friendship towards the Soviet people. The representatives of the capitalist countries realise this. But they do not want to admit it openly, because by admitting it they would be telling the truth to their people about the cohesion of our socialist community, the enduring friendship between the peoples of the socialist countries and the fraternal friendship between the Rumanian and Soviet peoples. (*Stormy applause. Cheers. Shouts of "Long live the friendship of the Rumanian and Soviet peoples!"*)

We admire the diligence of the Rumanian people, who have made tremendous progress through their dedicated labour. We are proud of it. In the years of people's power, the Rumanian People's Republic has gone a long way and achieved outstanding economic and cultural successes. At present, the people of Rumania have a firm footing on socialist soil. Socialism has won in Rumania, both in industry and in agriculture. The country now has an integrated socialist economy. That is a great victory, comrades! (*Prolonged applause.*)

We have won great victories. But we must not and will not let the grass grow under our feet. Leaning on what we have already achieved, we shall advance to our final goal still more rapidly and surely.

Now and then, some American journalists write the truth about the socialist countries. It does not happen often, but it happens all the same that the American correspondents, too, write the truth. I have just said it does not happen often, but this does not mean that I think all the bourgeois journalists are bad. Frequently, they write untruthfully, because they are not paid, or paid too little, for writing the truth. Untruths are better paid. (*Laughter. Applause.*) But even so the bourgeois press is compelled to admit the successes of the socialist countries.

We must appraise the achievements of the Rumanian and Soviet peoples and the peoples of the other socialist countries with a level head. Compared to what we had when we began, our successes are truly staggering. However, that is not enough compared to what we need. There is so much we

still have to do. The requirements of workers, peasants and the intelligentsia are mounting all the time. People want better homes. They want better food and better clothes. They want more of the material and cultural blessings. They want more cultural recreation facilities, more schools and universities. The mothers want more kindergartens and nurseries. I know it very well, and you know it as well as I do. Furthermore, we, the leaders, know that these requirements have to be satisfied. But we say: The objective conditions and possibilities must be taken into account. We can do no more than what our resources permit.

To use the language of the economists, the living standard of the peoples in the socialist countries depends on the development of the productive forces, on the productivity of labour, on the productive capability. We cannot live beyond our means, the means created by the labour of the workers, peasants and the intelligentsia. If we were to consume more than we produce, our economy would be thrown out of gear.

We must do as the thrifty housewife does, who is skilled at gauging when and what she must buy. When she comes to a shop she looks at one thing first, and then at the next. Suppose some article pleases her more than another but is beyond her means. She does not have money enough, and buys some other article. As for the article that struck her fancy, she may buy it the following year. Every housewife plans her household in keeping with the family income. That is only natural. We, too, plan our household, but on a nation-wide scale.

The Americans say their living standard is higher. To be sure, we have never denied this, but we know that there is a historical explanation for it. America has not suffered the destructive effects of world war. At a time when the Soviet and other peoples shed their blood in the struggle against the fascist aggressors, while our economy was being ravaged by war (by the way, your works, too, was demolished in the war by U.S. aircraft), not a single plant in the U.S. was so much as damaged. The monopolists pocketed thousands of millions of dollars in profits on war supplies. They battened on the blood of the people killed in the two world wars. Our peoples shed blood copiously, while the American monopolists plundered the whole world. That is the reason why the U.S. monopolists managed to raise their industry to so

high a level. That is the reason why the United States is today able to produce more commodities and to consume more of them.

The American industrial productivity of labour is much higher than that in Rumania and in other socialist countries. We know it.

Why is labour productivity higher in the United States? Is it because the American workers and farmers work better than the Rumanian or Soviet? Is it because there's something special about the American people? Of course, not! The American nation took shape from people of many different countries. These were British, French, Italian, German, Negro, Chinese, Rumanian and Russian—people from all parts of the world. The American people are just the same as all the other peoples of the world. But for the time being the Americans have more machines and a higher technical level of production. The Americans criticise us, because labour productivity in Soviet agriculture is lower than in the United States. Nor do we deny it. But put this in your pipe and smoke it, gentlemen: we are going to come out ahead in that province as well. (*Prolonged applause.*)

We are certain that we shall outstrip the capitalist world in the economic competition. But to do so, we must work better and better. It is only through labour, only thanks to labour, that we shall achieve a better life. It says in the Bible that at one time someone sent people manna from heaven. It says manna was dropped, but it does not say that anyone ate it. (*Laughter, general merriment.*)

We cannot expect manna from heaven. Everything we need will have to be created by labour. To get good harvests we need still more farming machinery and still more fertiliser than we have now. There will be wheat then and mamalyga, too. Don't tell me you do not like mamalyga!

*Exclamation*: We like it! (*Stormy applause.*)

*Khrushchov*: Every nation has its favourite dish and is proud of it. If mamalyga is properly made, eating good mamalyga one may, to use a figure of speech, swallow one's tongue with it. (*Merriment. Applause.*) Comrade Gheorghiu-Dej has just reminded me about the Ukranian *galushkas*. You may recall the following passage in Gogol's "Christmas Eve". A Ukrainian sits at the table and *galushkas* leap into his mouth out of a pot of sour cream. One should not read this

passage on an empty stomach. (*Laughter. Merriment.*) What are *galushkas*? To the Ukrainians *galushkas* are what mamalyga is to the Rumanians. (*Applause.*)

Dear comrades, we have seen your works, and have dropped in at many of its shops. I cannot say we have seen everything, but we have seen a certain amount. The works is good, and its workers are still better. It is the workers, the work they do, that is the making of a factory. (*Stormy applause.*)

But, as your comrades have said rightly, it is high time to rebuild the works, to modernise the equipment. Some of the machine tools are about my age. (*Merriment. Applause.*) Certainly, these lathes should be replaced with more modern equipment. You also need better tools and instruments, for then the workers will show a higher productivity of labour, and, comrades, high productivity is one of the sources of our wealth. If our productivity is not going to grow, the living standard will not grow either. Everybody knows that the living standard is bound up closely with the growth of labour productivity, the growth of a country's economic potential. That is what we must work for still more assiduously. (*Applause.*)

Now, let me speak about a few issues of war and peace. Our position in that field is good. We are working consistently for general and complete disarmament and for the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. Unfortunately, the Americans and their Western partners have not agreed so far to sign a treaty on general and complete disarmament. That compels us to make rockets, bombs and other items that reinforce our defences. We have no other choice. To be sure, we do not like having to expend the labour of many people on the production of means of destruction, instead of producing material blessings. But so long as we live in a world where imperialist countries exist as well, so long as the monopolists oppose a disarmament agreement, we are compelled to have an army equipped with the most up-to-date military equipment and weapons. I think you know that perfectly well yourselves. (*Applause.*)

The American imperialists would like nothing better than to alter the world balance of forces in their own favour. They would like us to reduce our defence expenditures. But can we afford to do so? No, we cannot!

Recently, we had to cope with the following question in the Soviet Union: the state was selling meat to the population at prices lower than it paid the collective farms; that is, meat was sold at a price that was below the cost of the meat. This price did not cover the outlay of labour made by the collective farmers in producing the meat. You will realise that animal husbandry cannot develop properly in these circumstances.

Therefore, we had to raise the state's purchasing price of meat, so that the collective farms would get more for it. But where to obtain the funds? To be sure, we could reduce the allocations for defence and produce fewer bombs, rockets and other weapons. But we asked ourselves: Would that be wise? Would the people pat us on the back for it? Like all the members of the Soviet Government and of the Central Committee of our Party, I knew that when meat prices go up people who buy the meat do not cheer. Everyone wants to buy a better product, and to pay less for it. That is only natural. Yet we decided to raise the price of meat all the same.

We appealed to the workers, to the people, and they understood us correctly. They say: The Central Committee of our Party, our Government, have done the right thing. We will bear it, but the defence allocations must not be reduced. The main thing is to make sure that American bombs are not going to be dropped on our countries. We must see to the defence of our peoples, the defence of our socialist states. (*Stormy applause.*)

In their public speeches the American and West German generals brag that they have piled up enough arms to destroy the Soviet Union. Mr. Kennedy, the U.S. President, said that in some circumstances the United States may take the initiative and start a nuclear war against our country. We should bear that in mind all the time, comrades! This was said by the U.S. President. It is being said by U.S. generals and by German generals who had once served Hitler and are now playing a leading role in NATO.

The imperialists threaten war against us. But in the present situation the imperialists will have to think twice about the consequences before they start a war. The most farsighted among them are coming to realise it would be suicide to attack us, because we are able to retaliate so devastatingly

that nothing will remain of our enemies. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

The time is over when the United States ended up among the victors in two world wars with the minimum loss in resources and manpower. In the last world war the United States lost about 300,000 people, whereas the Soviet Union lost many millions. And what big losses the other nations suffered!

This was in the past. But if ever the imperialists start a new world war, the fighting will also spread to the territory of the United States. We have a sufficient number of intercontinental rockets and other means that will reach America. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

There you are, the American correspondent is not applauding. Naturally, he is not pleased that we have such strength. But we do not want a war with the United States. We do not want to drop bombs on America. We do not want to drop bombs on any nation. We are living in socialist countries, and, Messrs. imperialists, keep your nose out of our affairs.

We want to live in peace with all nations, and not interfere in their internal affairs. Let the peoples pick the social system they like best. A country's internal make-up is the affair of its own people. (*Stormy applause.*)

To be sure, the time will come when the red socialist banner will wave over the United States as well. We believe in it as firmly as we believe in tomorrow. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers.*)

It is not we who are going to hoist that banner. The American working class, the people of America will do it themselves. Yes, the American people will do it themselves! (*Stormy applause.*)

The American correspondent is again shaking his head. He does not agree with me. But the American people are not going to ask him what to do. There were bourgeois correspondents in Rumania, too, and they also said "no" when they were told the people would come to power in Rumania. They said there would always be a king in Rumania, and that the capitalists and landowners would always rule the land. But the people swept the landowners, the capitalists and the other oppressors out of their way. Who did it? It was not the correspondents, of course. And it is not the correspondents

who will do it in America. It will be done by the American working class, the American people, and we wish them success. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

A few words about the German peace treaty. Comrade Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej has already dwelt on the matter in his speech. We are offering the United States and the other countries concerned to sign a peace treaty with both the German states and on this basis to settle the question of West Berlin as a free city. But if we do not manage to reach an understanding with them, we shall sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic. That will put an end to the occupation regime in West Berlin. (*Stormy applause.*)

In reply to this we are being threatened with war. But I must declare, none but maniacs behave that way, because pressing the button and starting a war against us is tantamount to pressing the button against oneself. Rockets will also sweep down upon those who start the war. None but suicides would therefore start a war.

The imperialists will do well not to threaten us with war, because we do not scare easily. The socialist countries and the other peace-loving peoples are able to bridle any aggressor. The means for it are ample. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Comrades, the relations between our two countries are very good. As they say, they could not be better. (*Prolonged applause.*) Our friendship is very close and there is complete identity of opinion between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Rumanian Workers' Party. The mutual understanding between the governments of our two countries is complete. If anyone doubts it, let him ask Comrade Maurer. He will confirm it. (*Stormy applause.*)

The relations between the Central Committees and between myself and Comrade Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, between the members of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and the members of the Politbureau of the C.C. R.W.P. are also of the very best and truly fraternal. (*Stormy applause. Audience scans, "R.W.P.-C.P.S.U.!", "R.P.R.-U.S.S.R.!"*)

Lasting, unbreakable friendship has developed between our peoples. We have a common goal—the building of a new life, the building of socialism and communism. That is the

cherished goal of our peoples. I am sure that in the future, too, we shall march hand in hand, in serried ranks. (*Stormy applause.*)

Dear comrades, let me wish you success and happiness! We wish you what we wish ourselves! (*Stormy applause. Audience scans, "R.W.P.-C.P.S.U.!", "R.P.R.-U.S.S.R.!" Shouts of "Friends for ever!"*)

Long live the Rumanian people! (*Stormy applause. Cheers.*)

Long live the Rumanian Workers' Party, the leader and organiser of the working class and of the whole Rumanian people! Long live the Central Committee of the Party, headed by Comrade Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej! *(Stormy applause. Cheers.)*

Long live the friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Rumanian People's Republic! (*Stormy applause. Cheers.*)

Forward to the victory of communism! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Ovation. Cheers. Audience scans, "R.W.P.-C.P.S.U.!", "R.P.R.-U.S.S.R.!", "Long live Soviet-Rumanian friendship!"*)

## SPEECH AT A MASS MEETING IN THE ONEŞTI-BORZEŞTI INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

*June 20, 1962*

Dear Comrades and Friends,

To begin with, allow me to thank you heartily for your warm reception and friendly hospitality. We attribute the attention you are showering upon our delegation fully to the multimillion Soviet people, your loyal friend, comrade-in-arms and brother.

It is with great pleasure that we convey to you, and through you to the youngest detachment of the Rumanian working class, the workers of the chemical industry, heartfelt greetings and the very best wishes from the whole Soviet people.

This is the third day of our stay in fraternal Rumania. Wherever we went we have felt without fail that we are among good friends.

As we travelled across Rumania, we were happy for our friends. We saw so many new towns and workers' estates,

new factories and power stations, and so many fine new houses and cultural institutions in your towns and villages!

It gave us special pleasure to see the mighty industrial complex in your district, that true offspring of socialism. It may be described as the symbol of the new, industrial Rumania.

Under the bourgeois and landowner regime your country did not have a chemical industry of its own, rich though it is in oil and other natural resources. Neither did it produce the equipment it needed. Much of the oil was shipped abroad unprocessed, and Rumania bought the oil products in other countries at excessive prices.

It is different now. Not only does the Rumanian People's Republic produce oil-mining equipment, other complex industrial equipment and even complete equipment for factories for its own needs, but also supplies other countries with it. The socialist system has brought Rumania out of a state of economic stagnation. The Rumanian people are enjoying the blessings of socialist economy and culture.

Comrades, for the first time more than a hundred years ago Karl Marx and Frederick Engels demonstrated the historic mission of the working class as the gravedigger of the old, exploiting system. Since then, portentous proletarian class struggles have swept the world one after the other. Capitalist rule came to an end first in Russia and then also in many other countries of the world. Experience shows that everywhere the working class achieved its victories in bitter class battles against the old world which refuses to depart voluntarily from the arena of history. Experience shows that the only way the working people can liberate themselves is through class struggle.

In the working-class struggle for the victory of the revolution success depends on the extent to which the working class and its Party master all the forms of revolutionary struggle, the extent to which they are prepared for rapid and sudden shifts from one form of struggle to another. No matter what form the transition from capitalism to socialism assumes, this transition is possible only through revolution, and revolution is class struggle.

The great constructive effort which the peoples of the socialist countries are now performing, is a direct projection of the revolutionary struggle begun by them for a better

future. The building of the new world is struggle, and it calls for a high degree of political consciousness, vision, unity and a will of iron on the part of the working class and all working people.

We are happy to see that on the labour front the Rumanian working class is showing the same high degree of organisation, the same fighting spirit that it showed in the grim years of struggle against capitalists and landowners. Under the leadership of their Party, the people of Rumania have in a short space of history built the economic basis of socialism and are now successfully completing socialist construction.

A good beginning, they say, is half the job done. The Rumanian people have made a good start on their Six-Year Plan which will elevate your country's economy to new heights.

Nothing but labour, selfless creative labour for the general weal, yields true joy and happiness. Nothing but labour secures an abundance of material and spiritual blessings. I have said so many times and will never tire to repeat it, because this seemingly simple truth contains the great wisdom of understanding the purpose of life.

Dear comrades, this is not only an age of atoms and spaceships, but also an age of chemicals. The chemical industry is a relatively young but very important branch of the national economy. We in the Soviet Union attach immense importance to the development of the chemical industry. We are doing our utmost to develop it more quickly and to supply industry, agriculture and the citizens' homes with all the useful things chemistry can yield. The chemical industry is now able to yield everything, from clothes and footwear to highly enduring building materials.

Chemistry has helped to resolve many interesting problems. Production of synthetic rubber, for example, is of great importance. Soviet scientists have developed a process of making rubber directly from gas instead of alcohol, and this has made production much cheaper. The synthetic rubber thus obtained is superior to natural rubber in many respects.

Chemistry, it is true, is not as yet able to produce foodstuffs. That most important problem has not yet been solved, but chemical engineers are working on it as well. If alcohol is a food product, then one might say that some success in this

field has already been achieved. Soviet chemical engineers make alcohol from natural gas, and the properties of this alcohol are the same as those of the alcohol obtained from industrial crops.

At present, the Soviet Union ranks second in the world in output of chemical products. More than 130 chemical plants have been built in our country in the first three years of our Seven-Year Plan. New centres of the chemical industry, based on natural gas and the by-products of oil refining have been built in Bashkiria, the Volga area, Azerbaijan and Siberia. But we are not going to rest content with what we have done, and will carry on.

We think highly of the achievements your country has made in the development of the chemical industry. We are pleased to hear that the aggregate output of Rumania's chemical industry increased more than 27 per cent last year, and as much as 700 per cent since 1950.

Our two countries compare notes extensively on advanced methods. The Rumanian scientists and specialists, for example, have told our chemical engineers about their new method of making acetylene. We, for our part, have always helped you with equipment and technical information for the building of chemical factories. These facts are graphic evidence that within the fraternal family of the socialist camp the achievements of one country are common property.

We wish sincerely for socialist Rumania, our friend, to have a modern highly developed chemical industry, and we want all the branches of its economy to grow quickly and flourish.

The Soviet people respect and appreciate the labour successes of their brothers in the other socialist countries. Our country has powerful productive forces and progressive science and technology. These did not fall into our lap from heaven. We acquired them through the tense effort of the Soviet people, that hard-working people, that people of fighters.

The example of the Soviet Union, the Rumanian People's Republic and the other socialist countries demonstrates how Lenin's words about the triumph of free labour are being translated into reality. "When millions of working people,"

Lenin said, "unite as one man and follow the best members of their class, victory is assured."

The working people of the Soviet Union and People's Rumania are legitimately proud to belong to the great fraternity of socialist nations, each of which considers comradely help to the other a sacred duty. In our great common cause of socialist and communist construction the creative efforts of the peoples merge into a mighty torrent. This torrent is growing bigger and stronger, and no obstacles can hold it back any more.

The peoples of the socialist countries are advancing confidently to their great goal of socialism and communism and working for lasting peace on earth. Our striking successes in the building of new society must not cause us to relax our vigilance with respect to the enemies of peace. Our countries have no use for war. What we need is peace.

The Soviet Union is working perseveringly for general and complete disarmament, for a nuclear weapons test ban. But the Western Powers do not want the arms race to stop. Neither do they want a relaxation of international tension. In these circumstances, the peoples of the socialist countries must strengthen their unity in every way, add to their economic potential and reinforce and improve the defences of the socialist camp. The imperialists must know that if they attack the socialist countries, they will meet with devastating retaliation.

We must be strong and sound to safeguard peace, and strength and endurance are born of labour. For this reason, our parties call on the peoples to work selflessly at the factories and in the fields, so that our resources should grow, and our might too.

Dear friends, dear brothers and sisters, thank you for your hearty reception. We wish you the very best, we wish you happiness, we wish you fruitful labour for the good of your wonderful land under the leadership of the Rumanian Workers' Party, the inspirer and organiser of the victories of the Rumanian people.

Long live the indestructible Soviet-Rumanian friendship!

Long live world peace!

(*The speech was repeatedly interrupted by stormy applause, cheers and hails to Soviet-Rumanian friendship.*)

## SPEECH AT A MEETING OF HUNEDOARA STEELWORKERS

*June 21, 1962*

Dear Comrades and Friends,

Allow me to convey warm fraternal greetings to you, the people of this steel-making city, from the working people of the Soviet Union.

Allow me, too, to express our heartfelt gratitude to you for the warm reception accorded to our delegation.

I should like to thank Comrade Maurer and the other speakers for the kind words they said about the Soviet Union and the peoples of our country.

I would say that we feel like the steelworkers beside a blast furnace. We feel hot and joyful: hot from the warmth of your sentiments for the Soviet people and our Communist Party, and joyful from the knowledge that the peoples of our countries are linked by a friendship that is as strong as steel.

So far as we know, the Rumanian steelworkers make very good steel. But all of you know that the most enduring of metals wears out in time and becomes brittle. But the friendship of the peoples forged in class battles against the exploiters and steeled in the struggle for socialism and communism is everlasting and unbreakable! Instead of becoming brittle as time goes on, it becomes stronger.

When a steelworker looks at the stream of molten metal, he sees a mental picture of new lathes and machines and rejoices that they will make man's labour still easier and man's life still happier; when all of us look at the lasting bonds of our friendship, we see the prototype of the wonderful relations that will arise for ever some day between all the peoples of the globe. So why not rejoice, comrades, and why not pride ourselves in what socialism already yields to mankind, and what communism will yield in still greater measure?

As we travel across your wonderful country, we see a new, industrial Rumania. And as we see the results of your people's inspired labour, the enthusiasm of the working people, we rejoice at your successes, at the joy of living that socialism has brought your country.

We have been told that your region is among the foremost in Rumania's economy. You have rich deposits of coal and iron ore, and your mountains are covered with timber forests. The valleys are fertile and yield good harvests. But I think

that its free and happy people are its greatest asset. That means you, dear comrades, you, the masters of all the wealth of your land, the tireless labourers and the creators of material values.

Some time ago, farm collectivisation was completed in Rumania. We know very well from our own experience how enormously important this victory is, and rejoice at it with you heartily. You, the steelworkers, have contributed to this victory beyond question. Everybody knows that a field cannot be ploughed and the crop harvested without metal, without machines. So, if the steelworkers need their bread every day, the farmers, too, need metal translated into tractors, ploughs and sowers. You, the steelworkers, provide them with this metal. You have powerful modern means of production with which you produce as much iron and steel at your one mill alone in two months as was produced in a year by the whole steel industry of bourgeois Rumania. Is that not a striking indication of the tremendous changes wrought in Rumania by the people's power and the Communist Party?

Dear comrades, you are showing us your achievements and telling us of your successes. But you are also no doubt interested in the state of affairs in the Soviet Union. I must say that things are going well with us. The Soviet people are working with dedication to fulfil the historic decisions of the Twenty-Second Party Congress. The programme of communist construction adopted at that Congress has become more than a Party Programme; it is the programme of the work and life of our entire people.

The new Party Programme has opened up the bright horizons of the communist future to the peoples of the Soviet Union. But, naturally, communism does not come of itself. It is created by the persevering labour of millions.

We face a bright and joyous future. We trust in it, and our labour is bringing it closer each day. We have begun building communism, a society in which there will be an abundance of material and spiritual blessings. In the coming ten years our country will overtake and surpass the United States, the most highly developed power of the capitalist world, in industrial production. In twenty years our steel industry will be able to produce about 250 million tons of steel a year, leaving the present steel production of the United States far behind.

Our Party is taking action to make agriculture in the Soviet Union fully cover the growing requirements of the population in the very near future. We are building houses on an unprecedented scale. A quarter of our population has been provided new comfortable homes in the brief space of some five years.

The Soviet people have a good present and wonderful prospects for the future. This does not mean, however, that we have no difficulties. Some naive people think that it was only in the first few five-year periods and after the Great Patriotic War that the Soviet Union experienced difficulties, and that now, after our country has so vastly expanded its productive forces, there cannot and must not be any difficulties. To be sure, our present difficulties do not compare with the difficulties we had in the past. But to reach the cherished goal will take a lot of effort, and we shall have to make certain sacrifices today in order to succeed tomorrow.

One should not think that the advance to communism proceeds without difficulties, without any hitch at all. The great plans of communist construction call for great efforts, for the determination to overcome all obstacles that may arise.

The Communist Parties do not have any goals more pressing than concern for the vital interests of the peoples, for their welfare and security. And we Communists have never spared and will never spare our strength for this.

Dear comrades, allow me to thank you once more from the bottom of my heart for your warm and hospitable reception. Please accept my wishes of success to you in your labour for the good of your land and the socialist community as a whole.

Long live the steelworkers of the Rumanian People's Republic, that advanced contingent of the heroic Rumanian working class!

Long live the working people of fraternal Rumania!

May the unbreakable, fraternal friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Rumanian People's Republic flourish and prosper!

*(The speech was heard with close attention and repeatedly interrupted by stormy, prolonged applause. Audience cheered and scanned, "R.P.R.-U.S.S.R.!", "R.P.R.-U.S.S.R.!", "C.P.S.U.-R.W.P.!", "C.P.S.U.-R.W.P.!", "Khrushchov-Dej!", "Khrushchov-Dej!")*

## SPEECH AT A RUMANIAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP MEETING CALLED BY THE MINERS OF JIU VALLEY

*June 21, 1962*

Dear Comrades and Friends,

Renowned miners of Jiu Valley,

Allow me to convey warm fraternal greetings to you from the numerous army of Soviet miners, from all the working people of the Soviet Union. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers.*)

It gives me special pleasure today to attend this meeting with you, members of a glorious contingent of the working class of socialist Rumania. There was a time when I, too, worked in a mine, and although I have long since left the miners' trade union because of my new occupation and pay my dues to another trade union, I have a warm spot in my heart for the miners. So when your leaders suggested that we visit you, I was happy to agree. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers. Audience scans, "R.P.R.-U.S.S.R.!"*)

Comrades, the veteran miners still remember the working conditions miners had in the past, when they worked for the capitalists. I shall not be far wrong in saying that the life of miners in tsarist Russia and royal Rumania was equally wretched. What awaited the miner in the world of capitalist exploitation when he ascended to the surface after ten or twelve hours of backbreaking work? Need and misery awaited him at home. It never occurred to the mine owners to spend an extra kopek on bettering the miners' living and working conditions. They exploited the miners ruthlessly, and then they flung them out into the street. I believe the same is true of the mines of your own coal basin. Your people had good reason at that time to call the Jiu Valley the valley of tears.

But miners are not the kind of people to take social injustice, oppression and slavery lying down, without complaint. The elder generation of Soviet people remembers the militant revolutionary traditions of the Lupeni miners, who showed endurance and courage in their long strike against the exploiters in 1929. You and we are both proud that the heroic struggle of your fathers and your elder comrades was so highly admired in its time by the international working class. Permit me to hail the veterans of the Lupeni strike who

are present here on behalf of our Leninist Party and the Soviet people! (*Stormy applause. Cheers. Audience scans, "U.S.S.R.!"*)

As one looks back, one is keenly aware of the grand socio-economic changes wrought in your country in the years of people's power. Is it not admirable that your work and energy has transformed the once wretched Jiu Valley into a valley of joy and happiness. A modern mining town populated by free and happy people has risen in place of the modest old-time workers' township. It is these free and happy people who provide their country with coal, the bread of industry, so absolutely essential in our time.

The miners and your town have made a good impression on us. We are happy that your coal mines have modern equipment, most of it made in Rumania, and that you are getting more of the new up-to-date machines, including cutters and coal combines. Mechanisation of all production processes is the future of the coal industry. The miner's work will become more mechanised and more efficient each year.

When our delegation visited the new industrial centres of your country, I was told that once a bourgeois diplomat declared haughtily that blast furnaces and factory chimneys were inconceivable as a part of the Rumanian landscape. He and his like would indeed have preferred to see Rumania for ever a backward agrarian country, a source of raw materials for foreign capital. But those times are gone never to return. Every impartial person who has visited your country cannot help seeing how far Rumania has advanced in its economic and cultural development. The outstanding achievements of the Rumanian people are a source of sincere joy for the Soviet people. (*Stormy applause.*)

Dear comrades and friends, I shall take the liberty of departing somewhat from the prepared text. It is impossible to anticipate everything when preparing a speech. Once you get to see the people you are going to speak to, you feel like saying things you did not anticipate when writing your speech.

I expected a good reception. Please do not misunderstand me: I expected it, because I had no reason to expect anything but a good reception from my brother miners. But what I saw and felt transcended by far all my assumptions and expectations. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers. Audience scans, "R.P.R.-U.S.S.R.!"*)

I anticipate certain difficulties on returning to the Soviet Union. When I start telling my people about my trip to Rumania, I shall be at a loss for words to describe all this cordial warmth of your reception, the strong friendship you express for our people, for our country. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Dear comrades, we came to the Rumanian people as to our brothers. But I think that the workers and peasants of Rumania will not misunderstand me if I say that the miners are doubly brothers to me. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers.*) My father was a miner, and I spent my childhood and youth among miners. That is why I come to you with special sentiments, because I understand you implicitly. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

All useful labour merits respect, but the hard labour of a miner merits it doubly. (*Prolonged applause.*) Lenin used to say very rightly that coal was the bread of industry. The peasants grow grain for people to eat, and the miners extract coal which is the lifeblood of industry. Coal is the source of energy. It makes the machines and lathes turn. Miners should be proud of their trade, and, at once, they should have a sense of responsibility for what they do. It is a combination of pride and responsibility that should distinguish the miner.

When going down to get coal, combating difficulties, the miner should remember that no progress would be conceivable without the miner's work. The coal extracted by the miner is needed by the railways, the factories, the steel mills and the power stations. All of them owe their development to the labour of the workers and the miners. (*Prolonged applause.*) That is why a place of honour is reserved for you miners in the ranks of the working class. That should give you pride and, most of all, it should give you a high sense of responsibility for what you do.

I enjoyed hearing the speech made here by Comrade Feher, the veteran miner. He produced a vivid picture of the past, and I understand him well. Dear comrades and friends, it is with a sense of joy and pride that I see what the miners have become in our socialist countries. No longer are they the slaves of the capitalists. They are complete masters of their land, their country, masters of their mines. They work for their own benefit, for their people, for their children, for socialism and communism. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

The miners are living much better now than before. You know it as well as I. But is that enough? Have we really attained the limit of our desires? No, we have not. You are better nourished now, and have better housing than before. But all of you want to live still better. That is only natural. What do we need to have a still better life? One may say briefly that we need to work better, to increase the productivity of our labour continuously.

Perhaps you will think: Our Rumanian leaders have always called on us to increase our labour productivity and now Khrushchov, a mate, an ex-miner, has come from the Soviet Union, and he, too, speaks of the need to increase labour productivity. But there is nothing surprising about that. Nothing but continuous growth of labour productivity will secure further economic progress and a higher living standard in our countries.

Suppose the productivity of labour will not increase. Then, the living standard will not rise either. On the contrary, it will drop, because the population grows all the time. Take your own country, Rumania. The birth rate here, I think, is pretty high. (*Merriment. Applause.*) Yet every new-born citizen wants to eat and requires housing, clothing, and, in due course, he also requires schools for his education, etc.

Yet, all this calls for funds. More material values have to be created for it. It is essential to increase production, to raise labour productivity continuously, in order to secure social progress.

I hope you have not misunderstood me. I am not implying that higher productivity should be achieved solely through greater physical efforts. You must apply your brains and your energy, you must enhance mechanisation, you must learn to use your machinery better, and this will add to your efficiency.

Do you use coal-cutters in your mines or pneumatic drills?

*Voices*: We use pneumatic drills.

*Khrushchov*: Do all the men using the drills have the same productivity? I can tell in advance that their productivity is not the same at all. This means that you have great potentialities. Now you see how insistently I urge a higher productivity of labour. (*Animation.*)

Let me confess that when I speak to the Soviet workers I tell them the same thing.

The Twenty-Second Congress of the C.P.S.U. has adopted a new Party Programme, a programme of communist construction. Our people do not stint their energy in realising this programme. But there are some who conceive communist construction something like this: work less, no more than one feels like, and eat more, as much as one feels like. But if all of us behave like that, who is going to do the work, who will create the values essential for the life of man?

That sort of notion about communist construction can exist among lazy people, among parasites only. Decent people, the politically conscious workers and peasants know perfectly well that the only way to create a better life is to work for it. The more productive their labour is, the more prosperously the people will live.

In the capitalist countries the capitalist pays for only a small part of the worker's labour. He appropriates the rest himself, accumulating capital thereby. Under socialism, everything the workers and peasants create is employed for the common weal, for the benefit of every workingman. This is why every citizen should apply his knowledge and his efforts to increasing the country's wealth continuously. If the country's wealth grows, the well-being of every worker, peasant and intellectual will grow too. (*Applause.*)

The revolutionary song says: "Labour will rule the world." This is quite true now of the socialist countries. And it will also be true some day of all countries. It will be true sooner or later. We Marxists-Leninists are deeply convinced of that. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers.*)

Dear comrades and friends, permit me to thank you from the bottom of my heart for your hospitable and kind reception of our delegation and for the good things said here by Comrade Gheorghiu-Dej and other comrades about the Soviet people and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

We wish you and all the miners, all the working people of socialist Rumania fresh successes in socialist construction! (*Stormy applause. Cheers. Audience scans, "R.P.R.-U.S.S.R.!"*)

Long live the industrious people of Rumania, who are advancing firmly along the socialist path under the leadership of their glorious Rumanian Workers' Party and its Central Committee headed by Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, that loyal son of the Rumanian people! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers. Audience scans, "R.W.P.-C.P.S.U.!"*)

May the indestructible friendship of the Soviet and Rumanian peoples grow stronger and flourish! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live the powerful socialist camp! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live world peace! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers. Audience scans, "R.W.P.-C.P.S.U.!", "R.P.R.-U.S.S.R.!"*)

## SPEECH AT A MASS MEETING IN BUCHAREST

*June 24, 1962*

Dear Comrade Gheorghiu-Dej,

Dear Comrade Maurer,

Dear Comrades and Friends,

Our delegation has been looking forward with special pleasure to meeting the working people of Bucharest, the glorious capital of the Rumanian People's Republic. After all, a capital is much like the heart of a country. In many respects, the rhythm of life in a country depends on the capital. We were pleased to note that the heart of People's Rumania is functioning well, that it is a young and strong heart. (*Stormy applause. Cheers.*) It ensures sound blood circulation in the economic and political body of your country. Bucharest's working people are living up to the honour conferred on them, and stand in the forefront of the builders of socialism.

On behalf of the Soviet Party and government delegation I heartily greet the people of the Rumanian capital. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers.*)

Allow me, on behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Government and the Soviet people as a whole, to convey to you, and through you to the whole Rumanian people, warm fraternal greetings, and to wish you from the bottom of our hearts new achievements in socialist construction and great success in your labour and life. (*Stormy prolonged applause. Cheers.*)

During our stay in your country we have again seen how great is the sympathy and affection of the Rumanian people for the Soviet Union. I am at a loss for words to express our gratitude for the warmth and cordiality shown to the envoys of the Soviet people in Rumania. Our meetings are striking proof of the fraternity of our peoples, of the strength and indestructibility of the Soviet-Rumanian friendship.

Our friendship is illumined by the undying light of Marxism-Leninism. It rises upon the granite foundation of socialist internationalism, upon the identity of our goals and interests. That is a dependable guarantee that the fraternal unity of the Soviet and Rumanian peoples will continue to grow stronger. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Audience scans, "R.P.R.-U.S.S.R.!"*)

Our delegation has had an opportunity to see how the Rumanian people are living and to witness their outstanding successes in the building of socialist society. To convey the impression gathered from our trip across your country, we may briefly say that the Rumanian People's Republic is one grand building site of socialism. The Rumanian Communists, under whose leadership the people are scoring brilliant victories in socialist construction, are the soul of it.

Bourgeois and landowner Rumania was a poor country. The Rumanians used to say ruefully that their country was like a horse that hauled oats and did not know what the oats tasted like. The capitalist system doomed Rumania to stagnation and backwardness. The Western monopolists considered it their agrarian and raw materials appendage.

Socialism liberated the forces of the Rumanian people. The workers and peasants of new Rumania have shown what they can do, how they can transform and embellish their land once it is free from capitalists and landowners. In a brief time, the people of Rumania have accomplished such immense tasks as the development of a heavy industry and as the socialist reorganisation of agriculture. At present, Rumania is a socialist country with an advanced, well-developed economy and culture.

The bourgeois press admits, too, that the Rumanian economy is highly dynamic and prosperous. I have read a comment by the *New York Times*, which has no affection at all for Communism. Here, in effect, is what it wrote about Rumania: This country has shown most striking evidence of national dynamism and economic progress.... No other country has demonstrated the challenge to the West as strikingly as Rumania, whose Communists have lifted it from standstill to the standards of this industrial epoch.

This is a forced confession, obtained from our adversaries by the labour of the gifted Rumanian people, by their creative accomplishments under socialism. (*Prolonged applause.*)

High rates of economic development are typical for all the countries of the socialist system. Experience shows that the reasons for the rapid development of countries that embark on socialism and communism is rooted, above all, in the very nature of the socialist system, in the advantages of the socialist relations of production, which offer unprecedented scope for the development of production and ensure high rates of growth.

Only the victory of socialism makes it possible to create an advanced economy in the interests of the fullest satisfaction of the material and spiritual requirements of people. The Communists are convinced advocates of socialist industrialisation. We believe it is impossible to surmount economic backwardness, to develop the economy successfully and, hence, to satisfy the needs of the people, unless a modern, highly developed industry is built up. For us industrialisation is not a goal in itself, it is not production of machines for the sake of machines. For us it is the infallible road towards better living conditions, and a reliable means of securing the independence and defensive capacity of the socialist countries. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The policy of socialist industrialisation is based on concern for man's welfare. This distinguishes it radically from the industrial development that proceeded and still proceeds in the capitalist countries, where automation and other technical novelties designed to lighten man's labour ultimately boomerang against the working people. They squeeze the remnants of their strength out of them, they elbow the working people out of the factories and add to the army of unemployed.

The socialist industrialisation carried through in our countries creates an excellent basis for the improvement of people's welfare and the development of all branches of economy. Take agriculture. The demand for farm products and raw materials is so great today that only large-scale mechanised farming run on scientific lines is able to meet it. Can such farming be organised without a developed industry? Of course not. "A large-scale machine industry," wrote Lenin, "that is capable of reorganising agriculture is the only material basis that is possible for socialism." The experience of Rumania, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries shows how absolutely right the great Lenin was.

The collectivisation of agriculture was completed in your country at the beginning of this year. Dear friends, allow me to congratulate you from the bottom of my heart on this grand victory. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

But collective farms need modern machinery to operate well, to yield greater incomes to peasants than before, when they farmed singly. Yet nothing but a well-developed industry can produce machines.

On my earlier visits to Rumania I saw the vast fields of the state and collective farms and the patchy fields of the individual farmers criss-crossed by boundaries. It is difficult to employ modern farm machinery on small plots of land, yet labour productivity will not rise without machines. The boundaries in the fields divide not only the land, but also the people who work it. It may be recalled that son went against father, and brother went against brother in disputes over these boundaries. By bringing the peasants together on collective farms, socialism remakes the psychology of the peasants themselves, and brings them closer to the working class, the vanguard of socialist society. (*Prolonged applause.*) The alliance of the working class and the peasants grows stronger and, hence, people's power grows stronger too. That is also a very important gain for the working people, one that would have been inconceivable if the Communists did not pursue the policy of industrialisation.

The Rumanian Workers' Party has carried through the socialist reorganisation of farming with skill. It has seen to it that the produce of crop farming and animal husbandry did not shrink, but rather increased, in the process. That is an impressive success for the Rumanian Communists, a fine contribution to our common treasure-trove of the theory and practice of socialist construction. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

The completion of collectivisation in the Rumanian countryside is an imposing victory of historic impact. It opens up great opportunities for the further development of the productive forces both in industry and agriculture. It means that the Rumanian working people will live still better.

We know from our own experience that reorganising farming on socialist lines is a very difficult thing. In the new conditions, the organising role and responsibility of the Party for the development of agriculture increases still more.

The needs of the people will grow year after year. Socialist farming will have to satisfy the people's continuously rising demand in grain, meat, milk, butter and other products, and also the demand for industrial crops.

The only way to solve this task is for large-scale farm production to make better use of the land and the machinery, and secure better organisation and a higher productivity of labour, so that greater quantities of products are obtained at smaller outlays of labour and resources.

We believe that to achieve this, the people must first of all make better use of manpower on the collective farms and use agricultural machinery as widely as possible. It is not manual but mechanised labour that is the basis of large-scale collective-farm production, because nothing but all-round mechanisation will yield a high productivity of labour.

But if the machines are too few on the collective farms in the first stage, the available implements and horses may be used to better advantage, and thus a higher productivity may be achieved. That will be much more effective than if the peasant bends double with a hoe.

Experience at the Soviet collective farms shows that, if used skilfully, ordinary implements and draught animals may be employed to good advantage in, say, square-pocket sowing.

Soon after the war, when neither tractors nor other machines were available on the collective and state farms in the Ukraine, the collective farmers planted maize by the square-pocket method with manual seeders on an area of more than two million hectares. It was hard work, but it enabled them to save considerably on labour in tending the crops, to till them in good time with draught animals and to bring home a good harvest. At present, our farmers use machines of modern design to cultivate crops, and many of them show excellent results, one operator raising maize on an area of one hundred hectares.

Take the example of the Moldavian Republic. The collective and state farms there sowed 689,000 hectares to maize last year and harvested 37 centners per hectare on 406,000 hectares cultivated for grain. In point of fact, the harvest at many of the farms was 50 or more centners of grain per hectare. The Lipkani and the Karpinensk districts, both of which

border on Rumania, harvested an average of 49 and 48 centners of maize grain per hectare, respectively.

It is not anything special about their soil or climate that lay behind these yields, but the fact that the collective and state farms in those districts sowed the maize by the square-pocket method, which enabled them to cultivate their crops in two directions in good time and effectively.

This year the working people of the Moldavian Republic have set their minds on harvesting 40-50 centners of maize per hectare on an area of 615,000 hectares. This is what I wanted to tell you out of the farming experience of the Soviet Union.

Two years ago, at about this time, we were privileged to witness and participate in a big event. We attended the Third Congress of the Rumanian Workers' Party, which passed the wonderful plan for completing socialist construction in your country. Speaking at that Congress, I remember saying that your Six-Year Plan was like a symphony. Rightly so, because the audacious prospect charted in that plan sounds like a hymn to inspired and free labour. It is very important to create good music, but it is not everything by far. It is also essential to have good performers and an experienced conductor. You have wonderful performers—the industrious and gifted Rumanian people. Your conductor, too, is an experienced one. The Rumanian Workers' Party is guiding and organising socialist construction skilfully. Hence, your symphony sounds good. (*Stormy prolonged applause. Cheers. Audience scans, "R.W.P.!"*)

It is gratifying to see that the Rumanian people consider their Party's Marxist-Leninist policy as their own, and that they do not stint efforts in realising it. Beyond a doubt, the Rumanian working people, who have in a short time succeeded in building up the material and technical basis of socialism, will successfully complete the building of socialist society and will raise the economy, culture and living standard in their country to a still higher level.

From the bottom of our hearts, we wish new, still greater successes in socialist construction to the glorious working class, the working peasants and the people's intelligentsia. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers.*)

Dear comrades, in our time the world-wide historic about-turn of humankind to socialism proceeds with unheard-of

vigour. A whole system of socialist countries, to which all progressives look with hope and which they regard as their future, is developing well on the international scene.

The socialist countries have by now accumulated a wealth of experience in transforming the life of hundreds of millions of people, a wealth of experience in building socialism on a national scale. But now our countries have come to a point where they must, alongside their national economies, concentrate seriously on the building of the economy of the world socialist system as a whole.

A Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties of countries party to the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance was held recently to discuss these matters. As Comrade Gheorghiu-Dej has already told you, the Conference discussed the need for extensive co-ordination in the economic development of our countries, division of labour and specialisation. The decisions of the June Conference are of tremendous importance for the development of the world socialist system as a whole. They are focused on the task of employing the advantages of socialism not only within the various countries, but also by the world socialist system as a whole.

The most effective way of organising production in our time is through automation, through the use of continuous-flow production and other progressive methods, which yield an output of high quality and in large quantities and make better use of manpower and raw materials. That is the only way to achieve a steady growth of labour productivity, to reduce production costs and to accumulate funds more rapidly. Extended reproduction is inconceivable without that. It will enable us to allocate more funds to the development of agriculture and to satisfy the growing material and cultural requirements of the peoples of our countries, while expanding production of means of production.

It is now clear that only extensive co-operation between the industries of the socialist countries, and only division of labour, will help us to exploit the advantages of organised socialist economy to the best possible benefit. Not only will it promote the general economic development of the socialist countries as a whole, but also that of each of our countries separately.

Far from damaging industrial development in the countries of the socialist camp, international division of labour and

specialisation of production create the best possible conditions for the development of each one of them. When labour is divided, we may organise continuous-flow production of machine tools, machines and various equipment on a wider scale through the use of the latest scientific and technological discoveries. This will enable us to produce not only for the needs of some one country, but also meet the requirements of the other socialist countries.

Such co-operation is advantageous for both the large and, especially, the small countries, which will be thus enabled to participate in the mass production of industrial commodities and obtain from the other countries items that the latter will produce in accordance with the general agreement.

The decisions of the Conference are a new important step in the development of the world socialist economy as an integrated and well-balanced complex. Once they are realised, the mutual assistance of the socialist countries will become still more effective, and that will elevate the relations between the peoples of the socialist countries to a higher level.

Our countries are growing and developing at a rapid pace, proving the advantages of socialism over the moribund capitalist system. At the Conference we spoke precisely about the most effective use of all our vast resources. The mighty economic upswing of the CMEA member countries enables us today to tackle questions pertaining to the further development and improvement of the forms and methods of our co-operation.

Comrades, the international situation is a favourable one for us. The forces of peace and socialism are growing stronger and progressively more powerful. This is why the imperialists have failed so far to start a new world war. Yet it is all too obvious that the situation in the world is still complicated, and the war threat has not been eliminated. It continues to exist.

Some placid-minded people may say that since the peace forces are continuing to grow and there has been no world war for nearly 20 years, there is no need any longer to worry about the menace of a world conflagration. But that is a simplified way of looking at things. We Communists will not tire to speak about the need of struggling for peace, of rallying the masses against the war threat, because the imperialists have not abandoned their plans of starting a new war.

The struggle for peace is of special importance now, because the latest scientific and technological achievements have been pressed into serving war. The Soviet Union has gone to great pains to avert the war threat while it was still the only socialist country in the world. War precipitates immense hardship and suffering upon working people. The peoples experienced it while no atomic and hydrogen bombs and no rockets yet existed. But never before has mankind faced so immense a danger as now, in this age of atoms, electronics and space conquest.

In the circumstances, the only sensible thing to do is to pursue a policy of peaceful coexistence, and that is exactly what the socialist countries are doing all the time. Unfortunately, there are influential forces in the capitalist world who abhor the idea of peaceful coexistence, peace and friendship among the nations. Their unbridled arms race, their provocations, endanger the lives and the welfare of millions of people.

The nuclear explosions in the atmosphere started by the United States are a graphic example of this anti-popular policy. Brazenly, the U.S. militarists defy the will of the peoples. They are playing dangerously with fire, and their game is fraught with terrible consequences for mankind. The aggressive circles in America and other imperialist countries want to secure superiority in arms at any price, in order to exert pressure on the peoples of all countries and put them under imperialist domination.

In these circumstances, the peoples of the socialist countries and all people of good will should be on their toes. We are obliged to strengthen and improve our defences continuously. The imperialists respect nothing but strength. They could not care less for humanistic considerations. Therefore, we must always be strong, in order to make the imperialists respect the will of the peoples. (*Prolonged applause.*)

For millions upon millions of people a nuclear world war would be a calamity unprecedented in the history of mankind. An H-bomb makes no distinctions. All peoples are equal to it—white, yellow, black, pious and atheist, progressive and conservative. Nuclear war will spare nobody. Our struggle for peace is prompted by our wish that this grief should never descend upon our earth.

The imperialists will not be able to realise their maniacal plans if the peoples of all countries work actively against

the arms race, if they intensify their pressure on the governments of the capitalist countries, demanding that they end their militarist policy.

The imperialists are pinning their hopes on strength. They think that the clock of history can be turned back by the use of arms. But it is a hopeless undertaking to go against the march of history. Even the imperialist camp cannot but take account of that. It should be said that the more farsighted leaders in the capitalist countries are coming to realise more and more distinctly that it is necessary to search for ways and means of preserving peaceful relations between the socialist and the capitalist countries and settling questions in dispute by peaceful means. The example of Laos shows that such ways and means may be found.

It may be noted with satisfaction that the agreement reached on the establishment of a coalition government under prince Souvanna Phouma is promoting a return to normal in that country. The positive solution was achieved through the efforts of many countries and, naturally, most of all the efforts of the patriotic forces in Laos itself.

This settlement in Laos, provided it is not quashed by the reactionary forces who are already trying to do so, could serve as a fine model for the solution of other problems, such as the German problem and the question of West Berlin.

At the June session of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty signatories, the delegates adopted a declaration on the German problem, which expresses our common determination to apply further efforts, in order to find a mutually acceptable solution of the German problem through the conclusion of a peace treaty and a normalisation in West Berlin.

The Soviet Government has time and again presented its standpoint on the German issue, and it will persevere in its efforts to eliminate the survivals of the Second World War, in order to reinforce the peace in Europe and the rest of the world.

Some of the Western correspondents distorted what I said about the German question at the mass meeting of Krasnaya Grivitza workers. It may be recalled that I said the following: We offer the United States and other countries to sign a German peace treaty with both the German states, and to settle on its basis the question of West Berlin as a free city.

But if we fail to reach an agreement with them, we are going to sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic. An end will thereby be put to the occupation regime in West Berlin.

Although the issue was put quite clearly, some Western papers interpreted it to mean that the Soviet Union has, of all things, departed from its former attitude and is likely to consent to the present dangerous situation in Berlin continuing. Such misconstructions are obviously meant to delude world public opinion.

I should like to state once more in this connection that the Soviet Government is as determined as it ever was to eliminate the remnants of the Second World War and to normalise the situation in Central Europe. We are firmly convinced that abolition of the occupation regime in West Berlin, withdrawal of the occupation troops and conversion of West Berlin into a free, demilitarised city is the only way to improve the situation and to create a favourable climate for the solution of other international problems. (*Prolonged applause.*)

It should not be inferred from the good will and patience shown by the Soviet Government in its negotiations with the Western Powers as it seeks a peace settlement in Germany with their participation that the solution of this issue can be put off indefinitely. The seat of the war danger in the heart of Europe benefits none but the men who profit on war preparations and on the existing tension.

We are being patient, but if the Western Powers will deliberately continue to exploit the negotiations for the purpose of evading a solution of this urgent problem, the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, together with the other states that may so wish, will sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic, with all the consequences this entails. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The imperialists need not waste their breath in trying to scare us. No threats will stop the socialist countries from taking measures that conform with the vital interests of the peoples.

In our time, when there is a powerful socialist camp, when the forces of the national liberation movement are growing and the ranks of the peace champions are swelling, the imperialist policy of aggression and war augurs no good to

those who are trying to carry it through. If the imperialists dare to start a war of conquest, that will only speed the end of capitalism. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

There is no room for the ideology of war wherever the working class, the working people assume power. Think back to the history of the Balkans. Only recently the Balkan Peninsula was known as the powder-keg of Europe. Imperialism turned this region into an object of intrigue, kindling contradictions between the peoples and pitting one people against another. A most elaborate knot of contradictions was conceived in the Balkans, giving the imperialists an opportunity to strike off a war at a convenient time.

In the first half of the twentieth century the Balkan peoples suffered four devastating wars, of which two were world-wide. Capitalism caused the death of hundreds of thousands, even of millions of people in the Balkan countries. It caused the destruction of material and cultural wealth built up over the centuries. The development of the productive forces in that region was badly retarded.

The victory of socialism in a number of the Balkan countries has changed the situation radically in that part of Europe. A number of socialist states has emerged there, whose foreign and domestic policy is geared to the interests of the working people, and the key principles of this policy are the Leninist principles of the peaceful coexistence of states with different socio-economic systems.

It is 17 years that socialist countries, bastions of peace and a reliable shield against aggressors, have existed in the Balkans. The years of peace have enabled the peoples of the socialist countries to wipe out their age-old economic backwardness in short order, and to put their countries among the leading countries of Europe.

The socialist countries of the Balkan Peninsula are active champions of peace not only in the Balkans, but in the world as a whole. The Rumanian People's Republic is making an important contribution to the struggle for lasting peace. Its people, its Party and its Government are working actively to prevent a new world war and to turn the Balkans into a zone of peace and international co-operation. They are applying sincere efforts to establish and maintain friendly relations with all the countries of the world. Acting upon the will of the working people, the Government of the Rumanian People's

Republic is strongly advocating the establishment of an atom-free zone in the Balkans and the Adriatic area.

Having come here to your wonderful country, we have seen how the industrious Rumanian people are living and what they are aspiring to. Like all the socialist peoples, the Rumanians want peaceful and friendly relations to exist between countries everywhere in the Balkans—not only along one section of the Black Sea coast but on all its shores. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Dear comrades and friends, we are living in the wonderful time when, having won the minds of the masses, the ideas of communism have become a great material force. These ideas are all-powerful, because they are profoundly true and have stood the test of history. They open up the horizons of a new world to the people.

The future belongs to socialism and communism. Already now socialism is a centre of attraction for all the progressive forces, for all people of good will. Our system offers the people the truth of a bright, truly human life; and truth, as the saying goes, is brighter than the sun, and no clouds can therefore conceal it.

We are very pleased that the working people in your land are ranged so closely behind their militant and tested vanguard, the Rumanian Workers' Party and its Central Committee, headed by Comrade Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, that outstanding Party leader, statesman and gifted organiser of the masses. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers.*) The Rumanian Workers' Party is living up to the Leninist injunction about the bonds between the Party and the masses and is leading the people confidently to the final victory of socialism. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Audience scans, "R.W.P.!" Cheers.*)

From the bottom of our hearts we wish you new wonderful victories along this glorious path. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Long live the friendship of the Soviet and Rumanian peoples! (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Long live the world socialist system! (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Long live world peace! (*Stormy, very prolonged applause: Audience scans, "R.P.R.-U.S.S.R.!", "R.W.P.-C.P.S.U.!" Loud cheers.*)

## SPEECH ON THE DEPARTURE FROM BUCHAREST OF THE SOVIET PARTY AND GOVERNMENT DELEGATION

*June 25, 1962*

Dear Comrade Gheorghiu-Dej,

Dear Comrade Maurer,

Our dear Rumanian Comrades and Friends,

Our stay in fraternal Rumania has come to an end. We are taking home the unforgettable impression of the warm and heartfelt meetings we have had with the working people of your Republic—the workers, peasants and intellectuals.

Our delegation was received everywhere with great kindness and hospitality. The tokens of warm friendship shown for the Soviet people and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union are imprinted indelibly on our memory. We saw them wherever we went.

Allow me once more to express to you and all Rumanians the gratitude of our delegation for the cordial reception, for the warmth shown us from the first to the last day of our stay in Rumania, for your kind wishes of success to the Soviet people, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government.

The friendliest and truly fraternal relations obtain between our countries, between our parties and governments. We have held several comradely conversations and negotiations with the leaders of the Rumanian Workers' Party and the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic during our stay here. These conversations and talks again revealed complete agreement between us on all the matters discussed. This fact is indicated in the joint communiqué we have signed, and which will be published.

We march forward with pride in our great victories and with confidence in our future. Our will and energy is multiplied by so great a force as the cohesion and unity of the peoples of the socialist countries.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Rumanian Workers' Party will not stint effort in realising the historic decisions set forth in the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement of the Moscow meetings of fraternal parties. It is our sacred duty to work uncompromisingly and consistently for the purity of the great Marxist-Leninist teaching against any

and all signs of revisionism and dogmatism, and for the triumph of the principles of proletarian internationalism.

We hope that our coming to Rumania, like last year's visit to the Soviet Union of the Rumanian Party and Government delegation headed by our good friend, Comrade Gheorghiu-Dej, will further extend and develop the closest fraternal contacts and co-operation between our peoples, our countries and our parties.

From the bottom of our hearts we wish the fraternal Rumanian people, the Rumanian Workers' Party and you, our dear comrades and friends, new and big success in socialist construction and in the struggle for world peace.

Long live the Rumanian people! Hail to its new victories in socialist construction!

Long live the Rumanian Workers' Party and its Central Committee headed by Comrade Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej!

May the indestructible Soviet-Rumanian friendship go from strength to strength!

Long live peace and friendship among the nations!

## RADIO AND TELEVISION SPEECH ON THE VISIT OF THE SOVIET PARTY AND GOVERNMENT DELEGATION TO THE RUMANIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

*July 2, 1962*

Dear Comrades,

It has become a tradition that Party and Government delegations tell the people of our land about their impressions when they return from visits abroad. Such speeches are, as it were, reports by the respective delegations to the Soviet people. In keeping with this good tradition, allow me to tell you today about the visit of the Soviet Party and Government delegation to fraternal Rumania.

For seven days we were guests of the fraternal Rumanian people on the invitation of the Central Committee of the Rumanian Workers' Party, the State Council and the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic. Our stay in Rumania has been fruitful, interesting and useful. In a relatively short time our Rumanian friends have shown us much of what the workers, peasants and intellectuals have created by their labour in the years of people's power.

Our stay in hospitable Rumania will remain for ever in our memories. Those days were an exciting demonstration of the great and lasting friendship that has united the peoples of our countries for all time.

We can say with deep satisfaction that the trip of the Soviet Party and Government delegation to Rumania has helped further to strengthen the friendship and co-operation of the Soviet and Rumanian peoples and that it has been useful in strengthening the unity and solidarity of the world socialist system.

Speaking to the Rumanian miners, I said that on coming home we would hardly find words to express the exciting atmosphere of cordiality and true fraternal feeling that reigned at our meetings with the working people of Rumania. Comrades, that is quite true. The ambassadors of the Soviet people were received with so much affectionate warmth in the towns, at mills and agricultural co-operatives that it was indeed hard to decide at times why it was so hot—whether from the scorching and generous Rumanian sun, or from the warmth of the people who came out to meet us.

We again cordially thank the fraternal Rumanian people, the leaders of the Rumanian Workers' Party and the Rumanian People's Republic for the attention and care, the warmth and cordiality showered upon our delegation.

We visited several towns and villages in Rumania and held friendly conversations with the leaders of the Rumanian Workers' Party and the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic, with the workers and peasants and the intelligentsia. Wherever we went, the people of socialist Rumania asked me to convey their cordial greetings and best wishes in communist construction to the peoples of the Soviet Union. So did Comrades Gheorghiu-Dej, Maurer and the other leaders of the Rumanian People's Republic. Dear comrades, I am glad to discharge this pleasing request of our Rumanian friends.

All those who visit Rumania these days cannot help seeing the great changes in the life of the Rumanian people. Once a poor agrarian country fully dependent on the big imperialist powers, Rumania has now become a developed and flourishing socialist state.

Our delegation visited the country's main industrial areas and saw the Krasnaya Grivitza Works and the mines in

Lupeni, those wonderful enterprises with glorious revolutionary traditions. We saw the new factories, the fruits of the country's socialist industrialisation, and the well-planned towns that were put on the map of Rumania just a short time ago. We saw the new Rumanian countryside, where socialism is spreading prosperity and culture.

We visited Onești-Borzești, the heart of the chemical and oil industry, and admired the bright and spacious buildings of the chemical plant, equipped with up-to-date equipment. A few years ago a village stood on its site. Today, it is a real socialist town, a town of big-time chemistry. It is a young enterprise—and not just because it was recently built, but also because most of its employees are young people who are tackling the big tasks set by the Party with audacity.

Our meeting with the Hunedoara steelworkers made an immense impression on us. The steel mill in that town is truly a token of the giant changes that have come about in Rumania under people's power. The people we met there told us how quickly the mill was growing. It was good to hear how highly the Rumanian steelworkers praised the equipment made in the Soviet Union. After I spoke to the workers and saw how they worked, I realised that they knew their job excellently and were grown to the most complicated production tasks.

While showing us all this, our Rumanian comrades recalled that just a quarter of a century ago Rumania was a country of staggering social contrasts. Poverty and injustice prevailed alongside the luxury of a handful of Rumanian dignitaries. Foreign monopolies had a stranglehold on the old Rumanian economy and battened on its blood. Nearly 95 per cent of the essential equipment was imported from abroad, and in the final analysis it was the workers and peasants who had to pay for it all.

This was in the past. Today, the Rumanians recall it to accentuate the immense changes that have occurred in their country. Not only have the Rumanian people eliminated the backwardness inherited from capitalism in a short period of history under the leadership of their Workers' Party. They have accomplished things that will soon put Rumania among the leading economically developed countries of Europe.

It is indicative that the bourgeois press, which only recently referred to Rumania with scorn, has now changed its outlook under pressure of the facts. Many bourgeois papers note that

Rumania is in the midst of an economic upsurge unmatched in its history, and that the Rumanian economy is showing "amazing dynamism" and rapid rates of development.

When our delegation was setting out on its visit to the Rumanian People's Republic, a few bourgeois correspondents wrote that Khrushchov would probably in his speeches compare the economic achievements of socialist Rumania with those of its closest capitalist neighbours. I did not do so in Rumania. But now, as I speak about our trip, I would, so to say, like to meet their wish.

In comparing the development of socialist Rumania with the development of such closely situated countries as Turkey and Greece, one may say that People's Rumania is advancing at a much faster rate. To use a figure of speech, it manages to walk about four steps in the time the above countries take to make just one.

The American imperialists like to brag about their aid to the underdeveloped countries, among which they also list Turkey. Let us see what has become of Turkey's economy through their "generosity".

The West began giving Turkey so-called aid in 1949. In 1948, before the Menderes government accepted U.S. "aid", Turkey's industrial sector accounted for 10.5 per cent of the national income. In 1960, after 12 years of American "aid", the share of the industrial sector in Turkey's national income was 10.9 per cent. What does that mean? It means that Turkey is still an agricultural country, and that it has no industry to speak of. Turkey's economy has run into a blind alley. The country owes so much to its creditors that it will not settle its debts before 2008. That is not our own computation. These figures are quoted in the *Vatan,* a Turkish bourgeois newspaper.

Nor is it just Turkish industry that fell victim to the compact between the Turkish reactionaries and the overseas imperialists. Turkey's agriculture is in so pitiful a state that it cannot even supply the people with bread, the grain for which is also being imported from abroad.

Some time ago the *Cumhuriyet,* a Turkish daily, reported strange celebration held in Stambul to mark the completion of deliveries to Turkey by the Western Powers of 3 million tons of wheat. These celebrations, the paper said ruefully, "caused a deplorable reaction, like the dull sound of earth

shovelled into a freshly dug grave. The speeches made at the elevator were reminiscent of funeral prayers.... Who knows how many more years we shall have to stretch out our hand to foreigners."

We cannot but agree with the writer of this report. Such assistance, if one may call it so, will not only make one stretch out one's hand, but kick up one's heels as well.

What we see in people's Rumania is entirely different. Socialist development is yielding wonderful results. In 1960 the industrial sector accounted for more than 53 per cent of Rumania's national income. In 1938 Rumania produced 18 kilograms of steel per head of population and 98 kilograms in 1960. In 1938 the electric power output per head of population was 72 kwh and in 1960 it was 416 kwh. The rate of growth of Rumania's national income surpasses that of many developed capitalist countries.

This spring Rumania completed the collectivisation of its agriculture. That is a big accomplishment for the Rumanian people and their Workers' Party. Now Rumania's farming, like that of other socialist countries, will follow the new, socialist trend, one that will enable it to speed mechanisation of farm jobs and make more extensive use of scientific novelties.

We visited the collective farm of Chaku. The peasants on that farm, as on many other farms, are working well. Their successes are many.

We went to the Institute of Grain and Industrial Crops near Bucharest. They are doing many interesting things there. Their soya bean and bean experiments command attention. I think our institutes and agronomists would do well to study the efforts of our Rumanian friends closely, and to pick up all their useful experience.

We ought to compare notes more and use the good experience of our friends to accelerate our common advance.

To take the first things first, what impressed us most in the Rumanian People's Republic is the deep faith of our friends in the path they have chosen to achieve happiness and prosperity, the striking labour and political enthusiasm of the people and their boundless trust in their tried and true leader, the Rumanian Workers' Party.

We have returned from our trip to Rumania with the firm conviction that, like the other socialist countries, it is doing well. But we Communists never rest on our oars in the matter

of economic development and the enhancement of public wealth. What we achieve is never enough for us, and we always want to achieve more and better things for the people, and to advance in their interests more rapidly. We know that to satisfy the rapidly growing requirements of the people, to win the economic competition against capitalism, the socialist economy must develop at a rapid pace and produce progressively more goods, better goods and cheaper goods. This is why we appreciate the wish of the Rumanian comrades to advance to new and higher standards in their economic and cultural development.

The Rumanian Communists, like those of the fraternal parties in the other socialist countries, are conscious of the great opportunities that arise through greater co-operation and a further improvement of the international division of labour for increasing production. The decisions of the June Conference held by the fraternal parties of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance member countries were devoted to this subject. The joint Soviet-Rumanian communiqué takes note of the importance of that Conference.

The decisions of the June Conference will promote the development of the world socialist economy as a balanced integrated complex. Their realisation will elevate the relations between the peoples of the socialist countries to a new and higher level.

In the past, too, the socialist countries co-ordinated efforts in their economic development. But our international division of labour, our co-operation and industrial specialisation were not developed to a sufficient degree. At times, this caused unproductive expenditure of materials and manpower and held up our progress. Now, the conditions are ripe to approach the questions of economic co-operation from a new angle.

The sense of the decisions of the June Conference lies in expanding industrial co-operation between the socialist countries more boldly and making fuller use of the advantages of planned socialist economy.

Marx said that even a simple mechanical joining of labour considerably increases its productivity. It is quite obvious that the productivity of social labour will grow markedly, and the economies of the socialist countries will develop much more effectively once they have joined efforts more efficiently

in the key sectors of modern production. This will yield a palpable gain for us in our economic competition with capitalism, both in time and resources. The socialist countries will be able to develop the world socialist economy at a still higher rate and will produce more economically and purposefully with lesser outlays of labour and materials. The decisions of the Conference are a good basis for the successful progress of the socialist countries towards an integrated world socialist economic complex first conceived by Lenin.

Comrades, in our conversations with our Rumanian friends, which proceeded in an atmosphere of complete unanimity, we discussed the key issues of the international situation and voiced our determination to continue our persevering struggle for a stronger peace and the security of the peoples together with the other socialist countries. Our Rumanian comrades and we believe that the growth of the forces of peace and socialism is continuously strengthening the barriers to the imperialists' starting wars.

However, recent developments show clearly that the reactionary forces want to preserve the cold war climate in the world, and to maintain the tension at all costs. The aggressive Western forces are preparing for a new world war. They are stockpiling nuclear weapons feverishly. It is obvious to all that the furious arms drive, especially the drive for more weapons of mass annihilation, is leading to a war that may have most fatal repercussions for all mankind.

Only recently the democratic forces managed to achieve a peaceful accommodation of the Laos question. The establishment of a coalition government in Laos revealed once again that where there is the will to settle disputed issues, the difficulties, whatever they are, can be put out of the way in the long run and a mutually acceptable settlement can be reached.

One would think that after the peaceful adjustment in Laos the situation in South-East Asia and the Far East would gradually improve and go back to normal. But in the last few days there has been distinct evidence that the aggressive forces have set their minds on creating new seats of armed provocation in that region of the world.

Chiang Kai-shek, who survives solely with U.S. imperialist support, is now beating the drums furiously and boasting loudly about his intention to make a "tiger's leap to the main-

land". Far-flung preparations are under way in Taiwan for this reckless move. From the southern parts of the island troops are being deployed closer to the Taiwan Straits, landing ships are being made ready and administrations are being formed for regions which the Chiang Kai-shek gang hopes to seize. It would be folly to think that this uproar is being raised on the sole initiative of Chiang Kai-shek and his clique. The Taiwan brass are sounding off about armed campaigns with an eye to the support they will get from aggressive U.S. groups.

Lately, Pentagon generals and admirals have been paying frequent visits to Taiwan. The American militarists are encouraging and comforting Chiang Kai-shek by sending ships of the U.S. Seventh Fleet to the Taiwan Straits. By doing so the American imperialists are demonstrating their desire to fan a new seat of war and add to the international tension in the Far East.

What can we say about this new provocation close to the frontiers of People's China? We can say with confidence that this reckless undertaking, if anyone ever ventures to carry it through, is doomed to complete failure. The people of China will never let anyone rob them of their great revolutionary gains. The People's Republic of China has a comradeship of arms and comradely solidarity with the Soviet people and all the other peoples of the mighty socialist camp, whose joint forces, as stated in the 1960 Statement of the fraternal parties, reliably guarantee every socialist country from incursions by imperialist reactionaries.

Four years ago, in 1958, the Chiang Kai-shek clique started provocative activities in the Taiwan Straits in compact with the American militarists. At that time, the Soviet Government issued a strong warning to all who like to play with fire that the Soviet Union was on the side of the great fraternal Chinese Republic heart and soul. Now, we again declare: He who dares to attack the People's Republic of China will encounter devastating retaliation by the great Chinese people, the peoples of the Soviet Union and the rest of the socialist camp. Let none have any doubts at all on this score.

This is not the first time the imperialists are trying to test the strength and endurance of Soviet-Chinese friendship, the unity and cohesion of the peoples of the socialist community. They have learned every time that this friendship is an

insuperable force which smashes all the designs of our enemies.

Wherever they go, the presence of American troops tends to strain the situation and increases the threat to the peace and security of the peoples. Take Korea. For many years that country has been partitioned. Although the war in Korea ended nearly 10 years ago, the Korean people are still unable to reunify. Who is it that blocks the way to Korea's peaceful unification? Who is it that obstructs the cherished aspirations of the peace-loving Korean people? It is none other than the American militarists. It is they who back the anti-national elements opposing the country's unification.

The Government of the Korean People's Democratic Republic has been working very hard to pave the way for the peaceful unification of the country. It has repeatedly approached the authorities of South Korea with proposals to negotiate, but its offers were turned down every time by the South Korean rulers who are completely dependent on the U.S. reactionaries. The unjustifiable presence of U.S. troops in Korea is a serious barrier to the establishment of a united, peace-loving and democratic Korean state.

Some time ago the Supreme People's Assembly of the Korean People's Democratic Republic addressed a message to the parliaments of all countries, in which it again declared its readiness to negotiate with the South Korean authorities the evacuation of U.S. troops and the conclusion of a convention on the mutual non-employment of armed force by South and North Korea. The message expressed the conviction that after the U.S. troops are withdrawn from South Korea the Korean people will be able to settle the problems of unification on peaceful terms.

The Soviet Government backs this peace-abiding proposal entirely, for it accords with the interests of the Korean people and the interests of the peoples of Asia and the rest of the world. It speaks for the peace-loving aspirations of the socialist countries, who are foreign to any thought of war as a means of settling international disputes.

The peoples of the great socialist community are engaged in intensive creative labour. Peace is organically inherent in the nature of socialism. The Soviet people, like all the peoples of the socialist countries, consider it their duty to struggle actively for peace against the threat of a new world war.

The working people in all countries are turning with hope to the socialist countries, whom they regard as the staunchest champions of peace. This is evidenced by the fact that the friends of peace have picked Moscow for the coming World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace.

Dear comrades, our meetings and conversations with Comrade Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej and the other leaders of the Rumanian People's Republic proceeded in a spirit of friendship, cordiality and comradely understanding. It is gratifying to note that we have no differences with the leadership of the Rumanian Workers' Party and the Rumanian Government over either general or particular issues. Both our parties reaffirmed their loyalty to the 1957 Declaration and the Statement of the 1960 Moscow Meeting, which serve as a dependable guide in the struggle for the great goals facing the Communists, the working class and the progressives of all countries.

In conclusion, I would like once more to send the very best of wishes to the Rumanian people, the Rumanian Workers' Party, to its Central Committee headed by Gheorghiu-Dej, and to the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic headed by Comrade Maurer. Again I want to wish them new and wonderful successes in the great cause of socialist construction.

Here in Moscow, just as in hospitable Rumania, I want to say once more from the bottom of my heart: May the strong and indestructible Soviet-Rumanian friendship live down the ages!

Dear comrades, thank you for your attention.

# SPEECHES MADE DURING THE STAY IN THE U.S.S.R. OF THE FEDERAL CHANCELLOR OF THE AUSTRIAN REPUBLIC

## SPEECH ON THE ARRIVAL OF THE FEDERAL CHANCELLOR OF THE AUSTRIAN REPUBLIC

*June 28, 1962*

Dear Mr. Federal Chancellor,

We are very happy to welcome you, head of the Government of neutral Austria, Herr Kreisky, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and the other members of your party here in Moscow today. When I came to Vienna last year to meet the President of the United States of America, both you and I in our conversations agreed that it is desirable to maintain personal contacts between Austrian and Soviet statesmen; this has become a good tradition in the relations between our countries.

I should like to stress that the Soviet Government and all Soviet people have the most friendly of feelings for the Austrian people. We think highly of your achievements and we sincerely wish that Soviet-Austrian friendship should continue to grow. As you know, Austria's policy of permanent neutrality has been widely acclaimed in the Soviet Union and everywhere else in the world.

Your visit to our country, our meetings and talks, and the opportunity you will have to see the life of the Soviet people for yourselves will, we hope, serve to further strengthen Soviet-Austrian relations in the interests of the peoples of our countries and European peace. We know well the hospitality shown to Soviet visitors in your country and shall do our best to make your stay in the Soviet Union pleasant and useful.

Welcome, gentlemen!

## SPEECH AT A LUNCHEON GIVEN FOR THE FEDERAL CHANCELLOR OF THE AUSTRIAN REPUBLIC

*June 29, 1962*

Dear Mr. Federal Chancellor,
Dear Austrian Guests,
Comrades,

Once again, we are entertaining our Austrian visitors in the Kremlin, where seven years ago we negotiated with Herr Julius Raab, your predecessor, Mr. Federal Chancellor, with Herr Adolf Schärf, now the President of Austria, and with Herr Bruno Kreisky, Minister of Foreign Affairs. We had our work cut out for us. It was up to us to restore an independent and democratic Austria, to secure her neutrality, and to see to it that no *Anschluss*, hated by the Austrian people and a peril to European peace, should ever reoccur.

Both sides displayed good will. The Austrian statesmen returned from Moscow fully satisfied, and with good reason. For, in fact, they brought home the State Treaty, which was signed a month later. The governments of the Soviet Union and Austria proved capable of finding a solution equally consistent with the interests of both nations and the interests of European peace. We know, Mr. Chancellor, that you, too, contributed then to that historic act, to Austria's proclamation of permanent neutrality.

The State Treaty and Austria's proclamation of permanent neutrality created a good basis for the development of friendly relations between our countries. In the last few years our two governments have worked hard to strengthen mutual confidence and expand commercial, cultural and scientific ties. But there still exist untapped opportunities for a further expansion of friendly relations. As far as the Soviet Government is concerned, I can assure you that it is ready to do its bit to this end.

When Austria proclaimed her neutrality in 1955, some people said this would relegate Austria to the background in world affairs. Actually, the reverse has happened. On becoming a neutral state, Austria won new friends both in the East and in the West.

To be sure, opponents of neutrality still exist. They can be found in the West, and in Austria, too. They claim that in the

present European environment the neutral nations will inevitably take sides. In their view salvation lies with the European Economic Community, or, as they call it, the Common Market.

The Soviet Union makes no secret of its negative attitude towards that community of several West European countries. We hold this view because the Community is disrupting European trade, because it has declared economic war against other countries, because it undermines the independence and sovereignty of the small countries associated with it and does not let them shape their own national policies.

The so-called Common Market is the economic base of the aggressive NATO bloc in Western Europe. We have always opposed and continue to oppose the Common Market.

Dear Mr. Federal Chancellor, today you will start on a tour of our country. You will visit glorious Leningrad. You will see the new Soviet Siberia, where the liberated labour of Soviet people has completely transformed what amounts to a whole continent in a historically short time. You will visit the Bratsk Hydropower Station. I have been there myself and I can tell you that it creates a tremendous impression. It will be the world's most powerful hydroelectric station, almost twice as big as the Volga Hydropower Station which ranks first in the world so far.

The Soviet people are engaged in peaceful creative work; they are concentrating their efforts on the great task of building communist society. Unfortunately, you have not much time for touring the Soviet Union. Otherwise, you would see for yourselves that not only Bratsk, but the whole Soviet Union is a vast and peaceful building site.

I hope, Herr Gorbach, that your visit to our country will further promote Soviet-Austrian relations for the benefit of our nations, for the benefit of world peace. We sincerely hope that it will.

I propose a toast to the preservation and strengthening of the friendly relations between Austria and the Soviet Union!

To your health, Mr. Federal Chancellor!

To your health, Mr. Foreign Minister!

To the health of our Austrian guests!

## SPEECH AT A KREMLIN RECEPTION GIVEN FOR THE FEDERAL CHANCELLOR OF THE AUSTRIAN REPUBLIC

*July 4, 1962*

Dear Mr. Federal Chancellor,

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

Dear Friends and Comrades,

We are happy, here in the Kremlin Palace, to greet Herr Gorbach, Federal Chancellor of the Austrian Republic, Herr Kreisky, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and our other Austrian guests who returned yesterday from their brief tour of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Federal Chancellor, as you viewed our country, you realised one of its main features. You said in Irkutsk that, wonderful though our country is, the people inhabiting it are even more wonderful, even more beautiful. This is very true. In the Soviet Union, a new man has developed, endowed with wonderful spiritual qualities. The prime concern of Soviet people is that the fruits of their labour, which belong to all society, should not be destroyed in a war. This is what determines the Soviet Government's policies with respect to all countries, Austria included.

Some people in the West, and in Austria, too, are displeased at the good relations between the Soviet Union and the Austrian Republic. These relations did not arise yesterday or today. They have stood the test of time at various sharp turns of history. When Austria fell prey to Hitler's aggression the Soviet Union firmly denounced the *Anschluss*. Today, it is clear to all that the *Anschluss* was a misfortune for the Austrian people, and not for them alone, because the *Anschluss* encouraged the German nazis to further acts of plunder and aggression.

The Soviet people bore the brunt of the Second World War. Not only did they liberate their country from Hitler's hordes, but also brought freedom to other peoples of Europe at the cost of millions of lives. Mr. Federal Chancellor, you have noted that the Austrian people have not forgotten the sacrifices made by the Soviet Union for Austria's liberation.

In 1955 the Soviet Government took the initiative of concluding the State Treaty, which restored an independent and democratic Austria. The signing of the State Treaty and

Austria's proclamation of permanent neutrality put Soviet-Austrian relations on a strong and sound basis. We have both repeatedly expressed satisfaction at the way our relations developed. If we keep to this reliable basis we can confidently continue to strengthen and expand our relations.

People in different quarters say that Austria should join the so-called Common Market and thereby fall in line with the policy of the Federal Republic of Germany and the other NATO countries dominating the market. There are rumours of Austria's departing from her neutralist policy. All this is motivated by the consideration that Austria is engaged in extensive trade with Common Market countries.

During our talks we told you frankly of our negative attitude towards the Common Market, which is the economic base of the aggressive NATO bloc. We believe that without frankness there can be no mutual trust. I would not have touched on this subject here again if a few days ago Herr Adenauer had not declared once more that it was one of the primary objectives of the Common Market to carry through in Europe the joint NATO policy in the military field. This confirms at first hand what we have spoken about with you.

You told us, Herr Gorbach, that your government will not depart from its neutrality and will strictly adhere to Austria's commitments under the State Treaty. We were naturally glad to take note of this assurance.

Dear gentlemen, comrades,

A government of national unity was formed recently in Laos. This shows, like the solution of the Austrian question showed earlier, that given determination and good will, even very complicated international problems may be solved by negotiation.

We believe that we can and should come to terms in the near future regarding a German peace settlement. The interests of peace and the security of the peoples require it insistently. Today, the revenge-seekers who launched aggressions in the past, are active in West Germany and West Berlin; they commit dangerous provocations against the German Democratic Republic and other socialist countries. If the events are allowed to follow this direction the world will head towards a dangerous brink, beyond which lies the abyss of a disastrous war. It is time to make a decision. There is no escaping the outstanding problems of a peaceful settlement,

in Germany, of a German peace treaty and the normalisation of the situation in West Berlin on its basis, provided, of course, we take guidance in the interests of peace in Europe and the whole world. The Soviet Government is always guided by these interests, and it is ready to contribute to a strengthening of friendship and co-operation between states and peoples.

In conclusion, allow me to voice the hope, Mr. Federal Chancellor, that your visit and an exchange of opinions will promote greater confidence and friendship between our countries.

I propose a toast to the friendship between Austria and the Soviet Union!

To the health of the Federal President of the Austrian Republic, Herr Schärf!

To the health of the Federal Chancellor, Herr Gorbach!

To the health of the Foreign Minister, Herr Kreisky!

To the health of our dear Austrian guests!

## SPEECH ON THE DEPARTURE FROM MOSCOW OF THE FEDERAL CHANCELLOR OF THE AUSTRIAN REPUBLIC

*July 5, 1962*

Dear Mr. Federal Chancellor,

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

Comrades,

Mr. Federal Chancellor, today marks the end of your visit to our country. I should like to note that our meetings and talks were useful and frank. They proceeded in an atmosphere of understanding and friendliness. We reiterated our mutual desire to promote the further development of the friendly relations that link the Soviet Union and Austria. We also recognised that we have potentialities for a further expansion of trade and of scientific, technical and cultural contacts. The results of our talks are recorded in the joint Soviet-Austrian communiqué, which has been released to the press.

Mr. Federal Chancellor, you have seen for yourself that Soviet people have deep respect for Austria and her industrious people. You have seen that the Soviet people are preoccupied with peaceful works, and that they sincerely want

peace. We know that the Austrian people, too, want peace ardently. That is a good common basis for expanding and bettering relations between the Soviet Union and Austria.

We hope that your visit will promote the good-neighbour relations obtaining between our countries, that it will help consolidate peace in Europe. As concerns the Soviet Government, it will do its utmost for the relations between the Soviet Union and neutral Austria to continue developing in this direction.

We are sincerely grateful to you for inviting a Soviet government delegation to visit Austria. We have accepted this invitation with pleasure. We highly appreciate your kindness and share your view about the great importance of maintaining personal contacts between the statesmen of our two countries.

Please convey best wishes of peace and prosperity to the Austrian people from the peoples of the Soviet Union. Please convey our cordial greetings and best wishes to the Federal President of the Austrian Republic, Herr Adolf Schärf, and to Herr Julius Raab, Herr Bruno Pittermann, Herr Leopold Figl and the other Austrian statesmen.

A pleasant journey to you, dear guests!

Till we meet again!

# SPEECH AT RECEPTION GIVEN BY THE LEADERS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION AND THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT FOR THE GRADUATES OF MILITARY ACADEMIES

*July 5, 1962*

Dear Comrades and Friends,

Allow me, on behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., to congratulate you and all the graduates of the higher and secondary military educational establishments on completing your academies and schools and to wish you the best of success in your fine work of strengthening the military might of our socialist land. (*Stormy applause.*)

Present here are officers of armies of fraternal countries who have received a higher military education at Soviet military academies. Dear friends, from the bottom of our hearts we wish you success in strengthening the national armed forces of the fraternal socialist countries. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Allow me to express the heartfelt gratitude of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government to the professors and instructors of the academies for their big and fruitful work of teaching the commanders, engineers and political personnel of our Armed Forces. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Dear comrades,

This is a very crucial period of social development. The working class, the Bolshevik Party headed by the great Lenin, raised the banner of revolution to make the life of the working people happy and prosperous. Following the road indicated by Lenin, our Party has led the Soviet people to victories of tremendous historic impact. Socialism, of which working people have been dreaming for centuries, is already dispensing its great benefits to the peoples of our country. The peoples of many countries have embarked on socialism and are confidently building a new life.

The new Party Programme spells out stupendous tasks in the building of the material and technical basis for communism. The Soviet people know perfectly well that they must work very hard to realise these great plans. Throughout the country we are building factories and houses on an unprecedented scale, and have started a drive to improve our agriculture and increase the output of consumer goods. All this is being done in the name of man, for the benefit of man.

The great ideals of PEACE, LABOUR, FREEDOM, EQUALITY, FRATERNITY, and HAPPINESS of all the peoples are inscribed in our Party Programme.

It is obvious that to set and achieve these goals the Communist Party and the Soviet people are vitally interested in a lasting peace. It is this that shapes the Soviet Government's foreign policy. We firmly uphold Lenin's principle of the peaceful coexistence of socialist and capitalist countries. The socialist countries are alien to aggressive designs against other peoples. We do not interfere in the affairs of other states. It is for the peoples of every country to choose the social system they wish to have.

Our government has put forward to all nations a comprehensive programme of action aimed at preventing a new world war, at consolidating peace and the security of the peoples. You know that disarmament talks are taking place in Geneva. These negotiations indicate that the Western Powers do not want disarmament. In these circumstances we cannot afford to ignore the fact that the imperialists are intensifying the arms race, and preparing their armed forces for war against us and stockpiling arms, including nuclear weapons.

For the security of our country and of the whole socialist camp we must spare no effort in adding to the might of our Armed Forces. In the present state of world affairs, as long as there is no agreement on disarmament, we have no other alternative. The stronger the socialist camp is, the greater is our country's defensive potential, the less is the danger of an attack, the less is the chance of a devastating thermonuclear war breaking out.

We shall not let anyone catch us unawares. We have a dependable sentinel who will in good time stay the hand of those that may try to destroy our towns and villages. By this dependable sentinel I mean the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union and of all the socialist countries. (*Applause.*)

As to the imperialists' hope of evading retaliation, we have said before and say now: If, in spite of everything, they start a war, they will suffer a crushing retaliatory blow. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

As long as aggressive imperalist forces exist, we are compelled to strengthen our Armed Forces to the utmost. It is their duty to safeguard peace, to defend the great gains of socialism from imperialist encroachments and to prevent an outbreak of war. This is the historic purpose of our Army, Air Force and Navy. That is why the whole Soviet people and the working people of all countries respect our army so deeply. (*Applause.*)

The officers are the backbone of our Armed Forces. The nation has entrusted them with the job of enhancing the capabilities and the combat readiness of our army. The commanders, engineers and political workers of our army are true Soviet patriots devoted to the people, to the communist cause. They deserve the confidence put in them by the Soviet people and the Communist Party, and are doing their duty honourably.

Dear comrades!

The Communist Party and the Soviet people show constant concern for the Armed Forces. In recent years our Army, Air Force and Navy, all the arms of the service have been amply supplied with powerful modern weapons. The development of science and technology, the continuous improvement of all types of weapons inevitably lead to changes in the methods of using them.

Modern combat operations, the use of elaborate weapons, call for comprehensive knowledge and high skill in all the specialities. I am sure you know how much greater is the role and responsibility of officers in training the men. The methods of training should be improved, and the most up-to-date technical means should be used for this purpose. This applies not only to training in institutions of higher learning, but also to military training in all the units.

A Soviet officer is not just a commander and a qualified military expert. He is also an able educator of his subordinates. The education of people is a difficult job. All the work of the commanders, their daily life and behaviour should be aimed entirely at developing in their men the high moral, political and military qualities necessary for the courageous

and able defence of our socialist land. It is most important that the officers set a good example to their men. You must set an example in the performance of your military duty, in following the moral code of the builders of communism, and be the bearers of the military traditions of our glorious Armed Forces.

The Communist Party vests in the Soviet officers complete responsibility for the combat training and political education of servicemen, for the fighting efficiency and constant combat readiness of all units. The Party Programme stresses that one-man leadership is a fundamental principle in the structure of the Soviet Armed Forces. This is a token of the great confidence the Party and the people have in our commanding officers. At the same time, we must always remember that leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the growing role and influence of Party organisations in all the formations and units are the bedrock of our military establishment. The wisdom and will of the commanding officer, imaginative work by Party and Komsomol organisations and the men and officers of every unit, the active and devoted effort of every single man, constitute a firm guarantee of the solution of the immediate tasks.

Our Party derives its strength from the great teaching of Marxism-Leninism, a true and reliable compass in all its activities. Comrades, do not stint time in studying Marxist-Leninist theory. See to it all the time that communist ideas blend organically with communist deeds in the work and behaviour of every man.

Dear comrades,

Allow me to congratulate you again on graduating from your respective academies and to wish you success in your great and noble service to your socialist country! (*Applause.*)

Long live our Communist Party, the inspirer and organiser of the Soviet people's victories! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live our Armed Forces, the bulwark of peace and of the security of the Soviet Union. May they grow stronger! (*Stormy applause.*)

May the co-operation of the officers and men of the armies of the socialist countries grow ever stronger! (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

# GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT IS A GUARANTEE OF PEACE AND SECURITY FOR ALL NATIONS

## SPEECH AT THE WORLD CONGRESS FOR GENERAL DISARMAMENT AND PEACE

*July 10, 1962*

Dear delegates and guests of the World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace,

Dear fellow-fighters for peace,

Comrades and friends,

To begin with, allow me on behalf of the Soviet Government and the people of our country to welcome you here and to thank you for picking Moscow as the place for this, history's most representative, Congress of spokesmen of the forces of peace. (*Prolonged applause.*) All the Soviet people are in heart and spirit here with you in this auditorium, because the goals of the Congress coincide to the letter with their most cherished hopes.

*The World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace is one of the most significant events of our time.* Spokesmen of nearly all the nations of our globe, people of different races and nationalities, classes and social groups, parties and political convictions, men and women of the various religions, and atheists have put aside all that divides them, and have come together to discuss the most urgent issue of our time—how to block off war.

Mankind is living in a momentous epoch. The unprecedented acceleration of social progress, the striking upheaval in science and technology, in our knowledge of Nature, are capable of giving all people on earth the greatest blessings.

But we must never forget that the sinister forces of aggression and evil threaten to turn the achievements of human genius against mankind and civilisation.

Most vigorous and immediate action by all sections of

the people is called for to handcuff, once and for all, the criminal hands reaching for the buttons of a nuclear-missile war. The success of the effort of unifying all the peoples and all who want to live and build against the threat of a new world war, depends largely on the peace fighters. So may this responsibility to mankind lend inspiration to the delegates to this Congress! (*Prolonged applause.*)

## I. DISARMAMENT—THE COMPELLING NEED OF OUR TIME

Dear friends, like the heads of the other governments participating in the Geneva disarmament negotiations, I have been invited to tell the Congress about my country's standpoint in the matter of general and complete disarmament. The Soviet Government has accepted the invitation with gratitude, and considers it its duty to set out to the Congress its views on this most important problem of our time.

We must all face the facts squarely. The threat of a new world war really exists. Mankind may be drawn into it if determined measures are not taken. It is all too obvious that thermonuclear weapons are being continuously improved, their accumulation in the arsenals is reaching the critical point where, as we used to say, the guns start shooting of their own volition, and, as we can now say, paraphrasing this saying, where the rockets with thermonuclear warheads will start flying by themselves. Nuclear weapons are being dispositioned in an increasing number of countries. More and more military units are being equipped with them. This adds continuously to the danger of the adventurist groups starting a new world war.

*Never before have war preparations proceeded on so gigantic a scale as today.* The league of war-industrial monopolies, the "death merchants" and the zealot militarists—this "military-industrial complex", as ex-President Eisenhower described it—is hotting up the arms race to a frenzy. Competent Western atomic scientists estimate that the "nuclear death potential" in the contemporary world amounts to 250,000 megatons, or 250,000 million tons of TNT. This makes more than 80 tons of explosive for every inhabitant of our planet. Explosives, as you see, are a product that the world population has in abundant supply.

Even according to official figures the world spends $120,000 million on war needs every year. This is equal to about half the capital investments made in the world economy. It equals about two-thirds of the total national income of all the economically underdeveloped countries. The NATO countries alone spend a million dollars every ten minutes on war preparations!

The United States ranks first for the scale of its war preparations. In seventeen years, from 1946 to 1962, direct and indirect U.S. military expenditures added up to something like $900,000 million, or nearly as much as all the capitalist countries combined spent in the Second World War. The other NATO countries are following the same disastrous path of military waste. Their war machine has grown to fantastic proportions.

The arms race is consuming a colossal amount of the people's labour. Today, more than 20,000,000 people are serving in the armed forces, and more than 100,000,000 are giving of their energy to military needs. Seventy per cent of the world's scientific personnel are, in one way or another, employed in the military sphere. The threat that militarism will engulf the civilian society is becoming a reality in the Western countries.

Lately, the Western press has been harping on the contention that the dangers of a thermonuclear war and its consequences are highly exaggerated. The United States, it is said, can afford to start such a war, because it is not much worse than an ordinary one. It will involve just a "somewhat" greater number of victims, "somewhat" greater material losses, and make rehabilitation only "somewhat" more difficult. To survive it, it is said, one need only build shelters in advance and adapt oneself to the mole's way of life.

There was a time when Eisenhower and then his successor, President Kennedy, were realistic and said that the military strength of the Soviet Union and the United States was equal. This was President Kennedy's standpoint at the time of our Vienna meeting. At present, however, the U.S. leadership has set out to impress upon its own people and its allies that the balance of strength has tipped in favour of the United States. The purpose of these contentions is quite clear. By saying that they will win the war, the American milita-

rists are trying to put heart into their own armed forces, and those of their allies.

This dangerous conception is in itself aimed at increasing the tension in international affairs and adding to the war threat. But from the point of view of reality, it does not have a leg to stand on. I wonder how the American leaders came to infer that the relation of strength has changed in their favour? They have nothing to back up this claim. If the matter were examined objectively, the state of affairs would look entirely different. In order to ensure its security the Soviet Union was forced to develop in the last few years nuclear weapons of 50, 100 and more megatons, inter-continental rockets, the global rocket which is practically impervious to defence, and an anti-missile rocket. The ruling groups of the United States, who do not have the same powerful weapons, have no grounds at all to say that the balance of strength has changed in their favour.

It is common knowledge that the relation of strength is measured in military action and, more precisely, by the outcome of a war. In his day, Hitler kept saying that he had a tremendous margin of strength, but was overwhelmed by the Soviet Union and its allies. Today, when there are nuclear-missile weapons on hand, errors in the judgement of the balance of strength are incalculably more dangerous to the peoples. Who can say how many 100-megaton bombs are needed to destroy the cities of, say, West Germany, or of the other powers whose leaders are in a bellicose mood? The false claims of the U.S. leadership that the balance of forces favours the U.S.A. over the Soviet Union are fraught with the greatest peril both for the peoples of other countries, and for the American people.

Lately, American leaders talk more and more about thermonuclear war. They are building up a kind of thermonuclear war cult. Take Defence Secretary McNamara's speech of June 16. It is a typical example. He says in it that an understanding may be reached to use nuclear weapons solely for striking at the armed forces, and not at the big cities. The U.S. press says that McNamara's statement had the approval of the White House, and interprets it as a sort of proposal to the Soviet Union on "rules" of conducting a nuclear war.

What is there to say about this "proposal"?

It is a monstrous proposal filled from beginning to end

with a misanthropic disdain for men, for mankind, because it seeks to legalise nuclear war and thereby the murder of millions upon millions of people. (*Murmur.*)

It shows that certain groups in the United States want to divert the main blow to the countries that have American bases and armed forces, such as Italy, Turkey, Britain, West Germany, Japan, Greece, etc.

Lastly, it is the grossest of deceptions also as far as the population of the United States is concerned. Are there no armed forces in the big cities and in their vicinity? Will not the nuclear bombs, exploded according to McNamara's "rules" in, say, the suburbs of New York, singe the immense city with a deadly breath? Some countries do not have big cities like the United States, and the destruction of medium-size towns, townships and villages seems to be within the "rules" proposed by McNamara. And is not the population of medium-size towns and villages, on which McNamara sees fit to shower atomic bombs, just as dear as the population of the big cities?

*We believe that what we must agree on is not how to conduct nuclear war, but how to eliminate the very possibility of its breaking out* (*stormy applause*), so that towns, big and small, remain intact, and that all townships, villages and farmsteads remain intact as well.

In the present environment, world war should not be measured by old criteria and considered in outworn categories. We have to face up to the fact that the weapons of war have changed radically and in principle, and that their destructive force has increased to unheard of proportions. What does this imply?

Firstly, modern weapons cannot in any way be compared to the old. The explosive force of just one powerful hydrogen bomb is many times greater than that of all the explosives used in all the wars in history, including the first and second world wars.

Secondly, nuclear-missile war erases the line between the battlefield and the rear entirely. What is more, it is the civilian population that will be the first to fall prey to the weapons of mass annihilation. In a war of that sort just a few thermonuclear bombs are liable to wipe out entire states, let alone the biggest industrial centres with populations of many millions. American experts estimate that one 20-megaton

H-bomb, exploded in the air, would raze to the ground all brick and reinforced houses within a range of 24 kilometres from the epicentre of the explosion. A roaring ocean of flame would engulf everything that burns, all living beings, over a stretch equal to the distance from New York to Philadelphia. Yet there are now bombs of 50, 100 and even more megatons. Scientists estimate roughly that the world stockpile of nuclear weapons is by now equal in force to 12,500,000 bombs of the kind dropped on Hiroshima.

Last but not least, with the current alignment of forces and the new types of weapons, the nuclear war contemplated by the American militarists would not confine itself to the territories of just two countries. It would be universal, and would bring destruction and death to millions of people in all parts of the world. What would that cost mankind? One of the outstanding fighters against atomic death, the prominent American scientist, Linus Pauling, estimates in his book, *No More War*, that the probable number of nuclear war victims will be 800,000,000. This is a grim truth about the actual nature of thermonuclear war. And if the Western statesmen today keep this truth from the peoples, they are committing a crime against humanity, the peoples of their own countries included. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Those who are balancing on the "brink of war" maintain that nuclear-missile weapons are in themselves a reliable guarantee that peace will prevail. This conception, known in the West as the "equilibrium of fear", goes against common sense and is a gross deception of people. In fact, the "equilibrium of fear" signboard is used to camouflage plans of a preventive war. Some responsible U.S. statesmen go to the length of saying publicly that they are prepared to take the "initiative in a nuclear conflict with the Soviet Union".

Give this some thought. It is not a mere threat of thermonuclear war, but an attempt to impose an ill-omened competition in who is the first to start the war. By saying that they can be the first to start a war, they seem to give the cue to other countries. Hurry, they say, and outdo your adversary. What is this likely to lead to? The consequences will obviously be disastrous. Statements like that are positively surprising. Their authors have given no thought to what war holds in store for the United States itself, and for its allies. The U.S. politicians tell their people more and more insistently

that in a nuclear war the United States will suffer smaller losses than the Soviet Union and can allegedly gain the upper hand. This is a fatuous illusion. The propagation of this idea is meant to condition public opinion in the United States and the allied countries to war: We must hurry and start the war now, it implies, for the situation may change. This is nothing but conditioning men's minds to the inevitability of war and vindicating the aggressive forces who are eager to speed the outbreak of an atomic war.

But we declare most firmly: If the aggressors start a nuclear war, they will inevitably perish themselves in its flames. (*Applause.*)

It should be borne in mind that in a world of international tension even a simple mistake may cause the lightning-like chain reaction of a universal war. Take the case of General Power, who heads the U.S. Strategic Air Command. In November 1961, after a false alarm, he ordered bombers stationed at all U.S. bases to head out for the Soviet Union. He did not even bother to inform the U.S. President, that is, the supreme commander of the country's armed forces, about it. For all of twelve and a half minutes the American Strategic Air Command was virtually in a state of war with the Soviet Union. Who is to guarantee that in the event of another false alarm the over-zealous American generals will sound the retreat before disaster breaks loose?

There is a big danger that war may break out accidentally, due to some technical miscalculation. Crashes of American planes carrying A and H-bombs, and of rockets with nuclear warheads, are growing in number. Just a few weeks ago, on June 4, 1962, a Thor rocket was destroyed in the air due to some technical faults, and its nuclear warhead fell somewhere in the Pacific Ocean. The same happened on June 20. Things like that are very alarming. *Giustizia,* an Italian newspaper, commented quite rightly that "the runaway Thor could have set off a world war". This shows once more how dangerous the atomic psychosis of the reactionary Western militarist groups is to the peace.

As long as the various national stockpiles of lethal weapons remain and grow, the war threat will grow too. The path to genuine peace is general and complete disarmament.

Dear delegates, I know that people of many and diverse political beliefs are assembled in this hall. They did not gather

here to discuss the advantages of the different social systems. It was the common wish, the common desire to salvage the peace, to avert the ordeal of a thermonuclear war, that has brought all of us here. (*Stormy applause.*)

But one cannot help reminding this world-wide forum that the aggressive forces are pursuing the arms race and the preparations for a new world war behind a smokescreen of talk about a war threat emanating from the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. This malicious falsehood must not be glossed over. Let me recall a few undeniable facts.

Ten million people were killed and twenty million were crippled in the First World War. Was it Communists, or socialist states, that were responsible for that war? At the time it broke out there were as yet no socialist states on earth, and the Communists were not in power in any of the countries.

The Second World War cost nearly fifty million lives. Was it the Communists, the socialist states, who started it? The Second World War was started by German, Italian and Japanese fascists. It was the Soviet Union that suffered the greatest losses in the act of saving mankind from fascist barbarity. (*Stormy applause.*) It was the Soviet Union that made the greatest contribution to beating the fascists and delivering the peoples from the death camps, the gas chambers of Maidanek and Oświęcim, and from fascist slavery.

Was it the Soviet Union that made of Hiroshima and Nagasaki the Pompeii of our age? The culprits, as you know, came from another part of the world.

Let us see what the world looks like today. It is covered with a rash of war bases. Whose bases are they? All of you know that they were established by the United States and its allies.

Take the propaganda of war. Where is it conducted? Where do the calls come from to drop atomic bombs on a country, to destroy half of its population and three-quarters of its industrial potential "in 24 hours"? General Nathan Twining and Congressman Olin Teague, who sounded these calls, are not citizens of any of the socialist countries. In the countries of the socialist community, where the propaganda of war has been outlawed, people of that sort would have been prosecuted in a court of law. (*Applause.*)

It was a cherished dream of the founder of the Soviet state, Lenin, that war should become impossible. He branded world

war as the greatest of crimes, a total break from the accomplishments of modern civilisation and culture. He warned that the use of formidable technical gains for the mass annihilation of millions of human lives and the conversion of all the productive forces to war needs inevitably "undermine the very conditions for the existence of human society" (*Collected Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 27, p. 386). The socialist countries warn the world about this danger and work hard to avert it. This is the positive truth about the standpoint of the socialist countries, the standpoint of the Communists. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Our Soviet state was born with Lenin's well-known Peace Decree. Lenin rejected most vigorously the suggestion to have the sword depicted in the Soviet coat-of-arms. "The sword is not an emblem for us," he said. It was the Hammer and Sickle that became the emblem of the Soviet land—a symbol of peaceful and constructive labour. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*) We have stood, now stand, and will always stand upon Lenin's principles of peaceful coexistence. *That is the only doctrine of relations between states with different social systems that accords with the historical conditions of our age, on whose basis peace can be preserved. (Applause.)* No matter what people think about the way of life in the countries of the other social system, the world is whole and indivisible in face of the threat of nuclear disaster. That is where we all are the human race. (*Applause.*)

Many people in the West ask ever more frequently, "Does mankind have a future?" I would like to reply to them: Yes, it has, and it is going to be a radiant future. We believe that mankind is grown to the task of bridling the atomic maniacs. (*Stormy applause.*)

In this age of nuclear weapons, this age of rockets, the danger of a deadly nuclear war cannot be eliminated, unless the means of mass annihilation are destroyed to the last and nuclear weapons are prohibited. We favour the complete destruction of the material means of warfare. (*Applause.*)

The policy "from positions of strength", of "brinkmanship" and "atomic intimidation", will be impossible in the international relations of a disarmed world. The slogan of general and complete disarmament is an equivalent of the slogan, "Down with wars between nations, long live peace!" (*Stormy applause.*)

*That is why the struggle for general and complete disarmament is becoming the prime duty of all the peace forces, of all the national and international organisations and trends advocating the maintenance and promotion of peace. Disarmament is the compelling need of our time.* (*Prolonged applause.*)

## II. THE SOVIET DISARMAMENT PROGRAMME

Dear delegates, the Soviet Government is firmly and consistently carrying on a policy of promoting peace and peaceful coexistence. In putting forward its programme for general and complete disarmament, the Soviet Government was prompted by the necessity for radically solving the problem of security for all nations by precluding the very possibility of war.

What is the main point of our programme? *The pivot and core of disarmament is the banning and complete destruction of nuclear weapons.* (*Applause.*)

The Soviet Government suggests at least immobilising all nuclear weapons, paralysing them by destroying all means of their delivery from the outset, at the very first stage of disarmament. (*Applause.*) We propose abolishing at one stroke rockets, aircraft, warships and submarines that can carry nuclear weapons, atomic artillery installations and all military bases on foreign soil and withdrawing all foreign troops from the countries concerned. (*Prolonged applause.*) Without rockets, aircraft, warships and submarines, nuclear arms would no longer be dangerous even if an unscrupulous government tried to stow away some of them. The destruction of all means of delivery would make it impossible for any country possessing atomic weapons to strike a nuclear blow at other countries. A proposal to this effect was made at one time by the French President, General de Gaulle, and we fully agree with it. Unfortunately, the French Government took no effective steps to ensure the implementation of its proposal. What is more, it refused to take part in the disarmament negotiations at Geneva.

It is said that nuclear weapons can also be carried in TU-114s, Boeing 707s and other civil aircraft. But if there is a real desire for disarmament, the various countries may

for a while keep their means of defence—anti-aircraft artillery, and air defence rockets and fighters. Modern means of warfare make it possible to shoot down any aircraft flying at any altitude. As you see, the argument is untenable throughout.

By proposing that disarmament be begun with the abolition of all vehicles of delivery of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union, which has the world's most powerful global and inter-continental missiles, relinquishes of its own free will a most important military advantage. (*Applause.*) We will not hesitate to take this step because we believe that it would expedite the solution of the disarmament problem.

For our part, we insist that the Western Powers should agree to dismantle all of their military bases on foreign soil and withdraw their troops from foreign countries. Those bases have been set up for aggression and not for defence. It must be obvious to anyone that, say, the U.S. rocket and nuclear bases on the Japanese island of Okinawa or in Libya, on African soil, or the U.S. bases in Britain, Italy, Turkey, Greece and Thailand are not needed for the defence of the United States. Whoever denies this is trying to pass off black for white. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Douglas, member of the U.S. Supreme Court, makes a revealing admission on this score. "We ringed Russia," he writes in his new book, "with airports where our bombers and fighter planes stood in readiness night and day. Our bases included Morocco, where for some years bombers were aloft around the clock—loaded with atomic bombs and ready on the flash of a coded word to wing their way to designated targets."

This is added proof that the threat of a new world war will persist so long as those bases exist.

To greatly ease the threat of armed conflict between countries, the Soviet Union also proposes that at the very beginning of disarmament the numerical strength of national armed forces be substantially cut and conventional armaments reduced accordingly. We think it possible to carry disarmament through to the end in four years. This is a short but perfectly sufficient time limit.

We are willing to seek and find mutually acceptable formulas for all the provisions of our draft treaty, and to compromise wherever necessary—that is, of course, if that will not harm the cause of general and complete disarmament. The

only thing we are not willing to do is to renounce general and complete disarmament, to emasculate our draft treaty, to strip it of all the real disarmament measures. That is something we will never agree to. (*Applause.*)

We are for disarmament and not for talk of disarmament. A situation in which the arms race is growing in intensity even as disarmament negotiations go on can no longer be tolerated. According to estimates made by the *U.S. News and World Report,* the years from 1946 to 1962 have seen 863 international disarmament meetings, which took 17,000 hours to hold and at which 18 million words were uttered. (*Animation.*) While millions of words about disarmament become so much useless slag of history, arms production is increasing. Certain Western circles turn disarmament negotiations into a talking club to be able to maintain favourable conditions for war business and continue piling up armaments behind the smokescreen of verbiage about disarmament.

The Western Powers' behaviour at Geneva indicates that they want no disarmament. The speeches made by the delegates of the United States and its allies at Geneva are purely perfunctory and declarative. Those delegates pretend that their negative stand is acceptable and represent us as opponents of agreement. But let us look into the U.S. proposals.

You will recall that after a long delay the U.S. finally submitted an Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World. That Outline shows that the U.S. stand on general and complete disarmament remains essentially negative, although as far as secondary points and form are concerned, that stand has now been varnished somewhat and contains many words about disarmament. But in reality the Basic Provisions do not envisage what is precisely the basic thing, namely, a complete ban on nuclear arms, the destruction of all stockpiles made by nations, and the abolition of military bases on foreign soil. To agree to this sort of "disarmament" would mean deceiving the peoples and injuring the cause of peace.

No sooner had the negotiations begun than the United States and its partners attempted again, as in the past, to switch all attention from disarmament questions to the much-advertised problem of international control, alleging that control was the crux of the disarmament problem.

As regards the meaning of the U.S. proposal for control,

it is the same old demand for control without disarmament, slightly refurbished. True, this time it is presented more subtly than before, but its meaning is the same—it is designed to set up a legalised system of international espionage for the benefit of a potential aggressor. The Russian people say about this kind of "novelty": "It's the same broth but a bit thinner." (*Animation. Applause.*)

Our position is simple and easy to understand. We stand for completely abolishing the various kinds of armament, one after another. Furthermore, every step towards general and complete disarmament envisaged in our draft treaty is invariably accompanied by measures for strict international control.

But we are against establishing control over armaments that will remain. Control over remaining weapons is bound to be reconnaissance, an attempt to ascertain whether the balance of forces has changed as a result of the cut in armaments and whether it is not possible to use eventual changes for launching an attack. No self-respecting country can accept such control. (*Applause.*)

The Western Powers are seeking all-inclusive control, while proposing very limited disarmament measures. The United States proposes beginning disarmament with a 30 per cent reduction of the means of delivery of nuclear weapons and certain conventional armaments.

But the question arises whether the actual threat of war would be eased thereby. No, it would not, because a huge thermonuclear potential would be retained. Mr. Nehru, the esteemed Prime Minister of India, is perfectly right in declaring that "disarmament is no more a question of reduction of armaments. A quarter of the nuclear arsenal of the big powers is enough to wipe out the whole world".

Furthermore, the U.S., which proposes a 30 per cent reduction of the number of ICBMs and global missiles at the first stage, wants to keep the existing network of military bases. The U.S. virtually does not provide for the abolition of military bases on foreign territory and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the countries concerned even at the third stage of disarmament. Does the U.S. Government really imagine that the Soviet Union would agree to a 30 per cent cut at the first stage, and to another 35 per cent cut at the second stage, in its most developed, most powerful combat mis-

siles while the U.S. military bases, so situated as to be able to strike at our territory, remained absolutely intact? We are not our own enemies and will never agree to that sort of disarmament, if we may call it that. (*Applause.*)

And lastly, with this approach to the matter, U.S. acceptance of partial disarmament looks like a stratagem intended to discover all the arsenals of our national security, that is, to throw the doors open to a reconnaissance and espionage system and thus make things easier for the potential aggressor. The so-called inspection by zones envisaged by the U.S. Outline also pursues an obvious aim, which is to establish the exact location of Soviet nuclear-rocket installations. In this case we may say, using an American expression, that the reconnaissance tail wags the policy dog.

All difficulties over the issue of control arise from the fact that the Western Powers virtually dissociate it from the fulfilment of the decisive task, that is, real disarmament. We call on the Western Powers once again to accept our proposals for general and complete disarmament, and then we will accept any control measures they may propose. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The U.S. Government suggests establishing large international armed forces and insists on their being equipped with nuclear arms. It regards the so-called U.N. troops in the Congo as a model of such forces. It is legitimate to ask, as we have already done more than once: Who will command those armed forces? Who will give the orders? The U.S. says the United Nations will. But what would this imply in practice? The U.N. machinery in its present form is dominated by the very powers that govern NATO, as events in the Congo clearly showed. In these circumstances, to accept the U.S. proposal would mean choosing suicide, disarming ourselves and enabling NATO to use the international armed forces for dictating its will to us.

The only reasonable solution of the problem is to provide equal opportunities for control of the international forces. Today there are three groups of countries represented in the United Nations, and each group should enjoy the same rights and opportunities as the other two.

Is it normal that, because of U.S. opposition, the People's Republic of China has not to this day assumed its lawful seat in the United Nations? (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Only on the condition that all the groups of states are equal, will there be no abuses of international armed forces to the detriment of any one of the groups of countries. It stands to reason that placing nuclear weapons at the disposal of international armed forces is out of the question. It would be equivalent to mocking at the peoples, who insist on being delivered for ever from the horrors of a nuclear war. (*Applause.*)

The United States also proposes empowering the International Court of Justice, in which no veto may be invoked, to adopt decisions binding on countries, including decisions on peace and security issues. That proposal, which in effect undermines the U.N. Charter and nullifies the role of the Security Council as the chief agency for the maintenance of international peace and security, is aimed at infringing Soviet interests and replacing the U.N. by a new international political system in which the Western Powers expect to occupy a dominant position. Can we accept such a thing? Of course not. These proposals are aimed at undermining and not promoting peace.

The U.S. persists in its refusal to specify the general time limit for the implementation of general and complete disarmament measures, although it now gives time limits for the first two stages. The provisions of the U.S. Outline have been so worded that they enable the Western Powers to stall indefinitely on disarmament and, indeed, to foil it if at a particular moment they come to the conclusion that strategically it is to their advantage to do so.

Lastly, I cannot withold mention of the fact that, as it becomes increasingly evident at Geneva, the U.S. does not at all want a treaty of general and complete disarmament that would oblige countries to scrap their war machinery within a strictly defined period of time. U.S. Government spokesmen plainly tell our delegates at Geneva that the U.S. Government would never sign, nor Congress ratify, a general and complete disarmament treaty. It follows that the U.S. is merely talking of disarmament while actually taking a stand against it. (*Applause.*)

The Soviet Union is prepared to take account, as it has done in the past, of all the suggestions of the Western Powers that do not contradict the solution of the problem of general

and complete disarmament. But such suggestions are still very few.

We are willing to consider carefully any proposal of our partners in the negotiations, to seek for and find mutually acceptable ways of advancing the working out of a disarmament treaty. We are willing to do our utmost so that the work of the 18-Nation Committee in Geneva may succeed and our collective efforts result in an effective programme for disarmament.

World opinion favours the conclusion of a disarmament treaty, and offers advice as to how to surmount the differences. Certain propositions advanced by philosopher Bertrand Russell in his message to this Congress are noteworthy in that respect.

Lord Russell says:

"I should like all negotiators from the West to state: 'I am firmly convinced that the nuclear war would be worse than the world-wide victory of communism.' I should like every negotiator from the East to declare, 'I am firmly convinced that a nuclear war would be worse than a world-wide victory of capitalism.' Those on either side who refuse to make such a declaration would brand themselves as enemies of mankind and advocate the extinction of the human race." (*Applause.*)

We, the spokesmen of the socialist world, have never said we were prepared to launch a thermonuclear war to achieve victory for communism throughout the world. (*Prolonged applause.*) Our leader, Lenin, proclaimed the policy of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems back in the early years of our Revolution, and stated that the struggle against the capitalist system should be transferred to the sphere of economic competition. We stand squarely upon these Leninist principles. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

We do not interpret Mr. Russell's message to be an appeal for an ultimatum: either war and atomic death, or recognition of communism, and, vice versa, either nuclear war or the recognition of capitalism. We believe that if either side works for the victory of its ideology and policy by increasing its armed forces and making threats of war, things will surely move towards a world-wide nuclear war. *We declare to the whole world that the policy of starting a world*

*war in order that the communist ideology should win out, is alien to us. (Stormy, prolonged applause.)*

We proceed from the fact that there are two systems in the world–one system of states based on capitalist principles, and the other based on the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, on socialist principles. An ideological and political struggle is in progress between these two systems. We believe that this struggle should not be projected into a war between the states with different social systems, and that the matter should be settled through peaceful competition. Let every country of the socialist and the capitalist world prove the advantages of its system by peaceful endeavour. (*Prolonged applause.*) The main criteria are: Which system, the capitalist or the socialist, provides greater material and spiritual benefits, higher living and cultural standards to the masses, which of them provides genuine freedom for the individual, and ensures the rapid development of the productive forces, culture and science in the interests of man, in the interests of the people.

We believe this to be the basis on which to settle the debate about whose system, whose views, are progressive, and which system really serves the interests of the masses. The system that will prove its advantages will win the minds of men. (*Applause.*)

The programme of general and complete disarmament put forward by the Soviet Government is most striking and strong proof of our desire to settle controversial issues through peaceful competition, and not by war. It also shows that we are confident in winning the peaceful competition with capitalism.

Those, on the other hand, who oppose disarmament and say that war between the capitalist and socialist countries is inevitable, have no faith in the strength of capitalism and its victory in the peaceful competition with socialism. This is why they clutch at nuclear war as at a chance of deliverance. Spokesmen of the Western ruling circles say for all to hear that they prefer atomic death to the victory of communism.

Mr. Pella, for example, the former Foreign Minister of Italy, said, "Italy would rather run the risk of a Soviet atomic attack than fall under communist domination." Lord Birdwood said in the House of Lords on February 11, 1959, "I would rather prefer destruction to life in a communist

world." Rodney Gilbert, an American author, said in his book, *Competitive Coexistence–The New Soviet Challenge:* "Peace without a victory over communism be damned!" Even one of the Right-wing Labour leaders, Donnelly, exhorts, "Better dead than Red." *(Commotion.)*

Those are very dangerous things to say. They show that some Western spokesmen want to transfer competition from the economic sphere, the sphere where the advantages of one system over another are tested by history, to the sphere of war. This means that many defenders of imperialism have lost confidence in capitalism's ability to win the competition with socialism and are prepared to start a destructive world war, to put to death millions upon millions of people for the sake of preserving capitalism.

We Communists are confident in the strength of socialism, in its advantages. It is a thing history has already proved. Socialism has in a short time demonstrated its viability, its superiority in rates of economic development, scientific and technological progress, public education, and the provision of true freedoms to the masses. The heights which the Soviet Union has now scaled are imposing evidence of the advantages of socialism. We are not afraid of competing with capitalism. Let capitalism, too, as Mr. Russell suggests, abandon the idea of war and project its dispute with socialism into the plane of peaceful competition. (*Applause.*)

The great significance of our stand lies in the fact that we project the solution of the main controversial question of our time, that of which system is better–it is in this controversy that many representatives of the Western ruling circles espy the chief reason for the inevitability of armed conflicts–from the military sphere into the sphere of peaceful competition between countries with different social systems. The possibility is thereby created of delivering mankind from thermonuclear war.

Peace can be radically safeguarded through the complete abolition of the physical machinery of war. The Soviet Government does not rule out but, on the contrary, considers it indispensable to agree, in advancing to this goal, on the adoption of a series of steps towards lessening international tension, strengthening confidence among countries and considerably facilitating general and complete disarmament. Among such measures we include the establishment of

denuclearised zones in various areas, renunciation of the further spread of nuclear weapons, the withdrawal of troops from foreign territory, the prohibition of war propaganda, and the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries.

We have made numerous attempts to reach agreement with the Western Powers on a limited disarmament programme but have invariably come up against a refusal.

Take the disarmament proposals we presented to the Western Powers in 1955. Those were not proposals for general and complete disarmament—they only called for a reduction of the armed forces of the Soviet Union and the United States to 1,500,000 men. Nor was this figure accidental at all, because the Western Powers had themselves named it in the course of the talks then in progress. But what happened? As soon as we had agreed to the contingent of 1,500,000 men for the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A., our partners called it off and turned down our proposal.

In 1957 the Soviet Government proposed an agreement on at least partial disarmament measures. Among these measures we included, this time as well, the Western Powers' own proposal for establishing aerial photography zones with a view to discovering secret preparations for aggression. You may remember that aerial photography at that time was a pet idea of President Eisenhower's. We proposed establishing one aerial photography zone in Europe, 800 kilometres deep on either side of the demarcation line between the armed forces of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. The zone was to have comprised the territories of the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Czechoslovakia and a sizable strip of Soviet territory. The other zone was to have covered our Far East all the way to Lake Baikal, and an equal part of U.S. territory. In the same period we proposed setting up control posts at railway junctions, in harbours, and on highways to prevent surprise attack. In this case too, we took Western suggestions into consideration.

And what was the outcome? What was the lot that befell our proposals for aerial photography zones and control posts? They were rejected by the United States and the other NATO powers, which is regrettable, for anyone realises that had we at that time succeeded in reaching agreement on the lines suggested by us, the war danger would now be far less.

But now that rockets have become our principal means of defence and NATO generals would readily sell their souls to the devil if only they could find out their location, these measures can no longer be carried out in the absence of general and complete disarmament.

The Soviet Government has approached the disarmament problem from different angles. For a number of years we proposed, for example, reaching agreement on the withdrawal of foreign troops from German territory or, to begin with, on reducing those troops by one-third, our purpose being a relaxation of tension in Europe where the armed forces of the two alignments of countries are in direct contact. But this Soviet proposal too was left hanging in the air because of the Western Powers' negative attitude.

Unfortunately, the Western Powers do not want any agreement on disarmament questions. Their negative stand is particularly manifest in their refusal to come to terms on the discontinuance of all atomic and hydrogen weapons tests.

It is true that nuclear tests are not the same as nuclear war. But their after-effects are very serious for mankind even now. The new major series of nuclear tests which the U.S. Government is carrying out jointly with the British Government is a challenge to mankind. Matters have reached a point where the United States is testing nuclear weapons in space, even though the effect of the tests on people's living conditions may prove very dangerous.

President Kennedy said: "There is no health hazard here in this country, nor will there be from our tests." Mr. Kennedy did not tell the truth to the people of his country. Present-day scientific data say that the U.S. tests are doing enormous damage to people's health. Besides, the earth is inhabited not only by the Americans but also by the British, Russians, Chinese, Japanese, French, Italians, and other peoples. Yet those who are carrying on the tests do not even see fit to think of them and of the harm they are doing to the health of these peoples.

It should be clear to everyone that by carrying out the new, and largest, series of nuclear weapons tests, the U.S. and its allies want to secure military advantages for themselves and to intensify their aggressive policies. They have been doggedly following these policies, which imperil peace,

for many long years. You will recall that in 1958 the Soviet Union stopped its nuclear weapons tests by unilateral action. But what did the United States, Britain and France do? They stepped up the arms race. France began to test its atomic bombs. The aggressive NATO bloc began openly to threaten us with war over a German peace treaty. In those conditions the Soviet Union was compelled to take steps to perfect its thermonuclear weapons so as to cool certain hotheads who suggested wiping out Russia "at one blow".

We would have committed a crime against our people and all mankind had we not prevented a dangerous turn of events last summer. Anyone who follows world developments knows that the Soviet Union's nuclear rocket might is the decisive factor in the maintenance of peace and has on more than one occasion saved mankind from a world war which the imperialist circles of the West had been trying to start. (*Applause.*) Today, when the militarists in Western countries are intensifying their aggressive policies, we cannot but take steps to strengthen the defences of the Soviet Union and the socialist community at large.

By increasing its might, the Soviet Union promotes not only its own interests but also those of all mankind, and contributes to the maintenance of world peace. But we are by no means happy that we have to spend so much effort and resources on the production of modern weapons. Our scientists and technicians could find a much better use for their knowledge and experience. The improvement of weapons is a necessity forced on the socialist countries. It would be much better if all weapons were dumped in the sea. (*Applause.*) We stand for general and complete disarmament. We are willing to sign an agreement with all the nuclear powers to ban all tests of these weapons. This would be a big step towards general disarmament. But nobody will live to see the socialist countries disarm unilaterally. (*Applause.*)

The "atomic jinnee" which has broken loose would long since have been driven back into the vessel but for Western resistance. Control over the discontinuance of the tests is no longer a problem. The present state of science makes it possible to detect all nuclear explosions by means of national control systems, without any particular difficulty. An agreement banning nuclear weapons tests would have been reached long ago had the Western Powers shown, in the course of

negotiations, so much as a fraction of the good will shown by the Soviet Union.

Last spring the U.S. Government sent three delegations abroad. One of them went to Geneva, another to the session of the NATO Council at Athens and the third, the most numerous, to the area of the Christmas and Johnston islands to supervise nuclear tests. The activity of which of the three delegations reflects with the greatest clarity the essence of U.S. policy? Everything indicates that it is the activity of the second and third. As for the Geneva delegation, it is a sort of cover. A very short time ago, on June 16 last, McNamara, the U.S. Secretary of Defence, said:

"We cannot hope to move toward our objective unless we move from strength."

The blasts over Christmas Island are part of that policy being put into effect. They strike at the hopes of the peoples. But they can neither weaken nor shake our will to fight for disarmament and for the discontinuance of nuclear explosions, everywhere and for ever. History itself demands ever more imperatively that all weapons and means of warfare be abolished. (*Applause.*)

Dear delegates, allow me now to say a few words about the German question. This question has no direct bearing on disarmament but is closely linked with it. A peaceful settlement with Germany and normalisation of the situation in West Berlin on its basis would ease international tension, and would also provide a sound groundwork for furthering the cause of disarmament. This is increasingly realised by many statesmen.

Indeed, those who are striving for peace cannot but feel seriously alarmed, since the hotbed of war danger in the heart of Europe is becoming ever more ominous. West German militarism and revanchism, which has brought incredible suffering to the peoples, has once again been nurtured by the U.S. monopolies, and is embarking more and more openly on a course of aggression and adventure. Although Chancellor Adenauer poses as an opponent of the Hitler regime, he leans on Hitler generals and officers and is in effect pursuing a Hitlerite policy. Here are the facts.

During his term in office Adenauer has spent more on West German armaments than Hitler spent on preparations for the Second World War. Hitler's military expenditure from

1933 to 1939 made up 90,000 million marks, while that of Chancellor Adenauer between 1950 and 1961 alone amounted to 100,000 million marks. Peace-loving mankind cannot but stop to think of these figures, for they are figures of death and suffering for the people. Hitler generals have been entrusted with the command of the NATO ground forces in Europe. Certain European countries are beginning to march to the drumbeat of the Bonn revenge-seekers, and even the Great Powers are beginning to dance in time with it.

The West German militarists fiercely resist disarmament and a relaxation of international tension. In 1874 Moltke, an ideologist of German militarism, said cynically: "Everlasting peace is a dream, and an ugly one." Many changes have come about in the world since then. But the cannibal ideology of German militarism is unchanged. Defence Minister Strauss resists all disarmament plans with might and main. The Bonn militarists are reaching out for the atomic bomb, and are already close to getting it, as the Athens session of the NATO Council showed.

Bonn makes no secret of its plans for a forcible revision of the results of the last war, for a revision of the German frontiers established under the Potsdam Agreements. Minister Seebohm of Bonn says: "Czechoslovakia, Poland and the Soviet Union should not entertain the hope that we have renounced the territories beyond the Oder and Neisse." He is seconded by von Hassel, Minister-President of Schleswig-Holstein, who says: "Our territorial claims reach far beyond the Oder-Neisse line. We want to regain the old regions of German domination."

Some revenge-seeking politicians, including Herr Brandt, even take the liberty of threatening the socialist countries.

From these threats and from what the Bonn politicians are doing, one might doubt whether they were living in 1962 or whether the hands of their watches had stopped at the time of Hitler's campaigns of conquest. (*Animation.*)

What the Soviet Union advocates is to write *finis* to the Second World War, conclude a peace treaty with the two German states and on its basis normalise the situation in West Berlin, which is fraught with an explosion.

This is evidently the only possible and sensible stand to take. Yet the U.S., British and French governments are against the conclusion of a German peace treaty. They are

trying to perpetuate the occupation regime in West Berlin and keep their troops there. But how can one be reconciled to the fact that in the centre of Europe there is a powder keg with a burning fuse? In what way can this fact answer the interests of the people of West Berlin or any country?

It only meets the objectives of the manufacturers of lethal weapons and the West German revenge-seekers. Strictly speaking, the Western statesmen on whom agreement on the conclusion of a peace treaty depends are aware of this, and the only reason why they do not conclude a treaty is that they do not want to hurt the feelings of Chancellor Adenauer, their ally. West Germany and its armed forces are already becoming the backbone of the aggressive forces of NATO, and are shaping the policies of that bloc to an increasing extent. As for those who believe themselves to be the leaders, they connive with the West German revenge-seekers on the plea that Western unity must not be impaired. Under the guise of preserving Western unity, that is, NATO unity, they take their cue from the aggressive forces in West Germany.

One must not overlook yet another circumstance. The present occupation of West Berlin has long since ceased to be the occupation that was implied at the time the Allies signed their quadripartite agreements following the defeat of Hitler Germany. Those agreements were aimed at abolishing German militarism and nazism and preventing the threat of a new war on the part of Germany. But occupied West Berlin today is a special kind of NATO military base where the troops of the powers in that aggressive bloc are stationed, a base directed against former allies—the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and a number of other countries who fought against Hitler Germany.

We want West Berlin, as an independent political unit, to be given the most reliable international guarantees, we want its people to be granted the right freely to shape their own way of life. (*Applause.*) But the Western Powers are concerned with the maintenance of their military base in West Berlin and not with the destiny of the population of that city.

The Soviet Government has taken a number of steps to bring about mutually acceptable decisions, and has agreed to the occupation forces in West Berlin being replaced on certain conditions by U.N. or neutral troops. As no agreement has been reached on this matter, we suggest that the troops

to be stationed in West Berlin should be those of Norway and Denmark or of Belgium and the Netherlands, as well as those of Poland and Czechoslovakia. Needless to say that those troops should be under the United Nations flag, and should not represent either of the existing military alignments.

Time presses! If the Western Powers persist in their refusal to contribute to the elimination of the survivals of the Second World War, the socialist countries, as well as other peace-loving countries, will have no choice but to conclude a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic, with all that it implies. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The example of Laos shows that, given a desire for agreement, ways can be found of settling the most challenging and complicated international problems. Removal of the vestiges of the Second World War is vital to peace, and the solution of this problem brooks no further delay. Disarmament, the exclusion of war from the life of society and the establishment of a lasting peace on earth constitute one of the cherished goals of the Soviet people and their government.

As far back as the last century Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, the eminent author of *The Song of Hiawatha,* called "the tribes of men together", saying:

> *Bury your war-clubs and your weapons...*
> *Smoke the calumet together.*

I do not smoke, but, really, I would be happy to light the calumet together with the leaders of all powers! (*Animation. Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

## III. A WORLD WITHOUT ARMS WOULD BE A GREAT BLESSING FOR ALL MANKIND

Martin Andersen Nexö, an outstanding representative of world culture, said that people needed peace "to work, to rejoice and to make life beautiful". Disarmament and peace could open up truly inexhaustible wellsprings of creative endeavour, which today are being blocked by the militarists. The huge resources thrown into the maw of war preparation could be switched to meeting the pressing needs of mankind, which are so numerous.

The disarmament problem has lately drawn the attention of increasingly wide sections of the population in the West, including the United States. In a number of cases scientists give a sober analysis of the eventual social and economic effects of general disarmament.

The conclusions arrived at by a team of experts who recently prepared, on instructions from the United Nations, a report on the economic and social consequences of disarmament are worthy of note. The report stresses that disarmament would produce beneficial results and lead to an improvement in the condition of the peoples of all countries. If the governments proceed with determination to switch funds from military to peaceful uses, the report points out, "no country need fear a lack of useful employment opportunities for the resources that would become available to it through disarmament".

Yet the ideologists of military business, particularly in the United States, are fairly hammering it into the minds of people that the enormous national expenditure on armaments is a means of achieving "economic prosperity" while disarmament would bring nothing but economic dislocation and increased unemployment. Is this not a disgusting and monstrous idea which makes the possibility of economic progress, of employment and a guaranteed livelihood conditional on the quantity production of means of destruction? (*Applause.*)

Experience gives the lie to the economic arguments of the opponents of disarmament. Growing military spending can only produce a short-lived, unhealthy expansion of industrial production, and in the final analysis will lead to economic stagnation and mass unemployment. In fact, which are the capitalist countries where armaments expenditure has assumed the greatest scale in recent years? They are first of all the United States and Britain. And which are the capitalist countries where the rate of industrial growth has been the lowest during the same period? The United States and Britain.

The militarists and monopolists, who make unprecedented profits from arms production, intimidate the masses, saying that in the event of disarmament millions of people would find themselves out of jobs, and that an "economic disaster" would set in. This point of view is groundless. On the contrary, disarmament would bring real economic benefits to all

sections of the population in the capitalist countries, above all to the working class, the peasantry and the middle sections of the town population, whom it would relieve of the backbreaking tax burden.

Manufacturers, scientists, workers and engineers, whose well-being today depends on the arms race, on the sinister "death business", would do well to recall *Mother Courage and Her Children,* that excellent play by Bertolt Brecht, the German anti-fascist writer. The play presents the tragic portrait of a sutler who lives on war but whom war robs of her children, one after another, and thus drains her life of meaning and purpose. In the same way, war preparations which today are rewarded with seeming and fleeting benefits will tomorrow require a heavy tribute in the lives, health and future of children and grandchildren.

It is true that disarmament alone will not solve all social problems. But stopping the insane waste of forces and funds on means of destruction, and switching these resources to peaceful purposes, will undoubtedly benefit the economies of all countries. Even in so rich a capitalist country as the United States, millions of people are badly in need of housing, hospitals and schools. Even the U.S. President says that there are too many illiterate and uneducated people in the United States and that, on the other hand, the country is short of more than 127,000 classrooms.

There are no funds to build schools and hospitals and improve the living standards of the people. Yet thousands of millions of dollars are spent on means of destruction. Disarmament would make it possible to allocate funds for meeting the urgent needs of the American people. American economists estimate that the U.S. Government could within the first five years following disarmament spend $330,000 million. Some $160,000 million would have to be spent on clearing the slums, on housing and water supply, $30,000 million on school construction and education, $35,000 million on health and hospitals, and $105,000 million on road-building and for other purposes. These figures smash the myth which says that in the event of disarmament there would be nothing to make up for the so-called national war market.

Disarmament would benefit the whole Western economy. The only losers would be a small handful of arms manufac-

turers, who would be deprived of the possibility of plundering the peoples through arms supplies. The sooner they are deprived of this possibility, the more the people will gain. But even the arms manufacturers could, if they are still human at all, reconvert their plants to the production of means of satisfying the requirements of people instead of means of exterminating people. (*Applause.*)

Disarmament would also bring tremendous advantages to the underdeveloped countries which are beginning to fulfil vast projects of national revival and to the peoples fighting for their liberation from colonial tyranny.

The liberation of peoples from the chains of colonial slavery is a great progressive development. The Soviet Union wholeheartedly supports the sacred, just struggle of the peoples against colonialism. (*Prolonged applause.*) The Soviet attitude is clear and precise. *There must be no people shackled with the chains of colonialism in Asia, Africa, Latin America or any other area of the globe. All peoples must be free!* (*Stormy applause.*) There is a close interconnection between the struggle for national liberation and the struggle for disarmament and peace. (*Applause.*) The struggle for general disarmament facilitates the struggle for national independence. The achievements of the national liberation movement, in their turn, promote peace and contribute to the struggle for disarmament. (*Applause.*)

The colonialists have always established and maintained their rule by force of arms. Naturally, to deprive them of arms would mean pulling out the teeth of the colonialist sharks. (*Applause.*) It would for ever eliminate the possibility of any colonialist revenge and finally and irrevocably undermine the foundations of their rule in the colonies still existing. I would like to stress once again that the Soviet proposals for general and complete disarmament speak above all else of the need of destroying modern lethal weapons. As it happens, these weapons are not in the hands of those fighting against colonialism. Disarmament means disarming the war forces, abolishing militarism, ruling out armed interference in the internal affairs of any country, and doing away completely and finally with all forms of colonialism. (*Prolonged applause.*) That is why disarmament would make for a further development of the national liberation movement. Given a durable peace, nothing could hamper the progress

of the national liberation struggle of the peoples or prevent them from winning complete political and economic independence.

Today the economically underdeveloped countries are spending roughly $5,000-$6,000 million a year for military purposes. This is a colossal amount for countries which need every single cent to break free from poverty and backwardness. There can be no doubt that, given peace and deliverance from the burden of military spending, the underdeveloped countries could the sooner develop their economies and gain economic independence.

Disarmament would create proper conditions for a tremendous increase in the scale of assistance to the newly established national states. If a mere 8-10 per cent of the $120,000 million spent for military purposes throughout the world were turned to this purpose, it would be possible to end hunger, disease and illiteracy in the distressed areas of the globe within twenty years. A mere fifth of the amount spent for military purposes would be sufficient to build 96 steel plants the size of the Bhilai Works in India, which is to turn out 2,500,000 tons of steel a year, or 17 giants like the Aswan Dam in the U.A.R. This amount would be enough to set up from 30 to 40 power industry centres of world significance, such as powerful industrial combines in the valleys of the Nile, Niger, Congo and Zambesi in Africa, in the Sahara, in the valleys of the great Indus, Ganges and Mekong in Asia, in the foothills of the Andes and on the banks of South American rivers.

It is needless to speak of the beneficial effect these measures would have on the development of the young national states, of the powerful impetus they would give to their industrialisation and progress. Those countries could within the next 20 to 25 years overcome their economic backwardness to a considerable degree and approach the industrial standards of countries like Britain and France.

Such an advance of the newly established national states would undoubtedly require their close co-operation with the industrially developed countries. The main condition for this co-operation is genuine equality and mutual advantage. This co-operation would result in expanded production and would provide many further millions of people in all countries with jobs.

It has been calculated that with the funds spent for military purposes all over the world during the past decade, an end could have been put to the housing shortage in all countries. Given general and complete disarmament, the wealth of the world could be more than doubled within 20 to 25 years.

Needless to say that the peoples of the Soviet Union and all socialist countries have a vital concern in disarmament. As has been said, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are being compelled by the arms race to spend large sums on strengthening their defences. We could make proper use of the resources that would be released through disarmament to carry out peace-time projects for the happiness of people.

Last autumn the Twenty-Second Congress of the C.P.S.U. adopted its new Programme in this hall. The Programme envisages a titanic amount of work on creating material and spiritual values such as the age-long history of mankind has never known. Allow me to cite a few facts and figures to enable you to assess the magnitude of the tasks which the Soviet people have set themselves.

It is our intention that 20 years from now the Soviet Union's industrial product should be almost double the product now turned out by all of the non-socialist world. (*Applause.*) In 1980, for example, we will produce up to 3,000,000 million kilowatt hours of electric power, or 50 per cent more than the power produced by the capitalist world in 1961. (*Applause.*) We have set ourselves the imposing task of building up an abundance of all blessings and of going over to the principle, from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The unprecedented sweep of our building programmes speaks for itself. Even many of our ill-wishers admit now that people who draw up and execute plans of that sort must be vitally interested in enduring peace. We set our sights far ahead, we plan years and decades in advance. Our plans and targets, this accelerating rhythm of our development that justifies our likening the immense body of socialist countries from the Elbe to the Pacific Ocean with a giant building site, leave no room for war. (*Applause.*)

The peace policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries springs directly from the nature of our society.

It is part and parcel of our society. Our economic and social system has no "nutritive medium" for militarism, for a policy of conquest and for war business. We have no classes, groups or individuals yearning to seize foreign lands, external markets, or spheres of investment. We have no people who profit by government war orders. In our country no group will ever fan a militarist psychosis, scaring the parliament into increasing military appropriations and taxes on the population. We have all the resources we need. All thoughts of revising borders, acquiring new territories or subjugating other countries economically are quite alien to the Soviet Union.

The desire for peace is inherent in the very nature of the socialist countries, while aggressive designs against other peoples are alien to them. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and all the other Communist Parties always appeal for friendship among the peoples, and not for attacks by one nation upon another. (*Applause.*)

The class struggle in the capitalist countries, it is true, prevails, and it is inevitable, because it springs from the division of society into classes. The outcome of the class struggle, the choice of the way of life and of the political system, is a domestic affair of the population of each country.

The Communists of all countries, assembled at their meeting in 1960, adopted an Appeal to the Peoples, in which they solemnly proclaimed that they consider struggle for the preservation and promotion of peace a sacred duty. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Our constructive twenty-year Programme also defines the chief purpose of Soviet foreign policy. This purpose is to ensure a peaceful environment for the building of communist society in the Soviet Union and the development of the world socialist system, and to deliver mankind in concert with all the peace-loving peoples from a world-wide destructive war. (*Applause.*)

*The great ideals of Peace, Labour, Freedom, Equality, Fraternity and Happiness for all peoples are inscribed on our banner. (Stormy, prolonged applause.)*

*V. I. Lenin proclaimed disarmament as the socialist ideal.* As far back as 1922, in Genoa, at the first international conference attended by the Soviet state, our country's spokesmen on Lenin's instructions proposed general disarmament and

the disbandment of standing armies. In the history of mankind this was the first proposal for general disarmament to come formally from a state. And we are proud that it came from our socialist state, from its head of government, Lenin. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

A big period of history lies between Genoa 1922 and Geneva 1962. Deep-going changes have occurred on our planet. But today, just as forty years ago, the Soviet standpoint in matters of disarmament is essentially the same.

*We have always advocated disarmament and apply all our efforts to reinforcing world peace.* The most radical proposals in behalf of peace—the proposals to conclude a German peace treaty, to ban nuclear tests and totally eliminate nuclear weapons, to establish atom-free zones, to reduce the armed forces, to conclude a Peace Pact, to settle all controversial matters by negotiation, and, last but not least, crowning them all, the draft Treaty for General and Complete Disarmament—have all come from the Soviet Union. (*Prolonged applause.*) We worked for peace and disarmament when we were still weak in the military way. We work for peace and disarmament now, when—let's be frank about it—we have the most perfect of weapons that no other power possesses. Is this not the best possible proof that the Soviet Union does not want war? (*Stormy applause.*)

Between 1955 and 1958 we reduced unilaterally our armed forces by 2,140,000 men on our own initiative. We gave up war bases. Could any country afford to reduce its armed forces to that extent if it were preparing for attack? Only a country that seeks peace can afford to do so. And we regret that the other countries negotiating disarmament with us have not followed suit. In 1960 the session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. adopted a decision to reduce the strength of the Soviet Armed Forces by another third, or 1,200,000 men. The Soviet Union had begun to effect this decision, but the unveiled Western threat to go to war against the Soviet Union compelled us to suspend the discharge of soldiers and officers.

If the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries had not been threatened by the Western aggressive forces, which are armed to the teeth, we would long since have disbanded our armies and converted our war industries entirely to civilian production. In the last four years we have been

spending an annual average of about 10,000 million new rubles on defence. It is easily seen how much faster our gigantic construction programme would proceed if these vast resources were put into peaceful development. But so long as the aggressive imperialist forces exist, we are compelled to produce powerful modern weapons, keep the necessary armed forces, and maintain the defences of the Soviet state at a level that ensures decisive and complete defeat of the aggressor. (*Applause.*) But we are ready to disarm at any moment, even tomorrow, if the capitalist countries do likewise.

*General and complete disarmament would ring in a truly historic change in men's lives from the epoch of wars to the epoch of lasting peace on earth.* This historic change can come true. It must come true! Everything depends on the masses, on their perseverance and determination. *(Prolonged applause.)*

## IV. THE PEOPLES CAN AND MUST ACHIEVE DISARMAMENT AND PRESERVE THE PEACE

Mankind can and must live without war. War in the contemporary epoch is not fatally inevitable. But neither is peace fatally inevitable.

The question is whether the people today have the resources to stop the race towards death, towards a new war. We say unequivocally: Yes, they have. Today there are real and powerful forces, capable of protecting the peace. They are the Soviet Union and the world socialist system, which present a powerful barrier to a new world war; the many young sovereign states favouring general disarmament and lasting peace, which include such Great Powers as India and Indonesia (*prolonged applause*); and the peace-loving forces in all countries, fighting for the elimination of the very possibility of armed conflicts.

The World Peace Movement headed by the World Council of Peace, and the various other organisations of peace fighters are making a big contribution to the lofty cause of peace. Present at the Congress are spokesmen of many new organisations that have joined the battle for peace. This shows that the peace movement is expanding and gaining strength.

The fight for peace waged by the finest sons of the peoples

in the capitalist countries is bound up with big difficulties. A hail of reprisals is showered upon the courageous men and women who truly represent the conscience of mankind. But in spite of the hardships, they carry on their noble work perseveringly. And grateful mankind will never forget their efforts. (*Stormy applause.*)

It is not to be expected, of course, that the militarists will want to disarm of their own volition. The warlike groups are resisting disarmament desperately, and will continue to do so. We must never forget that so long as the militarists, those makers of military thunderclaps, exist in Europe and America, the danger of war will persist. But there are forces in the world today capable of forcing them to disarm. (*Applause.*)

Great trials have fallen to the lot of our generation. Grave responsibilities rest upon its shoulders. If we live up to them and check the aggressive forces, it will mean that we will have wrought a safe future for mankind.

People conscious of the future and the happiness of their children, will realise that, though much has been done in the past years to preserve and fortify the peace, much more still has to be done, a hundred and a thousand times more.

There are strong forces waging an effective struggle for enduring peace, for greater understanding among countries and nations, and for the great idea of general and complete disarmament in the United States, Britain, West Germany, France and other member countries of the various aggressive blocs. That is quite true. Many individuals belonging to the ruling classes take part in this struggle as well, because they see the present world situation in a sober and realistic light.

But to speak frankly, many people in the Western countries do not appreciate all the dangers of a nuclear war, and stay out of the active struggle for disarmament and peace. Many trade unions, big sections of the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia have not yet joined in the battle. Yet, hand in hand with the present peace fighters, they are capable of making the Western ruling quarters heed the will of the peoples. Quite a number of people are led astray by the slogans of parties that speak sweet words of peace, especially at election time, while, in effect, the governments composed of their members are carrying on the arms race. Yet the

parties, which have had a hand in founding the aggressive NATO, SEATO and CENTO blocs, get the electorates' approval over and over again for forming governments.

The indisputable fact and the complexity of the present international situation lie in that the top leadership of the principal Western bourgeois parties and many of the Right-wing leaders of Social-Democratic parties favour the arms race.

Take the United States. It has a Democratic and a Republican Party. There are disputes between them, though it is impossible for a man unversed in politics to appreciate their purport, but in matters concerning war preparations the Republican elephant and the Democratic donkey are in one harness. (*Animation. Applause.*) It is the same in West Germany. The party of war and revenge headed by Adenauer sets the tune, and the leadership of the Social-Democratic Party chime in. In Britain, the Right-wing Labour Party leadership falls in with the Conservatives in the cardinal issues of war and peace and gives active support to their war measures in defiance of the will of the rank-and-file membership and the trade unions. The picture is essentially the same as far as the French rulers are concerned. As for the other NATO, SEATO and CENTO member countries, they play what is in effect a very subordinate role and have no final say in matters of war and peace. In Norway and Denmark the governments are headed by Social-Democrats. But instead of acting upon the will of the working class and the rest of the working people, who do not want war, they fall in with the militarist forces, and help work out arms race decisions in the aggressive NATO bloc.

In all frankness, there is tremendous inconformity between the will of the peoples, who appreciate the dangers of a new world war, and the fact that nuclear war preparations are being stepped up in the Western countries. The somewhat passive attitude of many sections of the population there to the peace struggle and the fact that they underrate their own possibilities, is playing into the hands of the warmakers.

General and complete disarmament is truly a great goal and calls for great actions and great efforts by all the peoples. Keenly aware that the hour is critical and grave, we should like to declare from this rostrum to all men and women regardless of their social background and con-

victions, to the generation that has lived through the terrors of war and to the young people who know about war only from what their elders tell them: *This is the time to act! In the name of life on earth and the happiness of all men, in the name of the future of mankind, show firmness and determination in demanding the atomic weapons ban and general disarmament! (Stormy applause.)*

If the people act, they can compel the priests of war to retire from the political arena, make governments alter their policy and change the climate of international relations as a whole. But for this they must act, act and act again. That is the main thing.

It is especially the *workers*, who, with their families, comprise more than half of the population in the developed capitalist countries, that can do a lot in behalf of peace. The many millions of the working class, the class of creators to whom destruction is alien, are destined by history to thwart the atomic maniacs and to deliver mankind from the deadly peril that overhangs it.

The *peasants*, the second biggest section of the popular force, are also vitally interested in preventing a nuclear war. The time has come for the voice of the peasant masses to resound against war throughout the world.

Can the *women*, who give life to new generations, fail to show a special, I daresay unparalleled, activity in the struggle against the forces threatening to start a nuclear war? A war of that sort would turn the bright world of children into a world of orphans and cripples.

And the *young people*–does not the solution of the cardinal question of our time depend on them to a large extent? To the young, war is frustration of all their hopes, it is ravished youth. Peace is breathtaking prospects of creation, realisation of dreams, enhancement of mankind's wealth and exploration of the Universe. (*Prolonged applause.*)

I should like to say that the role of the *intellectuals, the scientists*, those magicians of spiritual culture and discoverers of more and more secrets of Nature, has never been as important. It is good to see that many scientists and men of culture, aware of what modern lethal weapons spell to mankind, are sounding the alarm, calling on the peoples to bridle the forces of war before it is too late. The great French scientist, Joliot-Curie, who served to his dying breath as an

inspiring example of dedication to peace, will live in the memory of men for ever. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Can the scientists and technicians developing atomic and hydrogen bombs, rockets, warplanes, submarines and ships wash their hands of responsibility if these tools of death are used to attack peace-loving countries? In the Western countries, scientists, technicians and workingmen develop unprecedentedly lethal weapons, while a handful of capitalist monopoly bosses controls them. It goes against the conscience and intelligence of scientists and technicians that the powerful weapons they have developed should be turned against civilisation, against the peoples, against themselves, against life on earth.

The fundamental difference between the situation of scientists doing military work in the socialist and the imperialist countries is quite obvious. The Soviet scientists work in a country that is fighting to banish war from the life of society. They work for the sake of fortifying peace. But like the rest of the Soviet people they would prefer to give of their strength and skill to building and building alone in a world disarmed.

History also puts the businessmen in the capitalist countries face to face with the keenest of questions. In past wars the death of millions of people was accompanied by fabulous profits for members of the business world, but a modern war will yield them death instead of profits. Nuclear weapons draw no line between the rich and the poor. Only ultra-militarists on the brink of insanity, who scorn the future of nations, hope they will sit it out in bomb shelters. There is no shelter from nuclear bombs. He who wants to live must fight for disarmament. (*Stormy applause.*)

The independent Asian, African and Latin American countries, usually called non-aligned or neutralist, are beginning to play an increasingly important part in the grand battle for peace. India, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, Brazil, Ghana, Guinea, Ceylon, Burma, Afghanistan, Mali and many other countries, are in favour of signing a general and complete disarmament treaty. (*Applause.*)

There can be no neutrality in the question of general and complete disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war. If war breaks out it will not only involve the belligerents, but will also bring grave calamities to the populations of

the neutralist countries. The neutralist countries should make their contribution to the solution of the all-important question of our day. They will make that contribution if their policy in matters of disarmament will not succumb to external political and economic pressure and will not be influenced by mercantile and transient interests.

Dear delegates, the struggle for peace has brought together people of different classes and political convictions. The situation of impending storm calls for a truly world-wide anti-war alliance of the peoples, expressing the will of all social groups, all the nations of Europe, Asia, Africa, America and Oceania. There can be just one goal for the programme and the activities of this truly world-wide association of diverse peace-loving forces—to prevent a thermonuclear war and to put the warlike maniacs in a state of siege. (*Applause.*)

Let me reassure this Congress that the Soviet Union will continue to apply all its efforts in behalf of the great and lofty cause of peace. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The Soviet Union is for peace and friendship among all nations. Our government has instructed me to declare from this rostrum that the Soviet people want to live in peace and friendship with the industrious and gifted people of America. (*Stormy applause.*) The Soviet and American peoples have no grounds to be hostile to each other. Peace and friendship are in their common interest. The Soviet people call on the American people, and on all other peoples, to work together for these lofty aims. (*Stormy applause.*)

I should like to stress once more that the masses, and their actions, are the decisive force in the battle for disarmament. May the world-wide movement for general disarmament and peace expand each day and each week. May all the peoples rise and with their actions achieve disarmament and block the road to world war. The greater the army of peace fighters, the more active it is, the quicker general and complete disarmament will be accomplished. (*Prolonged applause.*) The people of every country will no doubt find effective forms and methods of struggle for general disarmament and enduring peace, consistent with the specific local conditions, and thereby do their bit for the solution of this problem. (*Applause.*)

Over a hundred years ago Victor Hugo spoke at the Congress of Peace in Paris of a future day when guns would

be exhibited in museums and people would wonder how such barbarity was possible in the past. "The day will come," Victor Hugo exclaimed, "when markets open to trade and minds open to ideas will be the only battlefields."

"Peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations–entangling alliances with none," was what that great American, Thomas Jefferson, wanted to see in the international relations of the future. (*Applause.*)

In the day of Hugo and Jefferson these appeals were a magnificent but unrealisable dream. Today, when there is the powerful world socialist system, which throws its weight on the scales of the peace struggle, when a large group of peaceful Asian, African and Latin American countries has emerged on the international arena, and when the working-class, general democratic and national liberation movements have developed into one of the decisive factors of our time, real conditions are arising to make the dreams of generations about peace come true at last. (*Applause.*)

Friends, the peoples are pinning far-reaching hopes on the work of this Congress. *So may its summons be heard throughout the Universe, inspiring new tens of millions of people to fight for enduring peace on earth with determination and dedication!* (*Stormy applause.*)

Once the various streams of which the movement against the threat of nuclear war is composed merge into one common torrent, its force will be irrepressible. It will surge over all the continents like the spring floods and will sweep the obstacles to general and complete disarmament out of the way. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Hail to the fighters for peace, for the prevention of a nuclear world war! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live enduring peace and friendship among all nations! (*Stormy applause.*)

Thank you. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Ovation. All rise.*)

# INTERVIEW WITH A GROUP OF U.S. JOURNALISTS

## *July 13, 1962*

On July 13, 1962, N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., received a group of U.S. journalists headed by Mr. Lee Hills, President of the American Society of Newspaper Editors and Executive Editor of Knight Newspapers.

The group consisted of Mr. Paul Miller, President of Gannett Newspapers, Mr. Walker Stone, Editor-in-Chief of Scripps-Howard Newspapers, Mr. Michael Ogden, Managing Editor of the *Providence Journal-Bulletin*, Vermont Royster, Editor of the *Wall Street Journal*, John R. Herbert, Editor of the *Quincy Patriot Ledger*, Mr. John Harris, Editor of the *Hutchison News*, Mr. Lauren Soth, Editor of the *Des Moines Register and Tribune*, Mr. William Westendyke, Editor of *Newsday*, Mr. Felix McKnight, Editor of the *Dallas Times Herald*, Mr. Creed Black, Editor of *News Journal*, Mr. Robert Estabrook, European Correspondent of the *Washington Post and Times Herald*, Mr. Stephen Cousinfield, Correspondent of the *Washington Post*, and Mr. Peter Hickey, Chief Photographer of the *Times Union*.

A transcript of the interview, parts of which are here retranslated from the Russian, follows.

To begin with, N. S. Khrushchov welcomed the American journalists and asked them how they liked their tour of the Soviet Union.

*Lee Hills* (President of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, head of the delegation): Mr. Chairman, we had an interesting tour of the Soviet Union and were accorded a warm and cordial welcome wherever we went. We were greeted with great hospitality by all sections of the public in all the cities we visited. We were greatly impressed by the progress achieved by the Soviet people in all spheres of human endeavour.

Our group of American editors sincerely wishes to get information about the Soviet Union and to gain a better understanding of your country and your views on various world and domestic problems.

We think that, like the Americans, the Soviet people sincerely want peace. We think that the governments of both our countries also sincerely want peace, and we find it hard

to understand why the Soviet press so frequently attacks the United States and the motives behind the policies of the U.S. Government. We hope that a frank discussion with you on questions of interest to us will promote the better understanding that our countries need most of all.

*Khrushchov*: To begin with, allow me to thank you for your kind words about the Soviet Union and the Soviet people. I am glad to hear that your delegation was hospitably received in the Soviet Union and that the Soviet people showed good will towards you as representatives of the American people. I am especially happy to hear this from you, an American. This attitude of Soviet people towards the American people is also a token of the Soviet Government's policy.

I am now ready to answer your questions.

*Lee Hills*: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the first question. But first I want to thank you for consenting to see us and to answer our questions.

I would like to ask the following question: What, in your view, are the main problems dividing our two countries and how do you, as a realist, envisage the possibility of resolving them? In particular, I would like you to comment on President Kennedy's statement of July 5 that he will continue his efforts aimed at reducing tensions and creating the conditions for living in peace with all countries.

*Khrushchov*: One should, of course, always bear in mind that our countries have different social systems. The Soviet Union is a socialist country, and the U.S.A. is a capitalist country. This determines the policies of each country. History will decide which socio-political system is better. We believe firmly that this question should be solved not by war, but by peaceful competition. The peoples themselves should choose the social system that suits them best.

One thing is clear: even with different social systems we can and should live in peace and have good relations. In short, we should coexist peacefully.

In our view, the difference in social systems is no obstacle to the development of good-neighbour relations between the Soviet Union and the United States.

As for problems that would be insuperable obstacles to the development of co-operation between our countries, I do not, in substance, know of any such problems. We have no claims upon the United States, territorial or otherwise. I

think that the United States, too, has no claims upon us. Neither are we competitors of the U.S.A. On the contrary, our countries could co-operate fruitfully in economic matters. This would undoubtedly promote a still greater development of both our countries.

How do things stand today? Trade between our countries is virtually non-existent. I should say that this is due to what may be described as a psychological shock which American monopoly capital suffers from its dread of communism.

The U.S.A. has in effect given up trading with us. But it is thereby harming itself. We regret the absence of normal commercial relations between our countries. But we regret it not because trade with the U.S.A. is essential for the development of Soviet economy. We regret it because trade clears the way for better relations between states and nations. It has been a rule since ancient times that if states trade with one another and seek to expand trade, they do not fight between themselves and live in peace. Trade and war exclude one another. The halting of trade, on the other hand, has always portended a deterioration of relations between countries.

It is not our fault that there is no normal trade between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. at present. We are trading with very many countries, your allies among them, and our trade is not bad. The Soviet Union will continue to promote the development of these trade relations.

What, then, prevents the development of Soviet-American relations if there are no insuperable problems impeding the improvement of relations between our two countries? The thing is that the United States has assumed ignoble leadership in the fight against communism. This is a wrong and dangerous course, and it will yield no political dividends. Our people say in such cases: Be as you were at birth until you gain some sense; or one could use another expression: until you think better of it. (*Animation.*) It is practically the same thing. To be sure, we cannot help the United States in this matter.

The American concept of anti-communism gives rise to difficulties also in solving the German problem. We could long since have found a mutually acceptable solution of this problem. There are many points we hold in common on this score. I won't enumerate the questions on which understanding has already been reached, because the negotiations are still under

way and I would not like to speak for the U.S. politicians and possibly put them in an embarrassing position. As for our standpoint, surely you know it well.

On what issue do we differ in the talks? We do not see eye to eye on the need to withdraw the occupation forces from West Berlin. We think that the occupation forces of the U.S.A., Britain and France should be withdrawn from West Berlin. You will ask why. Because this would create normal conditions for the population of West Berlin as a free city.

It is hard to understand what the U.S.A. wants in West Berlin. Its arguments in favour of perpetuating the occupation status in West Berlin are groundless. As long as U.S., British and French occupation forces stay in West Berlin they will act as a stimulant that raises the temperature in relations between states.

I would like to dwell on the problem in greater detail, because it is one of the main issues in the present world situation. To solve it would, if I may use the comparison, be like finding the bad tooth and pulling it, thus easing the situation. West Berlin is just that sort of bad tooth.

Does the United States really need West Berlin? Do France or Britain need it? No, they do not. They cling to West Berlin as to a source of tensions. It is often claimed in the West that Western occupation forces are needed to safeguard the freedom of the people of West Berlin. But nobody is encroaching on their freedom. We are ready to guarantee this freedom together with the U.S.A., Britain and France, and to ensure non-interference in West Berlin affairs. We are ready to have this guarantee formalised with the seal of the United Nations.

But all we hear in response to this desire of ours is no, no and no!

What does the United States want? Does it want our consent to its troops staying in West Berlin and to the perpetuation of the occupation? It is claimed that these rights were gained by the Western Powers in the war. But we were allies in that war, and we occupied Germany together. Seventeen years have passed since the war. It is high time to put an end to the survivals of the war and to sign a peace treaty. Yet we are told: No, the occupation of West Berlin must continue. Today, this occupation is no longer in the interests of

the countries which fought against Hitler Germany. The NATO bloc, which is spearheaded against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, has used the occupation of West Berlin to turn it, in effect, into a military bridgehead. Our stand on this question was elucidated in yesterday's TASS Statement.

Some people say that Western occupation troops are needed to reassure the population of West Berlin. This is a groundless contention. Can the presence of American troops reassure the people of West Berlin? I think they would feel much safer without any occupation forces. I don't know whether this comparison is a good one, but it suggests itself: it is much like a trumpeter who moves in next door to an old man's bedroom, and tells him: I'll play the trumpet all the time so you will know that I am wide awake and will always be wide awake, and that you are safe. The old man would probably find such company inconvenient and would most certainly lose his sleep and peace of mind. A person who wants to sleep needs quiet and calm and wants no trumpeter to disturb this quiet. The Germans in West Berlin need to live normally, and they need to have confidence that existing tensions have really been eased and that the situation has been normalised. Business in West Berlin would also revive.

Indeed, what capitalist will put his money in the West Berlin banks if he is unsure of the future? Is it not indicative that the death rate in West Berlin today is higher than the birth rate? Why is this so? It is because people lack confidence in the future, and this sense of insecurity and crisis will swell.

Even representatives of the bourgeois world tell us that this state of affairs cannot last for more than a decade, after which West Berlin will wither. In effect, Walter Lippmann, the American journalist, expressed the same view in his articles. You can make sure by reading them.

What will halt this process? We are sure that it can be halted by the signing of a peace treaty, the establishment of a free city status for West Berlin and the creation of stability. Only then will West Berlin and its people see prospects of further development. None will fear any more to invest money in the city's industry and to expand trade. For our part, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries could place or-

ders which would also support the West Berlin economy. All this, however, is impracticable until a German peace treaty is signed and West Berlin is turned into a free city.

Thus, to show genuine concern for the people of West Berlin means signing a peace treaty.

This is what we are asking of the United States, Britain and France. This is the sensible solution we are working for.

To be sure, the problem of West Berlin involves much more than the interests of its population. It appears that, if we were to solve this problem, we would remove one of the chief obstacles to a reduction of international tension, one that sets us at odds with the United States, Britain and France. A solution of this problem would clear the horizons in Europe and formalise the situation that has come about on that continent after the war. As to the post-war borders, they have been recognised in effect. Even Adenauer has declared that he has no intention of altering the borders by means of war. But this state of affairs should be formalised in legal fashion by the signing of a peace treaty.

I should like to stress once again that agreement on questions related to a German peace settlement and solution of the West Berlin problem on this basis would undoubtedly promote better understanding between our countries and lead to a marked improvement of the European situation as a whole. Conversely, the problem will remain a source of tension so long as it is not solved.

Here is an example. In 1960 we passed a law on reducing our Armed Forces by one-third. We began carrying it out and disbanded a part of our army. But in the summer of 1961 the United States heated the atmosphere over West Berlin. The U.S. President announced an increase in arms appropriations and declared a mobilisation. We were threatened with war. In reply we were forced to halt the reduction of the Soviet Armed Forces and to take auxiliary measures for strengthening our defences. All talk of disarmament was quite useless in these circumstances.

The Soviet Government attaches great importance to solving the German problem. We have been explaining our stand patiently and persistently. Not until we have exhausted all our possibilities of gaining the understanding of our Western partners will we conclude a peace treaty, together with those states that may wish to do it. By doing this we shall only

be repeating what the United States did when it concluded a peace treaty with Japan without the Soviet Union.

We have been told that if we and other countries sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic and settle the question of West Berlin on this basis, the Western Powers will resort to force. We are being threatened and intimidated with mobilisation. But we will sign a peace treaty all the same.

When will we do it? We are in no hurry, but neither shall we delay it too long. I set no deadlines. We have not yet lost hope that the U.S.A. and its allies will show sensible understanding. We have not lost hope that the problem will be solved reasonably. The question is like a leach clinging to a healthy body. If we find the means to reach an understanding and tear this leach away, we shall have done much to strengthen peace. I think that no sane person and no sane country would respond with war to an act of peace. Besides, it should be borne in mind that we are neither Laos, Thailand, nor some other small state. We have the same resources as those we are threatened with. Those who threaten us will get precisely what they hold in store for us.

I think the U.S. Government realises what all this means, and will therefore take a reasonable approach to the solution of the German problem.

Please excuse me for going into such detail on this question. I have explained our stand a few times before, and may have to do it again. I have dwelt on this question at such length because I regard it as the source of the friction between our countries.

Many Americans understand the problem correctly. I could mention Lippmann and Stevenson. True, in Eisenhower's time Stevenson showed a better understanding of the problem. Under Kennedy, when he is no longer in the opposition and has become the U.S. representative at the United Nations, his approach to the same problems has changed. Those are two different Stevensons. I could name many other sober-minded persons who see the need for a peaceful solution of the German problem.

Now, I should like to answer that part of your question which refers to what the U.S. President said at his press conference on July 5. Well, I welcome what the President said about his intention to live in peace with all countries.

To live in peace and friendship with all peoples is our goal, our cherished desire. Everything the Soviet Government does and the efforts of all the Soviet people are aimed at this. But it is impossible to judge of a government's policy by just one declaration of good intentions. The peoples estimate the policies of governments by their deeds, not their words. Yet the deeds, unfortunately, do not bear out the intentions which the President mentioned in his statement. Take the U.S. stand on the German problem and a few other issues.

The United States has ringed the Soviet Union with its bases, and threatens us. Are these good relations? So, as you see, the deeds are at odds with certain good intentions. We would be delighted if the U.S. President's statements were in step with the American Government's actions, because this would clear the horizon and create a better atmosphere for the peaceful solution of various problems.

*Paul Miller* (President of Gannett Newspapers): When we return to the United States we will do our best to write objectively about the Soviet Union. In doing so, we will point out the positive aspects, and whatever we regard as negative.

However, we have seen here that the picture of the United States presented by the Soviet press is almost always negative throughout, and the actions and motives of the United States are frequently distorted.

The Soviet citizens we have spoken to want to know the facts about the United States, and the Americans want to know more about the actual state of affairs in the Soviet Union. We would like to discuss the available opportunities for gaining a better understanding of each other. For my part, I would like in particular to point out one or two such opportunities.

First, I would like to ask how a two-way exchange of information could be encouraged and developed. You, Mr. Chairman, are probably aware that, with the exception of the magazine *America*, no non-communist magazines or newspapers are translated into Russian or sold at newspaper stands, whereas American citizens can buy Soviet publications in the United States. When will Soviet citizens be able to buy American newspapers, magazines and books at Soviet stores and newspaper stands?

*Khrushchov*: Your contention that we write and speak only negatively about the United States is incorrect. When I

criticise shortcomings in our country's agriculture, for instance, I often name the example of the farming output in America and say that we should set our minds on achieving that level. Is this vilification of the United States? On the contrary, it is praise of your country's achievements.

Our newspapers recently reprinted an article by Mr. Garst in full, and I read it with pleasure.

In general, we frequently reprint articles by various American public figures in full. I repeat, in full, without deletions, although we do not agree with some of the points they make.

I could name dozens and hundreds of examples when we follow events in the United States most closely, and report them in our press in order to keep the Soviet public informed. We publish a special magazine, *Za Rubezhom* (*Abroad*), which carries reprints of many items of interest to the Soviet reader.

But to be quite fair, I should say that your papers often print things which even Americans do not care to read. For instance, your papers carry notices that some millionaire lady is seeking a husband of such-and-such an age. This is of no interest to us, and we do not reprint it. (*Animation.*) On the other hand, we follow information on how to ensure a maximum gain of weight in pigs or poultry with a minimum expenditure of labour and fodder. We print such valuable information.

I have met many Americans and had rather pleasant conversations with them. I am very pleased with our talk today. I shall probably be seeing Mr. Garst this year, and will be happy to hear what he has to say. It is a pleasure to talk with him.

We are people of different political views, of different poles, we could say, and we judge differently of what is good and what is bad in the life of society. This is natural. That is why something that is good to you may seem bad to us, while you may abhor something we think to be good. Let us each stick to our own opinion. Take from us whatever you consider to be good, and we will pick up what is good from you. This is what the policy of peaceful coexistence amounts to. Incidentally, books by American authors on different questions and by people of different views are published in the Soviet Union in large printings.

We are more inclined to buy machines and other commodities from you. We would be glad to sell you whatever goods

you like. Buy what you need, and we shall buy what we need from you.

Literature is a spiritual commodity. Yet our spiritual trends differ. Some people require spiritual food of one kind, while others are nauseated by that sort of literature. Tastes are controversial. Americans, for instance, like to chew gum, while a Russian is irritated by this. But a habit is a habit. We won't go to war just because you like to chew gum and we do not. But that was just a joke.

The time will come when we shall exchange publications on a wider basis. The sooner it comes, the better. At present your newspapers publish many articles whose authors are liable to legal prosecution under Soviet law because they advocate war.

I would like to cite an example concerning exchanges. We are exchanging films at present. I saw the film, *The Magnificent Seven.* The actors played their parts marvellously. But when it was shown in our country, we received many reproaches. Teachers wrote to the newspapers and a critical article entitled "Two For the Seven"*, appeared in one of the papers. It said that the film had a bad influence on young people. I agree with our educators. You Americans have many films in which people punch each other in the face, torture and kill. Many of the films are perverted. In your country this is considered to be interesting. In our country showing these things is believed to be harmful. This is what I wanted to say in answer to your question.

*Paul Miller*: Thank you for your answer to my first question. I would like to ask another one. The United States has just announced the lifting of all restrictions on the travel of Soviet tourists in the U.S.A. Does the Soviet Union intend to end similar restrictions on the travel of American tourists in the Soviet Union?

*Khrushchov*: We are Russians, and Russians say "feel first, before believing". I visited New York not as a tourist, but all the same I always had to ask the police for permission whenever I wanted to go outside the limits of New York. This was an act of discrimination–not against me, but against the United Nations.

Were you restricted in your tour of the Soviet Union?

---

* Two being a low mark in Soviet schools.–*Tr.*

*Voices*: No.

*Lauren Soth* (*Des Moines Register and Tribune*): Yes.

*Khrushchov*: What places were you barred from?

*Lauren Soth*: We wanted to visit the collective farms.

*Krushchov*: Weren't you given an opportunity to do it?

*Lauren Soth*: Not yet.

*Khrushchov*: Go today. What collective farm do you want to visit?

*Lauren Soth*: It's too late now.

*Khrushchov*: But I read in the *Pravda* today that you visited some collective farms in the Ukraine.

*E. V. Litoshko* (Member of the *Pravda* Editorial Board): Nikita Sergeyevich, I accompanied my American colleagues on their tour of the country. They visited two Ukrainian collective farms.

*Lauren Soth*: I would like to see some other collective farms.

*Khrushchov*: You are welcome. Stay here a year. (*Laughter.*) You will then be able to see all our collective farms. We are not restricting you.

*Lauren Soth*: My energy would run out. (*Animation.*)

*Khrushchov*: Stay for a month. Is that settled?

*Lauren Soth*: Unfortunately, I've got to go home to my newspaper.

*Khrushchov*: Well, that is not my fault. (*Laughter.*) You see, he does not want to visit a collective farm and puts the blame on us. Mr. Soth is a clever editor, and his unfortunate question was probably just a slip. In his time, he did a good thing: he was the first in the U.S.A. to urge an exchange of agricultural delegations between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A.

*Lauren Soth*: Thank you for your kindness. I did write an article then in the *Des Moines Register* suggesting an exchange of agricultural delegations.

*Khrushchov*: And you did a good thing.

*Paul Miller*: Mr. Chairman, you have answered the first part of my question. The second part is: can we look forward to a reduction of travel restrictions for American journalists and diplomats in the Soviet Union?

*Khrushchov*: We are moving in that direction and the sooner we come to an agreement on the main problem, that of the German peace treaty, the sooner we eliminate tension in Europe and clear the way for a disarmament agreement,

the sooner will all travel restrictions for foreigners be removed. Then you will be able to go wherever you please. Meanwhile, we have to be on the look-out as to the tourists entering our country. Among the journalists, too, some have never written a line for any journal, though they carry a journalist's card. We are compelled to keep an eye on that kind of journalists and on the object of their visit.

You know that we have had to prosecute a few student "tourists" from West Germany for agreeing to carry out spying assignments of the U.S. intelligence in the Soviet Union during their "tourist" trip. Their trial was covered by the press, and I will not go into it. I mention it as an episode showing that not all tourists coming to our country are really tourists.

We will reduce the travel restrictions for foreigners in the U.S.S.R., but in a way as will not jeopardise the security of our country.

You know that your state—the U.S.A.—is very much inclined to espionage in other countries. Ex-President Eisenhower went to the length of saying so publicly, and claimed that this is inevitable and essential in the interests of the United States. You know of the Powers case and of other similar cases. Let us not go back to them. It would be best if they never recurred. The sooner this happens, the sooner will foreigners be able to travel wherever they want. As to what you say about the U.S. decision to lift restrictions on tourist travel, we will study it.

*Paul Miller*: Would this mean that you are ready to consider the possibility of a relaxation with regard to the movement of foreigners in the Soviet Union?

*Khrushchov*: That is what I meant. The greater the understanding between countries, the more will restrictions on the movement of foreigners be reduced.

*Paul Miller*: Thank you. I would like to add here that the U.S. Government has stated its readiness to lift travel restrictions if the Soviet Union does the same. True, this measure has not yet been tried in practice.

Allow me to ask my last question: can we look forward to a further expansion in the exchange of ideas, exchange in the field of education, culture, science, etc., so as to enable people in our countries to gain a better understanding of the political views and the situation in each country?

*Khrushchov*: I think we have never restricted entry to our country for Americans or citizens of other countries wishing to visit the Soviet Union.

We shall continue to receive visitors from abroad. This is useful and necessary.

*Paul Miller*: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

*Robert Estabrook* (Correspondent of the *Washington Post*): Mr. Chairman, we have read your speech on disarmament. I would like to ask you to clarify a number of points.

It is sometimes said in the West that the best opportunities would arise to achieve agreement on ending the arms race if there were co-operation in the halting of nuclear tests and in the joint exploration of outer space. Some say that after the present series of American nuclear tests the Soviet Union will want to carry out a series of tests, and after that the likelihood may appear for an agreement to end nuclear tests with the establishment of an appropriate control system satisfactory to both parties.

Some even say that you share President Kennedy's desire to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries, such as Germany and China, and that you realise the difficulties involved in this problem.

What, in your view, is the outlook for co-operation between our two countries in these fields?

*Khrushchov*: First, the question about tests. With regard to who was the first to make nuclear tests, the whole world knows that it was the United States that began the tests and the nuclear weapons race. Even before we had nuclear weapons we sought a United Nations resolution banning the use of nuclear weapons, calling for their destruction and setting a ban on their manufacture. The United States was then the only country to possess atomic weapons. The most reasonable course for America would have been to say: We accept your proposals, and let us sign an agreement. In that case we would never have had these weapons. But America refused to do it; it rejected our proposal. For the sake of our defence, we were forced to develop nuclear weapons. Now, Britain and France also have them.

Other countries, too, are probably on the point of producing their own nuclear weapons: the basic scientific data needed for their manufacture are known to all. Large invest-

ments of capital are needed for it and a developed industrial potential.

To eliminate the threat of nuclear war we are seeking an agreement on disarmament, on the destruction of nuclear weapons and the banning of all kinds of nuclear tests for all time. We are ready to sign an agreement on a reasonable basis at any time, and to control it. We believe that national means can ensure control over the ban of nuclear tests. I was gratified to read a report issued by the U.S. Department of Defence that the United States had instruments capable of detecting the difference between earth tremors caused by natural phenomena and tremors caused by underground nuclear explosions. In other words, instruments capable of controlling underground tests are available. If this statement serves the right purpose, we may have some hope that the United States will agree to sign a nuclear test ban treaty controlled by national detection systems, whose draft has been drawn up in Geneva.

So much for the matter of ending the tests.

As to the question of what countries may have nuclear weapons, with or without the help of other powers, and what countries may not, the Soviet Union has not been and is not engaged in negotiations on questions of this kind. There was an exchange of opinions to the effect that the armies of West Germany and East Germany should not have nuclear weapons. We did discuss this question, and I think that it would be sensible.

*Robert Estabrook*: Thank you.

*Walker Stone* (Scripps-Howard Newspapers): I would like to refer to your remark that the United States was the first to begin nuclear tests. That is really so, and tests began when the war was still on. You have also said that the United States did not show the right attitude when it was the only owner of the atom bomb. But I would like to recall that as far back as June 14, 1946, when the United States was still the sole owner of the atom bomb, the United States in the Atomic Energy Commission in the person of its delegate, Bernard Baruch, put forward the proposal to destroy all existing atom bombs and ban nuclear weapons for all time.

*Khrushchov*: This is not entirely correct. At the time no one but America had any bombs. The Baruch Plan envisaged the setting up of international control machinery which

would have ownership rights over atomic raw materials and atomic enterprises, control all research in the sphere of atomic energy and possess the right to interfere in the economic life of states. This is what the U.S.A. wanted, rather than the banning and destruction of nuclear weapons. It wanted to prevent the development of atomic energy in other countries and to perpetuate the United States' nuclear weapons monopoly. It is only natural that we could not agree to this.

*Walker Stone*: Please repeat in what sense my statement was inaccurate?

*Khrushchov*: Baruch could not have demanded the destruction of all bombs at a time when we had no bombs and other countries had no bombs. Baruch's idea was quite different. He wanted to establish control over atomic energy and sources of atomic raw materials under the United Nations signboard. Actually, the U.S. proposal did not provide for the banning of atomic weapons and was aimed at ensuring for the U.S.A. a dominant position in the production and utilisation of atomic energy. Baruch's Plan did not apply to bombs, but to ways and means of depriving other countries of the chance to use atomic energy. America even refused to accept a resolution ruling out the use of atomic weapons along the lines of the international convention banning the use in war of bacteriological and chemical weapons. Incidentally, America has not ratified the international convention prohibiting the use of bacteriological and chemical weapons.

Documents exist on all these questions, and they may be obtained at our Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

*Walker Stone*: I do not need any information from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, because I was present at the negotiations of the Baruch Plan.

Baruch's proposal was that American bombs should be destroyed and the manufacture of nuclear weapons prohibited. He suggested that the development of atomic energy should be placed entirely under United Nations control, including the transfer to the U.N. of all plants manufacturing fissionable materials and of all available information, both scientific and technical, concerning atomic energy.

*Khrushchov*: This is nearer to the truth. But it is no more than a case of America's encroaching on the opportunities of all the countries to develop the use of atomic energy.

What would it mean to put the development of atomic energy under U.N. control? It would mean to put it under U.S. control, because the United Nations is practically a branch of the U.S. State Department. The U.N. is not yet an organisation of united nations in the true sense of the word. The U.N. will some day become an organisation of truly united nations, but as yet it is far from being one, for certain groups of Western countries headed by the United States hold sway there. But this period in U.N. history is coming to an end, and it will soon be over.

*Lauren Soth*: Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to introduce a more pleasant topic. I come from Iowa and am interested in agriculture. The papers recently reported you as having said that the Soviet Union should invest more capital in the manufacture of mineral fertilisers, herbicides, insecticides, farm machinery, etc. American farmers, especially Iowa farmers, have every regard for this programme of yours. So I would like to know whether the Soviet Union would be ready to buy some part of these goods abroad?

And another question. Seven years have passed since contacts initiated by our newspaper began between Iowa farmers and Soviet farm experts. Do you consider these contacts useful and should they be expanded? In short, is there any basis for agricultural co-operation between our two countries?

*Khrushchov*: People in our country are pleased with this co-operation. Many farmers and farm experts from the United States have visited the Soviet Union, and delegations of Soviet farm experts have been to the United States. We are satisfied with the results of these trips and are ready to promote further contacts.

America has many things of interest. But there are many problems of agricultural production in which, far from lagging behind the United States, we stand higher. Take selection breeding, for example. We can exchange experience with each other, of course, but in the Soviet Union this work is undoubtedly more successful than in the U.S.A. We have produced some excellent composite maize strains which are not inferior to the very best strains developed in the United States, although in the U.S.A. this work is also of a high standard. Our plant-breeders have produced a new sunflower variety with an oil yield of over 50 per cent. It is a splendid sunflower. We have excellent varieties of wheat which yield

70 and more centners per hectare. We have achieved excellent results in sugar-beet breeding. We are proud of having developed a breed of cattle with a high cream content. This was done under Academician T. D. Lysenko.

You will ask what is of the greatest interest to us in America. It is the organisation of agriculture. You have gained considerable experience in this sphere which deserves to be studied. We have adopted your methods of organising maize seed production for example. We bought seed mills from you, lost no time in learning to use them, and now they are working successfully. When Mr. Garst was here he visited them and was satisfied.

Farm labour is better organised in the United States than in the Soviet Union. You have a better range of machines, especially for livestock farming. That is why the U.S.A. is still ahead of the Soviet Union, and has achieved a higher productivity of farm labour.

As you see, it is not only bad things that we say about America; we also note the good things. (*Animation.*) Write that down. (*Animation.*)

The manufacture of herbicides, antibiotics and combined fodder is really well organised in your country. This is something we have to learn from you, though of course the Soviet Union has achieved substantial success in that sphere.

You see how self-critical I am. (*Animation.*) In general, I am against glossing over shortcomings. This is harmful. One ought to speak truthfully about the shortcomings; it helps us to rally our scientists, engineers, workers and collective farmers to eliminate the lags in this or that sector.

I think that exchanging farming experience with America is very useful, even though no secrets are involved. The main thing is perseverance and hard work. Time is essential, because nothing can be done at once and personnel must be trained. That is why I am especially grateful to you, Mr. Soth, for having taken the fine initiative of advocating exchanges of agricultural delegations between the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. in your newspaper. You made a good start, so carry on in the same spirit. I wish you success in this praiseworthy undertaking.

*Lauren Soth*: Bolshoye spasibo—thank you. (*Merriment.*)

*Khrushchov*: As for the possibility of buying some necessary farming commodities in the United States, we could

buy some. But our country is so vast that we should follow the line of manufacturing ourselves, rather than buying finished products from others. That is why we have decided to increase investments in agriculture. We have drawn up a programme for the building of mineral fertiliser plants. We are expanding herbicide production, and have drawn up a comprehensive programme for increasing the output of farm machinery. But we would be ready to buy some items of interest, whose manufacture is well developed in the United States.

But even if the U.S. Government refuses to sell us items of interest we will thank America all the same, because then we will start expanding our own output much faster. After all, America did not give or sell us rockets, yet we made them before the U.S.A., and moreover, such types of them which America does not have. (*Animation.*) The manufacture of new farm machines will call for much less effort than the development of rockets. So if we mobilise our resources, we will harness not only machines, but the devil himself. (*Laughter.*)

*Lauren Soth*: To be sure, it is better to invest money in mineral fertilisers than in rocketry.

*Khrushchov*: It is not only better, but also more useful. Money invested in rockets is a waste. Who needs rockets? You can't put them into the soup or make a beefsteak of them. As we see, sensible people are deliberately doing foolish things, because they cannot come to terms on disarmament. Well, let's live in the kind of world we have, until the opponents of disarmament grow wiser and agree to sign a disarmament treaty. I want to say thereby that we are wiser, because our country is ready to sign such a treaty. (*Animation.*) So, Messrs. journalists, if you have the authority to sign a disarmament treaty, I am ready to do it at once.

*Felix McKnight* (Editor of the *Dallas Times Herald*): Mr. Chairman, during our trip we heard a number of critical remarks regarding the current series of American nuclear tests. This makes us wonder whether the Soviet people know, firstly, that the Soviet Union broke the moratorium on nuclear tests, which had lasted for three years, and made 40 nuclear weapons tests, and that after the Soviet Union had made its tests President Kennedy declared the U.S.A. would not resume testing if a mutually acceptable nuclear test ban

were achieved. Secondly, do they know that the recent American explosion in the upper atmosphere was made to test the defensive capabilities of the United States in connection with your statement, Mr. Khrushchov, that the Soviet Union was in possession of a global missile capable of breaking the American defences.

*Khrushchov*: I must disillusion you. The high-altitude test carried out by the U.S.A. can in no way interfere with the action of our global missiles. I conclude from what you said that you are not very well informed about rocketry and about the way rockets work. You are a victim of people who have abused your confidence. Better not repeat what you just said in the presence of an engineer, for you will make a laughing stock of yourself. What you have just said makes no sense at all.

I am not boasting when I say that we really have a global missile which cannot be destroyed by any anti-missile means, and I know what anti-missile means are, because we have them. We thought of showing the delegates of the World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace a documentary film showing our anti-missile missiles in action. But when I spoke with some members of the Congress they advised me against it, because it might have been wrongly interpreted. But if people saw that film, they would realise what kind of machine it is. Our rocket could practically hit a fly in outer space.

Now about the tests. In this, too, you have been misled and have probably not followed the Soviet, and even the American, press.

No one can claim that the Soviet Union was the first to begin tests, just as you cannot say that the United States was the first in outer space. You can only say that you visited outer space after we had already been there. Just as Columbus discovered America, so Gagarin discovered outer space. The Soviet Union was the first, and this fact will go down in history and live down the ages.

Who was the first to begin atomic tests? It was the United States of America.

Who used atomic weapons to kill people in Hiroshima and Nagasaki? It was the United States of America.

This, too, will go down in history.

You say that we terminated the moratorium. Actually, it

was all different. When carrying out nuclear weapons tests, the Soviet Union was from the outset replying to a corresponding series of tests carried out by the U.S.A. The negotiations on ending nuclear tests began after a series of American tests to which the Soviet Union did not reply in the hope that a treaty ending all nuclear tests would be signed. The Soviet Union honestly took part in the talks, until the U.S. President declared a mobilisation of the armed forces and began to threaten us with war. It was then that we decided to carry out nuclear weapons tests in order to prepare our army better in case the U.S. President actually carries out his threat and unleashes war against the Soviet Union. But even in that case the Soviet tests were a reply to tests previously made by the U.S.A.

So no one can say that we broke the moratorium. As far as the number of series of tests is concerned, the United States is continuously in the fore, and the Soviet Union will be able to catch up with the U.S.A.–and then only in the number of test series, but not in the number of actual explosions–if it makes new tests after the current American series. We hope that after this the U.S.A. will finally agree to signing a treaty banning tests for all time.

However, if the Americans end their nuclear weapons tests now, and if we reach an agreement on general and complete disarmament and the destruction of nuclear weapons, we would no longer need to make our tests. On the other hand, if America pursues the policy of testing, stockpiling and improving nuclear weapons, then, of course, we shall be compelled to do the same. That is the true state of affairs on this question.

*Michael Ogden* (Editor of the *Providence Journal-Bulletin*): Mr. Chairman, those members of our delegation who have been to the Soviet Union before, note that there are more consumer goods in the Soviet shops. In fact, we have all seen that Soviet people are better off and that shops are really well stocked. I must say that in every city we visited we made a point of going to the shops to see what people were buying, and found that the shops had all the necessary goods.

In this connection, I have two questions. First, does the Soviet Union intend to allocate more money for the manufacture of consumer goods?

Second, what are your plans concerning the task you have set yourselves of overtaking the United States in industrial output and the manufacture of consumer goods and food?

*Khrushchov*: First of all I would like to thank you for being objective. I am glad to hear that you have visited the shops in our towns and villages and seen for yourselves that they are well stocked, that our people are satisfying their needs in consumer goods better than before, and that we have achieved progress in this. This is a statement of fact, and I am especially gratified to hear it from you, a foreigner.

I would like to point out that due to our climate, it costs much more to satisfy people's needs than, say, in America. Our people need warm winter clothing, autumn clothing and light summer clothing. You don't need warm clothes as much as we do. We have to build houses with thicker walls than in the U.S.A. We have to use more fuel for heating. On our farms we have to keep livestock indoors six months of the year. All these are things we have to reckon with.

But for all that we would, naturally, not agree to live in your climate, because we are accustomed to ours. During the war our Siberians, for instance, fought in the West. They marched across the whole of the Soviet Union, but they returned to Siberia. A Siberian needs wide open spaces, and a biting frost braces him.

These differences in climate are, of course, no reason for war or even for controversy.

You ask about our plans for the development of our economy. Our task is to develop the economy in order to meet more completely our people's material and spiritual requirements. All metal-producing countries know that they make metal not for eating but to be used in the manufacture of machines needed to produce food, clothing and other consumer goods. That is why we are allocating money to build up industries producing means of production.

Our attention is centred on man with his needs and requirements. But these requirements can be met only by developing industry. If the United States, for example, were deprived of its industry, it would slide back to a primitive state. You would have to scratch the ground with a stick in order to produce food.

We are being wrongly accused of laying too much account on machines and production, and less of an accent on man.

This is an erroneous view. When we build an airplane, we are thinking primarily of man, for if there were no airplanes man would be forced to walk. I wonder how long it would take a dweller of, say, the Far East to get to Moscow in that case? Three years or so, I suppose, and even then not everyone would be able to make such a trip. (*Animation, laughter.*)

It is to satisfy the requirements of man that we are developing our industry, our means of production.

America's level of production is not a limit for us. The United States holds first place in the capitalist world. Therefore, our first stage is to overtake America. But we do not intend to stop there. We will forge ahead.

*Michael Ogden*: Thank you very much for your reply.

*Lee Hills*: Mr. Chairman, we have many more questions, but we are grateful to you for the time you have given us.

*Khrushchov*: I see that one gentleman still wants to ask a question. Let him do so, or he may be offended.

*Lee Hills*: Personally, I would be glad to stay here for another couple of hours and give everyone a chance to speak.

*Khrushchov*: I was once exploited by capitalists, so I am ready now to be exploited by journalists. (*Animation, laughter.*)

*Voices*: The head of our delegation is a strict man. When he says "enough" he means enough.

*Khrushchov*: It's good to have a strict leader.

If you want to wind up, I am agreeable. But I want there to be no dissatisfaction, for someone might say like your Iowa colleague that you were not "allowed to see a collective farm". This journalist might now say, "I wanted to ask Khrushchov a question, but I wasn't allowed to."

I would like to express my satisfaction at your having visited our country. I hope your trip has been useful, and that you are satisfied with your stay here.

We really would want to have the very best of relations with all countries for the sake of strengthening world peace. We would like to have the very best of relations with the United States, the strongest country in the capitalist world.

If some unwise statesman in a small country goes mad, it will do no harm to anyone but him. But if the leaders of countries like the United States or the Soviet Union act unwisely, this is liable to cause a calamity not only for the peoples of our countries, but for the peoples of the whole

world. We realise this very well. Very much depends on understanding between our countries. All honest people on earth who want peace, would like the Soviet Union and the United States to live in peace and friendship.

For our part, we are sparing no efforts to remove from the relations between our countries the sedimentation that obstructs understanding and co-operation in the interest of all people.

We think very highly of the American people's achievements. Soviet people would like to strengthen friendship with the American people. Much depends on the press, on you journalists and publishers, in the development of good-neighbour relations between our countries.

I would like to wish you success and express the hope that your pen will always serve the cause of good, peace, and friendship among nations.

The socio-political system of a country is the concern of its own people. It is wrong for a state to interfere in the domestic affairs of other states. Every people should arrange their life as they see fit and show tolerance and respect towards other peoples. Only then can peace and co-operation among states and nations be secured.

Please convey to the American people the best wishes of the Soviet people, the Soviet Government and myself. Tell them that Soviet people wish to live in peace and friendship with the American people, that they would like to co-operate with the U.S. Government in deeds aimed at securing peace. That is my request to you.

*Voices*: Thank you very much.

# SPEECH AT A MASS MEETING IN MOSCOW ON THE FLIGHT OF SPACESHIPS VOSTOK-3 and VOSTOK-4

*August 18, 1962*

Dear Comrades and Friends,
Dear Compatriots,
Citizens of our planet,

This is the third time that Soviet people assemble in Red Square to welcome space heroes. Each new space flight takes us farther into outer space and reveals new secrets.

A little over a year ago we gathered here to welcome the first spaceman, Yuri Alexeyevich Gagarin, a citizen of the Soviet land. (*Stormy applause.*) He was the first man in history to girdle the globe in Vostok-1, the pioneer Soviet spaceship. (*Applause.*)

Last August we gathered to welcome the second Soviet spaceman, Herman Stepanovich Titov (*stormy applause*), who circled the globe more than 17 times in spaceship Vostok-2. (*Applause.*)

Today, we are here to welcome two new space brothers at once, cosmic twins, our heroes Andrian Grigoryevich Nikolayev and Pavel Romanovich Popovich. (*Stormy applause.*) Theirs has been a great exploit, which ushers in a new stage in the exploration of outer space.

It has become a fine tradition for the people of Moscow to honour the space heroes—a joyous holiday for our people and for progressives all over the world. The Soviet people are proud that our socialist country is the pioneer of space exploration. And is it not profoundly symbolic and natural that we celebrate these accomplishments in space research here, in Red Square, where Soviet people annually celebrate the birth of the world's first socialist state founded by the great Lenin? (*Stormy applause.*)

The group flight of space pilots Andrian Nikolayev and Pavel Popovich is a marvellous achievement of science and

technology, industry and culture, a new triumph of human genius. This group flight is a new tangible step forward along the road to interplanetary communications. It is a source of special gratification to the Soviet people that it is our Soviet land, our people who have had the honour of performing this historic feat. Our people have been able to prepare our country industrially, scientifically, technically and culturally and, most important of all, to train scientists, designers, engineers and workers capable of creating the fine space vehicles which performed these unparalleled flights. (*Applause.*) Our country has developed a new man. He excels in the latest achievements of science, steers spaceships ably, and performs exploits which rouse the admiration of all mankind.

No matter how hard the spokesmen of the old world try to belittle our people's accomplishments–such persons still exist–they will never succeed. It is impossible. Former U.S. President Harry Truman attempted to deny this new flight of our spacemen and wanted proof that Soviet people had really performed a group flight in outer space. But he only made a laughing-stock of himself, even among people of his own mould.

The source of our successes lies in the socialist system, the socialist mode of economy, the socialist structure of our state. Soviet people know that all the achievements in the development of their country, its economy, science and culture, are inseparably linked with the name of Vladimir Lenin, with the work of the Communist Party that he founded. (*Prolonged applause.*) Lenin performed the most daring flight of all into the future. He put forward the slogan of socialist revolution, the slogan for the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of working-class, working people's, government, the slogan of struggle for peace and the happiness of all the peoples.

His was an incredible flight of genius, a sweep of revolutionary action based on profound confidence in the people, in their creative abilities and their inexhaustible strength.

The October Revolution set free the peoples shackled by the old regime. The victory of the socialist revolution made the people masters of their own fate. Under the leadership of the Communist Party they have transformed their formerly backward country, reorganised the life of society along

new, socialist lines, and secured a mighty upsurge of economy, science, technology and culture. We have advanced so far ahead and risen to such heights that even the opponents of communism are forced to acknowledge the success and greatness of the Soviet land. The Soviet Union gained all these successes in a short historical period–just 45 years, many of which were years of war that did not facilitate the country's development, and only ravaged its economy and retarded our forward movement.

Now, in connection with the new space flight, many people in the capitalist world are again wondering why the Soviet people, the Soviet land was the first to perform it. Some call it a puzzle. It is no puzzle at all, gentlemen. The Soviet Union was first, because it was the first to embark on socialist construction. (*Prolonged applause.*) It was the first to overthrow the capitalist system and to create abundant opportunities for every Soviet man and woman to bring out their talents and abilities. The Soviet people could breathe freely, square their mighty shoulders and reveal their giant strength. Our country has overtaken and even outstripped many countries which once considered themselves the most advanced. They never dreamed that after the Revolution the peoples of former tsarist Russia would attain such scintillating heights in their development.

The great achievements of the Soviet Union in the building of socialism and communism are testimony to the strength of our ideas, the strength of Marxism-Leninism. It is on these lofty ideas that our people are brought up. The heroes of outer space, Gagarin, Titov, Nikolayev and Popovich, are true sons of our people, the builders of communism, and of our great Leninist Party. Today, as we acclaim the new triumph of our cosmonauts, our scientists, designers, engineers and workers, we are deeply conscious of the fact that their victories and glory are due to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, the ideas and the genius of our great Lenin. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

But while celebrating new victories we should not let them go to our heads and should not rest on our oars. We know that we have many difficulties to contend with, and that we have our work cut out for us to improve our living standard still more. Soviet people know this perfectly well, just as they know that their country now possesses all the

lesources to accomplish this task. What we need is to marshal our efforts better and to work, work, and again work co carry out the great Programme adopted by the Twenty-Second Congress of the Communist Party. Good organisacion, clear understanding, perseverance and industry will enable us to fulfil our plans in the shortest possible time. (*Applause.*)

Let the capitalist crystal-gazers croak all they want, and raise a howl when some shortcoming arises in our practical work. There were so many of these crystal-gazers in the years since the October Revolution! Where are they now? History has swept them into the dust bin. Meanwhile, our country is advancing confidently along Lenin's road—developing, growing stronger, accumulating new strength, multiplying its wealth and astounding the world with its discoveries and victories. (*Prolonged applause.*) Mind you, our people and country will show a lot more yet! (*Applause.*) All peoples are capable. Everything depends on the opportunities for their abilities to unfold, opportunities to apply the creative energy of one and all in the interests of the peoples, in the interests of progress and peace.

The Vostok-3 and Vostok-4 flights, which lasted several days, usher in co-ordinated group actions in outer space, a new stage in the conquest of the Universe. (*Applause.*) The launching of two space vehicles, their simultaneous flight and simultaneous landing demonstrate the efficiency and reliability of the technical gear, which put them in precomputed orbits at a precisely envisaged time. But this is only one aspect of the matter.

The other, no less important aspect is the co-ordination of the space pilots during the flight. They established stable direct two-way radio and television communication with each other, and co-ordinated their actions as they steered their ships, exchanging data and comparing observations.

Comrades Nikolayev and Popovich had a better time in outer space than their predecessors, Gagarin and Titov, besides keeping in contact with the Earth they could converse and see each other at work. As you know, they ever held something of an amateur concert for the Universe: they sang a duet, the refrain of which suits the present occasion very well and, I think, fits in perfectly with our future space plans. (*Applause.*)

*I am sure, friends, that rocket caravans*
*Will carry us forward from star to star.*
*The dusty paths of distant planets*
*Will bear our footprints! (Stormy applause. Cheers.)*

Co-ordinated teamwork in space flights is essential for the conquest of the Universe. The farther space vehicles will penetrate into the deep of outer space, the more will they probably have to co-ordinate their work with other spaceships and intermediary stations, and maintain communications through them with the Earth. That was how Konstantin Tsiolkovsky, the great Russian scientist and the founder of astronautics, visualised the conquest of outer space. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The achievements in space exploration, and outer space itself, belong to the whole of mankind. The results of space exploration should therefore belong equally to all the people inhabiting our wonderful planet, the Earth. (*Applause.*)

The Soviet people are rightly proud that the world's first joint flight in outer space was performed by their heroic sons, Major Andrian Nikolayev and Lt.-Col. Pavel Popovich. (*Prolonged applause.*) In this flight both of them acted as worthy citizens of our great country and as real Communists. They displayed great courage and heroism in carrying out the assignment of the Party and the Government. (*Applause.*)

The orbital spaceship Vostok-3, piloted by Andrian Nikolayev, was in orbit for 95 hours, or almost 4 days and nights. In this time it circled the globe more than 64 times covering a distance of over 2,600,000 kilometres. (*Applause.*)

The orbital spaceship Vostok-4, piloted by Pavel Popovich, circled our planet more than 48 times in 71 hours and covered a distance of about 2,000,000 kilometres. (*Applause.*)

It gives me great pleasure to welcome our heroes here, on the podium of the Lenin Mausoleum. On behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., the Soviet Government and our heroic people, I warmly congratulate you, dear Andrian Grigoryevich, and you, dear Pavel Romanovich, on your outstanding space victory and express our heartfelt thanks for your exploit, which has glorified our beloved country and

brought fame to you for all time. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

I am happy to inform you that for carrying out the world's first group space flight lasting several days in the orbital spaceships Vostok-3 and Vostok-4, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. confers on Andrian Nikolayev and Pavel Popovich the title of Hero of the Soviet Union. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers.*) From the bottom of my heart I congratulate you on this high decoration. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The title of Pilot-Astronaut of the U.S.S.R. has been conferred upon you, Andrian Grigoryevich and Pavel Romanovich, as upon your space brothers Yuri Gagarin and Herman Titov. (*Prolonged applause.*)

With feelings of profound respect I congratulate the parents of the space heroes, Anna Alexeyevna Nikolayeva and Feodosia Kasyanovna and Roman Porfiryevich Popovich. (*Prolonged applause.*) Modest Soviet people, they have brought up real heroes of our time. (*Applause.*)

Allow me to congratulate Pavel Romanovich's wife, Maria Lavrentyevna, who has also contributed to her husband's success. Incidentally, Maria Lavrentyevna was also a pilot. So she has all the courage in the world. (*Prolonged applause.*) They have a daughter, Natasha. It's a fine family! (*Applause.*)

It is also a source of great pleasure that today's celebration coincides with Soviet Air Force Day. This coincidence is all the more noteworthy because the flights of our space pilots represent, as it were, a further step forward in the development of the Air Force. All the Soviet spacemen come from the ranks of the glorious Soviet Air Force. Allow me to take this opportunity to heartily congratulate our wonderful airmen, engineers, technicians, workers and other employees of aviation, the aircraft and rocket industry, on this double holiday and to wish them new success in developing Soviet aviation and strengthening our country's defence potential! (*Stormy applause.*)

The Soviet space heroes come from the people. They have been brought up by the Communist Party and are boundlessly devoted to the communist cause. It is most significant that we see today among the sky brothers men of different nationalities–Russians, a Ukrainian and a Chuvash. We are sure that in the future the sons and daughters of the

various peoples of our multinational state will join the family of cosmonauts. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Our space heroes are people who already today embody the lofty traits of the man of communist society: high intellectual culture, moral integrity and physical perfection. Their actions are motivated by love of country, a sense of social duty and the lofty ideals of communism.

Dear comrades and friends,

The place of honour at our celebration today belongs by rights to Soviet science. Step by step, Soviet science is making a planned exploration of the Universe. It is successfully overcoming barrier after barrier and unravelling one secret of nature after another. The joint flight of Soviet spaceships, which has proved the possibility not only of penetrating farther into space, but also of living and working there for a long stretch of time, is a new and great triumph for our Soviet science and technology.

Space flights are the result of tremendous efforts put in by large teams of scientists, designers, engineers, technicians and workers. Their creative genius and inspired labour has developed super-rockets, steerable cosmic wonder-ships and remarkably clever machines which help man make swift computations with flawless precision. Without these gains of Soviet science, without our highly developed industry, space flights would have been impossible.

We are living in an age of unparalleled scientific progress, when scientists are audaciously penetrating deeper and deeper into what once seemed the most inaccessible and most hidden secrets of nature. In our time the mighty force of science is increasingly influencing the development of production and the life of modern society. If aimed at destruction, this force can cause humanity immeasurable suffering. If used for peaceful creative purposes, science can, and should, tremendously accelerate social progress. In our country of communism in the making, science has been elevated to lofty heights. The Soviet people spare no efforts and resources for the development and advancement of science.

Allow me, on behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. and the Soviet Government, wholeheartedly to congratulate our scientists, engineers and workers, the creators of the most complex space technology

on their intense and truly creative work for the glory of our land, and let me wish them new achievements in their great and praiseworthy work (*Stormy applause.*)

It is through labour and labour alone that man creates all the good things on earth and in outer space. Socialism was built in our country with the labour of the Soviet people. It is the creative labour of millions of Soviet people that is erecting the majestic edifice of communism. Socialism and communism are the reliable cosmodrome from which mankind is storming and will continue to storm the expanses of the Universe.

Our new achievements in the exploration of outer space are profoundly peaceful and genuinely humane, and however much the bourgeois inkslingers may try, they will never prove the contrary.

At the present level of science and technology all people could be happy and have peace and prosperity. The main thing for this is to preserve and consolidate peace on earth. We believe that the transition to the socialist way of life will be a great blessing to all the peoples of our planet. But it is up to every people to settle the questions of social order for themselves.

The peoples of all countries, irrespective of their socio-political system, need peace. Peaceful coexistence, the preservation and strengthening of peace, will be a great boon to the peoples. Their efforts will be aimed not at producing means of destruction, but at developing the economy, at producing means of production. We should not let the tremendous efforts of the people and huge sums to be squandered further on the production of means of destruction, means of annihilating people, the makers of all material and spiritual values.

We have always stood firmly for peace and have always directed our means and our efforts for peaceful development, for the security of the peoples and for the improvement of the living standard and will do so in the future.

What is needed to ensure peace? It is not enough for our people, our state, our government or the governments of the socialist countries to have a clear idea of the ways and means of consolidating peace. This must also be understood by the opponents of socialism, the governments of the capitalist countries.

The opponents of socialism should realise that today no power on earth, no efforts of the reactionary forces are able to bring back the old times when capital ruled undivided. No one can eliminate the socialist system in the countries where it has triumphed and is successfully developing. It is high time for the representatives of the old world to learn the lessons of history. If the imperialist powers were unable to crush the first socialist state in the years immediately following the socialist revolution in Russia, the evil designs of the reactionaries are doubly doomed to failure today. The Soviet Union and the socialist countries have the latest machines, a highly developed economy, industry and science and possess most up-to-date means of defending their countries and the whole socialist camp. (*Prolonged applause.*)

One must be blind or mad to try and impose the capitalist way of life upon us and make the peoples turn off the socialist path by threatening or starting a war. If, for all that, these madmen from the imperialist camp attempt to carry out their aggressive designs, their action will be tantamount to the self-destruction of capitalism. (*Applause.*) The socialist countries have not only the very means with which the capitalist world threatens them; they surpass them in armaments. Furthermore, none are as strong as we ideologically, because our ideas are supported not only by the peoples in the socialist countries, for Marxist-Leninist ideas have won the minds of progressives the world over.

In order that people should live freely and not worry about the future, we must, step by step, do our utmost to consolidate peace and secure general disarmament under strict international control. We must clear the road to disarmament of all the pebbles that still remain, of all roadblocks that are still unremoved.

First and foremost, we must do away with the remnants of the Second World War and sign a German peace treaty. This would be a good basis for solving the existing controversial problems which are fraught with the danger of a third world war. Among the outstanding, still unsolved world problems are such urgent issues as recognition of the two German states and their admission to the United Nations; abolition on the basis of the German peace treaty of the occupation status in West Berlin; abolition of all NATO military bases

in West Berlin and withdrawal of the troops of the Western Powers from West Berlin.

Much has changed in the seventeen years since the defeat and surrender of Hitler Germany, and the right of the Western Powers to keep their troops in West Berlin has long acquired a different complexion. Today, Western troops belong to the aggressive NATO bloc, and the revenge-seeking forces of West Germany are growing into their assault force. This is why the imperialists insist so desperately on the presence of their troops in West Berlin. They do not want peace or disarmament. They are building up strength for a new war.

The Western Powers profess to be championing peace and disarmament. But how can such assurances be reconciled with their maintaining the occupation status in West Berlin and surrounding the socialist countries with NATO military bases? They need all this not for peace, but to prepare a new war. The imperialists go out of their way to claim that the occupation troops are needed so that the West Berlin population preserve the existing socio-political system. This is an obvious falsehood, because no one is encroaching on the system existing in West Berlin, no one is imperilling it.

We have declared repeatedly and say again that we recognise the right of all the peoples to choose the socio-political system they like best, and that we have never interfered, and do not interfere, in the domestic affairs of other countries. The Soviet Government has declared time and again that the West Berlin population are free to have the socio-political system that suits them best. It stands to reason that the population of West Berlin should have normal contacts with all the countries of the world.

The imperialists contend that the West Berliners' freedom of choice as to the social system must be guaranteed by the presence of occupation forces. We consider this claim absurd. We agree to guarantees, but these guarantees must be ensured by the signing of a peace treaty. If this is not enough, we agree to the temporary presence in West Berlin of troops under the United Nations flag. But we cannot agree that these troops, brought in as a sort of guarantee, should be from member countries of the aggressive NATO bloc, a bloc set up for war against the socialist countries.

We cannot agree to this and we will not cease our efforts to conclude a German peace treaty and to normalise the

situation in West Berlin on its basis. This is a reasonable solution, the only correct one, which will write *finis* to the Second World War.

If we do not secure the understanding of the Western Powers, we shall have no alternative but to sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic and thereby end the state of war. On this basis, the occupation status of West Berlin, which lies in the heart of the G.D.R., will be invalidated. No imperialist threats will prevent us from doing this. (*Applause.*) The signing of a peace treaty after a war is not merely the right, but also the duty of all the countries which participated in the war. None but maniacs can object to our peaceful proposals.

The imperialists threaten us, but their threats cannot intimidate the peace-loving countries. Threats to countries that are at least as strong and possess at least the same resources as the imperialist countries, are threats made by suicides. We shall not be thrown off our course by these threats and shall do everything to do away with the survivals of the Second World War, clear the way for a general disarmament agreement and create better opportunities for the peaceful coexistence of states, regardless of their socio-political system.

Recent experience shows that such co-operation is fruitful if there is the will to settle the complicated world problems on the basis of co-operation and if the interests of all sides concerned are taken into account. I would like to give two examples in this connection.

For a long time the events in Laos threatened to grow into a big war. Not long ago, as you all know, positive results were achieved in settling the Laos problem.

Equally acute and fraught with war was the problem of Western Irian. In the last few days an agreement was reached between Indonesia and the Netherlands, under which sovereignty over Western Irian will be transferred to Indonesia as of May 1963, thus putting an end to Dutch colonial rule in Indonesia.

On this occasion we congratulate Dr. Sukarno, President of Indonesia, and the whole friendly Indonesian people, on the liberation of Western Irian and on its return to its country's bosom. (*Prolonged applause.*)

These two examples are graphic testimony to the fact that difficult international problems can and should be solved not by threatening war, but by peaceful negotiation. The Soviet Union has always stood for this way of solving the controversial issues, and considers this approach as the only correct one and consistent with the interests of peace.

We think that questions concerning the signing of a German peace treaty, admission of the German Democratic Republic and the German Federal Republic to the United Nations and the establishment of the status of a free city for West Berlin could be settled along similar lines. This would be a big contribution to the strengthening of peace and would create a favourable climate for negotiating the main problem, which is of interest to all mankind–the problem of general disarmament under strict international control.

Those are the few remarks on international matters which I wanted to make here today.

Dear comrades, friends,

The Soviet people's success in the building of communism is the basis for our achievements in the study and exploration of outer space. That is why, while storming the infinite expanses of the Universe, we do not lose sight of our day-to-day work in advancing economy, science and culture. We are satisfied with the results. The Twenty-Second Party Congress has rallied the Soviet people to the great drive for the triumph of communism. The Soviet people, inspired by the programme of communist construction, are successfully scaling new heights in all spheres of economy and culture. Our industry and agriculture are forging ahead.

On this festive occasion, as we pay tribute to our space heroes, allow me to congratulate the workers of all the industrial enterprises, building projects, collective and state farms who are fulfilling their production plans and their socialist pledges. They, too, are heroes storming the heights of communism. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Comrades, we are living in a wonderful, heroic time. So let us spare no effort in multiplying our country's material and spiritual wealth. Let us by selfless labour bring closer the time when the great ideals of communism–Peace, Labour, Freedom, Equality, Fraternity and Happiness of all peoples–will triumph all over the world. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

The new Soviet victory in the conquest of space has aroused the admiration of all progressives. The Soviet Government, the Central Committee of our Party, our glorious spacemen, are getting thousands upon thousands of messages of congratulation. On behalf of the Soviet Government and the Central Committee of the Communist Party, allow me to express our sincere gratitude to all the statesmen and public figures, fraternal parties and public organisations, scientists and researchers and all the others, who have sent in congratulations on the flight of the Vostok-3 and Vostok-4, and to all those who have not sent their congratulations but who rejoice together with us. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Long live our space heroes, Andrian Nikolayev and Pavel Popovich, who are true sons of our great people! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live our glorious Soviet land! (*Stormy applause.*)

Glory to the Soviet people, the builder of communism! (*Stormy applause.*)

Glory to our Communist Party, the party of Lenin! (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live world peace! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Cheers.*)

# VITAL QUESTIONS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIALIST WORLD SYSTEM*

The meeting in Moscow of first secretaries of the Central Committees of the Communist and Workers' Parties and heads of government of the member countries of the Council of Mutual Economic Aid, held on the initiative of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party in June 1962, was an important event in the life of the countries of the socialist commonwealth. That this meeting will play a big role in further strengthening the socialist system and in extending its influence on world development is beyond doubt.

Attention was focused on current problems of the economic co-operation between the member countries, problems of the greatest interest both to each of the countries and to the socialist world system as a whole. These problems have their source first of all in the internal requirements of the growth of world socialism, and also in the need to ensure our superiority in the competition with capitalism. Their solution will powerfully stimulate the further expansion of the productive forces and will be a milestone on the road to closer friendship and co-operation of the nations now building a new life, on the road to our great common goal.

Lenin foresaw the future collaboration of socialist nations as a single world-wide co-operative in which the economy would be conducted according to a common plan. In his address to the Third Congress of Workers' Co-operatives in 1918 he pointed out that "only one thing is needed at the moment—the unanimous desire to go ahead with an open mind in this single world-wide co-operative" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 28).

These words of our leader and teacher express the final aim towards which all the socialist countries and the entire

* The present translation has been taken from *World Marxist Review*, No. 9, 1962.

international revolutionary movement of the working class are striving. However, the formation of a "world-wide co-operative of the nations" is a long, complicated and many-sided process. The main thing about it is not just the consistent, step-by-step realisation of economic co-operation between our countries, but also the ideological, political and cultural coming together of the socialist nations, in the course of which the mistrust and alienation sown among the nations by capitalism will ultimately disappear and the spirit of fraternity, friendship and co-operation will prevail.

On the way to this aim we shall go through a series of successive stages, none of which can be bypassed. It will be necessary to work hard over the solution of the many big and small problems of all kinds in order to reach that high level of unity without which one cannot even imagine the future joint life of the socialist nations.

When capitalism was still in its infancy the productive forces, as they developed, destroyed first local and then national exclusiveness. Then as it came into its own, capitalism brought into being firm and steadily growing and developing international contacts. The trend towards a single world-wide economy regulated by the working class of all nations according to a common plan "is already quite clearly revealed under capitalism and, undoubtedly, will be further developed and fully consummated under socialism," Lenin said (*Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. 31, p. 125). The objective necessity for a single world economy finds its fullest expression in the main productive force of society—the working class—which, in the course of class struggle, becomes a powerful social force.

In the Soviet Union the victory of socialism led to the truly social and economic unity of the whole of society which became the complete master of all the main means of production. And on this basis the social, political and ideological unity of the Soviet people took shape.

Now with the emergence of socialism beyond the boundaries of one country we observe an unparalleled process of working people joining in the effort to build a new society on the scale of a world system. Strictly speaking, this process only began in the course of the past fifteen years when new relations between the peoples and new forms of the all-round co-operation of the socialist countries were taking

shape. In the socialist countries there are still classes, but these are friendly classes; the national peculiarities will remain for a long time, and what is more, the most favourable conditions are being created for the flowering of the nations. It follows, then, that national and, to a certain extent, class interests and distinctions still remain. At the same time, irrespective of class and national affinities, a steadily growing significance is acquired by the main and decisive things, those that unite and make kindred all the people taking part in building the new life, namely, their common interests in the fight to ensure the victory and consolidation of socialism and communism on a world scale, and their common Marxist-Leninist ideology.

And this grand community of political aims and interests, resting on the granite foundation of the Marxist-Leninist teaching and of proletarian internationalism, is the reliable guarantee of the stability of the socialist world system, the guarantee of those splendid successes which socialism is ordained to win.

### 1. A NEW STAGE IN ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION

The socialist world system is advancing to a higher level, as are the forms of the contacts and the co-operation between the countries. After the victory of the socialist revolutions the peoples of all our countries naturally sought to combine their forces in order to uphold their gains. The main thing in that period was to combine politically with the aim of consolidating the rule of the people, reinforcing the socialist system in all spheres of social and economic life in each country, and organising the joint defence of the socialist countries from possible imperialist aggression. In substance this was a politico-military alliance of the socialist countries.

On the scale of the world system an important thesis of Marxism-Leninism had found confirmation, the thesis that the socialist mode of production could arise and expand only after the working masses headed by the working class had won political power in the course of the socialist revolution and had organised the defence of their gains against the onslaught of the counter-revolution.

In the economic sense, and especially in the sphere of

international economic relations, the countries of people's democracy in Europe could be described as breakaways from the capitalist world. The new socialist relations did not triumph overnight. The economies of these countries were multiform and preserved deep traces of the antagonisms and ills left by capitalism. The economies of most of the People's Democracies, orientated on the West, still retained the hallmarks of subordination to the big imperialist powers with whom they had been closely linked in the past. At this time the economic relations between the socialist countries developed largely on a bilateral basis. The socialist world market was just emerging and the new forms of co-operation characteristic of the socialist commonwealth had just begun to take shape.

This phase may be described as a kind of transition from the old system of external economic relations typical for capitalism to the moulding of the new type of international contacts. And just as the separate countries that had had their socialist revolution found it necessary during the transitional period to erect a new socio-economic edifice using the old materials, so too in establishing the new system of relations between the countries taking the socialist road, we had to utilise what we inherited from capitalism, to make use for the time being of those forms of economic contact left to us by capitalism.

The formation in 1949 of the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance marked the beginning of multilateral co-operation at first in the sphere of trade and afterwards also in the sphere of production. The socialist world system is now beginning to take shape as a single entity not only politically but also economically. In the course of the twelve years' existence of the Council we have succeeded in creating, at least for the member countries of the organisation, a solid basis for joint co-operation and mutual aid.

The functions of the Council in organising joint economic co-operation do not extend as yet to all the socialist countries. The differences in time in taking the road to socialism prevented them from simultaneously entering into joint economic co-operation. However, the successful economic integration of the member countries will make joint co-operation easier for all the socialist countries. Between the member countries and the socialist countries which do not belong to the Council

broad economic contacts are taking shape, and these are paving the way for still wider economic co-operation.

At present the socialist camp as a whole and most of the countries in it have a developed industry and large-scale socialised agriculture. The socialist system, which embraces 26 per cent of the territory of the world, produces, according to incomplete figures, about 37 per cent of the world industrial output. In most of the socialist countries industry accounts approximately for three-quarters of the overall national product.

A socialist world market has emerged and grown strong, and all the socialist countries—the Soviet Union, People's China, and the People's Democracies in Europe and Asia—are promoting its development.

The socialist countries are now at a stage when favourable conditions have ripened for raising their economic and political co-operation to a new and higher level. At this level a special significance is acquired by co-ordinated economic plans, socialist international division of labour, and by co-ordination and specialisation of production which will guarantee successful joint development of the socialist countries.

The socialist world system is now at a stage when it is no longer possible correctly to chart its development by merely adding up the national economies. The thing now is to do everything to consolidate the national economy of each country, broaden its relations and gradually advance towards that single world-wide organism embracing the system as a whole which Lenin's genius foresaw.

With the emergence of socialism beyond the boundaries of a single country, its economic laws found much greater room for action and their operation became more and more complex.

For example, the law of planned and proportional development operating on the scale of the system as a whole calls for planning and definite proportions both in each of the socialist countries taken separately and on the scale of the entire commonwealth. To utilise the economic laws of socialism fully we must take due cognisance of their operation not only at national levels but also on the international plane.

We are now faced with a task of historical significance—to learn how to make the most effective use of the

advantages of socialism, of advantages accruing from the existence of the new world system, that is, ably to direct the socialist international division of labour, specialisation and co-ordination of production, co-ordination of research and technological work and to make full use of the possibilities opened up by the socialist world market.

Marx in his time pointed out that even the simple addition of labour greatly increases its productivity. All the greater then is the productivity of social labour, given the combined efforts of the socialist countries with their single-type social structure and community of political aims and interests. By co-ordinating the economies of the socialist countries we will be able to increase tenfold the strength of each and of the system as a whole. We are bringing the forms of our economic co-operation into conformity with our increased productive forces, and we are clearing the way for their further development.

Streamlining the system of co-operation and mutual aid will help to bring the socialist nations closer, make for the evening up of their economic development generally and, at the same time, enhance the sovereignty of each country since each will have in addition to its own resources the support of the entire socialist community. Not to make use of the advantages deriving from the international division of labour now that we have a system of socialist countries would mean taking the more difficult way in creating modern productive forces, depriving ourselves of the possibility of expanding production in keeping with the latest achievements of science and technology.

It goes without saying that a major precondition for the further expansion of the productive forces of the socialist countries and, consequently, of the entire socialist world economy, is the fullest utilisation by each country of its internal resources, steady improvement in the forms and methods of economic leadership and consistent application of the Leninist principles and methods of socialist management.

The socialist world system, it should be said, can forge ahead only through the all-round co-operation of the countries belonging to it, through their co-ordinated effort, and consideration for the interests of each country and of the socialist community as a whole. There is no other way.

The need for more active co-operation between the socialist

countries is prompted also by the advantages of winning time for victory in the economic competition with capitalism. We should bear in mind that the imperialists, having seriously accepted our challenge to compete with them economically, are now seeking to combine their forces in order to halt the onward march of socialism. They would like to wipe out the socialist system and restore capitalist rule throughout the world. But the socialist countries have reached such a level in their economic, scientific and technological development that even some circles in the West now appreciate that they cannot realise their designs by way of war. The imperialists cannot but see that, far from lagging behind, the socialist camp is in many respects ahead of them in the development of modern arms, corresponding to the latest achievements in science and technology. Today only those who have lost all sense of judgement can count on resolving the historical debate between socialism and capitalism by means of war.

True, there are in the West enemies of socialism who say that it would be better to die under capitalism than to live under communism. But this is the view of the lunatic fringe. Sober-minded politicians in the West tend more and more to the realistic view that, willy-nilly, they have to reckon with the existence in the world of the two systems—socialism and capitalism—that is, they have to take into account the policy of peaceful coexistence. Naturally, this conclusion does not mean that the imperialists have become reconciled to socialism, to our theory, to our practice and to our ideas. Not at all. They had to recognise the new balance of forces in the world brought about by the growth of the powerful socialist system. There is no escaping that. That is why the imperialists have been forced to take into account the existing state of affairs. Objectively this signifies that gradually we are impelling the capitalist countries onto the highway of peaceful competition between the two systems.

In this recognition of things the imperialists, clearly, act from the standpoint of their interests. They have not the slightest desire to part with the hope of undermining the socialist countries in one way or another, nor have they relinquished their struggle against the socialist camp. But in the military sphere this struggle lands them in a blind alley since both sides, that is, the socialist countries and the capitalist

countries, possess powerful nuclear forces. Not risking at the moment to start a war against the socialist countries but making no let-up in the arms drive, the imperialists are utilising all their possibilities in the struggle against the socialist world system in the sphere of economy, politics and ideology.

At the moment the question stands like this—which system will manifest the greatest viability, that is, which system in the quickest time will provide the people with more material and spiritual values. Evidently it is in this area that hard battles will be fought between capitalism and socialism.

After the adoption by the Twenty-Second Congress of the C.P.S.U. of the programme for building communism in the Soviet Union, the imperialists began loudly to trumpet about the "economic challenge" of the U.S.S.R., to work feverishly to hold their own in the economic competition between the two systems. The leaders of capitalism and its ideologists forthrightly declare that, in view of the growing threat of an economic offensive on the part of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, the capitalist countries should combine their forces. It was not accidental that President Kennedy, in a recent declaration about the so-called interdependence of the Western Powers, called for joint effort on the part of the imperialist countries of Western Europe and the United States with a view to establishing an "Atlantic partnership". It goes without saying that Kennedy's plans provide for maintaining and enhancing the leading role of the United States in the capitalist world. These developments show once again that the imperialists dread economic competition every bit as much as they dread our military might, and are trying to counterpose to the socialist countries, to the international communist movement and to the national liberation struggle of the peoples a solid front of the reactionary forces.

After the Second World War the trend towards integrating the foreign policy and the economies of the capitalist countries became more pronounced. We saw the rise of international organisations such as the European Coal and Steel Community, the Common Market, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, and others. The rulers of the Western world, notwithstanding all their antagonisms, have partly succeeded in forming inter-state alliances

the activities of which create difficulties for the newly emergent countries in Asia and Africa, and also in Latin America.

How is it that the imperialists, despite their antagonisms, have managed in a measure to co-ordinate on an international scale economic co-operation in a number of important spheres?

First, we see manifested here, although on a contradictory basis, the objective trend towards greater internationalisation of economic life, rendered more pronounced in our days by the rapid scientific and technological advance. State-monopoly capital on its part is anxious to encourage this trend and to use it for its aggressive politico-military aims. By forming their inter-state economic associations, the imperialists are trying to counteract the negative consequences of the spontaneous development of the capitalist world economy.

Second, faced with the fact of the growing might of the socialist system with its planned economy, and faced with the fact of the rapid advance of the emancipation movement of the peoples, the imperialists are forced to find ways and means of easing the antagonisms in their camp. Dreading peaceful economic competition with the socialist countries, they are trying to tone down their internal antagonisms in view of the basic contradiction of our epoch—the contradiction between capitalism and socialism.

The Common Market signifies big advantages for the imperialist monopolies. At the same time it threatens the interests of the working class, the peasantry and the middle sections of the urban population. The small countries will, increasingly, be more dependent on this imperialist alliance which, in substance, signifies a new form of the division and redivision of the capitalist world market. The aggressive forces want to use the Common Market for the purpose of reinforcing NATO and stepping up the arms drive.

With the formation of the international imperialist alliances, the smaller countries of the capitalist system, losing their previous role and their sovereignty, are forced to follow in the wake of the United States and the other big imperialist powers. The rulers of these countries are going so far as to forego even their independence, because they see in the Common Market and in other organisations of its kind

a certain defence against the onward march of socialism and against the pressures coming from the working people.

Here we see manifested yet another aspect of the politico-military alliances of the imperialists–more and more openly they are assuming the role of international gendarmes for the purpose of crushing the movement of the peoples for freedom and social progress.

The imperialists and their propaganda depict the movement of the peoples for freedom and the struggle of the working people for their rights as the penetration of communism from "without", as an external force upsetting the political balance in the world. These arguments are designed as a screen for their dread of the growing discontent of the popular masses. And they try to distort the obvious truth that the communist movement, far from being brought in from outside, grows inside the capitalist countries on the soil of class struggle, on the soil of the mounting antagonism between the working class and the capitalists, between all working people and their exploiters.

The rulers of the Western world cannot but see that the balance of forces is tilting more and more in favour of socialism. The old world of exploitation, colonial tyranny and oppression of the working masses is staggering under the powerful blows of the emancipation movement of the peoples, is cracking up, threatening the ruling classes with catastrophe. And in the endeavour to maintain the peoples in subjection, the imperialists are forming aggressive military blocs like NATO and SEATO which, on the one hand, are spearheaded against the socialist system as the main bulwark of the freedom and happiness of the peoples, and, on the other, fulfil functions of a gendarme in relation to the national liberation movement and the working masses striving to overthrow the rule of the exploiters. The so-called economic alliances of the imperialists are designed for precisely the same purposes. The Western rulers do not even bother to conceal the direct link and interdependence which exist, for example, between the economic organisation of the Common Market and the aggressive NATO alliance. They delight in stressing that their economic unions are also called upon to fulfil important functions for the so-called defence of the West, by which they mean the aggressive policy of the imperialists.

It goes without saying that one should not exaggerate the possibilities of these international unions of the imperialists. No matter how much they talk in the West about European integration and its results, one cannot get away from the fact that the formation of these unions cannot rid the capitalist world of its deep-going antagonisms and defects. Dominated by the United States, the military blocs and alliances are frequently in a state of crisis arising from the profound contradictions between the main imperialist powers. The interests of the small group of imperialist powers conflict with the interests of the other capitalist countries and with the interests of all nations. This state of affairs, obviously, cannot but weaken the imperialist amalgamations and unions.

But if we do not exaggerate the strength of the adversary this does not mean that we should ignore it. It would be unwise and short-sighted not to pay attention to the designs and actions of the men behind the European integration. The Communists are combating the attempts to use the Common Market and other amalgamations of this kind for the purpose of preparing another war and of stepping up the arms drive, for purposes of exerting economic and political pressure on other countries and especially on the newly emergent states. We have exposed and we shall continue to expose the dangerous consequences of the capitalist integration for the working people.

At the same time we take into consideration the objective trend towards internationalisation of production which can be observed in the capitalist world and, in keeping with this, we are designing our own policy and our own economic measures. And this brings us to the question of the possibility of economic co-operation and peaceful economic competition not only between the separate countries with differing social systems, but also between their economic amalgamations.

We can see the danger contained in the striving of the imperialists to utilise the advantages accruing from West European integration for the purpose of forming exclusive inter-state economic groupings bearing an aggressive character. By means of this policy the West is erecting barriers in the way of world trade and economic co-operation between the economic unions of the two systems. In contrast, the

socialist countries in this new situation advance proposals aimed at expanding international trade between the countries of the two diametrically opposed systems.

In the published communiqué the participants in the meeting expressed the desire for more trade with the capitalist countries. They advanced the proposal for an international trade conference to discuss the forming of an international trading organisation which would take in all areas and all countries of the world without discrimination.

We stand for co-operation with the capitalist countries also in the sphere of production. The socialist countries, for example, have repeatedly put forward proposals for co-operation with the West European countries in the extraction of raw materials that are in short supply, in multiplying energy resources, in joint exploitation of waterways, and in other branches.

At the same time, with the imperialists working overtime to combine their forces, we Communists draw also another conclusion. To the combined front of imperialism the socialist commonwealth counterposes a still closer union based on genuine equality, community of interests and lofty humanist aims.

Our vital interests—the interests of building socialism and communism—call for combined efforts, in the matter of developing the national economy of each of the socialist countries and in increasing the might of the socialist commonwealth as a whole; they call for constant attention to strengthening the unified material and technological basis of socialism. For us this is the highway leading to a world-wide socialist economy.

## 2. INTERNATIONAL DIVISION OF LABOUR, CO-OPERATION AND CO-ORDINATION OF PRODUCTION

International division of labour, realised by way of co-ordination and specialisation of production, is a vital condition for the successful development of the socialist world economy.

Division of labour between countries has existed for a long time. And indissolubly associated with it is the advance made by the productive forces of society. Capitalism, as we

know, right from its inception made the widest possible use of international division of labour. But under capitalism the link between the economies of the different countries took on a deformed, lop-sided character with the result that in the imperialist era the world has found itself so divided that alongside a small group of highly developed industrial countries–exploiters–there is a large number of underdeveloped countries which have become the objects of colonial exploitation and dependence.

Under capitalism the international division of labour serves as an instrument of the monopolies for plundering the nations whose economic development was retarded. Through a thousand economic threads, including financial and other "aid", it binds these countries to the big powers, thus deepening the inequality of the countries and dooming millions to backwardness and poverty.

Under socialism the international division of labour is a striking expression of the relations of genuine friendship, equality and co-operation that exist between the nations building the new life. The socialist division of labour accelerates our rate of advance and helps to overcome the economic and other difficulties which arise. It is aimed at abolishing the economic gap between the industrial countries and the formerly backward countries, facilitating the industrialisation of the agrarian countries, accelerating their economic and cultural progress, consolidating the independence and sovereignty of all the socialist countries.

On the level of the socialist system as a whole the international division of labour is organised and developed as a planned process based on conscious utilisation of the economic laws of socialism and, therefore, contains unlimited possibilities for accelerating expansion of the productive forces and for multiplying the material benefits of society. Socialist international division of labour and wide specialisation and co-ordination of production provide the national economies of the socialist countries with the broadest opportunities for the most fruitful development; the various economies, supplementing one another, will gradually merge into a single streamlined economic complex with each having its own place and functions and in which each country, each people, will have an even stronger foundation for solving the national tasks of socialist construction.

Much work has been done to further the socialist international division of labour during the years of the existence of the Council of Mutual Economic Aid. Not long ago the Council published its *Basic Principles of the Socialist International Division of Labour*. This important document will be a guide in economic co-operation. Many specific recommendations have been worked out for specialisation and co-ordination of production. And while some of these have already been carried out, far more will have to be done in this direction.

The participants in the meeting of the Council unanimously recognised that joint co-ordination of economic policies is of the utmost importance at present for the advance of the socialist world system, that it is becoming the main thing in our economic co-operation.

The need for co-ordinated national economic plans on the scale of the socialist world system derives from the objective economic law of the planned and proportional growth of the socialist economy. If we learn to utilise this law on the scale of the socialist system as a whole, or for a beginning on the scale of the countries belonging to the Council, if we improve planning not only of the national economies but of the entire system of economic relations between our countries, the socialist world economy could make still more rapid progress, the opportunities for operating with our economic resources would be greater and we could produce more economically, with the minimum expenditure.

Work along lines of co-ordinating the national economic plans of the member countries began as early as 1956. This enabled us to reach agreement on a number of important targets up to 1965. At the moment consultations are under way on plans for the next twenty years. The results of joint decisions on some important aspects of the development of fuel, power and raw material resources are quite good, and the same can be said about inter-state specialisation and co-ordination in machine building and in the chemical industry.

Thus in co-ordinating national economic plans the member countries got off to a good start. And with these good results behind us, we should now be able to make even greater progress in this vital matter. We are now in a position to co-ordinate not only separate industrial output targets but also to work out the main national economic proportions in keep-

ing with our common interests, and to arrive at a kind of overall balance which could fulfil the role of a joint economic development plan of the member countries. It was said quite correctly at the meeting that we should work out unified plans for the basic branches of industry. This would make it possible to satisfy not only the requirements of each country separately, but of our whole organisation.

Marx pointed out that under capitalism planning is possible only within the limits of a single enterprise, beyond the walls of which reigns the spontaneous action of economic laws and anarchy of production. We Communists, having abolished the capitalist production relations in our countries, have got rid of the anarchy of production and, at national levels, we have curbed the blind market relations. Now we are confronted with the need to go beyond this and, by starting out from planning on a national scale, go in for planning at the level of the Council of Mutual Economic Aid, and afterwards at the level of the socialist world system as a whole.

Our common aim is to build the socialist world economy as a single entity. But to accomplish this the socialist countries have no resources to draw on other than the accumulations created by each. It follows, then, that we cannot get on without co-ordinating, even if only in general outline, the policy of creating and utilising accumulations on the scale of the Council. This presupposes, first, allocating funds for building common enterprises—a thing which we have just begun to do—and, second, co-ordinating national investment plans which would as far as possible take into account national and common interests.

Inherent in the socialist world system are many advantages which are enjoyed by the socialist economy within the national boundaries as well. And these advantages, for one thing, enable us to avoid the unnecessary expenditure which is a feature of capitalism and also of small-scale commodity production. An analogy with the agricultural producer cooperative will not be out of place. Where a producer cooperative has one large modern farm building, individual peasants have two or three hundred small ones which, in the aggregate, are very costly. If we transfer this example to the socialist economy as a whole, we will see that it is of greater advantage to the socialist countries operating with

co-ordinated plans to build one large enterprise jointly rather than several smaller ones separately.

In co-ordinating programmes for capital building we should, evidently, aim at a more balanced allocation of effort in the sphere of capital expenditure. It goes without saying that it is the sovereign right of each country to determine what proportion of its national income goes for accumulation. In each country this share is fixed on the basis of the concrete tasks of economic upbuilding and the specific conditions. But each socialist country may be expected to take an equal share proportionate to its economic potential in developing those vital branches which serve our common needs.

Since our job is to secure the most effective utilisation of the means allocated for capital building, it may well be that we shall have to reswitch some of the allocations from country to country, on mutually acceptable conditions, of course, for the interested countries. This way of doing things will be well worth while and will benefit the countries concerned.

The Soviet Government, like the governments of the other member countries of the Council, stands for extending the joint financing of industrial building, transport installations and other enterprises of an international significance. Joint financing should be practised first of all in the raw material branches working for export since these branches are the biggest consumers of capital. In our view the conditions have matured for jointly examining in the Council plans for building the more important enterprises of common interest.

Co-ordinating capital building will ensure a rational distribution of the productive forces on the scale of the entire commonwealth. And should we succeed, and of this there can hardly be any doubt, in co-ordinating plans for capital building between the countries with the proviso that the new enterprises will cater not only for national, but also for common needs, that account will be taken not only of the production capacity of one's own country, but also of the others, then it will be possible to release quite substantial funds for other requirements.

Co-ordination of plans, far from restricting the economic initiative of the countries, will, on the contrary, further it. The result will be a much better and fuller utilisation of the

possibilities for advancing both the economy of each socialist country and that of the socialist world as a whole.

In the past the Council was not in a position to revise the system of co-ordinating plans generally and investment plans in particular on a new basis, because, first, according to the old statute it did not have the necessary powers and, second, it lacked the necessary planning instruments—material balances, comparable national economic indices and unified statistics. The decisions of the June meeting will, however, enable the work of the Council to be reorganised in this field.

Co-ordinated national economic plans together with co-ordinated and specialised production will help to bring the economies of the socialist countries closer together and will add to our common economic potential. What we need are those flexible forms of mutually advantageous and equal co-operation that will best take into account the interests of each country and help it to prosper.

The process of deepening the international division of labour is reflected best of all in foreign trade. The overall volume of foreign trade of the member countries of the Council in 1961 exceeded the 1950 volume three and a half times over. The increase in the direct trade between the member countries was approximately the same. True, the volume of industrial production for this period rose in the same proportion. But if we bear in mind that the growth of agricultural output was somewhat more tardy, we will find that the growth in trade between the member countries exceeded the growth of their overall national economic production. This was due partly to the extended division of labour.

The foregoing figures, while they can be regarded as satisfactory for the previous stage of co-operation, do not correspond to the tasks of today. With the substantial extension of the division of labour and specialisation and co-ordination, the growth of trade between the member countries will as a matter of course noticeably outstrip the growth in their output and the increase in the volume of their overall foreign trade.

Some bourgeois economists delight in stressing the successes of the West European integration, particularly in the sphere of the division of labour. They point out, for example, that the growth of trade between the Common Market

countries from 1950 to 1961 was almost double the rate of growth of their industrial output, that it considerably surpassed the growth of their overall foreign trade.

Comparing the growth of trade in the Common Market countries with that in the member countries of the Council, they claim that the international division of labour among the countries of the Council of Mutual Economic Aid is still at a lower level than in the European Community. But in saying this they ignore the fact that we started out from different levels, and that it took the capitalists dozens of years to reach their present level. Long before the integration, the "Six" were highly developed industrially and specialisation and co-ordination were more widely practised. But we had to begin from scratch. In the early stages the conditions needed for extensive division of labour did not exist in all the countries of people's democracy. Some of them had little or no industry, no sources of accumulation, i.e., they lacked the base, without which effective international division of labour is unthinkable.

Now, however, this stage has been passed. All the member countries of the Council have their own industrial base, which can be extended more rapidly by way of the socialist international division of labour. The higher the level of the productive forces the more insistent the need for greater co-ordination and specialisation and the better will be the conditions for their realisation.

The facts show that year by year in the socialist camp the exchange of goods, mainly raw materials and other items, is growing. This, of course, is a good thing. As to the mutual deliveries of manufactures, and of machinery and equipment in the first place, their growth so far has lagged behind the increased output in these branches. For the period from 1955 to 1960 the output of machinery and equipment in the member countries of the Council showed a growth of 95 per cent. Moreover, former agrarian countries like Bulgaria, Rumania and others, became suppliers of up-to-date machines, which is proof of their successful industrialisation. The mutual deliveries between the member countries for the same period showed an increase of 79 per cent. By 1965 the member countries of the Council plan to better their 1960 output of machines and equipment by approximately 50 per cent, while mutual deliveries of this production, in keeping with trade

agreements, will rise by 45 per cent. But the level of the division of labour between our countries no longer corresponds to their economic requirements.

The lag in the mutual deliveries of machinery and equipment compared with the general rate of growth of output of these items shows that the division of labour and specialisation and co-ordination among the countries of the Council of Mutual Economic Aid have been inadequately developed. But this lag is doubtlessly a temporary matter and we are now working to overcome it.

It should be said that in the sphere of specialisation and co-ordination in the manufacturing branches of industry the member countries of the Council inherited a pretty bad "legacy" from capitalism. The conditions in some of the People's Democracies in the past when they were part of the capitalist world economy were such that they were left with an economically unjustified universalisation of industry based on small-quantity production. The absence of a reliable raw materials and fuel base and above all the economic dependence on the imperialist monopolies of the big powers deprived the majority of these countries of the possibility of developing large-scale production. This circumstance prevented them from taking part in the international division of labour on any kind of favourable conditions and engendered a tendency for them to produce as many types of manufactures as possible. They had no guarantees that they could get the things they needed in exchange for their own products.

The course of the co-operation between the member countries of the Council made it quite clear that this kind of "universalisation" had no justification—it was much too costly.

The tendency for a country to produce as many types of manufactures as possible, which derives from the principle of "having everything of your own" regardless of the cost, generally speaking, can arise in our time either as a result of an insufficiently developed economy or for reasons of a non-economic character. We are speaking here not about the big powers, for they can afford to have a more universal industry thanks to the possibility of organising specialisation and co-ordination inside their countries and to a relatively big home market. But even for these countries international co-ordination has its advantages.

Under socialism the operation of the law of value does not bear a spontaneous character. Our enterprises do not come under the hammer even when they show a loss. But it goes without saying that we cannot afford to ignore the principle of profitableness without which it is impossible to conduct socialist economy.

The more profitable the socialist enterprises are, the greater the accumulations at the disposal of the state for extended reproduction and for satisfying the requirements of the people. Today an enterprise can be profitable only if it goes in for mass production and specialisation, and makes use of the latest achievements of science and technology. Hence for the member countries of the Council the question stands as follows: either the way of universalisation of industry in each country or a resolute advance along the road of co-ordination and international specialisation. The member countries hold that only in the latter way will their successful development be assured.

As we know, the expansion of the productive forces under capitalism is associated with a vast concentration and centralisation of capital which makes it possible to engage in mass production. In the developed capitalist countries the elemental ups and downs of the market lead to the abolition of small production. As a rule the enterprises which come out on top in the competitive struggle are those which engage in mass production and where production costs are low. The capitalists are impelled to division of labour and specialisation by the merciless operation of the law of value according to which any enterprise must be profitable, otherwise it goes to the wall. Mass production is the key to the economic successes of capitalism. Why, for example, was Ford able to flood the world market with his automobiles. Because he engaged in assembly-line production, which is the cheapest way to produce.

But it is here, too, that we see the weak and vulnerable sides of capitalist production. Concentration of capital and mass production under capitalism are based on private ownership of the means of production. The capitalist produces not for himself but for the market. In the conditions of private ownership and the operation of the blind laws of capitalism growth of production comes up against the relatively narrow dimensions of the market, making it impossible to fore-

see for any considerable length of time the requirements of the market. This is one of the sources of the many unpleasant moments encountered by the capitalists, including crises and recesses in their industry.

The socialist countries, having put an end to private ownership of the means of production, have liberated themselves also from the ills engendered by capitalism. And if we now, on the scale of the entire socialist system, combine our planning with the organisation, on the basis of socialist "concentration of capital", of assembly-line production–the advantages of which had been demonstrated by capitalism–we shall undoubtedly accelerate our victory in the economic competition with the capitalist system. But for this we must widely organise co-ordination and specialisation on the scale of the socialist world system. Present-day highly developed production such as in the socialist countries has nothing in common with autarchy. To cling to the national exclusiveness of the economies of our countries would signify turning our backs on the very great advantages accruing from the socialist system, artificially holding back our advance, thus causing injury to our cause.

The socialist world system is not simply a socio-political union of nations, it is a world economic system. It follows then that co-ordination should be pursued not within the restricted limits of each socialist country but on the scale of the socialist world economy, which means overcoming the national exclusiveness inherited from the past. Our planned production will enable us to do this successfully.

We are now advancing towards a much higher level, a level from which it is possible to observe and to take into account much more fully the interests of the entire socialist world economy.

International division of labour and specialisation of production offer the best conditions for socialist industrialisation, especially in the formerly backward countries. We Communists fully understand the desire of each of the socialist countries to have a developed industry since this is a precondition for expanding the national economy, raising the culture and evening up the general level of economic development in the socialist community. We fully appreciate the desire of the peoples of these countries to overcome as quickly as possible the legacy of the past and to reach the level

of the developed countries. And we hold that specialisation and co-ordination will make possible the construction of bigger and highly profitable enterprises using modern technology. Given this approach, the national income will grow rapidly, accumulations for extended reproduction will be built up with greater success, and better conditions will be created for training highly skilled personnel and for scientific and technological progress.

The big specialised enterprises set up in keeping with the socialist division of labour are guaranteed sales for their products on the socialist world market, and the planned character of socialist economy ensures a stable demand for them. What is more, since all or many of the socialist countries are interested in these specialised enterprises, this presupposes joint activity and help in building and running them. It follows, therefore, that building a specialised and co-ordinated industry is equally advantageous both for the countries which already have developed industries and for those now advancing along the road of industrialisation.

International specialisation benefits not only small countries but also big states like the Soviet Union. It goes without saying that a country like the U.S.S.R. with its big market can build large enterprises of optimal size designed to satisfy home requirements alone. But it, too, can benefit from participation in the socialist international division of labour. The Soviet Union is prepared even to cut down production of certain types of manufacture should it be found more expedient to manufacture them in the other member countries of the Council.

Co-operation in the Council has now reached a point when it is necessary to decide the trend of specialisation in production in each country, that is, to decide exactly which branches, in what combination and using what raw materials, should be built in each of the countries so as to meet our common needs most economically. The time has come to draw up a balance sheet of production and consumption of the main types of manufacture in our countries for a period extending at least up to 1970 and on this basis to prepare a general scheme for inter-state specialisation and co-ordination. The intention for the immediate years is to produce the more important types of manufacture on the basis of international specialisation and co-ordination.

The programme for promoting and improving the socialist international division of labour should be supplemented by agreed measures for improving organisation and planning in the sphere of trade. With the emergence of socialism beyond the boundaries of a single country there arose the socialist world market–a completely new sphere of international exchange–which, in contrast to the capitalist world market, is governed not by blind laws but by planning. Trade between the socialist countries is ensured by long-term agreements based on planned production.

From the foreign trade relations which have taken shape, we can see that we are still not making full use of the abundant possibilities for expanding trade among the member countries of the Council. It often happens that needed goods are purchased "on the side", whereas with the proper organisation they could be purchased in our own countries. There is hardly any need to say that this state of affairs hampers our economic advance.

The socialist international division of labour can develop successfully only if the mechanism of our foreign trade operates smoothly and without a hitch, if trade ensures the full and timely realisation of the goods created through the division of labour. This explains why the member countries have agreed on a series of measures to improve the system of foreign trade. In particular, a big role will be played by the transition to multilateral accounting, and also by measures to enhance mutual responsibility for fulfilment of trade commitments.

Expansion of foreign trade depends on the rate of growth of production, on the organisation of international division of labour and on the state of the foreign trade relations. Up till now the expansion of trade on the scale of the member countries has had its source chiefly in the growth in volume of production. The time has now come to make the fullest possible use of all three factors.

The greater international specialisation and co-ordination provide a sound basis for long-term trade agreements. The Council is now faced with the job of drawing up a system which will ensure going over from bilateral to multilateral planning and regulation of the trade and accounting between the socialist countries.

Also important in the sphere of foreign trade is to extend the range and improve the quality of consumer goods. This,

for many reasons, is a particularly urgent matter. The industry of the socialist countries now has everything needed to ensure a fuller and wider satisfaction of the needs of the population for consumer goods. It should be said frankly that the opportunities for doing this, in the Soviet Union for example, are not being fully utilised. We have set ourselves the task, on the basis of an advance in agriculture and the expansion of the chemical industry, greatly to improve the quality of consumer goods, to widen the range of the goods and to put them more within the reach of the consumer.

In the capitalist world, as we know, competition is a powerful stimulus to improving quality and extending the range of goods. On our socialist market there is no such thing as a competitive struggle. But this does not mean that we should reject the principle of healthy competition for better quality and greater variety of goods, for such competition will enable us to decide how best, from the economic standpoint, to distribute the productive forces and production capacities.

It is obvious that the demand above all for the more essential, low-priced and high-quality goods will, increasingly, become the guiding principle both within our countries and in the socialist world market.

The measures for extending the international division of labour, co-ordination and specialisation will in the next few years strengthen the mutual relations and the interdependence of the national economies of the member countries of the Council and of the socialist community as a whole. In this context questions of accounting and control, and of strict economy, which are essential to socialist economic management, will acquire special significance. Applied to the socialist world economy this signifies, first, a balanced growth of the national economy of each country and of its foreign trade and, second, interchange of the results of the economic activity with mutual compensation for the socially necessary labour expended.

What we have in mind here is a further development of the Leninist principles of sound business practised in foreign trade on an enlarged international scale.

The further improvement and consolidation of these methods which have fully justified themselves in building the socialist world economy presuppose mutual fraternal aid in all its

forms. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union sees its internationalist duty in continuing to help the other socialist countries in the matter of gathering resources with which to expand their economies, in doing everything necessary to reinforce the defence capacity of its country which stands guard over the socialist gains of our commonwealth and in reinforcing the defence capacity of the socialist camp as a whole. We hold that one of the main tasks of the Council is to study the question of extending mutual aid among the socialist countries, especially aid to those still behind economically. This applies, for example, to the newest member of the Council, the Mongolian People's Republic, which needs the aid of all our countries.

In order to ensure the correct combination of the economic interests of the separate countries with the interests of the commonwealth as a whole we would do well to think in terms of better utilisation of the system of incentives. Clearly, one of the important tasks facing the Council is to find those economic levers which would stimulate the interest of the socialist countries in extending co-ordination and specialisation, in expanding mutually advantageous trade. We should strive to create conditions in which the economic needs, the economic advantages and the self-interest of each of the socialist countries would act as a stimulus to the socialist international division of labour and help to bring the national economies closer.

This aim, possibly, could be furthered by a policy of preferential prices for specialised products and also by joint credits for enterprises which are being built or reconstructed by way of international specialisation and co-ordination. It may perhaps be expedient in future to establish a joint bank of the socialist countries for financing measures of this kind.

Just how to arrive at a system of incentives for specialisation and co-ordination is a matter for close study by experts. In our view the stimuli should be worked out first of all for the more important branches of industry, which are of the greatest significance for the socialist system as a whole and in which specialisation yields the best results, and also for branches producing goods which are in particularly short supply. For each particular type of production the incentives should be calculated for a definite period, since in the future, with the mastering of production and the

transition to regular mass production, the producer country would automatically derive greater advantages and be no longer in need of supplementary material stimuli.

Co-ordination of production, bringing the economies of the various countries closer together, the evening out of their general line of economic development should, ultimately, lead to a state of affairs in which possibly it will be advantageous and desirable for the goods of one socialist country to find direct outlet on the markets of the others. This will be one of the manifestations of the gradual lowering and abolishing of the economic barriers between the socialist countries.

### 3. STRENGTHENING THE MATERIAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL BASE OF THE COUNCIL COUNTRIES

Already today the strengthening of the material and technological base of the socialist countries necessitates the solution of a number of urgent problems. At the moment the member countries are consulting about the main trends of their economic development and their interrelations for the next twenty-year period. As can be seen from the projected long-term plans on which the consultations are being held, the industrial output of the Council countries for the period from 1961 to 1980 will increase more than sixfold, agricultural output threefold, while the national income will rise nearly fivefold.

For the purpose of completing these tasks it is most important that through joint efforts the way should be found for the most effective solution of the problems of fuel and raw and other materials since their increased output involves enormous capital investment.

In 1960 the member countries produced 970 million tons of fuel (in terms of conventional units), and by 1980 it is anticipated that the output will be in the region of 3,400 million tons. The attainment of this goal will be facilitated by working out a single fuel and power balance for our countries in which the satisfaction of the fuel needs of each should be gauged from the standpoint of minimum expenditure and progressively increasing consumption rates.

Of the utmost importance is the application of methods which ensure an economy of coking coal. For the first time

in world practice we are now making wide use of natural gas in the iron and steel industry, with the result that we have greatly cut our consumption of costly coke. If oxygen were to be added to the natural gas used in blast furnaces, the saving of coke could be raised to 30-35 per cent. And what is more, the saving would be accompanied by greater furnace productivity.

The preliminary outlines for the next twenty years envisage a production in the member countries of the Council in 1980 of 3,500,000 million kilowatt-hours of electric energy compared with the 1960 figure of 407,000 million. In resolving the fuel and power problem we should aim at achieving by 1970 the establishment of a single power grid for the European countries of people's democracy and the European part of the Soviet Union. This would give us an invaluable means for going ahead with co-ordinated development; the power capacity could be utilised much more effectively and with greater flexibility. This will signify the realisation of Lenin's idea about electrifying a number of neighbouring countries according to a unified plan.

Another urgent problem of the socialist world economy is to ascertain the most rational way of rapidly increasing the output of iron and steel to a level that will fully meet the constantly growing requirements of the socialist countries. Preliminary calculations show that by 1980 the output of steel will have risen to 330 million tons, compared with 86 million in 1960. In view of the irregular occurrence of raw material and coking coal deposits close attention should be paid to the more rational siting of the iron and steel enterprises in order to ensure the necessary growth in output with the minimum expenditure of time, money and labour.

Solving the fuel and raw material problems has another aspect. For a number of reasons the socialist countries are still dependent on the non-socialist market for some raw materials at present in short supply. We believe the policy in this question should be to ensure ourselves reliable import sources of such items as copper, nickel, rubber and cotton. Together with this, the new developments in science and technology make it possible for us to arrange for the production of some of these items or their substitutes in the socialist countries. For example, the progress made by chemists in the U.S.S.R. and in the other socialist countries

enables us to think in terms of undertaking in the next few years joint production of high-quality synthetic rubber that can in every way replace natural rubber, and synthetic fibres which will successfully compete with cotton.

The long-term plans of the Council countries quite correctly assign a very important place to the rapid development of the chemical industry. But to do this with the forces of each country separately would not be an easy matter. This is a new branch of industry for nearly all of us, and it will be far easier to build it up jointly. In keeping with the decisions of the June meeting, the planning bodies will jointly define the trend of specialisation and co-ordination in chemical production for each country and will provide the industry with the necessary raw materials and equipment.

The volume of the industrial expansion and the division of labour on the scale of the member countries pose very serious transport problems. According to preliminary calculations, the volume of goods shipped to the European People's Democracies from the Soviet Union alone is anticipated to rise from 50 million tons in 1960 to 250 million in 1980. A substantial growth of freightage will take place also between the People's Democracies.

This presupposes new railways and highways, modernisation of the old ports and the building of new ones, bigger river and marine fleets, new waterways and other means of communication. We shall cope more easily with these tasks if we jointly work out plans for building and reconstructing transport arteries of international significance and also the methods of financing and administering them.

We are living at the time of a great scientific and technological revolution, at a time when truly astounding discoveries are being made. The new advances open up tremendous possibilities for the rapid growth of the productive forces generally and especially in the conditions of our system. In the economic competition with capitalism the scientific and technological advance is becoming decisive in our accelerated forward march and at the same time an arena of intense struggle. We can outstrip the leading capitalist countries for productivity of labour only by utilising all the achievements of science and technology, by better organised production, and communism will finally triumph when the productive forces and the productivity of labour will have outpaced the

capitalist countries. Hence full use must be made of science and technology and of the advantages offered by our socialist planned economy to enable us in the shortest possible time to surpass capitalism in the economic sphere. With this in mind we are doing everything to make sure that our socialist science and technology and production organisation will be in the lead.

The socialist countries have vast possibilities for utilising the latest achievements of science and technology in production. Our countries do not compete with one another, we have no so-called commercial or industrial secrets. We exchange scientific and technological information widely and in a disinterested way. Yet the introduction of progressive methods is in some instances proceeding slowly. Take, for example, the method of continuous smelting of steel worked out by Soviet scientists and engineers. By means of this method the output of rolled metal can be raised by an average of 8-10 per cent, and of some types by up to 17 per cent, and productivity of labour can be raised by approximately 20 per cent. Moreover, there will be no need for powerful blooming mills or slabbing units. The saving that could be effected by this method is obvious. And yet here in the Soviet Union its introduction is still proceeding slowly, and as far as I know it is not being used at all in the other socialist countries.

Some say that the method of continuous smelting narrows the possibility for producing different types of steel. That is true. But here again the international division of labour comes to our help. If the production of certain kinds of steel were to be divided between our countries and arrangements made for their exchange, we would gain considerably from the more efficient method of production and the necessary assortment would be ensured.

Big advantages would accrue from the abolition of the unjustified parallelism in technological research and designing methods which at present results in dispersal of manpower and money. For example, the saving that could be effected by abolishing in the member countries parallel designing of the same type of metal-cutting machines would amount to 4,500 men-months—the equivalent of a year's work by a thousand designers.

Evidently the time has come to go over to planning

scientific and technological development at an international level, to conduct important scientific and technological research of joint interest according to a uniform long-term plan. This would enable us to distribute the lines of research and to suggest problems which it would be advisable to solve through the combined efforts of researchers and engineers of a number of countries.

In the matter of creating the material and technological base in our countries an important place belongs to agriculture. Our plans for building socialism and communism would have no sense whatever if they, in the long run, did not ensure an abundance of material and spiritual benefits for the people. And we can reach this abundance only if we have a highly developed and productive agriculture.

Each of the socialist countries is tackling this job, and correctly so, chiefly with its own manpower and means. Still here, too, international co-operation could be very useful. We could combine our efforts, say, in the matter of mechanisation and in applying chemistry to agriculture, in designing and producing agricultural machines, in electrifying the production processes and so on.

It is necessary to study each other's experience in managing socialist agriculture, and make use of all that is best in the different countries. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union attaches great importance to agricultural management. At the meeting of the Central Committee of our Party held last March a system of measures was drawn up for reconstructing the agricultural bodies and for radically improving farm management. The Party and the administrative authorities have already gained some experience in this respect. At the same time we are ready to study and make use of everything of value which the other fraternal parties have to offer in this respect.

The June meeting approved the important proposals made by the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party and the Government of the Polish People's Republic for enhancing the role of the Council and improving its functions. There was unanimous agreement that the organisational structure of the Council and the forms and methods of its work were no longer abreast of the times.

The decision taken at the meeting that the first secretaries of the fraternal parties and the heads of government of the

member countries should meet regularly to discuss current problems of economic co-operation, the establishment of an Executive of the Council invested with broad powers, and the other measures outlined in the communiqué and decisions adopted at the meeting will, undoubtedly, raise the organisation of the economic co-operation between our countries to a level corresponding to the new phase of development.

## 4. THE INTERNATIONAL INFLUENCE EXERTED BY THE ECONOMIC SUCCESSES OF SOCIALISM

We are living at a time when man's social development has posed the question of replacing socialism for the capitalist system on a world-wide scale. Ours is the era of sharp struggle, with capitalism doing its utmost to stave off the hour of its demise, while socialism, in addition to growing stronger and consolidating its gains, is helping all the peoples to realise their just aspirations for national and social emancipation, for peace and progress.

For us Communists the basic question in the struggle of the two systems is how, and in what way, to ensure the steady growth of the influence of socialism throughout the world. The answer to this question was supplied in his day by Lenin who said that triumphant socalism would exert its main influence on the course of world events chiefly by succesfully developing the socialist society and above all its economy (*Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. 32, p. 413). This was said at a time when socialism had triumphed only in one country, in Russia. We can easily infer the full significance of these words now that the ideas of socialism are being realised on the scale of an entire system.

History has imposed on us the task of demonstrating in the briefest possible space of time the superiority of the socialist mode of production and its limitless possibilities. And in order to do this we should combine not only our political but also our economic energies. Through co-ordination, division of labour, better and more effective utilisation of the new achievements of science and technology we must secure a still more rapid development of the socialist countries. This path is recognised by all the Marxist-Leninist parties, and the grounds for it are set forth in the programme documents

adopted at the meetings held in Moscow in 1957 and in 1960.

There are, however, people who call themselves Marxists and who try by means of scholastic arguments to defame the important conclusion reached by Lenin about the need for peaceful economic competition between the two systems—socialism and capitalism—about the decisive significance of our economic successes. Speaking against the policy of peaceful coexistence, peaceful economic competition, these people declare that it is simply repetition of the theory of the Economists who, as is known, gave priority to the economic struggle of the working class and relegated the political struggle of the workers against capitalism to the background.

But such arguments can be invoked only by people who are unable to grasp the essence of Leninism.

The thesis about the peaceful economic competition of the two systems has nothing whatever in common with the theories of the Economists. Lenin, criticising the Economists, emphasised that the working class should fight not only to improve its economic conditions, but, as the most revolutionary class, it should not lose sight of its main aim—the struggle for the overthrow of the autocracy and capitalism—since any fundamental improvement in the economic conditions of the working people was impossible without the abolition of tsarism and capitalism, and the capitalist system could not be abolished without putting an end to the rule of the capitalists and landowners.

The peaceful economic competition of the two systems, which is restated in the policy documents of the Communist and Workers' Parties, does not deny class struggle, on the contrary, it presupposes the political class struggle of the workers in the capitalist countries for socialism. And it is precisely the successes of the socialist countries on the economic front which create the most favourable conditions for unfolding the struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries for its social emancipation, for intensifying the national liberation struggle of the peoples. This truth is obvious and recognised by all Marxists.

In the new conditions the world communist movement, on the basis of a profound analysis of the situation, carried forward these ideas of Lenin at the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow in 1960.

The sense of the decisions of the Meeting and the exchange of views which took place is that the communist movement is searching for, and finding, the surest ways for increasing its influence on world development.

All the experience of our struggle from the time of the October Revolution up to the present day convincingly shows that the more we advance towards our great goal the stronger the power of attraction of socialism and of its ideas. The success registered in building socialism and communism, seen in the most convincing material–the facts of life–demonstrates the tremendous possibilities and the advantages of socialism as a system, furthers the deepening of political consciousness among the working people and the growth of class struggle in the capitalist countries.

Here we recall Lenin's words: "We have said and we continue to say that socialism possesses the force of example. . . . It is necessary to show in practice, on the basis of example, the significance of communism" (*Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. 31, p. 426).

In recent years the role and force of the example set by socialism in the matter of social development has grown immeasurably. How can we speak of socialist countries influencing the course of events by economic success in Lenin's day, when at that time Russia alone had taken the socialist road, a Russia devastated by war and intervention? The imperialist powers, Lenin wrote in those days, prevented the new system established by the revolution from "at once taking the step forward that would have justified the forecasts of the socialists, that would have enabled them to develop the productive forces with enormous speed, to develop all the potentialities which taken together would have produced socialism and thus vividly to demonstrate to each and all that socialism contains within itself vast stores of energy and that man had now entered a new phase of development replete with the most glorious possibilities" (*Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. 33, p. 456).

The Soviet Union and the European People's Democracies have, in the main, already overcome the effects of the unfavourable factors which prevented socialism, right from the very first steps, from outstripping capitalism in all the main indices. We have in mind first of all the legacy which capitalism left to many of these countries, a legacy of economic

and cultural backwardness as compared with the level of development in the leading capitalist states, and the devastation and loss of life caused by the last war. Important, too, is the fact that socialism has now acquired experience which enables it to avoid many mistakes. Also of great significance is that resolute struggle which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union waged against the personality cult and its consequences, a struggle which was correctly understood and supported by the international communist movement.

The successful overcoming of the unfavourable factors, and the successes achieved in building socialism in our country have brought us to a new phase in the competition with capitalism. Moving forward now from the new level we can in the near future outstrip the more developed capitalist countries also in those spheres where we have been lagging behind, including the sphere of material well-being and production of consumer goods.

Successfully building socialism, and then communism, consolidating and expanding the economy, we are creating sound guarantees for the gains of the socialist countries against any encroachment on the part of the imperialists. The military might of socialism is a shield reliably defending the cause of world progress. More than once in the past the might of the socialist countries has halted the imperialists in their attempts by means of military action to finish with the socialist and the national liberation revolution. And as long as the imperialist states refuse to agree to general and complete disarmament under strict international control, the socialist countries will do everything to reinforce their military strength, the safeguard of peace and the security of the peoples.

The economic successes of socialism create the possibilities for extending still wider and more varied aid to the other countries in enhancing their economies. This is especially important for the newly emergent national states. The aid of the socialist camp enables them to get rid of their dependence on the imperialist powers, to avoid the danger of new enslavement, it stimulates their progress and contributes to the normal development and even the acceleration of those internal processes which may take these countries onto the highway leading to socialism. As for the economically underdeveloped countries which have already taken this road, the

economic aid of the socialist countries enables them to advance towards socialism and saves their people from the burdens and the torment associated with the capitalist stage of development. This signifies that real possibilities are being created for building socialism in all countries irrespective of the level of economic and social development reached by them at the time of their revolutions.

The socialist commonwealth now has tremendous new possibilities for exerting an influence on world development. And this cannot but be a source of joy to us Communists. But as internationalists we realise that this imposes also great obligations. On the socialist countries and on their Marxist-Leninist parties rests a truly historical responsibility so that these possibilities be used in full measure both in each country and on the scale of our entire system.

The further strengthening of the socialist world system, the perfecting of the political and economic interrelations between the socialist countries, being powerful accelerators of their economic development, will add enormously to the influence socialism has on the course of events all over the world and, in this way, will be a big contribution to the cause of social progress for all mankind.

# SPEECH AT A LUNCHEON GIVEN AT THE EMBASSY OF THE REPUBLIC OF FINLAND

*October 16, 1962*

Dear Mr. President and Mrs. Kekkonen,
Dear Mr. Ambassador and Mrs. Vuori,
Ladies and Gentlemen,
Comrades,

We are truly happy, Mr. President, that you and Mrs. Kekkonen could come for a vacation to the Soviet Union. You have visited our country many times, but all your previous trips were on business, to discuss problems concerning Soviet-Finnish relations. This time you have come for a holiday, and we are deeply pleased that you picked our Black Sea coast.

But, Mr. President, you and I are political leaders, and wittingly or not, on vacation or not, when statesmen meet their conversation is bound ultimately to turn to political matters. It is therefore probably better to acknowledge at once that during your stay here we discussed international politics and the relations between our two countries. Nobody will believe us all the same if we deny it.

Mr. President, I should like to note with satisfaction that our mutual understanding increased and deepened every time we met. We agree entirely with the appraisal you gave of our conversation in Novosibirsk last year. Indeed, only friends can have such conversations. Whatever our ill-wishers may say about it, the Novosibirsk meeting was a good example of how a large and a small country can take account of each other's foreign policy interests in connection with world developments.

Soviet-Finnish co-operation is making good progress and yielding rich fruit for the peoples of our countries. That is a source of genuine joy for both the Finnish and the Soviet peoples. I think I am not wrong in saying that the strengthening of the friendship of our two countries is also a source of joy for the Finnish people.

Mr. President, you have many times rightly stressed that Finland's foreign policy is based on the Soviet-Finnish Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance. We owe it to this Treaty, whose fifteenth anniversary we shall celebrate next year, that the principles of sincere friendship, confidence and mutual understanding govern Soviet-Finnish relations. We are convinced that the 1948 Treaty will continue to serve the good cause of greater Soviet-Finnish co-operation.

The 1948 Treaty is the permanent basis for the relations of our two states. It helps us settle many questions, including such as the lease to Finland of the Soviet part of the Saimaa Canal. Mr. President, we know how close to heart you take the economic development of Finland, and are sincerely pleased if our concluding the Saimaa agreement has helped our industrious neighbour in developing its natural wealth.

For the first time in world practice a Great Power is leasing its territory to a smaller country. In doing so the Soviet side sought to create the most favourable conditions for the exploitation of the Saimaa Canal and had no intention at all to derive any material gain from it. It seems to me that we have every reason to consider the Saimaa Canal agreement a big success in our co-operation and a fresh token of the principles of peaceful coexistence.

Soviet-Finnish co-operation is also developing well in other fields. Steps are being taken to extend commercial and economic contacts still more. We may expect the exchange of trade delegations and the coming commercial and economic talks to play an important part in increasing mutually profitable trade between our countries.

Mr. President, you have expressed the wish that the Soviet Union should increase its purchases from Finland's leading industry, the wood-working industry, with an eye to the fact that its capacities are not being used to the full. The Soviet Government will most thoroughly study the possibilities of meeting this wish—on the assumption, of course, that the Finnish trade agencies, too, will buy more goods from the Soviet Union in the common interest of developing our commercial and economic relations.

Expansion of economic, scientific and cultural contacts between the Soviet Union and Finland is promoting increasingly closer bonds between our peoples, and stronger mutual

understanding. That is a striking token of the friendly good-neighbour policy pursued by both the Soviet and the Finnish governments.

People in the Soviet Union have deep respect and understanding for the Paasikivi-Kekkonen line initiated by J. K. Paasikivi, that outstanding Finnish statesman, and which you, Mr. President, are so farsightedly developing and carrying through. The Paasikivi-Kekkonen line is a line of peace, friendship and good-neighbourliness.

Permit me to propose this toast to the health of Mr. Kekkonen, the President of the Finnish Republic, and Mrs. Kekkonen.

May Soviet-Finnish friendship gain added strength and may it flourish!

# SPEECHES MADE DURING THE STAY IN THE U.S.S.R. OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE FEDERATIVE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA AND GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE LEAGUE OF COMMUNISTS OF YUGOSLAVIA

## SPEECH ON THE ARRIVAL OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE FEDERATIVE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA AND GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE LEAGUE OF COMMUNISTS OF YUGOSLAVIA

*December 4, 1962*

Dear Comrade Tito,

Permit me to heartily welcome you, your wife and all the comrades that have come with you, all the representatives of the fraternal Yugoslav people, in Moscow, the capital of our land.

We are pleased that you have come on your vacation to our country and will do our utmost to make your stay pleasant and interesting. This is not the first time you are visiting the Soviet Union, and I hope you will agree with me that we have many wonderful spots for a really good holiday. We shall also be glad to furnish you and your comrades every opportunity, while you are here, to observe the various aspects of the life of the Soviet people.

I believe that being political leaders and statesmen we shall be able to combine your vacation with conversations and exchanges of opinion on matters concerning the relations between our two countries and concerning current international problems of mutual interest. I assume that personal contacts between the Yugoslav and Soviet leaders will be useful in the future as well and will promote greater friendship and co-operation between our countries.

Today, I should like to repeat what I have already said in Bulgaria during the visit there of our Party and government delegation this year: we are pleased at the way rela-

tions are developing between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. We have already noted, and I would like to repeat once more, that in many important international matters the positions of our countries coincide. All the necessary conditions are on hand for our good relations to develop and expand successfully.

The Soviet Union is firmly pursuing the policy of peaceful coexistence. We are working for the consolidation of all the forces fighting for peace and social progress.

We are sincerely eager to extend our economic, cultural, scientific and other contacts with socialist Yugoslavia. It is of benefit to both our countries and consistent with the interests of all the socialist countries, the interests of strengthening peace and friendship among the peoples.

We greet you once more, dear comrades, and bid you welcome!

## SPEECH ON THE DEPARTURE FROM MOSCOW OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE FEDERATIVE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA AND GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE LEAGUE OF COMMUNISTS OF YUGOSLAVIA

*December 18, 1962*

Dear Comrade Tito,

Our dear Yugoslav Guests,

Comrades and Friends,

Comrade Tito, today you, your wife and the other Yugoslav guests are leaving Moscow, the capital of our country, and going home. We did our best to make your short stay in the Soviet Union pleasant and useful.

While you were here, we had a chance to exchange opinions candidly and in a comradely way concerning the further development of fraternal Soviet-Yugoslav relations and various aspects of the contemporary international situation. Comrade Tito, the Deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. and all Soviet people received your speech at the Supreme Soviet session which has just ended with great interest. We are grateful to you for your kind and friendly words about our country and our people who have feelings of fraternal friendship for the glorious Yugoslav people.

We are happy to note once again that our views on important international issues coincide, or are close, and that both sides have expressed the wish to promote the further development and strengthening of Soviet-Yugoslav friendship. During their stay in Moscow and Volgograd, our Yugoslav visitors have had a chance to see for themselves that the Soviet people have deep and sincere feelings for the fraternal Yugoslav people and its representatives.

Allow me again to express our trust that the stay in the Soviet Union of Comrade Tito, Comrade Ranković, Veselinov and other leading Yugoslav comrades will promote the further development and strengthening of friendship and cooperation between the fraternal peoples of our countries. This accords not only with the interests of our two countries, but also with the interests of all the socialist countries, and serves the struggle for peace and for the happiness and prosperity of all peoples.

On behalf of the Soviet people and on my own behalf I wish you and the peoples of Yugoslavia great success in socialist construction, in the struggle for lasting peace and peaceful coexistence.

Today, the people of Moscow are saying good-bye to their Yugoslav friends and are wishing them a happy journey. I join in these good wishes, although in two days I expect to be seeing our guests off again in Kiev, where I will be with them.

Long live the friendship between the fraternal peoples of the Soviet Union and the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia!

Long live peace and communism!

## SPEECH ON THE DEPARTURE FROM KIEV OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE FEDERATIVE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA AND GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE LEAGUE OF COMMUNISTS OF YUGOSLAVIA

*December 20, 1962*

Dear Comrade Tito,

Dear Yugoslav Guests,

Your short vacation in the Soviet Union is coming to an end today. In our opinion, your stay in the Soviet Union has

been useful and fruitful. In this short period you have had a chance to see for yourselves that the Soviet people are working with enthusiasm to realise the great plans charted by Vladimir Lenin for the building of communist society.

During your travels across our country you have seen the warmth and the sincere friendship shown to you, representatives of the fraternal Yugoslav people, by the Soviet people.

Wherever you went, at the Moscow factories and in the heroic cities of Volgograd and Kiev, among the tractor makers, at electric power stations, among engineering and textile workers, you have seen how strong the bonds of fraternal friendship are that unite the peoples of our countries.

Comrade Tito, although you came here on a vacation, we agreed to depart somewhat from the usual holiday routine. We met and exchanged opinions exhaustively and candidly on questions concerning the development and strengthening of relations between our countries and on the key international problems. This comradely exchange of opinion has enabled us to understand each other better, and this will doubtlessly promote the further strengthening of friendship and co-operation between our countries and benefit the cause of peace and socialism.

We are aware that some people do not want the relations between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union to improve. But we hold a different opinion on that score and are deeply convinced that this improvement of relations between our countries is in complete accord not only with the interests of our peoples, but also with the interests of the other socialist countries, and that it promotes lasting peace.

I am pleased to note that during our meetings and conversations we have both come to the common conclusions that our countries and peoples have every opportunity to develop economic, political, cultural and other contacts, and that the governments of both our countries are prepared to do whatever is necessary to strengthen all-round co-operation between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

Dear comrades, allow me to wish you and the whole fraternal Yugoslav people great success in the building of

socialist Yugoslavia and in the struggle for lasting peace on earth.

We wish a happy journey to you, Comrade Tito, and to your wife and to Comrades Ranković and Veselinov and to all the Yugoslav guests.

May the fraternal Soviet-Yugoslav friendship grow stronger and flourish for the good of our peoples!

# THE PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE SOVIET UNION

REPORT TO THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R.

*December 12, 1962*

Comrade Deputies, extremely important events have taken place in the international arena during the seven months since the last session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. A number of these events constituted a serious threat to peace. The Soviet Government regards it as its duty to analyse the present international situation and to set out the steps in foreign policy it has recently taken.

The foreign policy of a state and its diplomatic activity demand of the ruling political parties and statesmen of the socialist countries a penetrating scientific approach in analysing international affairs and high political skill in order to find solutions as would take into consideration the real state of affairs, would soberly assess the balance of forces and produce results that strengthen the positions of socialism and accord with the interests of all peaceable peoples.

Acting firmly upon the Leninist principles of the policy of peaceful coexistence, the Soviet Government has done and is doing everything necessary for the maintenance of peace.

The principal result of Soviet foreign policy, and the foreign policy of the governments of the other socialist countries, the result of the struggle of all peace forces during this period is that the attack on Cuba, prepared by the aggressive imperialist circles of the United States of America, has been prevented. The direct threat of a thermonuclear world war, which arose in connection with the crisis in the Caribbean, has been averted. (*Prolonged applause.*)

World opinion, people holding various political views and convictions and living in various parts of the world, have enthusiastically acclaimed this victory of the policy of reason. (*Applause.*)

Our people and our Party have cause to pride themselves in the results of their resolute actions during those perilous days. Developments have reaffirmed that the peace forces are able to overcome the most dangerous international crises and to check the imperialist aggressors. (*Prolonged applause.*)

## I

## OUR PURPOSE IS PEACE, CREATION AND COMMUNISM

The Soviet policy of peace ensues from the socialist nature of our state, a state of the whole people, and from the noble aim of building communist society. All our thoughts are concentrated on creation and creation alone, on the construction of communism. These lofty aims of our Party, our people, were demonstrated once again at the November Plenary Meeting of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee.

The Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee examined the key questions related to the advance of Soviet society, to the development of the Party and state, and the improvement of economic Party guidance. Its decisions were directed towards the earliest accomplishment of the tasks of communist construction set by the new Programme of the C.P.S.U. To put it in a nutshell, the Plenary Meeting discussed the question of how to build communism still more successfully, how to advance the economy more rapidly, and to produce more material and spiritual blessings for our people.

*All the proceedings of the Plenary Meeting and its decisions show convincingly that our Party, supporting and developing the new and progressive, sweeping out all that is obsolete, is firmly and consistently advancing along the Leninist course. (Prolonged applause.) The course of the Party, its domestic and foreign policy, and the measures to improve the guidance of the economy, taken in recent years, are producing wonderful results.*

Advancing on the basis of the priority growth of heavy industry, Soviet industry fulfilled the plan for gross output in the first four years of the Seven-Year Plan period 104.5 per cent, and the overall increment in gross output during this period will be 45 per cent instead of the 39 per cent envisaged in the plan. If our industry advances at the same

pace in the remaining three years of the seven-year period, and we are sure it will, the seven-year increase in gross output will be about 100 per cent, and not 80 per cent as planned.

In recent years the Party, the Government and the Soviet people have been taking big measures to advance agriculture. In spite of unfavourable weather in a number of districts, the grain harvest was 9,000 million poods as against 5,000 million poods in 1953. Grain procurements this year will be some 3,500 million poods as against 1,900 million poods in 1953. The output of livestock produce is expanding.

The Party and the Soviet Government are working for a steady rise in the living standard of the people, for the manufacture of consumer goods at a faster pace, and for the ever better satisfaction of the material and spiritual requirements of the Soviet people.

Comrade Deputies, our Party and Government, adhering to the behests of the great Lenin, see and rightly assess not only the successes achieved, but also the shortcomings. We realise perfectly well that our industry can work still better and that a faster pace of development can be set in agriculture. The decisions of the November Plenary Meeting of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee and the economic plan and budget for 1963, which have just been passed by the Supreme Soviet, pave the way to new, higher levels in the fifth year of the Seven-Year Plan period.

Our country is advancing confidently along the road of economic and cultural progress. Marching with us along this road are the peoples of the socialist countries, with whom we have friendly, fraternal relations which continue to develop and gain in strength.

Congresses have been held recently by the Bulgarian Communist Party, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. A congress will be held soon by the Communists of the German Democratic Republic. The decisions of these congresses and the pre-congress documents show that the fraternal parties of the socialist countries are concentrating their attention on peaceful creative goals—on completing the building of socialism and preparing conditions for a gradual transition to communism.

*The processes of the internal development of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries show convincingly to*

*all peoples that the socialist countries are engrossed in great creative work in the name of peace, the welfare and happiness of man, and the victory of socialism and communism.* (*Prolonged applause.*)

Comrade Deputies, the Soviet people, who have passed through the grim school of several wars, and particularly the Second World War which swept like fire over a considerable part of our territory, know well what armed struggle between states means. Naturally, they can understand the better what thermonuclear war may be like.

And when Soviet people are asked, as in the words of the song, *Do Russian people stand for war?*, our answer is clear—we say an emphatic "No!" to war. The same answer is given by the peoples of the other socialist countries. But we are not alone on this planet, and we cannot disregard the fact that the aggressive forces of imperialism support the cold war and further intensify the arms race, that they have ringed the Soviet Union with military bases and are boasting of their military plans for an attack on the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

The Soviet people have worked hard to develop the most up-to-date and powerful means of defence—atomic and hydrogen bombs and rocket weapons, including inter-continental ballistic and global missiles. We have developed these weapons. They are the best in the world, and we have enough of them to reply to a blow by our enemies with a lightning, smashing blow which would obliterate the bases spearheaded against us, wherever they are, and the industries forging the weapons for the armed forces of the aggressor. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The NATO militarists like to prate about an "equilibrium of fear", about a "balance of forces of retaliation", and even about a "balance of terror", as a factor capable of guaranteeing peace on earth. But is it sensible to pin one's hopes on peace built on such a foundation? A closer look will show that the world now lives, figuratively speaking, on a mined powder magazine crammed with thermonuclear weapons.

The only choice mankind has in our time is peaceful coexistence or devastating war. But no people in any country needs a military catastrophe. A new war, if permitted to start, would kill people by the million, regardless of nationality and property status. Consequently, there is only one

choice: peaceful coexistence. This means renunciation of war among states as a way of settling international disputes. This means their solution through negotiation.

The Soviet Government always follows a peace policy and together with the governments of the other socialist countries is pressing for general and complete disarmament, the conclusion of a German peace treaty and on this basis the solution of the problem of West Berlin, and the elimination of the centres of war danger which hold the peril of world war. We contribute by every means to the strengthening of the independent states of Asia, Africa and Latin America. We support warmly, fraternally, the powerful national liberation movement. We spare no effort to extirpate the disgraceful system of colonialism.

All the thoughts of the socialist countries, all our actions are aimed at preventing a world war and strengthening peace on earth. (*Applause.*)

Counterposed to the line of peaceful coexistence and the solution of international problems by peaceful means, followed by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, is the line of the aggressive imperialist circles aimed at maintaining the cold war and increasing international tension. It is their fault that crises flare up, one after another, aggravating the international situation and pushing mankind to the abyss of a world war.

The imperialists are trying to find a way out of their difficulties by assaulting the living standard of the workers of their countries and intensifying the plunder of the economically underdeveloped countries. After the collapse of the colonial empires, the plan of the imperialist monopolies is to preserve intact, and even to intensify, the economic enslavement of the young national states and to keep in chains the peoples which are still in colonial bondage. Thus, we have, on the one hand, a growth of the national liberation movement, which is supported by all progressive mankind, and on the other, an intensification of the attempts of the imperialist powers to crush this movement at all costs.

The most aggressive and adventurist circles of imperialism are trying to resolve their difficulties by a further intensification of the arms race and the preparation of a war of aggression against the socialist countries and the young sovereign states of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that the centres of aggression created by the imperialists may spark off an all-out nuclear-rocket war.

The aggressive imperialist forces are tying knots of international tension which are fraught with dangerous consequences for mankind. So far the most acute point of this tension was the crisis in the Caribbean.

## II

## SOLUTION OF THE CRISIS IN THE CARIBBEAN WAS A MAJOR VICTORY FOR THE POLICY OF PEACE

Comrade Deputies, everyone remembers the tense days of October when mankind was anxiously following the news coming from the Caribbean. In those days the world was on the brink of a thermonuclear catastrophe.

What created this crisis? How did it develop? What lessons must be learned from it? These questions call for a thorough analysis which will help the peace forces better to understand the resulting situation and to define their tasks in the struggle for the further maintenance and consolidation of peace.

But before passing over to this analysis, I should like to recall how the Cuban revolution developed and how the relations between the Soviet Union and Cuba proceeded.

### SOVIET-CUBAN FRIENDSHIP IS UNBREAKABLE

Having hoisted the banner of the people's anti-imperialist revolution, the freedom-loving Cuban people, rallied behind their leader Fidel Castro and his comrades-in-arms, had by 1959 cleared their land of the North American plunderers and their accomplices. This was indeed a heroic struggle worthy of admiration. The revolution in Cuba was a revolution of the working people and for the working people. In a brief space of time a radical land reform was effected, industrial enterprises, firms and banks were nationalised, and a cultural revolution accomplished. The Republic of Cuba became a democratic state laying the foundations of socialism. (*Stormy applause.*)

The victory of the revolution in Cuba was gained by the Cuban people themselves. The Soviet Army, which our

enemies seek to depict as an "exporter of revolution", was many thousands of miles away from the "Island Aflame", as Cuba is called.

All who cherish the cause of freedom and socialism rejoiced in this wonderful victory. When the people of Cuba, who had gained independence, were subjected to economic and later also to military pressure on the part of its imperialist neighbour, the socialist countries, primarily the Soviet Union, of course, came to the assistance of Cuba.

Relations of sincere friendship resting on equality, respect of sovereignty and economic co-operation arose between the Soviet Union and Cuba from the very first days of her new life. We could not but give a helping hand to the Cuban people, our brothers in labour, our class brothers. (*Prolonged applause.*) The importance of friendly Soviet-Cuban relations for the consolidation of the socialist gains in Cuba has more than once been emphasised by the leaders of the Cuban Republic. "We know," said Comrade Fidel Castro, "that without the Soviet Union, without the socialist camp, without their assistance, the victory of the revolution in such a small country as Cuba would have been impossible, in view of imperialist aggression."

The Soviet people are helping with an open heart the fraternal people of heroic Cuba. (*Applause.*)

The victory of the revolution in Cuba and her success in building a new life gave rise to an outburst of malice among the imperialist circles of the United States of America. The imperialists are frightened by Cuba because of her ideas. They do not want to reconcile themselves to the fact that little Cuba dares to live and develop independently, as her people want to, and not in the way which would please the American monopolies. But the question of how people are to live, what road they are to take, is the internal affair of every people!

Flouting the generally accepted standards of international relations, the reactionary forces in the United States have been doing everything from the first day of the victory of the Cuban revolution to overthrow Cuba's revolutionary Government and to restore their domination there. They broke off diplomatic relations with Cuba, have conducted and are conducting subversive activities and established an economic blockade of Cuba. Threatening to apply sanctions, the United

States began to press its allies not only to stop trading with Cuba, but even not to make ships available to carry food to Cuba from the socialist countries which came to the assistance of their brothers. This is an anti-human policy—a scheme to starve a whole nation.

But even this seemed insufficient to them. They arrogated the functions of a policeman and decided to take the path of military suppression of the Cuban revolution. In other words, they wanted to usurp the right to export counter-revolution.

United States policy *vis-à-vis* Cuba is a most unbridled, reactionary policy. To declare that Cuba threatens America, or any other country, and on this plea to usurp a special right to act against Cuba is simply monstrous.

Seeking to justify its aggressive actions, American reaction claims that the crisis in the Caribbean was created by Cuba herself, adding that blame also rests with the Soviet Union which shipped rockets and IL-28 bombers there.

But is this so? It is true that we brought weapons there at the request of the Cuban Government. But what were our motives in doing that? Exclusively humanitarian motives—Cuba needed weapons as a means of deterring the aggressors, and not as a means of attack. For Cuba was under a real threat of invasion. Piratical attacks were repeatedly being made on her coast; Havana was shelled, and airborne groups were dropped to carry out sabotage.

A large-scale military invasion of Cuba by counter-revolutionary mercenaries was launched in April last year. This invasion was prepared and carried out with the full support of the United States.

Further events have shown that the failure of the invasion did not discourage the United States imperialists in their desire to strangle Cuba. They began preparing another attack. In the autumn of this year a very alarming situation was created. There was every indication that the United States was preparing to attack the Cuban Republic, using its own armed forces.

Revolutionary Cuba was compelled to take all measures to strengthen her defence. The Soviet Union helped her build up a strong army standing guard over the achievements of the Cuban people. In view of the mounting threat from the United States, the Government of Cuba, in the summer of this year, requested the Soviet Government to render further

assistance. Agreement was reached on a number of new measures, including the stationing of several dozen Soviet I.R.B.M.s in Cuba. These weapons were to be in the hands of Soviet military men.

What were the aims behind this decision? Naturally neither we nor our Cuban friends had in mind that this small number of medium range I.R.B.M.s sent to Cuba would be used for an attack on the United States or any other country.

Our aim was only to defend Cuba. Everybody saw how the American imperialists were whetting their knives and threatening Cuba with a massed attack. We could not remain impartial observers in face of this bandit-like policy, contrary to all the standards governing relations between states and contrary to the United Nations Charter. We decided to give a helping hand to Cuba. (*Prolonged applause.*) We saw a possibility of protecting the freedom-loving people of Cuba by installing rockets there so that the American imperialists, if they really decided to invade, would realise that the war which they threatened to start stood at their own borders, so that they would see more realistically the dangers of thermonuclear war.

We took this step because of the serious worsening of the situation. We were confident that it would bring the aggressors to their senses and that they–realising that Cuba was not defenceless and that American imperialism was not all-powerful–would be compelled to change their plans. Then the need for retaining rockets in Cuba would naturally disappear.

Indeed, had there been no threat of an invasion and had we had assurances that the United States would not invade Cuba, and would restrain its allies from doing so, had the United States been guided by this in its policy, there would have been no need for our rockets to be stationed in Cuba.

Some people contend that the rockets were supplied by us for an attack on the United States. This, of course, is not a clever deduction. Why should we station rockets in Cuba for this purpose, when we were and are able to strike from our own territory, possessing as we do the necessary number of inter-continental missiles of the required range and power. (*Applause.*)

We do not at all need military bases on foreign territories. It is known that we have dismantled all our bases abroad.

All people who have any understanding of military matters know that in the age of inter-continental and global rockets, Cuba—that small far-away island which is only 50 kilometres wide in some places—is of no strategic importance for the defence of the Soviet Union. We stationed rockets in Cuba only for the defence of the Cuban Republic, and not for an attack on the United States. A small country like Cuba cannot, naturally, build up forces such as could launch an offensive against so big a country as the United States.

Only people who are not "all there" can claim that the Soviet Union chose Cuba as a springboard for an invasion of the American continent—of the United States or countries of Latin America. If we wanted to start a war against the United States, we would not have agreed to dismantle the rockets installed in Cuba, which were ready for launching, for battle. We would have used them. But we did not do that, because we did not pursue such aims.

Thus, all the talk about Cuba being converted into a base for an attack on the United States of America is a vicious lie. The purpose of that lie is to cover up the plans for aggression against Cuba. We are loyal to Lenin's principles of peaceful coexistence and we consider that all disputes among states should be settled by peaceful means, by means of negotiation.

## HOW EVENTS DEVELOPED AROUND CUBA

Developments in the Caribbean confirmed that there was a threat of such aggression. In the last ten days of October, a large-scale build-up of U.S. naval and air forces, paratroopers and marines began in the south of the United States, at the approaches to Cuba. The U.S. Government sent reinforcements to its naval base at Guantanamo, lying on Cuban territory. Big military manoeuvres were announced in the Caribbean. In the course of those "manoeuvres", a landing was to be made on the island of Vieques. On October 22, Kennedy's Administration announced a quarantine of Cuba. The word "quarantine", by the way, was merely a fig leaf in this case. Actually it was a blockade, piracy on the high seas.

Events developed rapidly. The American Command alerted all its armed forces, including its troops in Europe, and

also the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean and the Seventh Fleet based in the Taiwan area. Several airborne, infantry and armoured divisions, numbering about 100,000 men, were set aside just for an attack on Cuba. Moreover, 183 warships with 85,000 naval personnel were moved to the shores of Cuba. The landing on Cuba was to be covered by a few thousand military planes. Close to 20 per cent of all the planes of the U.S. Strategic Air Command were kept in the air round the clock, carrying atom and hydrogen bombs. Reservists were called up.

The troops of America's NATO allies in Europe were also put on the alert. A joint command was set up by the United States and Latin American countries, and some of these countries sent warships to take part in the blockade of Cuba. As a result of these aggressive steps on the part of the U.S. Government there arose a threat of thermonuclear war.

In face of these intensive military preparations, we, for our part, had to take appropriate measures. The Soviet Government instructed the U.S.S.R. Minister of Defence to alert all the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union, and above all the Soviet inter-continental and strategic rocket forces, the rocket anti-aircraft defences and the fighter command, the strategic air command, and the Navy. Our submarine fleet, including atomic submarines, took up assigned positions. A state of top military readiness was announced in the ground forces, and the discharge of servicemen of senior age groups from the strategic rocket forces, the anti-aircraft defence forces and the submarine fleet was halted. The armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty countries were also fully alerted.

In these conditions, if one or the other side had not shown restraint, had not done everything necessary to avert the outbreak of war, an explosion would have followed with irreparable consequences.

Now, when the tension caused by the events in the Caribbean has been reduced, when we have reached the last stage of settling the conflict, I should like to report to the Deputies of the Supreme Soviet what the Soviet Government did to extinguish the approaching flames of war.

On October 23, immediately after the United States had proclaimed the blockade of Cuba, the Soviet Government, besides taking defensive measures, issued a statement resolutely warning that the United States Government was

assuming a grave responsibility for the fate of the peace and was recklessly playing with fire. We frankly told the United States President that we would not tolerate piratical actions by United States ships on the high seas and that we would take appropriate measures with this object in view.

At the same time the Soviet Government urged all peoples to bar the road to the aggressors. Simultaneously, it took certain steps in the United Nations. The peaceful initiative of the Soviet Government in settling the Cuban crisis met with full support from the socialist countries and the peoples of most other United Nations member states. The United Nations Secretary-General, U Thant, made great efforts to settle the conflict.

However, the Government of the United States continued to worsen the situation. Militarist forces in the United States were pushing developments towards an attack on Cuba. On the morning of October 27 we received information from the Cuban comrades and from other sources which bluntly said that the invasion would be carried out within the next two or three days. We assessed the messages received as a signal of the utmost alarm. And this was a well-founded alarm.

Immediate action was needed to prevent an invasion of Cuba and to preserve peace. A message suggesting a mutually acceptable solution was sent to the United States President. At that moment it was not yet too late to extinguish the fuse of war which had already begun to smoulder. In sending this message we took into consideration the fact that the President's own messages had expressed anxiety and a desire to find a way out of the existing situation. We declared that if the United States undertook not to invade Cuba and would also restrain other states allied with it from aggression against Cuba, the Soviet Union would be willing to remove from Cuba the weapons which the United States described as "offensive".

The United States President replied by declaring that if the Soviet Government agreed to remove these weapons from Cuba, the American Government would lift the quarantine, i.e., the blockade, and would give an assurance that Cuba would not be invaded, either by the United States itself or other countries of the Western Hemisphere. The President declared quite definitely, and this is known to the whole

world, that the United States would not attack Cuba and would also restrain its allies from such actions.

We shipped our weapons to Cuba precisely for the purpose of preventing aggression against her. That was why the Soviet Government reaffirmed its agreement to remove the ballistic rockets from Cuba.

Thus, briefly speaking, a mutually acceptable solution was achieved, which meant a victory for reason, a success for the cause of peace. The Cuban question entered the stage of peaceful talks and, as regards the United States, was, so to speak, transferred from the generals to the diplomats.

Talks began in New York on October 29 between representatives of the U.S.S.R., the United States and Cuba, with the participation of U Thant. Comrade Mikoyan, First Deputy Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, flew to Havana for an exchange of views with the Government of Cuba.

Meanwhile, the two sides set about discharging their commitments. The Soviet Union removed from Cuba all the rockets which the United States described as offensive weapons. The Soviet crews servicing the rocket installations also left. The United States was offered an opportunity of convincing itself that all the ballistic rockets which were in Cuba had indeed been removed, and this has been confirmed in statements by United States officials.

At the same time, seeking to expedite a settlement of the crisis in the Caribbean, we agreed to withdraw the Soviet IL-28 planes from Cuba within a month, although they are obsolete as bombers. By December 7 these planes had already been removed from Cuba. They had been shipped to Cuba only to be used as a kind of flying coastal defence artillery, to operate under the cover of anti-aircraft facilities.

For its part, the United States Government on November 21 lifted the naval blockade of Cuba and withdrew its warships from that region. The United States Command withdrew from the Florida region the ground and air forces concentrated there for an attack on Cuba and demobilised the reservists who had been called up. The additional troops sent to Guantanamo during the crisis were also removed from that base. At the same time, the President reaffirmed the United States' assurance that there would be no invasion of Cuba.

Taking this into consideration, we also cancelled the

military measures we had been obliged to take in connection with the worsening of the Cuban crisis. The Republic of Cuba, in its turn, began demobilising the men called up for the defence of their country, and they are returning to peaceful work and to their families.

Favourable conditions have now been created for the solution of the dangerous crisis that arose in the Caribbean. It is now necessary to conclude the talks, to formalise the understanding reached as a result of the exchange of messages between the Government of the Soviet Union and the Government of the United States, and to seal this understanding with the authority of the United Nations.

*The Soviet Government is convinced that it is not in the interests of peace to delay the completion of the settlement of the Caribbean crisis, and we hope that the Government of the United States understands this too.*

## SOME LESSONS AND CONCLUSIONS

From this there follow some obvious results of the normalisation now beginning in the Cuban situation.

1. It has been possible to avert the invasion which was imminently threatening the Republic of Cuba and, therefore, to avert an armed conflict, to overcome a crisis which was fraught with the danger of universal thermonuclear war.

2. The United States publicly, before the entire world, pledged itself not to attack the Republic of Cuba, and to restrain its allies from so doing.

3. The most rabid imperialists who were gambling on starting a world thermonuclear war over Cuba have not been able to do so. The Soviet Union and the forces of peace and socialism have proved that they are in a position to impose peace on the advocates of war. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Which side triumphed? Who won? In this connection it can be said that it was reason, the cause of peace and the security of peoples, that won. (*Stormy applause.*) The sides displayed a sober approach and took into account that unless such steps were taken as could help to overcome the dangerous development of events, a third world war might break out. As a result of mutual concessions and compromise, an understanding was reached which made it possible to remove dangerous tension, to normalise the situation.

Both sides made concessions. We withdrew the ballistic rockets and agreed to withdraw the IL-28 planes. This gives satisfaction to the Americans. But both Cuba and the Soviet Union received satisfaction, too. An American invasion of Cuba has been averted, the naval blockade has been lifted; the situation in the Caribbean area is returning to normal; People's Cuba exists and is growing stronger and developing under the leadership of its revolutionary government and its dauntless leader, Fidel Castro. (*Stormy applause.*)

Some people allege that the United States compelled us to yield on certain points. But if this yardstick is applied, these people should say that the United States, too, was compelled to yield. Settlement of outstanding issues between states, without war, by peaceful means—this is precisely the policy of peaceful coexistence in action. Had we agreed to put our relations on such a basis, had the United States' relations with Cuba been built on the basis of the United Nations Charter, it would not have been necessary to take our rockets to Cuba and to install them there.

We are satisfied with this outcome of the Caribbean events; unquestionably all the other peoples favouring peaceful coexistence are also satisfied. This has made it possible for them to live and work in conditions of peace.

Now let us imagine for a minute what could have happened had we copied diehard politicians and refused to make mutual concessions. It would have been like the two goats in the folk tale who met on a footbridge over a chasm and, having locked horns, refused to make way for each other. As is known, both crashed into the chasm. But is this a wise course for human beings?

Among the ruling circles of the United States there are some politicians who are rightly called "wild". The "wild men" insisted and continue to insist on starting war as soon as possible against the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist camp. Is it not clear that if we had taken an uncompromising position, we would only have helped the camp of the "wild men" to take advantage of the situation in order to strike a blow at Cuba and touch off a world war?

In justice it should be noted that among the leading circles of the United States there are also some people who take a saner view of the situation and, considering the present

balance of forces in the international arena, realise that, if the United States touched off a war, it would not win it, and would fail to achieve its purpose.

Comrade Deputies, I want to note specially the tremendous contribution made to the cause of preserving peace in the Caribbean area by the heroic Republic of Cuba, by her courageous people, by her glorious leaders headed by our great friend, Fidel Castro. (*Prolonged applause.*) Allow me, Comrade Deputies, on your behalf, on behalf of the entire Soviet people, to congratulate our Cuban friends. Revolutionary Cuba has passed an important and difficult test and has stood her ground with credit in the struggle for her freedom and independence! Cuba emerged from this new test stronger and more mature. (*Stormy applause.*)

In the face of imminent danger, the Cuban leaders displayed firmness and determination to uphold the sovereignty of their country and to preserve their socialist gains. The whole Cuban people rose to the defence of their homeland, ready to stand their ground to the death in the struggle against invaders. The Soviet people admire their courage. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The Cuban Government has rightly posed the question that any settlement of the Caribbean crisis must be of a long-term nature and include guarantees for the Cuban Republic which would safeguard her from aggression and ensure the Cuban people the possibility to build their new life in a peaceful environment. This purpose is served by the five points advanced in the speech of the Prime Minister of Cuba, Fidel Castro, on October 28, which have our full support.

These five points are just demands, in keeping with the elementary rights of every sovereign state and prompted by concern for peace and the security of Cuba and consistent with the principles of the United Nations Charter. (*Applause.*)

Revolutionary Cuba wants to live, to develop independently and to have a political and social structure which accords with the interests of her people. This is Cuba's right, and, naturally, all peace-loving states, all peace-loving peoples, are on Cuba's side. (*Applause.*)

The leaders of revolutionary Cuba have repeatedly stressed their desire to settle all disputes with the United States by peaceful means, through negotiation.

Who is to blame for the fact that the relations between

Cuba and the United States have still not been normalised? The answer is clear: it is none but the ruling circles of the United States, who do not want to negotiate with their neighbour. However, we are still hopeful that reason will prevail. Sooner or later the United States will have to agree to a normalisation of relations with Cuba.

We solemnly declare that the Soviet Union has been and remains with revolutionary Cuba. We shall continue to help the Cuban people to build a happy future. (*Stormy applause.*) The solution of the crisis enables it to return to peaceful work, but the forces of peace must remain vigilant.

The Soviet Government hopes that the United States will adhere strictly to its pledges concerning Cuba. For violation of these pledges would be dangerous not only to the area in question, as it would inevitably produce a new acute conflict and create a new threat to peace. What is more, it would destroy all faith in such pledges, and this would preclude the use in the future of the method of peaceful adjustment which played a positive role in the solution of the crisis over Cuba.

We, for our part, will firmly abide by the agreement reached as a result of the exchange of messages with the President of the United States. We would like to give the clear warning that our commitments will stand so long as the other side, too, abides by the agreement. (*Applause.*) If the other side does not honour its pledges, we shall have to undertake such actions as may be required in the circumstances. (*Applause.*)

*It should be clear to all that our country will never leave revolutionary Cuba in her hour of need.* (*Prolonged applause.*) *The Soviet Union will honour its promise to help revolutionary Cuba. Revolutionary Cuba will not remain defenceless.* (*Stormy applause.*)

In our times, the imperialists cannot disregard the growing might of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries. We have the necessary number of powerful intercontinental rockets, which will enable us to strike back if war is started against us.

The militarists who boast that they have nuclear submarines against the Soviet Union, with Polaris missiles and other "surprises", as they put it, would do well to remember that we are not exactly rustics either. (*Animation. Prolonged applause.*)

Why do I recall such unpleasant things as inter-continental missiles and atomic submarines? Because we are compelled to do this by the irresponsible statements of certain leaders of the United States and its allies.

When the Cuban events were at their height and there was imminent danger in the air, many people in the West said it was necessary to seek a reasonable solution of disputes in order to prevent war. But now, when the shock has passed, so to speak, some of them are beginning to say that disputes should be settled by concessions by one side only. This is an unwise and dangerous policy.

We are not surprised that the main tune in the discordant chorus of the advocates of a "tough line" is called by Adenauer and his like.

The West German revenge-seekers have for many years served the sinister cause of fanning military conflicts and are always ready to rush with inflammable material to where a crisis is building up. They cannot wait to add fuel to the flames in order to cause a war. Adenauer dreams of revenge, and this is why he regards all international developments from the standpoint of how to secure more weapons for the Bundeswehr on the pretended need to resist the Soviet Union and the socialist camp, and how to bring about a collision between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Still, I should like to tell the cold war Chancellor that there was no cause for him to rejoice at the "toughness" of the West, which allegedly forced us to withdraw rockets from Cuba. I can assure you, Herr Chancellor, that when we decided to install some forty rockets in Cuba, we did not touch that "share" of them which are reserved for you, should you start an aggression in Europe. (*Laughter. Stormy applause.*) Now, after our rockets have returned from Cuba to your "satisfaction", we have added them to the defensive means protecting our western frontiers. (*Applause.*)

Why do you rejoice, Herr Adenauer? It would appear that you have forgotten the elementary rule of arithmetic that the sum total—in this case, the power of Soviet retaliation—does not change if the order of its items changes. (*Prolonged applause.*)

It should be said that now, after the situation has become calmer in the world, "toughness" is advocated not only by Adenauer, but by some other leaders as well. Thus, the Brit-

ish Foreign Secretary, Lord Home, said the other day that there "were some signs that after the purging experience of Cuba the Russians might reassess their role in international society", that is to say, they might begin to yield to the NATO bloc in everything. He said this is how the Soviet Union should "apply" the lessons of Cuba now.

The British Foreign Secretary should know that the Soviet Union always duly considers the lessons of international events. Those, however, who now advocate a "tough policy" with regard to the Soviet Union would do well to consider that if such a crisis recurs, and if this time it proves impossible to arrest the dangerous drift of events, Britain, together with her allies, would be plunged directly into the vortex of a catastrophe, and it would then be too late to do anything.

Warlike calls for "toughness" again resound in the United States too. What can we say of such imprudent boasters? They remind me of the long-eared hero of a certain hunting story.

A man once went hunting with his dogs. The dogs started a hare. The hare kept ahead of the dogs for some time, but finally they began to overtake him. Suddenly the hare saw a hole in the ground and dived into it. But, alas, he found himself in a foxhole, and there were cubs there. The hare was very frightened, and asked in a tiny, ingratiating voice:

"Little foxes, where is your mother?" (*Laughter.*)

"Our mother went to get a chicken to feed us," the cubs replied.

The hare then recovered some of his courage and said, in a gruff voice this time:

"Pity, I'd have shown her."

In the same way, some Western politicians now say: "Pity, we would have shown the Soviet Union." Well, gentlemen, try it! (*Stormy applause.*)

It is quite on the cards that some madman may start a war. But if he starts it, even a thousand wise men will be hard put to it to stop it. This is known from history.

Is a new invasion of Cuba possible? One cannot, of course, give guarantees for the demented militarists, but it can be confidently said that any madmen who dare start a war will meet with the same inglorious end as the Hitlers, the Mussolinis and other barbarians who plunged the world into wars. (*Prolonged applause.*)

And yet, the legitimate question arises: We have succeeded in preventing war in the case of Cuba with the help of a reasonable compromise–and the world was literally on the very brink of war. But will it be possible to loosen the knot, if only a little, should the imperialists pull it tighter again? One cannot vouch for this.

Indeed, consider for a moment that a knot of tension has been created in Europe, say over the question of a peace treaty with Germany. I imagine that the American militarists and critics like Adenauer, who prompt them from behind, will claim that "firmness" pays off for the West, and that an even tougher position should therefore be taken.

One can say to these people: Do you imagine that we shall undertake–under your pressure–to withdraw rockets from the Soviet Union, or be frightened by the threat of bombing? I shall tell you frankly, gentlemen: If you build your policy on such calculations, you will make a gross miscalculation.

Such methods will not enable you to remove pressing international problems from the agenda, including the question of a German peace settlement. They must be solved. But you apparently want to bury these questions, and us with them. If anybody thinks that there is a shovel big enough to bury us with our rocket weapons, we can say that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, have a shovel just as big, perhaps bigger. (*Prolonged applause.*)

To take this road–the road of settling disputes from positions of strength–might provoke a really devastating world war. And the Western statesmen should bear it in mind.

## AGAINST DOGMATISM, FOR CREATIVE APPLICATION OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST TEACHING

Comrade Deputies, it should be said that during the peaceful adjustment of the conflict in the Caribbean shrill voices of discontent were also heard from another side, from people who even call themselves Marxists-Leninists, although their actions have nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism. Whom I mean are the Albanian leaders. Their criticism of the Soviet Union in effect echoed the criticism coming from the most reactionary, bellicose Western circles.

Why is it that the Albanian leaders are now shouting the

loudest? I should like to recount an incident from my life to explain this.

I spent my childhood and youth in the mines. If Gorky's university was his life among the people, my university was the mines. It was a kind of Cambridge for a workingman, a "university" of the dispossessed people of Russia. My father went there, and so did I in my childhood and youth.

I remember that in mining settlements foul-mouthed people would find a small boy who had barely begun to articulate words without yet understanding what they meant, and taught him the foulest of words. They would tell him: "Go to that house and say this to the people there." Sometimes they did even worse. "Go to your mother," they would say, "and repeat these words to her. Here are three kopeks for you. Afterwards we'll give you five."

The child would run to the window, or to his mother, and repeat the foul words. It was a kind of show for the "jokers".

The Albanian leaders are like these unreasoning boys. Someone has taught them foul language, and they go about and use it against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Yet it is their mother! For using this foul language they get the promised three kopeks. If they use stronger and more inventive language they get another five kopeks, and praise.

What do they want, these people who call themselves Marxists-Leninists? Why are they pressing for the same thing, in fact, as Adenauer, that is, pushing us to conflicts, to an aggravation of the international situation? It is a true saying: If you go to the left, you'll finally come to the right. Objectively, during the Cuban crisis they acted like people provoking a conflict. They wanted to bring about a collision between the Soviet Union and the United States. But what does that mean? It means provoking a world thermonuclear war.

I wonder how they would behave in such a war? I do not think that they would want to take part in it. Obviously, they would prefer to sit it out. But the question arises: What do they want? Can it be that they want the blood of the peoples of the Soviet Union, Cuba and other socialist countries to flow?

The Albanian leaders, judging by their statements, are obviously dissatisfied that the crisis over Cuba has been resolved. They describe its solution as a retreat, and some go

to the length of alleging that the Soviet Union has surrendered to imperialism.

The question arises: In what way have we retreated? Socialist Cuba exists; Cuba remains a beacon of Marxist-Leninist ideas in the Western Hemisphere. The strength of her revolutionary example will increase. The United States Government has undertaken on behalf of its country not to invade Cuba; the threat of a thermonuclear war has been averted. Is this really our retreat? (*Stormy applause.*)

The critics of a peaceful settlement of the conflict say: Don't you see that one cannot trust the word of the United States, that history knows many instances when treaties were violated? Yes, history has such instances, but if one proceeds from this alone, one would have to acknowledge that people now have no other prospect except mutual extermination. To assert this means, wittingly or unwittingly, to take the road of militarism, to regard war as the only method of settling disputes.

Are international disputes really bound to be settled through war and not through negotiations? No, reaching a settlement of disputes between states through war is madness, which can hold only suffering and disaster for the peoples. It has nothing in common with the teaching of Marx and Lenin. It is tantamount to denying international treaties and agreements, denying the principle of peaceful coexistence. Reasonable standards of international relations exist, and we must not undermine, but strengthen them. Vituperation will not settle disputed issues.

On the assumption that the nature of imperialism has not changed, some people say that it must be exposed and cursed. Imperialism, of course, must be exposed—it is an evil for the peoples of the world, but cursing alone, no matter how rightly, will not sap its strength.

It is, of course, true that the nature of imperialism has not changed. But imperialism today is no longer what it used to be when it held undivided sway over the world. If it is now a "paper tiger", those who say this know that this "paper tiger" has atomic teeth. It can use them and it must not be treated lightly. It is possible in relations with imperialist countries to make reciprocal compromises, while, on the other hand, one must have all the means to smash the aggressors, should they unleash war. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Some people confined themselves to cursing when difficult conditions were created for Cuba. Noisy statements did not reduce the strength of the imperialist forces, and Cuba hardly got any relief from this. The Soviet Union acted differently. It not only exposed the United States imperialist intrigues against revolutionary Cuba. It sent its weapons to Cuba and sent people who were ready to lay down their lives in the defence of Cuba. (*Applause.*) When Cuba was threatened, our men were ordered to defend Cuba against invasion, to fight shoulder to shoulder with the Cubans, to stand to the death with the Cuban people. (*Prolonged applause.*) These are genuinely fraternal sentiments, a fraternal attitude, fraternal solidarity. (*Stormy applause.*)

Of course, this was a critical time and the Government of the United States understood the possible development of events. It understood that if its armed forces set off a war in Cuba, and both Cubans and Soviet men in Cuba would be burnt in this conflagration, no force would restrain the Soviet Union from striking a crushing retaliatory blow. (*Stormy applause.*) That is why the United States Government displayed reason at the crucial moment of the crisis.

Offering a mutually acceptable solution, we took into consideration the whole complex of circumstances, and war was averted.

Now we tell our critics: Your cursing is praise for our Government, our Party, our people, praise for all the Marxist-Leninist parties which stand on the positions of the 1957 Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties and the 1960 Statement of Eighty-One Parties and uphold the ideas of peaceful coexistence between states with different social and political systems. (*Prolonged applause.*)

One must be very cautious and not make irresponsible charges, such as that some follow an orthodox policy, while others pursue a mistaken policy, some are attacking imperialism and are intolerant of it, while others allegedly display liberalism. These questions can be rightly understood and actions can be correctly assessed only if one takes into account the time, place and circumstances in which one has to operate.

India, for instance, achieved the liberation of Goa, Diu and Daman. Those were vestiges of colonialism on Indian soil. Even when the British colonialists had been expelled

from India, Portugal retained her colonies there, colonies which disseminated the foul stench of colonialism. India and her government showed patience and tolerated this for several years, but then threw out the colonialists. Did they act rightly? Of course, they did! (*Applause.*)

Incidentally, when this question was discussed in the Security Council, the United States and Great Britain tried, in point of actual fact, to have India proclaimed an aggressor. They tried to set world public opinion against India. It was only the veto of the Soviet Union that prevented them from achieving this. (*Applause.*)

One more example. When Indonesia gained her freedom, the Dutch colonialists tried to retain West Irian. The Indonesian people and their government, however, compelled the colonialists to withdraw from West Irian. We did what we could to help Indonesia in her struggle, and we welcome the liberation of West Irian, and her reunification with free Indonesia. (*Applause.*)

Macao is situated at the mouth of the Chukiang River, on the coast of China. It is a small territory and not easily spotted on the map. It was leased by the Portuguese in the middle of the sixteenth century and in 1887 they wrested it completely from China and made it their colony. The British colony of Hong Kong is there also—it lies in the delta of the Sikiang River, literally under the heart of such an important city as Kwangchow (Canton). The odour coming from these places is by no means sweeter than that which emanated from colonial Goa.

But no one will blame the People's Republic of China for leaving these fragments of colonialism intact. It would be wrong to prod China into actions which she considers untimely. If the Government of the People's Republic of China tolerates Macao and Hong Kong it must clearly have good reasons for it. It would, therefore, be ridiculous to charge that this is a concession to the British and Portuguese colonialists, that this is appeasement.

But is it perhaps a retreat from Marxism-Leninism? Nothing of the kind! It means that the Government of the People's Republic of China is taking into account reality, the actual possibilities. It does not mean that the Chinese are less sensitive to colonialism than the Indians, that they are more tolerant towards Salazar than India is. No, our Chinese

friends hate colonialism just as every revolutionary does. But they are clearly basing themselves on their conditions, acting on their own views and showing patience.

Does this mean that we must condemn them for this, that we must claim that they have retreated from Marxism-Leninism? No, it doesn't! That would be ridiculous.

Due to a variety of conditions one sometimes has to live not among fragrant roses, but amidst thorns, and sometimes even in close proximity to the colonialists' latrines.

But the hour will come when our Chinese friends will find this position intolerable and will tell the colonialists in a loud voice, "Get out!" (*Prolonged applause.*) And we shall welcome that step. But it is for our Chinese friends themselves to decide when this is to be done. We are not hurrying them. On the contrary, we say: "Settle this matter in your country's interests and the interests of the whole socialist camp."

What would have happened if, during the events over Cuba, we had failed to display the necessary restraint and had listened to the shrill promptings of the "ultra-revolutionaries"? We would have entered a period of a new world war, a thermonuclear war. Our vast country would have held out, of course, but tens upon tens of millions of people would have perished! As for Cuba, one result of a thermonuclear war would probably be that it would simply have ceased to exist. Other densely populated countries lacking open spaces, drawn into the conflict, would also have perished completely. Further, the consequences of atomic radiation would have brought untold suffering to the survivors and to future generations.

But is that the path of mankind's development envisaged by Marx and Lenin? No, it isn't! Those who try to ascribe that world outlook and those designs to our great teachers are insulting their memory. When the revolution began in tsarist Russia, our slogan was "Peace to the Huts, War to the Palaces!" This was in keeping with the Party line that the imperialist war should develop into a civil war; it was a call for class struggle, for struggle against the landowners and capitalists. When the Revolution had conquered, the first decree of the Soviet power, drawn up by Lenin, was the Decree on Peace. Although the Germans at that time occupied quite a large part of Russia, Lenin and our whole

country sought to end the war and sign a peace treaty with the Germans.

A delegation was sent to Brest to sign the treaty, headed by Trotsky, who then also styled himself a Marxist. But he went against the Party, provocatively broke up the peace negotiations with the Germans and left Brest. Then Lenin had to send Chicherin, and the peace treaty was signed. History has confirmed the correctness and the genius of Lenin's foresight. It has shown that the road outlined and defended by Lenin in the struggle against the pseudo-revolutionaries was the only reasonable and true road. The treaty of Brest was, of course, a temporary concession to German militarism.

But what happened in the last analysis? Who made concessions to whom? The Marxist-Leninist banner now flies not only over the entire territory of the Soviet Union, but has also gone beyond its borders and has been raised in other countries, including the territory of the German Democratic Republic. And those German militarists who invaded our country lie buried in the ground. It is now for you to judge who was correct. It was the Leninist approach to the solution of that complex question that has triumphed. (*Prolonged applause.*)

There is, of course, no similarity between the treaty of Brest and the settlement of the Caribbean conflict. The point is that, on each occasion, it is necessary to take into account the concrete circumstances and the concrete conditions. A dogmatic approach which overlooks the realities is harmful, because it is a source of the most serious errors. Marxists-Leninists must remember that abstract truth does not exist, that truth is always concrete.

Some dogmatists have slipped to Trotskyist positions and are prodding the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries on to the course of unleashing world war. They would like to impose the same kind of provocative policy that Trotsky followed in his time. Clearly, the Albanian leaders and those who are goading them on have lost faith in the possibility of the victory of socialism without war between states; possibly they never appreciated the possibility, believing that only through war, by destroying millions of human beings, is it possible to achieve communism. But that folly cannot make the peoples of other countries follow the

Communist Parties! It can, on the other hand, repel millions upon millions of people from the communist movement.

The Albanian dogmatists are disappointed that a compromise solution has been reached and that the dangerous crisis in the Caribbean, which the American militarists started, has been eliminated. They are evidently disappointed that a thermonuclear war was not touched off, that the peoples, having passed through a dangerous crisis, are living and working in conditions of peace. Because of this, they criticise our Party, and our Government, slinging mud in bucketfuls at the Soviet Union and at the Soviet people.

## MORAL AND POLITICAL VICTORY OF SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

We have said already that it was not in the interests of socialism to allow the crisis over Cuba to develop into a thermonuclear world war. Such a war is needed by the aggressive imperialist forces, who are frightened by the inevitable historical prospect of the defeat of capitalism in peaceful competition with socialism. They say: If we've got to die, let it be with music, as the saying goes, even if that music be the bursting of nuclear bombs.

So it happens that, on the one hand, war is eagerly desired by the aggressive adventurist forces of imperialism, the "wild men" who have lost the hope that capitalism can hold its own in peaceful competition with socialism; and, on the other hand, attempts are being made to push events in the same direction by people who call themselves Marxists-Leninists but are actually dogmatists that do not believe in the possibility of the victory of socialism and communism in the conditions of peaceful coexistence with capitalism. The former and the latter both want to prod history on to a new war, to settle the question of the victory of communism or capitalism by means of war, in which millions upon millions of men and women would be killed.

These people, it would seem, are poles apart in their thinking, but in fact their positions coincide. They hold the same views and act in the same way on this vitally important question.

But for us, people building communism, just as for our brothers who are building socialism, there is no reason to

die either with or without music. We must complete the work of building communism. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Why should we invite ourselves to go to the Devil? Why should we hurry to the other world? Nobody has yet returned from there to tell us that it is better there than it is on earth. (*Laughter.*) Are you, Comrade Deputies, disappointed that you have gathered in this hall to discuss questions concerning the further development of our country in conditions of peace, at a time when thermonuclear war has been prevented? No, we all rejoice over this. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

A few days ago, members of the Presidium and the Secretaries of the Central Committee visited a new textile mill in Noviye Cheremushki, in Moscow. We talked to women workers there. I asked one of them:

"How are you making out?"

She replied:

"Very well, Comrade Khrushchov."

"Have you got a flat?"

"Yes, I have."

"Where?"

"Not far from here," she said. "When housing was built near the factory, I was given a flat there."

"Have you got a family?"

"Yes. I have two boys. One is at boarding-school. The other is living with me, and is also going to school."

The woman told me her wages and about her living and working conditions.

"So you can manage all right?" I asked.

"Yes, Comrade Khrushchov. We all have only one concern, one great wish—that there should be no war." (*Prolonged applause.*)

That woman voiced the sentiments of all the working people. The same feelings are expressed by the peoples of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, India, Albania, the United States, Britain, France and all the other countries of the world.

We do not need war! The Soviet people, who raised the banner of the struggle for socialism and to whom has fallen the honour of building communism, want peace. We are confident that we are right; we are confident of our strength. (*Prolonged applause.*)

We have travelled a long road in forty-five years. Now we are advancing with even greater strides. What we used to cover in five years we are now covering in a month. Do we have anything to treasure? Of course, we have; we have prospects; we have confidence in the ultimate victory of our ideas. We seek these victories not on the road of war, but on the road of peaceful creation and peaceful competition with capitalism. We reject not only world thermonuclear war, but all wars between states in general, with the exception of a just war of liberation and a defensive war waged by people who are the victims of aggression.

Naturally, if a war is imposed on us from whatever quarter, we shall stand up for ourselves and for our allies, and shall use all the means we have at our disposal. We shall, however, do everything in our power to avoid a military clash, in order to exclude wars altogether from the life of society. (*Prolonged applause.*) Can this aim be achieved given the existence in the world of two systems–the capitalist and the socialist systems? The balance in the world is now such that the forces of peace and socialism can curb the aggressive forces of imperialism and compel them to heed the will of the peoples.

Imperialism is no longer all-powerful, and the developments over Cuba have confirmed this. The imperialists now have to reckon with the might of the socialist countries.

To preserve peace, to preserve the great gains of socialism, we are ready to agree, and do agree, to reasonable political compromise, firmly abiding by the principles of the Marxist-Leninist teaching. We follow the injunctions of Lenin, who time and time again stressed the possibility and need for compromise in politics.

Lenin wrote that "the task of a truly revolutionary party is not to renounce compromises once and for all, but to be able *through all compromises*, since they are unavoidable, to remain true to its principles, to its class, to its revolutionary purpose" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 25, "On Compromises"). He justly pointed out that to deny all compromises was to forget the basic precepts of Marxism. He wrote: "It would be absurd to formulate a recipe or general rule ('No compromises') to serve all cases. One must use one's own brains and be able to find one's bearings in each specific case. That,

in fact, is one of the functions of a party organisation and of party leaders worthy of the name, in order through the prolonged, persistent, many-sided and comprehensive efforts of all thinking representatives of the given class to evolve the knowledge, the experience and–in addition to knowledge and experience–the political instinct necessary for the speedier and correct solution of complicated political problems" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 31). (*Prolonged applause.*)

This is how Lenin put the question, and we, his pupils and followers, have acted and will go on acting in his way, upholding in persevering, consistent and principled struggle the independence of Cuba and the cause of world peace. (*Stormy applause.*)

Comrade Deputies, we can note with satisfaction that in these tense days the inviolable solidarity and effective co-operation of the forces of peace and socialism have been particularly manifest. Our policy, the policy of the Soviet Government, has been assessed by all peoples as the most sober, peace-loving policy.

The peoples of the world now regard our Party and Government with even greater trust and respect.

In the hour of grim danger, the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties and the peoples of the socialist countries proclaimed their unflinching support for heroic Cuba, their loyalty to the principles of proletarian internationalism. Many countries which have freed themselves from the colonial yoke also raised their voice in defence of Cuba. The Soviet Government and the Central Committtee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union received numerous messages, letters and telegrams from heads of state, heads of government, leaders of parties in different countries, from public organisations, from workers, peasants and professional people in the Soviet Union and other countries expressing approval of, and strong support for, the actions of the Soviet Union designed to defend Cuba and preserve peace. (*Applause.*)

Permit me, Comrade Deputies, to express heartfelt gratitude in your name, and from myself personally, to all who supported the actions of the Soviet Government aimed at preserving peace, at helping revolutionary Cuba. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Only rabid militarists and foul-mouthed, embittered people are dissatisfied that a sober-minded policy has made it

possible to avert a new world war, to prevent an imperialist invasion of Cuba, to preserve peace for all peoples.

There is no doubt that the successful struggle for the preservation of Cuba's independence, the indisputable fact that this struggle has been won by the forces of peace, will make many people change their views on the development of the international situation and their estimate of the balance of forces in the world. They will now have a more tangible picture of the dangers of a nuclear catastrophe. In any case, the events over Cuba have made millions of Americans, for the first time in the history of the United States, feel the nearness of thermonuclear war and realise that their territory is not immune to crushing retaliation. In the days of the crisis, the American people felt the searing breath of thermonuclear war on their doorsteps. They began to understand that should a world war break out, it would proceed not somewhere beyond the oceans, in Europe and Asia, but everywhere, including the United States, bringing misery and death to millions of Americans.

Among the numerous letters and telegrams which the Soviet Government received from various countries in the days of the Cuban crisis were many telegrams and letters from United States citizens. They expressed alarm over the fate of the world, expressed gratitude to the Soviet Government and approved the steps taken by us to relieve the tension in the Caribbean and thus avert thermonuclear war.

The sentiments of the American people, their attitude to the events over Cuba, are illustrated by the fact that in the elections held after the sharpness of the crisis had, in the main, been blunted, the American people "blackballed" some of the more aggressive politicians, and above all such a warmonger as Nixon. It is not for us to lament the failure of such persons, who hate peace and the freedom of the peoples.

The policy of peace has gained a great moral and political victory. At the same time we must continue tirelessly to exert efforts aimed at preserving and strengthening peace. The situation demands of us unflagging vigilance and an indefatigable struggle for lasting peace on earth. (*Prolonged applause.*)

## III

## LET US SEARCH PERSISTENTLY FOR PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF OUTSTANDING ISSUES

Comrade Deputies, the Soviet Government thinks that all governments and peoples of the world, all responsible statesmen and political leaders, should draw the due conclusions from the crisis in the Caribbean. It is imperative to show more common sense, to display a greater desire to remove obstructions which give rise to friction and create tension in the relations between states. Good will must be shown in searching for mutually acceptable solutions on which the relaxation of international tension and the strengthening of peace on earth depend.

### TWO PRIORITY TASKS

The Soviet Government is in all its foreign policy actively striving to relieve international relations from disputed and outstanding issues. In so doing, the Soviet Government takes into account the complex nature of the many aspects of the problems confronting various states, displays proper self-restraint and holds constructive views. However, we persistently emphasise that there are priority problems whose solution must not be delayed, because their unsettled state very greatly worsens the international situation.

One of these problems is the problem of general and complete disarmament. The United Nations has unanimously supported the Soviet Government's initiative on this subject. Some three years have gone by since the resolution on general and complete disarmament was passed, committees, commissions and subcommittees are in almost continuous session, and yet we are no nearer to our objective.

Does this mean that the Soviet Union, which presented a comprehensive plan for disarmament under strict international control, has not met its partners half way in these negotiations? Does this mean it has not tried to close the gap between the views? Every honest politician will say that this is not so.

Whether the issues were deadlines for the disarmament programme, abolition of the means of delivery of nuclear

weapons, the numerical strength of conventional armed forces or any of the many other questions, we took into consideration the Western Powers' position and tried to close the gap. One aspect of general and complete disarmament, as we are well aware, is a nuclear test ban. Here, too, we have taken the necessary steps towards an understanding. However, as the diplomats say, there can be no agreement if one partner moves forward while the other stands still.

Now, during the exchange of views on a nuclear test ban, ways of solving the problems have emerged. It may be hoped that this agreement will be signed, provided the United States and Britain show common sense.

*We again declare solemnly that our entire foreign policy will be aimed at achieving a treaty on general and complete disarmament. We appeal to the Western Powers to remove the last obstacles standing in the way of an agreement banning all nuclear tests for all time. We appeal to them to sign a treaty for general and complete disarmament, under strict international control.* (*Applause.*)

The urgency of concluding a German peace treaty and normalising, on this basis, the situation in West Berlin, has become still more obvious in present conditions. It is only natural that when the crisis in the Caribbean came to a head millions of Europeans were thinking anxiously that the unsettled state of the German problem might lead mankind to still more terrible trials. People saw more clearly that a solution of the German problem could not be avoided–otherwise it would be very easy to jump from one international crisis into another still more dangerous crisis.

As in the issue of general and complete disarmament, the Soviet Union is trying to take into consideration the position of its partners in the talks on this score. What, then, prevents us from completing the job we have begun of eliminating the vestiges of the Second World War in Europe ?

The main issue is the presence of troops in West Berlin–or, rather, the question of the capacity of those troops, the flag under which they will operate and the length of time they will remain there. The Soviet Government proposes that the troops in West Berlin should not represent NATO countries, that the NATO flag in West Berlin should be replaced by the United Nations flag and that the United Nations

should undertake definite international commitments and functions there.

Let us hope that our partners in the talks will show common sense and treat this Soviet proposal with due consideration.

I should like to emphasise one thing only: If any people in the West hope that the Soviet Union will abandon its determination to conclude a German peace treaty and to normalise on this basis the situation in West Berlin, those people are mistaken. We are in favour of talks with the Western Powers, but patience can be strained only so far. Even if the Western Powers do not agree to the signing of such an agreement, it will be signed. (*Applause.*)

## ABOLISH TENSION AND CONFLICT THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

One of the fundamental trends of Soviet foreign policy has been and remains that of giving full support to peoples waging a sacred struggle for their freedom, for the consolidation of their national independence.

Relying on the support of the Soviet Union and the whole socialist camp, the national liberation movement is achieving epoch-making successes.

A new Asia is emerging and the last remnants of the former colonial empires are tumbling. The victorious advance of the national liberation movement continues in Africa. Latin America, where, in the recent past, foreign monopolies held undivided sway, has entered a new stage in its history—the stage of struggle for genuine national independence.

The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to the Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted by the United Nations on the initiative of the Soviet Union, has breathed added vigour into the national liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

But the colonialists have not surrendered. By intervening in the domestic affairs of sovereign states, often by force, they are trying to undermine their independence and sovereign rights, and to erect obstacles to the revolutionary liberation movement of the peoples. By their intervention in the liberation struggle of the peoples, the imperialists and colonialists have set up hotbeds of tension, conflict and military collision in many parts of the world.

Just look at the developments in the Yemen. For many centuries the Yemeni people have suffered oppression, exploitation and lack of rights. Now, at last, a revolution has been carried through in that country. Through a medieval fog, its peoples are forging their way to a new life, just as a plant in the desert shoots up to the surface when it receives a drop of moisture. But at once the united forces of imperialism and reaction came down upon them. Who took up arms against the Yemeni revolution, against progress? Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

Of course, the rulers of Saudi Arabia and Jordan—who themselves, it can be said, are hanging on by a thread—would not have dared to move their troops against the Yemeni Republic if they hadn't been put up to this by more powerful countries. Who is helping the Saudi and Jordanian forces? Who is arming them, and for what purpose? The peoples of the Arab East know very well that it is Britain and the United States, who call themselves "free countries", which are arming the Saudi Arabian and Jordanian troops so that Arabs fight against Arabs.

It turns out, therefore, that the so-called "free world" is helping Saudi Arabia where, quite recently, slavery existed officially and, in fact, still exists now. That is the country which is given arms to carry "freedom to the Yemen"! It is easily seen what kind of "freedom" Saudi Arabia is taking to the Yemen, and what are the "free countries" that help her to do it!

The Soviet Government condemns the imperialist machinations against the Yemeni Arab Republic and proclaims its deep respect and support for the just national aspirations of the Yemeni people. (*Applause.*)

Not only in the Yemen, but also in other parts of the globe the imperialists are trying to strangle the national liberation movement. Suffice it to recall the events in the Congo, Angola, South Vietnam and South Korea; and now an uprising has flared up in the Protectorate of Brunei in Borneo, and the British colonialists are in a hurry to suppress it.

Given the desire and good will, we believe it is always possible to find a peaceful and just solution of outstanding problems in dispute among states. What is needed for this is that the desire for a peaceful settlement of the conflicts

should be displayed not only by one side, but by all countries concerned, just as good will was displayed by all states in the settlement of the crisis in Laos.

Comrade Deputies, in examining the present international situation, one cannot overlook the regrettable events which have occurred in the area of the Indian-Chinese border. It is well known that it wasn't a week or a month ago that the border conflict began there. It began as long ago as 1959. Recently this conflict has worsened and developed into armed clashes, in the course of which thousands of men have fallen on both sides.

The Soviet Union's position with regard to the Indian-Chinese border conflict was stated as long ago as 1959 in the well-known TASS statement. That statement expressed the hope that the governments of the People's Republic of China and of India would not allow forces opposed to the easing of international tension to profit from their frontier incident, and that the two governments would settle the misunderstanding which has arisen between them with due consideration for mutual interests in the spirit of the traditional friendship between the peoples of China and India.

The Soviet Union expressed great regret regarding the incident. We sincerely hoped that the governments of the two countries would quickly find the road to a peaceful resolution of the dispute. To this day we regret that the two sides did not avail themselves in due time of the possibilities of nipping the incipient conflict in the bud.

It is especially painful to us that the blood of the sons of the fraternal People's Republic of China and of our friend, the Republic of India, has been shed. For the first time a situation has arisen in which a serious armed clash has resulted from a frontier dispute between a socialist country and a country which has started on the road of independent development and which is following a policy of non-alignment.

The Soviet people rejoice, as they always have done, at the successes of People's China which, after its victorious revolution, has scaled high summits on the front of peaceful economic development and has shown the entire world what a people can achieve when it takes its destiny into its own hands. In its foreign policy, People's China advocates the principles of peace, equality and friendly international co-

operation. It is high time to restore, at long last, the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. It is high time to restore to the People's Republic of China its ancestral land–the island of Taiwan. (*Prolonged applause.*)

As for India, the rate of her economic growth since achieving independence has been slower than that of China. However, India, too, whose social system differs from the socialist system of China has been overcoming year by year the grave aftermath of the age-old rule of the British colonialists and is more and more confidently advancing in the development of her economy and culture. India's policy of nonalignment, her neutralist policy, has acquired great moral and political weight in the world.

People's China and India have set a good example of fraternal friendship to other countries, having formulated and proclaimed in 1954 the well-known five principles of peaceful coexistence, or *Pancha Shila,* as they are also called. For years this policy has yielded good fruit.

For many centuries there had been no armed conflicts along the border between China and India, and clearly the territory of this area in itself is not of much value for human life, judging by the fact that the density of the population there is insignificant, although, as is well known, India and China are most densely populated countries. It would seem that every bit of land there should be occupied by people. However, the territories over which the dispute flared up were, in effect, uninhabited.

Suddenly a bloody border conflict flared up between the People's Republic of China and India, in which both the Chinese people and the Indian people have suffered heavy casualties. This has grieved us deeply.

War can be started by an accidental rifle shot. One accidental shot, two in reply, then another three in reply to these two. This is how war sometimes begins, but to end a war is not so easy even for experienced statesmen.

On the question of border disputes we maintain Leninist views. The forty-five-year experience of the Soviet Union suggests that there are no border disputes which, given a mutual desire, cannot be settled without resort to arms. It is from these positions that Soviet people evaluate the developments on the Chinese-Indian border.

But in the world there also exist forces, the international imperialist circles, which rejoice in the aggravation of the Indian-Chinese conflict. They attach far-reaching provocative plans to it. They hasten to offer arms, so that Indians and Chinese may kill each other. The imperialist powers are ready to loosen their purse-strings and to display "generosity", give armaments "free", as a "gift". To the imperialists this conflict is a real godsend.

The armed collisions on the Indian-Chinese border have created a nutritive medium for the harmful bacteria of nationalism and war hysteria. A chauvinistic slogan, "blood for blood", has been proclaimed. In point of fact this means war to a victorious end. Such is the logic of war: the more blood flows, the more blood is needed to atone for it. Where will this end? Each day the Moloch of war will devour more and more victims. It is insatiable, and only reason can halt the bloodshed. It is statesmen who must show such reason.

Therefore, we regard as reasonable the step taken by the Government of the People's Republic of China in announcing that it had unilaterally ceased fire and started to withdraw its troops on December 1. We are most happy about that and welcome such actions on the part of the Chinese comrades. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Some might say: "How is it that you claim this is a reasonable step, if it was taken after so many lives have been lost, after so much blood has been shed? Would it not have been better if both sides had refrained from resorting to arms?" Yes, of course, that would have been better. We have said this more than once, and we repeat it again. But if it was not possible to prevent such a course of events, it is better to display courage now and to end the clash. Is not this wisdom worthy of statesmen?

Of course, there might be some people who would say: "Look, the People's Republic of China is withdrawing its troops essentially to the line on which this conflict broke out. Wouldn't it have been better not to have advanced from the positions which those troops occupied at the time?" Such reasoning is understandable. It shows that people are displaying concern, and regret what has happened.

But, comrades, some people try to put a different construction on the decision taken by the Government of the People's Republic of China. They ask: "Isn't this a retreat?" They

also ask the question: "Isn't this a concession on the part of the Chinese comrades?" Of course, such questions are asked and apparently will be sprung by those who love to cavil, in order to hurt the feelings of this or that side, to kindle enmity between India and China and to profit from that.

We trust in the wisdom of the leaders of China and India, and hope that they will not fall prey to such provocations and will ensure a reasonable settlement of the conflict. (*Applause.*)

There are some persons who are already saying that apparently China desisted from hostilities because India had begun to receive support from the American and British imperialists, who are supplying her with armaments. "Therefore," such people say, "the People's Republic of China realised that if the armed conflict continued to develop it might grow into a major war which would result in still greater casualties."

Yes, clearly, our Chinese friends considered the situation and this also testifies to their wisdom and their understanding of the fact that when a war breaks out between friendly neighbouring peoples, the imperialists always try to profit from that. The United States and Britain have an overproduction of armaments and when a war breaks out they are happy to give this surplus to other countries which are prepared to abandon their national sovereignty in order to get hold of armaments, and fail to realise that by this very act they are putting their heads into a noose and falling into a state of dependence.

The death merchants reason along the following lines: "Why shouldn't we make something out of this conflict, without losing anything, when the blood of the Indian people and the Chinese people is being shed? And why shouldn't we even profit from this?" Besides, this action has another profitable aspect for the militarists in that it throws back the development of democratic principles in India and creates conditions for the strengthening of the positions of reactionary forces in that country.

It was not by chance that recently there were arrests of Communists and other progressive leaders in India. Tomorrow, if the war continues, anyone who says anything against the war will be called a Communist. This means that pacifists, too, will find themselves in this category. There you

have a rampage of reactionary forces–the most rabid militarists and reactionaries.

It seems that this, too, was taken into consideration by the Chinese comrades when they were studying the question of a cease-fire and the withdrawal of their troops.

Undoubtedly, the measures taken by the Government of the People's Republic of China will be duly acclaimed by peace-loving peoples. Indeed, why wage war? Did China ever have the aim of invading India? No, we reject such contentions as slanderous. And, of course, we also absolutely rule out the idea that India wanted to start a war with China. That is why we sincerely welcome the steps taken by the Government of People's China and in no way consider that it has made some sort of retreat. No, the Government of the People's Republic of China has displayed reason, a correct understanding of the situation and has made efforts to stop the military clash and to normalise the situation.

The fact that the guns are no longer firing on the Indian-Chinese border confirms that both sides have recognised that disputed questions must be solved not by military but by peaceful means, round the conference table. This is correct! For even the most complicated negotiations are better than war.

We ardently wish to see the two Great Powers–People's China and India–fully restore and consolidate their ancient traditional friendship. (*Prolonged applause.*)

## IV

## LIVE IN PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP WITH OUR NEIGHBOURS

Comrade Deputies, I would like to report to you briefly on how the Soviet Union's relations are developing with neighbouring countries. I have already spoken about the friendly, fraternal relations with the countries of the socialist camp. It goes without saying that the Soviet Union wants to have good relations with other neighbouring states too.

We have good relations with Finland. We highly value the independent peace-loving policy of the Government of Finland and the big contribution to this policy made by the President of the Finnish Republic, our friend, Dr. Urho Kekkonen. We are confident that in the future the political, economic, trade and cultural relations of the Soviet Union and Finland

will develop and grow stronger to the benefit of the peoples of both countries.

The Soviet Government greatly values the friendly policy of the Afghan Government, headed by Prime Minister Mohammed Daud. This year we have had a very useful meeting with King Mohammad Zahir Shah, of Afghanistan, which strengthened still more the good-neighbour relations between our countries.

There has been some improvement in our relations with Iran. In the recent past we have succeeded in eliminating much of what hindered the development of normal relations between the Soviet Union and Iran. We appreciate the undertaking of the Iranian Government not to grant to any foreign state the right to have missile bases of any type on the territory of Iran, and not to permit Iran to become a tool of aggression against the Soviet Union. It is true that not all obstacles have been eliminated to the *rapprochement* of our countries, but we hope that the good beginning will be further developed.

We want to live in friendship with the Turkish people and to do everything possible to ensure that the Black Sea does not divide us, but unites us. This would be beneficial both for the Soviet Union and for Turkey. The Turkish Government says that it wants to improve these relations. We hope that these statements will be backed up by real steps and that relations between the U.S.S.R. and Turkey will become friendly. There is a basis for this, and it was laid already by Lenin and Kemal Atatürk.

Our trade relations with Japan are developing satisfactorily, but the paramount question, the signing of a peace treaty, has not yet been solved. There are indications that the Japanese Government still does not have sufficient independence to settle this question. For up to now American troops are still stationed there, and the Japanese people are waging a struggle for the complete independence of their country.

Norway is also our neighbour. Our common frontier is small, but we would like the relations between our countries to be in inverse proportion to the length of the frontier. It must be noted that the rulers of NATO are doing everything in their power to prevent Norway from promoting a policy aimed at improving Soviet-Norwegian relations.

Comrade Deputies, I would like to dwell in somewhat greater detail on the question of our relations with the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia. You know that the friendship of the peoples of our countries has its roots in the distant past.

During the Second World War the fraternal relations of the peoples of our two countries were cemented by blood shed in the struggle against the common enemy. The peoples of Yugoslavia, under the leadership of their Communist Party, headed by Comrade Tito, displayed marvels of courage in battles against the fascist invaders; they made a big contribution to the rout of Hitler Germany. (*Stormy applause.*)

Unfortunately, the friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia were spoiled soon after the end of the Second World War. I will not speak about the reasons for the deterioration. As is well known, the Yugoslav comrades believe that the entire guilt for this rests with Stalin. In his time Stalin blamed the Yugoslavs for everything. We have our own opinion on this subject. We have already said, and say again that most of the guilt for the deterioration in Soviet-Yugoslav relations is undoubtedly borne by Stalin, who permitted flagrant and absolutely unwarranted arbitrariness in relation to Yugoslavia. However, we would not be quite sincere if we did not say that the Yugoslav comrades, too, bear a share of guilt for the way relations between our countries and our parties developed in that period.

That was the case in the past. But we Communists must look forward, must see the future of our peoples.

At the present time our relations with Yugoslavia are good. Comrade Tito and Comrades Ranković, Veselinov and other statesmen are now spending a holiday in our country on our invitation. They are present here. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*) We received them as friends and have already had several useful talks with them, which have yielded a great deal for better mutual understanding. We see that the Yugoslav leaders, like ourselves, are making efforts to eliminate the existing differences and pressing for an improvement in relations with our country. I must say that it has been confirmed once again that on many international problems and questions of inter-governmental and economic relations we have a common understanding, common views. The Yugoslav leaders and we are deeply convinced that the further development of ties

between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia meets not only the interests of our two countries, but also the interests of the strengthening of all the forces fighting for peace, for democracy, for socialism and communism. (*Applause.*)

As for our position on the question of developing relations with the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, it follows entirely from the course charted by the Twentieth and Twenty-Second congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This course is aimed at strengthening unity between the C.P.S.U. and all fraternal parties, at rallying all the forces of the anti-imperialist front.

In the past, the Yugoslavs abused us, and we replied in kind. (*Animation.*) At the present time the Yugoslav Communists and we are advancing along the road of improving our relations. It cannot be said that all the accumulated burdens and difficulties that existed in the relations between the C.P.S.U. and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia have been overcome. There have been and there still remain serious differences on a number of ideological questions, reflected in the Programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, as was noted in the Statement of the Meeting of fraternal parties. But we, for our part, are ready to do everything in our power to overcome these differences.

This depends not only on us, but also on the attitude of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, and its leadership. We are convinced that the restoration and strengthening of the unity of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia with all the fraternal parties on ideological questions, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, would accord with the interests of both our parties, of the entire world communist movement.

We Communists must take account of how the process of history is developing, how the struggle for socialism is developing in practice in various countries. Already, many countries of Europe and Asia have embarked on the socialist road. Naturally, each Communist Party in these countries tries to apply creatively the principles of Marxism-Leninism to the concrete historical, geographical and other conditions of its own country, and on this basis it exercises its guidance of the people in building socialism and communism. It is clear that our understanding cannot completely coincide on all questions that confront this or that Communist or Workers' Party in the struggle for the building of a new society. A

different interpretation of concrete questions of socialist construction, a different approach to this or that question, cannot be ruled out. This is so in practice and, apparently, this is how it will be when other peoples embark on the socialist road.

Therefore, it would be wrong to work out some set pattern and to keep to it in the relations with other socialist countries. It would be a mistake to brand as renegades all who do not conform with this pattern. What then? Are we to press for the complete expulsion of a Communist Party from the ranks of our movement? Is it possible to ignore the fact that the people of such a country are building socialism? Or perhaps we must turn a blind eye to the very existence of such a people and struggle against it? To act in that way would be tantamount to adopting the bestial laws of the capitalist world and to applying them to the relations between Communist Parties and socialist countries.

But it is precisely such a bestial morality that the Albanian sectarians and splitters recommend us to adhere to in relations with Yugoslavia. They, literally, are ready to tear at the throat of the Yugoslav Communists for their mistakes, although they themselves are retreating from Marxism-Leninism much farther than those whom they accuse. Such a morality is alien to us Communists. We are fighting for a better future for mankind, for communism under which the genuine brotherhood of all the peoples of the world will come into being. We are deeply convinced that in the future, with the complete victory of communism, as Lenin taught, the state frontiers that now divide peoples will be no more. National isolation will completely disappear, and the peoples will form a single family as brothers.

In advancing to this cherished goal we must do everything possible to overcome differences if they appear among Communists of different countries. Our duty is to help a party that has committed errors or has deviated from the standards of the international revolutionary workers' movement, from Marxism-Leninism, to help it to realise its mistakes and to mend them, so that it may occupy a worthy place in the family of all the fraternal parties.

It must be said that the steps taken recently by the Yugoslav Communists and their leaders, both in domestic and foreign policy, have eliminated very much of what we consid-

ered to be erroneous and damaging to the cause of socialist construction in Yugoslavia. This has been reflected in some of the decisions of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, in the speeches of Comrades Tito, Ranković and other Yugoslav leaders. But if, so far, we still do not have complete understanding on some questions, this does not at all mean that we must build our relations on the remnants of our differences, or that we must shut our eyes to the steps the Communists of Yugoslavia have taken towards *rapprochement* and unity with the whole international communist movement. That would be a policy aimed not at unification, but at disunity. Even more erroneous would it be for us to carry the differences which still exist into the sphere of inter-governmental relations. On the contrary, the strengthening and development of economic ties, of relations along government and public lines between our two countries create the conditions for our positions on ideological questions as well to come closer together.

The Albanian sectarians and dogmatists are doing their utmost to prevent an improvement in the relations of the socialist countries with Yugoslavia. They have raised a hue and cry, especially now, when Comrades Tito, Ranković, Veselinov and other Yugoslav leaders have come to the U.S.S.R. The Albanian splitters are obviously displeased that we are welcoming the Yugoslav comrades fraternally.

We are told that it is reprehensible for us to have good relations with Yugoslavia along governmental lines and in the economic field so long as some ideological differences with the League of Communists of Yugoslavia have not been fully overcome. This is said by people who call themselves Marxists-Leninists! That, however, is simply ridiculous. Even the imperialists are trying to overcome and iron out their contradictions, so as to survive in their struggle against the advancing forces of the communist, working-class and national liberation movement. They are now frenziedly strengthening and expanding the association of the Common Market countries, in spite of the contradictions among the states incorporated in it. But we, in our camp, have people who want to split our forces. This is not our policy, it is not a Marxist-Leninist policy.

Some people contend that Yugoslavia is not a socialist country. Then, it is permissible to ask: What sort of a coun-

try is it? In answering that question, one must proceed from the Marxist-Leninist teaching, from an objective analysis of the country's social development, the nature of its social and political system. Subjectivism is impermissible here! One must not think that some Buddha-like individual can, ignoring facts, utter truths and determine which country is socialist and which is not. In this connection, knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory, a profound analysis of reality is required.

As is well known, there have been no landowners or capitalists in Yugoslavia for a long time now, and no private capital, no private enterprises or landed estates, no private banks. We see also that the Yugoslav Communists and their leaders are channelling their efforts into the development of their economy, the consolidation of the gains of socialism. Therefore, if one is to base oneself on objective laws, on the teaching of Marxism-Leninism, it is impossible to deny that Yugoslavia is a socialist country. And it is from this that we proceed in our policy, it is on this that we base our relations with Yugoslavia as a socialist country. There are now grounds for the further development of relations between our countries. (*Prolonged applause.*)

True to its policy of friendship with all peoples, the Soviet Union is doing and will continue to do everything it can to strengthen the unity of the forces fighting for peace and social progress. If this policy is subjected to attacks by some people, it only shows that those people are not showing a genuine interest in strengthening the ranks of the communist movement, in rallying all our forces.

The leaders of the Albanian Party of Labour have recently passed all bounds in their malicious attacks on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, on the whole world communist movement. In their attempts to slander the Leninist course of the Twentieth Congress of our Party, the Albanian leaders are again attempting to boost the cult of Stalin's person. They want the restoration of the abnormal atmosphere that existed in the communist movement during the days of the cult of the individual.

Our Party has subjected Stalin's errors and abuses to sharp and vigorous criticism, although it does not deny his services to the Party and to the communist movement. We have done this not only for the sake of historical truth, but

also so as to establish all the necessary guarantees against the recurrence of anything similar in the future, against the recurrence of phenomena that are alien to Leninism, the danger of which Lenin himself pointed out in his time.

We have done so not only in the interests of our Party and our people, but also in the interest of the entire world communist movement, for the sake of the struggle for the world-wide victory of socialism. Our Party was confident that other Marxists-Leninists would draw the necessary lessons from the experience of the struggle of the C.P.S.U. against the cult of the individual and its harmful consequences.

We were not mistaken. The Leninist course of the Twentieth Congress of our Party was approved by all Marxist-Leninist parties. It helped the working out of the general line of the world communist movement meeting the present-day tasks of the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The Albanian leaders are now clinging precisely to what was most negative in Stalin's activity, what typified his retreat from Marxism-Leninism. They are most attracted by the methods of repression and crude administrative pressure used by Stalin, which are alien to the very spirit of a socialist state. They, you see, want to become the pillars of the international communist movement, the infallible guardians of Marxism-Leninism. But these attempts are like those of the proverbial frog. Remember that in the well-known fable the frog wanted to be as big as an ox. Everybody knows the outcome: the frog blew itself up and burst. Nothing remained of it. (*Animation.*)

The anti-Leninist ideology of the personality cult lies at the base of the whole of the present erroneous line of the Albanian leaders. They are doing everything in their power to preserve in Albania a situation in which, uncontrolled and unpunished, they are able to violate all the standards of Party and government life so as to satisfy their own interests. Hoxha and Shehu know that they would not have remained in power if they had slackened their regime of repression and persecution. The people would not tolerate them in the leadership, because their hands are smeared with the blood of the best sons of the Albanian Party of Labour.

The Albanian leaders have broken with Marxism-Leninism and are becoming increasingly bogged down in Left-wing

opportunism, sectarianism and splitting activities. The leaders of the Albanian Party of Labour have raised their anti-Leninist conceptions to the level of the state policy of their country. They are promoting an isolationist and adventurist foreign policy; they refuse to co-operate in the international arena with the other socialist countries. They hinder in every way the efforts of those countries to consolidate peace and to ease international tension.

It is well known that the 1960 Statement of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties pointed out that the main danger in the world communist movement is revisionism. It also pointed to the need to wage a resolute struggle against Left-wing opportunism, against sectarianism and dogmatism. Today, too, we consider those propositions to be correct. Our Party will fight, as it always has done, both against revisionism and against dogmatism and sectarianism. The Meeting of the fraternal parties warned that, unless a consistent struggle was waged against sectarianism and dogmatism, they might become the main danger at some particular stage in the development of individual parties.

Events which have taken place in the communist movement since the Statement of the fraternal parties was adopted, show how farsighted that conclusion was.

Some people, repeating the correct propositions of the Statement of the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, place lop-sided emphasis only on the danger of revisionism, mentioning Yugoslav revisionism in and out of context. But one must take a concrete view of things. In the crisis we experienced over Cuba, the Yugoslav Communists took a correct stand, while the dogmatists who pose as true Marxists-Leninists took a provocative one. When a proposition has been put down in writing one cannot, therefore, repeat and interpret it in a one-sided way without making a Marxist analysis. The crisis over Cuba showed specifically that it was those who took and are taking their stand on dogmatic positions that present the main danger.

The present-day Left opportunists and sectarians, the most outspoken mouthpieces of whom are the Albanian leaders, cover up their struggle against the Leninist policy of peace and peaceful coexistence with shrill pseudo-revolutionary phrases. As has already been said, they have slipped to Trotskyist positions. It will easily be seen that this policy

undermines the unity of the forces opposing imperialism and plays into the hands of the most aggressive imperialist circles of the Western Powers, encouraging their anti-communist schemes.

This "Leftist", dogmatic policy has been properly assessed at the congresses of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Italy. This provocative policy was exposed and sharply denounced in the speeches of representatives of fraternal parties, who addressed those congresses. (*Prolonged applause.*)

If one were to scratch the loud-mouthed "Leftist" dogmatists, one would easily discover that behind their brave façade there is nothing but fear of imperialism, lack of faith in the possibility of beating the capitalist system in peaceful economic competition. This is precisely the characteristic feature of the petty-bourgeois instability and vacillation which Lenin so ruthlessly exposed and ridiculed. He told such gasbags bluntly: "In your objective role, you are tools of imperialist provocation. And your subjective 'mentality' is that of a frenzied petty bourgeois who swaggers and blusters, but knows perfectly well that the proletarian is *right*..." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 27). What a sharp and pointed remark by Lenin! It is as if he had in mind the present Albanian gasbags.

Forty years ago, with keen insight, Lenin pointed out the serious danger of Left-wing opportunism to the communist movement. He said that if in that period Left doctrinairism could be described as an "infantile disorder" of communism, that was only because it was quite a young, incipient trend.

One of the negative effects of the Stalin personality cult on the international communist movement was the spread of Left-sectarian, dogmatic views, which gravely harmed the great cause of the struggle for socialism and which weakened the influence of Marxism-Leninism on the broad masses of the people. As Lenin had warned, underestimation of the struggle against Left-wing opportunism resulted in neglect of that disorder, which has long since ceased to be an infantile one. The specific features of the development of the communist movement in our time, when the peoples of countries at the most varied economic and social levels, are setting out on the road of socialism, create favourable conditions for the dissemination of "Leftist" communism. It has always found

favourable soil in instability, in the rushing of representatives of the petty bourgeoisie from one extreme to another.

The Left-sectarian disease is nurtured by nationalism and, in turn, it nurtures nationalism. It becomes intolerable when it is displayed in the activity of a ruling party, on whose policy the destiny of the people largely depends. It becomes dangerous, because it is directed against the line of the communist movement on such vital problems as those of war and peace, which have a bearing on the fate of all mankind.

One cannot deny that, in the light of all these reasons, Left-wing opportunism, dogmatism and sectarianism are emerging more and more as a serious danger in the world communist movement. Not to see this means to be afraid to face the facts, to turn one's back on realities, to fail to understand the full scope of the responsibility which devolves on Marxists-Leninists in our time.

Soviet Communists, to whom there is nothing higher than the unity of the ranks of the world communist movement, will wage a resolute struggle both against Right-wing opportunism and against the Left-wing opportunism which today is no less dangerous than revisionism. (*Applause.*)

* * *

Comrade Deputies, let us take a glance at our planet. Not only from outer space but even from here, from the solid earth, a beautiful and inspiring picture opens before us. Mankind is taking mighty strides along the road of progress, and the pillars of the old world, the world of oppression, lies and injustice, are cracking and crumbling. Every year the new world heralding the spring of mankind is gaining strength.

With every year that goes by the peoples of the socialist commonwealth of nations are multiplying their achievements in the building of the new life. The peaceful work of our peoples, their victories in science and culture, their brotherhood and mutual assistance are an inspiring example to millions of people who have already broken the fetters of colonial bondage or who are still fighting for their national liberation; they are an inspiring example to the working people of capitalist countries. A great and purifying storm is indeed raging over the world. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence is the general line of our foreign policy, the banner of all the socialist countries, the cherished goal of all peoples. May reason triumph over recklessness, may the method of negotiation in solving outstanding issues of international life replace for ever the dangerous method of "testing strength"! The people of the Earth can and must find tranquillity at last, and be spared the fear that tomorrow may bring down on them a thermonuclear conflict. (*Applause.*) Mankind wants to build its future not on rubble, not on smouldering ruins, but on the material foundations already created by the labour of many generations.

This is why we address to the peoples a call to intensify their actions in defence of peace, to step up the struggle against the imperialist warmongers. The peoples are a great force in the struggle for peace; they can and must say their decisive word. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Of course, the Soviet Union must reckon with realities, with the concrete policy followed by the Western Powers, especially in the military sphere. As long as bellicose circles in the West stubbornly raise obstacles to agreement on general and complete disarmament, as long as sabre-rattling and the arms race continue there, we Soviet people must keep our powder dry, must strengthen our defence potential and must be prepared to administer a crushing rebuff to any aggressor who might dare to interfere with our peaceful labours. (*Stormy applause.*) We have plenty of everything we need to safeguard ourselves and our friends from the aggressive encroachments of the imperialists. (*Prolonged applause.*)

In its prime, evoking the respect of the working people of all countries, our country is confidently advancing towards the future which belongs to communism. (*Prolonged applause.*) Let us not spare our efforts and energy to achieve that radiant goal! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. Ovation. All rise.*)

*

# REPLIES TO THE EDITORS OF THE *DAILY EXPRESS*

The editors of the London *Daily Express* requested N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., to reply on New Year's Eve 1963 to questions concerning the international situation.

N. S. Khrushchov's answers follow.

*Question*: What do you think of the prospects for a nuclear test ban and what further steps towards nuclear and general disarmament do you envisage?

*Answer*: Let me begin with disarmament, whose importance is rightly stressed in your question. Hardly anyone today will deny that there can be no lasting peace on earth unless there is general and complete disarmament. Such disarmament would mean that the material basis of warfare will be destroyed. It would also mean that the material and technical basis will be created for the rapid progress of a peace economy and the improvement of living standards in all countries of the world. A number of good United Nations resolutions recognise this fact.

The Soviet Union has submitted the draft of a Treaty for General and Complete Disarmament, whose realisation would at once eliminate the threat of nuclear war and would in four or five years completely relieve the world of the burden of armaments and militarism. More than once have we met the Western Powers half way in the negotiations, in order to reach an understanding as quickly as possible.

Yet the situation at the Geneva negotiations could not be worse. Long speeches are made, but nothing effective is done. None of the more or less important questions of general and complete disarmament have yet been settled. It seems that the 18-Nation Committee is turning into a debating society.

The Western delegates in Geneva prattle about disarmament, while the NATO Council and the Western military staffs are drawing up five-year, seven-year and other plans to step up the arms race. We have the impression that war

preparations are being accelerated to the accompaniment of lulling speeches in Geneva. Western policy seems to be gliding along two divergent rails: there is talk of disarmament, on the one hand, and ever-increasing war preparations, on the other. You have to look at things realistically: a locomotive like that will at some point inevitably run off the rails.

In the coming year the Soviet Union will work still harder for an effective solution of the disarmament problem. That is a vital need for all the peoples, and not a job for the diplomats alone. All forces favouring peace and general and complete disarmament should join hands in a common, purposeful effort. The peoples must make themselves heard and employ all their vigour to make the treaty for general and complete disarmament a reality in the near future. Remember Hiroshima, and remember the crisis in the Caribbean, where a group of the more aggressive leaders of the imperialist camp nearly set off a world-wide thermonuclear war!

The most important and the most urgent of tasks is to shield the world with disarmament from the maniacs who want to walk the tight rope of brinkmanship with atom bombs in their hands.

Now about the discontinuance of nuclear tests. The U.N. General Assembly has recently appealed to the nuclear powers to cease all nuclear weapons tests as of January 1, 1963. The Soviet Government is quite willing to do so. If the Western nuclear powers respond likewise to the United Nations appeal there will be no more explosions of nuclear bombs and charges after January 1, 1963.

Furthermore, we are ready to sign immediately an international agreement banning any and all nuclear weapons tests for all time. It is British and United States objections concerning underground nuclear tests that obstruct such an agreement. We have already told our partners in the negotiations that we are ready to meet them more than half way by supplementing the national detection systems with other methods, namely, an appropriate number of automatic seismic stations. We believe that all the Western objections to concluding an agreement should now drop, and this agreement will be a definite step closer to a disarmament treaty.

*Question*: What hopes and suggestions have you on New Year's Eve in relation to the Berlin crisis and a general settlement of the Berlin problem?

*Answer*: I know that your paper and its readers appreciate our concern over the present abnormal situation in West Berlin and over developments in the Federal Republic of Germany. There is, indeed, more than enough reason for concern. Hitler began preparing his aggressions with an army of 100,000, but the criminal ventures of the German militarists cost the nations 50 million lives. The West German Bundeswehr already has 400,000 men and officers. They are commanded by the nazi generals Heusinger, Speidel, Foertsch, Kammhuber, and the like, the very men who sowed death on Soviet, Polish, Yugoslav and French soil, the men who bombed London and demolished Coventry, who smothered the European countries in blood. Like their Hitlerite forerunners, the West German militarists and revenge-seekers discourse about "defending the free world" from the so-called communist peril. As they prattle about combating communism, the West German militarists are stretching their hands towards atomic weapons. Bonn says it means to aim its guns on Moscow. But its true purpose is to aim its guns on the whole world.

In what part of Europe today do we again hear explosions and shots? It is in West Berlin. The explosions occur in West Berlin, but the fuse is lit in Bonn. What does that indicate? The British Government, like that of the United States and France, admits that the F.R.G. has no right to make any claims to that city. Indeed, under the quadripartite agreements it cannot have any claims to it. But since West Berlin has become a NATO base and the F.R.G. is an active member of that bloc, the occupation authorities of the Three Powers, Britain included, do not simply condone its dangerous intrigues and international provocations in West Berlin, but even cover them up.

Your commentator was quite right when he described West Berlin as a nuclear fuse that will go on imperilling the world until it is rendered harmless.

The road to normalising the situation in West Berlin and Europe as a whole, being a matter of bridling the revenge-seekers and militarists, lies in completing the peaceful settlement in Germany. We have come close to it in substance,

and the final efforts must be made. It is the duty of all the countries of East and West to erect a barrier to the dangerous development of events in the heart of Europe if, having emerged from the dangerous Caribbean crisis, they do not want to plunge into another still more perilous crisis, one that will be harder to overcome.

The Soviet Government proposes that this task be settled on a sensible basis. It suggests that the main remaining question in dispute, the one about the troops in West Berlin, be settled by a compromise. To be precise, it is not now a matter of troops staying in West Berlin, but of the capacity in which they will stay there, and whose troops will stay, under whose flag, and for how long. The Soviet Government proposes that the troops stationed in West Berlin should not represent NATO countries, that the NATO flag in West Berlin should be replaced with the flag of the United Nations, and that the U.N. should undertake certain international obligations and functions in that city. The interests of the West Berlin population, and the interests of Britain, France and the United States for that matter, will not be prejudiced in the least, while the cause of universal peace will unquestionably benefit.

We should like to hope that in the new year the Western Powers will be reasonable, and a mutually acceptable solution will be found at last for the questions left over by the Second World War, normalisation of the situation in West Berlin included. To accomplish this, our partners in the negotiations should also show an understanding of the vital interests of the German Democratic Republic, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, who are striving to secure lasting peace in Europe.

*Question*: What consequences do you think the Caribbean crisis will have on the development of international relations?

*Answer*: I am sure that this crisis will have a strong impact on international relations. It was a moment when the ominous shadow of nuclear war swept over the world, and people looked at the question of war and peace in a new way.

Mankind has the policy of reason, which was won at the height of the Caribbean crisis, to thank for the fact that it is celebrating New Year's 1963 in a peaceful environment, rather

than among ruins covered with radioactive dust. This crisis, much sharper than any in the past, confronted the states with a crucial question: Will there be peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems or will the world be pushed into the abyss of war by the insane attempts of a handful of monopolists to impose their will upon the freedom-loving, albeit small, people—this time the people of heroic Cuba. The danger was dispelled by compromise on the principle of "concession for concession", and not, as some Western leaders advised, by "sword against sword".

There was talk at the time of the Caribbean crisis that it was necessary to begin a bold, determined and constructive examination of the unresolved international problems and to cut the knots of dangerous tension that are liable to cause new crises. We agree. A more dependable and enduring foundation should be furnished to peaceful coexistence, which cannot but be lasting. To be sure, we have ideological contradictions—yes, we have contradictions, we say so and it would be absurd to deny it. But let the question of which social system is better and which system is more viable be settled through peaceful economic competition, with respect for the sovereign rights of all peoples. The other way—thermonuclear war—must be ruled out.

Unfortunately, there are still leaders in the West who, having barely recovered from the shock of the Caribbean crisis, are again extolling cold war and the "positions of strength" policy. The world may have to pay dearly for the foolishness of these men, and the peoples who let them speak on their behalf may have to pay the dearest.

As we enter the new year, we believe that reason will triumph in the world and that the principles of peaceful coexistence will enduringly become the practice in international relations. We want people to celebrate New Year's in an environment of peace and creative labour not only on the eve of 1963, but also on the eve of an endless succession of future years.

I believe that all people of good will in Britain, too, have the same wish.

*Question*: Do you consider it possible or desirable for two Great Powers to dominate the world?

*Answer*: I do not believe it either possible or desirable. Neither the Soviet Union nor the United States should "dominate" the world. The times when countries "dominated" other countries are gone, never to return. Only leaders willing to ignore the international weight of other countries can entertain any doubts on this score. But that is wrong. Today, as never before, it is important that every state, big and small, contribute to the general effort of securing lasting peace.

Yet it is quite right to say that a special responsibility for the future of world peace now devolves for a number of reasons upon the Soviet Union and the United States. These two countries have the most highly developed economies and the most powerful war potentials. The mutual understanding of these two powers, their readiness to co-operate with each other in settling disputed international issues upon the basis of the U.N. Charter, the principles of peaceful coexistence, have a strong bearing on the general state of international relations.

Therefore, we favour good, if possible friendly, relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. Best of all, we wish there would be co-operation in the spirit which governed our relations at the time of Franklin Roosevelt, that great President of the United States. It would be a good thing to channel Soviet-American relations along that track. We believe it would be in the interests of the peoples not only of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A., but also of Britain and the other countries of the world.

*Question*: How will Soviet-British relations develop in the political and economic spheres?

*Answer*: We favour the development of the same kind of good and friendly relations with Britain as well.

Good Soviet-British relations can and must play a positive role on the international scene. We would like to co-operate with Britain, one of the world's major powers, in containing the most aggressive and reactionary forces that are spoiling to put their finger on the button of nuclear war. If Britain's statesmen and political leaders so wish, they can, of course, help to improve relations between East and West.

The Soviet Government regards with satisfaction the statements of British statesmen, political and public leaders to

the effect that the elimination of the crisis in the Caribbean area offers new opportunities for more fruitful work in the field of disarmament and for the settlement of the question of a nuclear test ban.

We have the impression that many people in Britain are seeking to reappraise the problem of military bases in foreign territories and to support the idea of nuclear-free zones in different regions of the world, including Central Europe.

We are prepared to co-operate with Great Britain in carrying through any measures that are honestly designed to fortify the peace.

Our two countries also have good opportunities of expanding still more their co-operation in the economic and cultural fields. Mutually beneficial contacts are expanding in the fields of science, technology and culture. Our trade is doing rather well, and that is especially important. We have always believed that trade between countries is the basis for peaceful political relations between them, and that has been proved true over the centuries. The British, who need not be taught to trade, know it no worse, and perhaps better, than others. A good deal could still be done to mutual advantage in the development of trade between our two countries. A British agricultural exhibition is planned in Moscow for the coming year. Exchanges of delegations and students are under way. That is good. We are prepared to develop such contacts in the future as well.

*Question*: What main hope do you personally pin on 1963?

*Answer*: I believe my hopes on the eve of the new year coincide with the hopes and wishes of millions of people throughout the world. I hope that 1963 will be a year of peaceful development for mankind, a year of substantial progress in the settlement of urgent international problems and the easing of international tension.

I am firmly convinced that 1963 will also be a year of further consolidation and development for the Soviet Union and the world socialist system as a whole, a year of new successes in the consolidation of the independent states that arose on the ruins of the colonial empires, and a year of further successes in the final abolition of colonialism. All decent and progressive people on earth wish the young sovereign states and their peoples that they eliminate their inherited economic backwardness more quickly and gain the

opportunity to share in the blessings of modern culture and civilisation.

In conclusion, I would like to send my very best New Year's wishes of happiness and prosperity to the readers of the *Daily Express* and to the whole British nation.

*Pravda,* January 1, 1963.

(*The questions of the Daily Express editors have been retranslated from the Russian.*)

## DIARY OF VISITS, TALKS AND RECEPTIONS

## *1962*

*January 26*

Ambassador U Kyin, head of an economic delegation of the Burman Union, calls on N. S. Khrushchov

*February*

R. Assumpação de Araujo, Brazilian chargé d'affaires in the U.S.S.R., calls on N. S. Khrushchov

*February*

Minister Omar Dhani, Chief of Staff of the Indonesian Air Force, and Adam Malik, Ambassador to the U.S.S.R., call on N. S. Khrushchov

*February*

N'famara Keita, Minister of Commerce of Guinea, and Ambassador Sori Caba, call on N. S. Khrushchov

*February 26-28*

N. S. Khrushchov meets Walter Ulbricht, First Secretary of the C.C., Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic

*March 3*

Minister of Defence and Education, Rashad Barmada, head of a government delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic, calls on N. S. Khrushchov

*March 10*

Japanese Ambassador Hisanari Jamada calls on N. S. Khrushchov

*March 23*

N. S. Khrushchov receives members of the Danish Communist Party leadership

*April 4*

Zenon Kliszko, Member of the Political Bureau of the C.C., Polish United Workers' Party and Secretary of the C.C., P.U.W.P., calls on N. S. Khrushchov

*April 16*

Nicolae Guina, Ambassador of the Rumanian People's Republic, calls on N. S. Khrushchov

*April 20*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Gardner Cowles, U.S. publisher

*April 25*

T. Takasaki, Chairman of the National Federation of Fishery Associations of Japan, calls on N. S. Khrushchov

*April 28*

N. S. Khrushchov receives delegates of the United Revolutionary Organisations of Cuba, Osman Cienfuegos and Joaquin Ordoqui

*April 30*

N. S. Khrushchov meets Queen Elizabeth of Belgium

*May 5*

Faure Chomón Mediavilla, Ambassador of the Cuban Republic, calls on N. S. Khrushchov

*May 7*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Ichiro Kono, Japanese Minister of Agriculture and Forestry

*May 8*

N. S. Khrushchov receives an Indonesian government delegation

*May 12*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Pierre Salinger, U.S. President's Press Secretary

*May 22*

N. S. Khrushchov converses with Modibo Keita, Head of State and Chairman of the Government of the Mali Republic

*June 2*

Laotian military delegation calls on N. S. Khrushchov

*June 4*

N. S. Khrushchov meets Walter Ulbricht, First Secretary of the C.C., Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic

*June 4*

N. S. Khrushchov receives a delegation of the National Assembly of Czechoslovakia

*June 4*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Sourou Migan Apithy, Vice-President of the Dahomey Republic

*June 7*

N. S. Khrushchov meets Wladyslaw Gomulka, First Secretary of the C.C., Polish United Workers' Party

*June 8*

N. S. Khrushchov meets Antonin Novotný, First Secretary of the C.C., Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and President of the Czechoslovakian Socialist Republic

*June 8*

N. S. Khrushchov meets Janoş Kadar, First Secretary of the C.C., Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and Chairman of the Hungarian Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government

*June 8*

N. S. Khrushchov meets Yumzhagiin Tsedenbal, First Secretary of the C.C., Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Mongolian People's Republic

*June 9*

N. S. Khrushchov receives L. Preti, Italian Minister of Foreign Trade

*June 11*

V. T. Leitao da Cuña, Ambassador of Brazil, calls on N. S. Khrushchov

*June 11*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Vittorio Valletta, president of the Fiat concern of Italy

*June 12*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Avery Brundage, President of the International Olympic Committee

*June 13*

N. S. Khrushchov meets Mamadou Dia, Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Minister of National Defence, Republic of Senegal

*June 14*

N. S. Khrushchov receives a delegation of the Sejm, Polish People's Republic

*June 28*

N. S. Khrushchov receives A. Gorbach, Federal Chancellor of the Austrian Republic

*June 29*

N. S. Khrushchov converses with A. Gorbach, Federal Chancellor of the Austrian Republic

*June 30*

N. S. Khrushchov receives members of the Spanish Communist Party leadership

*July 2*

N. S. Khrushchov receives a delegation of the Federal Skupshina of the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia

*July 3*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Raúl Castro Ruz, Minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces, Republic of Cuba

*July 5*

N. S. Khrushchov receives M. Todorović, head of a Yugoslav economic delegation

*July 10*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Canon Lewis John Collins

*July 13*

N. S. Khrushchov has a talk with a group of U.S. journalists

*July 13*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Carlo Alberto Straneo, Ambassador of Italy

*July 25*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Llewellyn Thompson, Ambassador of the United States

*July 26*

N. S. Khrushchov meets Yumzhagiin Tsedenbal, First Secretary of the C.C., Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Mongolian People's Republic

*July 26*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Mamadou Fadiala Keita, Ambassador of the Republic of Mali

*July 26*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Bashir Ben Abbas, Moroccan Ambassador to the U.S.S.R.

*July 26*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Rafik El Asha, Ambassador of the Syrian Arab Republic

*August 8*

King Mohammad Zahir Shah, of Afghanistan, calls on N. S. Khrushchov

*August 15*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Labour M.P. John Desmond Cronin, of Britain

*August 22*

N. S. Khrushchov converses with a delegation of Japanese businessmen

*August 28*

N. S. Khrushchov meets Walter Ulbricht, Chairman of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic and First Secretary of the C.C., Socialist Unity Party of Germany

*August*

N. S. Khrushchov receives U Thant, Acting Secretary-General of the United Nations

*August 30*

N. S. Khrushchov receives E. Guevara and E. Aragonés, Members of the National Leadership of the United Revolutionary Organisations of Cuba

*September 6*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Stewart L. Udall, U.S. Secretary of the Interior

*September 7*

N. S. Khrushchov meets Robert Frost, U.S. poet

*September*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Hans Kroll, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany to the U.S.S.R.

*September*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Ahmad Shoukairy, State Minister and Permanent Representative of Saudi Arabia at the United Nations

*September 17*

N. S. Khrushchov receives B. Pittermann, Vice-Chancellor of Austria

*September 18*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Raymond Scheyven, Belgian political and public leader

*September 24*

N. S. Khrushchov receives V. Kanga, head of a good will mission of the Federal Republic of Cameroon

*October 1*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Subimal Dutt, Ambassador of India to the U.S.S.R.

*October 1*

N. S. Khrushchov receives a delegation of the Gandhi Peace Fond

*October 11*

N. S. Khrushchov meets Max Reimann, First Secretary of the C.C., Communist Party of Germany

*October 13*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Liu Hsiao, Ambassador of the People's Republic of China to the U.S.S.R.

*October 13*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Prince Souphanouvang, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Economics and Planning of the Provisional Coalition Government of Laos and Chairman of the C.C. of the Neo Lao Hak Sat'

*October 15*

N. S. Khrushchov has a talk with Urho Kekkonen, President of the Republic of Finland

*October 16*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Foy D. Kohler, U.S. Ambassador to the U.S.S.R.

*October 19*

N. S. Khrushchov receives a military delegation of the German Democratic Republic

*October 24*

N. S. Khrushchov receives William Edward Knox, representative of U.S. business and president of Westinghouse Electric International

*October 26*

N. S. Khrushchov receives K. D. Malaviya, Minister of Minerals and Fuel of India

*October 26*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Mahmud Toroughi, head of an Iranian delegation

*October 30*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Sardar Mohammed Naim, Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Afghanistan

*November 9*

Triloki Nath Kaul, Ambassador of India, calls on N. S. Khrushchov

*November 9*

N. S. Khrushchov receives D. Maiga, chargé d'affaires of the Republic of Mali

*November 12*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Frank Roberts, Ambassador of Great Britain

*November 24*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Triloki Nath Kaul, Ambassador of India

*November 26*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Phoumi Nosavan, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, of Laos

*November 28*

N. S. Khrushchov receives C. Pérez, prominent Cuban revolutionary, Major of the Cuban Revolutionary Army

*November 28*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Arnold C. Smith, Ambassador of Canada

*December 6 and 7*

N. S. Khrushchov has talks with Josip Broz Tito, General Secretary of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and President of the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia

*December 11*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, head of a government trade delegation of the Cuban Republic, Member of the National Leadership of the United Revolutionary Organisations of Cuba and President of the National Institute of Agrarian Reform

*December*

N. S. Khrushchov meets S. A. Dange, Chairman of the Communist Party of India

*December 17*

N. S. Khrushchov receives a military delegation of the Polish People's Republic

*December 18*

N. S. Khrushchov receives Barry Boubacar Biro, Ambassador of the Republic of Guinea

*December 20*

N. S. Khrushchov has a talk with Josip Broz Tito, General Secretary of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and President of the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia

# SUBJECT INDEX


A

*Afghanistan*–260, 382
*The Albanian Party of Labour*–60, 361-68, 385, 386, 388, 389, 390
See also *Opportunism*
*Algeria*–33, 40, 60, 84
*Angola*–34, 120, 376
*Asian, African and Latin American countries*–102-03, 119, 120, 122, 125-28, 129, 130, 131, 133, 160, 161, 234, 251, 252, 260, 262, 307, 346, 374
*Austria*–213, 214, 216, 217, 218, 219

B

*Belgium*–248
*Brazil*–260
*Brest Peace*–367
*Britain*–32, 49, 121, 228, 234, 257, 258, 360, 364, 369, 376, 380, 394, 398
*The German question*–47, 48, 246-47, 265-66, 267-68, 395-96
*Disarmament and nuclear test ban* 30, 243, 249, 275, 373-74, 394
*Brunei*–376
*Bulgaria*–66, 67-70, 74-76, 77, 89, 90, 96-98, 104, 105, 110-11, 117, 316
*Communist Party of Bulgaria*–69, 76, 82, 90, 92-94, 106-07, 108, 109, 111-14, 344, 390
*Burma*–260

C

*Ceylon*–260
*Class struggle in capitalist countries*–50, 77, 85, 102, 177, 178, 254, 308, 330
*Common Market*–128-29, 130, 139-40, 215, 217, 306, 307-10, 315-16, 386
*Communist and working-class movement*–15, 82, 308
–Communists–39, 59, 60, 78, 98, 99, 150-53, 154, 183, 196, 208, 241, 313, 329
–meetings of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties–84, 94, 108, 202-03, 210, 212, 254, 329, 330, 331, 364, 384, 389, 390
–unity–57, 383, 384, 386, 389, 391
*Communist Party of the Soviet Union*–7, 21-22, 36, 220, 223, 254, 287
–Communists–9, 39, 59, 78, 91, 98, 99, 124, 183, 191, 208, 241, 290, 313, 329, 385, 390, 391
–congresses: XX-384, 387 XXII-7, 10, 297, 384
–international experience–15-16, 57, 68, 81-82, 100-01, 121, 133, 192, 193
–Plenary Meetings–18, 53, 328, 343, 344
–Programme–10, 15-16, 21, 22, 75, 100, 157, 182, 220, 223, 253, 254

-rectification of consequences of the personality cult-56-57, 58, 63, 91, 332, 383, 387, 390
-role in the world communist movement-14-15, 94, 100-06, 322, 331, 384, 386
-anti-Party group-63
*Congo*-34, 121, 126, 237, 376
*Crisis in the Caribbean*-342, 343, 347, 349, 351, 352-55, 361, 362, 368, 372, 373, 389, 394, 396, 398
*Cuba*-80, 141-43, 144, 145, 146, 151, 154, 348, 356, 357, 358
-imperialist aggression against Cuba-35, 145, 347, 348, 350, 351, 354, 357, 360, 362, 366, 396
*Czechoslovakia*-242, 246, 247, 390
-Communist Party of Czechoslavakia-344-45

D

*Democratic Republic of Vietnam*-79-80, 83
*Denmark*-248, 258

E

*Economic competition of the U.S.S.R. with the capitalist countries*-13-14, 15-16, 18-19, 31-32, 52-53, 54-55, 81, 148-49, 170-71, 182, 240-41, 242, 252-53, 278-79, 284, 304,-05, 306-07, 309, 330, 331-32, 397
*"Export of revolution"*-59, 348

F

*Federal Republic of Germany*-23-24, 32, 45-46, 47, 79-80, 173, 217, 227, 228, 245-46, 247-48, 257, 258, 268, 274, 276, 294, 295, 297, 359, 361, 362, 395-96
*Finland*-381
*Foreign policy of the U.S.S.R.*
-basic principles-22, 23, 35, 39, 44-45, 60-72, 84, 161, 173-74, 180, 216, 240, 248, 254, 260, 274, 342, 343, 346, 373, 381
-U.S.S.R. and Afghanistan-382
-U.S.S.R. and Algeria-84
-U.S.S.R. and Asian, African and Latin American countries-130-31, 159, 160-61, 162, 346
-U.S.S.R. and Austria-213, 214-15, 216, 217, 218-19
-U.S.S.R. and Britain-139, 400
-U.S.S.R. and Bulgaria-65-66, 67, 72, 73-74, 75, 76-77, 89-90, 92, 93-95, 96-97, 104-06, 107-09, 110-11. 114, 115
-U.S.S.R. and Cuba-35, 142, 145, 154, 347, 348, 349, 350, 356, 358, 359, 364
-U.S.S.R. and Federal Republic of Germany-139, 274
-U.S.S.R. and Finland-334-36, 381
-U.S.S.R. and France-139
-U.S.S.R. and India-131, 365, 377, 381
-U.S.S.R. and Indonesia-84, 365
-U.S.S.R. and Iran-382
-U.S.S.R. and Italy-137-38, 139, 140-41
-U.S.S.R. and Japan-139, 382
-U.S.S.R. and Korean People's Democratic Republic-211, 212
-U.S.S.R. and Laos-83, 115, 116, 117
-U.S.S.R. and Mali-118-19, 120, 122, 123, 133, 134, 136
-U.S.S.R. and Norway-382
-U.S.S.R. and People's Republic of China-210-11, 365, 378, 379, 381
-U.S.S.R. and Rumania-164, 165, 166, 167, 169, 176, 177, 181, 182, 186, 188, 189, 190, 202-03, 203-05, 209, 212
-U.S.S.R. and Senegal-159, 160, 161, 162, 163
-U.S.S.R. and Turkey-382
-U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A.-24, 25-27, 28-30, 42-44, 45, 47, 51, 61, 62, 86, 103, 198, 230, 234, 242, 264-70, 271, 273, 274, 275, 278-80, 284-85, 349, 350, 351,

352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 362, 364
-U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia-72, 337, 338, 339, 340, 383, 386
See also *Proletarian internationalism, International position of the U.S.S.R., Peaceful Coexistence, Soviet Assistance to economically underdeveloped countries, General and Complete Disarmament*
*France*-32, 33, 83, 85, 121-22, 257, 258, 369, 395
-the German question-47, 48, 246-47, 266, 267-68, 395-96
-disarmament and nuclear test ban-86, 87, 233, 244, 275

G

*General and Complete Disarmament*-25, 26-27, 27-28, 30-31, 32-33, 39-40, 42-43, 45, 47, 62, 87-88, 103, 122, 158, 172-73, 233-39, 241-43, 244-45, 248-49, 250-53, 254-57, 258-59, 260-61, 261-62, 280-81, 373-74, 393-94
-18-Nation Committee-28, 32, 40, 42, 85-86, 221, 233, 235, 238-39, 245, 255, 276, 393-94
*Genoa conference in 1922*-254
*Ghana*-260
*Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*-45, 90, 150, 170, 173, 216, 227, 231, 345
*Greece*-97, 104, 206, 228, 234
*German Democratic Republic*-23-24, 25, 46, 48, 175, 198, 199, 217, 242, 248, 268-69, 276, 295, 296, 297, 367, 395, 396
-Socialist Unity Party of Germany-344
*German question*-23-24, 45-48, 62, 175, 217, 245, 246-48
-conclusion of peace treaty-198-99, 267, 269, 294, 295, 297, 346, 374-75
-question of West Berlin-23, 46-47, 48, 175, 198, 199, 218, 246, 247, 266, 269, 295-96, 297, 346, 374-75, 394-97
*Germany 1939-45*-79, 152-53, 216, 227, 231, 245, 395
*Guinea*-260

H

*History of the U.S.S.R.*-49, 52, 53, 61, 78-79, 87, 89, 100, 105, 110 121, 124, 143-44, 147, 148, 152, 184, 232, 288, 331
*Hungary*
-Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party-344, 390

I

*Imperialism*
-aggressive foreign policy-22-23, 25, 31, 79, 80, 102-04, 114-15, 158, 173, 175, 196, 197, 199, 209, 232, 240, 243, 245, 247, 293-94, 296, 305, 345-46, 347, 358-61, 363-64, 372, 392, 394, 396
-aggressive war blocs-23-24, 47, 71, 104, 128, 217, 226, 237, 242, 243, 244, 245, 247, 258, 267, 294, 295, 307-08, 309, 345, 352, 360, 375, 382, 393, 396
-anti-communism-75, 77-79, 80, 81, 138, 139
-arms race-196, 225-26, 249-50, 393
-colonialism-32, 34, 40, 83, 85, 115, 116, 119, 120, 121, 122, 126, 129, 131-33, 161, 251, 346, 364, 365, 375-76, 378-79
*India*-252, 256, 260, 364, 365, 369
*Indonesia*-34, 84, 256, 260, 296, 365
*Internal situation in the U.S.S.R.*
-agriculture-7, 17, 18, 51, 54, 55-56, 81-84, 100, 146, 148-49, 150-51, 155, 156, 157, 171, 173, 182-83, 192-93, 271, 278-79, 328, 344
-armed forces-23, 25-27, 28-29, 86, 150, 172-73, 174, 197, 221-22, 227, 236, 237, 243, 245, 256, 268, 280, 281, 282, 345, 350, 352, 358, 361, 392

-industry-7, 13, 16-17, 18, 100, 146, 150, 151, 178, 182, 205, 215, 252, 283-84, 320, 322, 327, 343-44
-living and cultural standards in the Soviet Union-7, 8, 18, 19, 20, 146, 148, 183, 282-84, 322, 344
-science and culture-20, 21, 27, 81, 260, 287, 289, 291, 292
-Soviet people-13, 18, 124, 147, 149, 215, 216, 264, 286, 288, 289, 300
-Soviet socialist state-10-12, 14, 35, 36, 63, 81, 160
-Young Communist League-154, 155-56
*International position of the U.S.S.R.*-88, 100, 172, 196, 397
*Italy*-137, 138, 140, 228, 234, 240
-Communist Party of Italy-390
*Iran*-382

J

*Japan*-168, 228, 229, 231, 234, 269, 281, 394
*Jordan*-376

K

*Korean People's Democratic Republic*-79, 211

L

*Laos*-35, 83, 115, 117, 269
-peaceful solution of the Laotian question-115, 198, 209, 217, 248, 296, 377
*Libya*-234

M

*Mali*-118, 122, 125, 129, 133, 153, 260
*Marxism-Leninism*-10, 21, 57, 59, 77-78, 101, 121, 132, 133, 177, 201, 288, 301
*Material and technical basis*-53-55, 59
*Meetings of the heads of the states*-43, 44, 115-17, 226
*Mongolian People's Republic*-323

N

*National liberation movement*-8, 33-36, 40, 59-60, 83-85, 101-03, 119, 120-21, 124-28, 129-31, 160-61, 163, 251-53, 332-33, 346-47, 375-76
*Netherlands*-89, 121-22, 248, 296
*Norway*-248, 258, 382
*Nuclear-free zones*-241-42
-in Europe-105, 201, 398
*Nuclear weapon*-22-23, 24-26, 27, 28, 38-39, 99, 150, 225, 226, 227, 228-29, 244, 260, 306
-banning of nuclear tests-28, 29-30, 41-42, 43, 86-87, 228, 232, 233-34, 238, 242-44, 245, 275-76, 277-78, 281-82, 373-74, 394-95

O

*Opportunism*
-dogmatism and sectarianism-330, 367-68, 371-72, 389-92
-revisionism-389-90
*Outer space and its conquest*-8, 20, 21, 27, 61, 62, 78, 81, 124, 138, 139, 146, 281, 286, 287, 288, 293, 297

P

*Paris Commune*-12
*Peaceful coexistence*-47, 88, 196-97, 221, 232, 239, 241, 264, 265, 269, 271, 272, 285, 293, 305, 306, 330, 342, 345, 356, 363, 364, 371, 391, 397, 398
*People's Republic of China*-60-61, 79, 210, 237, 303, 365-66, 369, 377-81
-Communist Party of China-59
*Poland*-242, 246, 247
-Polish United Workers' Party-299, 328
*Portugal*-34, 85, 121-22, 365
*Proletarian internationalism*-92-94, 323

R

*Rumania*–71, 167-68, 169, 170, 171, 172, 174-75, 176-77, 178, 179, 180, 181-82, 184-85, 186-88, 189, 190-92, 200-01, 205-06, 207-08, 316
–Rumanian Workers' Party–165, 166-67, 168, 175-76, 190, 192, 194-95, 201, 202-03, 207, 208, 212

S

*Saudi Arabia*–376
*Senegal*–159-61
*Social-Democratic and Socialist parties*–257-58
*Socialism and communism*–9-10, 75, 99-100, 101, 117, 122, 133, 240-41, 286-87, 292-94, 303-04, 331
–communism–9, 10, 31, 32, 39, 49-51, 123-24, 124-25, 183, 201
*Socialist revolution*–177-78
*Soviet assistance to economically underdeveloped countries*–129-30, 131, 163
*Soviet economic and cultural relations with other countries*–62-63, 72, 130-31, 137-38, 139, 161, 219, 264-65, 271-72, 273-74, 275, 278-80, 309-10, 325-26, 335-36, 381-82, 398-99
*South Korea*–211
*South Vietnam*–35, 83, 120, 376
*Spain*–85
*Struggle for peace*–8, 32-33, 71, 105, 197, 198, 212, 224-25, 254-55, 256-62, 391-92

T

*Taiwan*–209-10, 378
*Thailand*–83-84, 116, 234, 269
*Turkey*–70-71, 97, 110-11, 206, 207, 228, 234, 382

U

*United Arab Republic*–252, 260
*United Nations Organisation*–40, 85, 120, 130, 237, 238, 247, 249, 266, 269, 272, 275, 277, 294, 295-96, 297, 350, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 365, 373, 374, 375, 378, 393, 394, 396
–structure of the executive bodies –237-38, 278
*United States of America*–11, 40, 48-49, 50, 51, 58, 138, 169-70, 174-75, 206, 228-29, 257, 258, 262, 283, 287
–aggressive foreign policy–25-27, 28, 34-35, 43-45, 79-80, 82-84, 102-04, 114-15, 127-28, 168-69, 173-74, 209-10, 211, 225, 226-30, 231, 234, 240-41, 264-66, 270, 273-75, 309, 348-51, 351-52, 353-55, 356-57, 358, 364, 365, 371-72, 376, 380, 382
–economy–13-15, 18-19, 52, 52-53, 57, 81, 149, 170-71, 182, 249, 250, 278-79, 283, 284, 306, 318, 398
–disarmament and nuclear test ban–25-27, 28-30, 31, 32, 40, 85-86, 87, 172-173, 197, 235-36, 237-39, 242-43, 244, 245-46, 249, 275-76, 277-78, 281-82, 373-74, 394-95
–German question–23-25, 45-48, 175, 198-99, 245, 246-47, 265-69, 395-96

W

*War*
–Communists' stand on war–39, 40, 60, 85, 230-32, 345, 367-68, 369
–liberation wars–40, 59-60
–possibility of preventing wars in modern times–72, 73, 228, 231, 241, 256, 261, 343, 355, 356, 369, 370
–reasons for war–39, 256-57
–thermonuclear war–38-39, 103, 150, 175, 197, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 260, 366, 367
–world wars–26, 27, 45, 79, 153, 173, 216, 227, 230, 231, 345

*War bases on foreign territories*–71, 228, 233, 234, 236-37, 270, 350
*Working class*
–in the U.S.S.R.–14, 173
–under socialism–97-98, 111, 168, 177-78, 181-82, 185, 186-88 200
–in the capitalist countries–14-15, 50, 84, 85, 88-89, 102, 148-49, 174-75, 177-78, 184-85, 187-88, 249-51, 259, 300, 330
*World capitalist system*–13, 14, 48-49, 132, 306-07, 310-11, 318
–bourgeois democracy–11, 12, 168-70, 258
–capitalist morale–27, 31, 88, 99, 132, 188
–deepening of the general crisis of capitalism in modern times –14, 31, 34, 77, 84, 308, 329, 391
*World socialist system*–8, 15-16, 76, 133, 153, 179, 200, 220, 253, 301, 329, 367, 387
–Council of Mutual Economic Assistance–195-96, 208-09, 299-300, 302-05, 310, 311-18, 319-29
–decisive factor in the development of modern society–10, 33-34, 73, 79-80, 81, 86, 87, 103-04, 114-16, 124, 129-30, 158, 175-76, 212, 221, 240-41, 256, 293-95, 304-06, 332-33, 355-56, 358-59, 370-71, 391-92
–economy–96, 98, 100, 101, 128-29, 170, 177-78, 179, 191-92, 207-09, 302, 303, 313, 316, 317-18, 321-22, 331-32
–unity and cohesion–57-58, 66, 72, 89-91, 92, 93-95, 104-06, 108-10, 111, 112-13, 114-15, 158, 164, 165, 166-67, 169, 175, 180, 181, 189-90, 202-03, 204, 210-11, 212, 300, 301-02, 344-45, 370-72, 383-86
–Warsaw Treaty–198, 242, 352

Y

*Yemen*–376
*Yugoslavia*–72
–League of Communists of Yugoslavia–383-87, 389

**Н. С. ХРУЩЕВ**

ПРЕДОТВРАТИТЬ ВОЙНУ, ОТСТОЯТЬ МИР!

*На английском языке*

*Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*