

**June 27, 1956**

**Protocol Record of a Conversation between K. E. Voroshilov, N. A. Bulganin, N. S. Khrushchev, and A. I. Mikoyan with the Shah of Iran Mohammad Reza Pahlavi**

**Citation:**

"Protocol Record of a Conversation between K. E. Voroshilov, N. A. Bulganin, N. S. Khrushchev, and A. I. Mikoyan with the Shah of Iran Mohammad Reza Pahlavi", June 27, 1956, Wilson Center Digital Archive, RGANI, f. 52, op. 1, d. 567, ll. 15-36. Contributed by Sergey Radchenko and translated by Gary Goldberg.  
<https://digitalarchive.umd.edu/document/208810>

**Summary:**

Khrushchev, Voroshilov, Bulganin, and Mikoyan speak with Iranian Shah about international affairs, atomic and hydrogen bombs, the situation in the Middle East and South Asia, and the Baghdad Pact.

**Credits:**

This document was made possible with support from Blavatnik Family Foundation

**Original Language:**

Russian

**Contents:**

Translation - English

Secret Copy N<sup>o</sup> 6  
to N<sup>o</sup> 419/OP 30 June 1956

PROTOCOL OF THE DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN K. YE. VOROSHILOV, N. A. BULGANIN, N. S. KHRUSHCHEV, AND A. I. MIKOYAN AND THE SHAH OF IRAN MOHAMMED REZA PAHLAVI

27 June 1956

Present from the Soviet side: V. S. Semenov, L F. Il'ichev, A. I. Lavrent'yev, and A. P. Pavlov

from the Iranian side: Minister of Trade of Iran Ibrahim Kashani, Senator M. Sa'ed, Adjutant General of the Shah Yazdan Panah, and Iranian Ambassador in the USSR A. G. Masoud Ansari

After a brief mutual exchange of greetings K. Ye. Voroshilov, turning to the Shah, asks:

Your Majesty, may we begin our discussions? It would be good to hear your opinion about the contemporary international situation. The Soviet side has no prepared program of discussions and intends to hold a free exchange of opinions, if you agree.

Shah. In my opinion, the current situation in the entire world is in a state of change. It seems that everywhere a need is felt for calm and peace. However, a durable peace can be established only when agreement is reached between the great powers and ways found to prohibit atomic and thermonuclear weapons and to limit all weapons. On the other hand, we all see that the peoples are demanding independence, we see that in almost the entire world there are no longer colonies, and this is manifested in the form of nationalism and in other forms. I am confident that sooner or later all countries will achieve their goal. Of course, this instills great hopes.

And when all people come to this the means of provocation and threats will be fewer. This will help secure peace. And this will be when all peoples who have obtained independence are able to create their own economies - industry and agriculture - and develop their own natural resources. Then conditions will be created for the development of friendly existence [SIC].

Of course it would be considerably better if the industry of various countries instead of creating means of destruction created means of subsistence for the population. How long will this transitional stage last? I hope that it is not long.

Khrushchev Right.

K. Voroshilov We agree, we also think this way. But how long will this stage last? There can be different opinions. This can be drawn out, and events can go very quickly. I want to add a couple of words to what His Majesty the Shah said. It seems to me that all countries, including the USSR and Iran, should exhibit activity. The activity should not only be inside the country, in domestic development for the purposes of developing the national economy, culture, and art, the activity should also be in the international arena. With their activity the countries should actively avert the possibility of an outbreak of international conflicts. His Highness the Shah is right when he said yesterday that even small conflicts might grow into large clashes. If the measures of our countries and of others concur, this is very good. But even if they don't, they will be directed at one and the same goal, peace, and this will be good. Of course, each country should find its means. I would very much like to know the opinion of His Majesty.

Shah Of course, this is an object of our desires within those limits in which we can help achieve this great goal. The great powers - four or five - have permanent seats in the Security Council of the United Nations. These countries, which have stipulated more (predominant) rights for themselves in order that whatever they do their actions will be more effective. The only responsibility of the small countries is to help to do everything possible as concerns changes to international life.

N. Khrushchev We consider the international situation not bad at the present time

and, moreover, good. This is an improvement of relations between countries. Whereas two or three years ago there were discussions about war, about defense, etc. the situation is different right now. Now it is hard to speak of war even as obvious phrase-mongering since reactionary politicians have to reckon with public opinion. I consider this a great step forward. Don't suspect us of boasting, says N. S. Khrushchev, turning to the Shah, if we say that our role, the role of our country in the cause of lessening tension, is not small.

Shah expresses agreement.

N. Khrushchev We are actively pursuing a policy toward peace and it seems to us that success is evident. We have sought to establish diplomatic relations with the GFR [German Federal Republic], and have eliminated conflict with Yugoslavia. This conflict was sort of a delayed-action mine in international relations. Now our relations with Yugoslavia have become friendly and even very friendly. We solved the Austrian question, which created tension in the international situation. We understood that Austria was a bridgehead in the heart of Europe both for us as well as for the Western powers. We eliminated our military base in Finland. We thought that as long as our troops were in Finland – and we haven't had and do not have poor relations with Finland – relations between our countries were not fully normal, and we withdrew our troops. This was done so quickly that the Finns were very surprised. When N. A. Bulganin, A. I. Mikoyan, and I were in China we came to agreement about the elimination of our military base in Port Arthur. We did this based on the principle that there ought not be foreign military bases on foreign territory.

Such are some of the steps we have made directed at an improvement of the international situation. And even for a person who has been biased against us, it is hard to argue against these facts, which show that we need peace and that we are travelling the path of reducing international tension, and toward establishing trust among countries.

Our steps in the field of reducing armaments and fighting for a prohibition of atomic weapons were made in the same direction. We favor reducing armaments and armed forces, and are for a prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons. Our position in this respect is firm and consistent. We agreed to pull troops out of Germany if our Western partners do the same. However, our proposals have not yet been accepted. But we are confident that these measures are like a drop striking a rock, gradually softening minds and reaching the consciousness [even] of diehard people, and we have recently begun to reap the fruits of this policy.

When we saw that in the Subcommittee for Disarmament that some countries have sent their representatives who repeat the same arguments like phonograph records and no progress is made, we took the initiative into our hands and announced a reduction of our army by 640,000 men. Much ink was spilled by our enemies to lessen the importance of this step of ours, but the good seed gave good results. We went further and reduced our army further by another 1,200,000 men, including 30,000 withdrawn from Germany (actually 39,000).

Those are our matters which were done in the face of world public opinion. If we had a favorable reply from our partners we would have gone further. We are refraining from useless words so as not to irritate the military circles of some countries. Sometimes we read statements of high-ranking, but unintelligent, diplomats who say insulting things against our country, but we don't reply to them and don't engage in polemics with them. Of course, we see that our policy makes them mad, but nevertheless they have to change their language. If they don't change it themselves then their peoples will force them to change it.

Peoples view the Soviet Union as a mighty power, and this is true. And now the peoples do not believe the legend that the Soviet Union wants war or is preparing to attack someone. In fact, not one country which wants war will reduce its armed forces, not one country which wants war will abandon advantageous military bridgeheads, in particular such a bridgehead in the center of Europe as Austria. N. S. Khrushchev says, turning to the Shah, you may ask what is our evidence[?] The evidence is the facts of which I just spoke. It should be clear to anyone that there is nothing we can get by war. In current conditions in the case of war we will have enormous destruction. Of course, we will destroy Europe and America in turn. As regards America, it isn't beyond the mountains, as they said before. Of course, we

have had previously and now have such aircraft which can deliver any means of destruction very well and at a distance and we will show you this equipment. But that's not even the matter right now. With the appearance of ballistic missiles which can travel thousands of kilometers in several minutes much of the not long ago advanced aviation equipment will lose its previous importance. I want to tell you, says N. S. Khrushchev, turning to the Shah, that we are not boasting. This is the objective information of this weapon.

K. Voroshilov notes that the military will soon have nothing to do when the equipment is activated.

N. Khrushchev We have such weapons and think that some other countries also have such weapons, the US and possibly Britain. We don't need war, and destruction is not necessary. The enormous natural wealth of our country and the labor of our peoples allow us to have everything necessary. In addition, we are ready and able to help develop the economy of less-developed countries and we have made a challenge to some industrialized countries in this regard. This is a challenge to peaceful competition, although we also know that some do not like this challenge of ours very much.

Now I would like to touch on some ideological questions. In the West and in other countries they have their ways, and we have ours There is a capitalist system there, and we have a socialist system. We pursue our measures and we think that our system is better, but we don't impose it on anyone. We say, let's compete, [and see] whose system is better. If the people eat better, get more, have everything necessary, have enough, and feel happy, it means such a system is better. But we want to solve this dispute by peaceful means. It is known that it is impossible to fight ideas with the aid of cannon. It is true that in the Middle Ages, during the Inquisition, when people were burned in bonfires, they thought that one could fight ideas with force but, as we know from historical experience, nothing came of this, the ideas continued to exist. As regards us, we are not imposing anything on anyone, we ourselves want to live in the conditions which, as they say, God gave us. The political system of various countries is the affair of the peoples of these countries. We hold to the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other countries and demand the same of others.

This is inherently our principle of relations with other countries, including with neighboring ones. We favor peaceful coexistence between countries with different political and social systems. This is in agreement with what Lenin taught. It is true that Lenin spoke there being war from time to time, but now after the 20th Congress of our Party we think that war can be avoided. Some depict the matter that the Soviet Union is looking for a means of expanding its influence with the aid of war. This is wrong. We think that war is not unavoidable, it also might not break out in present conditions. Of course, if a war breaks out we will defend ourselves and attack in self-defense. Now the idea of peaceful coexistence has become widespread. Indeed, for there is no other way out - either peaceful coexistence and economic cooperation or war. We think that those who don't want to accept the socialist system but do not want to reckon with the facts, nevertheless understand what modern war is.

We just noted the holiday of Soviet aviation. It was very pleasant for us that on this holiday many countries, great and small, sent their representatives. We held friendly conversations right here with American, British, and other military representatives, not to mention the conversations we had with the Americans, British, and French before this. The Turks have not had any contacts with us for a long time, but they sent their general, the commander-in-chief of their air forces, for the holiday of Soviet aviation. Turkey is a poor country. And if it is in conflict with the Soviet Union and searches for friends for distant lands then the matter will end badly. Until these friends come to help, there will no longer be a Turkey. We can hit all the territory of Turkey from our territory, and again I stress that we are not boasting, objective information says this. For example, British scientists calculated that six hydrogen bombs are enough to destroy all of Britain. It's not we, but British physicists who say this. Turkey has somewhat more territory and a smaller population, [so] possibly seven hydrogen bombs which can be delivered by flying warheads are needed.

I want to stress, says N. S. Khrushchev, this is not a threat. I want you to help us

improve our relations with Turkey.

N. Bulganin Perhaps it's worth talking about the Near and Middle East.

N. Khrushchev We have very good relations with the Arab countries. Some say in connection with this that in the Near and Middle East we are pursuing a tactic of pushing the Western countries out and therefore establishing good relations with the countries of the Arab East. This is stupidity. We are acting pursuant to our convictions, pursuant to the fact that we are against colonies and colonial dependence in principle, and favor the elimination of colonialism. Now even some Western countries have come to the conclusion that it is hard to hold onto colonies and therefore they are trying to replace the political oppression in the colonies or former colonies with economic oppression. But this is not better for the peoples. The peoples do not want to die of hunger for the sake of preserving the colonial system and its new forms. When we were in Britain the question of the Near and Middle East was being very heatedly discussed.

A. Mikoyan This is one of the most heated questions.

N. Khrushchev We told the British that we are irreconcilable on this question. We do not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, but are always stand up for the countries being liberated from colonial dependence and are against any vestiges of colonialism.

Speaking of trade relations with countries of this region, we think that it is possible and necessary to have trade relations. But we oppose onerous conditions and using trade relations as a means to establish economic dependence. The Arab countries and many countries of Africa are pleased with our policy. And they like our voice. We will do everything that is in our power for them to have economic independence besides political independence.

This is our point of view. I have said nothing new. All this is presented in our documents. We think that this is a correct and fair policy which is harmless and useful for you, for Iran.

Shah I am very delighted, having heard an extraordinarily clear and precise statement from you. I draw this conclusion: it is possible that a war has been averted so far, this is a terrible weapons which the United States of American and the Soviet Union have. But once it happens that ballistic projectiles with atomic or other warheads begin to fly from one end of the world to the other, and as a result the whole world will be destroyed and collapse. Therefore it is necessary to strive for such a danger to be removed by prohibiting atomic and hydrogen weapons so that there are no such weapons at all so that peace is ensured without weapons.

K. Voroshilov requests to be excused for the remark and says: we are striving for this. We foresaw a lot beforehand and submitted a corresponding proposal to prohibit atomic and hydrogen weapons but unfortunately it did not encounter support. We saw that beyond our borders a weapon is being prepared, and we knew that they are being prepared against someone; we knew precisely that it was being prepared against us and we were forced in turn to supply ourselves with such weapons.

Shah In reality we Iranians are in the middle. The Americans have a terrible weapon, the USSR has [it], possibly Britain has the keys to the situation, thus it is in the hands of the US and USSR, and possibly also Britain's, too. The responsibility of small countries, and in any event the responsibility of Iran in these conditions, is to help everyone who facilitates a reduction of tension and disarmament. For small countries, and Iran is small, although a country rich in its possibilities, it is especially necessary for a durable peace and sympathies between peoples to exist. This is necessary for people to be able to make use of the wealth of the country and to possibly have a higher standard of living. With respect to Iran it can be said that it still has not passed through the stage of capitalist development. Inasmuch as the wealth of the country and the main industrial resources are in the hands of the Iranian government we have no fears for further development.

Personally I am very glad that I have heard the clear and precise policy which you have explained. The clearer, the better. In the conditions of Iran we of course not only know how much our country needs for peace and calm, we also know that all our future depends on peace and calm in the entire world. I am afraid that what I will say will be repetitive, but from everything said a conclusion can be drawn: we are acting

from a pure heart so that the danger of war is eliminated in the entire world so we can live in peace and develop trade relations, especially with the Soviet Union.

Khrushchev We are very glad of this.

K. Voroshilov This is our desire, too.

A. Mikoyan says that he thinks it useful to talk about some of his conversation with government figures, in particular, with the President of Pakistan, during [his] recent visit there.

When I asked the Pakistanis why they need the Baghdad Pact they said that they have no claims against the Soviet Union, and that Pakistan would never become a territory for an attack on the Soviet Union. In reply to my question, why was the Baghdad Pact needed then, the Pakistanis replied that it is needed for protection against India. That is why they did not reject the Pact when it was suggested that they join this Pact. To this they added that the Baghdad Pact does not interfere with them improving their relations with the Soviet Union. Several days after this discussion the Pakistanis appointed their ambassador to our country. We are developing trade relations with the, and they are making concrete steps.

The Pakistanis told me that it would be significantly easier for them to improve their relations with the Soviet Union if relations with the Muslim countries bordering the Soviet Union – Turkey and Iran – were improved. For its part, the Soviet Union has already undertaken many steps directed at an improvement of relations with Iran. Financial claims and border disputes were settled not long ago, even such disputes which remained from the Tsar's [time]. And suddenly at this very time Iran joins the Baghdad Pact. When the question about this came up in Pakistan I said that the arrival of His Highness the Shah in the USSR would clarify the situation.

I had a meeting with Menderes. Why not improve Soviet-Turkish relations, I asked Menderes. The whole world is dealing with the Soviet Union, but Turkey is estranged from it. Menderes replied that until there is a general improvement of the international situation there will be no improvement of relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union. In reply to this he was told that neighbors can improve relations between one another independent of the general direction of international relations. However, Menderes did not want to delve into this.

Thus [we] had to tell the President that a vicious circle is resulting. The Soviet Union wants an improvement of relations with Pakistan, the Pakistanis tie an improvement of their relations with the Soviet Union with an improvement of Soviet-Turkish and Soviet-Iranian relations, but the Turks tie an improvement of Soviet-Turkish relations with an improvement of the overall international situation. But an improvement of the overall international situation will not come if relations between individual countries don't improve.

The conversation which I had with Nehru deserves attention. Nehru said that he had formed the impression that Iran is afraid of its northern neighbor. As regards grounds and reasons for this we already talked about this yesterday and today. There are no grounds for this.

The Soviet Union is not in such a position to ask Iran for friendship; Iran needs good relations in any event, no less than the Soviet Union. You cannot doubt our sincerity. It is necessary that fear be discarded in the relations of the Soviet Union with Turkey and Iran. During the Second World War and afterward events took place which increased Iran's mistrust of the Soviet Union. In the name of all of us N. S. Khrushchev said that we regret those mistaken steps which took place then; but if one is to tell the truth those present here should not personally bear responsibility for these mistakes. We speak about our responsibility because we are responsible for policy, although none of us at that time was a supporter of those mistaken steps which were made from our side.

N. Khrushchev notes that then those present right now at the discussions were against the mistaken steps with regard to Turkey and Iran, but then they could change nothing. This concerns the actions associated with the name of Stalin, in addition Beria also had a hand in this matter at one time.

A. Mikoyan This concerns the creation of an atmosphere of trust, which the Soviet Union wants. We hope that you see that we do not threaten you militarily.

A. I. Mikoyan speaks of the good relations between the USSR and Afghanistan and in connection with this the recent talks between N. A. Bulganin and N. S. Khrushchev with leaders of the Afghan government. Iran and Afghanistan have much in common: the Muslim religion, a similar economy, and even similar languages. We have good relations with Afghanistan.

N. Khrushchev makes a remark: We have very good relations with Afghanistan.

A. Mikoyan Why does Iran not have the same relations with the Soviet Union as Afghanistan has with the Soviet Union? What do we need from Iran? First of all, that Iran not be a foreign base for an attack on the Soviet Union. No attack threatens you from our side, we want good relations with Iran, and it is necessary for you to be convinced of this and it will be to the benefit of Iran and the cause of peace.

Shah I am very grateful to Mr. Mikoyan for his statement. Inasmuch as our conversation has taken on a frank and cordial nature and has nothing in common with the notes which are usually exchanged by countries through official channels [we] can freely say words full of friendship and openness. You ask, why did Iran join the Baghdad Pact, which I consider a defensive alliance. This has its roots in the 150-year history of relations between our countries which needs to be corrected. Can one cite even once instance where Iran has attacked Russia in 150 years or has had in mind the idea of attacking and seizing Soviet territory?

Sa'ed notes that in 1878 Iran supported Russia against Turkey and also supported Russia for 20 years of the 20th century. Sa'ed says, I was consul-general in Baku at this time and transferred tons of wheat for starving people in Russia. We had no aggressive thoughts.

Shah But Russia has attacked Iran two or three times from 1811 to the World War. In 1907 Russian divided Iran with Britain, in the First World War Russian troops entered Iran together with British troops, in the Second World War Soviet troops also entered Iranian territory in 1941. Iran concluded a treaty with the USSR; however, in spite of this treaty matters reached the point that part of Iranian territory was nearly taken away from Iran. Therefore the factor of fear and anxiety has existed and this forced us to take some steps, even if this was useless from the military point of view. Speaking of the possible military uselessness of Iran's joining the Baghdad Pact, the Shah adds, I have in mind that Iran's military might is very limited, and I also mean modern military equipment, in particular rockets, against which it is impossible to defend. Our dream is that there not be any war. Any position that Iran took would have no importance if, God forbid, a war occurred, since Iran would be drawn into military operations all the same. Now you see how sincerely we are interested in no war occurring.

Of course, I do not want to say that Soviet-Iranian relations cannot be improved until the international situation improves. Perhaps the honor which we have had, our arrival in your country, is it not a sign and evidence of a wish to improve relations with the Soviet Union[?] But the basis of the whole matter is that until the terrible specter, which casts a shadow on all of us, is [lifted], until the danger of war is eliminated in the entire world, it is completely impossible to solve all questions. The basis of this terrible specter is the atomic and thermonuclear weapons and all modern weaponry in general. Iran itself, what danger can it present to the Soviet Union?

if Iran itself is not dangerous to you, but you think that a danger from Iranian territory might threaten you then I say that as long as I am alive no danger from Iran will threaten you (then the Shah adds: no danger threatens you from the territory of Iran). We are in such a position that we have to look at our neighbors and when necessary bring our policy closer to that of our neighbors. This ensues from the geographical position of our country.

Now the discussion has turned on relations with Pakistan. For specific reasons, a common religion and lack of conflict, Iran has very good relations with Pakistan. I also hold to the opinion that Pakistan has no grounds to have poor relations with you or have suspicions of you. In my opinion, the same can also be said of Turkey. What power does it have to have bad aims with respect to the USSR[?] Of course, if you say that you can cause such damage in this country from your territory, that it will practically be destroyed, then Turkey knows this. As regards Afghanistan, then Afghanistan is in a different situation. It did not take part in the last two World Wars.

Obviously the geographic position helps Afghanistan here. Iran has a common religion and language with Afghanistan, we wish them happiness and progress, although they concern us somewhat with respect to the waters of the Helmand.

We have again come to the conclusion that it is necessary to create such conditions which would avert war.

N. Khrushchev It is pleasing to hear your statement that you will not permit any threat or danger to the Soviet Union from your territory. As regards some incidents of the past to which Your Highness pointed, we have spoken of them ourselves. But if one speaks all the time about some bad act from one side or another then relations will remain at a standstill. It is necessary to begin a new history. N. A Bulganin and I spent some time in Afghanistan and had conversations with the King and leading government figures of Afghanistan. It was very pleasant, we established very amiable relations, and now we await the leaders of the government of Afghanistan as our guests. We have no conflicts with Afghanistan, and if there are minor border incidents they are easily settled by our border commissars. Our relations with Afghanistan are very good.

Now about your trip to the Soviet Union. You acted wisely in coming to us, and we value your courage since you decided on this trip in spite of the insistence of some advisers. However, you are unfair with respect to the assessment of some events of the recent military situation. I mean 1941.

Sa'ed makes the comment that in 1941, as in 1907, the initiators were the British, and adds that in a conversation with V. M. Molotov during the past visit, he stressed that the introduction of troops in 1941 was done at the initiative of the British and that one can only regret the participation of the Soviet Union in this affair.

N. Khrushchev Why such an unfair attitude toward the Soviet Union? You Iranians have the best relations with the initiators of the introduction of troops into Iran, the British, but not with us. You have poor relations with us for the unjustified step made by the British, but good ones with them. For we know the role of Britain, we have spoken to the British about this and heard much from them. They were the initiators of all the bad deeds, but you are with them in the Baghdad Pact.

Shah I can give you two replies to this. First, I want to point out the measures from the Soviet side which followed during the Second World War and served as the cause of those events which almost led to the separation of Iranian Azerbaijan from Iran; second, at the end of the War Soviet troops did not leave Iran in 1945 at the time the British troops left.

N. Khrushchev We have already said that this was a mistake, that this was done under Stalin, and that Beria had a hand in this. We also, for example, considered and consider that Georgian historians at one time, referring to the Georgian army and Georgian population being in some territories of Turkey at one time, incorrectly declared these territories a part of Georgia. We directly and frankly declared that this was incorrect. We said this to you yesterday, and are saying it today. But the main thing is that all our actions in recent years have been directed at an improvement of relations with Iran, we settled all the financial and border differences, and we signed a good agreement with Iran on this question, and received this, the Baghdad Pact, in exchange. This is unjust.

Shah As regards the British, who were also guilty in this evil deed as the introduction of troops into the territory of Iran, the British were punished for this.

N. Khrushchev Now you want to punish us?

Shah The Baghdad Pact is a defensive pact. Wherever you look, everywhere there are pacts: the Atlantic Pact, the Warsaw Pact, your pact with China. Perhaps the only key to the situation is not the danger of war and the elimination of atomic and hydrogen weapons, perhaps we would like there to be a war and the Soviet armed forces come to Iran and destroy us? Perhaps to want this wouldn't be craziness?

N. Khrushchev I want to agree with you. I want to understand your logic. If you went into a military pact then today it might be defensive, but tomorrow aggressive. For the Pact actually provides that foreign troops or bases might be on the territory of Iran.

Shah I am lucky that I can say that this is not so. Not one point of the Pact gives the

right to this.

N. Khrushchev If there are foreign troops and military bases are created on the territory of a host country which is in the Pact then the owners of the foreign troops and bases who are also in the Pact might not ask the host country and take the territory of this country for their purposes. For the countries are stronger than you, they also might not ask your opinion.

General Yazdan-Panah – interrupts the discussion and notes that there is no word in the Baghdad Pact about the possibility of the entry of foreign troops into Iranian territory.

N. Bulganin We know of the substance of the discussions at the last session of the Baghdad Pact, where military measures were developed, but nothing else. We have read the speech of the representative of Britain at the last session of the Baghdad Pact. Britain was represented there by the Minister of Defense. The discussion was about the development of military measures. You have good relations with Turkey, good relations with Pakistan, and they are also in the Baghdad Pact. So, against whom were the speeches made there? We talked about this to Eden and Lloyd, but Lloyd replied with a joke: the Premier and others were, he said, busy and therefore they had to send the Minister of Defense to Tehran to the Baghdad Pact. Then we asked if this explains the matter then why send the Minister of Defense all the same, and not the Minister of Education and why were such speeches made[?]

That's how the situation is developing and you see the reasons for the aggravation of relations.

Shah I want to repeat one thing. Of course, the Baghdad Pact has a military nature. However, the Baghdad Pact is a defensive pact. I would like to refer to a single fact. In many newspapers they write, where the line of defense should pass in connection with the Baghdad Pact: along the Zagros Mountains or the Alborz Mountains. But both mountains are on Iranian territory. This once more shows the defensive nature of the Baghdad bloc.

N. Bulganin His Majesty the Shah speaks of the Iranian point of view, but N. S. Khrushchev justly points out that the allies can impose some things on you.

Shah This won't happen.

N. Khrushchev I would like to tell you a few things in confidence, although nothing that is said here is not intended for the press. Let's calmly analyze the Baghdad Pact and show to whose advantage it is. That's why I talked about a conversation concerning this question confidentially. We would like to have good relations with the British, and we wouldn't like for what is said here to be used to worsen our relations with Britain. However, we wouldn't be ashamed to say this to the face of the British if it were necessary.

Who needs the Baghdad Pact? The British do not believe in our attack in the West, not to mention in the East. If they thought up this Pact then it is not because they are concerned with defense but because it is to their advantage. Advertising the Pact as military, drawing the people of the Near and Middle East into it, the British are creating a base for the economic enslavement of the allies, for wringing oil and other natural resources out of them without interference for the defense of this region. A discussion of what the Pact is intended supposedly for defense of this region is done only to create the impression that they, the British, allegedly are concerned about you. At first in such cases they declare that this is necessary to defend you, but then they say: in order to defend you we have to send our soldiers and have bases on your territory. In 1941 the entry of foreign troops into Iranian territory was primarily a British matter. They want to hold Iran in "friendly" dependence on themselves. We are not talking about this right now, but if necessary we can say directly to whomever it is desired, including the British – the Baghdad Pact is a continuation of a colonial policy.

K. Voroshilov The form of colonialism is more disguised.

N. Khrushchev This is a continuation of an old colonial policy, but only in a new form. As regards the military aspect of the matter, we are not afraid of the British and, in particular, we are not afraid of them in the Near and Middle East. In the event of a conflict to which they can force us, we will smash them and go further. The Baghdad Pact is not frightful to us in this respect, but we view it as an insult to our good

intentions. The attitude toward all we have done for Iran, which was manifested in Iran joining the Baghdad Pact, offends us. However, what is the outcome of this? The Baghdad Pact exists one way or another. Of course, it will perish and die, we are confident of this, but Iran and the Soviet Union have to exist, our relations should be developed. But how can this be? So, advance a demand about Iran leaving the Baghdad Pact? Possibly do it another way – reckon with the existence of the Baghdad Pact, but nullify it in practice. Possibly, come to agreement to express such a position in some document, whether a statement of His Majesty or our joint communiqué. It could say in this document that Iran will not offer its territory against the Soviet Union for any actions of a third country and will develop economic and trade relations with the Soviet Union.

If such a proposal is acceptable it might be charged to prepare some text of a statement of His Majesty the Shah or draw up a joint communiqué. We would consider it a beginning of a new zone [*polosa*] in the development of our relations.

Shah is silent for a time, then tries to say something.

N. Khrushchev apologizes for interrupting and says that the Shah might not reply to this proposal right away. If there is such an opportunity, one might think about it or consult on this question.

Shah I would like to clear up two questions. Not [just] one pact exists in the entire world. Why do you, as Iranians say, point a finger to the Baghdad Pact? The Baghdad Pact is the weakest pact compared to the other pacts. Considering the geographic position of its participants, this Pact can never have an aggressive nature. This became clear with respect to Iran, in particular that it spoke of a defensive line along the Zagros or Alborz Ranges. I think that the solution is that there be no pacts at all.

Now, as regards the past. Up to now no pressure has been put on Iran and no proposals have been made directed at Iran becoming a weapon of someone's aggression against the Soviet Union. Be confident that such situation will never arise as long as I have influence in my country. If any discussions are possible on this basis then your Embassy in Iran and our Embassy in Moscow can continue the discussions. I think that you believe my statements.

N. Khrushchev We believe [them]. But it would be good to make publish what you have said. The form can be chosen.

Shah According to the Constitution of Iran you can accept a personal statement from me. If this is sufficient then all the better. If not, then there should be talks between the ministries of foreign affairs of both countries.

N. Bulganin This will be sufficient.

N. Khrushchev I have one more comment. Here you say, N. S. Khrushchev turns to the Shah, that we have attacked the Baghdad Pact, although it, this Pact, is the worst of all pacts; but we have attacked and we also attack the Atlantic Pact. We have sharply criticized and are criticizing it. But right now, in conversations with you, what is the use of attacking the Atlantic Pact where its participants and organizers are not here? In principle we favor disbanding all blocs, including the Warsaw military alliance, which we were forced to [make]. But not everything depends on us in this matter.

K. Voroshilov says that he wants to explain why the fact of Iran's joining the Baghdad bloc troubles us. Not so long ago relations with Turkey were exacerbated. However, after changes occurred inside our country after the death of Stalin we declared our wish to improve relations with Turkey. Unfortunately, our statement has not yet had an effect on Turkey.

N. Khrushchev Our steps with respect to Turkey are beginning to have an effect.

K. Voroshilov Turkey's participation in the Baghdad bloc and its hostile position with respect to the Soviet Union are not at all safe. We know that there are foreign troops and foreign navy ships and foreign military bases in Turkey, including bases intended for atomic bombs. Against whom is all this directed? Against us, the Soviet Union. Of course, if the Turks or someone else from the territory of Turkey attack us (for there are irrational people), they will try and cause us damage, then it will be bad for Turkey, very bad. But as for the Soviet Union, you can believe us. We not only do not plan to attack, but do not have a thought of this. We have no such intentions. Turning

to the Shah, K. Ye. Voroshilov says: your statement is entirely sufficient for us, but it is necessary that this statement of yours and others can be read so that everyone know that the Baghdad Pact, as it regards Iran, will not serve the purposes of an attack on the Soviet Union.

A. Mikoyan says that he would like to make a comment about the past, and says that the injustices which were committed by Tsarist Russia against Iran cannot be transferred to the Soviet Union. We have respected Iran since the first days of the existence of Soviet power, we withdrew troops from the territory of Iran, liquidated all unequal treaties, and established relations with Iran as equals. His Majesty the Shah forgets, but he takes out small misunderstandings of the war and post-war years. Everyone knows what Lenin did for the East, but right now we are reestablishing the Leninist policy in all rights. We ask you to understand our policy, then there will be correct relations between us and mutual understanding.

Shah You should know that not one bad word has been said against Lenin in Iran. Don't forget that our country was among the first to recognize Lenin's regime. Don't forget that we did not exhibit a lack of foresight in this regard.

N. Khrushchev Afghanistan recognized the Soviet Union first.

N. Bulganin Afghanistan and Iran generally recognized us almost simultaneously.

Shah Everywhere in Iran they have always spoken of Lenin and to this day speak of him with great respect. As regards bases and foreign troops on the territory of Turkey, then Turkey is a member of NATO and these bases are belong to NATO.

K. Voroshilov It is not a bit easier for us that the bases in Turkey are fundamentally NATO's, but that in Iran there will be bases which are fundamentally the Baghdad Pact's.

Shah I do not mean this, I would very much like for the USSR to have good relations with Turkey.

K. Voroshilov With what did we end today's talks?

N. Bulganin Today's talks should be concluded with a breakfast.

K. Voroshilov It is necessary to agree about the future. If the Iranian side wishes this then it is possible to meet again and continue the conversation.

N. Bulganin If [we] sum up some results of our talks then the Soviet side is very satisfied with the friendly, frank, and useful conversation. We think that we will have breakfast today, then rest, and possibly continue the conversation tomorrow.

Shah does not object.

N. Bulganin What will we report for the press [?]

Shah If the Soviet side agrees then it would possible to say that the talks continued in a very friendly atmosphere and touched on the friendly relations between the two countries. However the sides hold to the same views of strengthening these friendly relations.

K. Voroshilov There are no objections to this. The text of a report today's meeting can be entrusted to Ambassador Ansari and Il'ichev.

At that the meeting closed.

11 copies

Nº 831

30 June