

**September 16, 1961**

**Record of Conversation Between N. S. Khrushchev  
and Subandrio, Deputy First Minister and Foreign  
Minister of Indonesia**

**Citation:**

"Record of Conversation Between N. S. Khrushchev and Subandrio, Deputy First Minister and Foreign Minister of Indonesia", September 16, 1961, Wilson Center Digital Archive, RGANI, f. 52, op. 1, d. 565, ll. 71-90. Contributed by Sergey Radchenko and translated by Gary Goldberg. <https://digitalarchive.umd.edu/document/300926>

**Summary:**

Subandrio discusses Indonesia's relations with the US, particularly Sukarno's recent meeting with Kennedy, where they debated non-alignment, nuclear testing, and the German question. Khrushchev shares his perspective on global tensions, including his discussions with French politician Paul Reynaud and concerns over Western military strategies.

**Credits:**

This document was made possible with support from Blavatnik Family Foundation

**Original Language:**

Russian

**Contents:**

Translation - English

RECORD OF A CONVERSATION BETWEEN N. S. KHRUSHCHEV  
AND SUBANDRIO, DEPUTY FIRST MINISTER [SIC] AND MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
OF INDONESIA

16 September 1961\*

[handwritten note at the bottom of the first page: The record of the conversation was not reviewed by Cde. N.S. Khrushchev]

After mutual greetings Subandrio apologized to N. S. Khrushchev for disrupting his evening rest and expressed gratitude for N. S. Khrushchev finding the time and the opportunity to receive him. He passed greetings from President Sukarno and said that if Sukarno had the opportunity he would come to Moscow to personally talk about the results of the discussions with President Kennedy held in Washington.

President Sukarno met with Kennedy in Washington by authorization of the Belgrade Conference of Non-Aligned Countries as a representative of this Conference, that is, on the same basis on which President Nkrumah and Prime Minister Nehru were sent to Moscow to meet with N. S. Khrushchev.

The discussions of President Sukarno and President of Mali Keita with Kennedy was comparatively short. After the conversation, which lasted an hour and half, Kennedy declared that he was ready to meet with N. S. Khrushchev at any time and at any place. When he said this Kennedy expressed a desire for a number of preparatory measures to be conducted before the summit meeting which would facilitate the success of the discussions. He expressed concern and alarm that if the summit meeting was held without preliminary preparation and was unsuccessful then evidently after this weapons would speak.

After the discussions of the three presidents a separate meeting was held between Sukarno and Kennedy. During this conversation Sukarno tried to explain the substance of the events taking place in the world, the German problem in particular.

As is well known, President Kennedy is very dissatisfied with the results of the Belgrade Conference. During the meeting with Sukarno Kennedy even accused Sukarno of Indonesia not holding to the policy of non-alignment with blocs. He accused Indonesia of standing on the side of the Soviet Union since it did not criticize the Soviet Union for resuming nuclear tests.

Sukarno made use of the meetings to present the point of view of Indonesia on the course of events at the present time. Indonesia views the current situation from its point of view and in this case its position coincides with the position of the Soviet Union. Being among the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America Indonesia represents new forces, forces of the new fighting with the forces of the old. Therefore it states that the growth of the strength and might of the Soviet Union means for Indonesia and similar countries a strengthening of their social strength, a new social power in the world.

Sukarno declared that if we were striving to strengthen peace then we should support a structure based on justice and prosperity. In the case Sukarno's concept is the concept of the Belgrade Conference. It is in this connection that he views the German question. This question cannot be isolated from the course of events in the world as a whole.

In the course of the conversation Kennedy advanced as his main argument the assertion that the system in East Germany is not democratic. Sukarno replied that it is not for us to judge what system is democratic, in the GDR or the FRG. Let the peoples themselves talk about this. The position of the Belgrade bloc is to view the German question not divorced from the current international situation on the whole, then a week after the solution of the German question some new "German" question will arise in the Congo or in Laos, in Indonesia, or somewhere else.

The whole matter of the clash of the forces of the new developing forces with the forces of the old is outdated. Therefore, when Kennedy asked Sukarno what, in his opinion, was the solution of the German problem, Sukarno replied that we view the German problem as a symptom of the clash of the forces of the new and the old world[s]. Sukarno declared that the German question needs to be solved on the basis

of a realistic approach, proceeding from the situation which actually exists. A West Germany and an East Germany, and a West Berlin and an East Berlin exist.

It is on this very question that disputes arose between Sukarno and Kennedy. Kennedy expressed the idea of holding a plebiscite in Germany. Sukarno replied that such a suggestion was in contradiction to the reality which already exists.

When Kennedy asked Sukarno's opinion about the Belgrade Conference he replied that the Conference took a completely correct position. It sees the solution to the German problem in the way of a realistic accounting for the situation which has developed, taking account of what exists today. Time will tell what will be the future course of events. The future will show whether Germany wants to be united or not,

After the discussions with Kennedy Sukarno formed the impression that Kennedy could accept Sukarno's concept about the approach to the German question on the basis of the real existence of two Germanys. The United States did not object to the Soviet Union concluding a treaty with East Germany, although it cannot recognize the system which exists in the GDR. The United States could accept

the real existing division of Berlin into West and East. In the course of the conversation Kennedy also stressed that if one proceeds from the real state of affairs then it is necessary to also recognize the existence of West Berlin. It is necessary to recognize the fact that the social and political system of West Berlin is different from the system of East Berlin.

N. S. Khrushchev noted that this is correct and that we recognize this.

Subandrio continued and said that Kennedy stressed in addition that one also ought to recognize the fact that West Berlin is economically quite dependent on the West and that West Berlin's ties with the outside world and Western countries should be free.

Kennedy asked Sukarno what guarantees regarding these ties there could be in a treaty with East Germany. Sukarno replied that from conversations with N. S. Khrushchev he drew the impression that the Soviet Union favored guarantees of free ties of West Berlin with the outside world. The question is who will give such guarantees. If the Soviet Union gives them that the US could agree with this, but if the assurance and implementation of the guarantees were transferred to the GDR then the US expresses concern that the government of East Germany might annul these guarantees at any time and West Berlin would stop being free.

Kennedy said that during the meeting in Vienna he had been told that after the Soviet Union concluded the peace treaty with the GDR the US government would be forced to settle the question of ties with West Berlin with the government of the GDR. He was also told that if the US government did not recognize the sovereignty of the GDR and tried to break through to West Berlin by force of arms the Soviet Union would defend the GDR.

N. S. Khrushchev said that he said this to Kennedy during the meeting in Vienna and that it would be so. Otherwise, it turns out that the US does what it wants.

Subandrio said that the main question which arose with Kennedy was who would answer for the guarantees of free access to West Berlin, the Soviet Union or the GDR.

N. S. Khrushchev replied that legally each sovereign country is responsible for its own obligations. It is absolutely obvious that the GDR exists as a sovereign state, has its own borders and territory, and only the government of the GDR can permit the use of this territory. This is a question of principle. There cannot be two lines on this question.

What goals do the Western powers pursue when they present a demand that the Soviet Union ensure the guarantees? They want to say that there is no GDR, there is no GDR government, but there is, as they say, an Eastern Zone of Occupation of the Soviet Union. Therefore let the Soviet Union act as the guarantor. Thus, this question is not only of non-recognition de jure, but also of non-recognition de facto. However, this is an unrealistic position. There was one politician in the US who held to this line, this was Dulles. But Dulles has died, and now they want to resurrect the dead. The US wants to pursue a policy of diktat, but this is an unrealistic policy.

N. S. Khrushchev asked, did Sukarno talk with Kennedy one to one in English, or were there interpreters[?]

Subandrio replied that the conversation was held directly in English, but advisers from both sides were present.

When during the conversation Kennedy accused Sukarno of not criticizing the Soviet Union for resuming nuclear tests Sukarno replied that, in his opinion, the Soviet Union had no alternative. The Soviet Union clearly saw that the West was making preparations for war. Sukarno said that he had been in the USSR and other socialist countries repeatedly and was convinced that the governments of these countries were interested in improving the lives of their peoples and did not want to fight. He was convinced that N. S. Khrushchev did not want war, but was nevertheless forced to strengthen the defense capability of his country in the face of the military preparations of the West in connection with the Berlin question.

In the course of the discussions Kennedy tried to convince Sukarno for about a half hour that America also does not want war. He said that accusations had been raised previously that the US wanted war to seize others' territory and enrich itself. But at the present time he assumed that in the event of war the US would lose about 70,000,000 people. Kennedy said that he is a father, that he has children, and they also might die. He cannot take the responsibility on himself for this, he does not want war.

Kennedy admitted that the US has made mistakes in the past, and is gradually beginning to understand that the world should develop on the basis of justice, prosperity, and independence. He admitted that the Soviet Union should become a great and flourishing power. But in the transitional period that represents the greatest difficulties. It is in the transitional period that forces too rarely oppose one another. It is in this period, in Kennedy's opinion, that it would be advisable to wait for about two years while the tension falls, and come to a temporary compromise, and then achieve a solution of the German question. Kennedy expressed the opinion that if the rights of the Western powers to free access to West Berlin are abolished then this would lead to the collapse of NATO and the isolation of the US.

If there were no NATO or Warsaw Pact and disarmament were achieved the solution of such questions would not present difficulties. In this connection Kennedy turned to Sukarno with a question of how to achieve a solution of the German question in this transitional period.

In the course of the conversation Sukarno constantly stressed that the New World would continually develop and the forces of the Old World should retreat. Colonialism and imperialism should disappear from the face of the Earth. Sukarno had bitter debates on this question with Stevenson, who was present at the conversation with Kennedy and met with Sukarno separately after this conversation.

Stevenson had asserted that there are two kinds of colonialism - the colonialism of the Western powers and the colonialism of the Eastern bloc, namely of the Soviet Union. Sukarno stressed that he had personally visited the socialist countries and engaged in direct contact with the peoples of these countries. He declared that he well understands the people since he has led people for many years now. In no way did he develop the impression that the peoples of the socialist countries are oppressed. Of course, during the development of a new system there are groups who exhibit discontent. This can also be seen in the example of Indonesia. In Indonesia there exists a system of a directed democracy, and there were rebels who opposed this system with the support of Western powers.

N. S. Khrushchev noted that the rebels were directed by the United States and we know this.

Subandrio said that this is what Sukarno declared to Kennedy and Stevenson. He said that there are actually certain discontented groups, but they do not represent the people.

Bitter debates developed between Sukarno and Kennedy on the question of Cuba. Kennedy asserted that Communism is being planted in Cuba by force. Sukarno interrupted Kennedy and said it is not for us to judge from the outside whether the system which exists there was being imposed on the Cuban people. At one time Sukarno himself created guided democracy in Indonesia, and he is confident that if a liberal system existed in Indonesia, then it would lead to the death of democracy. Sukarno drew the impression from the conversation with Kennedy that in broad

outline Kennedy recognizes the formation and development of new forces at the present time. Sukarno declared that the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin American see in the Soviet Union a pioneer in the development of the new. He explained that if there were no Soviet Union Indonesia, for example, could not pursue a firm policy with respect to the Netherlands. Even if the Soviet Union did not give any support the very fact of its existence is enormous moral support and inspires peoples in their struggle for independence and freedom.

At the same time Sukarno called for there to be no war during the transitional period. Unquestionably conflicts reflecting the struggle between the new and the old will take place during this period, for example, the fight for the liberation of peoples in Algeria and Angola, the economic conflict with the oil monopolies in Indonesia, and the conflict between Moscow and Washington. Sukarno said that we recognize the existence of all these conflicts, but call for there being no war.

After a detailed exchange of opinions Kennedy asked Sukarno what, in his opinion, was the way to solve problems during the transitional period. Sukarno stated that the Berlin question is the most critical and bitter and it might put the world under threat since the Soviet Union and the US stand face to face here. But the conflicts in Algeria and Angola, where people are dying in a fight for their independence, are no less critical and bitter. It is possible that for the peoples of Angola and Algeria their fights are more important than the Berlin question.

At the Belgrade Conference Sukarno met with a representative of Angola. The latter told him that the Angolans consider the Berlin question important. The matter cannot come to war, but it needs to be borne in mind at the same time that the people of Angola are being subjected to oppression and extermination.

In connection with this Sukarno asked President Kennedy not to place all emphasis on the conflict with the Soviet Union and not to hinder peoples' fight for their freedom.

Subandrio said further that he had briefly presented what President Sukarno had charged him with saying regarding the discussions in Washington, and that N. S. Khrushchev could use this information as he saw fit.

N. S. Khrushchev thanked Subandrio for the report and asked that his most sincere and warmest gratitude be passed to President Sukarno.

I fully agree with his line of argument, said N. S. Khrushchev, with each letter and idea. He spoke like I think. It was very pleasant for me and this further strengthens the personal friendly relations between me and the President and between our countries and peoples. I will use what you reported to me in the name of brother Karno [SIC].

N. S. Khrushchev said further that in his opinion Kennedy is actually searching for some solution. If he were free to decide himself then he would rather opt for negotiations. But he is in a difficult position.

Subandrio said that is why Sukarno declared to Kennedy that there is no other way except peaceful coexistence and Kennedy agreed with this. He even admitted that the PRC ought to be come a member of the UN.

Kennedy asked Sukarno to regard with due attention the fact that he had inherited much from the previous government. A year had not passed since he became President, and he was already faced with a crisis.

Kennedy declared that the desire for peaceful coexistence is his goal and that he favors cooperation between the Soviet Union and the US for the purpose of improving the situation in the world. He also favors such cooperation which would serve to benefit the world as a whole. Kennedy said that it is necessary to take into consideration that he inherited a domestic situation in the US and had received as Adenauer and De Gaulle as well.

N. S. Khrushchev said that yesterday he received Paul Reynaud. This is an old person, but a prominent political figure close to De Gaulle. Actually, Reynaud advanced De Gaulle as a political figure at a time when he was Prime Minister, and De Gaulle was a colonel.

After a three-hour conversation during which N. S. Khrushchev presented Reynaud with the position of the Soviet government the latter said that he was glad that not all prime ministers are idiots, and that he will leave calmly.

I can't tell for sure that he arrived at the instructions of De Gaulle, although he talked with him before departure, but in any events he will pass on the substance of the conversation to De Gaulle.

During the conversation Reynaud expressed his opinion about the belligerent speech of De Gaulle on 5 September. He said that he agreed with that part where De Gaulle said that it is necessary to live in peace, and did not agree at all with the belligerent part of the speech.

In connection with the question of the peace treaty with Germany, said N. S. Khrushchev, he would like to repeat to some degree what he said to Kennedy, and Reynaud will also tell Spaak when the latter comes to the Soviet Union. We invited him to visit our country, but this was not our initiative. He turned to us to invite him and we did this. We never would have invited Spaak at our own initiative since we well know what sort of a person he is. He is a socialist, and imperialist, and a colonizer. Nevertheless we invited him, and when he arrives we will greet him and thank him for accepting our invitation. Therefore, noted N. S. Khrushchev, if you read in the newspapers that I invited him, don't believe this. But we consider this visit useful. Spaak is one of the leaders of the socialists and is influential in his circle.

What are our opportunities in solving the German question? Where is the possible limit to which the West might agree and below which we won't go? Evidently, the Western countries do not want to sign the peace treaty with Germany, and we will sign it without them. The status of free city of West Berlin, which provides for the preservation of access to West Berlin and West Berlin's ties with all countries, will be attached to the treaty. The government of the GDR will give a solemn commitment that it will recognize the sovereignty of West Berlin, and will pursue a policy of non-interference in its affairs and ensure uninterrupted communications with West Berlin through its territory for all countries which want to have ties with this city.

But an agreement with the government of the GDR has to be concluded for this. This is a customary practice accomplished in relations between all countries de facto and de jure.

For example, direct rail communications exist between Moscow and Paris. A Soviet train car passes through the territory of the FRG. And we have an agreement with Adenauer for the right of passage of our car. Soviet aircraft flying the Moscow-London route make trips via Copenhagen. We have an agreement with Denmark for this.

This is ordinary generally-accepted international practice. The same practice should be applied with respect to all countries which want to have ties with West Berlin. They should have corresponding agreements with the GDR. There can be no retreat on this. No threats will help here.

West Berlin should have the status of a free city. No one should interfere in the affairs of West Berlin. The political and social system of this city are the business of its residents.

Kennedy, Fanfani, and Reynaud have displayed concern with respect to the guarantees. This is the main question for them. Nehru also raised this question. The Western powers want the Soviet Union to give such guarantees [inserted by hand: so the GDR can be ignored], which is impossible. However, it is necessary to understand that this is impossible. We are actually an ally of the GDR, but today we are allies and tomorrow the GDR might declare that it does not need such an alliance. As an ally we can give advice to the government of the GDR which it is free to accept or not accept. But we cannot force [them] to carry out our advice by force of arms. Only those whose brains are twisted might think that we act this way. We cannot give guarantees, even if we wanted this. Such guarantees might [inserted above by hand: should] be given only by the government on whose territory West Berlin is located. This is a sovereign government, and we cannot employ a policy of diktat and compulsion against it.

Some think that since we are Communists we have everything in common. But we represent our peoples, who have their own governments, their own laws, and their own borders. For example, we have very spoiled relations with Albania [inserted above by hand: the Albanian leaders]. They are also Communists, but [inserted above by hand: they are hostile to us] they hate us, and we do not respect them, although at one time [we were] great friends. The situation might change. Countries, parties,

and governments might quarrel. Therefore [inserted above by hand: it is impossible for us to give] guarantees [inserted above by hand: but the GDR is ignored]; if we gave them [inserted above by hand: such guarantees] then those who would accept them would be unserious people.

But we are for [inserted above by hand: for international] guarantees. And this is not because we do not trust the government of the GDR and think that it will interfere in the affairs of West Berlin. We are for guarantees, but then it will ensue from the signing of the peace treaty with the GDR by the socialist countries and a special agreement about guarantees for West Berlin. We are ready to sign such guarantees.

N. S. Khrushchev said that he had presented this position to Paul Reynaud, who wrote down his statements very carefully, and after this said that now he saw that not all prime ministers are idiots and there will be no war. Evidently such a position suited him. He gave a report about the conversation in the press and reacted to our position favorably. The same position was presented to Fanfani and will be presented to Spaak.

Subandrio asked whether Kennedy knows about this position.

N. S. Khrushchev replied that he is convinced that Fanfani informed Kennedy. Although Fanfani did not say this directly, the impression was formed that he himself agreed with this position. But the ambassador of Italy questioned A. A. Gromyko in detail about the guarantees. A. A. Gromyko repeated our proposals regarding the troops of neutral countries, UN troops, or the troops of the four powers, including the USSR. Then the three Western powers and one socialist power, including the two mightiest powers - the USSR and the US - will be represented in West Berlin. This is a real guarantee for those who do not want war, but peace.

The Soviet Union does not need West Berlin. The population of this city is 2,500,000 at a time when the annual growth rate of the population in the Soviet Union is 3,500,000, and in China, 15,000,000. What significance does this question have in our fight against capitalism whether West Berlin is in the socialist or the capitalist camp? Perhaps this is the last drop outweighing the forces of socialism or capitalism? Berlin does not play any role in this historical dispute, although it might be the source of a spark which aggravates our relations.

Our dispute will be settled on a wider field, on the field of the peaceful coexistence of the two systems. If before the difference in the levels of economic development between our country and the US was considerable, now we fly into space, but the Americans cannot. This is not the result of our being smarter, but the American stupider. No, people are all alike. But this is a demonstration of the advantages of our system. We are convinced of our victory and we will win.

As concerns Reynaud, this is a reactionary person, a De Gaullist. De Gaulle and Reynaud are one and the same. But, said N. S. Khrushchev, he believes that I want to secure peace. I will meet with Reynaud a second time. He once went to China and when he returned through Moscow we had a conversation with him. There was also a brief meeting in Paris. When Reynaud was returning from China, and during the last conversation he repeated that if a military conflict breaks out we, the white people, will start to destroy one another and then, he said, the Chinese, representing the yellow race, will make use of this for their purposes.

I replied that we live at such a time when a struggle is going on between the whites and blacks or the yellows. We Marxists stand on class positions. Our sympathies are on the side of those who fight for their freedom from the yoke of oppressors, regardless of the race to which they belong. There is a struggle going on right now between classes, regardless of whether the people are white, black, yellow, Orthodox, Buddhists, or Muslim. If you take the Chinese, then there is the Chinese people and there is the Taiwan clique. If you take the black people, there are Lumumba and Gizenga, and there are Mobutu and Tshombe. Lumumba and Gizenga are our friends, Mobutu and Tshombe are our enemies. although all of them are black. Of course, Reynaud does not understand this.

I have presented our position. If Kennedy actually doesn't want war, but peace, then it is easy for him to accept this position. For what will he fight? We demand nothing, we do not impose, and we do not humiliate anyone. Reynaud said that it is necessary to find an opportunity for an agreement. The Western countries are ready to

guarantee the borders of Germany which have been formed. France is ready get involved [*prilozhit' ruku*] so that West Germany does not have nuclear weapons. All this is good. Not just De Gaulle, but also everyone recognizes the borders which have been formed. Adenauer, too, recognized this when he talked with our ambassador, but he is deciding not to declare this publicly.

Subandrio noted that during the conversation with Kennedy Sukarno formed the impression that Kennedy did not want a united Germany.

N. S. Khrushchev said that right now no one wants a united Germany, including Adenauer. If Germany were reunited right now the Social Democrats would win and throw out Adenauer.

Subandrio said that during the conversation with Sukarno Kennedy stressed that the US does not want a war because of Berlin. The question is that if the US made a concession on Berlin this would lead to a collapse of NATO and the fall of Kennedy.

N. S. Khrushchev noted that they cannot expect from us that we promote the strengthening of NATO. If a war breaks out, it will also not strengthen NATO, but will lead to its destruction. Once a political leader told about his conversation with Churchill. When the conversation touched on the relations between Britain and the other Western countries and the Soviet Union Churchill said that the Western powers had developed a plan to attack various important centers of the Soviet Union which were to be destroyed. Then this leader noted that the Soviet Union would launch a retaliatory blow and asked what would happen with Britain in such an event. Churchill replied that Britain would be totally destroyed.

Churchill expressed a realistic thought here. The Western countries are trying to frighten us. However, one volley would be sufficient to destroy not only Britain, but also France, Italy, West Germany, Spain, etc.

This is not a threat, but reality. If they attack us we can respond, and don't pray to God. Therefore only stupid people can frighten us. We understand that in the event of a nuclear war we will also suffer enormous losses. But the others will also be completely destroyed. Therefore we think that only suicidal people can begin an atomic war. There are no reasons for a war; we demand nothing, and we are humiliating no one. We are convinced that there will be no war since the Western countries understand that a nuclear war threatens them.

Now is not the time when the US had a monopoly in the area of atomic weapons. Now the Soviet Union has good bombs and good missiles. We sent a missile to the area of Pearl Harbor right now, its accuracy is very good, one kilometer from the target. For an atomic bomb this is the same as hitting a fly, for the flight range is more than 12,000 km. We will continue to test missiles. Our ships are located there and are observing. American ships and aircraft also track and report to their government that the missile fell around a Russian ship.

Subandrio said it is clear to Indonesia that the stronger the Soviet Union is the stronger are the new forces and the faster their development.

He replied that the role of President Sukarno has grown considerably right now. If before Eisenhower gave advice to Sukarno, now Kennedy asks Sukarno's advice and opinion. This says that in America they are beginning to fear war.

N. S. Khrushchev said that this is so, that the Americans are beginning to grow wiser. They grew fat at a time when the Soviet Union lost many millions in war; their losses totaled 250,000. But on the other hand they have robbed almost the entire world.

Subandrio said that he had formed the impression that Kennedy is striving to find a way out of the current crisis.

N. S. Khrushchev said Kennedy does not want war, but he has a difficult position: he is young, they are putting pressure on him in connection with the fact that he became President by an insignificant majority of votes.

Subandrio asked N. S. Khrushchev's opinion about Kennedy as a President compared to Eisenhower.

N. S. Khrushchev replied that, in his opinion, Eisenhower also did not want war. But he was more of a megalomaniac. Kennedy has a more realistic approach to events, he feels the changes that are occurring.

Subandrio said that Sukarno pointed out that from the psychological point of view

with any solution of the question between Moscow and Washington Kennedy has to proceed from the fact that it is necessary to talk with Moscow on an equal basis.

N. S. Khrushchev noted that he spoke about this to Kennedy during the meeting in Vienna. Kennedy said that we are equal in strength and can destroy one another. But the correct conclusion needs to be drawn from this: if the forces are equal then the opportunities should also be equal; the US recognizes equality with respect to strength, but wants to reserve the opportunities for itself.

Kennedy declared that the US has given commitments to NATO, CENTO, and SEATO. But who asked them to give such commitments? They gave the commitments, but we have to recognize them, although they are directed against us. Naturally, we will fight against such commitments, but this means to enter into conflict. If there were no commitments, there would be no conflict. This is like the anecdote of a man who goes into a restaurant, ate, but did not pay. He asks the waiter, what do you do with someone who eats but doesn't pay[?] The waiter answers, "We give him a beating [ *daem v sheyu*, literally give [it to him] in the neck".] Then he asks that the same be done with him. The US is asking that it be done with those who give commitments and do not fulfill them. We say that the same needs to be done.

This is a painful, but unavoidable historical process. For example, generals are so accustomed to commanding that when they retire the government gives them adjutants. There are no troops, so there is at least an adjutant. So, too, the imperialists. They have lost a monopoly position, but are accustomed to pounding with a fist so that everyone hears them. Now they are pounding, but they don't listen to them. And this moral breakdown is very serious.

Subandrio said that Sukarno asked Kennedy a question, to which the latter did not directly answer. He asked, does Kennedy think that the Soviet Union conducting nuclear weapons tests has the goal of only demonstrating power or is it a means of putting pressure on overly belligerent heads in the US. Kennedy did not answer this question directly, but then said to Sukarno that it would be good if the Soviet Union did not demonstrate power constantly, for this puts Kennedy in a very unenviable position. Sukarno noted that at the same time the cooling of some hotheads in the US would be to Kennedy's benefit.

N. S. Khrushchev said that it is necessary to come to agreement about disarmament. We are ready to sign a treaty on general and complete disarmament at any time and to destroy weapons. What could be a more emphatic demonstration of a desire for peace than a readiness to eliminate armed forces? Let the Western powers sign such a treaty. When armies are disbanded and weapons destroyed the question of tests will also be eliminated; no one will need them.

What is an agreement to cease testing without disarmament? This is a sleeping pill for insomnia. This is an anesthetic during an operation. The accumulation of weapons is continuing, the threat of war is increasing, but the man on the street thinks that if there are no tests then this serves as a guarantee that there will be no war.

Right now some dim-witted people criticize us, they say that the tests contaminate the atmosphere. This is so. But what does it mean not to contaminate the atmosphere and to create bombs at the same time? This is like an executioner arriving to hang a person and finding him sick. They take this person to a hospital, treat him, and when he recovers his health, they hang him. This "concern for health" appears to be the same. If a war breaks out then hundreds of millions will die. Here they display "nobility [Translator's note: *blagorodstvo*, which can also mean "generosity"], and argue about the contamination of the atmosphere. It is necessary to save lives, but to do this it is necessary to eliminate war and destroy weapons. We Communists propose to conclude a treaty on universal and complete disarmament. This is also concern for people. But the Western powers do not want to conclude a treaty. Hence it is obvious who is for peace and who is for war. Inasmuch as they do not want to sign a treaty on disarmament we would be idiots if we did not improve [our] weapons. We should have the most modern weapons. What do [we] do - [we] have to live like in a minefield.

Then N. S. Khrushchev told how during the War he lived for several days in a mined dugout. During the German offensive in the Kursk Bulge the pilots of one airfield left and mined the dugout. The German offensive was halted and N. S. Khrushchev, who

at that time was Member of the Military Council of the Front, and several generals occupied the dugout. When the pilots returned they said that the dugout was mined and showed the mines which should have exploded 20 days after being laid. Fortunately, this period had not yet expired.

Just in case an agreement is concluded about prohibiting tests all the same, the US is trying to find a loophole so as to then have the right to conduct tests underground or the so-called tests "for peaceful purposes". But any test is a test of an explosive device, regardless of under what pretext it is conducted.

It is also necessary to take into consideration that at the time negotiations were being held about halting tests, France continues to explode atomic weapons. It can happen such that some other country will invent a nuclear weapon and begin to test it. When this happens it will advance the argument that a number of powers already have nuclear weapons and have tested them.

Thus, an agreement to prohibit testing cannot be an obstacle for the arms race, and cannot eliminate the threat of a new world war.

It is another matter if all countries come to agreement about disarmament and the destruction of nuclear weapons. Then no one would have the desire to conduct tests. Only through disarmament can an agreement ensuring peace be achieved. The other proposals are a deception of public opinion, these are for fools. When a child is hungry and there is nothing to eat, the mother gives it a pacifier to deceive it. But we don't want such a pacifier.

Subandrio expressed gratitude for the conversation.

Present at the conversation were V. V. Kuznetsov, Deputy USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs; N. I. Molyakov, chief of a department of the USSR MFA, and also A. Malik, Ambassador of Indonesia in the USSR and Sumarjo, deputy chief of an Indonesian MFA department.

Recorded by: L. Yatsyna