

**June 9, 1963**

**Record of a Conversation between N. S. Khrushchev  
and the Vice President of the UAR Marshall Abdel  
Hakim Amer**

**Citation:**

"Record of a Conversation between N. S. Khrushchev and the Vice President of the UAR Marshall Abdel Hakim Amer", June 9, 1963, Wilson Center Digital Archive, RGANI, f. 52, op. 1, d. 561, ll. 122-142. Contributed by Sergey Radchenko and translated by Gary Goldberg. <https://digitalarchive.umd.edu/document/209100>

**Summary:**

Khrushchev and Marshal Amer discuss regional developments in Iraq and Syria, the Kurdish question, anti-imperialist struggles, and the UAR's economic nationalization efforts. Khrushchev criticizes Arab nationalism and the repression of communists, while Amer requests a review of Soviet arms pricing and emphasizes the UAR's commitment to socialism and independence.

**Credits:**

This document was made possible with support from Blavatnik Family Foundation

**Original Language:**

Russian

**Contents:**

Translation - English

Secret Copy N<sup>o</sup> [left blank]

RECORD OF A CONVERSATION

[between] Cde. N. S. KHRUSHCHEV and Marshal Abdel Hakim AMER, Vice President of the United Arab Republic

9 June 1963

[Translator's note: a faded, illegible handwritten sentence follows the last paragraph, but is probably "The record of the conversation was not reviewed by N. S. Khrushchev", as appears in two other records of his conversations].

At the beginning of the conversation Cde. N. S. Khrushchev and Marshal Amer exchanged greetings.

Amer: President Nasser [asked me] to pass a big hello to you, Mr. Khrushchev, and also the appreciation of the government and the people of the United Arab Republic to the Soviet Union for the aid which it has been sending our country for many years.

N. S. Khrushchev: Thank you.

Amer: The main questions of interest to both sides are explained in the message of President Nasser I passed to Your Excellency. I do not know, have you had time familiarize yourself with the message?

N. S. Khrushchev: Yes, I have familiarized myself with its content.

Amer: I would like to cover individual questions in more detail.

N. S. Khrushchev: Go ahead.

Amer: UAR policy is anti-imperialist, and we think that time has confirmed this. The experience of our relations with the Soviet Union has shown that it is not pretty phrases and not a tactic, but an actual practicable policy, and there is no basis to doubt this. We openly acknowledge that in our policy we rely on the aid and support of the Soviet Union, and therefore our relations are undoubtedly friendly.

Questions of relations between our countries were discussed during Adzhubey's meeting with President Nasser, and also [questions of] relations between the UAR, Syria, and Iraq. Such questions as the Yemeni revolution and UAR policy were also touched upon in this conversation, which lasted seven hours.

Events in Iraq and Syria were a surprise to us, and we were simply presented with a fait accompli. We do not bear responsibility for the acts of the Iraqi authorities who are conducting mass arrests of Communists and handing down death sentences. According to available information, about 16,000 people have been arrested in Iraq. About 1,500 officers have been arrested in the army. President Nasser has warned the Iraqi Baathists that such acts carry a danger inasmuch as they can spoil Iraq's relations with the countries of the socialist camp. However, the Baathists are continuing their policy.

N. S. Khrushchev: They are not only persecuting Communists and other progressive elements in Iraq, but also Arab nationalists and supporters of peace.

Amer: Right now there are actually broad punitive operations being conducted against Arab nationalists and in general against everyone who speaks against the Baathists. Our general assessment of the Baath is that the Baathists enjoy the support of no more than ¼ of the population. The Baath policy is a policy of a dictatorship

N. S. Khrushchev: The Baathists borrowed their methods from Hitler.

Amer: Exactly. We are against dictatorship. Therefore when after the events in Iraq and Syria [Translator's note: a few words were omitted at this point, but probably mean "representatives of"] the new regimes of both countries [were] in Cairo to hold talks about unification and we frankly wrote in the tripartite declaration that unification ought to be build on socialist and democratic foundations. We knew that the representatives of both countries will not observe these principles of unification, but in this event we are right to abandon our obligations. We could not openly declare that we opposed unification with these countries inasmuch as the people and public

opinion would not understand us.

In addition, while the delegation was in Cairo we noted an attempt to collude with imperialism among the Baathists even at the level of the leaders of this party. For example, Salah Bitar visited the American Kermit Roosevelt, who in the past worked in American intelligence, in one of the Cairo hotels. At the present time Roosevelt is working in oil companies, but he continues to work in American intelligence. Such a phenomenon, when the Prime Minister of Syria goes to meet an American intelligence officer, needs an explanation for the reasons prompting Bitar to [do] this.

We are for unification at any price, but on democratic and socialist foundations. Otherwise, we oppose unification. This is our real position on the question of unification.

It is strange that some Communist newspapers have presented our position on unification as if unification was the most important thing for us.

There is one more question - the Kurdish problem. The Iraqi Baathists have openly declared to us that they are not able to deal with the Kurds themselves, and have asked us for military aid to suppress them. We refused to do this for them. President Nasser openly replied that the Kurdish question is a domestic problem of the Iraqis.

We think that the Baathists in Iraq and Syria are losing support in the people and are isolated from them. The Baathists in Syria are especially weak.

N. S. Khrushchev: The last letter of Nasser and Adzhubey's conversation with President Nasser explains our position in general and in one and the same direction. We value the thoughts expressed in the conversation with Adzhubey and in the message. The position[s] of the UAR government on the question which are important from our point of view have become clearer to us. This is a general comment. Now, I want to tell how we assess the situation in Iraq and regard Kassem.

We consider the 14 July revolution in Iraq to be progressive and a positive phenomenon. Then we did not know that two years before the revolution Kassem had established relations with the Communists with the goal of combining efforts to overthrow the Feisal and Nuri Said regime. We also regarded Kassem as a progressive person. During our meeting with President Nasser then we decided to give support in defense of the Iraqi revolution. We held military maneuvers on our borders with Turkey and Iran and also on the Bulgarian-Turkish border in order to restrain Turkey, Pakistan, and Iran, which could have defeated the revolution.

We gave Kassem weapons without any agreement. We hoped that the revolution would develop along a progressive path. Then, however, it emerged that Kassem was a person with dictatorial ambitions. We sent Mikoyan for the celebration of the anniversary of the Iraqi revolution. Through him we frankly told Kassem our disagreement with his methods. However, Kassem went still further in pursuing his policy and isolated himself from the people. Mikoyan then told Kassem frankly what his behavior would lead to. Kassem agreed with us on something, but in practice went still further. We expected that Kassem's dictatorship would end earlier or later, but we didn't know when this would happen.

The forces which came to replace Kassem in Iraq turned out to be even more stupid. Therefore the situation in the country is unstable right now and the process is still not complete. Such a government which does not enjoy the support of the working people and which relies only on military force cannot hold out for long. A plot against the existing regime which might be accomplished was being prepared in the army itself. The plot, as the press wrote, was pro-Nasser, that is, it was being prepared by Nasserite supporters. We neither sympathized with this attempt nor were not against it.

Now about the situation in Syria. When Syria united with Egypt we said much about our position. We think that the form in which unification was then accomplished did not create conditions for a lasting union. We think that different forces were active then which did not pursue the goals of Arab unity, but each force pursued its own specific goals. We thought that unification was difficult to accomplish inasmuch as the regimes in both countries were different. Syria is a bourgeois democratic republic which inherited much from the French revolution. In Egypt, when unification occurred, there were no forces which called for a bourgeois democratic republic.

You have correctly understood that we did not really sympathize, although [we] did

not object to what happened. The unification was accomplished from unhealthy principles. And right now unification is being accomplished on unhealthy principles inasmuch as it is occurring under the slogans of anticommunism and Arab nationalism.

The Communist Party in Syria was influential and enjoyed popularity among the people. This threatened the Syrian bourgeoisie, feudal lords, and the Baathists. Hawrani is against the Communist Party and unification with the UAR. However, a choice was before him: either unification with the UAR or the victory of the Communists. He chose the first, and this was clear.

We consider Bakdash a good Communist. He favors the preservation of domestic procedures [*rezhimy*] and the parliament, and is in favor of unification agreed without loss of sovereignty to the participants of the unification.

We considered the level in Syria higher than the level of Egypt. Therefore, if unification occurs then Syria, being smaller than Egypt, would be reduced to the level of Egypt. This would undoubtedly create difficulties for you.

I will cite this example. In 1948 during a conversation between Stalin and Gottwald the latter proposed including Czechoslovakia in the Soviet Union. Stalin opposed this, and was right. He was right because the level in Czechoslovakia was higher than the level in the USSR, and with the incorporation of Czechoslovakia into the USSR we might cause dissatisfaction among the population of Czechoslovakia.

At the present time we also have some socialist countries asking us for inclusion in the USSR. But we think that the unification might be accomplished when the time comes, when the necessary preconditions are created for this\*. In a union with Syria you were thinking of taking on the Syrians, but it didn't turn out. You acted right here as military men, not as diplomats. But this is the past.

\*Translator's note: three lines of faded handwriting follow the above paragraph.

Concerning the situation in the UAR. We think that the UAR is moving quite boldly in the direction of progress, especially in the field of economics. The laws about the preservation of land ownership and the nationalization of industry, these are bold and progressive measures, more progressive than in Syria and Iraq.

The Syrian authorities want a return to the landlord system and they do not have support among the people. If the Syrian leaders also speak of socialism then they are essentially deceiving the people.

A variety of Hitler's national socialism is being observed in Iraq. The attempt of these rulers to conceal themselves with the word socialism says that the socialist ideas have deeply penetrated the consciousness of the masses. However we, as pioneers of the socialist theory developed by Marx and Engels and advanced by Lenin, view the declarations of the current rulers of Iraq about socialism with great reservations. Many different "socialisms" have appeared right now - Indian socialism, Indonesian socialism, Arab socialism, and others. We don't believe just in the word "socialism". We want to see why in some cases the slogan of socialism is possibly a tactic.

For example, the Iraqis also talk about socialism. Even the American leader Harriman has said that the Americans need to seek a new word instead of the word capitalism, which has finally discredited itself. I am speaking frankly inasmuch as I am accustomed to speak this way. You have problems and we understand this. But we Communists cannot trust your statements that you hold socialist positions if you put Communists in prison who are ideologically devoted builders of socialism.

About what socialism can one speak if the most consistent fighters for the cause of socialism are kept in prisons[?] We are Communists and you will understand us. Possibly we could not agree with Bakdash on all details. We have some differences with some of our Communist friends from other countries. However, we are united on fundamental questions.

Let's take the example of Castro, who is the head of a new socialist country. He was not a Communist before the Cuban Revolution. He appointed people as president and premier after the Revolution who are right now fighting against him. The émigré Cardona is well-known. But when Castro was convinced that the only progressive way to be on the side of the people was socialism and Communism he chose the theory of scientific socialism. And we support this.

As long as Castro did not openly declare that he took Marxist-Leninist positions we did not even publicly sympathize with him since we then thought that we ought not to do so for tactical considerations. When he announced his new position we began to openly him. When we saw that Castro, and this means Cuba, was threatened by the United States of America we offered to station nuclear weapons and missiles in Cuba. We did this in order to convince the American imperialists that if an attack were made on Cuba this would mean an attack on us inasmuch our people were in Cuba. And then we will come to [their] aid, yes, we will come. Why did we do this? Because we are faithful to the regime of the young Cuban republic.

We are giving Cuba much aid. The Americans thought that with an economic blockade of Cuba they would force us to abandon giving aid to this republic, thinking that it would be burdensome for us. But this is not so. We will continue to aid Cuba. Of course, this costs a lot of money but are completely able to afford it and we will help.

When your President told me that there are different Communists, and therefore they release some there and other sit in prison we frankly declared that we don't understand this. We cannot assess Communists this way. It cannot be said that only a liberated Communist is progressive. In Czarist times in Russia individual Communists gave pledges [*brali podpiski*] and were released [*vypuskali ikh na svobodu*]. But these were traitors, and not Communists. I am specifically not talking about UAR Communists, I don't know these people.

Here is an example with the Spanish Communist Grimau, who died a Communist. Therefore if you actually want to travel the path of socialism then it's incomprehensible why you keep Communists in prisons. You are thereby causing harm to the cause of development [*stroitel'stvo*] in your country. You are not using all the forces able to help you in moving forward.

Understand us correctly. We support you and give you aid. But in a dispute between Communist Parties one of the main arguments offered against us and myself personally is the aid which the USSR gives Nasser at a time when Communists in the UAR sit in prisons. They accuse us of retreating from the principles of international Communist solidarity. And you should bear this in mind.

You say that this is your domestic question, But you raised this question for discussion yourselves. Yes, and this is essentially not a national, but an international question.

A new prominent leader, Ben Bella, has appeared among you in the [Near] East. I will say frankly that we highly appreciate his statements. When he made a statement against Communists we condemned it [Translator's note: *yego*, which could also be translated "him"]. But we think that it was a forced step on his part. We strengthened our relations with Algeria. They told us that our Ambassador in Algeria was not active. We said that he was acting in accordance with our instructions inasmuch as if we Communists were operating actively what might they say about us? But if they turn to us for aid and need it we will give any aid and support, including to Algeria.

I met with Larbi Buhali, Secretary of the Algerian Communist Party. I saw him for the first time and he made a good impression on me. He thinks soberly and realistically. In Algeria the Communists participate in trade unions and other organizations. They are helping wage a struggle against imperialism. They criticize Ben Bella on individual questions, but he doesn't put them in prison. Therefore we are ready to radically come to Ben Bella's aid. We think that Ben Bella has realistic positions. He has declared that he is building socialism in Algeria of such a sort as in Cuba. But this is scientifically-based socialism.

We support your practical steps. This is progressive for a bourgeois country. As you see, we do not approach your socialism dogmatically. That is, if you do not stand on the principles of scientific socialism, then you are our enemies - no. Life pushes and will push you forward. Right now you are already others, not those who you were several years ago. We are well-disposed toward you. If we were ill-disposed toward you then we would not have taken such a step as a trip as a guest to the UAR by my daughter Rada, and my son-in-law A. I. Adzhubey, and grandsons. We understand that this visit has very great political importance.

Our hands are freed in many respects, but it would give us satisfaction if the

Communists in the UAR were free. This is to the benefit of us, our Party, and to you, for the Communists are not enemies of socialism, but its sincere supporters.

I will cite an example. In Czarist Russia there were relatively few Communists. Not Communists, but people under the leadership of Communists, made the revolution in our country. The Communists gave the direction, put the idea into the consciousness of the masses, who were the main force, but you don't put all the people in prison.

The Communists in Algeria gave [their] votes for Ben Bella. We understand that they do not agree with Ben Bella on all questions. But we Communists consider and evaluate the situation realistically.

That is our understanding of the situation. It is all the same, sooner or later all peoples will embark on the road of socialism.

Amer: You speak frankly, and we value this. We also speak frankly with you.

I want to touch on the question of the Communists.

We are not against Marxism. Our theory of socialism is also taken from Marxism-Leninism. Our line of thought is clear. Nevertheless I cannot understand why Communists attack the political system in the UAR. For example, the Lebanese Communist newspapers An-Nida and Al-Akhbar constantly accuse the UAR of being an agent of American imperialism. They attack us instead of attacking the Baathists.

I am speaking utterly frankly that we are encountering great difficulties in introducing the progressive in our country.

We still have reactionaries in the country at all levels, including the very highest, in the President's Council, who need to be fought and their resistance to be overcome. Nevertheless, we are going forward along the path of nationalization of sectors of the economy. We have nationalized importation 100% and exports by 90%.

The nationalization of small-scale trading is a very difficult problem. We are creating consumer cooperatives at the present time, that is, we are uniting a multitude of small traders into large trading stores. We are experiencing no little difficulty in limiting land ownership. This is explained by our peasants' exceptionally strong attachment to their own land.

Imperialist propaganda works against us, against the building of socialism. I will cite an example from Yemen. When I was in Yemen I asked one Yemeni prisoner why he was fighting against the revolution. He replied to me that the revolution was for socialism, but this means that they would take away his home and his wife. And at a time when his land holding was insignificantly small. Such are the methods of imperialist propaganda.

N. S. Khrushchev: They also said the same of us at one time, that we all sleep under one blanket, and they would take children from [their] parents.

Amer: The cotton industry was 50% nationalized in the UAR. This is explained by the fact that we still do not have sufficient experience in our personnel. Nevertheless, we recently completely nationalized cotton firms and the mills for the milling of rice and grain.

As I have already said, in all these measures we are encountering resistance among members of the President's Council. Our path is no easy. But we are not afraid and are going forward. Right now we have 50% representation of manual laborers, office workers, and peasants in our National Congress of Popular Forces. The people's consciousness is growing and we hope to overcome the difficulties with which we are faced.

About the Communists. No matter what, we released 50 people even earlier. This week another 180 Communists will be released. The remaining 180 will be released within a month. So the question of the Communists can be considered closed.

N. S. Khrushchev: When all the Communists will be released then the question can be considered closed. But it's still too early to speak of this.

Amer: Our Communists can criticize the authorities on one question or another. The main thing is that they do not conduct subversive activity against the regime in the UAR. This is the main question.

N. S. Khrushchev: In Algeria the Communists criticize the government, but they do not act against it; on the contrary, they support the government.

In Morocco Hassan II prohibited the Communist Party, but it actually exists and even publishes its own newspaper. And, of course, I do not want to say that the regime in Morocco is better than in the UAR, but I am speaking of the actual situation of the Communists there.

Amer: We have many Communist-Marxists [SIC] at liberty right now. Thirteen Communists work in the newspaper Al Akhram; in particular, Abd Ar-Razi and Lutfi Khuli. About 20 Marxists work in radio. The Communist Khaled Mokhi Ed-Diya was elected to the National Congress of Popular Forces.

We think that we are going forward in the anti-imperialist struggle and we will never swerve from this path. And this is the truth.

N. S. Khrushchev: I want to express my opinion about the question of Arab nationalism.

You have raised Arab nationalism to a great height and put it as the first and main thing. Frankly speaking, this is not progressive. Scientific socialism teaches that wars between peoples are always waged on national [Translator's note: *natsional'naya*, which can also be translated "ethnic"] and economic bases. In order to put an end to wars it is necessary to put an end to economic contradictions inside a country and to fight exploitation.

If you keep the slogan of Arab nationalism then it will unwittingly cause your nation to come into conflict with other nations, inasmuch nationalism means that this nation is above and better than the others.

We also had a nationalist party in Russia, the Union of the Russian People, which preached that the Russian nation was special. This party was the support of the Czarist throne. The Bolsheviks then opposed the slogan of this part inasmuch as this slogan was reactionary, it only caused nations to come into conflict. We had a strongly-developed nationalism before the Revolution which preached that the Slavic peoples are better than everyone. Lenin characterized pan-Slavism as a reactionary phenomenon.

And so right now you are speaking of Arab nationalism, the Africans about African [nationalism], etc. The German nationalism manifested during the Second World War was the most overt. We lost about 20 million people in this war. Under the flag of their nationalism the Germans killed old men, women, and children. This is what the theory of nationalism can lead to. We fight nationalism vigorously in all its manifestations.

Lenin said that equality and brotherhood should be at the forefront of the struggle. We are pursuing a Leninist policy. The main thing is the person. The workers are friends, and the exploiters are the enemies. But you speak [of] Arab nationalism. This is reactionary, essentially a biological theory.

Communists criticize Arab nationalism because it is not a social indication of the unity of people. We think that both Russians, Arabs, and black people are all equal. In our philosophy we hold class positions. There are Arab landowners and there are Arab peasants. In our country everyone is equal - Russians, Ukrainians, Belorussians, Armenians, Tajiks, Uzbeks, Kalmyks, and Tatars. Your old slogan of Arab nationalism will scare away other nations in the future. Black people, for example, will fear Arabs. Therefore you need to seriously think and possibly change the slogan to something else.

Amer: The slogan of Arab nationalist is a tactical stage on the path to building socialism.

N. S. Khrushchev: You are saying that they accuse you of cooperating with American imperialism. America right now thinks that the main danger is Communism inasmuch many colonial peoples of Africa and Asia are being liberated from imperialist dependence. Of the two evils, that is, Communism and Nasser, this is how they speak, the Americans have chosen the latter. Why did they make such a choice? Because the UAR is the strongest country in Africa and opposes Communism and socialism. This is how they talk.

In the UAR the United States hopes to find support in the fight against everything progressive in this region. In addition, the American imperialists see that the regimes in Iraq and Syria are being held weakly, and therefore they support the

anticommunist policy of President Nasser and offer him credits. We are not accusing you of cooperating with imperialists willingly. At this stage the UAR is simply more reliable than Iraq, and therefore the Americans place reliance on you.

As I have already said before, you are carrying out bold progressive measures in the economy. We understand that you have difficulties and domestic conflicts which are being slowly eliminated. This is your internal matter. You are taking a definite position, and we are not pushing you to change it. However, if you are honestly building socialism then why keep Communists in prisons[?]. Communists can work in trade unions and in peasant mass organizations. You won't build socialism without the masses. But in order to organize the masses [you] need a party armed with Marxist-Leninist theory.

Why do we criticize Stalin? We criticize him for having become estranged from the people, from the Party. After Stalin's death our country achieved enormous successes both in industry and in agriculture. This is explained by the people having rallied around the Party. Whereas during Stalin's time the people were afraid, right now they help the Party with great enthusiasm and support it.

Here's Castro, for example. He is building socialism based on the teachings of Marx and Lenin, and the people support him and help him.

Such is our Marxist understanding of the questions [we] have touched upon.

Without doubt, your country has undergone a good evolution in 11 years. It has not been easy for you to go this route, and we treat you with great tact and patience.

Amer: I agree. We understand this. Right now we are waging a broad struggle against imperialism in the entire region. The imperialists see this and know it. This is in particular demonstrated by the fact that at the last conferences of the members of the CENTO Treaty the question was discussed of what was more dangerous in the [Near] East - Communism or [Translator's note: there is a blank spot at the point]? As is well known, the opinions of the members of the conference were split.

N. S. Khrushchev: CENTO is an organization of colonizers, and colonizers naturally view Nasser as a force standing in their way to colonies. In addition, the British, Americans, and French are exploiting Arab oil, and they know that Nasser, enjoying great influence in the Arab world, can be right on their tails.

Amer: The colonizers are trying to hold their positions in Aden, in the southern Arabian protectorates, and also to keep the oil of Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and the Sahara for themselves. According to statistical information every month Britain gets 100 pounds Sterling income from Near East oil from each resident.

N. S. Khrushchev: Oil is very important for Britain. Eden said frankly that the British would die without oil, they are ready to fight for the sake of oil.

We are always ready to give the UAR aid in the anti-imperialist struggle. Remember the revolution in Yemen and the subsequent events. At your request the very next day we sent teams of bombers and transport aircraft to help the revolutionary forces.

Amer: We are quite grateful to the Soviet Union for this aid. I want to say frankly that the Yemeni revolution would not have had success without the Soviet aid.

N. S. Khrushchev: We aided Yemen via the UAR. Thus we are fighting against imperialism with common efforts.

At Sukarno's request, when he decided to free West Irian from the Dutch, we sent teams of bombers, crews for submarines, and also staff workers to develop military operations. Sukarno turned to us with this request inasmuch as the national military personnel in Indonesia were still insufficiently experienced.

Later we found out that while in the US Sukarno told the Americans what kind of military aid we had given him in preparation for the liberation of West Irian. He did this without agreement with us beforehand. But this step was not directed against us, but was rather calculated on intimidating the Dutch via the Americans. And we were not offended by Sukarno. West Irian was liberated as a result of all this. Thus the Indonesians were victorious and thereby we were, too.

Amer: Indonesia is of course making their contribution to the anti-imperialist movement. But I want to stress that in the importance of the anti-imperialist fight the UAR is ahead of the other countries of Asia and Africa. We are helping many African and Asian countries with weapons and specialists and making great sacrifices. In

Yemen alone we have spent up to 80 million pounds. Our large military forces numbering about 30,000 men are in Yemen and have been forced to remain there a long time. We have also sent a large quantity of military equipment to Yemen, including two thousand vehicles.

Besides these expenses we have now been forced to create new military formations instead of those which are in Yemen in order to strengthen our border with Israel. As is well known, Israel has received 90 Mirage aircraft from France. Israel annually receives foreign aid in the amount of one billion dollars. In a message of reply to President Nasser Kennedy wrote that the forces of Israel exceed the armed forces of the UAR. A direct threat to our country is contained in this. Israel is an imperialist base in the Near East and therefore the imperialists are strengthening and aiding it in every way.

You understand that we are waging a common anti-imperialist struggle. Therefore, it is necessary to be strong economically and militarily in order to preserve our independence and to have the capability to offer aid to other countries. Considering all this, in a letter to Mikoyan we asked that the prices for special equipment be reexamined and returned to the prices which existed before 1960. We would like to pay a set amount annually with the expectation that this would be very burdensome for our budget.

N. S. Khrushchev: We understand that, compared to many others, your country is in a more critical sector of the anti-imperialist struggle. We have given and continue to give you aid. As regards your request to reexamine the new prices for special deliveries this is impossible for us. It seems you have previously received weapons at 1/3 cost. This is almost free. Now we don't sell at such prices to anyone. A reexamination of prices for special deliveries is a political question inasmuch as it affects our relations with other countries. If we sell you weapons at prices lower than to others these countries will ask, why are we not getting the same discount[?] This could lead to complications in our relations with these countries.

Amer: We are in completely different conditions than others.

N. S. Khrushchev: But understand that we are not able to answer to other countries if they turn to us with a similar request.

I won't get into a discussion of the question of your expenses and difficulties. I want to say that only the Lord God alone knows how much we are spending for the conquest of space and for the construction of rockets. At a time when we are trying to reduce these expenditures our scientists are inventing ever newer, more modern types of missiles and we have to switch to the production of the newest rockets.

In any event we will examine your requests. We will do what we can. Cde, Mikoyan feels well after an operation and will go to work in 10 days, and you will be able to talk with him about these questions. We will charge Marshal Malinovsky with looking into military questions and Cde. Kosygin with general financial ones. We will search for some compromise [*srednee*] solution of the questions.

Amer: We nevertheless hope that all our requests will be considered favorably.

Permit me now to tell you that the people of the United Arab Republic await your visit to our country in accordance with the invitation of President Nasser. While visiting our country you will be convinced what sincere friendly sentiments our people feel toward the Soviet Union and you personally. You cannot even imagine what a warm reception will be given you in our country. We hope that you will come to the UAR this year.

N. S. Khrushchev: I very much want to visit your country and familiarize myself with the people of the United Arab Republic. However, this year all my time has already been scheduled. Evidently I even will be forced to postpone my visit to the Scandinavian countries because of a great workload. I think that I will be able to visit the UAR at the end of next year when it won't be so hot.

Amer: The first stage of the construction of the High Aswan Dam will be finished in 1964. The main construction work will be completed by that time and the lake which will be created after shutting off the Nile will be filled. Therefore you will not be able to see the entire scope of the construction work, the construction of the colossal tunnels and the reservoir. We urgently request you to search for an opportunity to visit our country this year.

N. S. Khrushchev: I understand that until the end of the construction of the first stage of the Aswan Dam one can see the process of construction and I would like to see it. But, I repeat, my time this year is all occupied and evidently I cannot make use of the invitation of President Nasser until next year.

Amer: We hope that you will try and find an opportunity to visit the UAR this year. In any event, permit us to retain the right to return to this question again.

I thank you for a very interesting and useful conversation.

UAR Ambassador in the USSR M. M. Ghaleb was present at the conversation together with Marshal Amer.

USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs A. A. Gromyko was present at the conversation from the Soviet side.

Recorded by Yu. Sultanov [signature]

Verified with the insertion of individual clarifications A. A. Gromyko

Six copies printed [nk/te/zch/fv]

mb-2934/gs

18 June 1963