The Present International Situation and Soviet Foreign Policy



N. S. KHRUSHCHOV'S REPORT

to USSR Supreme Soviet

on December 12, 1962

SOVIET LAND BOOKLETS

New Delhi, 1962

The Present International Situation and Soviet Foreign Policy

MUNAVIRVL ISLAM HIGH SCHOOL
Date.....
ERNAKULAM.

N. S. KHRUSHCHOV'S REPORT
to USSR Supreme Soviet
on December 12, 1962

SOVIET LAND BOOKLETS
New Delhi, 1962

Price: 30nP.

Published by the Information Department of the USSR Embassy in India, New Delhi and printed by the United India Press, Mathura Road, New Delhi.



N. S. KHRUSHCHOV

Comrades Deputies,

In the seven months since the USSR Supreme Soviet's last session, events of exceptionally great importance have taken place on the international scene. Some of them gravely imperilled peace. The Soviet Government believes it its duty to provide an analysis of the present international situation and make known the moves it has taken in the field of foreign policy of late.

National foreign policy and diplomacy require of the ruling political parties and statesmen of the socialist countries a profound scientific approach in their analysis of international affairs and great political skill in order to adopt decisions, taking the actual situation into account, taking sober stock of the balance of forces and having results that would strengthen the positions of socialism and accord with the interests of all peace-loving peoples.

Firmly abiding by the Leninist principles of the policy of peaceful coexistence, the Soviet Government has always done everything necessary to preserve peace and is continuing to do so.

The principal result of the activity of the Soviet Government and the governments of the other socialist countries in the field of foreign policy, the net result of the struggle waged by all lovers of peace over this period, is that the attack on Cuba planned by the aggressive imperialist quarters of the United States has been prevented. The direct threat of a global thermonuclear war, which arose owing to the Caribbean crisis, has been averted.

The world public, men and women of various political beliefs and convictions inhabiting different latitudes, have ardently acclaimed this triumph of the policy of reason.

Our people and our Party can be proud of the results of the decisive action they took in those crucial days. Events have shown that the peace forces can overcome the most perilous international crises and curb the imperialist aggressors.

I

OUR GOAL IS PEACE, CREATIVE ENDEAVOUR, COMMUNISM

The Soviet Union's policy of peace derives from the socialist character of our state, of the entire people, from the noble purposes of the building of a communist society. Our only thought is to

construct, nothing but construct, to build communism. And the CPSU Central Committee's November Plenary Meeting once again demonstrated these lofty aims of our Party and our people.

At its Plenary Meeting the Central Committee discussed cardinal issues pertaining to the advancement of Soviet society, Party and state affairs, and the improvement of Party guidance of the economy. The aim of these decisions is to carry out as soon as possible the tasks of communist construction as set forth in the new CPSU Programme. In short, the Plenary Meeting debated how to build communism more successfully, how to advance the economy faster in order to provide our people with more material and spiritual boons.

The entire course of proceedings at the Plenary Meeting and the decisions it took conclusively show that our Party is firmly and consistently advancing along the Leninist road, supporting and promoting all that is new and progressive and sweeping aside all that is moribund. The Party's line, its home and foreign policy, the measures taken in recent years to improve economic management, are yielding wonderful fruit.

Developing on the basis of the priority growth of the heavy industry, Soviet industry fulfilled the gross output plan for the first four years of the seven-year period by 104.5 per cent; meanwhile, the total increase in gross output over this period will amount to 45 per cent instead of the planned 39. If our industry advances at the same rate over the remaining three years of the seven-year period—and we have no doubt that it will—in the seven years it will increase output not by the presumed 80 per cent but roughly two-fold.

In recent years the Party, the Government and the Soviet people have carried out major undertakings to boost agriculture. Despite the inclement weather in several areas, grain production has now reached 9,000 million poods in place of the 1953 figure of 5,000 million. This year's grain procurements will total around 3,500 million poods instead of the 1953 figure of 1,900 million. Animal husbandry produce is likewise increasing.

The Party and the Soviet state are making it their concern to steadily raise the people's living standards, produce consumer goods faster and satisfy the Soviet people's material and spiritual requirements better and better.

Comrades Deputies, in following the great Lenin's behests our Party and Government note and correctly evaluate not only the successes scored but also the shortcomings. We are well aware that

our industry can do a still better job and that a faster rate of advance can be achieved in agriculture. The decisions of the CPSU Central Committee's November Plenary Meeting and the 1963 economic plan and budget, which the Supreme Soviet has just endorsed, hold out prospects of new, still greater advances in the fifth year of the seven-year period.

Our country is confidently advancing along the road of economic and cultural progress. The socialist nations, with whom we have well developing and strengthening friendly, fraternal relations, are going along the same road shoulder to shoulder with us.

A short while ago there took place congresses of the Bulgarian Communist Party, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. The Communists of the German Democratic Republic will soon gather for their congress. The decisions of these congresses and the documents that preceded them show that the fraternal parties of the socialist countries are concentrating mainly on peaceful aims of construction; they want to complete the building of socialism and pave the way for a gradual transition to communism.

The processes taking place within the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries convincingly show all the peoples that the socialist countries are occupied with the great work of construction, which they are doing for the sake of peace, for the benefit and happiness of mankind, for the sake of the triumph of socialism and communism.

Comrades Deputies, the Soviet people who have gone through the grim school of several wars—especially the Second World War whose wall of fire swept a large part of our territory—very well know what armed conflict between states is like. It is only natural that they have a keener perception of what a thermonuclear war may be like.

When the Soviet people are asked, "Do the Russians want war," as the song goes, our reply is plain and clear. We say a decisive No to war! The peoples of the other socialist countries give the same answer. But we are not all alone on this planet and cannot ignore the fact that the aggressive imperialist circles are supporting the cold war and stepping up the arms race, that they have encircled the Soviet Union with a ring of military bases and are bragging of their war designs against the Soviet Union, against the socialist countries.

The Soviet people have done a good job making the most up-to-date and powerful means of defence—A- and H-bombs and

rocket weapons, including intercontinental ballistic missiles and global rockets. We have made these things. They are the world's best. And we have enough of them to answer a blow from our enemies with lightning crushing retaliation that would turn to ashes both the bases aimed against us, wherever they may be, and the foundries forging the weapons for the armed forces of the aggressor.

The NATO militarists are fond of babbling about the "equilibrium of fear," the "equilibrium of the power of retaliation," and even the "equilibrium of the power of terror," as a factor capable of guaranteeing peace on earth. But is it reasonable to stake on peace built on such a basis? When you stop to think, you see that the world is living today, figuratively speaking, on top of a mined cellar crammed with thermonuclear weapons.

Man today has the one and only alternative of peaceful coexistence or a war of destruction. However, the disaster of war is something the people of no state want. If a new war were allowed to break out it would take a toll of millions of lives, regardless of nationality, or wealth. Hence, there is only one choice. This is peaceful coexistence. That, in turn, signifies repudiation of war between states as a means of solving international disputes, the resolving of these issues through negotiation.

Undeviatingly pursuing its peaceloving policy the Soviet Government, together with the governments of the socialist countries, works for general and complete disarmament, the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany, the solution of the West Berlin problem on this basis, and the elimination of the hotbeds of military danger which may develop into a world war. We do everything to promote the strengthening of the independent states of Asia, Africa and Latin America, we render warm and fraternal support to the powerful national-liberation movement. We do not spare efforts to eradicate the disgraceful colonial system.

All the thoughts of the countries of socialism, all our activities are aimed at averting a world war and strengthening peace on earth.

The policy of peaceful coexistence and the solution of international problems by peaceful means, adhered to by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, is opposed by another kind of policy, the policy of the aggressive imperialist circles aimed at supporting the "cold war" and aggravating international tension. It is their fault that crises, aggravating international situation and pushing mankind to the precipice of world war, break out so often.

The imperialist circles try to find a way out of their difficulties by attacking the living standards of the working people of their countries, by intensifying the plunder of the economically underdeveloped states. The imperialist monopolies, following the collapse of world colonial empires, hope to keep intact and even intensify the economic enslavement of the young national states, to keep in chains the peoples still enslaved by colonialism. So, what we can see now is the growth of national-liberation movement, supported by all progressive mankind, on the one hand, and the intensification of the attempts of the imperialist powers to stifle this movement by every means at their disposal, on the other.

The most aggressive and adventurist circles of imperialism try to find a way out of the situation by stepping up the armaments drive and the preparations for an aggressive war against the socialist countries and the young sovereign states of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

It is becoming ever more obvious that lurking in the hotbeds of aggression, set up by the imperialists, are sparks which may kindle the flame of a general rocket-and-nuclear war.

The aggressive forces of imperialism create hotbeds of international tension fraught with dangerous consequences for mankind. The crisis in the Caribbean area was the crucial point of that tension.

II

OVERCOMING OF CRISIS IN CARIBBEAN AREA IS MAJOR VICTORY OF POLICY OF PEACE

Comrades Deputies,

We all remember the tense October days, when mankind listened with alarm to the news arriving from the Caribbean area. The world was on the brink of a thermonuclear disaster in those days.

What gave rise to that crisis? How did it develop? What lessons must be learned from this? These questions call for a profound analysis which will help the peaceloving forces to understand the obtaining situation better and to determine their tasks in the struggle for the further maintenance and consolidation of peace.

But before going over to this analysis I should like to remind you how the Cuban revolution developed and how relations between the Soviet Union and Cuba were shaped.

Soviet-Cuban Friendship Is Indestructible

Having hoisted the banner of a people's anti-imperialist revolution the freedom-loving Cuban people, rallied around their leader Fidel Castro and his comrades-in-arms, cleared their soil of the North American robbers and their henchmen by 1959. That was a truly 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 agrarian reform was effected, industrial enterprises, firms and banks nationalized and cultural revolution carried through. The Republic of Cuba became a democratic state building up the foundation of socialism

The victory of the revolution in Cuba was won by the Cubans themselves, by the Cuban people. The Soviet Army, which our foes strive to present as an "exporter of revolution," was many thousands of kilometres away from the "flaming island," as Cuba is called.

That significant victory gladdened everyone who cherished the cause of freedom and socialism. And when the people of Cuba, who had won independence, were subjected first to economic and then to military pressure by their imperialist neighbour the socialist countries, the Soviet Union above all, naturally, started helping Cuba.

Relations of sincere friendship, based on equality, respect for sovereignty and economic cooperation, were established between the Soviet Union and Cuba from the beginning of the latter's independent life. We could not but offer our assistance to the Cuban people, our brothers in work and by class. The leaders of the Cuban Republic have pointed out more than once the importance of the friendly Soviet-Cuban relations for strengthening socialist gains in Cuba. "We know," Comrade Fidel Castro said, "that without the Soviet Union, without the socialist camp, without the assistance they render us the victory of the revolution in such a small country as Cuba would have been impossible in view of imperialist aggression."

The Soviet people render sincere assistance to the fraternal people of heroic Cuba.

The victory of the revolution in Cuba and its successes in building a new life have infuriated the United States imperialist circles. It is Cuba's ideas that the imperialists are afraid of. They do not want to reconcile themselves to the fact that little Cuba has dared to live and develop independently the way her people want and not the way suitable to the American monopolies. But the question of

how people should live, and what road they should follow is the internal affair of each nation!

Trampling upon the generally recognised standards of international relations the United States reactionary forces had, from the first day of the victory of the Cuban revolution, done everything to overthrow the revolutionary government of Cuba and restore their domination over her. They severed diplomatic relations with Cuba, conducted and still conduct subversive activities, and established an economic blockade against Cuba. Threatening to apply sanctions the United States tried to make its allies not only stop trading with Cuba but even not allow their ships to carry foodstuffs to Cuba from the socialist countries that have come to the assistance of their brothers. This was an inhuman policy aimed at starving a whole nation to death.

But even this seemed too little to the United States. Assuming the functions of gendarme it embarked upon the path of armed suppression of the Cuban revolution. In other words, it wanted to acquire the right of exporting counter-revolution.

The United States policy in regard to Cuba is the most unbridled reactionary policy. It is simply monstrous to allege that Cuba threatens America or any other country and, on these grounds, to assume the exclusive right of acting against Cuba.

In the attempt to justify their aggressive actions the American reactionaries allege that the Caribbean crisis was engendered by Cuba herself, adding that the Soviet Union too was to blame because it brought rockets and IL-28 bombers to Cuba.

But is this really the case? True, at the request of the Cuban Government we shipped arms there. But what motives guided us in doing this? Exclusively humane ones: Cuba needed arms as a means of restraining the aggressors and not as a means of attack. For, Cuba was really threatened with invasion. Piratical attacks were frequently made on her shores, Havana was subjected to artillery fire, paratroops were dropped from aeroplanes to carry out subversive activities.

In April last year a large-scale military invasion of Cuba was carried out by counter-revolutionary hirelings. This invasion was prepared and carried out with the full support of the United States.

The further events have shown that the failure of the invasion did not make the U.S. imperialists give up the idea of strangling Cuba. They began to prepare a new attack. A very alarming situa-

tion arose this autumn: everything showed that the United States was preparing to attack the Cuban Republic using its own armed forces.

Revolutionary Cuba was forced to take all necessary measures to strengthen her defence. The Soviet Union helped her to build up a strong army that stands on guard of the Cuban people's gains. In connection with the increased threat on the part of the United States, the Government of Cuba approached the Soviet Government last summer, to render it additional assistance. Agreement was reached on a number of new measures, including the stationing of a few dozen Soviet medium-range ballistic missiles to be controlled by Soviet officers.

What aims did this decision pursue? Naturally, neither we nor our Cuban friends figured that the small number of medium-range missiles sent to Cuba would be used for attacking the United States or any other country.

Our aim was only Cuba's defence. Everybody saw how the American imperialists were sharpening their knives and threatening Cuba with a massive attack. In the face of this predatory policy, which runs counter to all standards of relations between states and the United Nations Charter, we could not remain indifferent observers. We decided to extend a helping hand to Cuba. We saw a possibility of defending the freedom-loving people of Cuba in stationing rockets there so that the American imperialists, if they really dared to invade, should feel that the war with which they threaten is on their own borders, that they should realise more clearly the danger of a thermonuclear war.

This was the step we took, a step dictated by the serious aggravation of the situation. We were sure that this step would bring the aggressors to their senses, and having understood that Cuba was not defenceless and American imperialism not all-powerful, they would have to change their plans. In that case there would naturally be no need to keep rockets in Cuba any longer. Indeed, if there had been no threat of invasion and we had assurances before that the United States would not invade Cuba and would keep its allies from doing so, if the United States were guided by this in its policy, there would have been no need to station our rockets in Cuba.

Some people present matters as though the rockets were supplied by us for an attack on the United States. This, of course, is not a clever argument. Why should we have to station rockets in Cuba for this purpose when we had and still have the possibility

of dealing the blow from our own territory possessing the necessary number of inter-continental missiles of the necessary range and power.

We do not need military bases on foreign territories at all. It is well known that we dismantled all our bases abroad. People even little versed in military affairs know that in the age of inter-continental and global missiles Cuba, this small distant island which in some places is only 50 kilometres wide, has no strategic importance for the defence of the Soviet Union. It is for the defence of the Cuban Republic and not for attacking the United States that we stationed rockets in Cuba. Such a small country as Cuba cannot, naturally, build up forces capable of launching an offensive against such a big country as the United States.

Only he who has lost all presence of mind can assert that the Soviet Union has selected Cuba as a bridgehead for invading the American continent, the United States or the Latin American countries. If we wanted to begin war against the United States we would not have agreed to dismantle the rockets stationed in Cuba that were ready for launching for battle, we would have put them to use. But we did not do so because we did not pursue such aims.

Thus, all the talk alleging that Cuba had been converted into a base for an offensive against the United States of America is a malicious concoction. The object of these allegations is to camouflage the plans of aggression against Cuba. We remain loyal to the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence, and consider that outstanding issues between states should be settled by peaceful means, through negotiation.

How Cuban Events Developed

The developments in the Caribbean area confirmed that the danger of such aggression was present. An intensified concentration of large formations of the Navy, Air Force, paratroops, and the marines began by the last ten days of October on the approaches to Cuba, in the south of the United States. The U.S. Government dispatched reinforcements to its military base in Guantanamo, set up on Cuban territory. Big military exercises in the Caribbean Sea were announced. It was planned during these "exercises" to put a landing party ashore on Vieques Island. The Kennedy Government announced on October 22 that a quarantine had been imposed around Cuba. Incidentally, the word, "quarantine," in this case was only a fig-leaf, actually, it was to be a blockade, piracy on the high seas.

The events developed at a swift pace. The U.S. command readied for action all its armed forces, including troops stationed in Europe, and also the 6th Fleet, in the Mediterranean Sea, and the 7th Fleet, based in the Taiwan area. Several airborne, infantry and armoured divisions, adding up to nearly 100,000 servicemen, were singled out for an attack on Cuba alone. Besides, 183 warships, with 85,000 sailors on board, were advanced toward the shores of Cuba. The landing on Cuba was to be covered by several thousand warplanes. Nearly 20 per cent of all the U.S. Strategic Air Command aircraft, carrying atomic and hydrogen bombs, stayed up in the air on round-the-clock patrol. Reservists were called up.

The troops of the NATO allies of the United States in Europe were also readied for action. A Joint Command of the United States and Latin American countries was set up. Some of the latter countries sent their warships to take part in the blockade of Cuba. The danger of a thermonuclear war hovered over the world as a result of these aggressive steps by the U.S. Government.

In the face of such intensified war preparations, we, on our part, were forced to carry out appropriate measures. The Soviet Government instructed the USSR Defence Minister to ready the entire army of the Soviet Union for action, and, first of all, the Soviet intercontinental and strategic missile troops, surface-to-air missile and anti-aircraft defence of the country, fighter aviation of the anti-aircraft defence, strategic aviation, and naval forces. Our submarine fleet, including atomic submarines, took up positions as instructed. Increased military preparedness was announced for the land troops, and the discharge from the Soviet Army of senior-age men of the strategic missile troops, anti-aircraft defence troops and submarine fleet was held up. The armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty countries were also readied for action.

In these conditions, if one or the other side did not show restraint, did not do all that was necessary to prevent the development of war, an explosion would have followed with irreparable consequences.

Now that the tension, caused by the developments in the Caribbean area, has been reduced and we are in the final stage of settling the conflict, I wish to report to the Deputies of the Supreme Soviet what the Soviet Government did to put out the advancing flames of war.

On October 23, immediately after the United States imposed its blockade on Cuba, the Soviet Government, along with the adop-

tion of measures of a defensive nature, came out with a statement, in which it firmly warned that the U.S. Government was assuming grave responsibility for the fate of the world and playing recklessly with fire. We frankly told the President of the United States that we would not tolerate piratic action of U.S. ships on the high seas, and that for these aims we would take proper steps.

At the same time the Soviet Government appealed to all the peoples to block the road for the aggressors. It simultaneously took definite steps in the United Nations. The Soviet Government's peaceful initiative in settling the Cuban crisis found full support on the part of the socialist countries and the peoples of most of the other U.N. member-countries. U.N. Secretary-General U Thant did much to settle the conflict.

However, the Government of the United States continued to heat up the atmosphere. The U.S. militarist forces pushed developments to the point where an attack on Cuba would be effected. We received information from Cuban comrades and from other sources on the morning of October 27 which directly indicated that this attack would be carried out in the next two or three days. We interpreted these telegrams as an extremely alarming signal. And this alarm was well founded.

Immediate action was necessary to prevent the attack on Cuba and to preserve peace. A message was sent to the President of the United States, suggesting a mutually acceptable solution. It was still not too late at that moment to extinguish the wick of war which had already begun to smoulder. When forwarding this message, we took into account that the President's messages also expressed alarm and a desire to find a way out of the situation which had taken shape. We declared that if the United States pledged not to invade Cuba and would also hold other ally-states back from aggression against Cuba, then the Soviet Union would be ready to remove from Cuba those weapons which the United States call "offensive."

In reply, the President of the United States, on his part, declared that if the Soviet Government agreed to remove these weapons from Cuba, then the U.S. Government would lift the quarantine, i.e., the blockade, and give assurances that both the United States and other countries of the Western hemisphere would not invade Cuba. The President declared quite definitely, and the entire world knows this, that the United States would not attack Cuba and would also hold its allies back from any similar action.

But we had shipped our weapons to Cuba precisely to prevent an attack on her! That was why the Soviet Government confirmed its readiness to withdraw ballistic missiles from Cuba.

Thus, briefly speaking, a mutually acceptable decision was reached which meant a victory for reason and success for the cause of peace. The Cuban question entered the phase of peaceful negotiations and, as far as the United States of America is concerned, was transferred there, so to say. from the hands of generals into the hands of diplomats.

On October 29, negotiations began in New York between representatives of the USSR, the United States, and Cuba with the participation of U Thant. The First Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Comrade Mikoyan, flew to Havana to exchange views with the Government of Cuba.

Meanwhile, both sides got down to fulfilling the commitments they had assumed. The Soviet Union withdrew from Cuba all the rockets which the United States called an offensive weapon. The Soviet personnel which serviced the rocket installations also left. The United States was given the opportunity of seeing for itself that all the ballistic rockets sited on Cuba were really withdrawn, and this was confirmed in statements made by U.S. officials.

At the same time, desiring to expedite the settlement of the Caribbean crisis, we agreed to the withdrawal of Soviet IL-28 planes from Cuba within a month's time, although they have become outdated as bombers. By December 7 these planes had already been withdrawn from Cuba. They had been sent to Cuba only with a view to their potential use as a kind of flying artillery for coastal defence to operate under the cover of anti-aircraft guns.

On its part, on November 21 the United States Government lifted the naval blockade of Cuba and recalled its warships from the area. From the area of Florida the U.S. military authorities withdrew the troops and aircraft which had been concentrated there for attack on Cuba, and demobilised the called-up reservists. The additional troops which had been sent to Guantanamo in the period of the crisis were also withdrawn from that base. Simultaneously, the President reaffirmed the United States' pledge that Cuba would not be invaded.

Considering this, we also cancelled military measures which we had been compelled to take in view of the exacerbation of the crisis over Cuba. The Cuban Republic, in its turn, started demo-

bilizing people who had been called up for defending their homeland, and they are now returning to peaceful work, to their families.

Favourable conditions have been created now for liquidating the dangerous crisis in the Caribbean area. It is now necessary to bring the negotiations to completion, to put on record the agreement 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 agreement with the authority of the United Nations Organisation.

The Soviet Government is convinced that it is not in the interests of peace to delay a complete settlement of the Caribbean crisis, and we hope that the Government of the United States, too, understands this.

Some Lessons and Conclusions

Some results of the normalisation of the Cuban situation which is now in progress become clear from the above-said.

First, it has proved possible to prevent the invasion which threatened the Republic of Cuba every day, and, consequently, to prevent a military clash. It has proved possible to overcome the crisis which threatened a general thermonuclear war.

Second, the United States of America publicly assumed, before the whole world, a commitment not to attack the Republic of Cuba and to keep its allies from doing so.

Third, the most rabid imperialists who had counted on starting a world thermonuclear war over Cuba, have not been able to do so. The Soviet Union, the forces of peace and socialism have proved that they are able to impose peace on the advocates of war.

Which side was victorious, who won out? It may be said here that reason won out, the cause of peace and security of the nations won out. Both sides displayed a sober approach and realised that unless measures capable of overcoming the dangerous development of events are taken, a third world war may break out. As a result of mutual concessions and compromise, an agreement was reached which made it possible to ease the dangerous tension, to normalise the situation.

Concessions were made by both sides. We withdrew the ballistic rockets and agreed to withdraw the IL-28 planes. This has given the Americans satisfaction. But Cuba and the Soviet Union have also received satisfaction: the American invasion of Cuba has been averted, the naval blockade lifted, the situation in the Caribbean

has been normalised, People's Cuba continues to exist, strengthen and develop under the leadership of its revolutionary government, of its dauntless leader Fidel Castro.

Some say that the United States forced us to make some concessions. If we approach things with such a yardstick, these people should say that the United States too was forced to concede something. The solution of controversial issues between states without war, by peaceful means—such precisely is the policy of peaceful coexistence in action. If we agreed to build our relations on such a basis, if the relations between the USA and Cuba were built on the basis of the U.N. Charter, there would have been no need to send and install our rockets on Cuba.

We are pleased with this outcome of events in the Caribbean, all other peoples adhering to the position of peaceful coexistence are, undoubtedly, also pleased. They have gained the opportunity to live and work in peace.

And now let us imagine for a moment what might have happened had we acted as die-hard politicians and refused to agree to mutual concessions. This would have been like the tale in which two goats met on a little bridge over a precipice and collided head-on refusing to make way to one another. As you remember, both were plunged into the chasm. Is it sensible for men to act like this?

In U.S. ruling quarters there are politicians justly named "madmen". These "madmen" insisted and still insist on unleashing, as soon as possible, a war against the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist camp. Is it not clear that had we taken up an uncompromising stand, we would only have helped the camp of the "madmen" to use the situation in order to inflict a blow at Cuba and unleash a world war.

To be fair, it should be noted that among the leading officials of the United States there are also people who appraise the situation more soberly and, considering the existing relationship of forces in the international arena, realise that if they unleashed a war the United States would not win it and would not achieve its aim.

Comrades Deputies! I want to make special mention of the tremendous contribution to the cause of preservation of peace in the Caribbean area made by the heroic Republic of Cuba, its courageous people, its fine leaders, with our great friend, Fidel Castro, at their head. Permit me on your behalf Comrades Deputies, on behalf of all the Soviet people, to congratulate our Cuban friends. Revolu-

tionary Cuba has passed an important and difficult examination, has come out with flying colours from the struggle for its freedom and independence! Cuba has come out of this new test stronger and wiser.

In the menacing atmosphere which hung over them the Cuban leaders displayed firmness and determination to uphold their country's sovereignty, to preserve their socialist gains. The entire Cuban people rose to the defence of their motherland and were prepared for a life-and-death struggle with the interventionists. The Soviet people admire their courage.

The Cuban Government legitimately insisted that any solution of the Caribbean crisis must be of a long-term nature and include guarantees for the Cuban Republic that would shield it against aggression and ensure for the Cuban people an opportunity to build their new life in conditions of peace. This is the aim of the well-known five points advanced by the Cuban Prime Minister, Fidel Castro, in his speech of October 28, which we fully support.

These five points are just demands conforming to the elementary rights of any sovereign state and are dictated by concern for the preservation of the peace and security of Cuba, conforming to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations Organisation.

Revolutionary Cuba wants to live and develop independently, to have a political and social structure best suited to the interests of its people. This is Cuba's right, and, naturally, all peace-loving states, all peace-loving peoples are on the side of Cuba.

The leaders of revolutionary Cuba have repeatedly stressed their desire to settle all controversial issues with the United States peacefully, by means of negotiation.

Who should be blamed for the fact that relations between Cuba and the U.S. have not yet been normalised? The answer is clear: only the ruling quarters of the United States of America who do not want to sit down at the negotiations table with their neighbour. Still we hope that reason will triumph. Sooner or later the United States will have to agree to normalise relations with Cuba.

We solemnly declare that the Soviet Union has been and continues to be with revolutionary Cuba. We shall continue to help the Cuban people build a bright future. The solution of the crisis makes it possible for it to return to peaceful labour, but the forces of peace must continue to be vigilant.

The Soviet Government hopes that the commitments undertaken by the United States of America in relation to Cuba will be strictly observed. For a violation of these commitments would be dangerous not only to the given region, as it would inevitably result in a new acute conflict and create a new threat to peace. Moreover, all faith in such commitments would be killed, and this would rule out the possibility of employing in the future the same method of peaceful settlement which played its positive role in the solution of the crisis around Cuba.

We on our part will be firmly adhering to the agreement reached as a result of the exchange of messages with the President of the USA. We should like to give a clear warning that our undertakings will remain in effect so long as the other side carries out the terms of the agreement. Should the commitments undertaken not be carried out by the other side, we would be compelled to take such action as would be dictated by the situation.

It must be clear to all that our country will never leave revolutionary Cuba in trouble. The Soviet Union will abide by its promise to help revolutionary Cuba. Revolutionary Cuba will not remain defenceless.

In these days the imperialists cannot ignore the growing power of the Soviet Union, of the socialist countries. We have the necessary number of powerful inter-continental rockets, which make it possible for us to inflict a retaliatory blow at the adversary should he unleash a war.

Those militarists who boast that they have against the Soviet Union submarines with Polaris rockets on board and other "surprises", as they say, should remember that neither do we depend on luck only.

Why do I remind you of such unpleasant things as the action of inter-continental rockets and atomic submarines? Because we are being forced to this by the irresponsible statements of some of the leading officials of the U.S. and their allies.

In the midst of the Cuban events, when things got very hot, a good many leaders in the West urged that reasonable solutions of disputes should be sought in order to avert war. And now, when the state of shock is over, some of these people are beginning to say that controversial issues should be solved by concessions from one side only.This is an unwise and dangerous policy.

It does not surprise us that the role of the leading singer in the

dissonant choir of preachers of a "tough policy" is being played by Adenauer and his like.

The West German revenge-seekers have for many years been serving the black cause of fanning up military conflicts and have always hastened to bring combustible material wherever a critical situation developed. They are eager to add oil to the fire so that the flame of war may be started. Adenauer is dreaming of revenge, and he therefore views all international events from a single angle: how, under the pretext of resisting the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist camp, to get more arms for the Bundeswehr, how to make the Soviet Union clash with the United States.

But I still feel like telling Herr Chancellor of the cold war that he had no cause to express joy over the Western "toughness," which allegedly made us withdraw the rockets from Cuba. I dare assure you, Herr Chancellor, that when we took the decision to install some 40 of our rockets on Cuba we kept intact your "ration", so to speak, in case you launched aggression in Europe. And now, when to your "pleasure" our rockets have returned from Cuba, we have added them to the means of defence protecting our Western boundaries.

What are you rejoicing over, Herr Adenauer? It looks like you have forgotten the elementary rule of arithmetic: a change in the order of items does not change the sum—in this case the force of Soviet retaliation.

It should be noted that today, when the world situation has calmed down somewhat, the "tough policy" is beginning to be urged, in addition to Adenauer, by some other figures. For instance, the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Home, declared a few days ago that there were some signs that after the sobering Cuban affair the Russians would probably revise their role in the international society, that is to say, would begin to give in to the NATO bloc in everything. He said that the Soviet Union should assess the lessons of Cuba precisely in this way.

The British Foreign Secretary ought to know that the Soviet Union has always properly taken into consideration the lessons of international events. As regards those who preach "tough policy" towards the Soviet Union, they should bear in mind that if such a crisis is repeated and if it proves impossible to stop the dangerous development of events, Great Britain together with its allies will be plunged into the vortex of the catastrophe, and then it will be too late to do anything about it.

Bellicose demands for "toughness" are again heard in the United States. What can be said about such imprudent braggarts? They act like the long-eared character from a hunter's story.

Chased by a hunter's dogs, the hare dived into some hole and saw with horror that it was a fox-hole and that there were cubs in it. Scared to death, the hare asked in a weak, trembling voice:

"Dear little foxcubs, where is your mother?"

"Our mother has gone to fetch us a chick," the cubs replied.

The hare, his spirits recovered, said, now in a rude tone:

"Pity that she isn't here, for I'd give her the works . . ."

Similarly, some Western politicians are saying now: "It's a pity, for we would give the works to the Soviet Union." Well, try it, gentlemen !

It is not excluded that some madman may unleash a war. But if he unleashes it, it wil be difficult even for a thousand sages to stop it. This is known from history as well.

Is a new invasion of Cuba possible? One cannot, of course, give guarantees against the actions of crazy militarists, but it can be said with all confidence that the end of all those madmen who will dare to unleash a war will be ignominious as that of the Hitlers, Mussolinis and other barbarians who plunged the world into the abyss of war.

And yet the legitimate question arises: We succeeded in averting the unleashing of war in the case of Cuba with the help of a reasonable compromise—and the world was literally on the verge of war—but will there be a possibility, if the imperialists again tighten the knot, to slacken it at least? This cannot be guaranteed.

Indeed, let us imagine for a moment that the knot is being tightened in Europe—let us say, around the question of concluding a German peace treaty. And let us assume that the U.S. militarists and the critics like Adenauer, who are egging them on, go on asserting that "toughness" brings dividends to the West and that therefore a still tougher stand should be taken.

It can be said to these gentlemen: Don't you think that under your pressure we shall promise to take rockets out of the Soviet Union or will be scared by the threat of bombing? I shall say outright, gentlemen, that if you base your policy on such expectations you will be bitterly disappointed!

By these methods you will not remove outstanding international issues, the question of a German peace settlement includ-

ed, from the order of the day. They have to be settled, but you seem to be out to bury these questions, and us together with them. If some people think that there exists a spade big enough to bury us together with our rocket weapons, we can say that a spade as big, if not bigger, is possessed by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

If this path is taken, the path of settling disputed issues from the positions of strength, this can lead to a truly catastrophic world war. That is what the Western statesmen should remember.

Against Dogmatism, for Creative Application of Marxist-Leninist Teaching

Comrades Deputies, it should be said that in the period of the peaceful settlement of the conflict in the Caribbean area loud discontented cries were also heard from another corner, from people who even call themselves Marxists-Leninists, although their actions have nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism. I have in mind, in particular, the Albanian leaders. Their criticism of the Soviet Union was in line, as a matter of fact, with criticism on the part of the most reactionary bellicose quarters of the West.

Why is it precisely the Albanian leaders who are being more vociferous than others now? In this connection I would like to tell you a story from my personal experience.

I spent my childhood and youth in coalfields. While Gorky passed the schooling of people's universities, I was brought up in a miners' "university". It, too, was a kind of "Cambridge" for the working man, a "university" for the downtrodden people of Russia. My father had found himself there, and I, too, was in this "university" in childhood and youth.

I remember that vituperators in miners' towns used to do the following: they would find a little boy who had just learned to repeat words without understanding their meaning, teach him to pronounce the dirtiest swear-words, and tell him: "Go to the windows and tell these words to people." Or, worse still: "Go to you mother and repeat these words to her. Here is three kopecks, and afterwards we shall give five kopecks to you."

And this child would run under the windows of houses or to his mother and repeat the abuse, and this would be a kind of theatre for the vituperators.

The Albanian leaders are acting like these silly boys. Some people taught them to pronounce foul swear-words, and they are walking under the windows and shouting dirty curses at the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. But it is their mother! They get the promised three kopecks for their swearing. When they use a more violent and sophisticated language, five kopecks and a praise are given them in addition.

What do these people, who call themselves Marxists-Leninists, want? Why are they working, in fact, for what Adenauer wants, i.e., pressing for conflicts, for an aggravation of international tension? It is correctly said that if you go left you will come out on the right. If an objective view of things is taken, during the crisis around Cuba they actually acted like people who wanted to provoke a conflict, they wanted to engineer a clash between the Soviet Union and the United States. But what does staging a clash between these two great world powers mean? This means triggering off a world thermonuclear war.

It would be interesting to know how they themselves would act in such a war. I don't think they would be eager to take part in it. Evidently they would prefer to sit it out. But then may it be asked: What do they want? Do they really want the blood of the peoples of the Soviet Union, Cuba and the other socialist countries to be shed?

Judging by their pronouncements, the Albanian leaders are obviously displeased by the liquidation of the crisis around Cuba. They call the solution that has been reached a retreat, while some even go to such lengths as to declare that the Soviet Union has capitulated before imperialism.

The question is: In what respect have we retreated?

Socialist Cuba exists; Cuba remains the beacon of Marxist-Leninist ideas in the western hemisphere. The force of her revolutionary example will continue to grow. The U.S. Government has assumed, on behalf of its country, the obligation not to invade Cuba; the threat of thermonuclear war has been averted. Is this our retreat?

The critics of the peaceful settlement of the conflict say that the United States should not be taken at its word, that history knows many instances when treaties were violated. Yes, history knows such instances. But if only this is taken into consideration it will have to be admitted that people have no other prospect today but mutual annihilation. To assert this means to take, volun-

tarily or otherwise, the road of militarism, to regard war as the sole method of settling disputed issues.

Must international controversial questions be settled only through war and not through negotiation? No, preaching of the settlement of disputed issues between states by means of war is recklessness which can only bring suffering and calamities to the peoples. It has nothing in common with the teaching of Marx and Engels. It is the same as to deny the significance of international treaties and agreements, to deny the principle of peaceful co-existence. There exist reasonable standards of international relations, and we must strengthen and not undermine them. Vituperation will not help to solve disputed problems.

Basing themselves on the fact that the nature of imperialism has not changed some people say that it is necessary to expose it. to rail at it. Imperialism has to be exposed, of course, for it is an evil to the peoples of the world, but vituperation alone, no matter how just it may be, will not weaken imperialism.

It is certainly true that the nature of imperialism has not changed, but imperialism today is not what it used to be before. when it held an unchallenged sway over the world. If it is a "paper tiger" today, those who say so know that this "paper tiger" has atomic teeth. It still can use them, and it should not be taken, light-mindedly. For this reason it is possible to agree to mutual compromises in relations with the imperialist countries, but at the same time it is necessary to have all means to defeat the aggressors if they unleash a war.

When grave conditions took shape for Cuba, some people restricted themselves to mere abuse. The imperialist forces did not become weaker from loud statements, and it is doubtful whether this made matters easier for Cuba either. The Soviet Union acted otherwise. It not only exposed the United States' imperialist intrigues against revolutionary Cuba. It sent its arms to Cuba, sent its men who were prepared to give their lives in the struggle for the defence of Cuba. And when a threat hovered over Cuba our men received the order to protect Cuba from an invasion, to fight together with the Cubans and to stand to the end with the Cuban people: here is genuine fraternal sentiments, a fraternal attitude, fraternal solidarity.

Certainly this was a critical period and the Government of the United States understood the possible course of events. It realised

that if the U.S. armed forces kindle a war conflagration on Cuba and this conflagration takes the lives of both the Cubans and the Soviet men in Cuba then no force would be able to halt the Soviet Union from delivering a crushing retaliatory blow. This is why at the decisive moment of the crisis prudence was shown by the U.S. Government.

When proposing a mutually acceptable solution we took into account the sum total of all considerations. And war was averted.

Today we tell our critics: your abuse is praise for our Government, for our Party, for our people, is praise for all Marxist-Leninist Parties which adhere to the positions of the 1957 Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties and the 1960 Statement of the 81 Parties which uphold the ideas of the peaceful coexistence of states with different socio-political systems.

One should be very careful and not indulge in irresponsible accusations to the effect that, for instance, some pursue an orthodox policy, while others, an erroneous policy, that some attack imperialism and are intolerable towards it, while others allegedly display liberalism. These questions can be correctly understood, one or other action can be correctly appraised only when the time, the place and the conditions under which one has to act are taken into account.

India, for instance, achieved the liberation of Goa, Diu and Daman. These were vestiges of colonialism on Indian soil. Even when the British colonialists were driven out of India, Portugal preserved her colonies there which spread the stench of colonialism. India, her Government, showed patience, in the course of several years they reconciled themselves with this and then threw out the colonialists. Were they right in doing this? Certainly, they were. Incidentally, when this question was discussed in the Security Council, the United States and Britain actually tried to get India to be proclaimed an aggresor. They tried to direct world public opinion against India. It was only the veto of the Soviet Union that prevented them from doing so.

Here is another example. When Indonesia attained freedom, the Dutch colonialists attempted to retain West Irian. The Indonesian people and their government, however, forced the colonialists out of West Irian. We did what we could to help Indonesia in her struggle and welcomed the liberation of West Irian, its reunification with free Indonesia.

Macao is situated on China's coast near the estuary of the Chukiang River. This is a tiny territory which is even difficult to find on the map. The Portuguese leased it as early as in the middle of the 16th century and in 1887 completely wrested it from China and turned it into their colony. The British colony of Hong Kong also exists there; it is situated in the delta of the Hsikiang River and, literally, is at the very heart of such an important city as Kwangchow (Canton). The odour coming from these places is in no way better than the smell which came from colonialism in Goa.

But will anyone denounce the People's Republic of China for the vestiges of colonialism remaining untouched? It would be incorrect to urge China to take any actions which the latter considers untimely. If the Government of the People's Republic of China tolerates Macao and Hong Kong then apparently there are weighty reasons for this. It would therefore be absurd to attack it, advancing the accusation that this allegedly is a concession to the British and Portuguese colonialists, that this allegedly is conciliation.

Perhaps this is a deviation from Marxism-Leninism? Nothing of the kind. This means that the Government of the People's Republic of China takes into account the real situation, the real opportunities. And this by no means is taking place because the attitude of the Chinese towards colonialism is less acute than that of the Indians, that they show greater tolerance for Salazar than India. No, the hatred of our Chinese friends for colonialism is the same as that of every revolutionary. But they evidently proceed from their conditions, from their understanding and show patience.

Should we condemn them for this and claim that they have deviated from Marxism-Leninism? No. This would be nonsense.

Due to a number of conditions one, at times, has to live not among fragrant roses but among thorn bushes and at times even near the colonialist toilet.

But the hour will strike and the Chinese friends, recognising such a situation unbearable, will tell the colonialists for all to hear: "Get out!" And we shall greet this move. But let the Chinese friends themselves decide when this should be done. We are not egging them along. On the contrary, we tell them: "Solve this problem in a way which serves the interests of your country, the interests of the entire socialist camp."

And what would have happened if we during the Cuban events had not shown the necessary restraint and had listened to the

promptings of "ultra-revolutionary" shouters? We would have entered into a period of a new world war, a thermonuclear war. Of course, our vast country would have held out although tens upon tens of millions of people would have perished! And Cuba, probably as a result of a thermonuclear war, would have simply ceased to exist. Other densely populated countries, which do not possess such vast expanses, would have also completely perished on being drawn into the conflict. And those who would have remained alive and future generations would have been subjected to incredible sufferings from the consequences of atomic radiation.

But was this the road of development of mankind outlined by Marx and Lenin? No. Those who attempt to attribute such a world outlook and such conceptions to our great teachers only insult their memory. When the revolution started in tsarist Russia our slogan was: "Peace to the huts, war on the palaces." This was in accord with the Party's policy of developing the imperialist war into a civil war, this was a call to the class struggle, to the struggle against the landowners and capitalists. And when the revolution was victorious, the first decree of the Soviet Government drafted by V. I. Lenin was the Decree on Peace. And although the Germans at that time occupied a rather large part of Russia's territory, V. I. Lenin and our entire country sought to put an end to the war and to sign a peace treaty with the Germans.

A delegation headed by Trotsky, who at that time also called himself a Marxist, was sent to Brest to sign a treaty. But he went against the Party, provocatively wrecked the peace negotiations with the Germans and left Brest. Vladimir Ilyich was then forced to send Chicherin and a peace treaty was signed. History has confirmed the correctness and brilliancy of V. I. Lenin's foresight. It showed that the road which V. I. Lenin mapped out and upheld in the struggle against pseudo-revolutionaries was the only reasonable and true road. Of course, the Brest peace treaty was a temporary concession to German militarism.

However, what was the final result? Who made a concession to whom? Today the Marxist-Leninist banner is flying not only over the entire territory of the Soviet Union but beyond its boundaries, this banner has been raised over other countries, including the German Democratic Republic. And those German militarists who invaded our country are in their graves. Now, judge for yourselves who was right. The Leninist approach in solving such a complicated problem has triumphed.

It is, of course, certainly not a matter of some parallel between the Brest Peace Treaty and the settlement of the conflict in the Caribbean area. The thing is that each time it is necessary to take into consideration the concrete situation and the concrete conditions. A dogmatic approach devoid of a sober stock-taking of the actual situation is harmful, as it is the source of the gravest of blunders. Marxists-Leninists must remember that there is no abstract truth. Truth is always concrete.

Some of the doctrinaires have slithered to Trotskyite positions, and are impelling the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to unleash a world war. They would like to impose the same provocative policy as Trotsky conducted in his day. Evidently the Albanian leaders and those spurring them on have lost faith in that socialism can win without a war between the states. Perhaps in general they never realized that there is such a possibility, believing that communism can be reached only through war, by killing millions of people. However, this madness will never get the peoples of the other countries to follow the Communist Parties. On the contrary, it can only scare millions and millions of people away from the communist movement.

The Albanian doctrinaires are disappointed in that a compromise was reached and that the dangerous Caribbean crisis provoked by the American militarists was liquidated. They are upset, evidently, that no thermonuclear war was let loose, that the peoples, having surmounted a dangerous crisis, are living and working in conditions of peace. This is what they criticise our Party and Government for; this is why they are pouring filth on the Soviet Union and its people.

Moral and Political Victory for Soviet Foreign Policy

I have already remarked that it was not in socialism's interests to let the crisis around Cuba develop into a global thermonuclear war.

Such a war is necessary to aggressive imperialist forces, who, fearing the inevitable historical prospect of the defeat of capitalism in the peaceful competition with socialism, reason this way: if we've got to die, let's do it with a bang, even if it be the bang of A-bombs.

And so you see that on the one hand, it is imperialism's aggressive, adventurist forces, whom we may call the madmen, people who have lost hope of capitalism's holding out in the peaceful competition with socialism, that are trying high and low

to let a war loose. Meanwhile, on the other hand, people who style themselves Marxist-Leninists, but who are really just doctrinaires with no faith in the possibility of socialism and communism winning in conditions of peaceful coexistence with capitalism, are trying to impel developments to take the same direction. Both want to push history to a war, to have the question of the triumph of communism or capitalism decided by war, by the killing of millions upon millions of people.

People would seem to have diametrically opposite trends of thought, but actually they are joining hands, sharing in views and actions on this vital issue.

There is no point for us, who are building communism, like our brothers who are building socialism, dying with a bang or without one. We must work for the full and ultimate victory of communism.

So why beg the devil to invite us, why hurry up to heaven? After all someone has yet to come back to tell us whether it is better there than on earth. Are you, Comrades Deputies, disappointed at having gathered in this hall to discuss our country's further development in conditions of peace, when we have been able to avert a thermonuclear war? Not at all. On the contrary, we are all rejoicing.

A few days ago Presidium Members and Secretaries of the Central Committee visited a new weaving mills in Novye Cheremushki in Moscow. We had a chat there with women workers. I asked one of them:

"How are you getting on?"

"Fine, Comrade Khrushchov," she replied.

"Got a flat?"

"Yes."

"Where?"

"Here, not far away," she said. "When they were building houses near the mills, I got a flat."

"Got a family?"

"Yes. Two kids. One in a boarding-school and the other at home with me. He also goes to school."

She told me what her pay was and what living and working conditions were like.

"So you can get along?" I asked.

"Certainly, Comrade Khrushchov. Our only worry, the greatest desire of all of us, is to have no war."

This woman had expressed the feelings of the working people. Similar feelings are expressed by the peoples of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, India, Albania, the United States of America, Britain, France and all other countries of the world.

We don't need war! The Soviet people who unfurled the banner of struggle for socialism and to whose lot the honour has fallen to work to build communism, want peace. We are confident of our righteousness and strength.

In the space of 45 years we have gone a very long way and today our stride is still wider. Today we accomplish in a month what before it took us five years to achieve. Have we got something we prize? Of course, we have. We have prospects, the conviction that our ideas will ultimately win out. We want these victories to come not through war but through peaceful construction and competition with capitalism. We say: No, not only to a global thermonuclear war, but to all wars between states in general —with the exception of a just war of liberation and a war of defence, that a nation, against whom aggression has been perpetrated, is compelled to wage.

Of course, if war is thrust upon us from any quarter, we shall stand up for ourselves and our allies and draw on all available means. However, we shall do all we can to avoid an armed conflict, to have wars ruled out from the life of society in general. Can this be achieved when we have two systems—capitalism and socialism—in the world? The present world balance of forces is such that the forces of peace and socialism can curb the aggressive forces of imperialism, can compel imperialism to reckon with the will of peoples.

Imperialism is not all-powerful today. The trend of developments around Cuba has confirmed that. The imperialists are compelled to reckon with the might of the socialist countries.

To preserve peace, to preserve the great gains of socialism, we are prepared to accept sensible political compromises and we are doing that, firmly abiding by the principles of Marxism-Leninism. We are following the injunctions of V. I. Lenin, who emphasised more than once that compromises in politics were possible and necessary.

"The task of a truly revolutionary party," Lenin wrote, "is not to proclaim rejection of all compromises possible but to be able to *carry through all compromises*, since they are inevitable, a loyalty to its principles, class, and revolutionary task. . . " (Works, Vol. 25, p. 282) He justly qualified the full negation of compromises as forgetfulness of the basic truths of Marxism. Lenin wrote: "To cook up a remedy or a general rule ('No compromises!') that would suit all occasions is rubbish and nonsense. One must have a head on one's shoulders to figure out each particular case. And therein, incidentally, lies the significance of Party organisation and Party leaders deserving the title, evolving, as the result of the long persevering, multifarious, comprehensive work of all thinking representatives of the class in question, the necessary knowledge and the necessary experience and also the necessary political sense —in addition to knowledge and experience—in order to solve intricate political issues quickly and correctly." (Works, Vol. 31, p. 50).

That was how Lenin put the matter. We, his pupils and followers, have acted and will act in the Leninist way, upholding Cuba's independence and world peace by a persevering, consistent and principled struggle.

Comrades Deputies, we may note with satisfaction that the unbreakable solidarity and efficacious cooperation of the forces of peace and socialism were demonstrated with particular force during those days of tension. The peoples of the world appraised our policy, the policy of the Soviet Government, as the most sober policy of peace.

The peoples of the world today treat our Party and Government with still greater confidence and respect.

In the hour of grim danger the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties and the peoples of the socialist countries declared staunch support for heroic Cuba and loyalty to the principles of proletarian internationalism. Many of the countries that have shaken off the colonial yoke, also raised their voices in Cuba's defence. The Soviet Government and the C.P.S.U. Central Committee received a host of addresses, letters and cables from heads of state, heads of government, party leaders of different countries and public organisations, factory workers, peasants and intellectuals of the Soviet Union and other countries, in which their authors expressed approval and resolute support for the Soviet Union's actions to protect Cuba and preserve peace.

Allow me, Comrades Deputies, to express on behalf of you and myself cordial gratitude to all who supported the Soviet Government in the actions it took to preserve peace and help revolutionary Cuba.

Only rabid militarists and infuriated revilers are dissatisfied that, as the upshot of a sober-minded policy, we have been able to avert a new world war, prevent an imperialist invasion of Cuba, and preserve peace for all the peoples.

There need be no doubt that the successful struggle to preserve Cuba's independence, the undeniable winning of this battle by the forces of peace, will make many people change their views of international developments and their estimation of the world's balance of forces. Now they will take a more realistic view of the danger of a nuclear catastrophe. At any rate, under the influence of the Cuban developments, millions of Americans acutely felt for the first time in U.S. history the real nearness of a thermonuclear war and realized that their national territory was not insured against crushing retaliation. During the crisis the American people felt the breath of a thermonuclear war scorch their very threshold. They have begun to realise that were a world war to break out it would be fought not somewhere beyond the oceans, in Europe or Asia, but all over, including the U.S., and would bring millions of Americans misery and death.

Among the multitude of letters and telegrams which the Soviet Government received from different countries at the time of the Cuban crisis, there were many from U.S. citizens. They showed anxiety over the destinies of peace, expressed their gratitude to the Soviet Government and approved of the moves we had taken to eliminate the tension in the Caribbean and thus prevent a thermonuclear war.

The mood of the American people and their attitude to the Cuban events are illustrated also by the fact that at the elections, which took place already after the effort to withdraw the main sting of the crisis had been successful, the American people blackballed some arch-aggressive politicians, firstly such a warmonger as Nixon. It is not for us to bemoan the fiasco of these gentlemen who hate peace and the freedom of the peoples.

The policy of peace won a great moral and political victory. Nevertheless, it is our duty to go on working tirelessly to preserve and consolidate peace. The situation is such that we must main-

tain unflagging vigilance and struggle indefatigably for a lasting peace on earth.

III

PERSISTENTLY SEARCH FOR WAYS AND MEANS OF ACHIEVING A PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF OUTSTANDING ISSUES

Comrades Deputies, the Soviet Government maintains that all the governments and nations of the world, all responsibility-bearing statesmen and political leaders must draw the necessary conclusions from the Caribbean crisis. More sobriety must be shown and there must be more of a desire to clear away the road-blocks that cause friction and create tension in relations between states.

Goodwill must be shown in the search for the kind of mutually acceptable decisions, upon which the lessening of international tension and the consolidation of world peace depend.

Two Priority Tasks

In all its activity in the field of foreign policy the Soviet Government vigorously strives to rid international relations of controversial and outstanding issues. In so doing, the Soviet Government takes into consideration the complex and multifarious character of the problems confronting different states, displays the self-control, and adheres to constructive views. At the same time we insistently emphasise that there are priority problems, the solution of which cannot be delayed because their outstanding nature extremely exacerbates the international situation.

One of these tasks is the problem of general and complete disarmament. The United Nations has unanimously supported the Soviet Government's initiative in this respect. Already some three years have gone by since the resolution on general and complete disarmament was adopted. And though committees, commissions and sub-committees gather almost incessantly, no headway has been made.

Does this imply that in taking part in these negotiations the Soviet Union, which put forward the all-inclusive plan for disarmament under strict international control, has made no moves towards its partners and has not sought to approximate views? Every honest-minded politician will say that this is not so.

No matter what it was—time-schedule for a disarmament programme, the abolition of the means of nuclear weapons delivery, the strength of conventional armed forces or many other things—we always took the position of the Western powers into account and strove to reach closer understanding. One of the aspects of general and complete disarmament is, as you know, the prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. In this respect again we took necessary moves towards an understanding. However, as diplomats say, no agreement can be reached if one partner moves, while the other marks time.

At the present moment, in the course of an exchange of opinions on a nuclear test ban, ways and means of solving issues have taken shape. There is hope that such an agreement will be signed, provided the U.S. and Britain display common sense.

We once again solemnly declare that the whole of our activity in the field of foreign policy will be subordinated to the aim of reaching an agreement on general and complete disarmament. We call on the Western powers to remove the remaining obstacles to an agreement to end all nuclear tests for all time to come. We call on them to sign a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

The urgency of the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and the normalisation of the situation in West Berlin on its basis has become even more obvious nowadays. It is indicative that when the Caribbean crisis broke out millions of Europeans thought with alarm about the fact that the unsettled German problem may bring mankind even more terrible trials. People realised more clearly that there is no going away from the solution of the German problem, for otherwise it will be too easy to jump from one international crisis to another, even more dangerous.

Here, too, as on the problem of general and complete disarmament, the Soviet Union strives to take into account the positions of its partners in the talks. What is it, then, that hampers the conclusion of the work begun on the liquidation of the vestiges of World War II in Europe?

The question still calling for argument concerns, mainly, the stay of troops in West Berlin, or to be more precise, the question, in what capacity and under what flag these troops will act and how long they will stay there. The Soviet Government proposes that the troops stationed in West Berlin should not represent NATO coun-

tries, that the NATO flag should be replaced in West Berlin by the flag of the United Nations and that the United Nations should assume certain international obligations and functions there.

It is to be hoped that our partners in the talks will show common sense and regard the Soviet Union's proposal with attention.

I only wish to point out the following: if any one in the West hopes that the Soviet Union will give up its determination to conclude a German peace treaty and normalise the situation in West Berlin on its basis, he is mistaken. We are in favour of talks with the Western powers but there is a limit to long patience. Even if the Western powers do not agree to sign such a treaty it will be signed.

Tension Must Be Relaxed and Conflicts Eliminated in All Regions of the World

The rendering of every possible assistance to the peoples waging a sacred struggle for their freedom, for strengthening their national independence was, and is, one of the main trends of the Soviet foreign policy.

Relying on the support of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp the national-liberation movement has been scoring world-wide victories.

A new Asia is rising, an Asia where the last fragments of the former colonial empires are being removed. The victorious march of the national-liberation movement in Africa continues. Latin America, an undivided domain of foreign monopolies in the recent past, has entered a new stage of her history, the stage of the struggle for genuine national independence.

The Declaration on Granting Independence to the Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted by the United Nations on the Soviet Union's initiative, has imparted new vigour to the national-liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

But the colonialists have not laid down their arms. By interfering in the home affairs of sovereign states they try, not infrequently resorting to force for this purpose, to undermine their independence and sovereign rights and place obstacles in the way of the revolutionary-liberation movement of the peoples. By their interference in the liberation struggle of the peoples the imperialist colonialists

have created hotbeds of tension, conflicts and military clashes in many parts of the world.

Look at what is going on in Yemen. For ages the Yemeni people had been enduring oppression, exploitation and lack of rights. A revolution took place in the country at last. As a plant in the desert, on receiving a drop of moisture, pushes its way to the surface, so the people are breaking through the wall of medievalism to a new life. And immediately the joint forces of imperialism and reaction fell upon these people. Who has taken up arms against the Yemeni revolution, against progress? Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

Of course, the rulers of Saudi Arabia and Jordan, who are themselves hanging by a thread, one may say, would not have dared to move troops against the Yemeni Republic had they not been impelled to do so by more powerful countries. Who helps the Saudese and Jordanians, who gives them arms and for what purpose? The peoples of the Arab East know well that it is precisely Britain and the United States, who call themselves "free countries," that place arms in the hands of the Saudese and Jordanians so as to make Arabs fire at Arabs.

This is how it happens that the so-called free world helps Saudi Arabia where slavery officially existed until recently, and where it exists still today. And this country is given arms to bring "freedom to Yemen." It is easy to imagine what kind of "freedom" Saudi Arabia is bringing to Yemen and what kind of "free countries" are helping her to do this!

The Soviet Government condemns the imperialist intrigues against the Yemeni Arab Republic and announces its profound respect for and support to the just national aspirations of the Yemeni people.

It is not in Yemen alone but in other regions of the world as well that the imperialists try to strangle the national-liberation movement. One only has to recall the events in the Congo, Angola, South Vietnam and South Korea. And now a rebellion has flared up in the protectorate of Brunei in Borneo, and the British colonialists are hurrying to suppress it.

We think that given desire and goodwill it is always possible to achieve a peaceful and just solution of disputed, controversial problems between states. It is only necessary that the wish to a peaceful settlement be shown not by one side alone but

by all states concerned, just as it happened when goodwill was shown by all states when settling the crisis in Laos.

Comrades Deputies,

Examining the current international situation one cannot ignore the deplorable events on the Indo-Chinese border. As is known, the border conflict began not a week or a month ago but back in 1959. It has grown particularly acute of late and assumed the form of military clashes which took a toll of thousands of lives on both sides.

The Soviet Union's position on the Indo-Chinese border conflict was outlined in the well-known TASS statement back in 1959. In that statement a hope was expressed that the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of India would not allow the forces, which do not wish a relaxation of international tension, to benefit by that border conflict and that both governments would settle the misunderstanding with due account for mutual interests in the spirit of traditional friendship between the peoples of China and India.

The Soviet Union expressed great regret over the incident. We sincerely hoped that the governments of the two countries would soon find a way to peaceful settlement of the dispute. We still regret that the sides did not use in time all possibilities for extinguishing the border conflict in the beginning.

We are particularly sorry that the blood of the sons of the fraternal People's Republic of China and the friendly Republic of India was spilled. It is the first time that a situation has arisen when a border conflict between a socialist country and a country pursuing the road of independent development and adhering to the policy of non-alignment with blocs has led to serious military clashes.

The Soviet people rejoiced and are rejoicing in the success of People's China which after the victorious revolution has attained great heights in peaceful economic construction and shown to the whole world what a people is capable of when it takes its destiny in its own hands. In her foreign policy People's China upholds the principles of peace, equality and friendly international cooperation. It is necessary at last to restore the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, it is time to restore to the People's Republic of China its ancient land, the island of Taiwan.

As far as India is concerned, the rate of her economic development after winning independence was slower than China's. However, India, too, whose social system differs from the socialist system of China, is developing from year to year ever more confidently in the economic and cultural spheres, overcoming the grave heritage of the age-old rule of the British colonialists. The policy of non-alignment with blocs, the neutralist policy of India has won great moral and political weight in the world.

People's China and India have shown other countries a good example of fraternal friendship by formulating and proclaiming in 1954 the well-known "five pinciples" of peaceful co-existence, or "pancha shila," as they are also called. For a number of years this policy yielded good fruit.

In the course of many centuries there were no military conflicts along the borders of China and India. Apparently, neither does the territory of this area constitute any great value for the life of man, judging by the fact that the density of the population there is negligible, although, as is known, China and India are very densely populated countries. It would seem that every patch of land there had to be inhabited by people. But the territory over which the argument has arisen is actually uninhabited.

And suddenly a border conflict, in which blood has been shed and in which the Chinese people and the Indian people have suffered great losses, has broken out between the People's Republic of China and India. This has grieved us very much.

War can begin with an accidental rifle shot. One accidental shot is fired, then come two retaliatory ones, and the two retaliatory ones are followed by three retaliatory shots. This is how wars begin sometimes. But it is not so easy even for statesmen grown wise with experience to end war

On the question of border arguments we adhere to the Leninist views. The Soviet Union's 45 years of experience tell us that there are no such disputes of a border nature that, given mutual desire, cannot be settled without using arms. The Soviet people appraise the events on the Chinese-Indian border precisely from these positions.

There are forces in the world, international imperialist circles, who rejoice over the aggravation of the Indo-Chinese conflict. They link far-reaching provocative plans with this. They hasten to offer supplies of arms so that the Indians and Chinese kill one another. The imperialist powers are prepared to loosen their purse-strings

and display "magnanimity," supply arms "free", as a "gift." For the imperialists this conflict is a godsend.

The armed clashes on the Indo-Chinese border have created a nutrient medium for harmful bacilli of nationalism and military fever. The chauvinistic slogan has been put to use: the bloodshed should be washed away with blood. But this actually means war to the victorious end. The logic of war is such: the more blood shed, the more blood is required to wash it away. Where is the limit? The Moloch of war will take the toll of ever larger numbers of lives. He is insatiable. Only reason can stop the bloodshed, and statesmen have to possess such reason.

That is why we consider reasonable the step taken by the Government of the People's Republic of China when it declared that it ceases fire in a unilateral manner and begins to withdraw the troops as from December 1. We are very glad of this and welcome these actions of the Chinese comrades.

It may be asked, how can you call this a reasonable step when it was taken after so many lives had been lost and so much bloodshed. Would it not have been better if the sides did not resort to hostilities altogether? Yes, of course, it would have been better. We have said this constantly and repeat it again now. But if we did not succeed in averting the course of events it is better to display courage now and stop the conflict. Is this not wisdom worthy of statesmen!

There may, of course, be people who will say: the People's Republic of China is now withdrawing its troops actually to the line on which this conflict began, would it not have been better not to move from the positions on which these troops stood at one time? These arguments are understandable, they show that people display concern and regret over what has happened.

But, comrades, there are people who try to interpret differently the decision taken by the Government of the People's Republic of China. They say: is this not a retreat? And the following question too is asked: is this not a concession on the part of the Chinese comrades? These questions are of course being asked, and they will probably be dragged out by pettifoggers in order to offend one or the other side, in order to fan hostility between India and China and make capital out of it.

We believe in the wisdom of the leaders of China and India and hope they will not succumb to such provocations and will ensure a reasonable settlement of the conflict.

Some say that China has stopped hostilities apparently because India began to receive support from the American and British imperialists who supply her with arms. Consequently, say these people, the People's Republic of China felt that should the military conflict develop further it could grow into a big war which would require even greater sacrifices.

Yes, evidently, the Chinese friends have taken this circumstance into account, and this again points to their wisdom and understanding of the fact that when war breaks out between friendly neighbouring peoples, the imperialists always try to benefit from it. The United States and Britain have an overproduction of arms and when a war breaks out they gladly supply them to other countries which are prepared to waive their national sovereignty in order to receive arms without understanding that they are thus putting their head in a noose and becoming dependent.

This is how the death merchants reason: why not, without losing anything ourselves, earn on a conflict, make a profit out of a situation where blood of the Indian people and Chinese people is being shed? Besides, this action is of advantage to the militarists, because it reverses the development of democratic principles in India and creates conditions for the strengthening of the positions of the reactionary forces in that country.

It is no accident that of late Communists and other progressive leaders have been arrested in India. Tomorrow, if the war continues, whoever speaks against war will be considered a Communist. Hence, pacifists will also fall under this category. Here you have violence of the reactionary forces, of the most brazen militarists and reactionaries.

The Chinese comrades, evidently, also had this in mind when they decided the question of a cease-fire and withdrawal of troops.

The steps of the Government of the People's Republic of China will unquestionably be duly appreciated by the peace-loving peoples. Indeed, why should there be a war? Did China ever set herself the aim of invading India? No, we reject such assertions as slander. And, naturally, we also absolutely do not admit the thought 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 do not at all consider that it has beaten a retreat of some kind. No, the Government of the People's Republic of China showed wisdom and correct understanding of the situation and exerted efforts to curb a military clash and to normalise the situation.

The fact that firing died out on the Indo-Chinese border confirms the fact that both sides have recognised that controversial issues must not be settled by military, but by peaceful means, at the round-table of negotiation. This is correct! The most difficult negotiations are better than war.

We fervently wish that the Great Powers—People's China and India—fully restore and strengthen their old, traditional friendship.

IV

TO LIVE IN PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP WITH OUR NEIGHBOURS

Comrades Deputies! I want to tell you shortly how the relations of the Soviet Union with neighbouring countries are developing. I have already spoken about the friendly, fraternal relations with the countries of the socialist camp. Naturally, the Soviet Union wants to have good relations with other neighbouring states too.

Things are going well in our relations with Finland. We highly assess the independent peace-loving policy of the Government of Finland, and the great contribution made in implementing this policy by the President of the Republic of Finland, our friend, Mr. Urho Kekkonen. We are certain that the Soviet Union's political, economic, trade and cultural relations with Finland will continue to develop and strengthen to the benefit of the peoples of both countries.

The Soviet Government highly appraises the friendly policy of the Afghan Government, headed by Prime Minister M. Daud. This year, we have had a very useful meeting with the King of Afghanistan, Mohammed Zahir Shah, which still further strengthened the good-neighbourly relations between our countries.

Certain changes for the better have appeared in the relations with Iran. Lately, we have succeeded in eliminating many of the things which interfered with the development of normal relations between the Soviet Union and Iran. We value the engagement of the Iranian Government not to grant any foreign state the right to have rocket bases of any type on the territory of Iran, and not to permit Iran to be turned into an instrument of aggression against the Soviet Union. It is true that not all the obstacles in the way to

a rapprochement between our countries have yet been abolished, but we hope that this good beginning will be further developed.

We want to live in friendship with the Turkish people and to do everything so that the Black Sea should not disunite but unite us. That would be useful both for the Soviet Union and for Turkey. The Turkish Government states that it wants to improve these relations. We hope that these statements will be reinforced by real steps and the relations between the USSR and Turkey will become friendly. The foundation for this exists, it was laid already by V. I. Lenin and Kemal Ataturk.

Our trade relations with Japan are developing not badly, but the radical question, the conclusion of a peace treaty, has not yet been settled. Everything shows that the Japanese Government is not yet sufficiently independent to settle this question. American troops are still stationed in Japan, and the Japanese people are waging a struggle for the complete independence of their country.

Another of our neighbours is Norway. Our common frontier is a small one, but we would like the relations between our countries to be inversely proportional to the length of the border. It must be said that the NATO bosses are doing their best to prevent Norway from pursuing a course for improvement in Soviet-Norwegian relations.

Comrades Deputies! I want to dwell in somewhat greater detail on the question of the relations between our country and the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia. You know, that the friendship of the peoples of our countries is rooted in the distant past.

During the Second World War the fraternal relations of the peoples of our two countries were cemented in blood in the struggle against the common enemy. The peoples of Yugoslavia, under the guidance of their Communist Party, headed by Comrade Tito, displayed wonders of heroism in the battles against the fascist invaders, they made a great contribution to the rout of Hitlerite Germany.

Unfortunately, the friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia were spoiled soon after the Second World War ended. I will not speak of the causes of the impairment of these relations. The Yugoslav comrades, as it is known, consider that the blame for this lies wholly with Stalin. Stalin in his time blamed the Yugoslavs for everything. We have our own definite opinion on this

subject. We have already said, and we repeat once again, that the main guilt for worsening Soviet-Yugoslav relations is, undoubtedly, borne by Stalin who permitted himself crude and absolutely unfounded arbitrariness towards Yugoslavia. But we would not be absolutely sincere were we not to say that the Yugoslav comrades also bear their share of the responsibility for the way in which the relations between our countries and our Parties developed in that period.

Such was the situation in the past. But we, Communists, must look ahead, we must see the future of our peoples.

At present, our relations with Yugoslavia are good. Comrade Tito accompanied by Comrades Rancovic, Veselinov and other statesmen are spending a holiday in our country, on our invitation, and are present here, in this hall. We welcomed them like friends, and have already had a number of useful talks with them, which have done very much for better mutual understanding. We see that the Yugoslav leaders, like ourselves, are making efforts to overcome the existing differences, to bring about an improvement in the relations with our country. I must say that it has been confirmed once again that on many international issues, on questions of inter-state and economic relations, we have a common understanding, common views. The Yugoslav leaders and we are profoundly convinced that the further development of the relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia is not only in the interests of our countries, it is also in the interests of strengthening all the forces fighting for peace, for democracy, for socialism and communism.

As for our position on the question of the development of relations with the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, it ensues wholly from the line determined by the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU. This is the line of strengthening unity between the CPSU and all fraternal parties, of consolidating all the forces of the anti-imperialist front.

In the past the Yugoslavs swore at us and we repaid them with the same coin. At present we and the Yugoslav Communists follow the road of improving our relations. It cannot be said that all the resentment and difficulties which existed in the relations between the CPSU and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia are over. There were and still are serious differences on a number of ideological questions which found a reflection in the programme of the LCY, as was noted in the Declaration of the Conference of the fraternal parties. But we on our part are prepared to do everything to overcome the differences.

This depends not only on us but on the position of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, of its leadership. We are convinced that the restoration and consolidation of unity between the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and all fraternal parties on ideological questions on the basis of principles of Marxism-Leninism would be in the interests of both our Parties, of the entire international communist movement.

We Communists must take into account the way the historical process is going on, the way the struggle for socialism in the different countries is developing in practice. Many countries in Europe and Asia have already embarked on the path of socialism. It is only natural that each Communist Party in these countries is seeking creatively to apply these principles of Marxism-Leninism to the specific historical, geographical and other conditions of its country and is exercising on this basis its leadership of the people in the building of socialism and communism. It is clear that there can be no complete coincidence in the interpretation of all questions arising before this or that Communist or Workers' Party in the struggle for the building of the new society. Different interpretations of concrete questions of socialist construction, different approaches to this or that question, cannot be ruled out. This is what actually happens in practice and will apparently continue to occur when other nations take up the path of socialism.

It would therefore be wrong to work out some stereotyped pattern and adhere to it in the relations with the other socialist countries, it would be a mistake to condemn as renegades all those who do not fit into this pattern. Well, then, must we in such cases demand the total expulsion of such a Communist Party from the ranks of our movement? Can the fact be ignored that the people of that country are building socialism? Or are we to close our eyes to the very existence of this nation, to fight against it? To act in this way would be to take over the beastly laws of the capitalist world and apply them to the relations between the Communist Parties and the socialist countries.

But this is precisely the kind of beastly morality which the Albanian sectarians and splitters are urging us to adhere to in our relations with Yugoslavia. They are prepared literally to strangle Yugoslav Communists for their mistakes, although they themselves are now retreating much farther from Marxism-Leninism than those whom they accuse. We Communists are deeply alien to such morals. We are fighting for a better future for humanity, for communism, under which a true brotherhood of the

peoples of the entire globe will be established. We are deeply convinced that with the complete victory of communism, in the future, as V. I. Lenin taught us, there will be no state boundaries at all which now divide the nations, the national isolations will wither away, and the nations will merge into a single family, like brothers.

On the way to this cherished aim we must do everything possible to resolve differences if they arise between Communists of different countries. It is our duty to help a Party that has made mistakes or deflected from the norms of the international revolutionary working class movement, from Marxism-Leninism, to understand its mistakes and correct them, so that it may assume a worthy place in the family of all fraternal parties.

It must be said that the steps recently taken by the Yugoslav communists, by their leaders, in both domestic and foreign policy, have removed very much of what we had considered erroneous and injurious to the building of socialism in Yugoslavia. This has found a reflection in a number of decisions of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, in the speeches of Comrades Tito, Rancovic and other Yugoslav leaders. But if we do not yet have a common understanding of some questions, it does not at all mean that we must build our relations on the basis of the remaining differences, that we must close our eyes to the steps taken by the Yugoslav communists towards a rapprochement and unity with the entire world communist movement. This would be a policy aimed at disunity rather than unity. And it would be still more incorrect to apply the still existing differences to inter-state relations. On the contrary, the consolidation and development of economic contacts, of relations along state and public lines, between our countries provide the ground for bringing our positions nearer on ideological questions too.

The Albanian sectarians and dogmatists are doing everything in their power to prevent an improvement of relations between the socialist countries and Yugoslavia. They have raised a howl particularly now that Comrades Tito, Rancovic, Veselinov and other Yugoslav leaders have come to the USSR. The Albanian splitters clearly dislike the fact that we are meeting the Yugoslav comrades in a fraternal manner.

We are being told that it is prejudicial to have good relations with Yugoslavia along state lines and in the economic field so long as certain ideological differences with the LCY remain. And this is said by people calling themselves Marxist-Leninists! But this is

simply silly. Even the imperialists seek to overcome and smooth over their differences in order to survive in the struggle against the advancing forces of the communist, workers' and national-liberation movements. At present they are feverishly strengthening and broadening the union of the Common Market countries despite the differences between its member-states. Yet, in our camp there are people who want to disunite our forces. This is not our, not a Marxist-Leninist, policy.

There are some who assert that Yugoslavia is not a socialist country. May we be allowed to ask what kind of a country it is? In replying to this question it is necessary to proceed from the Marxist-Leninist teaching, from an objective analysis of the social development of the country, of the nature of its socio-political system. Here subjectivism is impermissible. One should not think that some people can, Buddha-like and in defiance of facts, pronounce truths and decide which country is socialist and which is not. In this case a knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory, a deep analysis of reality, is required.

It is known that for a long time there have been no landlords or capitalists in Yugoslavia, no private capital, no private enterprises, no landlord estates, no private banks. We see also that the Yugoslav Communists and their leaders are directing their efforts towards development of the economy, towards consolidation of the socialist gains. Hence, if we proceed from the objective laws, from the teaching of Marxism-Leninism, we cannot deny that Yugoslavia is a socialist country. This is what we are proceeding from in our policy and build up our relations with Yugoslavia as with a socialist country. Today, there are grounds for a further development of relations between our countries.

The Soviet Union, true to its policy of friendship with all nations, is doing and will continue to do everything to consolidate the unity of forces fighting for peace and social progress. And if this policy of ours is being subjected to onslaughts from certain people, this only shows that these people fail to display a genuine interest in the consolidation of the ranks of the communist movement, in the rallying of all our forces.

Lately the leaders of the Albanian Party of Labour have stepped beyond all bounds in their malicious attacks on the CPSU, on the entire world communist movement. In their attempts to slander the Leninist course of the 20th Congress of our Party the Albanian leaders are trying by all means to revive the Stalin personality cult.

They are urging a restoration of the unhealthy atmosphere which existed in the communist movement under the conditions of the personality cult.

Our Party has subjected to determined and sharp criticism the mistakes and abuses committed by Stalin, although it does not deny his services to the Party and the communist movement. We have done this not only in the name of the historical truth but also in order to create all necessary guarantees against a recurrence of anything like it in the future, against a recurrence of phenomena alien to Leninism, the danger of which V. I. Lenin pointed out in his time.

We have done this not only in the interests of our Party and our people but also in the interests of the entire world communist movement, in the name of the struggle for the victory of socialism the world over. Our Party was confident that other Marxists-Leninists too will draw the necessary lessons from the experience of the struggle of the CPSU against the personality cult and its harmful effects.

And we were not mistaken. The Leninist course of the 20th Congress of our Party has been approved by all Marxist-Leninist Parties. It has helped to work out a common line of policy by the world communist movement conforming to the present-day tasks in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism.

Now the Albanian leaders are holding on to what was precisely the most negative part of Stalin's activity, what constituted his retreat from Marxism-Leninism. What attracts them most is the methods of repressions and crude administrative pressure practised by Stalin and alien to the very spirit of a socialist state. They want, if you please, to become the mainstays of the international communist movement, the infallible defenders of Marxism-Leninism. But they resemble the proverbial frog. You remember the fable of the frog which wanted to be as big as an ox. We all know how it ended: the frog burst, and a wet patch was all that was left of it.

The anti-Leninist ideology of the personality cult lies at the basis of the whole of the present fallacious policy of the Albanian leaders. They are doing their best to maintain a situation in Albania, in which it is possible to violate, uncontrollably and with impunity, all the standards of Party and state life in their personal interests. Hoxha and Shehu know that they would not remain in power if they were to relax the regime of repressions and violence. The people would not tolerate their leadership, for their hands are

stained with the blood of the best sons of the Albanian Party of Labour.

The Albanian leaders have broken with Marxism-Leninism, they are floundering ever deeper in the bog of leftist opportunism, splitting tactics and sectarianism. The leaders of the Albanian Party of Labour have turned their anti-Leninist conceptions into the state policy of their country. They are pursuing an isolated, adventurist foreign policy, refusing to cooperate in the international arena with the other countries of socialism, interfering in every possible way with the efforts of the latter directed towards the consolidation of peace and relaxation of international tension.

It is known that the Statement of the Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties, made in 1960, points out that the chief danger in the world communist movement is revisionism, it also indicates the need to wage a resolute struggle against leftist opportunism, against sectarianism, and dogmatism. We still consider these theses correct today. Our Party has waged and will wage a struggle against revisionism, and against dogmatism and sectarianism. The Meeting of the fraternal Parties uttered a warning that sectarianism and dogmatism, if a consistent struggle is not waged against them, can become the main danger at one or another stage in the development of some parties.

The events which have occurred in the communist movement since the Statement of the fraternal Parties was adopted, have shown the full perspicacity of this conclusion.

Some people, repeating the correct theses of the Statement of the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, accent one-sidedly only the danger from revisionism, and mention Yugoslav revisionism in place and out of place. But one must look at things concretely. In the crisis concerning Cuba, which we have just lived through, the Yugoslav Communists took a correct position, while the dogmatists who claim to be genuine Marxists-Leninists, took a provocative stand. It follows, therefore, that a thesis once recorded cannot be repeated without a Marxist analysis, or interpreted one-sidedly. The Cuban crisis exactly showed that the chief danger came from those who have held and hold positions of dogmatism.

The modern leftist opportunists and sectarians, of whom the Albanian leaders are the most open spokesmen, cover by noisy pseudo-revolutionary phrases their struggle against the Leninist

policy of peace and peaceful coexistence. As it has already been said, they have slipped down to Trotskyite positions. It is not hard to see that such a policy undermines the unity of the forces coming out against imperialism, that it plays into the hands of the most aggressive imperialist circles of the Western powers, encouraging their anti-communist designs.

This leftist, dogmatist policy was appropriately assessed at the Congresses of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Italy. In their speeches at these congresses, the representatives of the fraternal Parties exposed and sharply censured this provocative policy.

If we scratch the leftist-shouters, dogmatists well, we can easily see that at the base of their vaunted courage there lies nothing but fear of imperialism, disbelief in the possibility of defeating the capitalist system in peaceful economic competition. This is just that characteristic feature of petty bourgeois instability and wavering which was so mercilessly exposed and ridiculed by V. I. Lenin. He openly told such shouters: "You are an instrument of imperialist provocation, by your own objective role. While your subjective 'psychology' is the psychology of the raving petty bourgeois who swaggers and boasts, but well understands that the proletarian is *right* . . . " (Col. Works, vol. 27, p. 297.) How sharp and apt the words of Vladimir Ilyich were! It was as if he had in mind the present shouters in Albania.

Forty years ago V. I. Lenin penetratingly pointed to the serious danger which left-wing opportunism presented to the Communist movement. He said that if leftist doctrinairism in that period could be called an 'infantile disorder" in Communism, it was only because it was a very young, budding trend.

The cult of Stalin's personality had, as one of its negative effects in the international Communist movement, the spread of left-sectarian, dogmatic views, which seriously harmed the great cause of the struggle for socialism, weakened the influence of Marxism-Leninism on broad masses of the people. As V. I. Lenin warned, underestimation of the struggle against left-wing opportunism resulted in the disorder becoming neglected, ceasing to be infantile long ago. The peculiarities of the development of the Communist movement in our time, when the peoples of countries with most diverse levels of economic and social development are taking the road of socialism, create favourable conditions for the spread of left-wing Communism. It has always found a foothold in

the instability of representatives of the petty bourgeoisie, in their jumping from one extreme to another.

The left-sectarian disorder is nourished by nationalism and nourishes nationalism in its turn. It becomes intolerable when it is manifested in the activities of a ruling party, on the policy of which the destinies of the people depend to a large degree. It becomes dangerous since it is directed against the policy of the Communist movement on such vital problems as those of war and peace, which affect the destinies of all mankind.

It cannot be denied that due to all these causes left-wing opportunism, dogmatism and sectarianism are more and more becoming a serious danger in the world communist movement. Not to see this means to be afraid to face the facts, it means to turn away from reality and fail to realise the responsibility borne by Marxists-Leninists in our time.

Soviet Communists, who prize the unity of the ranks of the world Communist movement above everything else, shall wage a resolute struggle against both right-wing opportunism and left-wing opportunism, which is not less dangerous today than revisionism.

* * *

Comrades Deputies,

Let us glance, mentally, over our planet. Not only from the height of outer space, but also from here, from the terra firma, a beautiful and inspiring picture opens up before us. Mankind is marching to progress in mighty strides. The foundations of the old world, the world of oppression, lies and injustice are cracking and crumbling. The new world is gaining in strength with every year, signifying the spring of mankind.

The peoples of the socialist community of states are constantly multiplying their successes in the building of a new life. The peaceful labour of our peoples, their victories in science and culture, their fraternity and mutual assistance serve as an inspiring example for millions of people who have cast off the chains of colonial oppression or who are still fighting for national liberation, for the working people of the capitalist countries. Truly a great purifying storm is thundering over the globe.

The Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence is the general line of the foreign policy of our country, it is the banner of all the

socialist states and a cherished goal of all the peoples. May reason triumph over recklessness, may the method of negotiation for settling disputed problems of international life replace for ever the dangerous method of "trial of strength"! People of the earth can and must acquire, at long last, peace of mind and stop fearing that tomorrow can bring a thermonuclear conflict to them. Mankind wants to build its future not on rubble, not on smouldering ruins, but on the material foundation which has already been created by the labour of many generations.

That is why we call upon the peoples further to intensify 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.

The Soviet Union is compelled, of course, to take into consideration the real state of things, the policy of the Western powers; especially in the military field. As long as the bellicose quarters in the West are putting up obstacles to agreement on general and complete disarmament, as long as sabre-rattling is heard and the arms race is continued there, we Soviet people must keep our powder dry, take care about strengthening our defence capacity and be prepared to give a crushing rebuff to any aggressor who might disturb our peaceful labour. We have everything, and in full supply, to defend ourselves and our friends against aggressive encroachments of the imperialists.

At the prime of its strength, arousing the respect of the working people of all lands, our country is marching confidently towards its future, which belongs to communism. Let us not spare efforts and energy for the achievement of this radiant goal !

(N. S. Khrushchov's speech was punctuated with applause.)

İSTANBUL İSLAM ARŞİVİ
Date.....