

February 14, 1958

Comments of N.S. Khrushchev about the Letter of Mr. Joseph

Citation:

"Comments of N.S. Khrushchev about the Letter of Mr. Joseph", February 14, 1958, Wilson Center Digital Archive, RGANI, f. 52, op. 1, d. 598, ll. 7-13. Contributed by Sergey Radchenko and translated by Gary Goldberg.
<https://digitalarchive.umd.edu/document/209710>

Summary:

Nikita Khrushchev comments on the alliance between the United States and NATO and the growing number of nuclear weapons in Western Europe, specifically Great Britain. The document also discusses US aircraft flights over the Soviet Union and the Algerian War of Independence.

Credits:

This document was made possible with support from Blavatnik Family Foundation

Original Language:

Russian

Contents:

Translation - English

COMMENTS OF N. S. KHRUSHCHEV
about the letter of Mr. Joseph

14 February 1958

In general it's correct. Possibly that's what needs to be said here.

The policy of the United States of America of imposing missile weapons on the West European countries in NATO, including Britain, the desire to deploy them as soon as possible - this ensues from the policy of the Cold War and arms race, which supplies the means of mass destruction with modern means of weaponry on the basis of science. This policy literally threatens catastrophic consequences.

And if this is a dangerous thing for all countries and all humanity, then for such countries as Britain, an island country with great population density with a comparatively small territory, or France or West Germany especially, and the other West European countries in NATO, this is all the more so dangerous. They are literally subjecting themselves to the danger of complete destruction, the destruction of everything living on their territory.

This is not a threat, understand gentlemen, but common sense advises that it is impossible to conceal this danger, but it needs to be exposed to cause great anger against this and achieve a correct solution.

Some say that Khrushchev is engaging in this for purposes of propaganda. I am proud of this if they consider me a strong propagandist against war and for peace, against weapons and for disarmament.

If all our enemies and people who reproach me would engage in this propaganda all humanity would gain from this propaganda.

I want to point out the following. Evidently, the bases will be deployed, this is clear from the statements of the press or government statements in Britain that they are supposedly already deployed and the areas are being chosen. And the statement of Mr. Lloyd says that Britain agrees with the proposal of the United States of America.

What does this mean? It means that a weapon is being installed on the British Isles which will not fire at the troops, but the territory of the Soviet Union, and fire rockets with thermonuclear warheads. Accordingly, this is a war to exterminate people.

Judge for yourselves, put yourself in our position. If you offer your territory for missile weaponry with thermonuclear warheads to destroy all life on Earth then this is no longer war, but extermination, and you understand that we, having these means of weaponry, have to take measures against these missile weapons.

But what measures to take? We also have to install our missiles with hydrogen weapons [two or three words illegible] to repay you. Those who started and those who will pay [one word illegible], of course, will incur colossal losses and disasters of everything living and material. But think, if we incur colossal losses, then (this is not to intimidate, I am requesting [that you] ask the scientists who know this equipment about this) this will lead to the complete destruction of everything living on the British Isles.

The secret means of nuclear weaponry also does not require a large number of missiles. Do you imagine that it means to blow up missiles over the British Isles? How many such missiles will be needed to destroy literally everything living, and what was not physically destroyed will be doomed to extinction as a result of the contamination of both the soil and the atmosphere which will occur.

This is a disastrous situation, do you really not understand[?] And your scientists speak of this, and ours confirm it. Therefore the only way is to condemn crazy people who are blinded by hatred of our ideology and want questions of ideology and ideological warfare to be solved not by conviction and proof in a peaceful arena, and not by a competition of which system is more perfect. The more perfect is that system which provides more benefits to a person, both material, cultural, and spiritual. They want this ideological question to be decided by war.

It is good to speak in such a tone right here, that we are very glad that the peoples of Britain increasingly understand this danger. And if a majority raise their voices

then the hand of a criminal which inflames warlike passions, the Cold War, and the arms race, will be stopped and a meeting will be reached at a high level at which the necessary means will be found. If the peoples demand their governments find these means so that the questions are decided by peaceful means, and not war, so that the Cold War is eliminated and cultural and trade relations with other peoples are developed, and not an arms race, this will be achieved.

I would like to speak again on the question of flights of bombers with atomic and hydrogen bombs.

It is necessary to take into consideration that there can be faults in the control of an aircraft, the aircraft guidance instruments might fail, and as a result of this an aircraft might appear over the territory of the Soviet Union.

For now it is widely known that your aircraft fly with atomic and hydrogen bombs. And if as a result of such an incident your aircraft might appear over the territory of the Soviet Union how will we know whether such an aircraft is not flying to bomb our peaceful cities[?]

In addition, Mr. Dulles, you also know that the military command of the US allows itself to send its aircraft over our territory for intelligence purposes. We have protested this to the appropriate bodies, to the UN. But, after our protests such flights by American aircraft continue from time to time.

But how can such a situation be understood? Is it compatible with the efforts which should be applied to the elimination of mistrust between our countries?

But such flights might lead to the most serious consequences which might cause a new world war with the use of atomic and hydrogen bombs.

We should be very careful not to give a cause for unleashing such a war in order not to let a war begin as a result of an accident of an aircraft and the appearance of an aircraft over the territory of other countries. It is necessary to avoid such accidental flights or the forced crossing of borders by aircraft equipped with atomic and hydrogen bombs, which might force another country to adopt preemptive measures. The necessary measures need to be adopted for this in order to exclude such a situation.

The following needs to be shown In the letter to Russell and Dulles:

Or take the war in Algeria, which has already gone on for more than three years. So much blood has been shed there. But perhaps the Communists, against whom you cast thunder and lightning, began this war. No, this war was begun by representatives of the monopoly capital of France who want to have colonies, keep them, and extract profits from there. But who is fault for the bombing of the defenseless population of the Tunisian settlement of Sakiet Sidi Youssef[?]

Perhaps the Algerians, who were fighting for their independence, are atheists? And perhaps all the French soldiers who are fighting in Algeria are also atheists? So Mr. Dulles' references to the moral aspects do not withstand any criticism. Many French soldiers have a cross on [their] neck and receive a blessing from priests. This war, which was sanctified by priests and the Pope, has cost many victims and much blood. All this is a result of the imperialists exerting every effort to keep colonies, but the peoples are fighting for their independence. Some have already been liberated, others are fighting for liberation, and yet others are gathering strength to act in the future and break the chains of colonial servitude. This happens because monopolists want to further accumulate riches for the exploitation of colonial peoples. They cannot abandon the fat sums which they had in the colonies, and have grown fat at the expense of the workers of the colonial and dependent countries.

These events trouble many people. The United Nations, which has called for defending the peaceful aspirations of peoples, discusses these questions from time to time, but the majority there holds to the policy of appeasing wolves with a lamb. There they often entrust the wolf to come to agreement with the lamb instead of taking effective measures to help peoples fighting for their independence.

Peoples are raising their voices against war. The duty of the United Nations is to take these demands of the peoples into account. You should find a means to condemn those who are striving to inflame passions, and who favor the further aggravation of the Cold War and the arms race.

It needs to be said that the governments of those countries which are waging colonial wars, and even get encouragement and support. For example, France gets credits. The French treasury is empty because they have spent enormous amounts of money accumulated by the labor of the workers and peasants of France for the war in Vietnam, and now in Algeria. These wars have led France to the brink of financial catastrophe. In accepting foreign credits France has put itself in a dependent position to the American dollar and the West German mark, and now it is accommodating its policy toward those who give it money.