

UNCLASSIFIED

27

Rein talks

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE
P. O. BOX 2604
Washington, D. C.

Key in USSR

APPROVED FOR RELEASE
DATE: OCT 2006

Khrushchev's Radio-Television Report

15 June 1961

~~TREAT AS
SECRET~~

JFK LIBRARY
MANDATORY REVIEW
CASE # RLR-07-4
ENCLOSURES 27

**EXEMPTED SIMULTANEOUSLY
TO STATE**

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

BB 1

U S S R I N T E R N A T I O N A L A F F A I R S

16 June 1961

KHRUSHCHEV REPORT ON TALKS WITH KENNEDY

Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 15 June 1961--L

(Text) Dear comrades, friends: As you know, I returned recently from Vienna, where in the course of two days I conferred and talked with the U.S. President, John Kennedy. In our press, as in the press throughout the world, much material was published on this matter. Many of you are already acquainted with the memorandums which were handed to President Kennedy in Vienna. They are a note about the discontinuance of the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons, and a note on the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and the settlement, on this basis, of the question of West Berlin. Obviously many of you have read President Kennedy's radio and TV speech, which was published in full in our newspapers. Therefore, the Soviet public is well informed of the point of view expounded by the U.S. President in his assessment of our meeting. Today I want to express some thoughts and impart my considerations about our meeting and talks with President Kennedy in Vienna.

As you know, the meeting was preceded by an exchange of opinions through diplomatic channels and by an exchange of messages between the U.S. President and myself. We agreed on the meeting being held in Vienna on 3 and 4 June. This meeting offered a good opportunity for establishing first personal contact and for an exchange of opinions on basic problems between myself, as chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the new U.S. President.

On the way to Vienna we spent several days with our Czechoslovak friends, and of course had very thorough talks with the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, First Secretary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Comrade Antonin Novotny, and with other Czechoslovak leaders.

I have had an opportunity to visit fraternal Czechoslovakia several times, and I have always received an exceptionally warm and cordial reception there. It was the same this time. Everywhere we were welcomed like old friends, like blood brothers linked by common interests and aims. Taking this opportunity, I would like to once again thank the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and all our friends--the dear Czechs and Slovaks--who welcomed us with such hospitality and warmth during our visit to their wonderful country, which is marching confidently along the path of communist construction. This is how relations among all our socialist countries have grown; the great common cause of building a new socialist world has brought us closely together, uniting us into one closely knit family.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

BB 2

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
16 June 1961

While defending and protecting the interests of their peoples, the leaders of our countries are also defending and protecting the interests of all the peoples of the socialist countries, the great cause of socialism, and an enduring peace on earth.

On our way to Vienna for our meeting with the U.S. President, we naturally thought first of all about how this meeting would reflect not only upon relations between our two countries but on the relations between the countries of the socialist world and the capitalist countries. We consider such meetings essential because under modern conditions questions which are not capable of solution by normal diplomatic methods urgently demand a meeting of heads of governments.

Such meetings are essential, of course, on the condition that these heads of governments are striving to insure peace between states. For our part, we are doing everything in our power to lessen international tension and to solve the basic questions in relations between states.

Before dealing with the concrete questions which were discussed during our talks with the U.S. President, I should like to express my sincere gratitude to the Federal president of Austria, Mr. Schaerf; to the Federal chancellor, Mr. Gorbach; and to the vice chancellor, Mr. Pitterman, for what they did to see that the Vienna meeting might take place under the most favorable conditions for both countries. We are grateful to the citizens of beautiful Vienna for their kind and cordial attitude toward us, representatives of the Soviet Union.

Now, dear comrades, allow me to expand our point of view on the questions which were discussed between President Kennedy and myself.

I would like to express some considerations about how, in our opinion, one can best solve all the controversial or unsolved problems in the relations between states which have become ripe--one can even say overripe--and urgently call for solution.

One such cardinal question is that of general and complete disarmament. It is well known that the Soviet Union has been persistently and consistently working to solve the question of disarmament. The Soviet state has been raising it before the world for decades. I recall that as far back as 1922, at a Genoa conference, the Soviet Union, on the initiative of the great Lenin, proposed general and complete disarmament. In 1927 we raised this question at the League of Nations. At that time it was impossible to achieve the solution of this problem, and the imperialists subsequently unleashed a world war.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

BB 3

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
16 June 1961

Since World War II, which brought such untold sorrow and misery to the peoples, we have doubled our efforts to achieve the speediest solution of the disarmament problem. In the United Nations and outside it we are using every opportunity to achieve a positive solution to the disarmament problem and to avert the threat of a new world war.

The Soviet Union took part in the work of the U.N. Atomic Energy Commission, which was instructed to work out an agreement on the banning of nuclear weapons. We also conducted negotiations within the commission on conventional armaments. Starting with 1950, when a joint disarmament commission was formed, the Soviet Union took active part in its work. For four years in London and New York our representatives sat in the subcommittee of that commission. Many proposals were advanced, many speeches were heard; but the solution of the disarmament problem has not advanced a single step.

Last year the 10-nation committee on disarmament met in Geneva. This time its composition differed from the bodies that preceded it. It consisted of representatives of five socialist and five Western powers. But the unwillingness of the Western powers to accept disarmament also led to the failure of this committee to achieve any positive results. It is said that if all the paper used in the committees and subcommittees on disarmament were thrown into Lake Geneva the lake would overflow. A lot of paper has been wasted but no practical solution to the disarmament problem has been achieved.

The question arises, why did all these committees and subcommittees fail to achieve successes in their work? This was because the Western powers were clearly not ready for serious negotiations, did not want--and, to put it frankly, still do not want--disarmament. It is understandable that no government can openly adopt this sort of attitude in the face of the peoples; the Western powers are afraid to declare outright and honestly to the public that they do not want businesslike negotiations with the Soviet Union on the problem of disarmament. The capitalist monopolies are making profits from the arms race and are interested in its prolongation. But to cover up all this they obviously need at least a pretense of negotiations. Hence they have chosen the diplomatic approach: without refusing to directly take part in negotiations, they at the same time will not agree to accept concrete proposals on disarmament. They are dragging their feet, as the saying goes. A complete system has been worked out to prevent the attainment of the goal, to make sure that the problem of disarmament ends in an impasse.

The proposals for complete and general disarmament which were submitted by myself on behalf of the Soviet Government for examination by the U.N. General Assembly provide a good basis for solving the problem of disarmament. These proposals of ours, if accepted, would relieve the peoples of the heavy burden of the arms race and the threat of a nuclear rocket war of extermination forever.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

BB 4

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
16 June 1961

We have declared, and I categorically repeat this now: If the Western powers will agree to complete and general disarmament, the Soviet Union is ready to accept any system of control which they would like to put forward. Despite this, the Western powers allege that the Soviet Union's stand on the question of control is an obstacle to an agreement on disarmament, that they cannot come to an agreement with us on these questions.

I repeat once more: the Soviet Union is for strict and effective international control. We are ready to accept your proposals on control, Mr. President of the United States, provided you accept our proposals on complete and general disarmament. Then there will be no deadlock in the negotiations on disarmament.

We want honest disarmament. We want to secure equal conditions for all states during disarmament, so that no one can ever take advantage of disarmament to obtain advantages to the detriment of the security of other countries.

Our proposals provide for strict control on each stage of implementation of the disarmament agreement. We consider that if complete disarmament is implemented, then the most thorough control will be needed. The control organs should have access everywhere without any so-called veto, without any prohibition, without any restrictions. There should be access at any time and at any place, and we are ready to provide this for the control organs. Only on the condition of complete and general disarmament under the strictest control is it possible to achieve confidence and create the necessary conditions for peaceful coexistence of states when no country or group of countries could secretly arm to attack other countries.

This is our general point of view. What clearer statement can one make to the Western representatives to stop repeating that the Soviet Union will not accept controls? All these fabrications about how the Soviet Union allegedly does not want control shows only one thing: how freely the people are deceived in the so-called free world. But our world, the world of the socialist countries, is excellently informed and knows that we stand for effective control. But in the free world, with its free flow of information, society can be freely deceived and obviously false assertions repeated to lead the people astray.

On 19 June talks are to begin in Washington between the Soviet Union and the United States on the question of disarmament. One hopes that this time we shall finally meet with a constructive approach from the United States.

Now I would like to talk about another question on which I exchanged opinions with President Kennedy: that of the banning of nuclear weapon tests.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

BB 5

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
16 June 1961

We have been holding talks in Geneva for nearly three years with the United States and Britain on this question. At the very beginning of the talks, we introduced a draft treaty for consideration by the Western powers. Although this treaty answers the interests of all those taking part in the talks, and that in the course of the talks we have met the Western powers halfway on a number of their wishes, the talks have not produced any concrete results. Now new difficulties have arisen. The Western powers are resolutely refusing to accept our proposals on the forms of control.

What is the essence of our proposals? Allow me to give a concrete summary of them.

In the beginning we considered it possible to agree with the Western powers' proposal that the executive body of the control system of the test ban be headed by one man, appointed by agreement of the sides. The events in the Congo, however, have made us cautious; they taught us sense, as the saying goes. The Government of the Congo asked the United Nations for help in the struggle against Belgian colonialists who were seeking to restore their colonial domination over that country. In this connection the Security Council and General Assembly adopted a number of good decisions. But what happened after that? Mr. Hammarskjöld, who claims to be a neutral person, taking advantage of his position as U.N. secretary general, interpreted and put into practice these decisions of the Security Council and General Assembly to suit the colonialists. Was this not proved by the base murder of Premier Patrice Lumumba--head of the same government which had asked for the help of the U.N. armed forces against the outrages of the colonialists? The tragedy of the Congolese people has clearly shown the consequences which may result from the arbitrariness of the U.N. executive body in the person of a single secretary general. Everything must be done to prevent a repetition of such actions. This is demanded by the interests of the peoples and the interests of the preservation of peace.

It is precisely for this reason that the Soviet Government has arrived at the firm conviction that control over the observance of a nuclear weapons test ban treaty must be implemented with the participation of representatives of the three existing groups of states--the socialist countries, the member countries of Western military alliances, and nations following a neutral policy--and at that, the representatives of these three groups of states may adopt only agreed decisions.

The Soviet Union has never demanded, nor does it demand, any exceptional status for itself. We do not seek to dominate the control commission, but neither shall we allow anyone to dominate us. We demand for ourselves precisely the same rights as the other parties to the treaty will have. We want to insure that there are no abuses on the part of the control organization.

UNCLASSIFIED

What do the Western powers want? They want to impose a "neutral" person of some kind on us as the sole interpreter and executor of the treaty. In other words, they want to foist a new Hammarskjöld off on us in this post, one that would supervise control over all our territory. Frankly speaking, they want such a man to allow them to conduct espionage within our territory in the interests of the West. To this, of course, we cannot agree; and will never agree because this concerns the security of our country.

It is clear to everyone, of course, that the ending of nuclear weapons tests alone will not be enough to prevent a nuclear missile war. We can ban nuclear weapon tests, but the existing stocks will remain, the production of these arms may continue, and, consequently, their stockpiling will go on. Thus, the danger of a nuclear missile war will keep mounting. It is quite obvious that the ending of nuclear weapons tests alone will not act as some sort of a dam to bar the way to the arms race. (Here Khrushchev paused and asked for a drink, saying: I must have a drink; this is a good drink--Ed.)

Judging by everything, it is difficult to reach agreement on the ending of nuclear weapon tests at the Geneva talks due to the position taken by the Western powers. The main thing at present is to solve the question of complete and general disarmament without delay. We told the U.S. President: Let us jointly solve both problems--the problem of tests and the problem of complete and general disarmament. Then it will be easier to reach agreement on the setting up of an executive control body. Under conditions of complete and general disarmament, the question of international security will appear in a new light: there will be no armies and no danger of one state attacking another. Under these conditions the Soviet Government will be ready to accept the Western powers control proposals. We shall agree to the provision of a control system without restrictions by any side, including the country in whose territory it is carried out. This will remove any danger of control being used for spying against a state. This is perfectly logical, because if there are no armies and no arms race nations will have no military secrets; and then the Western representatives will be able to enter any door, any plant, or institute in our country just as our representatives will in their countries.

In evaluating the possibilities of an agreement to end nuclear weapons tests under conditions of no agreement on complete and general disarmament, it is impossible to ignore another important factor: at the time when negotiations to end nuclear tests are going on between the three powers--the Soviet Union, the United States, and Britain--France is staging tests in defiance of the protests of world public opinion and governments and ignoring repeated decisions passed by the United Nations, decisions urging states to refrain from such tests.

UNCLASSIFIED

BB 7

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
16 June 1961

Thus a peculiar situation exists: While we are seeking agreement with the Western powers in Geneva, an ally of these powers--France--is continuing its testing of nuclear arms, and declaring that the Geneva talks do not put it under any obligation. Consequently, France, a member of NATO, this aggressive military bloc which does not conceal that it is directed against the Soviet Union, can perfect nuclear weapons in the interests of its Western allies.

Moreover, we must reckon with the fact that France's example may be followed by other countries when they have the appropriate scientific and technical prerequisites. Of course, we can understand the peculiar logic of the Western powers, which apparently do not have confidence in their allies in the military blocs and wish to insure their independence by relying on their own nuclear weapons. French President de Gaulle says, for instance, that he wants to have his own nuclear arms to enable France to conduct an independent policy. But other countries ensnared in the Western blocs may state that they also do not want to place reliance on the nuclear test ban treaty if the states possessing nuclear weapons retain them after the signing of such an agreement. They obviously can repeat the arguments now being used by France to justify the holding of tests, can strive to develop their own nuclear weapons and join the so-called nuclear club. Naturally this kind of logic is harmful to the cause of peace. It can be used and already is being employed by those circles in the West which do not want to renounce nuclear weapons and are continuing to put their stake on these weapons of mass annihilation.

All this brings us to the conclusion that we must link the solution of the question of ending nuclear weapon tests with the problem of complete and general disarmament. In the prevailing conditions it seems no other way out can be found.

During the exchange of views with the U.S. President, we set forth in detail our viewpoint concerning the interdependent solution of the problem of complete and general disarmament and the ending of nuclear weapons tests. We should like the U.S. Government to understand our view correctly. This would help to find a basis for agreement.

The peoples expect the governments to expedite the solution to the question of complete and general disarmament in order to safeguard peace. This is why world opinion is demanding that the governments which show no interest in the solution of this problem stop sabotaging and dragging out the talks. It is high time that the disarmament problem be lead out of the labyrinth of empty talk where it has remained for so many years.

Permit me now to turn to the German question which occupied an important place in our talks with President Kennedy.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

BB 8

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
16 June 1961

The Soviet Government has repeatedly stated its position on this question. The Western powers cannot complain that they are not familiar with our proposals. We have done and are doing everything to convince the Governments of Britain, the United States, France, and the other nations which took part with us in the war against Hitler Germany, that the absence of a peace treaty with Germany has created a deeply abnormal and dangerous situation in Europe.

It has always been recognized that peace treaties should be concluded at the end of wars between states. This has already become a custom and, if you wish, a standard of international law. Instances of this can also be found in international practice after the end of World War II. Peace treaties with Italy and the other states that fought on the side of Hitler Germany were signed more than 14 years ago. The United States, Britain, and the other countries concluded a peace treaty with Japan in 1951. But the governments of the same countries do not want to hear about the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany.

Can such a situation continue in the future? The peoples of Europe are vitally interested in the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany. It has been long awaited by the peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and all the other states bordering on Germany. This treaty is essential to both German states: the GDR and the German Federal Republic. The population of these countries live in the hope that a line will finally be drawn through World War II and the German people will maintain relations with neighboring nations on the basis of mutual confidence.

The question seems to be clear. A peace treaty with Germany is indispensable. Moreover, of course, there can be no question of any new changes of borders. We proceed from the premise that a peace treaty with Germany will fix what has already been established by the Potsdam agreement. The GDR Government has repeatedly stated that it recognizes as final the eastern border of Germany along the Oder-Neisse line, established by this agreement, and regards it as a boundary of peace between the German and Polish peoples. Indeed, the governments of the Western powers obviously also understand how senseless it would be to raise the question of revising Germany's boundaries now. Their representatives have often told us this during our conversations.

President de Gaulle, for instance, publicly stated that the German people "must not question the present frontiers in the west, east, north, and south." Even Chancellor Adenauer, this "cold war" herald and specialist in stirring up passions among states, came out with a statement to the effect that the German Federal Republic is not striving to alter the frontiers through war or the use of force.

UNCLASSIFIED

Then why not sign a peace treaty if everyone clearly realizes that the present frontiers of Germany cannot be altered without war and, as the Western governments declare, they do not want war. A simple operation, it would seem--to consolidate what actually already exists and what has long been demanded by the peoples.

What is it then that is keeping the Western governments from this reasonable step? The reason obviously lies in the fact that certain people, while paying lipservice to peace actually want to keep the smoldering coals of World War II alive so they can choose a suitable moment to fan the conflagration of a new war. For this purpose more and more new divisions are being formed in West Germany, and Chancellor Adenauer is demanding atomic weapons for his army.

What is the purpose of all this? After all, neither a large army nor atomic weapons are needed to retain what West Germany possesses today. There are forces there which still covet what does not belong to them and cannot resign themselves to the existing borders. What would an attempt to change the frontiers at present mean? It would mean war, and a thermonuclear war at that.

This is why the position of the enemies of a peaceful settlement with Germany cannot fail to put the peoples on their guard. They have the right to say: If you are for peace, prove it by deeds--sign a peace treaty and pursue your policy in conformity with it.

In his talks with me, President Kennedy and, as a matter of fact, also other Western representatives referred to the fact that the Western powers have some sort of obligations to the residents of West Berlin, and that these obligations cannot be affected even by the conclusion of a German peace treaty. It is natural to ask, however, what these obligations they feel must be maintained are, since they all stem from the surrender of Hitler Germany and the temporary allied agreements and, consequently, can only be valid until a peace treaty is signed. Moreover, there are no special allied commitments with regard to West Berlin.

The allied obligations applied to the entire territory of Germany, and it was precisely these agreements that were grossly violated by the Western powers. They turned West Germany into a militarist state, founded a military bloc directed against us, and in this bloc Federal Germany plays a primary part. The generals who commanded Hitler's troops, who committed atrocities in the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Yugoslavia, France, Greece, Belgium, Norway, and other countries now hold commanding positions in NATO.

UNCLASSIFIED

BB 10

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
16 June 1961

It has always been the case that after the signing of a peace treaty the conditions of capitulation lose force on the entire territory which the treaty covers, and throughout this territory the occupation terms are lifted. Consequently, West Berlin, which is situated on GDR territory, will, after the signing of the peace treaty, be free of all the conditions established as a result of the capitulation of Hitler's Germany and the introduction of the occupation regime there.

It must be said that when the question of a peace treaty with Germany arises, and consequently the question of normalizing the situation in West Berlin, the representatives of the Western powers in many cases abandon legal grounds and begin to invoke questions of prestige. But these attempts fail to stand up to criticism.

I should like to mention a fairly recent case. We fought with the United States against Japan; our peoples shed blood together. The Soviet Army routed the main nucleus of the Japanese Army--the Kwantung Army in Manchuria. The Soviet Union, together with the other countries that fought against Japan, took part in drafting the measures for controlling Japan's postwar development. The Far East Commission was set up in Washington, and an Allied Council for Japan with headquarters in Tokyo was created. In these bodies Soviet representatives took a most active part as members with equal rights. Then a peace treaty with Japan was concluded. Our allies disregarded the views of the Soviet Union and signed a separate peace treaty with Japan. I shall not dwell on the reasons which at that time determined the position of the Soviet Union on the question of a peace treaty with Japan, since now we are speaking of a different matter--of the way the United States treated its ally in that case.

It unilaterally abolished the Allied Council for Japan and deprived the Soviet representatives of all rights. Our representatives were virtually suspended in midair--they were pushed out of Tokyo by every means although we had certain rights and obligations which stemmed from the capitulation of Japan and were stipulated in the corresponding agreements. So you see that then the Americans disregarded both the rights of the Soviet Union and the international agreements. Leaning on its superiority in atomic weapons, it sought to dictate conditions not only to conquered Japan, but also to its allies in the war against Japan.

More than two years ago we published our draft of a peace treaty with Germany. It contains nothing detrimental to the interests of our former allies, or, incidentally, to the Germans themselves. The Soviet Union, which suffered greater losses than all the rest of the allies in the anti-Hitler coalition together, proposes the conclusion of a peace

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

BB 11

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
16 June 1961

treaty to normalize the situation in Europe, to normalize relations with both German states. But the United States, Britain, and France, together with the German Federal Republic, do not want to sign a peace treaty. They want to preserve an indefinite and dangerous situation. They are refusing to abolish the remnants of the last war through the conclusion of a peace treaty, and are insisting on keeping the occupation regime and their troops in West Berlin.

Every person of sound mind understands that the signing of a peace treaty is the way to improve relations between states. The refusal to sign a peace treaty and the perpetuation of the occupation regime in West Berlin are directed at continuing the cold war, and who can say where the border line lies between a cold war and a war in the full sense of the word? Is it not clear that a cold war is a period of preparation and an accumulation of forces for war? I am saying all this so everyone will understand the gravity of the danger incurred by any further delay in the conclusion of a German peace treaty.

When we suggest signing a peace treaty with Germany and turning West Berlin into a free city we are accused of wanting, allegedly, to deprive the Western powers of access to this city. But that is incorrect and groundless. The granting to West Berlin of the status of a free city would mean that all the countries of the world wishing to maintain economic and cultural ties with this city would have the right and opportunity to freely exercise these ties. Of course, agreement would have to be reached with the country across whose territory the communications that link West Berlin with the outside world pass. This is normal. Otherwise the sovereignty of the state inside which West Berlin is situated would be jeopardized.

The governments of the Western powers claim that they have pledged to defend the freedom and well-being of the population of West Berlin. In the four-power agreements on Berlin, however, nothing is said of these obligations of the United States, Britain, and France. The idea of insuring freedom for the population of West Berlin can in itself arouse no objections from anybody. It is precisely the Soviet Union which is proposing that the political and social regime in West Berlin be the kind its population wants.

That means that no attempt would be made against the freedom of West Berlin, nor would there be any obstacles to access to the city. We repeated in the past and repeat again: A peace treaty will create all necessary conditions for insuring the liberty of the free city of West Berlin and its unhampered communication with the outside world. Naturally, in solving the question of access to West Berlin it is essential to abide by the generally accepted international norms; that is, to use the territory of the country through which the roads of access pass only under agreement with its government.

UNCLASSIFIED

16 June 1961

Such a situation is recognized as normal by everyone. Therefore why should it be considered abnormal to ask the consent of the GDR to pass through its territory to West Berlin? After all, the ground routes to West Berlin pass through its territory, the waterways also run through its territory, as do the air routes. Consequently, after the conclusion of a peace treaty, the countries wishing to maintain ties with West Berlin will have to reach agreement with the GDR on ways of access to West Berlin and communications with this city.

We are not suggesting anything unusual. It has been this way in relations between equal states for hundreds of years, perhaps even many hundreds of years. We did not invent this, it not only exists de facto but also de jure, and has long been the general rule.

When the Soviet Government suggests concluding a peace treaty and normalizing the situation in West Berlin on this basis, it only wants peace; it wants to remove from relations between states everything that gives rise to friction and could cause a dangerous conflict. It is not the socialist countries but the Western powers which are throwing a challenge to the world when, contrary to commonsense, they declare they will not recognize the conclusion of a peace treaty and will seek to preserve the occupation regime in West Berlin, which they--if you please--conquered. That is not a policy of peace, that is trampling on the most elementary norms in relations between states: it is a desire to preserve a state of extreme tension in international relations, and moreover, it is a threat of war.

The Soviet Union and our friends do not want war and we will not begin one. But we will defend our sovereignty, and fulfill our sacred duty to defend our freedom and independence. If any country violates the peace and crosses the borders--ground, air, or water--of another it will assume full responsibility for the consequences of the aggression and will receive a proper rebuff.

The world press has published many comments on our meeting and talks with President Kennedy. Among these comments there are many sensible statements made in the United States, Britain, France, and West Germany, not to mention the GDR and the other socialist countries. But there are hate-ridden persons, lacking commonsense, who oppose negotiations with the Soviet Union and call for a crusade against communism. They are organizing new provocations all the time. It was by no means accidental that numerous rallies of revenge-seekers, at which belligerent speeches were made by Adenauer and other leaders of the Bonn government, were timed in Federal Germany to coincide with the Vienna meeting.

UNCLASSIFIED

BB 13

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
16 June 1961

The opponents of a normalization of the international situation have launched a new, large-scale provocation in West Berlin: since the beginning of June committees of the West German parliament have been meeting there, and a session of the Bundesrat is scheduled for 16 June, although West Berlin never was and is not at present a part of the German Federal Republic. Evidently there is a shortage of Lebensraum in West Germany itself for provocations.

The lengths of folly to which persons blinded by their hatred for socialism can go is shown by the statement of the Canadian-American interparliamentary group published a few days ago. These parliamentarians are howling like hyenas and threatening nuclear war. They have not seen war on their territory. I do not know whether they have personally taken part in a war or not, but it is absolutely clear that they have no idea what a modern thermonuclear war is like if they are pushing their countries, and with them others into a conflict. Any war now, even if it begins as a conventional, nonnuclear war, can develop into a devastating nuclear rocket war. The peoples should put straight-jackets on these madmen who are pushing toward war.

The peoples of Europe know what war is. We have had to take part in two world wars. Twenty years ago a war was forced on the Soviet people, the most bloody and difficult war in our history. The enemy reached the threshold of Moscow; he reached the Volga and occupied and devastated a considerable part of Soviet territory. But the Soviet Union withstood the drive of the enemy and won that war. We came to Berlin and punished those who unleashed the war.

We do not want another world war--we want peace. The Soviet people have achieved good mutual understanding with the Germans of the GDR. The best of relations have developed between the Soviet Union and the GDR. The conviction has grown that we should be friends, not enemies, and that this friendship is useful and advantageous to both peoples. The Soviet people wish to have good relations also with the Germans of West Germany. Our people want to be friends with the French. We fought together with them against Hitler's Germany, and each of us has learned from his own experience what fascism means, what war means.

We want friendship with the British, the Americans, the Norwegians, and other peoples of the anti-Hitler coalition with whom we fought for peace on earth. We have no reason to quarrel with any people, we want to live in friendship and concord with all peoples.

To that end the Soviet Union is proposing to sign a peace treaty with Germany jointly with other countries. This peaceful step is called a threat and even an act of aggression! Such talk can only come from those who are seeking to slander or distort our intentions and to poison the minds of the peoples with lies.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

BB 14

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
16 June 1961

We ask everyone to understand us correctly: the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany cannot be postponed any longer, a peaceful settlement in Europe must be attained this year.

We call on all countries that fought against Germany to take part in the peace conference when agreement is reached on its convention. The question now is not whether to sign a peace treaty or not, but whether the peace treaty will be signed with the two existing German states-- the GDR and the German Federal Republic--or with only one of the German states; whether all countries that fought against Germany will participate in the peace settlement or only a part of them.

The governments of some countries have announced in advance that they will not take part in a peace conference. The Soviet Union will, of course, regret it if some countries evade the signing of a German peace treaty for we have always wanted and still want all countries of the anti-Hitler coalition to take part in the peaceful settlement of the German question. But even if certain countries refuse to take part in the negotiations on the conclusion of a peace treaty, this will not stop us, and together with the other countries which desire it, we shall sign a peace treaty with the two German states. Should the German Federal Republic not agree to sign a peace treaty, we shall sign it with the GDR alone, which has long declared its desire to conclude a peace treaty and has agreed to the formation on its territory of the free city of West Berlin.

There are some in the West who threaten us, saying that if we sign a peace treaty it will not be recognized and that even arms will be brought into play to prevent its implementation. Evidently they forget that times are different now. If in the past the position of strength policy was useless against the Soviet Union, it is now more than ever doomed to failure. The Soviet Union is against the use of force in relations between states. We stand for the peaceful settlement of controversial questions between states. We are capable, however, of giving a proper rebuff to any use of force, and we have what is needed to defend our interests.

During the meeting in Vienna there was also an exchange of views on the situation in Laos and on a peaceful settlement of the Laotian question.

The communique says on this matter that the U.S. President and the Soviet Premier reaffirmed their support of a neutral and independent Laos under a government chosen by the Laotians themselves, and also of the international agreements for insuring this neutrality and independence; and in this connection they admitted the importance of an effective cease-fire in Laos.

UNCLASSIFIED

The Laotians are a peace-loving people. Having taken the road of independent development, this country threatened no one and was not a source of tension. That lasted until the imperialists decided to turn Laos into a military springboard, into a base for preparing aggression. An uprising was organized against the legitimate government of Prince Souvanna Phouma. The rebels received arms and military advisers from the United States. Peace in the country was disrupted and a war started, a war which because of outside interference threatened to develop into a big conflagration. An extremely dangerous situation for peace developed in southeast Asia.

The American side does not hide now that the responsibility for the dangerous events in Laos lies with the previous U.S. administration and that its policy in that part of the world has not always been wise. In March of this year, Mr. Kennedy stated that the government he heads will seek to create a neutral and independent Laos. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, we have stood and stand today for Laos being an independent and neutral state and not a tool in the hands of military blocs so that no one should interfere in the domestic affairs of that country. Thus, before the meeting in Vienna there existed sufficient grounds to find a basis for agreement on a peaceful settlement in Laos.

During the discussions with President Kennedy on the Laotian question it appeared that our approach was similar. I declared that to settle this question it was essential to insure the formation of an independent and neutral Laos. At the same time it was necessary to distinctly separate external problems from domestic ones. The domestic policy of Laos cannot and should not be determined either by the USSR, the United States, or other countries. If any countries are to determine how Laos will live and what government it will have, then there will not be an independent, neutral Laos, but a Laos governed from outside. That is impermissible. The three political forces acting in Laos must themselves form a government which will uphold the principles of independence and neutrality. The Soviet Union will welcome such a policy and will do everything in its power for it.

I told President Kennedy all this, and it seemed to me that the President reacted with understanding to what I told him. He declared that our two countries should influence the corresponding political groupings in Laos to achieve agreement on the formation of a single government and its program on the basis of recognition of independence and neutrality. We consider such an approach reasonable.

We are firmly convinced that no one should interfere in the domestic affairs of Laos, because the interference of any one side could be fraught with very dangerous consequences. It is essential to approach

UNCLASSIFIED

BB 16

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
16 June 1961

the settlement of the Laotian problem carefully and cautiously and not allow anything which could complicate the possibility of a peaceful settlement in Laos.

In this connection we drew attention to the fact that the use of American officers as military advisers to the rebel troops meant interference in the domestic affairs on the part of a certain political grouping. Such an approach runs counter to recognition of the policy of neutrality of Laos and is open interference in its domestic affairs. The sooner the American side renounces such interference, the better. If the present policy of connivance with the rebels continues, then the course of events could lead to bad consequences.

It is all the more impermissible that certain persons in the United States have not given up their plans for bringing Marines into Laos and waging war there with the help of special military units. In the United States these units are for some reason or other called guerilla units. In reality they are nothing but subversive and sabotage troops designed to be used against the peoples of those countries whose regimes do not suit U.S. ruling circles. It can be said in advance that those who seek to try such methods have not weighed all the consequences for themselves.

If the U.S. Government really wants peace in Laos, it should promote the speedy success of the talks in Geneva. No one should delay these talks under various invented pretexts, claiming, for instance, that in Laos there has been a violation of the cease-fire agreement. If there have been such cases, then it was not the national patriotic forces that were responsible. The American side and its military advisers in Laos are well aware of this.

We shall continue our efforts to insure a peaceful settlement in Laos and we urge all the other states taking part in the talks in Geneva to do the same. We are proceeding from the concept that if one really wants peace and not war, then relations between states with different social systems must be built on the basis of peaceful coexistence.

It emerged from our talks with President Kennedy that we interpret the peaceful coexistence of states differently. The President's idea is to build up something like a dam against the peoples movement to establish social systems in their countries which the ruling circles of the Western powers deem unsuitable. If one takes such a view, then one must conclude agreements and assume obligations to control other states, to prevent any changes of existing systems there, even if the peoples rebel against these systems. Thus, if the peoples of a country want to change their social and political system, this cannot be permitted.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

BB 17

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
16 June 1961

Naturally this concept is completely wrong and we, of course, cannot agree with it. It is in no one's power to halt the peoples wish for freedom. All regimes which are built on the oppression and exploitation of peoples are unstable and cannot exist forever. No matter how cunningly the system of exploitation and oppression is built, the peoples will still win freedom and overthrow the oppressors.

The changing of the social and political life of society is an inevitable process. It does not depend on agreement between statesmen. If anyone should display such folly and seek to get agreement on this question, he would thereby display his own worthlessness and lack of understanding of the events and the changes taking place in the world.

It is impossible to erect an obstacle to the peoples' movement for progress and a better life. This has been proved by the entire course of human development. In its time there was slavery; this was replaced by feudalism, and in turn by capitalism. One system replaced another, because the new system was more progressive. One could cite the example of the United States itself which emerged in the struggle against the colonial yoke of Britain. The American people waged a bitter liberation struggle and won independence by force. In its time the United States considered such a course of events normal.

Yet now when the peoples rise to struggle against reactionary regimes and their oppressors, the United States tries to interfere in the affairs of these countries to preserve the old regimes. The representatives of imperialist states want to find a way to prevent liberation ideas, the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, from spreading further. When the people of a capitalist or colonial country, displaying their discontent with the existing system, seek to change it and establish a new system corresponding to their interests, the governments of the imperialist countries immediately announce that it is communist scheming, the hand of Moscow, etc. They are not averse to using fabrications as a pretext for interfering in the domestic affairs of other countries.

The assistance of imperialist states to reactionary forces in other countries is fraught with great danger and could lead to great complications. The Soviet people and other freedom-loving peoples firmly stand for noninterference in the domestic affairs of any country. This is an essential condition for insuring peace. Every people has the right to independence and free national existence, and no state should interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. A class struggle is underway in the capitalist countries. The peoples are fighting against their oppressors, against reactionary regimes. It is impossible to regulate these processes by agreement. He who would seek to reach an agreement on this question would only show that he does not understand history and does not understand the laws of development of society.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

BB 18

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
16 June 1961

We believe that the most important thing that the Western powers, and particularly the United States, should recognize is that socialism is now firmly established in the world and no one can change this fact. It is common knowledge that the ruling circles of the Western powers have in the past and still harbor plans for abolishing the socialist system. But these attempts failed in the past and will fail again. It is essential to proceed from the fact that two social systems exist in the world and to build relations between the socialist and capitalist systems in such a way as to insure peaceful cooperation between them. This is the only sensible path to be taken in relations between states to safeguard peace. That is what I wanted to say, comrades, about our talks with the U.S. President. I must point out that on the whole I was pleased with these talks. If you were to ask me if it was worthwhile to agree to this meeting and hold it, I would reply without hesitation; this meeting was worthwhile; moreover, it was necessary.

In our talks with the U.S. President, neither side evaded bringing up and discussing the most acute questions. It can be said that we had frank talks. We listened attentively to the position of the U.S. Government and set out in detail the position of the Soviet Government on a number of major international problems. That in itself is quite important. Of course, no one thought that we would reach complete agreement--after all, the paths followed by our two countries are far too divergent to expect that. But I have the impression that President Kennedy understands the great responsibility that lies with the governments of two such powerful states. I should like to hope that the awareness of this responsibility will remain in the future so that outstanding international problems can be solved and that the rocks that bar the way to a stable peace and better relations between the Soviet Union and the United States can be removed. At present, relations between our countries leave much to be desired, and this situation is not the fault of the Soviet Union. But we would like to believe that there will come such a time when Soviet-American relations will improve, and this will favorably influence the entire international situation.

In Vienna we worked according to what might be called a planned time-table. The realization that we represented the great Soviet Union lent us energy and made our task easier. We knew that our Leninist foreign policy enjoys the wholehearted support of the Soviet people and the peoples of the socialist countries. The sympathies of hundreds of millions of people throughout the world are on our side. The Soviet Government will continue to consistently implement its Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence, the policy of strengthening peace and friendship between peoples.

Thank you, dear comrades. Goodbye. Goodnight.

~~TREAT AS
SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED