

**September 7, 1961**

**Memorandum of Conversation of N.S. Khrushchev  
with the Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru**

**Citation:**

"Memorandum of Conversation of N.S. Khrushchev with the Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru", September 7, 1961, Wilson Center Digital Archive, RGANI, f. 52, op. 1, d. 563, ll. 70-93. Contributed by Sergey Radchenko and translated by Angela Greenfield. <https://digitalarchive.umd.edu/document/300920>

**Summary:**

Nikita Khrushchev and Jawaharlal Nehru discuss global disarmament, the Soviet Union's resumption of nuclear weapons testing, and the ongoing tensions surrounding Berlin. Khrushchev defends Soviet nuclear tests as a necessary response to perceived Western threats and the failure of disarmament talks, asserting that such actions are essential to safeguard the USSR and the socialist bloc. He reassures Nehru that access to West Berlin will remain unobstructed after the signing of a peace treaty with East Germany, though the legal basis would shift from occupation rights to agreements with the GDR. Both leaders emphasize their shared commitment to disarmament, but Nehru voices concerns that continued nuclear testing may derail global peace efforts and delay meaningful progress toward disarmament.

**Credits:**

This document was made possible with support from Blavatnik Family Foundation

**Original Language:**

Russian

**Contents:**

Translation - English

## MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

OF N.S. KHRUSHCHEV with the Prime Minister of INDIA, Jawaharlal NEHRU

7 September, 1961<sup>[1]</sup>

1[handwritten at the bottom of the first page: "This was not examined by Cde. Khrushchev"]

N.S. Khrushchev inquires whether J. Nehru rested well and remarks that it would be good if he could stay in the Soviet Union for another week. The weather is very good on the Black Sea coast now. It's warm and he could swim.

J. Nehru responds that he has rested well but unfortunately cannot take advantage of the invitation to travel to the south for vacation. He then says that he would like to know whether the explosions of nuclear bombs with explosive yield equivalent to 100M tons of TNT planned by the Soviet Union would lead to the increase of harmful radioactivity in the air to dangerous levels.

N.S. Khrushchev responds that he didn't say that the tests of nuclear bombs with explosive yield equivalent to 100 million tons of TNT are planned. We, he continues, are planning to test 10-20 million ton bombs. This will allow us to test the detonating device for bombs with an explosive yield equivalent to 100 million tons of TNT. One cannot explode 100 million ton bombs, since scientists say that just the blast wave may cover the distance, for example, from the US to us, and cause some destruction. Therefore we are not going to explode such a bomb, but we will create one. This will be our last resort weapon. As to contaminating the atmosphere, scientist say that the contamination will not be higher than from ordinary nuclear explosions. What else do we have left to do if yesterday President Kennedy gave an order to conduct nuclear tests in the US without waiting for our response? World public opinion has to decisively demand disarmament, to create pressure on government officials with this purpose. I would like to lay out to you the thought process that we followed in order to make the decision on nuclear explosions. For the last few years negotiations on suspending nuclear tests have been taking place, and unfortunately we made certain concessions. America insisted that a certain amount of explosions per year be allowed for "peaceful purposes". This of course was only a trick designed to mislead the public opinion. During these negotiations France continued conducting nuclear tests. We condemned these actions by France, but world public remained calm, did not protest, and did not have any effect. France ignored public opinion and the UN resolutions, and continued conducting tests. We have formed the opinion that, even if we agreed with America about stopping the tests, we would not be able to accept their system of control, which in essence is espionage. In reality they have refused to disarm but wanted to sign an agreement on suspending tests so that they could cover our country with a spy network. If, let's say, we signed an agreement on banning nuclear weapons' production, then it would have been a sleeping pill for world public, which would have reasoned that, if there was an agreement, then there were no tests, and that everything was good. But the nuclear weapons production would carry on as usual, the military capability would be expanding, and the danger of war would be increasing, and a horrific outcome could ensue. Therefore this does not constitute a solution for preventing a war.

Furthermore, we also see danger in the fact that other countries are working on nuclear weapons production, to say nothing of France, which produces and tests them. They will succeed in producing them and, just like France, they will be testing them. They will justify their tests by the following argument: we also want to be nuclear powers. They will tell us: you produce and stockpile [nuclear] weapons, so why can't we do the same? Maybe you want to maintain your monopoly over nuclear weapons? And we wouldn't be able to provide a convincing answer to this question. The situation would be completely different if a disarmament treaty were concluded. All countries would be put on an equal footing. No one would have nuclear weapons, and those who did not [already] have them, would not be striving to produce it. This is what we were guided by when making our decision. And we believe that such a decision is correct.

As to the contamination of the atmosphere, as I already said yesterday, we do not need a clean atmosphere if America, Britain and France mobilize all [their] forces to attack the Soviet Union. They are like an executioner who is healing the person condemned to death so that, after he heals him, he could cut his head off. Therefore we are going to arm ourselves to the teeth if our proposals about universal and complete disarmament are not accepted. If they set a course for arming themselves, then we are not going to fall behind our opponents. We should not fall behind them, on the contrary, we should be stronger than them. That is why we are conducting tests. If they are concerned about negative consequences of nuclear tests for the health of people, then they should agree to disarm, and that will put an end to both the tests themselves and to the contamination of the atmosphere.

If we talk about the moral right to conduct a certain amount of explosions, then we are behind Britain, America, and France on the number of tests. If they do not want disarmament, then they should be supporting parity with respect to the amount of explosions.

I have to say that we believe that world public opinion does not make enough efforts to conclude a disarmament treaty, and behaves too passively. In this case we must only count on our own resources, and for this reason we resumed the tests. In this series of test explosions the biggest bomb will be 20 million tons and, as I already said, these explosions will allow us to create a 100 million ton bomb.

We cannot behave irresponsibly towards the fate of our people and [the people of] socialist countries, we cannot but resume the testing, use what science has to offer to strengthen the defense capability of our country, since we do not know how the arms race will pan out. If it leads to a war, then we will need powerful weapons.

The Western powers are refusing to sign a peace treaty with Germany. They do not recognize the reality of the existence of the two German states. I believe that J. Nehru does not doubt that we are ready to sign a peace treaty at any time. Mr. Nehru, you can draft such a treaty on universal and complete disarmament with respective controls and suggest Kennedy sign it. We will sign it right away if it is a treaty on universal and complete disarmament.

An exchange of opinions on disarmament between the USSR and the US was supposed to resume yesterday in New York. We would very much like to reach an agreement with America, but we cannot even reach an agreement on the composition of the disarmament commission. They do not want neutral countries to participate in this commission. They are saying that they may agree on the participation of India, but without the voting right.

A.A. Gromyko says that he can say in confidence that the US is the biggest opponent of including India in this commission.

N.S. Khrushchev says that India seems to be the main threat to the Americans in the disarmament negotiations. This is proof that they only want to pretend play at disarmament negotiations, but do not strive for disarmament. Why are we negotiating with them? So that people could see who really wants disarmament and who is blocking every path to it. The Americans do not wish disarmament, since it will lead to the decrease in their profits. So I am asking you - how is it possible under these conditions not to increase the military might of the Soviet Union?

J. Nehru thanks N.S. Khrushchev for the explanation of the position of the Soviet Union and says that India supports complete disarmament and, as much as it is possible, tries to persuade other countries of the need to disarm. If testing is stopped in the USSR, and the US continues it, says Nehru, then wouldn't it in itself lead to dangerous levels of contamination in the atmosphere? This has always been the strongest argument against nuclear tests. [People] are asking us about it and we do not know what to answer.

As N.S. Khrushchev said, from the point of view of defense, the Soviet Union has to always be ahead. Is there a threat that the US or any other country may surpass the Soviet Union with respect to defensibility?

N.S. Khrushchev answers that it is difficult to say at what level the defense capacity of Britain, the US, France and other countries is. But we believe that we are ahead, and they are boasting that they have larger nuclear weapons stockpiles. I think, N.S. Khrushchev continues, that in means of delivery we are ahead. Theirs are weaker.

The difference between their and our delivery devices is the same as between a horse cart and an automobile. Twenty million ton nuclear bombs cannot be tested off an airplane, because it won't have enough time to fly away to a safe distance and will be destroyed, but a missile makes testing of such bombs possible.

I understand your alarm and share your fears with respect to the contamination of the atmosphere. However if we cannot agree with the West on the issue of disarmament, then there is no other way but to maintain our military might at the highest level, so that we are capable of giving a devastating rebuff to an aggressor. I believe, N.S. Khrushchev continues, that all energy, all political actions need to be directed to organizing the masses to fight for an agreement on disarmament, and not to seek a solution in negotiations about banning nuclear tests. After all, such ban won't affect the interests of monopolistic capital which feeds off the arms race. The West is going to continue stockpiling weapons of certain types, increase their size, and this invites a nuclear war. If the tree of the nuclear war threat needs to be taken down, then it needs to be taken down to the roots and not by cutting its branches, i.e. nuclear tests. We have to cut the roots, to succeed in the banning of armies, the armaments, and in universal disarmament. It is specifically in this direction that government officials should direct their joint efforts. It has been two years since we put forward our proposals on disarmament for the UN's consideration. However nothing concrete has been done. The votes in the UN are divided in the following way: those countries that the US is providing assistance to or promising assistance, are tiptoeing around them and are afraid to speak the truth.

Through our secret services we have learned that the same thing took place in Belgrade too. West Germany was threatening to sever diplomatic relations with those countries which have recognized GDR, and they cited the example with Yugoslavia. However, we do not yield to such threats. To suspend nuclear tests at this time would work for the benefit of the imperialists of America, France, and Britain. The imperialists do not accept our proposals about disarmament, and if we want to survive we have to demonstrate that the socialist countries not only have a moral right to exist, but they also have an ability to vigorously defend their interests.

J. Nehru says that disarmament is the only path to lasting peace. In this the positions of India and the Soviet Union coincide. However, I am concerned that achieving disarmament, continues J. Nehru, may be postponed due to the emergence of new fears, because the testing of atomic weapons has started in various countries. Such tests may distract from an agreement on disarmament because there will be fear that the other side will start a war and become an aggressor. If explosions are conducted in America, the Sahara, and the Soviet Union, then it may inflict great harm on humanity. So what is the way out of this situation?

N.S. Khrushchev responds that there is only one way out of this situation - complete disarmament.

J. Nehru says that he agrees with this, but how to achieve disarmament under the current circumstances?

N.S. Khrushchev says that conducting nuclear tests helps to realize the most pressing need for disarmament. After all, science knows no limits in its development. If the arms race continues, then the budgets of countries will be exhausted, the living conditions of the nations will worsen, human energy will be wasted, atmosphere will be polluted, and the world will be facing the growing threat of a new war. The only way out of this is disarmament. If a disarmament treaty is signed and everyone disarms, then there will be no threat of attack, and there will be nothing to attack with. Therefore disarmament is the only correct and beneficial decision.

Tests have not been conducted for three years, but the production of nuclear bombs has continued, and France has continued to test its nuclear weapons. We put forward a proposal for a peace treaty with the GDR, but in response to this step the US announced a mobilization. This is one of the results of suspending nuclear tests. Banning nuclear tests is not a radical remedy, it does not cure the disease, but sweeps it under the carpet and muffles it. These sores on the body of humankind can be cured not by banning tests, but by a drastic measure - by disarming and dismantling armies. Then the threat of war will disappear. There are publications in the press that state that in the near future Israeli scientists will create a nuclear bomb. One can agree with that because a lot of Jewish Zionists have worked in the US

in the field of nuclear research, and it is quite possible that they have transferred the necessary information to Israel. Sweden is also close to creating an atomic bomb. However, when a disarmament treaty is signed, the incentive for continuing the work on the creation of atomic weapons will disappear. If, however, such treaty is not concluded, we will not be able to prevent other countries from stopping work [SIC] in the sphere of nuclear research. They would be justified in answering: you have nuclear weapons, you increase the stockpiles, and you have no right to forbid other countries from doing the same. This objection is quite logical. I have heard, continues Khrushchev, that France conduct tests in Sahara along with West Germany. That is why De Gaulle is holding on to Adenauer as, like the saying goes, a louse to a collar.

J. Nehru says that the importance of disarmament is obvious. The issue is how to achieve it. If all people suddenly became good, there would be no reason to worry. But it is impossible to make all people good at the same time, it takes time. Therefore we have to look at our every step from the standpoint of how we can help achieve disarmament.

N.S. Khrushchev says that he agrees with this point of view. We will literally have to live on top of atomic weapons. I would like to tell about a situation from my own life.

During the war I was a member of the Military Council. In 1943 the Germans launched an offensive just outside Kursk and forced us out of all the lines we occupied, of which there were three. The offensive tired out the enemy, and we were able to go over to the offensive and take back our old positions. We moved our command post into a large dugout which belonged to one of the temporary airfields before the German offensive. Soon the airfield resumed operations, and the pilots requested their dugout to be vacated. To prove that it was really their dugout, they said that it was mined and indeed they showed us mines under the floor. As luck would have it, they were programmed for twenty days, so that they could blow up the Germans. Either way, for several days we were living on top of the mines.

Now we are living like we did in that dugout, on our own mines, that is, atomic bombs. We would very much like to destroy them, and that is why we have been proposing disarmament. Once at a reception I met Marshal of the Armored Troops Katukov and a retired general with both of whom we were living in that dugout. We reminisced about how we were making jokes about our situation, but it was a war then. But even today there is a war going on, though without shots fired. In these conditions we cannot abandon nuclear testing. We love our people, life, and our kin. And we are doing everything to protect them.

J. Nehru says that he would like to clear something out for himself with respect to Berlin. N.S. Khrushchev very clearly stated that he does not want to interfere with the access to West Berlin from West Germany. That is, that the access will continue even after the treaty is signed. He would like to understand it a bit more clearly. Will there be any complications with respect to access from West Germany after the peace treaty with the GDR is signed, or will the access continue the same as it is now?

N.S. Khrushchev responds that there will be no physical changes in the access. Every opportunity for normal access to West Berlin will be put in place. However, the legal basis for the access will change. Currently access to West Berlin is conducted based on occupation regime, but after the signing of the treaty with the GDR, [the treaty] will serve as the legal basis. If the United States, Britain, and France want to have access to West Berlin, they will have to ask for permission from the GDR and from West Berlin, which wants to maintain its relations with West Germany. A relevant agreement with the GDR must be concluded, which will allow the use of access ways that go through its territory or over it. This is the procedure that has been in place for centuries. I have already given an example of how the air connection between Moscow and London with overflight over the territory of Denmark is managed. For this purpose, there is a corresponding agreement with Denmark. We have now reached an understanding, but because of the tensions [we] have not signed the agreement yet on organizing a direct air connection between Moscow and Washington. To organize such a connection, one must have a permit from the countries over whose territories the flight path will lie. As you can see, we are not trying to introduce anything new. We intend to sign a treaty and apply the same procedure as is used in the rest of the world. We are not looking for any privileges. We also have to request permission from all the countries through whose territories

our transit routes lie. We requested permission from Bonn when we were establishing a railroad connection between Moscow and Paris. Therefore we want that the same procedure is also used with respect to the GDR.

J. Nehru says that, as he understands, there will be practically no changes, but the legal basis will be changed.

N.S. Khrushchev says that this is exactly right.

J. Nehru asks if it means that, while the Soviet Union now agrees to unobstructed access to West Berlin, in the future the question about access will be decided by the government of the GDR?

N.S. Khrushchev answers that the representatives of the GDR will put their signature to the peace treaty in which there will be provisions reflecting the state of affairs which he, Khrushchev, already mentioned before.

J. Nehru asked whether these treaty provisions will only concern the GDR and the USSR.

N.S. Khrushchev responds that all countries who participated in WWII, if they so desire, can join this agreement between the GDR and the USSR. You, too, continues N.S. Khrushchev, are legally at war with Germany because you have inherited it from England.

Even if no third power puts its signature to this treaty, all of these provisions will be included in it and will be valid as if the treaty were signed by all countries. The Western powers will be able to sign this treaty subsequently, if they so wish. This right will be reserved for them. However, access rights will depend on the agreement with the GDR directly.

If they insist on their rights that flow from the occupation regime, and ignore the peace treaty, we will deem these actions to be an aggression. This is an important aspect of this issue. The Western countries indicate that they do not object to our signing the peace treaty, but they want to preserve the occupation rights even after it is signed. They declare that, if they are not allowed access to West Berlin, they will use force. We will also resort to force, which could result in a war breaking out.

J. Nehru asks which rights in practice they consider their occupation rights.

N.S. Khrushchev responds that after the surrender of Germany, a treaty was signed under which Berlin was divided into four sectors which were governed by the four allied powers. Each of the occupation zones of the Western states had its own corridor to West Berlin. Then these three sectors were consolidated, but the three corridors remained and we recognized this. However we then transferred our rights to the government of East Germany. The Eastern sector of Berlin was the Soviet sector. It was consolidated with the rest of the Soviet zone, but Berlin is the capital, so the GDR government, naturally, was located in this city.

American politicians and journalists advocate abolishing the occupation procedure in Germany. Not so long ago Senator Morse in his speech stated that the time had come to acknowledge the desirability of changing the occupation procedure and sign a peace treaty. However, the US government ignores these suggestions. I would like to say, continues N.S. Khrushchev, that the US Government ignores such proposals because Adenauer, who still have not given up hope of swallowing the GDR, demands it. He needs the state of war to remain, which will make it impossible to recognize the division of Germany. The Western powers also want to preserve the state of war, and [they] do not sign the peace treaty so as not to seal the existence of the two German states. De Gaulle does not want the unification of Germany, and [he] recognizes the border along the Oder-Neisse line. Britain also does not want this, though it does not openly admit it. Americans also hint that they are not against recognizing this border, though they do not wish its legal recognition.

This is done for Adenauer and the revanchist forces who are disputing the borders. These forces organize jamborees of former residents of Eastern Germany and other countries in West Berlin.

J. Nehru asks whether the US, Britain and France transferred their rights to the FRG the same as the Soviet Union did with respect to the GDR?

N.S. Khrushchev responds that they did not do this.

J. Nehru asks whether he understood it right that the Western allies transferred their

rights to the West Berlin government.

N.S. Khrushchev responds that they did not transfer their rights with respect to West Berlin.

J. Nehru asks how the Allies utilize their rights.

N.S. Khrushchev answers that they have their forces there, they control all the government bodies, and have their own commandant. Two years ago, N.S. Khrushchev continues, Brandt wished to meet with me in Berlin. The Foreign Minister of Austria, Kreisky, was the intermediary. He organized the meeting. When he, Khrushchev, came to Berlin, it turned out that the American commandant did not allow this meeting. Kreisky was shocked by this, and even wanted to publish an official statement in this respect. But I didn't want him to get in trouble and I asked him not to do it.

J. Nehru asks whether it is true that, though West Berlin is governed by a mayor, the power is ultimately in the hands of the three commandants, and whether there is communication between the three commandants of the Western sector and the commandant of the Soviet sector.

N.S. Khrushchev answers that such communications exist.

J. Nehru asks whether there is a Soviet commandant in West Berlin.

N.S. Khrushchev responds that there is no such commandant, but that we have the right of access to West Berlin. The three allied powers, continues N.S. Khrushchev, have their representatives assigned to our Commander-In-Chief in the GDR. They preserve this procedure because they want to prolong their occupation rights to West Berlin. N.S. Khrushchev then says that after the surrender the amount of reparations which Germany was supposed to pay to Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and the USSR, was established. But the western powers deprived us of these reparations. Therefore West Germany is in debt to us. The GDR paid us, but West Germany did not, since at one time Britain instructed it not to make reparations payments. West Germany paid in full only Yugoslavia, but neither Poland, nor Czechoslovakia, nor we received reparations that were due us. That is why this issue will be discussed again during the signing of the treaty.

J. Nehru asks whether the GDR paid reparations to Poland and Czechoslovakia.

N.S. Khrushchev responds that the GDR paid us the amount in full. But we, in accordance with an agreement, apportioned a part of it to Poland and Czechoslovakia. The fact that the GDR paid reparations in full, of course, affected the standard of living in the GDR, because it was draining its budget. West Germany not only did not pay, but on the contrary, was receiving money and therefore was developing quickly. Furthermore, initially they did not have defense expenses. When in 1959 I asked Eisenhower, continues N.S. Khrushchev, why he was allowing West Germany to arm itself, then one of his arguments was that, if the FRG did not spend money on weapons, then the US would have a hard time competing with it on international market. This is very dangerous, and Eisenhower acknowledged that. This is a typical contradiction of imperialism.

J. Nehru says that he would like to clarify the conditions for access to West Berlin. If the peace treaty is signed, asks Nehru, then would the terms of access to West Berlin be included in it?

N.S. Khrushchev answers that such terms will be included in the treaty, and that the status of a free city for West Berlin will be stipulated in the addendum to the treaty, and that this status will include every possible guarantee.

J. Nehru asks whether, after signing a peace treaty, the GDR will be able to limit the access for Western countries to West Berlin in some way.

N.S. Khrushchev responds that the GDR will not be able to do that if the Western countries sign the peace treaty. For the GDR not to "encroach" on West Berlin, we agree for the US, France, and Britain to maintain "symbolic" military contingents. Instead of these garrisons, armed forces of neutral countries of the UN can be positioned there. All sorts of comprehensive guarantees of freedom and independence could be provided to West Berlin.

J. Nehru asks whether the Western powers will have the right of access to West Berlin if they sign the peace treaty, and whether they have the right of access if they

effectively recognize this agreement but do not sign it.

N.S. Khrushchev answers that they will have this right if they recognize the status of a free city.

J. Nehru asks whether it means that a country that wants to gain the right of access will have to effectively recognize the agreement.

N.S. Khrushchev responds that the recognition will need to be *de facto*, and not *de jure*.

J. Nehru asks whether it means that instead of submitting requests to the representatives of the Soviet Union, Western powers will have to submit requests to the representatives of the GDR.

N.S. Khrushchev responds that even now matters of this order are resolved through the representatives of the GDR government. The USSR, continues N.S. Khrushchev, only provides access for Western military [personnel] into West Berlin. All non-military liaisons are handled with the approval of the GDR government, and we do not control it. The Germans have been handling liaisons of this sort among themselves, and the GDR has an agreement with Adenauer regarding these rules. Now, when the government of the GDR has closed the border between West and East Berlin, and controls all crossings, we do not have anything to do with this. We have only stipulated the conditions under which the GDR authorities would not impede the movement of military units prior to the signing of the peace treaty. That is why the US, Britain, and France conduct their occupation movements without obstruction. When recently the US sent a new contingent of their military to West Berlin in the amount of 1,500 people, it was allowed to proceed to its destination without obstruction. But after the peace treaty is signed, the Western powers will have to resolve these matters with the government of the GDR.

Currently there are 7,000 Western soldiers and officers in West Berlin. I have already told Kennedy, continues N.S. Khrushchev, that if he wishes so, he can position even 50,000 of his soldiers in Berlin. If he wants to do it prior to starting a war, this will only work in our favor. These troops will end up in a trap.

N.S. Khrushchev then says that the FRG wanted to block the GDR, but the GDR warned that if such measures are undertaken, then a blockade of West Berlin will be undertaken.

J. Nehru. What would be the significance of this blockade?

N.S. Khrushchev responds that life in West Berlin would be paralyzed, since there would be no raw materials shipments, and manufactured goods would not be transported out of West Berlin.

J. Nehru asks, what would be the significance of a blockade for the GDR?

N.S. Khrushchev responds that it would also have a big significance for the GDR, since currently there are numerous and varied connections between the GDR and the FRG. There is an exchange of equipment. The Western powers even now are developing a plan for blockading the socialist countries if we sign a peace agreement with the GDR. But they will lose more than us, because our trade connections with the West are quite limited. Britain, France, Italy, and Japan oppose such a blockade. We are currently concluding a lot of new contracts with them and receive a large number of proposals of commercial nature, including extensive credits. Business circles do not want to sever trade agreements. The FRG also gladly trades with the Soviet Union. We buy factory equipment from the FRG, especially chemical, because theirs is of a very high quality.

J. Nehru asks how N.S. Khrushchev would view a situation when the Soviet Union signs a peace treaty with the GDR, and the Western countries do not do that, but will effectively acknowledge the provisions of the treaty.

N.S. Khrushchev answers that this would be not a bad situation. Though the issue would not be fully resolved, it is still better if the treaty is supported by the Western countries than if there were no agreement at all.

J. Nehru asks if one can expect that the GDR subsequently suspends the access of Western powers to West Berlin.

N.S. Khrushchev answers that such action by the government of the GDR would result in a conflict.

J. Nehru asks whether the access for the Western powers to West Berlin will be guaranteed by the treaty.

N.S. Khrushchev answers that such provisions will be included in the treaty.

J. Nehru asks whether the government of the GDR may subsequently declare that, due to the fact that a certain country did not sign the peace treaty, it means that it does not recognize it and therefore does not have the right of access.

N.S. Khrushchev responds that this is exactly why he said that there may be a conflict. If all countries recognized the GDR *de jure*, then the conflicts could be avoided.

J. Nehru asks N.S. Khrushchev whether the Soviet government will exercise influence over the government of the GDR in order to prevent the latter from taking actions directed at suspending access of western powers to West Berlin.

N.S. Khrushchev responds that after the treaty is signed, all countries will enjoy equal rights. It would be a different story, if we signed a treaty together with the Western powers and developed a system of guarantees, and additionally were appointed a guarantor. In that case we would be responsible.

J. Nehru asks, referencing a press announcement, whether it is true that Ulbricht is subsequently intending to control access to West Berlin.

N.S. Khrushchev responds that this is exactly how it will be, since after the treaty is signed, all rights will be transferred to East Germany. This treaty will give the GDR all rights of a sovereign state.

J. Nehru asks whether the GDR authorities can ban free access to West Berlin irrespective of what is stipulated in the agreement.

N.S. Khrushchev responds that this would be a violation of the terms of the treaty. Apparently, continues N.S. Khrushchev, they meant a routine control which any sovereign country exercises over movements on its territory. But the GDR is not going to interfere in the affairs of West Berlin and its relations. I want to answer the question of whether we will consider ourselves guarantors of the treaty if the three Western powers do not sign it. We will sign the treaty, and possibly some socialist and non-socialist countries will sign it along with us. All of these countries will have equal rights and equal responsibilities, and we will not have more responsibilities and more rights than others. We will not have a special agreement on guarantees. If there were a special agreement, under which we would be declared guarantors, then we would have certain responsibilities. If not, then we will have the same responsibilities as other countries who will sign the agreement. I will be frank with you, man-to-man, continues N.S. Khrushchev. Currently we have established a very good relationship with the GDR and with W. Ulbricht. We respect him a lot. These are purely personal relations, and if you ask whether they will always exist, then I will respond that I don't know because we are all human. I will tell you in confidence that we had the best relations with Albania, but now they are abominable, and I cannot tell you why this happened. Let's take the worst case scenario. Our relationship with the GDR may cool off, and if we try to give it advice, they will not listen to us. In case an agreement on guarantees is signed and we are appointed the guarantor, then we will demand respect of our rights and of our signature put to the agreement, regardless of whether or not we have good relations. Because in the absence of the guarantees, all signatory countries of the peace treaty will bear responsibility. However, if the guarantees are worked out, then we will honor them.

J. Nehru says that he does not mean the responsibility of a country as a guarantor, but that he wants to know what responsibility the Soviet Union will have after signing the treaty with the GDR.

N.S. Khrushchev responds that all signatory countries of the treaty will have equal rights and equal responsibilities. If India signs the treaty, then it will have equal rights with us.

J. Nehru responds: do we need to take into account the fact that the Soviet Union enjoys great influence in that part of the world?

N.S. Khrushchev answers that in legal questions it does not play any role. He says that the countries of the socialist camp are very meticulous with respect to the smallest legal matters. We are Communists, but we are also bureaucrats, continues

N.S. Khrushchev. If there is a provision, then we are going to defend our rights stipulated by it. Currently we have very good relations with the GDR, but quarrels are possible even between a father and son, or between two brothers, let alone between neighbors. As a Russian saying goes, "Business and friendship don't mix."

J. Nehru thanks N.S. Khrushchev for his attention and the time that N.S. Khrushchev was able to devote to him.

N.S. Khrushchev responds that it was not a waste of time. In our friendly discussion, he says, we exchanged our opinions on good and bad aspects of the current situation. This is very useful, considering that the Soviet Union, along with India, bears a responsibility for the fate of the world.

J. Nehru says that if the Soviet Union tests atomic weapons in Central Asia, then the consequences will most likely be felt in India.

N.S. Khrushchev responds that the nuclear explosions will be conducted at high altitudes and more to the north. Five years ago, says N.S. Khrushchev jokingly, we wanted to conduct tests of powerful bombs, but scientists declared that as a result of these blasts windows in Norway might crack. We decided against conducting the tests then. But this time we can guarantee that the windows will be intact.

J. Nehru asks whether the latest achievements in the space exploration are conducive to strengthening military capabilities.

N.S. Khrushchev answers that these successes are to a great extent conducive to strengthening the military might of the USSR.

J. Nehru asks a question: does this mean that they increase the power of the Soviet Union?

N.S. Khrushchev that this is, without doubt, true. Our scientists, continues N.S. Khrushchev, work very productively. Between you and me, we have also achieved a very good result in destroying ballistic missiles. Some time ago, when we assigned one group of scientists to work on ballistic missiles, at the same time a second group of scientists was assigned to develop methods of shooting these missiles down. And we praised both [groups]. During our conversation with Mr. Sulzberger, he asked me what capabilities we had in terms of shooting down missiles. I answered that he was treading into the territory where it was difficult [for me] to provide answers, but nevertheless I told him that we praised both groups. The results were literally unbelievable.

J. Nehru asks: you first send the missiles and then you shoot them down?

N.S. Khrushchev says that this is exactly what we do, i.e. we do "dry runs" [*rabotaem vkhlostuyu*].

N.S. Khrushchev says that people engaged in intellectual labor are working on destruction. We make bombs for our enemies, and they make them for us.

N.S. Khrushchev says that capitalists do not need logic. They need profits. If Governor Rockefeller says bomb shelters need to be built, people start buying cement and metal. Meanwhile Dupont, Rockefeller, and Kennedy make money on this and set people on edge, and gamble with their blood, though it is common knowledge that it is impossible to protect oneself against a bomb with explosive yield equivalent to 100 million tons of TNT.

J. Nehru remarks that the most powerful weapon that the USSR has against capitalism is the progress of the USSR.

N.S. Khrushchev says: the progress plus the atomic bomb. Our progress for them is like pearls for swine. The only thing they need is money. For money they will obliterate, trample to death, and slit each other's throats.

The conversation continued for two hours and 30 minutes. Present at the conversation on the Soviet side were: Cdes. A.N. Kosygin, A.A. Gromyko, V.V. Kuznetsov, I.V. Arkhipov, M.A. Ol'shanskiy, I.A. Benediktov, and V.I. Likhachev; on the Indian side: General Secretary of the MFA of India R.K. Nehru; Ambassador of India to the USSR S. Dutt; Head of a department at the MFA of India, Minister Plenipotentiary V.H. Coelho; First Secretary of the Embassy of India in the USSR, A. Gonsalves.

Recorded by: [signature: "Yu. Vinogradov"] (Yu. Vinogradov)

2-aa, ng, lk

[\[1\]](#) [Handwritten: "Has not been reviewed by Cde. Khrushchev"]