

Regular news of Soviet achievements is published in

SOVIET WEEKLY

Illustrated

Thursday 3d.



Authentic, well-written articles on Soviet industry, agriculture, sport, international relations, and other aspects of Soviet life and work, can be found within its well-illustrated pages.



Subscription rates: 3s. 3d., 3 months; 6s. 6d., 6 months;

13s. 0d., 12 months.

from newsagents, or post free from

"SOVIET WEEKLY",

3 ROSARY GARDENS, LONDON, S.W.7

Expose the Manœuvres of Reaction

Speech by

N. S.

KHRUSHCHOV

**at the All-Union Conference
of Communist Work Teams
and Shockworkers
Moscow, May 28, 1960**

★ **Summit Wrecked by
U.S.A.**

★ **Upsurge in Soviet
Economy**

Soviet
Booklet
No. 74

6^{d.}

Scanned / Transcribed by
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus – London Bureaux

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/intro.htm>

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/english/home/index.php>



EXPOSE THE MANŒUVRES OF REACTION

Speech by
N. S. KHRUSHCHOV
at the All-Union Conference of
Communist Work Teams and
Shockworkers

Moscow, May 28, 1960

Expose the Manœuvres of Reaction

Speech by NIKITA KHRUSHCHOV at the
All-Union Conference of Communist Work
Teams and Shockworkers

May 28, 1960

Nikita Khrushchov made this speech in the Kremlin at a conference of the Communist work movement. More than 2,000 people had met at the conference to pool the experience gained in working in this great movement, already more than five million strong, which is guided by the principle of a conscientious Communist attitude to work and life.

Worthy Followers of Great Beginning

DEAR COMRADES,—It is a great pleasure for me to speak to you, who are taking part in the All-Union Conference of leaders in emulation for the title of Communist work teams and shockworkers, and to greet you on behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government. Permit me to wish you—and, through you, the entire multi-millioned army of leaders in industry, construction, transport and agriculture—to wish you success in your work for the good of the Soviet country, for the building of Communism !

You are the foremost people of our society. By your work and example in everyday life you are starting a new chapter in the fulfilment of the great destiny of Soviet man—the builder of a Communist society. In the short time this remarkable movement has existed, the leaders in the emulation drive for the title of Communist work teams and shockworkers have richly earned their widespread reputation and the deep respect and affection of the whole Soviet people. Inspired by your own work, dear friends, you are bringing nearer the triumph of Communism. By your fine example you are leading millions upon millions of the Soviet people along the road to our great goal.

Remember how highly Vladimir Lenin valued the first Communist Subbotniks.* He saw in them the shoots of the new elements, Communist elements, which were at last to take their place as the major

* Subbotniks—voluntary work done in spare time, to help forward the development of Socialist society.—Ed.

trend in the life of the workers of our Soviet Socialist society. Today everybody can see these new elements, Communist elements entering the life of our country, the life of the Soviet people, through this sweeping emulation drive for the title of Communist work teams and factories.

It is a very remarkable thing that this new movement started at the Moscow marshalling yards, the very station at which this country's first Communist Subbotnik, called "the great beginning" by Vladimir Lenin, took place.

In that modest initiative of rank-and-file Communist workers, Lenin's clear vision saw the beginning of a change which was more fundamental and more decisive than the overthrow of the bourgeoisie.

It was, Lenin said, the triumph over one's own hidebound conservatism, over the old habits and concepts which cursed capitalism had left the workers and peasants as its legacy. Lenin taught that as this change in the minds of men spread and gained ground, so our Communist cause would become more and more invincible. He called for the careful cherishing of the tiniest sprouts of a new attitude to work and to one's responsibilities to the community. The Leninist party has always done this, and will continue to do so. It has made work a matter of honour and glory. And now, in this sweeping emulation drive for the title of Communist work groups and teams of shock workers, we observe Lenin's forecast—"We shall see the triumph of Communist work!"—coming true.

It is by our day-to-day effort that we are translating Lenin's prophetic words into reality. The thing which distinguishes the workers of Communist society is a keen sense of civic duty, appreciation of the significance of their work and of their contribution to the common cause of building Communism. They are also distinguished by a high standard of culture and a thirst for more knowledge—a good kind of human restlessness, typical of the man of constructive work. And this is very pleasant, Comrades! The people of a Communist society must indeed have a very high level of understanding, education and culture, they must be people to whom work is a vital necessity, as is the acquisition of new knowledge, the raising of their cultural standards and adherence to the standards of behaviour of a Communist society.

That is the kind of people and the kind of society that mankind's greatest thinkers have dreamed about. That is the kind of man Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific Communism, and Vladimir Lenin, our immortal leader and teacher, saw in their mind's eye.

"... As we start carrying through Socialist transformations,"

Vladimir Lenin said, "we must set before ourselves the clear objective which these transformations are eventually designed to achieve—that is, the objective of creating a Communist society."

Lenin called for the tireless tending of the simple, humble, ordinary yet living shoots of Communism.

That precisely is what you specify in your pledges—or, as you solemnly call them, principles: "Let us study, live and work in a

Communist manner!" This is a high aspiration, in keeping with the times in which we live!

The 21st Congress of our Party marked our country's entry into the era of the full-scale building of Communist society. We are concentrating all our forces on the fulfilment of the great Seven-Year Plan. Under this plan, new factories, mills and power stations, new towns and villages are being built. The fulfilment of the Seven-Year Plan will strengthen still further the industrial potential of Soviet power. The Soviet people will live still better, science and culture will achieve still greater heights. Even if a man moves into a new flat, he tries to leave behind everything out of date and not to take any useless things with him. And here a whole society is gradually rising to a higher level. It is only natural that the foremost people in this society are trying ahead of time to develop those qualities, characteristics, habits which they will need in the new house. In this lies the great strength and great historical value of this movement, the representatives and initiators of which you are.

In this hall only a small proportion of the leading people of our time are present. Among those here are men and women well known in our country: miners Nikolai Mamai and Alexander Kolchik, and weaver Valentina Gaganova. They are, so to say, the standard-bearers. More and more shockworkers of Communist labour are rallying behind these glorious banners. They are Alexander Vitashkevich, Anatoly Morogov, Said Nuritdinov and many other comrades who have honoured their country by their outstanding work exploits. More than 2,000 have come here to take part in the conference. They are the cream, the pride of our tremendous army of the leaders of our time, working in industry, transport and agriculture, in all kind of offices and laboratories, in scientific research institutes. A tremendous army working heroically and devotedly to create with their work what is called Communism.

I am happy to see in this hall many young people. This is only to be expected. Our Leninist Young Communist League, initiator of the emulation of Communist work teams, has written another glorious page in its heroic history. Once again it has proved a loyal and reliable helper to our great Communist Party, and a fiery champion of its ideas.

"Communism is the youth of the world,

"And it is the young people who will build it!"

Those, I believe, are the words of your Komsomol* song. Well, we of the older generation also enjoy singing that song. We are happy and proud to see around us young people, champions, young forces. This means that we are not living in vain and the future belongs to Communism!

Dear Comrades, members of Communist work teams can correctly be called the pioneers of the future. Pioneers, as you know, march in

* Young Communist League.—Ed.

the van, blazing the trail for the main forces. But they must not lose contact with those forces, must not try to act in isolation from the other workers.

It would not be much to your credit if you didn't look beyond your teams : if you said : " We are clean, we are good, and we don't care about the others."

The Party, the people, regard you as innovators, because everything that you have achieved so far, all the successes you have yet made, you seek to pass on to others tomorrow. Therein lies your strength, therein lies your glory and if it should happen that today's pupils become the teachers tomorrow—well, that will be all the better. For our common cause will gain by it—we will all gain !

I should like to stress that remarkable initiative born among you, following the example set by Valentina Gaganova : the joining of backward teams by experienced foremen and gifted organisers so as to raise them to the level of leading teams.

Not much time has passed since those comrades went over to other teams which used to be backward—and now those teams carry the high title of Communist work teams.

Why did the Party support so enthusiastically this noble undertaking, born in the first year of our Seven-Year Plan period ? Because, Comrades, one team, one factory, one collective farm, one State farm or one district alone cannot attain Communism. It is only by joint efforts in a broad front of nation-wide struggle that we shall be able to attain the peaks of Communism. It is the duty of Party, Government, trade union and Komsomol organisations always to bear this in mind and to organise the masses of the people to accomplish the tasks of the Seven-Year Plan.

Two Positions on the Eve of the Paris Meeting

Dear Comrades, you are undoubtedly interested in international events, especially the events of recent weeks. Usually when we return from a trip to other countries we have given Muscovites an account of it on the same or the next day. This time, knowing in advance of your conference, we decided to postpone this report. We also took into consideration the fact that on my way from Paris to Moscow, I had in Berlin addressed our German friends from the German Democratic Republic. In that speech, I summed up some of the results and gave some views on the future, in relation to the wrecking of the Heads of Government conference in Paris by the United States of America. You clearly read that speech.

Several days have already passed since the trip to Paris. The Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet Government would like to state their appreciation and assessment of the wrecking of the Summit meeting in Paris, as a result of the treacherous intrusion of an American plane within the borders of the Soviet Union. And not only as a result of the intrusion of a plane—sometimes frontier

violations may be accidental. In this case, however, the intrusion was no accident. When it had taken place, American officials, including the President, declared that the intrusion was in line with the policy followed by the United States.

More than that, it was stated that such flights had been and would be carried out in the future, because, so they alleged, they were necessary to ensure the security of the U.S.

Such is the gross arbitrariness, the arrogance of American officials, of the President of the United States !

That incident now holds—and quite correctly—the attention of the peoples of all countries, although the wrecking of the Summit conference is explained in different ways by different persons. The majority of the political and public leaders and statesmen understand correctly who was guilty of torpedoing the conference. That does not call for any special perspicacity.

It was not a Soviet but an American plane that crossed a frontier and penetrated into another country. It violated the sovereignty of the countries over which it flew, and intruded into our country as an aggressor. We shot down this plane, and we have material evidence of the aggression. More than that, we might say that we have living evidence, in the person of Powers, the spy pilot. No soberminded person, therefore, needs to strain his brains to understand how matters stand ; it is enough to call a spade a spade and everything becomes clear.

But we must take into consideration the fact that we live in a period of tense struggle between two social systems, in the period of the sharpening of the class struggle in the camp of imperialism. This is why some leaders have found themselves in a rather embarrassing position. They cannot but recognise that a country must not violate the sovereignty of another country, that international law prohibits intrusion within the boundaries of another country, but they are unwilling to admit this, they are unwilling to offend the offenders.

The act of aggression was committed by the United States of America, but the United States is not used to being rebuked by anyone, not used to being called to account. This is how it happens that different points of view can be held on one and the same phenomenon, and acts of aggression get what might be called dual evaluation.

If an act of aggression is directed against a Socialist country then, it appears, it is not aggression at all. You can, it seems, even go into raptures over it. But if some action hurts an imperialist country, although this may be a legitimate action, then that is something to get angry and protest about. This is the kind of reasoning applied by those men who work on the principle : the law can be twisted in any direction you like.

But, gentlemen, you can go a very long way indeed if you follow that line ! We know very well that capitalist law justified the robbing of the poor by the rich and many other wrongs, but still there must be some standards of international law in our day, when two social

systems exist. Such standards are necessary in order to rule out errors in international relations which might well prove fatal.

It is on the basis of the standards of international law that sovereignty and national frontiers are defined ; it is for other nations to respect them. A nation is free to promulgate and enforce its law only within its own frontiers. It must respect, not break international law. For otherwise the result will, of course, be an inevitable war, a disastrous war. Whenever elementary international principles—principles which guard national frontiers and deter aggressors from crossing them—are flagrantly flouted the situation in the world becomes heated. This is what has happened now, through the fault of the Government of the United States of America.

The Government of the United States is responsible to the whole world for this act of treachery, for having ordered its pilot to intrude into the Soviet Union and thus violate the standards of international law. The curbing of aggressive circles will help ease the international situation ; encouragement of aggressors may lead to war.

Now I should like to tell you how the Government and peoples of the Soviet Union prepared for the Summit conference and what attitude the Government of the United States of America adopted.

We prepared for the Heads of Government conference with open hearts, realising that the peaceloving people of all nations placed great hopes in it. We understand that with the present development of military techniques, a new war would cause untold suffering to all nations and would be nothing short of a catastrophe for some of them.

This was why we prepared for the Summit meeting in Paris very earnestly while consistently pursuing our policy of peace. This has been amply proved by many objective factors.

The whole world knows that we have drawn up and are successfully carrying out a Seven-Year Plan. Our Seven-Year Plan is a great plan of peaceful construction. By carrying it out we are further advancing the economy of the Soviet Union and its basis, heavy industry ; and we are steadily raising the living standards and material wellbeing of the peoples of our country.

It is true that some blind men from among the bourgeois political leaders are inventing all kinds of stories, alleging that we are having difficulty in fulfilling our Seven-Year Plan. It is, however, well known that the mole is called a blind mole because he never sees the sun. And, of course, it is not for him to judge how bright and pleasant are the rays of the sun. He doesn't and cannot understand it. But in spite of that the sun goes on shining just the same.

Such defenders and hangers-on of capitalism could be told : “ The greater your hope that the Seven-Year Plan will not be fulfilled, the more bitter will be the pill you will have to swallow when the time comes, and early fulfilment of the Seven-Year Plan is announced ; and that time is not at all distant ! Remember that and, as the saying goes,

put it in your pipe and smoke it ! You will have this pill to swallow, so get ready for it in good time ! ”

The peaceful aspirations of the Soviet Union are also shown by the fact, universally known, that it was precisely the Soviet Government that submitted a programme for general and complete disarmament to the United Nations and was the first to start carrying that programme out. The Soviet Union has unilaterally reduced its armed forces by a third. It is clear to everyone that no State would reduce its armed forces if it intended to solve its disputes by means of war.

Recently we held a session of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet and took important decisions on the abolition of taxes levied on factory and office workers and on the completion in 1960 of the transition to a seven-or-six-hour working day.* This, too, is a major act for strengthening peace. It is the diametrical opposite to what is done in the capitalist countries by the men who set their course toward war.

It is obvious that war always calls for sacrifices. The arms race places a heavy burden on the shoulders of the peoples. It is accompanied by an increase in the taxes levied on the wages of factory and office workers.

This is precisely the picture we observe in the imperialist world. Immediately after the collapse of the Paris conference, the arms race advocates in the United States launched a broad campaign for an increase in military appropriations, in expenditures on armaments. Where can you get the money for these purposes ? Everyone realises that it is not the monopolists who will increase their contributions to the military expenditures. This latest fit of war hysteria and arms race—now as in the past—entails an onslaught by the monopolists on the living standards of America's factory and office workers.

The decisions on the abolition of taxes levied on factory and office workers, and on the reduction of the working day, are the best evidence of, the best testimonial to, the activity of the Soviet Government and the Communist Party in the peaceful development of our State.

All the measures we take, all our actions attest, therefore, to the Soviet Union's consistently peaceful policy. On a number of questions which await settlement—the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and the question of making West Berlin a free city, for instance—we have been in no hurry to take unilateral measures. All the world's honest people can see in our policy the sincere desire for peace and security of the peoples.

Now let us see how our partners, and above all the United States of America, prepared for this conference.

When, in the United States, I met and exchanged views with President Eisenhower and other American statesmen, I gained the impression that President Eisenhower really wanted peace and an improvement in the international climate. I must say that I still believe that now, too, the President himself wants peace. It seems, however, that the good

* 41- or 36-hour week.—Ed.

intentions of the President are one thing and the foreign policy of the American Government something else again. It is not said for nothing that the way to hell is paved with good intentions. And that is where Eisenhower will end.

In the United States of America the position of the President is a complicated one. While we were still at Camp David,* I told President Eisenhower that my position differed from his because in our country the Government, the Party, the people, the entire country, were of one opinion—that is, for a policy of easing international tension, ending the cold war, and creating the conditions for lasting peace. As for the President of the United States, the men who hinder the achievement of peaceful intentions loom behind him.

At the meeting in Moscow, upon my return from the United States, I declared again that there were forces in the U.S. which favoured continuing the cold war and the arms race, and that one should not be in a hurry to give a final answer to the question whether the victory would be with these forces or with those who stand for easing of international tension.

But, as now, we have always wanted an easing of international tension, and we have been working and will continue to work in that direction, in spite of the breakdown of the Summit conference.

Our trip to the United States and the other events of the past year have shown that all peoples of the world, including the American people, not only believe in peaceful co-existence but also strive for the ending of the cold war, for establishing normal relations among States. This frightened the American militarists and monopolists who line their pockets from the arms race. Sensing a threat to their positions, they began preparing to wreck the Summit conference, they again began aggravating the international situation.

Apparently, in the United States, an internal struggle developed around the further line of American foreign policy, and this struggle made itself felt in different spheres.

On the question of banning nuclear weapon tests, for instance, the American Government has been wavering all the time. At one moment, under the pressure of world opinion, it would take steps which seemed to facilitate agreement ; but then it would again throw a spanner into the works, in accordance with the demands of aggressively minded circles.

On May 7, that is on the eve of the Summit conference, President Eisenhower declared that the United States intended to resume underground nuclear tests.

I stress that this was done only eight days before our planned meeting in Paris.

We could not help pricking up our ears at the speeches made on the eve of the conference by Herter, Dillon and then by Nixon. They were unreasonable, provocative speeches. If they were made with the

idea of bringing pressure to bear on us, that pressure was, of course, doomed to failure, because the Soviet Government and the Soviet people do not yield to pressure. We always reciprocate good will, but to all pressure we offer a firm rebuff. And we have sufficient possibility of doing so.

The speeches made by Herter, Dillon and Nixon were, you might say, the overture. Above all, we were amazed, and I can say grieved, by the fact that, at his Press conference, the President of the United States endorsed these provocative pronouncements. He declared outright that they expressed the foreign policy of the United States.

At the same time, the West German Government stepped up its backstage activities, doing everything it could to prevent the Summit conference from being held, or to render it abortive. Adenauer went to Washington, Paris, Rome, Tokyo and London. Generally speaking, visits by statesmen to other countries are a good thing, if they are undertaken to strengthen peace. But when “a demon of sorrow, a spirit of banishment”* in the shape of Chancellor Adenauer, is rushing from one capital to another, that augurs no good ; that doesn't augur the easing of international tension, but the sharpening of the cold war. We were also concerned about this, before the meeting in Paris.

But the actual intentions of ruling circles in the United States became particularly clear when they staged two flagrant military provocations, one after another. On April 9 they sent a military spy-plane over our country. The plane returned to its base. This encouraged them to become even more arrogant. Then they decided to undertake another aggressive intrusion into the Soviet Union, choosing for this purpose May Day, the holiday of international working-class solidarity. In addition to other things, their objective was to insult the Soviet people, to deal a blow at the prestige of the Soviet Union.

The whole world is now well aware of the facts relating to the intrusion of the American plane over our country. I recall them only to show how treacherous and hypocritical was the behaviour of the United States Government, even after we announced that the American plane had been shot down.

Cornered by irrefutable facts and material evidence, the American authorities had to make an admission, but they made it in a way characteristic of brazen aggressors, who do not possess even the smallest traces of normal human ethics. They declared that they had sent the plane for intelligence purposes, that they were accustomed to flying over Soviet territory and would continue to do so, because they needed such flights, they alleged, to ensure the national security of the United States. Further, they declared that it was not the United States that was responsible for its planes flying over the Soviet Union, but the Soviet Union itself, because it does not permit American military

* Where Khrushchov and Eisenhower held their main talks in the U.S.—Ed.

* Quoted from a poem by Lermontov.—Ed.

planes to fly over Soviet territory and does not supply the United States Intelligence Service with espionage information.

So we have here an identical case to the one in the well-known folk story of the thief who broke into a house : " Ignat is not to blame because the village has many huts, the hut is to blame for letting Ignat in."

We seriously considered the situation then existing, and nevertheless resolved to do nothing that would prevent the President of the United States from getting out of the embarrassing predicament in which he had landed. We even expressed the view that the President of the United States hardly knew or approved of such actions and that, evidently, the hotheads from the Pentagon and that professional spy Allen Dulles were to blame.

But Eisenhower did not take advantage of the opportunity granted him, but declared that the spy flights had been approved by him and made with his knowledge.

I still believe that the President did not know of those flights, but as President it was embarrassing to admit that he did not know about it, that he did not know what was going on in his country. Because otherwise the people of America and the whole world would think : " What kind of President is this, if American spy-planes fly over foreign countries without his knowledge ? " If that is so, war might break out without the President's knowledge, and the Americans would have to pay the price with their blood.

But that is just my opinion. The President might not agree with it. However, the Americans themselves say that their President has two duties : one playing golf and the other being President. Which is his principal duty ? His principal duty is, perhaps, playing golf, while being President is subsidiary.

The legitimate question arose here : With whom are we dealing ? What kind of country is the United States of America which, living amid other States, refuses to be guided by the generally accepted international standards ? For we are now living in a time of peace and all people are striving to live with one another as good neighbours.

Only an aggressive State can openly refuse to recognise any standards of conduct in its relations with other countries, and doesn't want to develop normal relations with them.

This is when it became obvious that the purpose of the aggressive actions of the United States was to torpedo the Summit meeting. Resolving to wreck the Paris conference, they sought to fan war hysteria so as to increase the military budget of the United States in this situation, to obtain bigger military contracts, to heat up the atmosphere and to revert to the worst times of the cold war and speed up the arms race to the utmost. And they wanted to blame the Soviet Union for the collapse of the conference, to lay the blame at the wrong door, so to say.

In general we correctly foresaw that all the actions taken by the United States Government on the eve of the conference were calculated

to bring pressure to bear on the Soviet Union. The leaders of the United States hoped that, if Khrushchov came to Paris he wouldn't be able to negotiate with the other States on an equal footing, as befits the representative of a great and powerful State, but would have to beg for peaceful co-existence, to appeal for the maintenance of peaceful relations among States. In this way they wanted to humiliate our country before the whole world, before the fraternal peoples of the Socialist countries, before the peaceloving peoples in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. They wanted to demonstrate that the United States could dictate its will to the Soviet Union, too.

These were no small plans, as you see, but the calculations turned out to be foolish ones. To reinforce their calculations and actions they proclaimed on the very eve of the Paris conference a military alert of American forces and bases throughout the world.

Their actions can be summed up in this way : They are evidently getting hysterical. And, to express this idea in an American manner, you could say that they are doing a Forrestal. For Mr. Forrestal, a former Defence Secretary of the United States, was so scared after the war that we were going to attack the United States that he went out of his mind. He was put into hospital, but a fire-engine—so the newspapers wrote at the time—drove through the street, and he thought that Soviet tanks were passing and jumped out of a window in his strait-jacket. This feat apparently made him a national hero, and his name was given to the aircraft carrier Forrestal.

United States Government Wrecked Summit Conference

As you see, we were meeting in Paris in a " pleasant " atmosphere : the American forces had been alerted, their air force and navy were in a state of combat readiness. Seriously speaking, such actions by the United States on the very eve of the conference cannot be assessed otherwise than as a flagrant provocation.

But, in spite of all this, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government determined to show self-control to the last, taking advantage of all, even the smallest, chances of saving the Summit conference, enabling it to be held in the interests of peace and international co-operation.

Leaving for Paris in this complicated situation, we still hoped that President Eisenhower would find the courage to denounce the aggressive actions of the United States against the Soviet Union, to punish the guilty and give a guarantee that such actions would not be repeated. That would have removed the obstacles the United States had placed in the way of the conference.

Arriving in Paris in good time, together with Andrei Gromyko, the Foreign Minister, and Marshal of the Soviet Union Rodion Malinovsky, the Defence Minister, I held preliminary meetings with General Charles de Gaulle, the President of France, and with Mr. Harold Macmillan, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. I explained our position to them.

We gained the impression that the leaders of France and the United Kingdom were concerned that a Summit meeting should be held, though as allies of the United States in the aggressive North Atlantic Treaty bloc, they had no great freedom of judgment and even less of independent action.

In any case, we expected that, following these conversations, the President of the United States—whom de Gaulle and Macmillan had informed of our attitude—would take steps to pave the way to a Summit meeting, or would at least try to make an explanation to us. He had the time for this: the meeting of the four of us took place only on Monday morning, May 16.

But Eisenhower did not avail himself of this opportunity we offered him. He didn't even express any desire to meet us. I was therefore greatly astonished by the fact that, in his speech on May 25, Eisenhower reproached me for not having wished to meet him. The question arises: Who should have taken the initiative under those conditions? It is clear to everyone that it should have been taken by the person who broke the good relations which had begun to take shape between our countries. This would have been understood correctly by everyone. But he, you see, expected me to ask for an audience. This would have lent an entirely different meaning to the meeting: the Soviet Union had been insulted but still we sought a meeting with Eisenhower. No self-respecting Government could agree to that! (Shouts of "Hear! Hear!") Loud and prolonged applause. The audience stood up.) I am also applauding you, Comrades, applauding your correct understanding of events, your support for your Government.

Dear Comrades, while in Paris we did not for a moment doubt that the Soviet people fully supported our stand.

We saw Eisenhower only at a preliminary meeting in the Palais d'Elysee.

In reply to my statement, he read out a text prepared in advance, from which it followed that the United States Government persisted in carrying out its aggressive policy and that he, as President, assumed the responsibility for that policy and approved it.

American propaganda has raised a big clamour about one sentence in Eisenhower's statement, saying that the United States had "suspended" its spy flights and would not resume them. We were asked: "What else do you want? You must be satisfied."

But this is the manner of a lackey. If the master strikes the lackey in the face and then gives him a coin, the lackey replies immediately: "Thank you, sir. What can I do for you, my benefactor!" But we

know who we are, whom we represent and on what firm foundation our Soviet State rests.

Firstly, however, the United States President said himself that the flights were suspended only for his term of office—that is, until January 1961.

Secondly, even this decision was not presented as a renunciation of the aggressive policy of intruding into the air space of our country and not as a condemnation of that policy, but as a special favour conferred by the American President on the Soviet Union.

But we do not wish to accept any handouts from imperialists. We do not need their "generous" assurances that they have temporarily suspended their espionage flights over our territory. We are sufficiently strong to safeguard our own sovereignty. Those who sent the U-2 spy plane to our country were given ample proof of this.

The airman is in prison and the wreckage of the plane is displayed in the Gorky Recreation Park.

And we have already warned the American Government that if these flights are resumed we shall continue shooting down the American spy planes.

The statement read out by Eisenhower at our preliminary meeting on May 16 contained nothing new, therefore, the President of the United States burned with his own hands the bridges leading to the Summit conference.

In an effort to break the deadlock, the French President, de Gaulle, suggested we have a "Day of Meditation", so that the Heads of the four Powers would have time to think about the situation existing. We agreed to this, hoping that the leaders of the United States of America would remove the obstacle they had erected in the way of the conference. But the "Day of Meditation" passed and they continued to stick to their position. That was how the United States of America torpedoed the Summit conference.

Comrades, you know already that the Soviet Government submitted to the Security Council for consideration the question of the aggressive actions of the United States Air Force against our country, creating a threat to world peace.

What was the result of the discussion of the question we brought before the Security Council?

The trial of imperialism, of the aggressors whose military planes intruded into the air space of the Soviet Union, was held.

From the rostrum of the Security Council they were branded with ignominy in the eyes of world opinion. They were convicted of grave crimes like the deliberate provocative incursion into a foreign country which was fraught with the possibility of a military conflict. Caught red-handed, the American aggressors could not refute the obvious facts.

Any honest judge in such a case would have returned the only possible verdict: he would have sentenced the pirate.

But in this case, as you know, that did not happen. The majority in

the Security Council did not dare raise their voice against the American aggressors but in fact acquitted them.

Only those who themselves engage in piracy can judge a pirate in that way !

Let us see who returned the verdict in this case. Who has a majority in the Security Council ?

The most prominent role in this majority, apart from that of the representative of the United States, is played by the representatives of the United Kingdom and France. Would they rise to the level of an objective inquiry into the case of America's aggressive incursion ? No, they couldn't ! Why ?

Firstly, because the United Kingdom and France are linked with the aggressor—the United States of America—by the bonds of military alliances. More, the United States is the leader of their military alliances which pursue aggressive aims ; and when we stayed the hand of the aggressor, President Eisenhower declared that the United States had intruded into the Soviet Union in the interests of the whole “ free world,” as he calls the alliance of the imperialist Powers.

Secondly, it must be borne in mind that the Governments of the United Kingdom and France also have skeletons in their cupboards. Everyone knows that, together with the State of Israel, they launched a treacherous and piratical attack on Egypt. Was that “ innocent ” reconnaissance to ascertain the strength and solidarity of a country which had to cast off the colonial yoke and had gained its independence in battle, having driven the British colonialists out of its territory ? The Soviet Union, the Socialist countries and other peace-loving States exerted themselves a great deal to get that war ended in a fiasco for the colonialists. We were pleased that this happened.

The popular saying has it that a devil will never gouge out the eyes of another devil. Can the representative of the French Government raise his voice in condemnation of the American aggressors if his Government carries through a colonial policy, and this policy enjoys the active support of the United States of America ?

For seven years, the French colonialists were making war on the people of Viet Nam, fighting for their country's independence, and were defeated in that war. Now they have been making war for five years against the Algerian people, who are gallantly fighting for their freedom. In this colonial war France relies on the support of the United States.

The leaders of the United States like to prattle about their supposed support for the “ young countries,” as they call those States that have gained their independence. However, they only help the colonialists to strangle the peoples.

What could be said of the Italian representative on the Security Council ? How can he judge the question freely when his country is in fact subordinated to American imperialism, and spy planes of the United States Air Force are based in Italy ?

There is one more personage in this court—the so-called “ representative ” of China. Everyone knows who it is he really represents. This is no representative of China at all, but a flunkey of the American flunkey Chiang Kai-shek, who is still entrenched on the Chinese island of Taiwan*, thanks only to the aggressive intervention of the United States in the domestic affairs of the People's Republic of China.

Some members of the Security Council, representing economically underdeveloped countries, have dared to recognise that the intrusion of American military planes into Soviet air space was a violation of our sovereignty. But having said “ A ”, they were not brave enough to say “ B ”, to declare that this was aggression, and if it was aggression, that it should be denounced and ended.

Why didn't they find the courage ? Because these countries are under strong pressure from the United States.

Only the representatives of the Socialist countries—the Soviet Union and Poland, who are indeed free and can carry through their consistent independent policy of peace and peaceful co-existence—exposed to the end the act of aggression committed by the United States of America.

We might be told : Why did you have to go to the Security Council ? Wasn't the vote in the Security Council a defeat for you ?

No. The results of the Security Council's discussion of the aggressive actions by the United States are a victory for us, for we exposed the aggressors in the eyes of the whole world and they were condemned, irrespective of the formal results of the vote.

We had to raise the question of American aggression before the United Nations, and we raised it. The majority of the Security Council did not dare condemn the American pirates—we shall take this issue to the General Assembly. The Soviet Government will consistently and determinedly continue the struggle against the enemies of peace and the security of the peoples, it will tirelessly uncover the policy of the imperialist Powers who want to prolong their rule over colonial countries and to exploit and oppress the economically underdeveloped countries, who want to establish their world domination and to continue their “ policy of strength ”, which leads to a third world war.

The time when the imperialists could act with impunity has gone. Their road is barred by the Socialist countries, with more than a thousand million people already under their banners ; and with us are the peoples of the countries who have cast off the colonial yoke and are fighting to consolidate their national independence, fighting for peace and freedom, for peaceful co-existence, fighting to cut short aggressive actions by the imperialist countries.

After wrecking the Paris conference, President Eisenhower, in his broadcast of May 25, reaffirmed the brazen position taken up by his Government. He tried to justify the spy flights over Soviet territory and regretted only that Powers' spy flight had failed.

Eisenhower pretended he couldn't understand why in Paris

* Formosa.—Ed.

Khrushchov had taken such a tough stand against espionage, against the flights of American military spy planes. Khrushchov don't you see, knew before that such flights were made and had even wanted to speak about them to the President, but had not done so. From this the President draws the conclusion that since Khrushchov did not attach such importance to these flights before, it means that the present Soviet position is not due to these flights but to something else.

Yes, Comrades, I have already mentioned that I was going to speak to the President about these flights at our meeting at Camp David when he addressed me as : " My Friend."

See what a friend I have found !

What didn't I do this ? For it is true that United States planes flew over our country. I did not speak about these flights, as I have explained earlier, for a simple reason : We have protested more than once against the flights of American planes over our country, but the United States had denied the facts, and said that they were not their reconnaissance planes that were flying over Soviet territory. We had no material evidence of such incursions. That is why the Soviet Government believed that it was a waste of time to protest. It would have been, as the saying goes, the same as casting pearls before swine. The President of the United States and his brasshats would have used this against us, gloating that the Soviet Union complained because it hadn't the means of shooting down the American planes flying over at great altitudes.

I more or less held my tongue at that time and didn't tell the President of the United States at Camp David that the flights of American spy planes were intolerable, for I knew whom I was dealing with, not because I didn't place as much importance on them as I do now.

On May 1, we shot down an American military aircraft and announced this. What happened next ? The American authorities lost no time in cooking up a ridiculous story that it had not been a military spy plane, but only a peaceful weather explorer. Only when they saw themselves cornered and when not only the equipment of the brought-down plane but the spy pilot himself fell into our hands did they confess to having sent in a reconnaissance aircraft. That is the sort my " friend " is. You can hardly avoid thinking of the saying : " God save me from such friends, and I'll save myself from my enemies."

I am winking at Semyon Mikhailovich Budenny*, for I served for some time in the First Cavalry Army, though I was a foot-slogger—but our infantry was beating the enemy shoulder to shoulder with the cavalry.

It is now being said in the West : " Since the Soviet Union did not shoot down the American planes before, it showed in that way that it was weak." We do not deny that there was a time when we could not

shoot down such planes. The reason we could not shoot them down was that they flew very high. Our fighters climbed as high as they did, but could not find the aggressor planes and hit them.

At that time, the Soviet Government told its scientists, engineers and workers that the gap had to be filled, and that our skies must be made out of bounds to enemy planes. The scientists, engineers and workers did a good job to carry out this assignment. They made up the leeway, so to speak, and produced wonderful missile techniques. And now it is the American brasshats themselves who have given us a chance of demonstrating in full measure the effectiveness of these missile techniques.

Allow me from this rostrum to express the gratitude of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government to the scientists, engineers and workers, to all those who shared in developing these fine missiles.

These means of warfare are trouble-proof. It has been announced already that the very first missile hit the American plane at a height of 20,000 metres*. That was the last day spy planes could be sent into our air space with impunity.

After we had shot down a plane which flew at a height of 20,000 metres, the American militarists started worrying. They started worrying not only because we had shot down their plane and they were exposed as collectors of intelligence over the territory of the Soviet Union. The main reason why they started worrying was because their entire military concept of attack on the Soviet Union, based on the use of their bomber force, crumbled away. Indeed, modern bombers do not fly higher than 12,000-15,000 metres.† This means that since we have shot down a plane at the height of 20,000 metres, we shall certainly not allow any bomber to get through to its target. All of them would be shot down, either by missiles or by fighters, or by the anti-aircraft guns which shoot as high as that.

This is how the " bomber arguments " of the war pirates of the United States are crumbling away.

Having failed in its attempts to spy with impunity on the Soviet Union, the Government of the United States is now seeking to justify its disgraceful practice of violating the sovereignty of other nations by getting its spying activity legalised. It is to this end that the Eisenhower-Nixon administration has once again put forward its old " open skies " plan. The United States wants to be compensated for the failure of its spying activities by permission for the American intelligence service to launch its activity legally in this country, under the cloak of the United Nations.

To this we say : The Soviet Union will regard any attempt at invading its airspace as an aggressive and premeditated attack on this

* Marshal of the Soviet Union, Budenny was Commander-in-Chief of a famous Cavalry Army in the Civil War.—Ed.

* Over 65,600 feet.—Ed.

† Roughly 40,000-50,000 feet.—Ed.

country and will have to take whatever measures of retaliation it finds necessary to ensure its security.

President Eisenhower claimed that the United States had wanted to discuss the disarmament question at the Summit conference. It is difficult to believe this.

What is the United States attitude to disarmament? In his speech of May 25, the President stated unequivocally that the United States would seek "arms control" rather than disarmament.

But, to be frank, you will have to admit that this sort of control without disarmament is, to all intents and purposes, espionage. To establish control over armaments means to obtain information on what kind of armaments and armed forces this or that nation has and where they are stationed. What does the United States need that for, since it shows no intention of accepting even the smallest disarmament measures to begin with?

The Soviet Government is prepared to conduct above-board negotiations with the Western nations, provided they really seek ways to disarmament, instead of paying lip service to it. I repeat that we shall press for genuine disarmament: that is to say, disarmament coupled with control over it, rather than control without disarmament.

The Soviet Union will also seek a ban on nuclear and all other weapons of mass destruction as an important step toward disarmament and toward establishing a normal international situation. The actions of the United States Government give us no reason for believing that it is willing to accept a ban on nuclear weapons. It is doing everything it can to obstruct a final decision to end nuclear tests—a matter which is all but agreed upon. The United States Government is striving by hook or by crook to retain the opportunity of going ahead with nuclear-weapon tests.

In regard to this I would like to warn it that if the United States resumes such tests, on whatever excuse, we will naturally have to resume our own nuclear tests in order to ensure the security of our country and those of our allies. Everyone can see what this would lead to.

We do not want events to take this course. That is why the Soviet Union proposes that all means of warfare—and, consequently, all means of attack—should be scrapped, and that effective international control should be established so that no one can secretly arm himself in preparation for an attack on other countries.

This is our position. We have stated it more than once. I have repeated it once again so that nobody should be left in doubt that we are prepared to conduct above-board and equal negotiations on the important international issue of disarmament. At the same time, we shall expose subterfuges by our partners, who profess a desire to conduct negotiations while doing everything they can to delay it.

The Soviet Government considers that President Eisenhower's statement in his speech of May 25 that the United States should maintain businesslike relations with the Soviet Union with regard to outstanding

issues can be of positive value if the United States strives for such relations in deeds rather than in words. For this to be possible, the United States Government must, of course, abandon its aggressive policy and guide its approach to relations with the U.S.S.R. by strict adherence to the principles of peaceful co-existence.

We have not given up, nor are we giving up the idea of a Heads of Government meeting, and we believe it could still be useful at this juncture. Our only desire is that the basis for such a meeting should be one of fair play. It could take place if the United States Government deplored what has happened.

We were prepared to do our bit toward achieving fruitful results at the Summit conference. But we could not sit down at one table with a President who had openly proclaimed espionage to be his policy, who wanted espionage to continue, who injured the dignity of the people and Government of another nation and who qualified himself as something like spy number one against the Soviet Union. We could not sit down at the conference table side by side with that man, because that would have meant we were joining him in refusing to respect and observe the elementary principles of international law—that is, to respect sovereignty and to refrain from interference in the affairs of other nations. That would have been a justification for the piratical imperialist policy, but we fought and shall go on fighting determinedly against that policy, until it disappears once and for all.

Comrades, the facts show that imperialist circles in the United States are clearly opposed to peaceful co-existence and competition with our country. They are afraid of it because they can have no faith in their own system and in capitalism's lease of life.

By undertaking acts of aggression against the U.S.S.R., they want to turn back the tide of international events to a state of heightened tension instead of to a détente. It is easier in an unsettled and strained situation for the United States monopolies to expand munitions production and make colossal profits.

In an effort to make us more compliant, the American imperialists act on the wrong assumption that our country is not, in fact, as strong and consolidated as it is in reality. American propaganda is spreading the most absurd stories about the situation in the Soviet Union.

There are some silly allegations, for instance, that the situation within our Party and Government is unstable and that this besets Khrushchov with difficulties, that he is being opposed by the army officers and generals who are being demobilised under the army reduction programme. The imperialists are also spreading slanderous stories that other Socialist countries are pressing the Soviet Union to give up its policy of détente and other things of this kind.

Some bourgeois journalists from the capitalist countries went to the lengths of writing: "Another man has fallen victim to the disarray within the Soviet Government. Mikoyan, the senior member of the political bureau, has been removed from the Central Committee, he no longer appears at receptions, he didn't attend a certain dinner . . ."

Anastas Ivanovich Mikoyan is now on holiday, and yesterday I spoke with him over the telephone and he invited me : "The weather is wonderful in the Caucasus, at Pitsunda," he said. "Do come here, the sea is calm, only chilly." It is not because things are well that the bourgeois hack writers resort to such inventions and even lies. No, gentlemen, we say to them that it must be the malice arising from your class instincts that make you blind, and that is why you accept the wished-for for the real. It seems that Allen Dulles' intelligence service, on which the United States is spending so much of the taxpayers' money, is good for nothing, if it bases its policy on absurd and primitive concoctions of this kind.

Now if your intelligence service is so weak and supplies you with information that is so wrong while you want to have a more accurate picture of the situation in the Soviet Union, then let me help you with a hint. You will hardly find a better scout than Mr. Harriman. You must, clearly, be in no doubt whatsoever that he is boundlessly devoted to capitalism and to so-called private enterprise. Talk with him, or if you do not want to do that, then at least read his account of his visit to the U.S.S.R. He has been to this country, travelled wherever he wanted and met whoever he wished. Here is what he wrote in his account of the trip, which has appeared as a book called *Peace with Russia*?

"We (he speaks of the American ruling circles) can no longer afford to be deluded by myths or have our policies muddled by confusion about what is going on in the Soviet Union. We cannot find comfort in any idea that the Communist régime is going to be overthrown or converted to our own beliefs."

So you see, we convinced Harriman anyway. He did not tour our country in vain.

The millionaire Harriman recommends the rulers of the United States to accept the Soviet Union's "challenge of all-out competitive co-existence" in the economic field and in all other fields of public life.

We, too, fully agree with that. We are able to defend our honour, and we shall win in peaceful competition.

If the advice of millionaire Harriman is not enough for the Government of the United States, perhaps it will heed the advice of Mr. Randall, the President's special assistant and a noted representative of business circles. Here is what he said recently in his book *The Communist Challenge to American Business*:

"The Soviet production rate is formidable. Their percentage of annual increase in gross national product is outstanding. An American businessman would be mad indeed to delude himself into believing that there is something which his company can do which the Russians cannot duplicate if they wish."

These are not my words. I am quoting the assistant of the United States President !

"If they are not doing something which we do, it is probably because they have a very good reason for not wanting to. Super-

men they are not, but we must accept the cold fact that they can now hold their own with us in any field of production that they may select."

Please applaud this capitalist ! Hear how well he speaks !

Speaking of the Soviet people, Mr. Randall writes :

"For the Russian people, love of their motherland already had centuries of tradition behind it before Communism was grafted on to that base and their fierce national pride, reinforced now by ideology, admits no limit for their future progress."

Let us applaud him once again ! Evidently a reasonable man and I salute him, because such an understanding of the features of our reality makes it possible to live not only in peace but also in friendship with the American people. This was said by an assistant to the President of the United States. He should not be an assistant, but President of the United States. Then we could clearly establish the best and most friendly relations with the United States. But it is not for us to decide who is to be elected President over there. This issue has to be settled by the American people, and we will not, therefore, intervene in their affairs.

What, after all this, is the value of the clumsy fabrications by Allen Dulles, his intelligence service and the American propaganda machine about the situation in the Soviet Union ? This intelligence service is not worth a brass farthing if it deludes its own Government by its stupid, pathetic fabrications and makes it appear ridiculous in the eyes of Americans and, indeed, of the whole world.

I should like to add: a Government which tolerates such a stupid intelligence service is not worth much either !

The Aggressive Policy of the Imperialists is Doomed to Failure

Comrades, the provocative actions of the American aggressors are angrily resented by all peace-loving peoples. Even in the United States itself, a wave of protest is growing against the wanton actions of the forces of aggression. Many noted politicians and statesmen, businessmen, scientists, and publicists are strongly criticising the provocative policy of the American Government. Our papers have printed many statements by prominent foreign statesmen and public personalities, branding this policy of the United States.

You know also that mass meetings of protest against the aggressive actions of the American brasshats have been held not only in the Soviet Union but in many other countries as well.

At the same time it should be borne in mind that there still are people in the capitalist countries, and specifically in the United States, who are not yet fully clear about what has happened. And this is largely

because the entire capitalist propaganda machine—the Press, radio and the television—has been mobilised to delude the people, to confuse them, to twist the existing situation. It is trumpeting day and night that the aggressive actions of the American military are not in any way as dangerous as the Soviet Union says.

Because of this, I should like to address myself to those people who sincerely wished that the Summit meeting would begin and end well, and who were naturally disturbed and disappointed by its failure. We understand their disappointment, because we too were eager for this conference to take place. More, we had worked hard for it over many years.

Some people, who apparently were none too clear about the situation, said to me in Paris : “Have some sympathy for Eisenhower—in his heart of hearts he must be sorry about what has happened himself.”

I recall the conversation I had in Paris with a delegation of the International Women’s Congress, held recently in Copenhagen. Some delegates, wholly deploring the aggressive actions of the American Government, asked me : “Wouldn’t it have been better, perhaps, to agree to the Summit even without getting an apology from the American Government ?”

One of them said : “It must be terrible for the American Government to apologise.” As if another Government can apologise, but for the American Government this is difficult and that I must understand its position. “They are so haughty,” she said. I replied : “That’s true, but this haughtiness must be knocked down ! Why must we tolerate aggressive actions by the United States ? Just consider what would have happened if we had sat down at the conference table without getting an apology from the United States. That would mean that we recognised their spy flights over the Soviet Union as legal, and what would that mean ?”

The aggressors wanted to force us to our knees. And if we had submitted, they would have saddled us and then mounted and whipped us on. This is what they wanted ! But Messieurs the imperialists had miscalculated. We told them firmly : “The Soviet Union cannot and will not take part in a meeting at which it would be placed in a position of inequality.”

I repeat, many honest people were disappointed by the failure of the Summit meeting. There are people like this in America too. But their bitter disappointment sometimes prevents them from taking a realistic stock of the situation.

Mr. Garst, for instance, my old friend and a good American farmer who knows everything about maize, has proved none too strong in politics. He thinks that President Eisenhower was “insulted” in Paris and that both sides made mistakes. I did not take offence at his statements, naturally, because I understand how he feels. I repeat : It is not feelings but reason that a man must guide himself by when he appraises important international events.

I should like to answer Mr. Garst briefly. Suppose someone came

at night and stole your entire maize crop ? You wake up in the morning and it is gone. You finally manage to catch the thief, you want to take him to court to get damages, but he strikes an attitude and says : “I like your maize, Mr. Garst. I have stolen it before, and I will steal it again !”

How would you feel, Mr. Garst ?

This is roughly how the American Government acted with regard to the Soviet Union in sending to us its thieving spy plane. For it violated all standards of international relations ! I spoke of your maize just now, Mr. Garst, but the same thing may well happen to any other American whose home is broken into by a thief who, on top of everything else, takes umbrage at being stopped !

And what if our military plane flew over your farm, Mr. Garst, and we said afterwards that we require intelligence data about your country in order to feel secure ? You, too, would have been indignant about this, of course, because you are an honest man.

I should like to remind you, Mr. Garst, of how you defended your farm—your sovereignty so to speak—when I was your guest. Correspondents and Press photographers would not comply with your rules then, and you used every means to protect your “sovereignty.” You had no weapons, I saw that, but you chucked maize roots at the crowd and with such zeal that you lost your balance and even fell over. I watched you and smiled because, I realised : Here is a man really defending his independence, his sovereignty—though, of course, sovereignty limited to his farm.

When a New York correspondent, Salisbury, got in your way, you, if you will pardon the expression, even gave him a good kick in the pants. It was rather crude but understandable, because you were on your own farm and he ought not to have pushed the host aside.

You, Mr. Garst, did everything to defend your “frontiers,” and when you realised that you would lose the battle if you were left on your own, you summoned your neighbours and you told them to come on horseback. “The Cossacks are coming,” you assured me. That was the cavalry, Semyon Mikhailovich !*

So, Mr. Garst, think again, think for yourself, do not swallow the propaganda bait but take counsel of your conscience, and you will reach the right conclusions.

You will realise that when an American military plane flies in the Soviet sky I cannot send a visiting card to the President of the United States to thank him, to present my compliments, to call him a peace-maker. If I did, I would disappoint the hopes and demands not only of the Soviet people but of all honest people who desire peace.

My advice to those who have not yet fully understood the real state of affairs, who still accept the American propaganda contentions at their face value, is to be more critical of the cynical statements of some inspirers and directors of the United States’ aggressive policy.

* An aside to Budenny.—Ed.

Take the United States' Vice-President Richard Nixon, for instance, who now brazenly demands that the Western Powers negotiate with the Soviet Union only from positions of strength. He went so far as to declare the other day that Russia must apologise, if you please, for wrecking the Summit meeting in Paris. Just think ! The United States committed an act of aggression against our country, proclaimed espionage flights over the territories of other countries to be its national policy, torpedoed the Summit meeting even before it began—but we should apologise !

It is no accident that Mr. Nixon has now had to abandon his act of being a “man of peace,” and has struck a new posture.

“Nixon clothed himself in the armour of an aggressive champion of the free world,” an Associated Press correspondent wrote not without irony. And this is true : it will be recalled that Nixon appeared in the political arena on the crest of the wave of McCarthyism.

I want to say this : Let me remind those who are trying to force us to our knees of what the Zaporozhye Cossacks* used to say in such cases. They were great diplomats. (*Laughter.*) Do you remember what they wrote in their famous message to the Turkish sultan ? I ask the Ukrainians to forgive me for not being able to express myself in the terms the Zaporozhye Cossacks used. Within the limits of the permissible, I would sum up the substance of their message to the Turkish sultan in the following way : “What kind of Hell's knight are you, if you cannot so much as kill a hedgehog with that part on which you sit—if your pants are down ?” I think that those who have read the message in the original will remember the exact expressions used there, and those who have not, will do well to read it—the Zaporozhye Cossacks used a much juicier language.

The Soviet Union has never bowed to anyone who threatened us and is ever ready to stand up for its just cause !

Strengthen the Vigilance of the Peoples, Expose the Manœuvres of Reaction

Comrades, we know that all the peoples, the Americans included, want peace. But to wish for peace is not enough. This wish has to be backed by intense activity. Today it is more important than ever to strengthen the vigilance of the peoples, to expose the manœuvres of the aggressive forces and to press for the principles of peaceful co-existence to be taken as the real basis for relations between States with different social systems.

* These Cossacks, living in the Dnieper basin, fled from their lords in the 16th and 17th centuries, and fought many battles with Turkish troops.—Ed.

By striking back at the aggressive actions of the United States of America, the Soviet Union is making a sizable contribution to the strengthening of peace. In Paris we were not defending the interests of our country alone. We defended the principle of sovereignty of all nations, including such States as Afghanistan and Austria, whose neutrality and sovereignty have been violated by American military aircraft.

By refusing to take part in the negotiations overshadowed by the threat of military pressure from the United States, we sought to create the conditions for a future successful Summit conference which, we hope, can meet within about six to eight months. That would give time for clearing the roadblocks erected by the opponents of international co-operation out of the way to the solution of urgent international problems.

There have lately been more and more sensible judgments in the Western Press on ways of solving pressing international problems. It has been pointed out, notably, that it can in no way be considered normal that the seat in the United Nations of a great nation—People's China—is still filled by the Chiang Kai-shek representative, a political corpse, that it is not normal when People's China is not invited to share in important political conferences and in solving vitally important international issues.

What is particularly pleasant to note is the perfectly justified remarks now being made that a conference of only four Heads of Governments cannot solve all the problems of ensuring world peace and security. We in the Soviet Union consider that the time has come for the Western Powers to see the need for inviting the Heads of Government of the Great Asian Powers to take part in the conference. This would be fair. It is well known that the nations of Asia have won their independence in struggle against colonialism and against imperialism, and are now successfully developing and gaining strength, and are already playing an important role in deciding international issues.

You have to look beyond the present day. For, indeed, today the issues of war and peace which will come up tomorrow are germinating. Therefore, for the future of the people of all nations to be unclouded and for it to provide conditions for truly peaceful development, the Western Powers must normalise their relations with People's China without any further delay and must invite the People's Republic of China, India, Indonesia and, perhaps, some other nations to take part in the future negotiations. You cannot but welcome these sensible judgments in the pronouncements of statesmen and in the Press of the Western Powers.

Some may ask : What if there is still no Summit within six or eight months, either ? Of course, we would regret it if that should happen. But that would not come as a surprise to us. We would interpret it as meaning that, apparently, realisation of the need for creating proper conditions for a better way to ensure peaceful co-existence has not yet gripped the minds of the leaders of the United States of America. But

whether the U.S. leaders like it or not, peaceful co-existence is a hard fact. The only point is, whether that co-existence will be on a good and friendly basis or whether it will be a sort of co-existence with daggers drawn, so to speak.

We believe that sooner or later the United States of America will have as its leaders men who will pursue a policy of peace and peaceful co-existence, the only realistic policy to pursue in our day.

How soon will that come about? This does not depend upon us, so we are not going to guess. But we believe in human reason and that is why we say: This will come about. Can we wait? Of course we can. That is why we are by no means disturbed by the hue and cry the American reactionary circles have now raised. In the meantime, we shall continue striving for a negotiated settlement of urgent international problems ripe for solution, including that of the German peace treaty and that of Western Berlin, and we shall work for closer international co-operation.

Ours is the right and fair policy, so why change it?

The aggressors' policy, on the other hand, has no backing from sensible people, nor can it have.

We are gratified to learn that Norway has taken a reasonable step in protesting to the United States against her territory being used by the American Air Force for organising piratical intrusions into the Soviet Union. Evidently the Government of Norway realises the danger to the Norwegian people arising from the existence of foreign bases on its territory and from similar actions by the United States.

The Government of Pakistan, in reply to a Note from the Soviet Government, has stated that it has lodged an official protest with the Government of the United States and called on the United States to give an assurance that there will be no more such incidents.

Yet the Government of Pakistan tries to deny the amply proved fact that the American U-2 plane was sent on its spying mission into the U.S.S.R. on May 1 from Peshawar.

This half and half and insincere position of Pakistan's Government can in no way satisfy the Soviet Union. We strongly warned Pakistan that if any more provocative flights were made from her territory the Soviet Government would have to take the proper action against the American bases in Pakistan. We would not like to see things take such a turn, and we hope the Government of Pakistan will draw the necessary conclusions from our warning.

The Soviet Government has long been striving to improve relations with our southern neighbour—Turkey—so as to make them good-neighbourly relations but we cannot ignore the fact that Turkey has given the United States bases for carrying out aggressive acts against our country. It has been learned that even now American intelligence planes still remain on Turkish territory. The Turkish Government, which, as you know, was overthrown yesterday, did not promote an improvement of relations between our two countries.

We hope that the new Government which will be set up in Turkey

will exert the necessary efforts to improve relations with the Soviet Union. As for the Soviet Government, we have long been striving for this. We hope that common sense and a correct understanding of the need to live in peace and friendship, as good neighbours, will prevail in Turkey.

In addition to Turkey and Pakistan, American intelligence planes of the U-2 type are also known to be based in Italy and Japan.

Italy doesn't border directly on us, and the planes based there are intended rather for espionage against the Socialist countries of Eastern Europe to which the Soviet Union is linked by allied commitments, but it is not excluded that these planes may be used against our country, too. Naturally, the Soviet Union will not be an onlooker in the event of a threat arising to the security of its friends and it will fulfil its allied duty sacredly. This is why we should like the Government of Italy to realise all the responsibility it will bear if the American Air Force is allowed to use Italian territory for aggressive actions against the Soviet Union or the other Socialist States.

A few words must also be said about the position of Japan. It is deplorable that, through the fault of Japanese ruling circles, our two countries still have no peace treaty. For its part, the Soviet Union is doing everything it can to conclude a peace treaty, to normalise completely its relations with Japan and to channel them towards the broad development of mutually beneficial economic and cultural relations.

Unfortunately, the Kishi Government has concluded a new military treaty with the United States, aimed in the first place against us and our friends, the great Chinese people. In pursuing this unwise policy, the Japanese Government has readily permitted the establishment of American bases on its territory, bases from which the United States threatens the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, the Korean People's Democratic Republic and other peace-loving democratic nations.

Assigned to the American war bases in Japan are planes intended for spy flights over the territory of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. The Japanese Government should realise that if such flights are undertaken the Soviet Government will be compelled to take the most resolute measures.

The Soviet Government again warns the governments of all countries which have United States war bases on their territories that if flights, intrusions or attacks on the Soviet Union are made from these bases, we, of course, will retaliate with all the means at our disposal, and will deal a crushing blow at those bases. The governments of these countries must take every measure so as not to allow the unleashing of the war into which some hotheads in the United States wish to draw them.

Those hotheads apparently hope that in the event of war they would be able to pay with the blood of the peoples of Europe, Asia and Africa in whose countries their war bases are located, and that they themselves would suffer less.

These are illusions, of course. In the event of aggression we shall

indeed deal blows at the American bases in countries where they are located. For this purpose we can use missiles with a range of 2,000-4,000 kilometres.* But we also have intercontinental missiles, intended for smiting the aggressor across the ocean.

Comrades, it is said and written in the United States that—they allege—many governments support it against the Soviet Union. But all the world knows what sort of support that is !

The most zealous accomplices of the United States in this business are reactionary Governments, which are kept in power against the people's will by force of arms. There is a saying : " Tell me who your friend is, and I will tell you who you are ". If we list those whom President Eisenhower himself declares to be friends of the United States, we will see that it is a rather curious company. A place of prominence in it belongs to Franco, that obscurantist, that dictator who drowned democracy and freedom in the blood of the working class and peasantry of Spain and who, with the help of Hitler and Mussolini has established a fascist régime in that country. And now this is Eisenhower's best friend. For him, Eisenhower has taken the place of Mussolini and Hitler. And Franco grovels before his masters both in big and small matters. All the world now laughs at his latest stunt in sports. As the Right Wing of the American defence line, he has put the ball through his own goal, by forbidding the Spanish footballers to play against the Soviet team.

Many times the United States President has called ex-President Syngman Rhee his " best friend ", and " the father of Korea ". How did it happen, then, that Syngman Rhee, this alleged father and benefactor of the Korean people, was overthrown by the people of South Korea, who rightly call him a bloody hangman ? A spontaneous uprising took place in Korea, and the struggle is only beginning there.

The United States President is preparing to visit his " best friend " Chiang Kai-shek in Taiwan. But what can be said of this " best friend " of the United States ? All the world knows that Chiang Kai-shek was driven off the mainland by the great Chinese people and has been able to hold out so far on his Chinese island with the help of American bayonets. The time will come when, under the guidance of their Government, the Chinese people liberate Taiwan both from Chiang Kai-shek and from American imperialism.

The United States President is planning to make a trip to Japan, to Prime Minister Kishi, whom he also calls his friend. I have already spoken about the exploits of this ruler. It is not without reason that the voice of a people resounds even more loudly in Japan—the voice of a people who have started a struggle for the independence of their country, for the establishment of a government which will really conform to the interests of the Japanese people and will be guided by them in its activity. We welcome this struggle of the Japanese people. It is very significant that the struggle of the Japanese people is going

on under the slogan : " Down with Japanese-American military collusion ! " It is not without reason that huge demonstrations are protesting against the arrival of Eisenhower in Japan.

The United States has a bilateral treaty with the Shah of Iran. What does this treaty say ? It says that the United States pledges itself to come to the Iranian Shah's assistance if aggression, direct or indirect, is committed against him. The treaty's mention of direct aggression is no more than a red herring designed to deceive the Iranian people, because it is well known that no one threatens Iran. What is meant by the " indirect aggression " mentioned in the treaty ? " Indirect " aggression means the attempts of an oppressed people to rise in a struggle for liberation from their oppressors. The United States has assumed the disgraceful role of a policeman—has committed itself to come to the rescue of a régime which is evoking the growing wrath of its people.

There is a similar situation in several other countries of Asia, Europe and South America.

I think that the American imperialists should look forward to other surprises too, because the peoples are now beginning to fight for their independence, so as to overthrow the puppet governments which serve the United States monopolies, not their own people. The peoples want to see their countries sovereign, want to have governments which will serve their people loyally.

But no matter how dark the night is, there will always be a dawn. No matter how strong the reactionary governments may be, there is always an end to their domination. This was the case with Russia, with China, with many other countries. Take, for instance, one of the latest examples. Batista, that stooge of American imperialism, ruled Cuba for quite a while.

He was a dictator and oppressed the Cuban people for many years ! But the people rose up in arms ; heroes, true sons of the people, urged them to fight against the oppressors and drove out that agent of American imperialism and set up their own Government, headed by the fiery patriot Fidel Castro, who is pursuing a policy conforming to the interests of the Cuban people.

We are witnesses of this irreversible process of history, a process by which the peoples throw off the yoke of the reactionary régimes. There is no force capable of stemming this inevitable process. Even the support of American bayonets will not save the anti-popular régimes.

Trying to justify their aggressive policy, the leaders of the United States complain, alleging that some sort of Soviet threat overhangs them. But they do not see the threat to the existence of capitalism where it really exists.

This threat is not provided by our rockets, although they are the world's most formidable weapons. Incidentally, we have already stopped the production of some types of rockets and slowed down output of certain other types—after all, they aren't cucumbers, you can't eat them ; and not more than a certain quantity of them is

* Roughly 1,250-2,500 miles.—Ed.

needed to repulse aggression. The Soviet Union will keep them in combat readiness until a disarmament agreement is concluded.

The leaders of the capitalist world must realise that the real threat to capitalism lies elsewhere. Yes, if you wish, we are "threatening" capitalism by peaceful economic competition, and as time goes on this threat will become bigger and bigger. So let us, Messieurs Capitalists, try our strength in the economic field, and then the peoples will see who is the better man ! We are ready for this peaceful competition and, using your favourite terminology, we challenge you to it.

We are abolishing taxes on factory and office workers—there is a first signal for you. What does it mean ? We, the Socialist countries, are abolishing taxes, while you, the capitalist countries, are increasing them from year to year. If you wish to prove that you, too, are concerned about the interests of the peoples—after all you now attach the signpost "people's" to the word "capitalism"—why don't you follow our example ?

But no, you will not risk that, because the very purpose of the capitalist system is to allow the monopolists to rob the working people and wax rich at their expense.

Why hasn't the United States already abolished taxes on factory and office workers, instead of increasing them all the time ? Because the Government of the United States is, in effect, an agency of the monopolists, which protects not the interests of the people, but the interests of the corporations and monopolies. Just look through the American reference books, and you will find an answer to this question.

Who is Thomas Gates, the United States Secretary of Defence, that very man who scared his own people by provocatively alerting the armed forces on the eve of the Paris meeting ? He is a member of the Philadelphia family of millionaire bankers, connected with the Morgan house. He is co-proprietor of Drexel and Company, a banking firm. Before taking his Government post, Mr. Gates was vice-president of the Beaver Coal Corporation and director of several other companies.

He is no Marshal Malinovsky, who lives on his salary. Gates is now being paid both by the Eisenhower administration and by the corporations which nominated him as America's Secretary of Defence.

Who is Christian Herter, the Secretary of State of the United States, who declared that the intrusion of American spy-planes into the Soviet sky was "the national policy" of his country ? He has a huge fortune, and is a relative of the founders of the Standard Oil Company, an American oil empire.

Who is Robert Anderson, the United States Secretary of the Treasury, the man who continues increasing the taxes ? Before his appointment to this post he was president of the big American-Canadian corporation Ventures Ltd., which is linked with the atomics industry and which has capital investments in many countries of the world. This corporation is a supplier of nuclear fuel, nickel and other strategic materials. It is

closely connected with General Motors, International Nickel and other monopolies.

This enumeration could be continued for a long time. But even what I have already said is enough to provide an idea of who the people are who rule the United States today. Yet they dare to say that their world is "free," is "democratic" !

Taking advantage of the fact that they have money, that they control radio, television and the Press, the advocates of imperialism are going out of their way to whitewash their system. But sooner or later they will be unmasked.

Having compared the actual state of affairs under capitalism and Socialism, the people will see for themselves which system is better.

We are now completing the transition to a seven- and six-hour working day and in 1964 we shall begin going over to a six- and five-hour working day.* So, in the very near future we shall have the shortest working day in the world, while our real wages will remain intact or will even be increased. Here is the second signal for you, gentlemen !

You also know of the decision recently taken by the Session of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet to invest additionally 25,000-30,000 million roubles in the production of consumer goods. The capitalists have so far regarded this branch of the national economy as our weak spot, the Achilles heel of the Socialist State. They have always shouted that we are behind the major capitalist States in output of clothing, footwear, television sets, washing machines and other consumer goods.

So what ? We have never concealed this. We deliberately economised on development of certain branches of light industry in order to ensure the priority development of heavy industry—the hub of hubs of our might and strength.

Now we are immeasurably stronger and richer than ten to 20 years ago. And we can now spend bigger funds on the development of light industry without slackening our efforts in developing heavy industry. This will permit us to meet better the requirements of our working people. The time is not far off when we shall outstrip the capitalist countries in consumption of manufactured goods per head. This will be the third signal for you !

The farther we advance along the road of Communism, the richer our country becomes and the happier the life of the Soviet people is, the better the peoples will see the ugliness of the obsolete capitalist system, the more they will become convinced of the advantages of Communism. No espionage, threats, intrusions of aircraft into our airspace, no prayers will save capitalism !

* 36- and 30-hour week.—Ed.

For a Mighty Upsurge in all Branches of National Economy

Comrades, we must assess the world developments calmly and soberly. Of course we are all disappointed that the Summit meeting was wrecked through the fault of the American imperialists. But this only confirms our conclusion that so long as imperialism exists reactionary forces, representing the interests of the capitalist monopolies, will look for warlike ventures and aggression. This is why all peoples must show great vigilance, must fight with determination to preserve world peace.

What must we do to avert the possibility of aggression? We must go on strengthening in every way the might of our Socialist State.

Following the road Lenin pointed out, the Soviet people have accomplished great deeds. All the world knows of our people's remarkable successes.

We are advancing by leaps and bounds. Only 18 months have passed since the 21st Congress of our Party endorsed the Seven-Year Plan for the development of the national economy. But what a great deal has been done during that short period! You know that last year's gross industrial output plan was topped substantially. In this second year of the Seven-Year Plan, our industry is working even better. During the first four months of this year it fulfilled its gross industrial programme by 104 per cent.

To show how the volume of industrial production has increased in our country, I shall make these comparisons:

At present our country produces in one day more manufactured goods than pre-revolutionary Russia did in roughly a whole month.

Let us take the growth in production. This increase grows bigger every year, every month. During the first four months of this year, therefore, we produced 1,260,000 tons more pig iron than in the same period of 1959, almost two million tons more steel, 1,570,000 tons more rolled metal, 6,150,000 tons more oil, 3,500 million cubic metres more gas,* 2,100,000 tons more cement, 1,200 million kWh more electricity, 141 million square metres more cotton textiles† and 12,800,000 pairs more leather footwear.

It is significant that not only the volume of production is growing in our country, but fundamental qualitative changes are taking place in industry. Labour productivity in all branches of the national economy has been growing rapidly recently, better use has been made of raw materials, fuel, electricity, supplies and equipment, the cost of production has been reduced. You, the Communist work team shockworkers, are contributing greatly to this. Glory to you!

The Soviet Union now has everything necessary to solve successfully any task of further developing all the branches of the national economy,

of increasing output of consumer goods and strengthening our country's defence capacity.

The growth of industrial production, the further raising of labour productivity, are being achieved on the basis of the programme of technical progress advanced by the Party. Ever bigger efforts are being made in all economic areas to introduce overall mechanisation and automation into production and the latest achievements of science and technology.

I think it is difficult to find any one today who doesn't realise that we shall not get far with obsolete machinery. Without technical progress, without automation and mechanisation of production, it is impossible to fulfil successfully the tremendous tasks of Communist construction.

Last June's plenary meeting of the Party central committee is known to have discussed the question of the further technological and organisational improvement of production. The decisions of this plenary meeting have already yielded remarkable results. The engineers, technicians and workers are actively promoting technical progress.

Six weeks from now, on July 13th, we are calling a regular plenary meeting of the central committee to discuss progress in fulfilling the decisions taken by the 21st Party Congress on the development of industry and the transport services, and on the introduction into production of the latest achievements of science and technology.

Some people may ask why it is necessary to discuss this question again at a plenary meeting of the central committee. After all, everything is running smoothly in industry and the transport services.

We can indeed be satisfied with the results of our work in industry and transport. But it is against the nature of Communism, of the Soviet people, to be carried away by their successes, no matter how big they are.

Life goes on, and the Soviet people are becoming more experienced and wiser, are learning to make better use of the available opportunities for expanding Socialist production. So the point is—to sum up the results of the work done, to criticise some of the bad workers and, relying on the creative initiative and rich experience of our innovators—on your experience, Comrades—to work out measures for an even more successful solution of the tasks set by the 21st Party Congress.

Though the tasks of the quantitative growth of production are being coped with successfully in our country, and plans are not only being fulfilled but overfulfilled, there are still serious deficiencies in a number of industries, as far as quality is concerned.

Speaking of quality, I mean quality in the broad sense of the word—and not merely the quality of goods manufactured by our factories and works. This is very important, of course. The struggle to uphold the reputation of the trade mark must always be in the centre of attention of all our economic and party organisations. After all, it is a pleasure for anyone to pick up a well-made article, to see a well-

* Roughly 4,578 thousand million cubic yards.—Ed.

† Over 1,517 million square feet.—Ed.

realised project. And all this must be done sensibly, economically, and in the most profitable way, with account being taken of the latest achievements of science and technology, so that each item is produced with the least expenditure of labour and materials.

Consequently, the task is to improve all qualitative indices of work in the national economy. This covers production costs, cost accounting, reduction of production costs, increase of accumulations and so on. All this is a decisive condition for the further growth of our country's wealth, for the continuous increase in our national income and the advancement of the Soviet people's well-being and culture.

Comrades, our conference is attended by many leading people from our collective and State farms. They represent a vast army of workers in agriculture who, together with the working class, are working in a dedicated way for the fulfilment ahead of time of the Seven-Year Plan.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the collective farmers, State farm workers and agricultural experts have, in recent years, done a vast amount of work for the further development of the common husbandries of the collective and State farms, and for raising the material standards of agricultural workers.

It is enough to say that our gross agricultural output last year was 50 per cent above the 1953 figure. The crop areas increased by 39 million hectares,* or 25 per cent. The output of grain, industrial crops and livestock products has increased considerably in our country, as have the herds of all kinds of cattle and the number of poultry.

All the Soviet people see how much has been done in agriculture in recent years, how the supply of foodstuffs for the population has improved. But we must not rest on our oars, let alone become complacent.

A lot remains to be done in agriculture, Comrades.

A stable quantity of grain must be produced, and the output of meat and milk must be sharply increased. We have everything necessary for this. We must continue to extend the crop areas in the virgin land reclamation regions and—this is the main thing—must take measures to achieve higher yields of wheat, maize for grain and silage, and all other crops.

We shall continue with our efforts to provide the necessary conditions for the further development of cattle breeding, sheep breeding and poultry raising in the virgin land development areas. All this will enable us to acquire large quantities of cheap meat. These are the tasks of the agricultural workers in the virgin land development areas.

Simultaneously, the Party is setting the task of sharply raising the yields and harvests of agricultural crops and increasing the herds and productivity of cattle in all parts of the country.

Many people would like to know how things are shaping up in our agriculture this year. The plan for spring sowing had been fulfilled 92 per cent by May 25—123 million hectares† had been put under

spring crops. In spite of the late spring, we may have a good year in agriculture.

There have been rains lately in the Ukraine, the Volga area, the North Caucasus, Kazakhstan and Siberia. They have watered the soil well, this is a good augury for the crop.

It will be remembered that conditions in some southern regions of the country were not too favourable for the wintering of winter crops, and a part of the area under them had consequently to be reseeded with high-yielding crops such as maize, for instance. Considerably more spring wheat has been sown in the Volga area, in some parts of Siberia and in Kazakhstan. The areas under sugar beet, cotton and other crops have been extended.

Here are some figures up to May 25* : Maize 20,500,000 hectares in 1960 ; 18,200,000 in 1959 ; and 2,400,000 in 1953.

Spring wheat 45,900,000 hectares ; 45,100,000 ; and 28,500,000.

Sugar beet 3,079,000 ; 2,857,000 ; and 1,510,000.

Cotton 2,137,000 ; 2,106,000 ; and 1,854,000 hectares respectively.

In general, we expect to receive as much, if not more, grain than in the best years in the past.

You all know how much attention our Party devotes to increasing the output of meat, milk and other livestock products. This year, following the example of the farmers of Ryazan region, nearly all the regions, territories and republics have assumed high Socialist emulation pledges. But it must be said frankly that, having assumed these pledges, some of them are doing little as yet to provide the growing cattle population with fodder. And fodder is the most important thing.

The efforts of all agricultural workers and the Party, Government, trade union and Komsomol organisations, should be concentrated on ensuring on every collective and State farm a big crop of cereals, maize for grain and silaging, and sugar beet, to stock more hay, to make a better use of pastures, to do everything—in brief, to provide an abundance of fodder for livestock farming, and to raise sharply the output of meat, milk and other products.

The central committee of our Party is convinced that the agricultural workers will fulfil with honour the Socialist pledges they have assumed.

Comrades, the aggressive action of the American imperialists has been unanimously rebuffed by the Soviet people, by the peoples of great China and all the ordinary people of the world.

The workers and collective farmers, scientists and technicians, all the working people of our country, are rallying still closer behind the Communist Party and the Government, and warmly and unanimously approve the home and foreign policy of the Soviet State.

Tens of millions of people in all parts of our vast country have joined in emulation for the fulfilment ahead of time of our Seven-Year Plan.

* Over 96 million acres.—Ed.

† Nearly 304 million acres.—Ed.

* Converted to acres, approximately, these figures read : Maize, 50,657,000 ; 44,974,000 ; 5,930,000 respectively. Spring Wheat, 113,422,000 ; 111,445,000 ; 70,426,000 respectively. Sugar Beet, 7,608,000 ; 7,059,000 ; 3,733,000 respectively. Cotton, 5,280,000 ; 5,204,000 ; 4,581,000 respectively.—Ed.

There are glad tidings from all parts of the country—from the Ukraine and Siberia, from the Baltic republics and Transcaucasia, from the republics of Central Asia—that industrial and agricultural workers are successfully fulfilling and overfulfilling the Socialist emulation pledges they have assumed.

The workers in the Russian Federation are displaying great labour heroism to fulfil the obligations they have assumed and to set an example. The Russian Federation is our largest republic and it can make a big contribution to the accomplishment of this task.

Comrades, there is no doubt that your conference will be of great value to our work. Upon your return home from Moscow, you will work even harder, even more productively, even better. Conferences like yours encourage the people and give them wings. And wings are necessary for big and bold flights of creative imagination. We need them to rise ever higher to the peaks of Communism.

For centuries the ideologists of capitalism have tried to persuade people that the working class, the working people, cannot ensure the progress of mankind, that everything beautiful on earth is created by a chosen few. The working people of our country were the first to give them the lie. Today hundreds of millions of ordinary people in many countries have taken power into their own hands and are building with it a new Socialist society, confirming by their deeds the superiority of Socialism over capitalism.

You can only rejoice on seeing how many wonderful people—innovators, people with bold, creative minds—have sprung up in our country under the inspiring leadership of the Communist Party.

The day and hour is not far off when the whole working class, the whole collective farm peasantry of our country will be highly educated people. We already have scores of factories, mills and State farms where all the people study, where the differences between people who do mental and physical work are being obliterated.

The ideologists of capitalism used to spread another lie in the minds and hearts of the people. They say, and are still saying, that the forces of revolution are destructive only. The history of the growth of our country's might, as also the history of development of the People's Democracies, explodes these phoney inventions of bourgeois ideologists as well.

No, it isn't the kings and millionaires who have built the cities, factories and canals, who create machines, cultivate orchards and take in the harvest. All this is done by the working people, the real authors of everything beautiful that has been created on earth.

At the end of my speech I should like to reveal to you a small "secret". It is doubtful, however, whether its disclosure will give joy to the American intelligence. Here it is. There is some talk in the Party's central committee and the Government—and this is the secret I am telling you—that it would perhaps be a good thing to award orders and medals to the most deserving Communist work team shockworkers. What do you think about this?

You will not feel any resentment, I think, if this thought is followed up, because this decision will only further strengthen those who work well, while those who are not yet on a par with you, but would like to be, will receive convincing and pleasant encouragement.

The Soviet people are proud of being working men. The Soviet people work well because they know that to work for all is to work for oneself too. This is why all of us, at the bench, on the tractor or in the laboratory, must be even more active in our work, so that all people work with the utmost dedication, so that every worker devotes his work to our common cause, as a bee carries the nectar to the hive.

Long live the working class of our great Motherland ! Long live the leaders of the Soviet working class ! Long live our collective farm peasantry, the loyal brother and ally of the workers of our country ! Long live the leaders of the Soviet collective farm peasantry ! Long live our Soviet people's intelligentsia !

Long live all the working people of our great country who, under the leadership of the Communist Party, are advancing confidently toward the building of a Communist society !

Let us strengthen peace by our creative work, let us ensure victory for our country in the competition with capitalism !

Long live Communism !

Other Booklets on the International Situation and Peace

- TRIUMPHANT MARCH OF LENIN'S IDEAS:** Speech by Otto Kuusinen at the anniversary meeting, Moscow, April 22, 1960. 3d.
- PEACE IN EUROPE—PEACE THROUGHOUT THE WORLD:** Speech by N. S. Khrushchov on his French tour, April 4, 1960. 6d.
- LET US WORK FOR PEACE:** Address of N. S. Khrushchov on French television, April 2, 1960. 6d.
- SOVIET UNION—FAITHFUL FRIEND OF THE PEOPLES FIGHTING FOR INDEPENDENCE:** Speeches and Documents of N. S. Khrushchov's tour of Asia, February-March, 1960. 104 pp., illustrated. 2s.
- THE SOVIET UNION—STANDARD BEARER OF PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN NATIONS:** Speech by N. S. Khrushchov on his Asian tour of February-March, 1960. 6d.
- DISARMAMENT—THE WAY TO SECURE PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP:** Speech of N. S. Khrushchov to U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet, January 14, 1960. 6d.
- REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE SOVIET NATION:** Report of N. S. Khrushchov to Third Session of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet, October 31, 1959. 6d.
- PEACE AND PROGRESS MUST TRIUMPH IN OUR TIME:** Speech by N. S. Khrushchov, September 28, 1959. 6d.
- NATIONS SHOULD LIVE AS GOOD NEIGHBOURS:** N. S. Khrushchov's American TV Speech, September 27, 1959. 3d.
- FOR COMPLETE AND GENERAL DISARMAMENT:** Speech of N. S. Khrushchov to U.N. General Assembly, September 18, 1959. 4d.
- SOVIET EFFORTS FOR THE SOLUTION OF THE QUESTIONS OF GERMANY AND WEST BERLIN:** Documents. March-August, 1959. 1s.
- IF THE ARMS RACE WERE STOPPED:** Professor M. Rubinstein. 3d.
- ABOLITION OF TAXES AND OTHER MEASURES TO ADVANCE THE WELL-BEING OF THE SOVIET PEOPLE:** Report and concluding speech of N. S. Khrushchov to the Supreme Soviet, May 5-7, 1960, with text of the new laws. 6d.
-

THE FIFTEEN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS—TODAY AND TOMORROW: A special series of booklets describing how the fifteen Union Republics — Russia, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Lithuania, Moldavia, Latvia, Kirghiz, Tajikistan, Armenia, Turkmenia and Estonia—overcame their former backwardness, became thriving, modern socialist republics, and are now making still greater progress under the Seven-Year Plan. 6d. each.

Booklets—Annual Subscription

Soviet Booklets are published at the rate of one or two per month. An annual subscription of 5s. will bring them all to you, post free.

All subscriptions, orders and enquiries regarding booklets should be sent to:
SOVIET BOOKLETS, 3 Rosary Gardens, S.W.7.
