
PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements

1-1-1956

Report to the Supreme Soviet on the trip to India, Burma and Afghanistan

Nokolay Aleksandrovich Bulganin

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/prism>
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Bulganin, Nokolay Aleksandrovich, "Report to the Supreme Soviet on the trip to India, Burma and Afghanistan" (1956). *PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements*. 247.
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/prism/247>



REPORT TO THE SUPREME SOVIET ON THE

Visit to

India

Burma and

Afghanistan

N. A. BULGANIN and N. S. KHRUSHCHEV

35 cents

TRIP TO INDIA, BURMA AND AFGHANISTAN

REPORT TO THE SUPREME SOVIET ON THE

Trip to India,

Burma and Afghanistan

by

N. A. BULGANIN *and* N. S. KHRUSHCHEV

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS: *New York*

PUBLISHER'S FOREWORD

THE RECENT MONTH-LONG visit of Soviet Premier N. A. Bulganin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., and N. S. Khrushchev, member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, to India, Burma and Afghanistan, at the invitation of the heads of state of those three Asian governments, attracted worldwide attention and interest. The U.S. State Department regarded it as a development of special concern to American interests, and the statements and speeches of the Soviet statesmen were widely commented on in the American press.

However, while newspaper accounts reported the unprecedented enthusiasm which greeted the Soviet leaders everywhere, with as many as two million assembling to hear their words in Calcutta, and although brief quotations from some of their speeches were carried by the press and radio, not a single U.S. daily reported any of these speeches in full despite their extraordinary political significance and their import for global coexistence.

To meet the demand for complete and verified texts of their remarks, the most important speeches and interviews by Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev have been made available, as a public service, in two companion pamphlets entitled *Visit to India* and *Visit to Burma and Afghanistan*, which include also joint statements, communiqués and treaties of the countries concerned.

This pamphlet, under the title, *Our Trip to India, Burma and Afghanistan*, contains the addresses delivered by Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. shortly after their return to the Soviet Union.

Published by NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

FEBRUARY, 1956

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

REPORT TO THE SUPREME SOVIET

By N. A. Bulganin ON THE TRIP TO INDIA, BURMA AND AFGHANISTAN

Moscow, December 29, 1955

Comrade Deputies:

This session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. is meeting at the close of 1955, the year of major international developments which led up to important changes in international relations.

The outgoing year will go down into history as one of a definite shift in the strained international situation which has developed over the past period. Not a little credit for the achievement of this shift is due, in large measure, to the efforts of the Soviet Union directed towards ensuring peace and security of the peoples, promoting international confidence and developing extensive political, economic and cultural contacts between countries, irrespective of their social and political systems.

For Soviet foreign policy the year 1955 has been one of particularly active and persistent struggle for the consolidation of peace, for the relaxation of international tension, for wider co-operation between peoples and states. No one can deny today that the efforts the Soviet Union has made in this direction have been crowned with notable success.

An important contribution to peace has been, undoubtedly, the development of friendship and co-operation between the Soviet Union and India, Burma and Afghanistan, the countries Comrade Khrushchev and I visited a short while ago. This trip is an ample manifestation of the peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet Union and a fitting conclusion of the year 1955 which abounded in important international developments.

A direct result of our trip to India, Burma and Afghanistan has been the consolidation and extension of the relations of friendship and co-operation between the Soviet Union and these countries and still closer contact between the Soviet people and the great Indian people, the peoples of Burma and Afghanistan. But its significance is not confined to this, however.

The trip assumed a great international importance which lies, above all, in the fact that it has borne out once more the correctness of the fundamental Leninist principle of peaceful co-existence of nations with different social and political systems. The trip has made it amply evident and irrefutable that this principle is a reliable basis for strengthening peace and security of the peoples and for promoting international confidence.

It is a fact that the countries of Asia, inhabited as they are by over half the world's population, are playing today an increasingly important role in international life in modern times. For centuries the population of many Asian countries has been subjected to severe colonial oppression, and some peoples are still subjected to it. In an effort to justify their policy and their domination over the peoples of Asia, the colonizers have tried and are still trying to prove these peoples to be culturally and socially backward. One should not forget, however, that the historical development of the peoples of Asia had begun long before the European peoples emerged on the historical arena. And if the social and political progress of Asia was slowed down and held back for the past few centuries, this has come about through no fault of the peoples of Asia, but through the fault of the colonizers who have implanted in the countries of Asia, and not only in Asia but in Africa just as well, a system of government based on violence, robbery and ruthless exploitation of the population. This system brings fabulous wealth to the colonizers but for the oppressed peoples of Asia and Africa it spells poverty and great suffering.

This state of affairs endured for a long time, but it could not last forever. It was clear to anyone more or less familiar with the

laws of social development that national liberation movements were bound to develop in Asian countries and that these would take on an increasingly large scope. This is just what has actually happened. The peoples of Asia have begun waking up and straightening out their shoulders. The factors which contributed to this great awakening have been the great October Socialist Revolution in this country and the weakening of the colonial powers as a result of the first and, particularly, of the second world wars.

Speaking of the Eastern countries, our great teacher V. I. Lenin repeatedly pointed out that the masses in those countries would certainly rise to put an end to their status of inequality and to become independent participants and architects of life. The time would come, Lenin used to say, when hundreds of millions of people in Asia would become an active factor in world history and would play their part in deciding the destinies of the whole of humanity. This time has now come. Today we see the colonial system falling to pieces in Asia and throughout the East as a whole.

The great Chinese people, led by the Communist Party of China, have emerged on the highway of national regeneration and independence and on the path of building a socialist society. The historic victory of the Chinese people has had a tremendous effect on the entire situation in Asia and in the East. It gave a new impetus to the national liberation movement of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries.

The peoples of great India and those of Burma have shaken off the yoke of colonial rule. These people, inspired as they are by the striving for the regeneration and rejuvenation of their countries, have now entered the phase of independent economic and national development.

The road to freedom and independence has been taken by Indonesia and a number of other Eastern countries.

The movement for strengthening national independence is growing in scope in the Arab countries. The peoples of Africa are active in their fight for liberation.

Comrade Deputies:

N. S. Khrushchev and myself have been in India for three weeks. All this time, from the moment we first stepped on Indian soil and right up to our departure from that hospitable land, we were surrounded by the friendship and love of the Indian people who manifested the warmest and most friendly sentiments towards us

and enthusiastically saluted the Soviet Union through us. This is why our trip to India can be described as a meeting with the great Indian people.

When we went to India we knew that it was a country friendly to us and that we could expect a warm welcome. But what we saw and heard surpassed all our expectations. As we stepped down from the plane on arriving in Delhi we beheld the officials meeting us with Prime Minister Mr. Nehru at their head and crowds of people as far as the eye could see and we heard an unceasing roar of thousands of voices. The people gathered there cried out words in their native tongue unfamiliar to us. But one could understand that they were words of friendship and joy, so warm and sincere they sounded. We felt we had come to true friends of the Soviet people, to our brothers.

About a million people turned out to welcome us in Ramlila Square in Delhi. That was an unforgettable sight. The vast square was filled with a surging crowd and one could hear greetings coming from all sides, and read slogans written in Russian: "*Indians and Russians are Brothers!*", "*Long Live Indian-Soviet Friendship!*", "*Long Live World Peace!*", "*Welcome, Our Dear Guests from the Soviet Union!*" Those words of greeting came from the bottom of the heart of the Indian people.

We were proud to realize that the enthusiastic welcome the Indian people accorded us was meant for our glorious homeland, for the great Soviet people who, under the leadership of their Communist Party, carried out the Great October Socialist Revolution, routed their numerous external and internal enemies and, undeviatingly following our Party's general line, have built the first socialist state in the world.

Through us the Indian people wholeheartedly hailed the peoples of the Soviet Union who, in the bitter struggle against fascist hordes in the years of the Great Patriotic War, defended their gains and are now building a new communist society by their persistent constructive efforts. We found that the achievements of our country, her successes and victories, are near and understandable to the Indian people and that they welcome them ardently, with all their hearts.

It is impossible to remain unmoved in recalling, further, the meetings with the Indian people in Bombay, Puna, Coimbatore, Bangalore, Madras, Jaipur, Srinagar and other cities. But our most unforgettable and most vivid impression is that of our

meeting with the people of Calcutta. People began assembling there from adjoining towns and villages several days before our arrival. Prime Minister Mr. Nehru came to Calcutta. The papers wrote later on that there had been over three million people welcoming us in the streets of that city. That was a human sea, surging and roaring. We heard warmest words of greetings, the words of friendship and love for the Soviet Union. We were told that many of those who were present at the Calcutta meeting came to the square the day before to occupy places as close to the platform as possible.

We have seen friendly sentiments manifested towards us, as representatives of the Soviet people, not only in big cities but also in small villages where men, women, old folks and children came out to meet and greet us. And there, too, we heard joyful cheering in honor of our country.

We were deeply impressed by our meeting with members of the Indian Parliament who welcomed us very warmly, listened to our speeches with great attention and heartily acclaimed them. Indian statesmen and the Governments of the states which we visited received us warmly and hospitably. They took great care to make our stay in India pleasant and useful.

In Delhi we were the guests of Mr. Prasad, President of India. We stayed at his residence. Mr. Prasad did much to make Comrade Khrushchev and myself and our companions feel well and comfortable at his residence. We had a number of conversations with Mr. Prasad. We handed him a message from Comrade K. Y. Voroshilov, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. Mr. Prasad expressed profound gratitude for that message and gave us a message of reply for Comrade Voroshilov.

We met Mr. Radhakrishnan, Vice President of India, an outstanding statesman who, as President of the Parliament, welcomed us warmly and said many good things in his speech about the Soviet Union.

It is necessary to emphasize particularly our meetings with Mr. Nehru, Prime Minister of India, an outstanding statesman of our times. All our meetings with Mr. Nehru were inspired by a sincere feeling of friendship. Wherever we went we always felt his consideration of us.

Ardent and sincere sentiments of love and friendship for the Soviet people have been expressed also by the peoples of the

Union of Burma and Afghanistan whom we met later on. In the cities and villages of Burma, in Kabul, the capital of Afghanistan, the population hailed the Soviet Union and the Soviet people through us with a feeling of joy and sympathy.

We heard it pointed out in Delhi and other cities of India, in Rangoon and Kabul that none of those cities have ever seen such a friendly and impressive welcome as that given us, representatives of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people.

During our tour of India, we gained a knowledge of many aspects of the life of the Indian people. The Government of India offered us the opportunity of travelling West, South, East and North.

During our trip, we flew 22,500 kilometres, about ten thousand kilometres over India alone, in our Soviet plane Il-14P, designed by Sergei Vladimirovich Ilyushin. We toured different parts of India, a host of cities and villages, we have been to construction projects and industrial establishments, visited state-owned farms, many cultural institutions and saw remarkable monuments of India's ancient and rich culture.

For the British colonizers, who ruled India for about two centuries, this rich country has been an agricultural and raw materials appendage of the Metropolis, a market for manufactured goods. The British were not, naturally, anxious to develop Indian industries. This is the way of all colonizers whose objective is to squeeze as much profit as they can out of the colonies, giving nothing, or next to nothing, in return.

The people of India, having rid themselves of colonial oppression and regained their independence, have set about developing their country's economy under the leadership of their Government. Initial achievements in this direction have been gained. We visited and acquainted ourselves with India's leading industrial area which developed in recent years. It lies in the Damodar River valley, at the junction of the states of Bihar and West Bengal. Situated there is part of Indian iron and steel, engineering and chemical industries, coal pits and ore mines.

In the town of Chittarandjan we saw a new locomotive-building works. This is a state-owned establishment which began manufacturing locomotives in 1950. By the time of our arrival it had produced its three-hundredth locomotive. The Indians are proud of this works which they consider their country's first engineering plant. The engineers who showed us around the Works laid par-

ticular emphasis on the fact that over 80 per cent of locomotive component parts were made at the Works.

We visited also a fertilizer factory in Sindri. This is also a new state-owned establishment playing an important role in the economy of India whose agriculture badly needs mineral fertilizers. The town of Sindri grew up around the factory no more than four or five years ago.

India is an agricultural country, with more than three-fourths of her population engaged in farming. One of the most important problems connected with the expansion of agricultural production in India is artificial irrigation. Non-irrigated fields produce low yields and the Indian Government is doing much to set up an extensive irrigation network.

We inspected one of India's major construction projects, the Bhakra-Nangal system, where a large dam is being erected and a power station will be built. This is a broadly and boldly conceived project and interesting solutions have been found for a number of technical problems. But of the greatest interest there was the tremendous labor enthusiasm of the workers and engineers who are building that installation. The Bhakra-Nangal Project reminded us of our first Five-Year Plan when we were building our first powerful establishments.

The Government of India is exploring ways for advancing agricultural production within the bounds of private landownership. To this end the Government is carrying out in the villages measures which have come to be known as "the Communal Development Program" and "the Program for the Promotion of National Development." We were told that nearly 20 per cent of Indian villages come within the scope of these programs at present and that this system of agrarian development is to be extended throughout the country under the second Five-Year Plan.

We visited a number of state-owned farms. These are small but well organized establishments which, in our opinion, are unquestionably fulfilling their positive role as experimental farms.

When we were in India we saw that the Indian people, who have freed themselves from colonial oppression, are capable of advancing boldly along the road of industrial progress, towards building an economically independent state. At the same time, we again and again found that the Indian people are yearning for peace and co-operation with other nations.

The visit of Mr. Nehru, Prime Minister of India, to the Soviet

Union last summer already showed the community of interests of the Soviet Union and India in the struggle for peace and international security which found its expression in the first Soviet-Indian Joint Statement signed in Moscow on June 22 this year.

In the course of our conversations in Delhi with Prime Minister Mr. Nehru and other Indian statesmen we again exchanged views both on questions of further promoting friendly co-operation between the Soviet Union and India and on most important international problems. The result of these talks with Mr. Nehru and other Indian statesmen has been the Soviet-Indian Joint Statement signed on December 13.

In that historic document of great international importance both Governments reaffirmed their allegiance to the principles of respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, for whatever reason—economic, political or ideological, equality and mutual benefit, peaceful co-existence. These principles are a reliable basis for peaceful co-existence of states with different social and political systems. The Soviet Government considers that the acceptance of these principles by other countries, including the United States of America, Britain and France, would contribute to the further easing of international tension and promoting the necessary confidence between the nations.

The Soviet and the Indian Governments denounced in their Statement signed in Delhi the current arms drive which is assuming increasingly alarming proportions and unanimously declared themselves for its cessation, for relieving the peoples of the heavy burden of military expenditures. Taking full account of the danger inherent in the situation when atomic and hydrogen weapons are being stockpiled systematically and incessantly, both Governments went on record for the unconditional prohibition of these weapons and for ridding mankind of the fear of atomic war involving incalculable material damage and incalculable human casualties.

The Soviet Union has stood and stands for putting an end to the arms race and concluding an international agreement outlawing atomic and hydrogen weapons and other types of weapons of mass annihilation, including rocket missiles which have been developed particularly over the past few years and, we can say, are becoming intercontinental weapons. As early as in May 1955 the Soviet Union put forward the proposal for the reduction of

conventional armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons.

The implementation of this proposal would be a substantial contribution to peace. We are glad that the Indian Government's view on this noble task is similar to our own.

As a result of our conversations in India full mutual understanding was reached that the policy of military blocs which is pursued by certain governments directed against other countries is aggravating international tension, increasing the danger of a new war and that such a policy is incompatible with interests of expanding co-operation between all states regardless of their political and social systems.

The peoples of Asian and African nations cannot but feel alarmed over the establishment of such aggressive military alignments as SEATO and the recently designed Baghdad pact.

It is the United States, Britain and France which have been the engineers of SEATO. As for the Baghdad military grouping, we know only too well that it was Britain who played the first fiddle in whipping it up. The Baghdad pact is a new form of colonialism. It is aggressive in essence which is shown by the nature of the commitments of the parties to this military grouping. It became particularly evident after the involvement of Iran into this grouping.

The Soviet Government has on a number of occasions drawn the attention of the Iranian Government to the fact that Iran's accession to the military alignments which the Western powers have long tried to make her join, is incompatible with the maintenance of good neighborly relations between Iran and the Soviet Union. In doing so we emphasized that we want to maintain good relations with Iran just as with other neighboring countries. Unfortunately, those responsible for Iran's policy have chosen a different course, acceding to the Baghdad pact and thus assuming grave responsibility for the emerged situation.

We wave aside as groundless the attempts of the Iranian Government to make out that Iran's accession to the above mentioned pact has the objective of strengthening peace in the Middle East. This assertion is no truer than that the Atlantic bloc pursued the purpose of strengthening peace in Europe.

We heard with satisfaction the statement made from this rostrum by Mr. Saed, head of the Iranian parliamentary delegation, that the Government and the people of Iran sincerely desire firmer friendly and good neighborly relations with the Soviet Union.

However, we have to reckon with the fact that the establishment of the Baghdad pact and the drawing into it of the countries bordering on the Soviet Union cannot but affect the security of our country. The Soviet Union has had to draw proper conclusions from this.

Accordingly, the Joint Statement signed during our stay in India denounces the policy of military alliances and regional military blocs and emphasizes that it is only through collective international efforts that peace and genuine security of the peoples can be guaranteed.

The Soviet Government and the Government of India have expressed the conviction that lasting peace in Asia is impossible without granting the People's Republic of China its legitimate seat in the United Nations. Both Governments have spoken of the need for the early settlement of other Far Eastern issues, including the question of Taiwan and the offshore Chinese islands, on the basis of satisfying the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China.

Our Joint Statement expresses the hope that these problems will be solved without delay through agreements.

The Governments of both countries stressed the need for settling the Korean question on the basis of recognizing the Korean people's national rights and in conformity with the interests of peace in the Far East and the need to implement the Geneva agreements on Indo-China. It is matter of record that attempts are now being made to raise obstacles to the implementing of these agreements, notwithstanding the fact that their violation, as rightly pointed out in the Soviet-Indian Statement of December 13, "is fraught with exceptionally grave consequences alike for Indo-China and the whole world."

The identity of views of the Soviet Union and India on unsolved problems of Asia and the Far East is undoubtedly an important factor, capable of facilitating a settlement of these issues on the basis of recognition of the legitimate rights of the peoples and in conformity with the requirements of maintaining peace.

Pursuing a policy of peace, the Soviet Union and India are successfully co-operating in a number of questions, on whose settlement the United Nations is working. This has been expressed not only in the community of views of both states on such prob-

lems as disarmament, but also on the question of United Nations membership. We note with gratification the Indian Government's support of the Soviet proposal on the admission of sixteen states into the United Nations—Albania, Jordan, Ireland, Portugal, Hungary, Italy, Austria, Rumania, Bulgaria, Finland, Ceylon, Nepal, Libya, Cambodia, Laos, and Spain. We share the hope expressed by Mr. Nehru that the countries which are today outside the United Nations will soon be admitted into the organization.

The Soviet-Indian Statement notes that the Soviet Union and India are unanimous in their assessment of the results of the Geneva Four Power Heads-of-Government Conference and in the appraisal of the recent Conference of the Foreign Ministers of these powers. Mr. Nehru and we reached full mutual understanding on the need to continue the efforts aimed at easing international tension considering that negotiation is the best method of settling disputed issues.

Comrade Deputies, the community of views between the Soviet Union and India on important international problems is explained not by transitory reasons and considerations dictated by current developments. It stems from the fundamental interests of the peoples of both states who are striving for peace and security.

The Soviet people, led by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, are engaged in peaceful constructive endeavors of building Communist society, carrying out the sweeping plans of economic and cultural development and raising their living standard. We have not threatened and do not threaten anyone, and in the Soviet Union all the peace-loving peoples will always find a staunch fighter for the cause of peace and international co-operation.

The peace-loving policy of India also rests on deep-rooted foundations stemming from the character of the development of the Indian state. We saw what great efforts the Indian people are exerting to develop their economy. From talks with Mr. Nehru and other Indian statesmen we learned the magnitude of the tasks facing India in advancing the living standards of the population. The Indian people are vitally interested in peace, are interested in working peacefully and creating material values for the good of their country.

The Soviet Union's and India's community of interests in the struggle for peace constitutes a solid foundation for the mainte-

nance and further development of the friendly relations established between both countries.

Of great importance for the continued consolidation of our relations with India are the economic ties between the two countries and the utilization of the available potentialities. For that reason the Indian Government and we exchanged views on the ways and means for the further development of economic relations and expansion of trade between India and the Soviet Union.

We agreed that the Soviet Union will deliver to India within three years, beginning with 1956, one million tons of rolled ferrous metals, including 300,000 tons in the first year and 350,000 tons each in the next two successive years. By agreement between the parties India will also be supplied with diverse industrial plant and other goods. Understanding was reached that the Soviet Union would increase the purchase of Indian goods. Both sides came to the conclusion that it was necessary to organize regular shipping lines between the ports of the U.S.S.R. and India and to establish aerial communication between our countries.

The Soviet Government holds that international co-operation means specifically the exchange of experience between countries, including countries with different social systems. During our meetings in India we pointed to the willingness of the Soviet Union to share its experience with India and first and foremost experience in economic construction. At the same time we said that we do not want to impose our experience on anyone, but if the friendly Indian people should wish to make use of that experience to some extent, we would readily share it with them. We also would like to and must utilize the experience of India which has an age-old culture.

The Soviet Union's consolidation of political and economic relations with India can and should be supplemented by the development of cultural bonds between our countries, which is desired by both sides. During our sojourn in India we learned of the great gifts of the Indian people who have created world-renowned monuments of material and spiritual culture, inimitable models of national architecture, their own remarkable school of histrionic art, dancing and music, which preserves and develops the traditions of folk art.

In India too there is a great striving for cultural rapprochement with the Soviet Union. We welcome this striving, convinced that such rapprochement will benefit both peoples.

In India we had many meetings and talks with statesmen and civic leaders, managers of industrial establishments and farms, workers in science, culture and the arts, representatives of the most diverse vocations. All of them were highly interested in the Soviet Union, and in the life and activities of the Soviet people. We invited many of them to visit our country to get better acquainted with the Soviet people, to see for themselves how they live and work. This no doubt will further strengthen friendship and bring our peoples still closer together.

Our frank statements on Goa and the Kashmir question have aroused great dissatisfaction of the reactionary press and of some foreign statesmen.

It is known that Portugal's small colony, Goa, is still preserved on the age-old Indian territory. The Indian people rightly demand that an end be put to such an intolerable situation, demand Goa's liberation. Suffice it to look at the map of India and at these "possessions" of the Portuguese usurpers to become convinced that the Indian Government justly and lawfully raises the question of reunifying this territory with India. The Soviet Government supports this just demand of India and holds that the preservation of a Portuguese colony on Indian territory, as in general the preservation of the colonial regime in our times, is a disgrace for the civilized nations.

As for the Kashmir problem, it has been created by states which pursue definite military and political objects in this area. On the pretext of supporting Pakistan in the Kashmir question, certain countries tried to entrench themselves in that part of India in order to threaten the areas around Kashmir and to exert pressure on them. Attempts have been made to sever Kashmir artificially from India, to turn it into a foreign military base.

The people of Kashmir have resolutely come out against this imperialist policy. The Kashmir question has already been settled by the people of Kashmir themselves. They consider themselves an integral part of the Republic of India and strive to build in the fraternal family of Indian peoples a new independent India, to fight for peace and the security of the nations. We have become profoundly convinced of this during our meetings with the people in Srinagar, in talks with the esteemed Prime Minister of Kashmir, Mr. Ghulam Mohammed Bakshi, and his colleagues.

The Soviet Government supports India's policy on the Kashmir

question because it fully accords with the interests of consolidating peace in that part of Asia. We stated so when we were in Kashmir, confirmed it at the press conference in Delhi on December 14, and reaffirm it now.

Our trip to India brought our countries still closer together. The friendly ties binding the Soviet Union and India were appreciably strengthened. We had known before we came to India of the sincere fraternal feelings of the Indian people for the Soviet peoples and became still more convinced of this during our visit. Political and economic co-operation between our countries received a new big stimulus for its all-round development. Broader prospects for expanding cultural and scientific relations were opened up.

We, Soviet people, wish our great friend, the Indian people, every success in advancing their country's economy, in developing industry and agriculture, in raising the material and cultural standards of the population, in strengthening the Republic of India as an independent and sovereign state.

Friendship and co-operation between the Soviet Union and India is a major factor in safeguarding peace and the security of the nations. We shall continue to develop and strengthen this great friendship.

I am going over to our trip to Burma.

Burma has embarked on the road of independent national development as a result of the selfless struggle of the whole people against the centuries-old rule of the British colonialists, and then during the second world war against the incursion of the Japanese militarists who ruthlessly robbed the Burmese peoples and looted their possessions.

In the struggle for their independence the Burmese people have displayed resolution and heroism. The leader of the Burmese people in their struggle for independence, the popular hero Aung San, and his companions-in-arms fell at the hands of the enemies of national liberation.

But the people have achieved their goal—they smashed the shackles of colonial slavery and created an independent state, the Union of Burma. Surmounting great difficulties, due to the consequences of colonial oppression and war destruction, the people of Burma undertook to restore and consolidate their country's economy.

The visit of Prime Minister U Nu of Burma to the Soviet Union

in October and November this year initiated close friendly contact between the Union of Burma and the U.S.S.R.

A Joint Soviet-Burmese Statement, permeated with the desire to strengthen the spirit of confidence and co-operation in international relations, was signed in Moscow on November 3. The Statement stressed that the sincere and friendly relations between our countries are founded on the well-known five principles of peaceful co-existence, which have already been recognized by many states and peoples of the world and are fully aimed at strengthening peace among the nations.

Our visit to the Union of Burma from December 1 to December 7 of this year, the meetings with the peoples of this hospitable country and personal contact with its leaders once again confirmed that Burma actively advocates the maintenance of friendly relations between states, condemns the policy of setting up military blocs and champions joint collective efforts of states in the consolidation of peace.

On December 1, we arrived in Rangoon, the Burmese capital, where the city's population and the leaders of the Burmese Government headed by Prime Minister U Nu gave us a friendly and very warm welcome. Similarly warm and joyous meetings with the people of Burma took place in the other cities we visited during our six-day sojourn in that country. Besides Rangoon, we visited the Shan State, part of the Union of Burma, and its capital Tounggyi and also Mandalay, the second biggest city of Burma. Everywhere the Burmese people cordially and sincerely hailed the Soviet people, the Soviet Union and the consolidation of Burmese-Soviet friendship.

Particularly joyful was the impression made on us by the meeting with the students and the faculty of Rangoon University in which several thousand Burmese youth and girls study. The young generation of a people that has thrown off the yoke of colonial oppression is taking the first steps in assimilating scientific knowledge essential for independent advance along the road chosen by the people, for the development of their national economy and culture.

The University students listened with rapt attention to the speech of Comrade N. S. Khrushchev who told them in detail about the Soviet Union, our life, the educational system in our country. Great interest was aroused by sections of the speech condemning the imperialist powers' colonialist policy and stating

that the Soviet Union does not support the colonialist policy and resolutely opposes it.

This statement, as many other parts of the speech, was enthusiastically approved by the students and professors.

During our stay in Burma we had useful meetings and talks with Dr. Ba U, President of the Union of Burma, to whom we conveyed the personal message of Comrade K. Y. Voroshilov, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. Dr. Ba U received this message with many thanks.

We on behalf of the Government invited U Ba Swe, Burmese Minister of Defense, and U Kyaw Nyein, Minister of Industry, to visit the Soviet Union. Both Ministers accepted the invitation.

Special mention should be made of our meetings and talks with Prime Minister U Nu of the Union of Burma, which proceeded in a warm and friendly atmosphere. The result of these meetings was the Soviet-Burmese Statement signed in Rangoon on December 6.

The statement notes the community of views of both countries on the main international issues requiring settlement: disarmament, including prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, the Far-Eastern problem, including the need to satisfy the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China with regard to Taiwan and the offshore islands of China, and the question of granting the People's Republic of China its lawful seat in the United Nations.

The Governments of both countries reaffirmed their unanimous opinion that the policy of building up blocs must be condemned, that only the policy of non-participation in such blocs promotes confidence and good will between nations. "International peace can be strengthened and confidence in the future ensured for the peoples not by the formation of blocs but only by the joint and collective efforts of all nations," the Soviet-Burmese Statement points out.

The Community of views of the Governments of both countries was also established as regards the results of the Geneva Four-Power Heads-of-Government Conference and the recent Conference of the Foreign Ministers of these countries. The Soviet-Burmese Statement of December 6 stresses that both countries stand for the continuation of joint efforts to settle outstanding international issues.

Our relations with Burma rest on a solid foundation because

both sides are vitally interested in maintaining and extending co-operation on the basis of the five principles of peaceful co-existence.

Our economic relations with the Union of Burma are founded on the principles of equality and mutual benefit and preclude the imposition by one side of political or any other fettering terms on the other side. In full conformity with these principles, supported also by the Government of the Union of Burma, we negotiated during our sojourn in Rangoon for the consolidation of Soviet-Burmese co-operation in the economic, cultural, scientific and technical spheres, specifically for the expansion of trade between Burma and the U.S.S.R.

Agreement was reached that the Soviet Union will co-operate in drawing up an agricultural project, in carrying out the main irrigation development work and in building some industrial establishments in Burma. Burma on her part will sell to the Soviet Union rice, and if the quantity of purchased rice does not compensate for the cost of our deliveries, in such cases Burma will enjoy the right of credit, that is, of installment payments in kind over a number of years by mutual agreement.

As a token of good will and respect for the people of the Union of Burma we offered, on behalf and on the instructions of the Soviet Government, to build and equip with the means and at the expense of the Soviet Union a technological institute in Rangoon as a gift to the people of the Union of Burma.

The Government of the Union of Burma deeply appreciated the motives which prompted the Soviet Government to make this offer, and accepted the gift with deep gratitude to the Soviet Government and the Soviet people.

On behalf of the Burmese people, Prime Minister U Nu offered in his turn as a gift to the Soviet Union a corresponding quantity of rice and certain other Burmese products. On behalf of the Soviet people we gratefully accepted this gift.

The leading statesmen of Burma and broad circles of the Burmese intellectuals are evincing a great desire to develop cultural relations with the Soviet Union. We declared that the Soviet Union was ready to develop cultural relations with Burma inasmuch as this can only be of benefit to both countries and can promote the further consolidation of friendly relations between them.

The Burmese Government expressed its satisfaction with the

good will manifested by the Soviet Government during the negotiations in Rangoon. On our part we wished the Burmese Union an early liquidation of the consequences of colonial oppression and the war damage, the consolidation and rallying of the Burmese people, further successes in the building of their economy which will be independent of foreign states and free of the difficulties which it still encounters because of certain foreign countries which are striving to place Burma at a disadvantage in the world markets.

The peoples of the Soviet Union and Burma are unanimous in their desire to preserve and consolidate peace, to ensure the security of the peoples and further develop co-operation and friendship among the nations. Comrade Khrushchev's and my stay in Burma as guests of the Government, the meetings we had with the Burmese people have brought the Soviet Union and Burma still closer together. Friendship and co-operation between our countries is assuming the significance of a factor of growing importance for the easing of international tension.

We will make every effort to develop and strengthen friendship and co-operation between our two states for the good and the happiness of our peoples.

Now, I shall go over to the results of our trip to Afghanistan.

It is difficult to overestimate the significance and the result of our sojourn in Afghanistan as guests of the Royal Government. The Soviet Union has a common frontier with Afghanistan stretching for 2,346 kilometres, and is bound up with that country by long-standing ties of close and friendly relations.

The Afghan people have won their national independence in a fierce struggle against the British imperialists who tried to turn Afghanistan into their colony. The intrepid Afghan people thrice emerged victorious from this struggle and in 1919 finally established their independence and statehood. An important part in the establishment of Afghanistan's independence was played by the defeat of the interventionists in Central Asia by the Soviet State.

Afghanistan has always enjoyed the invariable support of the Soviet State. Our country was the first power to recognize Afghanistan as a sovereign state as early as 1919. In her turn Afghanistan was one of the first foreign countries to recognize the Soviet State created as a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution. These facts show how deep-rooted are the good relations which

developed between the two countries. Experience has shown that these good-neighborly relations are completely in keeping with the vital interests of the peoples of both countries.

Our meetings in Kabul with His Majesty the King of Afghanistan,* Mr. Mohammed Daoud and other outstanding statesmen of Afghanistan showed that they wish to preserve and develop the good-neighbor relations between our countries.

This desire of Afghanistan's Royal Government can be only welcomed by us and we pointed this out while in Kabul. On its part the Soviet Government did and intends to do everything necessary to strengthen and develop our relations with this neighbor country.

The exchange of opinions with the leading statesmen of Afghanistan revealed the desire of both Governments to promote the further easing of international tension and the extension of international co-operation. We note with satisfaction the community of views held by both Governments on a number of international issues, including disarmament and the problems of Asia and the Far East, which found its expression in the Joint Soviet-Afghan Statement signed in Kabul on December 18.

In our speeches in Kabul we set forth our views regarding the Pushtunistan question which greatly worries the Afghan people. Pushtunistan is a region inhabited by "independent Afghan tribes." In 1893 the region was included in the British Empire, and in 1947, contrary to the interests of the tribes inhabiting it, Pushtunistan was incorporated in Pakistan.

We think the demands of Afghanistan to give the population of bordering Pushtunistan an opportunity of freely expressing their will are justified and grounded. The people of this region have the same right to national self-determination as any other people. There can be no justification for the stand of those who do not want to reckon with and disregard the lawful national interests of the people of Pushtunistan.

Our relations with Afghanistan are based on a number of treaties concluded since the establishment of an independent Afghan state. Important among them is the Treaty of Neutrality and Non-aggression between the U.S.S.R. and Afghanistan of June 24, 1931.

During our sojourn in Kabul, agreement was reached with the

**Mohammed Zahir Shah, the Prime Minister of Afghanistan*

Royal Government of Afghanistan to prolong the above-mentioned treaty for 10 years, i.e., until 1966. We also agreed that upon the expiration of this term the treaty shall remain in force if neither of the parties gives notice of its termination. A special Protocol was signed for this purpose in Kabul. This act is of great significance and shows that both sides earnestly regard their commitments and intend to develop their relations on the basis of the concluded treaties and agreements.

We hold that the policy of neutrality and good-neighbor relations pursued by the Royal Government of Afghanistan with regard to other countries promotes the consolidation of the positions of the Afghan state. In contradistinction to Pakistan which, owing to her participation in the Baghdad military alignment landed in a difficult situation as regards her home and foreign affairs, Afghanistan undoubtedly has great opportunities for its independent state and economic development.

We would be glad if Pakistan could also make use of these opportunities. The Soviet Union wants to maintain equally friendly relations with Pakistan as with India, Burma and Afghanistan and we are not to blame if these are lacking so far. Nevertheless, the Soviet Government has exerted and will continue to exert efforts to improve our relations also with Pakistan.

In Afghanistan we had a very fruitful exchange of opinions on the question of economic relations between our countries and their extension. Talks with Afghanistan's leading statesmen brought to light new opportunities for the further development of economic co-operation between both countries and, specifically, the expansion of Soviet-Afghan trade.

On instruction of the Government we agreed to grant Afghanistan a long-term credit amounting to 100 million United States' dollars.

While in Kabul we invited, on behalf of the Soviet Government, Prime Minister Mohammed Daoud of Afghanistan to visit the Soviet Union at a time he finds convenient. Mr. Mohammed Daoud accepted the invitation and expressed the desire to visit our country in 1956. We have no doubt that Mr. Mohammed Daoud's visit to the Soviet Union, just as the trip I made with Comrade Khrushchev to Afghanistan, will further promote the strengthening of friendly relations between our countries.

During the period of 36 years which have elapsed since the founding of the independent Afghan state, our relations with it

could serve as an example of true good-neighborliness and friendly co-operation. We intend to continue developing our relations with Afghanistan in a way which would answer the interests of the peoples of both countries and the interests of consolidating peace.

We want to see Afghanistan an economically strong and politically independent country, and we are glad to point out that our policy with regard to it meets with the complete understanding of the Afghan Royal Government and the Afghan people.

Comrade Deputies, the consolidation of our friendly relations with India, Burma and Afghanistan is a triumph of the Leninist principles underlying the peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet Union, a triumph of the principles of peaceful co-existence.

It is known that the Soviet Union, India, Burma and Afghanistan differ as to their social and political systems. However, this circumstance does not and will not hamper the further consolidation of relations between our countries. A solid basis for these relations are the five known principles of which I have spoken above.

These are the principles on which the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, India, Burma, Afghanistan and several other countries of Europe, Asia and Africa, base their relations between each other, and with the other countries. We profoundly respect these principles which are completely in keeping with the fundamentals of the Soviet Union's foreign policy, and hold that if more countries subscribe to them and take them as their guide, confidence between the states will develop more successfully, and the easing of international tension and the consolidation of peace will proceed at a more rapid pace.

Our trip to the countries of Asia, it is known, has met with wide response throughout the world and especially in the countries of Asia and Africa.

Addressing meetings and civic receptions in India, Burma and Afghanistan we spoke of the friendly sentiments entertained by our people to the peoples of these countries, of the Leninist peaceful policy conducted by our state.

We greeted the peoples who have thrown off the fetters of colonial slavery, and sympathized with those peoples who still languish under the yoke of the colonialists. In his speeches Comrade Khrushchev frankly and truthfully presented our view regarding the actions of the imperialists and the colonialists in Asia,

Africa and everywhere they formerly lorded supreme or where they still preserve their domination.

Foreign press reports indicate that great importance is attached to these speeches in the Eastern countries. In particular, the press notes that not a single representative of the bourgeois world would dare to tell the Asian peoples the truth about the colonial powers, and that such things could be said only by those who are champions of equality among the peoples and who conduct an active struggle for the freedom of all the countries of the world and for their development along lines of their own choosing.

Our straightforward, sincere words were received with sympathy and understanding not only by those we addressed. Our words were heard far beyond the frontiers of India, Burma and Afghanistan, they were heard by the other peoples of the Asian and the African continents.

Together with these peoples the positive results of our trip are acclaimed by the broad public of the People's Republic of China and the People's Democracies. Our trip is approved by progressive-minded people throughout the world, and by all our friends.

However, not everybody liked our visit to the countries of Asia. Our speeches in India, Burma and Afghanistan, and the documents of friendship signed in Delhi, Rangoon and Kabul, evoked dissatisfaction and even indignation of the reactionary press and the official representatives of certain countries. They do not like our friendship with India, Burma and Afghanistan. But we like it very much, and we will strengthen it, just as we will strengthen friendship and co-operation with other countries.

Certain Western statesmen disliked our frank statements regarding the colonialist policy. But we, just as the Asian and African peoples, dislike even more the colonial policy itself. We come out and will continue to come out against it because we hold that colonial regimes are a disgrace for present day mankind and are incompatible with the peaceful and democratic principles of the United Nations.

During our trip statements appeared in the Western countries alleging that our visit to India, Burma and Afghanistan had the purpose of undermining relations between the peoples of these countries and the peoples of the Western states. Such assertions are absolutely groundless. The consolidation of friendly relations between the Soviet Union, India, Burma and Afghanistan can in

no way prejudice relations between these nations and the other peoples.

On the contrary, it will promote the development of international co-operation.

This, perhaps, is not quite clear to those people who got into the habit of thinking in terms of military blocs and pacts. But we have a different approach to the question of improving relations between the Soviet Union and the other states. Similar views are held by the leading statesmen of India, Burma and Afghanistan, who, just as we do, stand for the expansion of international co-operation on the basis of peaceful co-existence.

Comrade Deputies, the results of our trip to India, Burma and Afghanistan show once again how important personal contacts between leading statesmen are for the consolidation of understanding between the peoples and the relaxation of international tension. We intend to make wide use of such contacts in the future.

I want to avail myself of this occasion to express, on behalf of the Soviet Government and our people, heartfelt gratitude to the peoples of India, Burma and Afghanistan for the cordial and warm reception accorded us.

We convey ardent greetings to the peoples of these three countries—sincere friends of the Soviet Union—and wish them success in the consolidation of their national independence and in their peaceful creative labor.

We thank from the bottom of our hearts Prime Minister Nehru of India who saw to it that our sojourn in India was beneficial to both countries.

We express cordial gratitude to Prime Minister U Nu of Burma with whom we have established warm and friendly relations.

We warmly thank Prime Minister Mohammed Daoud of Afghanistan who is actively upholding the independence and neutrality of his country.

We think it our duty to express our acknowledgements to Mr. Prasad, President of the Republic of India, Doctor Ba U, President of the Union of Burma, and to His Majesty the King of Afghanistan Mohammed Zahir Shah.

We thank all the statesmen and civic leaders of these countries who contributed to the success of our trip and rendered us all assistance.

In conclusion I deem it necessary to state that the Soviet Government will unswervingly and resolutely carry out all the

agreements with India, Burma and Afghanistan concluded during our trip there. We will spare no efforts to develop and strengthen friendship and co-operation between the U.S.S.R., India, Burma and Afghanistan for the good of our peoples and for the benefit of world peace.

REPORT TO THE SUPREME SOVIET

By **N. S. Khrushchev** **ON THE TRIP TO INDIA, BURMA** **AND AFGHANISTAN**

Moscow, December 29, 1955

Comrade Deputies:

We heard the report of Comrade Nikolai Alexandrovich Bulganin on the results of our trip to three friendly countries—India, Burma and Afghanistan. The report expresses the main thing which it was necessary to present to the Supreme Soviet concerning the results of our trip to those countries and the negotiations we conducted there on behalf of the Soviet Government, the agreements reached between the Government of the Soviet Union and the Governments of India, Burma and Afghanistan.

I fully agree with all the points in Comrade Bulganin's report. I also want to speak on some questions.

The Soviet Government has gladly accepted the invitation of the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, and has sent us to India on a friendly reply visit to establish personal contacts with the leaders and the people of that country. Our countries have many things in common which unite them and the most important is the struggle for the consolidation of world peace.

I think there is no need to speak on the importance of the Republic of India. The great Indian people are fully resolved to consolidate the national and political independence of their country which they have won. India, as a peaceloving state, plays an ever growing part in settling many major international questions. She is an active fighter for the maintenance and consolidation of world peace.

The peoples of India, who have liberated themselves from the colonial regime, are persistently searching for their own ways for developing the country. The Government of the Republic of India, headed by such an outstanding statesman and political leader as the esteemed Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, is consistently pursuing its own policy independent of other states. And this is worthy of great respect.

The close contact and businesslike co-operation of our countries is useful and beneficial to both sides.

We were guided by similar considerations, accepting the invitation of the Government of Burma and the Government of Afghanistan to visit their countries.

We knew that our visit to India, Burma and Afghanistan would arouse the dissatisfaction of the colonialists who are afraid that the consolidation of friendship between the Soviet Union and countries which but recently were under their heel would tend further to weaken the positions of the colonial powers. But the Messrs. colonialists have only themselves to blame.

It is generally known that the Soviet Union's principles of co-operation and friendship with other states radically differ from the principles upon which the colonialists' policy is based. The Soviet Union, setting an example of profound understanding and respect for the interests of all peoples and countries, big and small, proceeds from the premise that there are no unequal or inferior peoples.

Strengthening friendship with other states, the Soviet Union does not impose its will upon them, does not dictate any preliminary conditions, as the imperialist states do. It does not seek any special advantages for itself but proceeds from the principle that it is dealing with equal partners whose interests must be respected.

Each people have the right to arrange their life as they wish. The enslavement or pillage of one country by another is the greatest injustice and disgrace.

Equality of the peoples, non-interference of some states into

the internal affairs of other states, non-aggression, peaceful co-existence of countries irrespective of their political systems—it is on these principles that our relations with other countries have always been founded. The strict observance of these principles by us, our cooperation with Asian states, which is becoming ever closer, compel the colonialists to revise their tactics with regard to the countries where they seek to retain their positions, ease the position of these countries.

And this is a factor of no little importance.

We also had in view that our visit to India, Burma and Afghanistan will not only facilitate closer contact between the leaders of our countries but will also bring the peoples closer together. The peoples of India, Burma and Afghanistan were able to learn more about the Soviet Union, the life of the peoples in the Soviet land. And this will strengthen our friendly bonds. And, lastly, we were firmly convinced that our trip to India, Burma and Afghanistan will still more strengthen the positions of peace throughout the world, will weaken the camp of the warmakers. Even this consideration by itself made our trip imperative, because the cause of peace is a great cause expressing the supreme desire of all mankind.

Now we can say the big hopes placed in this trip have been fully justified.

Comrade Deputies,

I will not take up your time with a recital of my impressions of the tour of India, Burma and Afghanistan, since that would require too much time. I will say only one thing: these impressions are exceptionally strong and moving. They are unforgettable. And the strongest of them is the impression of meetings with the people.

We expected to be warmly received in India both by the leaders and the people. But what we felt from the very first moment of our arrival there surpassed all our expectations.

Both in Delhi, the Indian capital, and in the other states and cities of India we were welcomed by hundreds of thousands, millions of people. And these were exceptionally hearty meetings expressing the ardent love of the peoples of India for the peoples of the Soviet Union.

Wherever we came we were surrounded by friends, who cheered for eternal and inviolable friendship of India and the Soviet Union. The great family of the Indian peoples received us, envoys

of the great Soviet people, as warmly and heartily as a friendly family welcomes a beloved brother.

Similarly hearty was the welcome accorded us by the peoples of Burma, Prime Minister U Nu and the other leaders of the Union of Burma. We were received just as warmly in Afghanistan both by the people and the Prime Minister, Mr. Mohammed Daoud, and the other leaders of Afghanistan.

We naturally were far from thinking that the elation and expression of the most ardent love displayed by the peoples of India, Burma and Afghanistan for us were meant for us personally.

We saw in this an expression of the boundless love and respect of the peoples of the friendly countries for the peoples of the Soviet Union.

We saw in that sincere recognition by the peoples of India, Burma and Afghanistan of the historic services of the peoples of the Soviet Union in the struggle for world peace, for the radiant future of all mankind.

During our sojourn in India, Burma and Afghanistan we had a broad exchange of opinions with the governments of those countries on many important questions of international affairs. And everywhere we found common mutual understanding on all the questions we discussed. And we discussed chiefly questions of peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems, the further development of economic and cultural relations between our countries.

The community of our views was revealed in the course of the talks and we swiftly found mutually acceptable solutions of these problems and the necessary formulations for the joint statements and agreements.

So it was in India, so it was in Burma, so it was in Afghanistan. It is very pleasant to note this point.

Does it not show that given good will and honest intentions of the leaders of countries, it is possible and necessary to settle peacefully all questions of relations among countries notwithstanding the difference in social systems?

There are such common questions whose settlement is absolutely indisputable and mutually acceptable, in which all the peoples are equally interested irrespective of whether they live in socialist countries or capitalist countries. We can successfully cooperate in settling these matters.

Perhaps the most graphic and convincing example of this is

the relations of the Soviet Union with India. The social and political systems in the Soviet Union and India differ. We and the leaders of India have different views on a number of matters. Neither we nor our friends, the leaders of the Indian state, conceal this point.

This, however, does not prevent us and our Indian friends, while adhering to the five principles of peaceful co-existence which we have placed at the basis of our relations with other countries, from maintaining and developing friendly relations between the Soviet Union and India. The warm-hearted and friendly relations between our countries are progressing and developing.

Our relations with the Union of Burma and with Afghanistan, our old friend and good neighbor, are developing in the same direction.

As a result of our journey to India, Burma and Afghanistan, there have been concluded between the Soviet Union and these countries mutually beneficial economic agreements which serve the interests of the Soviet Union, India, Burma and Afghanistan.

In such states as the Republic of India, the Union of Burma, and Afghanistan we see equal partners in the struggle for peace in the whole world. Between us and the leaders of the countries which we visited there exist no two different opinions on the questions of the struggle for peace. And these questions are the main ones, and in their solution the whole of mankind is vitally interested.

Our journey to India, Burma and Afghanistan and the results of the Soviet-Indian, Soviet-Burmese and Soviet-Afghan negotiations have made a good impression upon all friends of peace.

In some countries, however, our trip was met in a very unfriendly and even openly hostile manner by some people, including some officials, and gave rise to virulent outbursts against us.

This is true mainly of Britain and the United States of America. This line was taken up or, to be more exact, echoed in other countries, Canada, for instance, where Foreign Secretary Mr. Pearson made a shortsighted statement. What is the reason behind this?

We have been condemned, lectured and subjected to other forms of pressure because we, in their eyes, have allegedly taken a wrong stand against the colonialists, because we sharply con-

demned this form of enslavement and plundering of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries by the imperialists.

What new have we said about the colonialists and the colonial regimes? Why did our statements cause such a frenzy among the colonialists and their apologists. After all, we quoted universally known and undeniable facts.

It is a fact, for instance, that the British colonialists—not the people but precisely the colonialists—had dominated in India for almost two centuries, that they oppressed for a long time the peoples of Burma and Afghanistan.

What was the upshot of all this?

I will take the liberty of quoting such an eminent authority on this question as the universally esteemed Prime Minister of India, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru.

He emphasizes in his book "The Discovery of India" that "the most obvious fact is the sterility of British rule in India and the thwarting of Indian life by it. Alien rule is inevitably cut off from the creative energies of the people it dominates. When this alien rule has its economic and cultural centre far from the subject country and is further backed by racialism, this divorce is complete, and leads to spiritual and cultural starvation of the subject peoples."

Characterizing the consequences of the British rule in India, Mr. Nehru recalls the devastating famine which occurred in the country in the years of the second world war. He writes:

"The famine unveiled a picture of . . . poverty and ugliness and human decay after all these generations of British rule. That was the culmination and fulfilment of British rule in India.

"It was not the calamity of nature or play of the elements that brought this famine, nor was it caused by actual war operations and enemy blockade. Every competent observer is agreed that it was a man-made famine which could have been foreseen and avoided."

It can be added to this that according to the Indian economist Singh, "author of the book "India's Food Problem," India was ravaged by famine 18 times during the last quarter of the 19th century alone; 26 million people died from starvation during this period. During the 20th century the scale of the famines grew even bigger. In 1943 alone three and a half million died from starvation in India.

Such are the facts. They do not speak in favor of the colonialists.

Just as tragic was the fate of the Burmese people who also experienced the domination of the British colonialists. As far back as 1824 Britain began an armed struggle for the conquest of Burma which ended with the complete occupation of the country in 1885. Burma was ruled by a Governor-General appointed by Britain who held unlimited powers.

During World War II Burma was occupied by Japan. After Japan's capitulation in 1945, the British colonial authorities again returned to Burma and tried to re-establish their domination. However, the patriotic forces of Burma, which had matured in the struggle against Japanese occupation, offered resolute resistance. In January 1948 the British imperialists were forced to grant independence to Burma.

The peoples of India, just as the peoples of Burma and Afghanistan, did not invite the colonialists so that they could pillage these countries. The colonialists established their domination in these countries as a result of aggressive and predatory wars. The territories of India and Burma were not uninhabited when the colonialists invaded them. They were populated by peoples who had their own highly developed culture. It is known, for instance, that the culture of the Indian people, was not inferior to the culture of the European countries, Britain included. But India was weak militarily, and she had inferior armaments. Only for this reason she fell prey to the colonialists.

Today, some proponents of the colonial regime say: Don't you see, we voluntarily granted freedom to India.

This is, to put it mildly, a rather hazy explanation of why the colonialists withdrew from India and acquiesced to the existence of an independent Republic of India.

They were forced to agree to this because they had no other choice. If they tried to remain in India, they would suffer great losses but all the same they would be swept out by the Indian people just as the Chinese people expelled from China the colonialists of every shade and hue, and together with them the predatory Chiang Kai-shek clique.

The colonialists sometimes like to say that they played a great historic part in spreading civilization. These fables are calculated for simple-minded or exceptionally gullible people, who do not know history.

Maybe the British colonialists really raised the cultural level of the people in the countries they conquered, maybe they helped

these countries to build up their own industry, to develop science and to enhance the living standard of their population?

No, they were robbers in the full sense of the word. They robbed these countries and considerably hampered their development. I recall how during our visit to a dairy farm in Bombay, Mr. Desai, Chief Minister of the Bombay State, said with bitterness: Everything was reduced to nil during the years of British domination. We were all but turned into barbarians during these 200 years.

The peoples of India, Burma and the other countries which were lorded over by the colonialists will have to exert much effort in order to liquidate the horrible consequences of colonialist rule.

After all it is a fact that but recently more than 80 per cent of the Indian population and 63 per cent of the Burmese population were illiterate.

It is a fact that the living standard of the Indian population, whose exploitation literally brought fortunes to the British colonialists, is considerably below that of Britain's population. The same refers to Burma and the other countries which were lorded over by the colonialists for a long time.

Wait a moment, the advocates of the colonial system might say to us, after all, these countries were incorporated in the British Empire and enjoyed almost equal rights with Britain.

But where is this equality then?

We have found no traces of it. We saw that during their domination the British colonialists built magnificent palaces for themselves both in India and in Burma.

They provided conditions for a group of turncoat feudals, and supported them. But the many-million-strong Indian people was deprived of all rights and most cruelly exploited.

It is natural therefore that the Indian people could not reconcile themselves to such a situation. The Indian people and all its fighters against the colonialists' rule in India led by such outstanding people as Gandhi, Nehru, and other leaders, played an important part in the achievement of political independence by India. Of course, we sympathized with their struggle, rejoiced in their successes and we pay due tribute to their courage displayed in this struggle.

Now we are told that by coming out against the colonialists, by exposing their predatory policy, we have displayed some sort of

unfriendliness with regard to Britain and the other countries, although we did not name these other countries, and even Britain was rather rarely mentioned by us. However, we do not want to play hide and seek.

We know, as all the world does, who were the colonialists in India, Burma and Afghanistan.

Indeed, speaking about the unseemly role of the colonialists, we had in view the British colonialists, too. But colonialists are, after all, not all of Britain and not her people. The British colonialists will never get the right of identifying themselves with the people of Britain.

Our statements contained nothing that could in any way offend Britain or the British people. We profoundly respect the talented and industrious British people and want to be friends with them.

We said nothing insulting or offensive about the British Government, too. But we condemned and condemn the colonial system and think that the sooner it will be ended the better, because it is a profoundly unjust, misanthropic system. The sooner the colonial nations get rid of it, the better. We are the most sincere friends of those who fight against colonial slavery and the colonial dependence. We will rejoice in and acclaim the destruction of the colonial regimes. I think that the majority of the British people will also acclaim this.

The time when the colonialists could lord it in the colonial and dependent countries with impunity is receding into the past. But the colonialists themselves, naturally, do not want to give up voluntarily the system which gives them an opportunity to rob whole nations. This cannot be expected.

Through our statements and actions we want to express our sympathy for those peoples who have not as yet rid themselves of the colonial yoke, for their national liberation struggle.

We understand that the colonialists bear grudge against us because our statements discuss the past work of the colonialists in India and Burma.

Attempting to justify in some way or other the actions of their predecessors in the oppression of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries, they are striving to preserve the present-day positions of the colonialists which are still very strong. The colonialists still have many colonies.

Take, for instance, Africa. It is all divided up among the European and non-European countries. There are different ways

and different methods of conducting the colonialist policy, but the chains of colonial slavery are no lighter because of this. These chains strangle the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries and arouse their hatred against the colonialists.

The peoples of these countries are ever more resolutely rising to the struggle against the colonial regimes. And we sympathize with this struggle and wish success to the peoples who are waging it.

It is simply surprising when certain short-sighted politicians accuse us of unfriendliness with regard to Britain or the United States and allege that we want these countries to quarrel with India, Burma and other countries. They themselves commit unfriendly acts with regard to these countries.

How can India regard, for instance, the statement made by Mr. Dulles and the Portuguese Foreign Minister, Mr. Cunha, concerning Goa?

Just think of what Dulles said: he permitted himself openly to declare that the Indian territory of Goa must belong to Portugal merely because the Portuguese invaders conquered it 400 years ago.

In connection with this the Indian press recalled quite justly to Mr. Dulles that 250 years ago the present-day United States of America was a colony of Britain and that if we adhere to his logic then Dulles should consider himself to be a subject of her Royal Majesty the Queen of Great Britain still today.

To agree with Mr. Dulles' statement would mean not only to bless, but perpetuate the system of colonial oppression.

Of course, we cannot agree to this. We think that this is an incorrect statement arising from an incorrect approach to the interests of the peoples. The Indian people and the leading statesmen of India rightly assessed the joint Dulles-Cunha communique regarding Goa, which is a shame for the civilized nations.

Permit me, in connection with this, to say a few words about another question legitimately worrying the Indian people, namely the so-called Kashmir question. During our stay in Kashmir Nikolai Alexandrovich Bulganin and I clearly and definitely stated what the Soviet people think about this question, which was not raised by the people, but artificially fanned by certain states trying to incite enmity among the peoples.

We have seen in Kashmir that the people regard their territory to be an unalienable part of the Republic of India. The Kashmir people have irrevocably decided this question, and we are deeply

convinced that they will be able to settle their affairs without foreign interference regardless of whether this is to the liking of those who would like to create a seat of trouble and international tensions in Kashmir.

The concern displayed by the Indian people and their Government regarding the consolidation of their state and the satisfaction of the legitimate desires of all the nationalities inhabiting the Republic of India are close and understandable to the Soviet people, just as the striving of all the peoples fighting for their national independence is close and understandable to us.

In the statements we made in India and Burma we said that our country is simultaneously a European and an Asian power, that the greater part of its territory is located in the Asian continent. In doing so we emphasized that all the peoples of the Soviet Union, regardless of whether they lived in the European or Asian part of the country, and regardless of the color of skin or creed, make up a united fraternal family of peoples, strong by its indestructible friendship. All the peoples of our country are united by the great goal of building communism.

The Soviet Union is a great multinational state comprised of 16 equal, voluntarily united Union Republics. All the power in our country is vested in the working class, the working peasantry, the intellectuals, the working people of the Soviet society.

We have always opposed national oppression, exploitation of man by man in whatever form, and all the more so, the rule of the colonialists who have brought so much misery to mankind. We stated this with all straightforwardness and frankness once again in our speeches in India and Burma, stressing that the colonial system is a system hostile to the people and profoundly unjust.

Why then have the colonialists become so excited now?

They are excited because our words meet with great sympathy among the masses, and not only in the places where we spoke, but also in places where people heard about our statements and where they will more than once hear about the unshakeable position of the Soviet Union which condemns the colonial system of oppressing and enslaving the peoples.

These are words of truth, and the imperialists will not succeed in barring them by any iron curtains.

It should be noted that Dulles' position is condemned not only by the enemies of colonialism, but also by men who are not

enemies of the colonial regime. We can refer if only to the speech of the American Senator Kefauver.

"Above all," the Senator said, "we in the United States must completely disassociate ourselves from the old colonialism in Asia."

Please note that Mr. Kefauver urges the United States to disassociate itself not from colonialism in general, but from "old" colonialism.

He would want the colonialists to look for new forms to reinforce their colonial rule, he advocates "new" colonialism.

Therefore he calls: "We must not allow our aid to be used to prop up bad governments."

This is quite a valuable admission.

The colonialists see how resolutely the peoples are rising against colonial slavery. They see that the peoples are prepared for self-sacrifice, for bold exploits, for selfless struggle for the freedom and national independence of their countries. The peoples have already driven out the colonialists from a number of countries.

An inspiring example for all the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries is offered by the struggle of the great Chinese people who, having cast off the foreign yoke, took their destiny in their own hands, under the guidance of the glorious Communist Party, built up the mighty People's Republic of China and are now successfully building socialism.

Today the colonialists have decided to change the forms of their colonial rule. They use less and less crude forms of violence as the sending of their troops to colonial countries and other acts of rude intervention in the affairs of the enslaved countries.

They do all this more delicately now: they bribe people who are in power, implant "good governments" and build up aggressive blocs like the Baghdad pact.

They allot money for so-called "economic aid," give arms "free of charge" to some countries. But to pay for these arms the states getting them must provide cannon fodder to the colonialists and set up big armies, thereby wasting away their peoples.

The colonialists give a dollar as "aid" in order to get subsequently ten dollars for it by exploiting the peoples who accepted such "aid." Having achieved this end they enslave the peoples politically as well. Such are the "new" forms of colonialists' rule.

And this is the case not only in the countries of Asia, Africa or other so-called underdeveloped countries. The United States

monopolists are zealously introducing such forms of "aid" in European countries. Why, even NATO reeks strongly of the same smell.

What is there to explain such "generosity" of the United States when it gives arms free of charge to European countries, including Western Germany which is a highly developed country itself? It pursues the same object: to harness to itself with a golden chain not only the underdeveloped, but also the highly developed countries.

Exposing such a policy we say that NATO and other similar blocs are organizations which pursue far-reaching political and economic ends.

It is said that NATO has been set up because the Soviet Union allegedly manifests a tendency to aggression and therefore, don't you see, it is necessary to create some kind of a superstrong joint army of member countries of NATO and to counterpoise it to the Soviet Union and all the countries of the socialist camp.

It is not difficult to divine who needs such a lie and for what purpose.

It is used to divert the attention of the masses from the changes which are taking place in the countries that are becoming increasingly dependent on the United States monopolists.

But the artificially created mirage is already beginning to vanish and people are beginning to discern the truth from the untruth.

People are beginning to reason as follows: if the Soviet Union actually had intention to blaze the path to a new social system in other countries by war, it would have done so long ago.

Indeed, who does not know that the Soviet state had the strongest army at the end of the war? Nothing prevented the Soviet Union at that time from advancing its mobilized armies and occupying the whole of Europe. This, however, did not happen, nor could it have happened.

Well known is the precept of Marxism-Leninism that revolutions are not exported, that they are made by the peoples themselves who are fighting for their liberation. Soviet men and women have always followed, and will follow, the path of peaceful co-existence indicated by the great Lenin, which envisages non-interference in the internal affairs of other states.

Why then have certain imperialist elements whipped up the war hysteria after the war ended, seeking to intimidate the peoples with the sham "Soviet menace?"

They have done so pursuing their selfish interests.

Their aim is clear—the imperialists needed to rob the people with impunity, to develop at the expense of huge taxes the war industry, in which the tycoons of the monopolies working for war are so interested.

They are raking in huge profits on this business. Suffice it to recall that the big United States monopolies are now getting profits from war production more than double those they had during the war.

In 1955 the profits of American corporations, according to preliminary figures, amount to 43,000 million dollars. So that the monopolists have money for rendering the so-called "aid" to countries which the United States is drawing into its sphere of influence. In fact this is not aid, but handouts of leftovers from the master's table, made conditional upon fettering obligations.

The Soviet Union denounces such a policy. It bases its relations with other countries on the principles of equality and mutual advantage, on the principles of non-interference in the domestic affairs of these countries.

When we render economic or technical assistance to one or another country, we do so as friends, without imposing our terms. We have no surplus capital. Our economy is operated according to a plan. We are not interested in the export of capital and in the export of goods which we produce in quantities needed for our country, for our allies and for trading with foreign countries. So far some goods in our country are produced in smaller quantities than needed for satisfying the growing requirements of the country.

And notwithstanding this, we consider it our duty to share with our friends, to help them in a brotherly way. Such help rendered on mutually advantageous terms is of benefit to both sides. Our friends see that they get unselfish help from us, that they are allotted resources from our internal funds. And this cannot but be appreciated by friends because it testifies to our honest intentions.

In these conditions the monopolists have to reorientate themselves somehow. Some of the more sensible bourgeois leaders say now that the capitalist countries have to increase economic help to underdeveloped countries. This is not a bad idea. Let the capitalist countries render such help. This is much better than to involve these countries in military blocs and alliances.

This help which the capitalist countries intend to render to states who recently won their independence cannot but be regarded as some kind of help by the Soviet Union to these countries. If there would be no Soviet Union would the monopolist circles and the imperialist states render help to the underdeveloped countries? Of course not. This has never happened before.

But as I have already said, the so-called free aid in the capitalist understanding of the term may actually bring about the enslavement of those to whom it will be rendered if it is regarded indiscriminately in those countries.

Mr. MacMillan, ex-Minister of Foreign Affairs of Britain, reviewing the Conservative Government's achievements recently, declared, among other things, that his Government had achieved a satisfactory settlement with Iran, with the result that Abadan oil started flowing to Britain in a broad stream.

But this is the wealth belonging to Iran that is flowing. This is gold flowing from Iran into the safes of British, American, Dutch and French banks. And this is at a time when the people of Iran are in dire straits. Giving "aid" to Iran, they are taking Iranian oil for a song and coining profits out of it, out of the hunger and poverty of the Iranian people.

We are not telling the peoples of Asia: do not take the aid which American and British monopolists are offering to you. But we honestly warn them that one must be careful about taking such "aid" because the monopolists do not give anything for nothing.

The capitalists give nothing free of charge. Capital cannot exist without profits.

Comrade Deputies,

I have said already that we retain the best of recollections of our stay in India, of our meetings with the leaders of the Indian Government, leading officials of the states, with the workers, peasants and intellectuals of India, with all those we happened to meet.

We set much value on our friendship with India, with her great and industrious people, on the friendship with Mr. Nehru and other outstanding statesmen of India with whom we came into contact and want to maintain and develop our friendly relations.

Both we and our Indian friends would like to develop and strengthen these friendly relations by no means to the detriment

of India's and the Soviet Union's friendly relations with other countries.

Our friendship, as we understand it, should not be confined to friendly contacts with one, two or a few nations. We want to be friends with all nations.

We are happy, therefore, to see our friends developing friendly relations with third nations including those with whom our relations are, perhaps, somewhat strained and cold for some reason or other. We hope to improve our relations with those nations through India, whom we consider our friend.

We have always striven earnestly and are striving for friendship with all countries including the capitalist ones. We should like to live in friendship, for instance, with the most powerful capitalist nations, the United States of America, Britain and France.

Should we achieve that, and it depends mainly not on us but on the Governments and the peoples of the United States, Britain and France, it would create conditions for genuine peaceful co-existence and competition of the two systems.

Unfortunately, we have not achieved it yet, but we do not give up the hope and we shall be unsparing of our efforts in this direction.

We fully understand and support the position of the Indian leaders who have declared that India holds a neutral position between us and other states. India is a neutral state indeed and deserves the trust and respect on our part as well as on the part of other nations.

We have most brotherly relations with the great People's Republic of China. The peoples of our countries are brothers.

There have developed and are becoming firmer our good friendly relations with the Republic of India. Wherever we travelled in India we heard the words coming from the bottom of the heart of the people: "Hindi-Rusi, bhai bhai!"—"Indians and Russians are brothers!" And the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India constitute half of mankind and are a powerful force in the struggle for preserving and strengthening the peace of the world.

Comrade Deputies,

Some foreign leaders and also most unscrupulous bourgeois journalists, discussing the results of our trip to India, Burma and Afghanistan and analyzing the statements we made in those coun-

tries, are accusing the Soviet Union of giving up the spirit of Geneva. This is not true.

We have shared most actively in making the important contribution to the relaxation of world tension which resulted from the meeting of the Heads of Government of the Four Powers in Geneva.

We worked to bring about this relaxation also both at the Heads of Government Conference and at the Conference of the Foreign Ministers who were instructed to consider such all-important items as the safeguarding of security in Europe and the German problem which is related to it, disarmament and also the development of East-West contacts.

It is not we who are to be blamed for the failure so far to achieve the results wanted by the peace-loving peoples who are striving for a further lessening of tension in international relations and a strengthening of peace.

The Geneva Four Power Top-level Conference as well as the Foreign Ministers Conference, but the Heads of Government Conference above all, have been welcomed enthusiastically by the peoples all over the world. The desire of the peoples to bring about an easing of international tension and a strengthening of peace obliged the parties to those conferences to plan their statements and proposals accordingly.

One has to admit, unfortunately, that the representatives of the Western Powers at the Summit Conference did not go any further beyond honeyed words in favor of a relaxation of international tension. This is true particularly of their Foreign Ministers who proved unwilling to work in real earnest and to apply themselves to achieving the aims fixed for them by the Heads of Government Conference.

This is an indication that the Governments of the Western Powers, having delegated their plenipotentiaries to the Conference of the Four Heads of Government, did not appear to wish the questions the conference had on its agenda to be settled practically. Going to that conference they were making a concession to public opinion which brought pressure to bear on them.

The very fact of summoning the Conference of the Four Heads of Government, the statements which were made there and the program of action drawn up by the Heads of Government for their Foreign Ministers, all this has, certainly, contributed to relieving international tension and raised hopes for some sort of more

concrete steps towards preventing armed conflicts and abolishing the "cold war."

That was how the "spirit of Geneva" came into being.

The peoples welcomed this because they want security, they want taxes to be reduced, arms expenditures to be cut and the huge funds released to be used for advancing the living standards of the population. This is the concrete wish of the peoples.

But just what the people like, what the peoples dream of, is not to the liking of the capitalists manufacturing atomic and hydrogen bombs and other arms. They take the prospect of arms reduction, and still more so disarmament, as a prospect of reduced profits to which they cannot by any means bring themselves to agree.

That is why immediately upon the conclusion of the Four-Power Top-level Conference those who are manufacturing the means of annihilation and those doing their bidding in the leading positions of capitalist states made no attempt at all to extend and promote the spirit of Geneva but instead sought to nip it in the bud.

As for the Soviet Union, its representatives both at the Heads of Government Meeting and at the Four Power Foreign Ministers Conference did everything within their power to achieve a positive result.

This desire of ours has not been reciprocated, unfortunately, and the questions of so much interest to the whole of mankind were left unsolved.

We shall not spare our efforts in trying to get these questions settled positively in the long run. But our efforts alone are not enough for this. The efforts of our partners are also required.

Finally, a tremendous role should be played by the forces of public opinion, the millions of people who stand for the safeguarding of security, for disarmament, for a relaxation of international tension, and for the cessation of the "cold war."

The problem of ensuring European security is the most burning issue of the day. It is on the settlement of this issue that the adjustment of other international problems depends. You know, however, that our partners to the talks—the United States, Britain and France—counterpose the German problem to this issue.

Their position is that Western Germany should be reunited with the German Democratic Republic, with all the social gains of the GDR working people to be wiped out, and that this German state,

united and integrated with NATO into the bargain, be armed to the teeth. On these terms they are not averse to signing a "European security" treaty, although this would, in practice, not only fail to safeguard European security but would, on the contrary, add much to the danger of a new war being unleashed in Europe with all its grave consequences for the peoples.

The advocates of this position do not conceal that there is but one purpose behind this military combination; that is to strengthen the camp of NATO countries and to make it overwhelming enough to force the USSR and the People's Democracies to knuckle under to them and to accept their terms.

A nice sort of "security" this is!

Every sober-minded person will understand that plans like this are not destined to come to fruition. And if there is a genuine desire to solve the problem of ensuring European security the approach to this should be a serious and a realistic one, based on the real state of affairs.

This real state of affairs is characterized, first of all, by the existence of two states with different political and social systems in German territory today, with one of them—the German Democratic Republic—pursuing the course of strengthening peace and democracy, and the leaders of the other one—the German Federal Republic—clinging to the policy "from positions of strength," with moreover the fact that the GFR itself is a party to the aggressive NATO bloc.

What does this show? That in the present conditions there is no real possibility to reunite these two German states which are so different. But does this mean that there is no possibility now of ensuring collective security in Europe and promoting thereby peace throughout the world?

No, it does not.

Britain and the USSR, France and Poland, Czechoslovakia and Belgium—all European countries as well as the United States are interested in safeguarding security in Europe and creating the conditions for the consolidation of peace.

If we really proceed from this premise and if we bear in mind that both German states which now are members of opposed alignments of states could successfully take part in a general European security system which would replace both these alignments, then the question can be settled in accordance with the interests of the peoples.

We see no other solution. No one can compel us to reinforce with our hands the military bloc directed against the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries.

And this is exactly what is wanted by those who are proposing that we agree to such a unification of Germany as would entail the participation of the united Germany in an aggressive anti-Soviet bloc.

We would wish that our position on this question be properly understood in the first place by Germans, especially in Western Germany. The peoples of the USSR, Germany and the European People's Democracies were twice inveigled in sanguinary world wars and it was the peoples of our country and Germany who bore the biggest sacrifices in these wars. It is high time now to think about this and to find a right solution precluding the recurrence of such events in the future.

As for our relations with Western Germany, we have more than once stated that in the interests of both the Soviet Union and the German Federal Republic it would be expedient to establish good friendly relations between our countries. There are all requisites for the establishment of such relations.

I will mention in passing that our efforts to safeguard general European security and to achieve a corresponding settlement of the German question to no degree run counter to the interests of Britain and France. And, on the contrary, if we assume for a moment that the utterly unfeasible dream of bellicose United States leaders to incorporate a united Germany in an aggressive bloc were realized, in that case the French and the British would hardly lead a calm life. Then the hands of the German revenge-seekers would be untied. They would act in their usual way and of course France would be a tempting morsel for them.

We speak about this not at all because we wish it to be so. No, we will do everything for it not to be so. But the experience of history teaches us that such a danger exists, all the more so since France is weaker than the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, and Britain too is weaker.

Therefore we sincerely would like to be properly understood both in France and in Britain as well. And is it not better for us instead of wasting our energies on preparing to fight each other to establish contacts in our activities and to find a right solution of the question of European security?

In this connection I want to recall that the proposals made in

Geneva by the Prime Minister of France, Monsieur Faure, and the Prime Minister of Britain, Mr. Eden, provide the grounds for negotiations aimed at safeguarding security in Europe.

Agreement on this question would facilitate the solution of other major problems, including disarmament.

It is well known that both at the Geneva conference and in the United Nations, the Soviet Union has put forth a number of concrete proposals on the reduction of armaments, prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and the establishment of international control. Achievement of agreement on these questions was prevented by the change in the position of the United States, which suddenly disavowed its former proposals when we agreed to accept them as a basis.

Now the United States, in fact removing from the agenda the question of reducing armaments, puts to the foreground the only proposal submitted by President Eisenhower in Geneva—on the exchange of military information and unhindered aerial photography.

We have already pointed out that the proposal on aerial photography does not settle the substance of the matter. In conditions when no reduction of armaments is actually envisaged and it is intended even to increase them, flights over the territories and aerial photography can only fan war passions and the war psychosis. This is no longer control and not even a semblance of control. This actually is a means used for the purpose of finding out more about the forces of another country. Is it not clear that information obtained in this way can be used for choosing the most convenient moment for sudden attack upon it? The question arises: in what way does this differ from what is known as military reconnaissance? In substance it does not differ in any way.

Quite another matter—to make a realistic approach to the disarmament problem: to reach agreement on levels and armaments, prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, to establish a rational system, possible already under the present conditions, of international control at railway junctions, naval bases, aerodromes, etc., which makes it possible to prevent sudden attacks of one country upon another. Such measures are fully feasible and all peoples would welcome them.

Some enemies of disarmament proceed from the erroneous assumption that they allegedly possess some kind of superiority in strength and hence it is of disadvantage for them to disarm.

We have warned and warn now these advocates of the notorious "positions of strength" policy that they may grossly miscalculate in their gamble.

We do not want to intimidate anyone; still less do we want to boast about the military technical achievements we have. But to cool the inflamed imagination of the more zealous proponents of the arms drive we have to recall the results of the recent tests of the latest Soviet hydrogen bomb.

The power of this weapon, as already announced, is equivalent to the power of many million tons of usual explosives and it can be increased substantially. We as hitherto stand for prohibition of the manufacture, tests and use of all types of atomic and hydrogen weapons. But those who are opposed to this ought not forget the results of the aforesaid tests.

Of great significance also is the question of developing East-West contacts which was examined in Geneva. The Soviet Union in deeds promotes these contacts. Wishing to ease international tension and to establish business-like contacts with various foreign leaders, we, for example, have not denied, and do not deny now, visas to foreigners who want to come to the Soviet Union and study its life. Many American Senators and Congressmen have been to our country this year. We willingly received them and spoke with them.

In the Soviet Union there freely travelled many correspondents of reactionary American newspapers who specialized in concocting the most absurd anti-Soviet articles. We knew about this and nevertheless permitted them to come to the Soviet Union although it was known that such journalists were coming to us in order to continue writing in the cold war spirit.

But the United States authorities have so far allowed to come to America only a small agricultural delegation, a delegation of builders and one group of Soviet journalists who, by the way, had to wait for visas for nine months. Children have been born to some of them during this time.

We want to extend contacts of Soviet people with the most diverse circles in the United States and other countries. We want the consolidation of mutual friendship but not the interference of other countries in the domestic affairs of the Soviet Union, as proposed by some in Geneva. Of course, we will never agree to that.

It must be mentioned in passing that some Western statesmen display a strange understanding of the Geneva spirit of late, to

say the least. They want the Soviet Union to disarm its army unilaterally, they want us also to disarm morally, spiritually and ideologically.

Talk on this subject is nothing new and it has been going on for more than one year, although life has on many occasions already taught bitter lessons to those who sought to impose such terms on the Soviet Union.

I will betray no secret if I say that such an unrealistic policy with regards to the Soviet Union is advocated most zealously in the United States, with the role of a sort of theoretician of this policy having been assumed by the present American Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles.

It is he who for a long period has been actively preaching the notorious ideas of "repulsing," "massed retaliatory blow" and similar absurd things.

Not wishing evidently to reckon with reality, certain United States circles in the present conditions too, after the Geneva Four Power Heads-of-Government Conference, try to speak the language of the "positions-of-strength" policy which failed long ago. Thence comes all the talk that, don't you see, "pressure on the Soviet Union must be continued," "the reds must be forced to retreat."

In this connection particular mention should be made of the position taken now by certain prominent leaders of the United States, including President Eisenhower who, as is known, spoke no little in Geneva about the need to ease international tension.

I have in mind specifically the so-called "Christmas messages" of President Eisenhower, State Secretary Dulles and other important American leaders to the peoples in the countries of People's Democracy, messages which in no way tally with the spirit of Geneva and are nothing else but rude interference in the domestic affairs of free and sovereign states which are members of the United Nations.

In their "Christmas messages" American leaders declared that they "are praying" for a change in the system existing in those countries and they openly promise the "support" of the United States in this matter.

Is this evidence of a desire for conciliation, of a striving to strengthen and spread the spirit of Geneva?

No, this has the opposite effect, this leads to the fanning of passions and, consequently, to a new arms drive, to a greater war danger.

I would not like to speak about all this, and particularly about Mr. Eisenhower whom I especially respect. It may be said that Khrushchev, speaking about these questions, wants to abolish the Geneva spirit. But I am not putting forth these questions myself but merely reply to those who, violating the Geneva spirit, openly interfere in the domestic affairs of our allies and friends—the People's Democracies.

As long as we talk about the "Christmas messages" which have taken on such a strikingly expressed political character, we can understand the authors of these messages. They represent quite substantial firms. Let us take such a venerable representative of this group as Mr. Harriman. He is known to have many millions. Others too have no little capital, more or less, God knows, we have not counted their money. But if they have fewer millions than Harriman they certainly want to have more than Harriman has which means that it is concern not for human souls but for one's own money bag.

When the authors of "Christmas messages" stomp for a change of the system in the People's Democracies, they stomp for Bata, the Radzivils, the Potockis, for Bratianus and the other big capitalists and landed magnates who were kicked out by the working folk of the People's Democracies from those countries. But the peoples of those countries must not be identified with the Batas, Radzivils, Potockis, Bratianus and their ilk.

The American authors of the far from religious "Christmas messages" have the closest possible ties with the capitalists expelled from the People's Democracies, or the capitalists that have fled from these countries. Desirous to change the order of things in the People's Democracies, these American mouthpieces want to restore the capitalist system in these countries, to return the plants and factories to the capitalists, and the land to the big landowners.

Mr. Harriman wants not only the capitalists to return to these countries, but, obviously, he himself wishes to boss the Hungarian economy as he did it prior to the establishment of people's democratic rule in that country.

But there is no return to the past. No "Christmas messages" will help the landowners, the capitalists, the bankers, big businessmen, or the other exploiters who were expelled by the working people of the People's Democracies from their countries.

We can refer to our own experience. When the peoples of our country overthrew the capitalist regime and set up the first

workers and peasants state in the world, there were no little number of people advocating the old, capitalist way of life, both in the country and abroad, which prayed for the restoration of the old capitalist order of things in Russia.

Abroad there were people who prayed diligently for the Milyukovs, Tereshchenkos, Yuzovs, Ryabushinskys, and other representatives of big capital, for the restoration of the power of the capitalists and landowners. But what came out of it? All the attempts of international imperialism to restore the capitalist order of things in our country suffered fiasco. Led by its tried and tested leader, the Communist Party, the Soviet people defeated all those who tried to reestablish the capitalist regime in Russia by force of arms or by various other ways.

The peoples of our country confidently and firmly marched along the road of socialist development and were the first in the world to build a socialist society, thereby implementing the age-old dream of the working people of the world. They have created a mighty socialist industry whose development is characterized already by the following data: in 1955 the Soviet Union's gross production exceeded the level production of 1913 twenty-seven times, and the production of the means of production increased 60 times, the generation of electric power 86 times and the output of the machine-building industry more than 160 times. The agriculture of our country is growing and developing.

Whereas prior to the Revolution 76 per cent of Russia's population was illiterate, our country succeeded in wiping out illiteracy even prior to World War II.

In the current year there are almost 35,000,000 pupils on the registers of our secondary and technical schools. One million eight hundred and sixty-five thousand students attend the higher educational establishments of the country. The Soviet Union trains much more specialists than Britain, France, Italy and the other capitalist countries of Western Europe taken together.

No wonder that such an active opponent of communism as Mr. Churchill who not only prayed for the restoration of the capitalist way of things in our country, but tried to reestablish them in Russia by force of arms, now has to admit that as to the training of specialists the Soviet Union has left the capitalist countries far behind. This irritates Mr. Churchill, but gladdens our hearts.

The remarkable results of our country's developments are an

inspiring example for the working people of the People's Democracies, and the peoples of the other countries.

The peoples of all the world, the colonial and the dependent countries included, are coming out more and more resolutely against the exploitation of man by man, against the oppression of some countries by the others.

In this we cannot but see the expression of the great power of the Marxist-Leninist teaching which penetrates into the conscience of millions and millions of people in all parts of the world. The future belongs to this teaching.

The working people of the People's Democracies who have learned on their own experience that only the overthrow of the capitalist power, its transition into the hands of the people leads to real freedom, will reply to all the machinations of their ill-wishers by still greater cohesion around the Communist Parties, Workers Parties and the Labor Parties.

No matter how the capitalists rave, they will not be able to undermine the socialist camp. We will continue advancing along the road charted out by the great Lenin, we will advance hand in hand, sweeping away everything in our countries which hampers the onward movement towards the building of communist society.

The more farsighted and sober-minded politicians of Britain, the United States of America and France understand that the positions held by certain circles in the Western countries of late contradicts the "Geneva spirit."

For example, I will refer to the recent statement by Lord Chorly, who agreed that the Western powers bear a great responsibility for the unsuccessful outcome of the Geneva Foreign Ministers Conference.

Chorly said that, in his opinion, the theory that the Western powers held the monopoly on reason, stands no criticism. . . . I must note, in passing, that we do not argue this. He said that, actually, they pursue a policy which, in his opinion, is nearly an obsolete "policy of strength". On the other hand, he thinks, that the Soviet Union has made several considerable concessions and has pursued a more pliable policy resulting in considerable achievements.

One cannot but agree with this assessment.

Attempting to lay the blame at somebody else's door and to accuse us of violating the "Geneva spirit", certain bourgeois journalists refer to my statements and the statements of our other

government and political leaders. They lament that in our statements, we say that the teaching of Marxism-Leninism will triumph. But is this a violation of the "Geneva spirit"?

Yes, we said, and we say that the peaceful competition of the two economic systems will lead to the victory of the socialist system, which is more advanced, progressive, and which is based on the only correct Marxist-Leninist teaching.

We are never surprised and we do not protest when the ideologists of the capitalist world, that is, of the opposing system, declare that capitalism will emerge victorious. We consider this argument to be natural, and we think that only history will decide it.

If certain people think that our confidence in the victory of socialism, in the teaching of Marxism-Leninism, to be a violation of the "Geneva spirit," they, obviously, have an incorrect notion of the "Geneva spirit." They should remember once and for all that we have never denounced and we will never denounce the ideas of struggle for the victory of communism. They will never attain our ideological disarmament!

Our conviction in the final victory of communism is not to the liking of proponents of capitalism, and this does not surprise or worry us. We say: in this competition, in this struggle we will never start an aggressive war, we will constantly fight against the armaments drive, for disarmament, for strengthening peace, for peaceful co-existence.

Thus, the facts show beyond all doubt that it is not the Soviet Union, but its Geneva Conference partners who are betraying the spirit of Geneva.

Let us take some more examples. It was even before the ink with which our Joint Statement on the results of the Geneva Conference was signed, had dried, that our partners to the Conference began involving more countries into the aggressive Baghdad pact—they dragged Iran into it and are forcing other countries to follow suit.

At the opening meeting of this session of the Supreme Soviet, we listened attentively to the statement by Mr. Mohammed Saed, the leader of the parliamentary delegation of Iran, who said that the Iranian people wanted peace and friendship with the Soviet Union.

We welcome this statement, but we cannot allow ourselves to say nothing of the fact that in spite of all the efforts the Soviet Union made for ensuring friendly relations with Iran, the Govern-

ment of that country joined the Baghdad military pact, thus offering Iran's territory at the disposal of aggressive forces, plotting attacks on the Soviet Union.

This is true not only of Iran, but of Turkey as well. It is a matter of record that when Kemal Ataturk and Ismet Inonu held the reins of power in Turkey, our relations with that country were very good, but these have been clouded later on. We cannot say that this happened through Turkey's fault alone, we, too, made some improper declarations which clouded those relations.

But, subsequently, we took steps to retrieve the situation and to restore friendly relations with that country. These have not been reciprocated, however, by Turkish statesmen, unfortunately.

American generals and admirals are travelling to Turkey and making bellicose speeches and parading their forces through visits of naval squadrons.

The governments of Iran and Turkey can hardly be said to act wisely in casting their lot in with the aggressive Baghdad pact and refusing to establish good neighborly friendly relations with the Soviet Union.

Pakistan which is also a party to the Baghdad pact, has found itself in a similar position in relation to its neighbors. It is indeed a fact that Pakistan's relations with India as well as with Afghanistan and the Soviet Union leave much to be desired.

One cannot, for instance, fail to pay attention to the fact that American Admiral Radford visited Pakistan and, subsequently, Iran quite a short while ago. It is evidently the purposes entirely different from those of promoting economic and cultural contacts that he had in mind, when he went to those countries.

The visit of the American admiral confirms the earlier fears that Pakistan and Iran were being increasingly involved into gambling machinations by the sponsors of aggressive blocs, contrary to their national interests. One need not doubt that should Pakistan take up a stand as independent as that of India, for instance, this would create conditions for the establishment of friendly relations between Pakistan and the neighboring countries.

We feel sure that it will be realized in Pakistan into what an inenviable situation that country had landed and proper conclusions will be made. On our part we are willing to meet Pakistan halfway in establishing friendly relations with us. A few words should be said, in connection with the Baghdad pact, about the situation in the countries of the Near and Middle East. The

sponsors of the Baghdad pact are known to be moving heaven and earth to inveigle the Arab nations into this aggressive bloc. But they are coming up against the mounting resistance of the peoples of those nations. Soviet public opinion has been and is following sympathetically, for instance, the course of the valiant struggle of the people of Jordan against the attempts at forcing their country to join the Baghdad pact.

We understand the yearnings of the peoples of the Arab nations who are fighting for their full liberation from foreign dependence. One cannot, at the same time, fail to recognize as condemnable the acts of the state of Israel which, ever since it came into being, has been threatening its neighbors and pursuing a policy hostile to them.

It stands to reason that such a policy does not conform to the national interests of the state of Israel and that it is the imperialist powers, well known to all, that stand behind those who are carrying out this policy. They are seeking to use Israel as their instrument against the Arab peoples with an eye on ruthless exploitation of the natural wealth of that area.

At a time when the Western powers are carrying on the policy of arms race and knocking together aggressive blocs, the Soviet Union is pursuing consistently and firmly its peace-loving foreign policy and strengthening friendship with all peoples who desire it for the sake of promoting peace and security.

In the course of this year alone, the Soviet Union has reduced its armed forces by 640,000 men, relinquished its military base in Finland, Porkkala Udd, and withdrawn its forces from Port Arthur before the agreed time limit. The Soviet Union has concluded a State Treaty with Austria, which adopted the course of permanent neutrality, and withdrew its forces from her territory, established diplomatic relations with the German Federal Republic and took a whole series of no less effective steps for the consolidation of peace.

The Soviet Union has re-established friendly relations with Yugoslavia with whom our relations were abnormal and strained for a long time. We shall continue to develop our good-neighborly, friendly relations with Yugoslavia and expand the Soviet Union's economic and cultural contacts with Yugoslavia.

Prominent among these steps has been our trip to India, Burma and Afghanistan and the agreements achieved between the Soviet Union and those countries.

As this Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. considered the State Budget for 1956, we voted unanimously for reduction of nearly 10,000 million rubles in defense appropriations, compared with last year.

At the same time the United States Secretary of Defense Wilson announced the other day that the expenditures for the maintenance of the United States armed forces will rise by another 1,000 million dollars in the next fiscal year, to reach the huge sum of 35,500 million dollars. Wilson failed to mention that sums by no means small are envisaged in the budget for other military expenditures over and above this figure, such as, for instance, for the manufacture of atomic weapons, the stockpiling of strategic raw materials and military "aid" to foreign countries.

It comes out that whereas we have taken practical steps towards easing international tension we do not see anything of the sort on the part of the other side, that is on the part of the Western powers. Quite the reverse, the United States of America is increasing arms appropriations and the leading officials of that country are extending aggressive pacts and some of them making bellicose declarations by no means aimed at solidifying the "spirit of Geneva."

Who is, then, promoting the "spirit of Geneva" and who is undermining it?

The question with which I should like to wind up is the one of the continued existence of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties which is called Cominform in the West.

There is, properly speaking, no reason at all for raising this question, however. But foreign journalists often asked us in India:

"Why could not you abolish the Cominform? Why not put an end to the activities of the Communist Parties in other countries?"

This is the sort of questions we were asked by other people who talked to us as well.

In our turn we told those men:

"Why are you not offering to disband the Socialist International? Why are you not offering to abolish the different international capitalist associations?"

They had nothing to reply to this.

The opponents of communism, naturally, do not like the Cominform. But scientific communism had been in existence as a doctrine for about a hundred years before the Information Bureau of the

Communist and Workers' Parties was founded. Co-operation within the framework of the Cominform is the business of the Communist and Workers' Parties which stand on the positions of Marxism-Leninism and propagate a definite order of social structure. The Communist Parties represent the working class, voice and defend its interests, the vital interests of the masses of the people.

The Cominform is not the only thing the enemies of communism dislike. They dislike much more the immutable fact that the all-conquering teaching of communism is winning more and more people in all countries under its banner with every year.

The Soviet people remember that the Social Revolutionaries, the Mensheviks and other working class enemies used to say at their time that they were in favor of Soviet rule but only without the Bolsheviks.

Those parties hoped to mislead the people with such slogans, to detach them from their leader, the Communist Party, founded by the great Lenin. They knew that the form of government could be changed but that it was impossible to change the Communist Party. It cannot be forced to give up the defense of the interests of the working class, the interests of the people, because the Communist Party is the true leader of the working class and the laboring peasantry, the leader of the people and the exponent of their vital interests.

Following the example of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist Parties of all countries are associating all their activities inseparably with the vital interests of the working class, with the interests of the people. This is just what is against the grain of those who would like to oppress the people forever. They dislike international solidarity of the working class and they, naturally, want the Cominform to pass out of existence. But that is something that does not depend on them!

These are, perhaps, all the questions which I believe had to be dealt with at some length.

Before closing my statement, I should like to express the confidence that the Supreme Soviet will approve the results of our trip to India, Burma and Afghanistan, as it serves the cause of strengthening friendship and co-operation of the peoples of the Soviet Union with those of India, Burma and Afghanistan. And friendship of the peoples of the world is a powerful wellspring of the strength of the peoples barring the road to a new war.

Permit me, Comrade Deputies, to express from this high rostrum

once more our wholehearted gratitude to the great Indian people, the Government of the Republic of India and to Prime Minister Mr. Nehru personally, to the friendly people of the Union of Burma, their Government and personally to Prime Minister of Burma U Nu, to the friendly people of Afghanistan, their Government and personally to Prime Minister Mr. Mohammed Daoud.

We are deeply grateful for the hospitality, consideration and love manifested by millions of people in those countries for the Soviet Union, for our great people during our tour of India, Burma and Afghanistan. We thank with all our hearts the statesmen and the public figures whom we happened to meet, Government officials of the states and provinces where we travelled, meeting most cordial and warmest reception everywhere.

Long live the great friendship of all the peoples of the world!

Long live the Soviet people, the mighty and intrepid champions of peace!

Long live the great friendship of all the peoples of the world! the inspiring and organizing force behind all the victories of the Soviet Union!

U.S.S.R SUPREME SOVIET DECISION ON RESULTS OF VISIT OF COMRADE N. A. BULGANIN, CHAIR- MAN OF U.S.S.R COUNCIL OF MINISTERS, AND COMRADE N. S. KHRUSHCHEV, MEMBER OF U.S.S.R SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDUM, TO INDIA, BURMA AND AFGHANISTAN

Having heard and discussed the accounts of Comrade N. A. Bulganin, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, and Comrade N. S. Khrushchev, Member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., of their visit to India, the Union of Burma and Afghanistan, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. expresses its full satisfaction with the results of this visit.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. notes that the friendship visit the leading statesmen of the U.S.S.R. paid to these countries swelled into a great political event promoting the strengthening of peace in Asia and the Far East, and also the further easing of tension in international relations.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. sees in the enthusiasm and warm feelings with which the Soviet leaders were welcomed in India, Burma and Afghanistan a manifestation of the deep esteem and friendship the peoples of these countries entertain for the peoples of the Soviet Union. The ardent reception given the representatives of the Soviet people shows that our people's efforts in the fight for peace and our country's achievements are near and understandable to the peoples of India, Burma and Afghanistan.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. notes that as the result of the visit of Comrades N. A. Bulganin and N. S. Khrushchev, another great move was made in the consolidation of friendship and co-operation between the U.S.S.R. and Great India, Burma and Afghanistan in the fight for peace, for the end of the cold

war and for the further lessening of international tension. The community of the aims and aspirations of our states in the cardinal issue of international affairs that of the preservation and strengthening of peace, has been confirmed once again. This community of views between the U.S.S.R., India, Burma and Afghanistan is not the outcome of transient causes, but of the community of fundamental interests between these states, seeking peace and the security of the nations.

The negotiations displayed full harmony of view on key aspects of the relations between our countries and also on major international problems: disarmament and the unqualified prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, the satisfaction of the lawful rights of the Chinese People's Republic to the offshore islands and Taiwan, the restitution to the Chinese People's Republic of its legitimate seat in United Nations and the settlement of other outstanding issues of Asia and the Far East in conformity with the lawful rights of the peoples.

The harmony attained on the question that peace can be secured exclusively through concerted efforts on the part of states is of great importance.

The relations between the Soviet Union and India, Burma and Afghanistan are built on the principles of reciprocal respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference into each other's internal affairs, equal rights and mutual advantage and peaceful co-existence among states regardless of their social systems.

The Supreme Soviet notes with satisfaction that these principles are finding ever wider international recognition. They have made the basis for the relations of the Chinese People's Republic with other countries, and are supported by the Bandung conference member-states as well as by a number of other states in Europe and Asia. The adoption of these principles in the relations between all states would be of immense importance for the establishment of the appropriate confidence among states and the banishment of the threat of another war.

Another important result of the visit of Comrades N. A. Bulganin and N. S. Khrushchev to the Asian countries is also the agreements reached with these countries to extend trade, economic, cultural and other ties, based on the principle of equal rights and mutual advantage, without any commitments of a political or military nature attached.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. is confident that contacts and co-operation between the Soviet Union, and India, Burma and Afghanistan in various spheres of state, economic, public and cultural activity will develop successfully, and that steps will be taken to broaden the mutual acquaintance of the peoples with each other's life, achievements and culture, as well as the reciprocal exchange of experience.

The community of interests of the U.S.S.R., the Republic of India, the Union of Burma and Afghanistan, as well as of all other peace-loving states, in the maintenance of peace and national independence of the peoples creates the conditions necessary for the development of a firm and lasting friendship between these countries, for the consolidation of co-operation among them for the good of their peoples, and in the interests of universal peace.

The visit of Comrades N. A. Bulganin and N. S. Khrushchev to India, Burma and Afghanistan met with an enormous favorable response among the peoples of many, particularly colonial and dependent, countries, and was hailed by all sincerely interested in removing the war danger and in securing firm and lasting peace.

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics maintains that the visit of Comrade N. A. Bulganin, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, and Comrade N. S. Khrushchev, Member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., demonstrated the great significance of personal contacts between statesmen for mutual understanding, the establishment of confidence among states and the development of international co-operation. This visit will serve to weaken the forces of the war supporters and strengthen world peace.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. hereby resolves:

To approve the activities of Comrade N. A. Bulganin, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, and Comrade N. S. Khrushchev, Member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., during their visit to the Republic of India, the Union of Burma and Afghanistan, as wholly according the Soviet Union's foreign policy of peace, and as promoting the strengthening of peace, friendship and co-operation among the nations.

THE KREMLIN, MOSCOW

December 29, 1955.

