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ACTING SECRETARY-GENERAL U THANT EXPRESSES
CONGRATULATIONS ON COSMONAUTS' ACHIEVEMENT

Following is the text of a message, dated 15 August, sent by Acting Secretary-General U Thant to Nikita S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Moscow:

SINCERE CONGRATULATIONS TO COSMONAUTS NIKOLAYEV AND POPOVICH ON THEIR HISTORIC FEAT, AND TO THE SOVIET SCIENTISTS AND TECHNOLOGISTS WHO MADE THIS ACHIEVEMENT POSSIBLE. THIS IS YET ANOTHER MILESTONE IN MAN'S GENIUS IN CONQUERING SPACE, WHICH I HOPE WILL BE USED FOR THE BENEFIT OF ALL MANKIND.

* *** *
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SINCERE CONGRATULATIONS TO COSMONAUTS NIKOLAYEV AND POPOVICH ON
THEIR HISTORIC FEAT, AND TO THE SOVIET SCIENTISTS AND TECHNOLOGISTS
WHO MADE THIS ACHIEVEMENT POSSIBLE. THIS IS YET ANOTHER MILESTONE
IN MAN’S GENIUS IN CONQUERING SPACE, WHICH I HOPE WILL BE USED FOR
THE BENEFIT OF ALL MANKIND.

U ThANT

ACTING SECRETARY-GENERAL

cc - Permanent Representative of USSR
    Mr. Kiselev
    Mr. Tavares de Sa
    Mr. Massif

C.V. Narasimhan
Chef de Cabinet
БЛАГОДАРЮ ВАС ЗА ПОЗДРАВЛЕНИЯ СОВЕТСКИХ ЛЕТЧИКОВ И КОСМОНАВТОВ, УЧЕНЫХ И ИНЖЕНЕРОВ - ТЕХНИЧЕСКИХ РАБОТНИКОВ, ОСУЩЕСТВИВШИХ ПЕРВЫЙ В ИСТОРИИ МНОГОДНЕВНЫЙ ГРУППОВОЙ ПОЛЕТ В КОСМИЧЕСКОЕ ПРОСТРАНСТВО. МЫ РАССМЫТРИВАЕМ ЭТОТ ПОДВИГ СОВЕТСКИХ КОСМОНАВТОВ В ДЕЛЕ МИРНОГО ОСВОЕНИЯ КОСМОСА, КАК КРУПНОЕ ДОСТИЖЕНИЕ ВСЕГО ЧЕЛОВЕЧЕСТВА.

Н. ХРУЩЕВ МОСКВА, КРЕМЛЬ "4" СЕНТЯБРЯ 1962 ГОДА

UNOFFICIAL TRANSLATION

MR. U THANT, ACTING SECRETARY - GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS NEW YORK

I SHOULD LIKE TO THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONGRATULATING THE SOVIET PILOTS - COSMONAUTS, SCIENTISTS AND THE STAFF OF ENGINEERS AND TECHNICIANS, WHO HAVE CARRIED OUT THE MANY DAYS' GROUP FLIGHT INTO OUTER SPACE, WHICH IS THE FIRST ONE ALL OVER HISTORY. WE CONSIDER THIS FEAT OF THE SOVIET COSMONAUTS, AIMED AT A PEACEFUL MASTERING OF OUTER SPACE, TO BE A MAJOR ACHIEVEMENT OF ALL MANKIND.

Н. ХРУШЧОВ КРЕМЛИН, МОСКВА "4" СЕНТЯБРЯ, 1962
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CABLE

Date: 17 November 1962

From: Mr. A. Gromyko, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR

To: U Thant, Acting Secretary-General of the United Nations, New York

I inform you that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has authorized Dobrynin Anatoly Fedorovich Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the United States of America to sign the International Coffee Agreement of 1962 and to make a declaration on behalf of the Government of USSR in connexion with the signing of that Agreement. Original authorization will be submitted in due course. Moscow 17 November 1962.
ВРСА ПСН 66
УНАШНЕ 224537
БЕЙ/НЯ

МНР164
S MOSCOU 79/77 17 1415 USSRGOVT

СТАТПРИОРИТЕ ПС

УНАШНЕ СОСПОДИНУ В ТАМУ ИСПОЛНЯЯСЕМУ ОБЯЗАННОСТИ
ГЕНЕРАЛНОГОСЕКРЕТАРИАОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЕДИЕНННХ НАЦИИ NEW YORK

СООБШАЮ ЧТО ПРАВИТЕЛЬСТВО СОЮЗА СОВЕТСКИХ СОЦИАЛИСТИЧЕСКИХ
РЕСПУБЛИК УПОЛНОМОЧИЛО ДОБРЫНИНА АКАТОЛИЯ ФЕДОРОВИЧА
ЧРЕЗВЫЧАЙНОГО И ПОЛНОМОЧНОГО ПО ЛАТВИИ НАСТРАДА АН РБ
СОЦИАЛИСТИЧЕСКИХ РЕСПУБЛИК В ОБЕДИЕНННХ НАЦИЙ ПО ЛАТВИИ НАСТРАДА АН РБ
ПОДПИСАТ МЕЖДУНАРОДНОЕ СОГЛАШЕНИЕ ПО КОРЕ 1962 ГОДА А ТАКЖЕ
СДЕЛАТЬ ЗАЯВЛЕНИЕ ОТ ИМЕНИ

ПС2

ПРАВИТЕЛЬСТВА СССР В СВЯЗИ С ПОДПИСАНИЕМ ЕТОГО СОГЛАШЕНИЯ
STOP ПОДЛЯННХЕ ПОЛНОМОЦИЯ БУДУТ ПРЕДСТАВЛЕНЫ ДОПОЛНИТЕЛЬНО
STOP МОСКВА 17 МЯЯБРИЯ 1962 ГОДА STOP
МИНИСТР ВНУТРЕННИХ ДЕЛ СССР А ГРОМЫКО
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Cable

Date: 8 July 1963
From: N. Khrushchev, Kremlin, Moscow
To: U Thant, Secretary-General, United Nations, New York

I thank you for your cordial congratulations on the latest success of Soviet science and technology in the peaceful conquest of outer space - the joint flight of astronauts V. Bykovsky and V. Terseshkova. The Soviet Union contributes all its achievements in the exploration and conquest of space to the treasure-house of world science and culture, and dedicates them to the service of human progress towards the triumph of the great cause of peace.
Cable

DATE: 20 JULY 1963

FROM: N. KHROUSHCHEV, CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR, MOSCOW

TO: U THANT, SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, NEW YORK

TEXT OF CABLE

SIR,

I HAVE RECEIVED YOUR MESSAGE OF GOODWILL IN WHICH YOU EXPRESS THE HOPE THAT THE TALKS IN MOSCOW ON THE DISCONTINUANCE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS WILL BE SUCCESSFUL. THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT, AS YOU, OF COURSE, ARE AWARE, HAS FOR MANY YEARS BEEN ENDEAVOURING TO OBTAIN AN INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT WHICH WOULD PUT AN END TO NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS. IT APPEARS TO US THAT CONDITIONS ARE NOW FAVOURABLE FOR OBTAINING SUCH AN AGREEMENT. FOR THAT REASON WE TOO HOPE THAT THE EXCHANGE OF VIEWS NOW TAKING PLACE IN MOSCOW BETWEEN REPRESENTATIVES OF THE USSR, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED KINGDOM ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE DISCONTINUANCE OF NUCLEAR TESTS AND OTHER MATTERS OF MUTUAL INTEREST WILL BE BROUGHT TO A SUCCESSFUL CONCLUSION. THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT CONSIDERS THAT SIMULTANEOUSLY WITH THE CONCLUSION OF AN AGREEMENT BANNING NUCLEAR TESTS, ANOTHER IMPORTANT STEP TOWARDS THE RELAXATION OF INTERNATIONAL TENSION AND THE STRENGTHENING OF PEACE SHOULD BE TAKEN: THE SIGNING OF A NON-AGGRESSION PACT BETWEEN THE STATES WHICH ARE PARTIES TO NATO AND THE COUNTRIES WHICH ARE MEMBERS OF THE WARSAW PACT.

I HAVE THE HONOUR TO BE, ETC.,

(Signed) N. KHROUSHCHEV

CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS
OF THE USSR
Cable

DATE: 29 JULY 1963
FROM: B. KHERCHEV, CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR, MOSCOW
TO: U THANT, SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, NEW YORK

TEXT OF CABLE

SIR,

I HAVE RECEIVED YOUR MESSAGE OF GOODWILL IN WHICH YOU EXPRESS THE HOPE THAT THE TALKS IN MOSCOW ON THE DISCONTINUANCE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS WILL BE SUCCESSFUL. THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT, AS YOU, OF COURSE, ARE AWARE, HAS FOR MANY YEARS BEEN ENDEAVOURING TO OBTAIN AN INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT WHICH WOULD PUT AN END TO NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS. IT APPEARS TO US THAT CONDITIONS ARE NOW FAVOURABLE FOR OBTAINING SUCH AN AGREEMENT. FOR THAT REASON WE TOO HOPE THAT THE EXCHANGE OF VIEWS NOW TAKING PLACE IN MOSCOW BETWEEN REPRESENTATIVES OF THE USSR, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED KINGDOM ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE DISCONTINUANCE OF NUCLEAR TESTS AND OTHER MATTERS OF MUTUAL INTEREST WILL BE BURNT TO A SUCCESSFUL CONCLUSION. THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT CONSIDERS THAT SIMULTANEOUSLY WITH THE CONCLUSION OF AN AGREEMENT BANNING NUCLEAR TESTS, ANOTHER IMPORTANT STEP TOWARDS THE RELAXATION OF INTERNATIONAL TENSION AND THE STRENGTHENING OF PEACE SHOULD BE TAKEN: THE SIGNING OF A NON-AGGRESSION PACT BETWEEN THE STATES WHICH ARE PARTIES TO NATO AND THE COUNTRIES WHICH ARE MEMBERS OF THE WARSZAWA PACT.

I HAVE THE HONOUR TO BE, ETC.,

(Signed) B. KHERCHEV
CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR
ВАЖАЕМЫЙ Г-Н ТАН,

Я ПОЛУЧИЛ ВАШЕ ПОСЛАНИЕ, В КОТОРОМ ВЫ РАЗУМЕНЬЕ, ЧТО РАЗГОВОРЫ В МОСКВЕ ПО ВОПРОСУ О ПЕРЕУСТРАНЕНИИ ИСПЫТАНИЙ ЯДЕРНОГО ОРУЖИЯ БУДУТ УСПЕШНЫМИ.

СОВЕТСКОЕ ПРАВИТЕЛЬСТВО, КАК ВЫ, КОНЧЕНО,

ЗНАЕТЕ, В ТЕЧЕНИЕ МНОГИХ ЛЕТ ПРИЛАГАЕТ УСИЛИЯ К ТОМУ, ЧТОБЫ ДОСТИГАТЬ ТАКОГО МЕЖДУНАРОДНОГО СОГЛАШЕНИЯ, КОТОРОЕ ПОЛУЧИЛО БЫ КОНЦ ИСПЫТАНИИ ЯДЕРНОГО ОРУЖИЯ.

НАМ ПРЕДСТАВЛЯЕТСЯ, ЧТО ТЕПЕРЬ СОГЛАШЕНИЕ БУДЕТ УСЛОВИЯМ СОГЛАШЕНИЯ ТАКОГО СОГЛАШЕНИЯ. ПОЭТОМУ МЫ ТОЖЕ НАДЕЕМСЯ НА УСПЕШНОЕ ЗАВЕРШЕНИЕ ПРОИСХОДЯЩЕГО В МОСКВЕ ОБМЕНА МНЕНИЯМИ.
MEJDU PREDSTAVITELIAMI SSSR, SSHA I VELIKOBRITANII PO VOPROSAM, SVIAZANNYM S PREKRASCENIEM IADERNYH ISPYTANII, I DRUGIM VOPROSAM, PREDSTAVLJAJUSHIM VZAIMNYI INTERES.

SOVETSKOE PRAVITELSTVO SCHITAET, CHTO ODNOREMENNO S ZAKLIUCHENIEM SOGLASHENIJA O ZAPRESCENII IADERNYH ISPYTANII SLEDOVALO BY SDELAT I DRUGOI VAJNYI SHAG V NAPRAVLENII OSŁABLENIIA MEJDUNARODNOI NAPRIAJENNOSTI I

UKREPLENIJA MIRA - PODPISAT PAKT O NENAPADENII MEJDU GOSUDARSTVAMI AUCHASTNIKAMI NATO I STRANAMI, VHODIASCIMI V VARSHAVSKIJ DOGOVOR.

S UVAJENIEM N. KRUSHCHOV PREDSEDATEL SOVETA MINISTROV SSSR

20 IIULIA 1963 GODA G. MOSKVA
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I. Initial World Reaction

There is evidence of growing support among governments for the partial test ban treaty, and of hope that it will lead to further East-West accommodations. Positive statements indicating willingness to sign have been made by the governments of Australia, Brazil, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Denmark, Greece, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Philippines, New Zealand and the United Arab Republic. The Treaty, Tass reported, was welcomed by the Warsaw Pact countries and Cuba.

The initial reaction from West Germany and Israel was somewhat restrained. The West German Government called the Treaty "a partial success", while Israel deferred a decision on adherence. President De Gaulle stated that the agreement "appears to us satisfactory, and we even participate in the joy expressed by President Kennedy". He added that France, however, would not be diverted or inconvenienced by the Moscow agreement. The Treaty was only of "limited importance" unless "stretched" to other problems, and France, he said, would seek a disarmament conference of the four nuclear Powers later this year.

The only vehement negative reaction has come from the People's Republic of China. Official editorials claimed that the Treaty was "an out-and-out fraud" of the United States aimed at preventing China and "other socialist countries than the Soviet Union from possessing nuclear capability". A test ban would be significant "only when it forms a component part of the programme for general disarmament and the total prohibition of nuclear weapons". (It was reported that the Japanese Communist Party supported Chinese views, while the Indian Communist Party praised the test ban.)

II. United States Reaction and Senate Ratification

Interest in United States reaction centres on the "advice and consent" which requires two-thirds, or 67 affirmative votes, if all 100 Senators vote. There is evidence of sufficient support developing under the leadership of the President, the Secretaries of State and Defence, the Director of the Disarmament Agency, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

A Senate resolution for an atmospheric test ban was introduced earlier this year by 34 senators (28 Democrat and 6 Republican), and a poll taken by
Senator Clark in the spring of this year indicated that 57 senators were ready to support a comprehensive test ban treaty. The New York Times stated on 28 July that it was expected that "the Treaty would have the support of perhaps 80 of the 100 senators on the strength of the argument that rejection would be a heavy blow to the prestige of the US as a seeker of the peace."

A recent public opinion poll (Washington Post, 8 July) showed that 73% of the public polled favoured a test ban agreement, as against 17% who indicated some opposition.

Among the Republicans who have indicated support are former Presidents Hoover and Eisenhower, and Nixon, McCloy and Wadsworth. Avowed opposition has come from Senator Goldwater and Congressman Hosmer. The Chairmen of the three important Senate Committees -- Senators Russell, Stennis and Jackson -- reserved judgment until the Administration's testimony. It is noteworthy that during the past year many detailed hearings were held on a comprehensive test ban and those who were prepared to oppose any such ban with less than seven on-site inspections seem to have been caught by surprise by the partial test ban. By the time a new opposition group is formed, the necessary majority is likely to be in the hands of President Kennedy.

The issues that may give the Administration spokesmen the most trouble are the ban's effect on the development of an anti-missile defence; the possibility of clandestine tests in outer space; the disutility of the Treaty as far as China and France are concerned, and the doubts about Soviet motivations. However, on all these issues, the Administration has already given seemingly convincing testimony. Barring some new disclosures as a result of the close scrutiny by Senate Committees, the President's assertion that it is in the national interest, and the world's generally favourable reaction should override marginal doubts.

III. The Test Ban in relation to Foreign Policy

The agreement on the partial test ban treaty shortly after the agreement on the communications link between Moscow and Washington strengthens the view that both sides recognize the collaborative element in their policy to avoid nuclear war without any loss of strategic, political or ideological position.
Since President Kennedy's American University address on 10 June, Administration officials have emphasized the immediate practical and favourable consequences of Khrushchev's policy of coexistence, without overlooking the constancy of the basic challenge on the part of Communist countries and ideology. Challenge in the political and economic areas of conflict is deemed preferable to an attempt by the USSR to gain military superiority in a costly arms race.

It is also important to understand that President Kennedy, bearing in mind the presidential election due for next year, is seeking to prove to the American people that his policy of a realistic approach to the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union has proved to be the right one. It seems certain in the circumstances that he would take every opportunity in the future to achieve negotiated settlements with the Soviet Union which would not in any way adversely affect the interests of the United States.

The development of new and ever more powerful weapons of war has made the nuclear Powers uneasy about all their past concepts and assumptions on military strategy. Similarly, the ever-present danger of unintended war is having a frightening effect on the peoples of the world. These factors have brought about a new concept of war and peace.

Economic considerations have also had their significant impact. There is a growing demand for not only putting a stop to the increasing defence expenditures but for reduction of the same and diversion of the savings for the improvement of world economic and social conditions. Aid to the developing countries has a very important place in the foreign policies of both the United States and the Soviet Union.

The connection between the recent agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union and the reported deepening rift between the Soviet Union and China appears to have been overplayed by many. The Sino-Soviet differences must be viewed realistically. While the recent talks between the Soviet Union and China have apparently brought about no reconciliation, it must be borne in mind that the ties between the two countries, and particularly the mutual defence pact, still exist. While it seems incontestable that the Soviet Union, in its negotiations and even agreements with the United States, is seeking to prove the soundness of the policy of coexistence, it would be wrong to assume, as some commentators do, that, without the Sino-Soviet differences, these agreements would not have been possible or even that the rift has been the main reason for the evolvement of the present propitious atmosphere.

The spirit of understanding and accommodation is reflected also in relation to the problem of Germany and Berlin. While there has been no basic shift in Soviet policy on these questions, it is significant that there is a mutual desire to settle the problem, taking into account the interests of all parties concerned.
Strategically, the United States seems to recognize the objective grounds for Soviet fears of a possible surprise attack and of potential catalytic behaviour especially on the part of Germany.

IV. Possible Next Steps

The Moscow communiqué and Treaty foreshadow priority for a ban on underground tests and a non-aggression agreement. The latter can cause difficulties in NATO, especially after France's negative attitude to arrangements which she has alleged were concluded "over her head". The fact, however, is that the US, for over a year, has considered parallel pledges of non-aggressive intent a reasonable objective, provided it led to explicit guarantees of access to West Berlin. West Germany has apparently not been opposed to exploration of such an arrangement and, in the past, it has to a large extent determined NATO policy in Central Europe. Should opportunities open up for inspection in Central Europe, the non-aggression pledge should be even more acceptable to the United States, but perhaps less so to West Germany.

Mr. Khrushchev's enumeration of subsequent steps on 19 July doubtless impressed the US, if only because it omits such previously unacceptable measures as the elimination of military bases; demilitarized European zones, and renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons. In a positive sense, Mr. Khrushchev's renewal of the suggestion for control posts for the prevention of surprise attack, especially at airfields, could lead to the early renewal of surprise attack talks which have been adjourned sine die since December 1958. Although the US has always favoured such arrangements, and probably continues to do so, the strategic requirements have changed since 1958, and the US no longer expects or fears a surprise nuclear attack by the Soviet Union and has secured its retaliatory capability. In any event, this is one subject on which the US would seem well prepared for early agreement.

The other specific Soviet proposal which seems to coincide with US thinking, and therefore likely to be seized as an early topic for negotiation, is that for an exchange of military observers in East and West Germany. While the territorial definition is bound to raise US opposition, the basic idea is similar to that put forward in some detail by the United States in December 1962 and by the United Kingdom as far back as 1955.
Here again the US would seem to be prepared technically to move towards agreement.

Among the measures that the US could be expected to push are prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons; cut-off of future fissile production; ban on the orbiting of weapons of mass destruction, and a first stage disarmament agreement with emphasis on the adaptation of Mr. Gromyko's 1962 proposal for the retention of a strictly limited number of missiles in both countries.

V. Role of the United Nations

The test ban treaty makes two references to the United Nations. Firstly, the preamble proclaims as the principal aim "the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations". Paragraph 6 of Article III states that the Treaty "shall be registered by the depository governments pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations."

In considering the possibility of a closer association of the Treaty with the United Nations, the Secretary-General could take advantage of the two opportunities that will present themselves, one at the signing of the Treaty by the three Powers in Moscow next week and again at the time of the registration of the Treaty with the United Nations. Appropriate statements could be made by the Secretary-General on these two occasions. At least on the second occasion, where the Secretariat will necessarily have to make the practical arrangements, it should be the aim to arrange for an impressive function, possibly at the beginning of the next session of the General Assembly, when a large number of Foreign Ministers of the Member States will be present here.

The conclusion of the test ban agreement is undoubtedly the first significant break-through in the protracted and at times seemingly frustrating negotiations over the years. It is extremely important that the role of the United Nations and, in particular, that of the Secretary-General in providing the necessary link in bringing about agreed solutions should be constantly stressed. This is obviously possible only if the Secretary-General is kept fully informed by the parties concerned of the developments in future negotiations which, it is safe to assume, will cover broader issues aimed at the relaxation of tension.
N.S. KHURUSHCHOV'S 70th BIRTHDAY

The 70th birthday of Nikita Khrushchov, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, falls due on April 17.

On this occasion the Novosty Press Agency (APN) distributed Khrushchov's biography. Here follows an abridged text of the biography.

Nikita Sergeyevich KHURUSHCHOV, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, was born 70 years ago, on April 17, 1894, in the village of Kalinovka, Kursk region, which lies in the heart of European Russia. His grandfather had been a serf. His father was a miner.

The working life of Nikita Khrushchov began very early. He herded cattle in summer when he was a boy, attending the village school during the winter. Then he worked for a rich landowner. At the age of fifteen he joined his father in the Donets coal basin, where he worked as a fitter in mines and factories.

The most politically advanced miners and steel workers in the Donbas were waging an active struggle for their rights and an end to exploitation. A young man with a keen, inquisitive turn of mind, Nikita soon espoused the cause of the workers' emancipation and began to take part in organizing miners' strikes.

In the autumn of 1917, the Socialist revolution triumphed in Russia under the guidance of the Communist party and its leader, Lenin. All power in the country passed into the hands of the people. With other active workers and intellectuals Nikita Khrushchov enthusiastically threw himself into the work of setting up the first Soviets in the miners' towns. In 1918 he joined the Communist party.
The young Soviet Republic soon came to resemble a besieged fortress. Practically the whole capitalist world was pitted against the new Russia. Many communists volunteered for the front immediately after joining the party in order to fight the foreign interventionists and internal counterrevolutionaries. That was what Nikita Khrushchov did, too. He was at the front, in the fighting ranks, throughout the civil war, from 1918 to 1920, conducting political propaganda among the men.

After the civil war Khrushchov returned to the Donbas where he was appointed assistant manager of a mine. He proved to be a good organizer. Soon the party organization of the mine offered him the opportunity to attend the workers' faculty at the Donetsk industrial institute. After finishing the workers' faculty Khrushchov was elected secretary of the Petrovsko-Maryinsky district committee of the party in the Donbas, then worked in party committees in Donetsk and Kiev.

In 1929 Khrushchov entered the Industrial Academy in Moscow where he was elected secretary of the Party committee by his fellow students.

That was in the period of the first five-year plan when the main goal before the Communist party and the nation was rapid industrialisation. Khrushchov had by that time come through a great schooling in life. His political experience was combined with an extensive knowledge of economic construction.

In 1931 he was elected Secretary of a Moscow District Party Committee, and then Secretary of the Moscow Regional and City Party Committees. At the 17th Party Congress in 1934 Khrushchov was elected to the Central Committee of the CPSU, and since has been elected to it at every Party Congress.

In 1938 Khrushchov was elected First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine. There his organizational ability manifested itself with particular force. The Ukrainian people in those years achieved big successes in all spheres of building a new life. In the same year Khrushchov was elected alternate member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and, in 1939, after the 18th Party Congress, member of the Political Bureau. He had become one of the most popular political leaders in the country.

Khrushchov was with the Army in the field throughout the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people against the German fascist invaders. His name is connected with the decisive battles of Volgograd and Kursk and the liberation of the Donbas and the Ukraine.
The war brought Khrushchov a great personal loss. His eldest son Leonid, a flyer, perished in 1943 in action against enemy aircraft...

After the war Khrushchov continued to work at his post as First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine. He played a big part in the economic advance of the Republic, in raising the cultural standards and well-being of the Ukrainian people.

In 1949 he was elected Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU and at the same time First Secretary of the Moscow Regional Committee of the Party. In March 1953, after Stalin’s death, it was found necessary that Khrushchov should devote himself entirely to the work in the Central Committee of the CPSU, in view of which he was relieved of his duties at the Moscow Committee of the Party. In September 1953 he was elected First Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU. In March 1958 Khrushchov became Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

One often reads in the foreign press that the rise of the erstwhile shepherd boy and miner Khrushchov to his present high position is nothing short of a "mystery", an inexplicable "riddle". But here is Khrushchov’s own explanation of the phenomenon: “The revolution opened the doors of education, of science, to the workers, to all the working people of our country, I am only another example of that kind of revolutionary advancement”.

His indivisible bond with the people is the most revealing trait of the Head of the Soviet Government. He has always endeavoured to be in the thick of the people’s life and pays close heed to their thoughts and general mood. Distance does not prevent him from frequently visiting factories, building sites, collective farms, educational and research institutes, and the families of workers and collective farmers up and down the length and breadth of the land. He stops to talk to people in the street, in shops, out in the fields. He always speaks frankly and likes to take the bull by the horns.

In the responsible posts he has been entrusted with by the people, N.S. Khrushchov has followed the policies collectively worked out by the Presidium of the Central Committee, the Plenary Meetings of the Party’s Central Committee, the Congresses of the CPSU, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

"Our goal", ha said once, “is to do everything best for people. A Communist is happy when he achieves happiness for all people".
His guiding principle could be thus defined: to build communism, taking careful stock of the possibilities of the country and the people, so that the present generation will also be able to enjoy the wonderful fruits of a society of abundance."

After Stalin's death, the Leninist core of the Central Committee of the CPSU launched a determined fight against the personality cult and its consequences. N.S. Khrushchov was the moving spirit and leader of that historical fight. In February 1956, at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, he levelled principled criticism at the Stalin personality cult alien to Marxism-Leninism. The Congress ruled that the Central Committee had issued a perfectly correct and timely denunciation of the personality cult, and instructed the Central Committee to ensure the complete overcoming of its harmful consequences in all spheres of Party, Government, economic and ideological work, to create firm guarantees for such phenomena never to occur again in the Party and the country.

The years following 1953 stand out in Soviet history. Soviet industrial output increased 2.7 times in the ten years.

"We have grown accustomed," Khrushchov said at the December Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee in 1963, "to high rates of growth of our economy, and consider them ordinary and natural. But just think, comrades, of the meaning of these figures: side by side with the giant that our industry was in 1953 there have emerged two more such giants in one decade! Exclamation this, like a flight into outer space, takes one's breath away. We have every reason to be proud, every reason to rejoice!"

The Party has drawn up measures for the accelerated development of the chemical industry as the most progressive branch of the country's economy. In the next seven years (1964-1970) the USSR plans to build 200 new chemical establishments and to reconstruct 500 operating chemical enterprises. Attention will chiefly be paid to the development of mineral fertilizer production and to consumer goods output.

Stressing the great importance the Party attaches to chemistry, Khrushchov said:

"Lenin said that communism is Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country. Were Lenin alive today he would probably say it in this way: communism is Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country, plus the chemicalization of the national economy."

The changes in agriculture in these years have been truly gigantic. The output and state purchase of farm products have greatly increased. Even in 1963, marked by a severe drought over 1.4 times more grain, nearly 2.6 times more meat, and nearly 2.7 times more milk were purchased than in 1953.

The decade has proved exceptionally fruitful for the development of science and technology. The network of research establishments has grown considerably in size and strength. The number of research workers has reached the enormous figure of 580,000. Guidance of scientific research has been improved in every way in order to provide the most favourable conditions for the work of the scientists, and to consolidate the ties of science with production, with life. Outstanding achievements of Soviet scientists in the solution of problems of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, space conquest, mathematics and geology, as well as industrial automation, have won general recognition.

The entire meaning of the activity of the Communist Party lies in its concern for the welfare of the people. The living standard of the Soviet people steadily rose in the past decade.

Large-scale housing construction has been launched in the country. In the past ten years 108 million people, that is, about half of the entire population of the USSR, moved into new flats. One of the most far-reaching social measures was the big increase in pension allotments, a measure that affected the welfare of 26 million people. Pensions are now from two to two and a half times larger than before.

The socialist culture of the Soviet peoples rapidly developed in the past decade. At present, 64 million people, i.e., one-third of the country's population, excluding children of pre-school age, are engaged in some form of study at schools and courses. Every other Soviet working man or woman has a secondary or higher education.

The noble principles of socialist democracy are being consistently put into effect. Strict observance of socialist legality has been guaranteed. The drafts of all important laws, plans and reforms are placed before the people for their consideration and endorsement.

Khrushchov's energetic organizational activities do not at all mean that he allows practice to push theory into the background.
In 1956, at the 20th Party Congress, Khrushchov presented a number of profound theoretical principles on pressing problems of international life. Creatively advancing Lenin’s idea of the peaceful coexistence of the two systems, in conformity with present-day conditions, the Congress came to a conclusion that war was no longer inevitable and could be everted in the modern period. That idea, put forward for the first time at the Congress, has been fully confirmed by the entire course of subsequent events.

A scientific explanation of the fundamental processes of social development in the USSR and throughout the world during the recent historical period can be found in the programme of the CPSU adopted by the 22nd Congress, the drafting of which took place with Khrushchov’s active participation. The CPSU programme is a new stage in the creative development of Marxism-Leninism.

N.S. Khrushchov devotes much attention at all times to the problems of culture of a new society, the problems of the development of the literature and art of the peoples of the USSR.

Khrushchov has been working tirelessly and consistently to implement the foreign policy of the Soviet Government that was originally laid down by Lenin—the policy of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. It will be no exaggeration to say that owing to the unflagging efforts of Khrushchov, the principles of peaceful coexistence have been taking firmer and firmer root in international relations in the past decade.

Khrushchov’s diplomatic activities are inseparably bound up with all the important acts in support of peace that have taken place in the past decade. Suffice it to recall such historical achievements as the peaceful settlement of the dangerous crisis in the Caribbean in the autumn of 1962 or the conclusion of the Moscow Treaty banning nuclear tests in the three spheres in the summer of 1963. Also closely associated with N.S. Khrushchov’s name is the great peace programme of our time, the plan for general and complete disarmament under strict international control, which the Soviet Premier introduced in a speech at the U.N. General Assembly.

On the eve of 1964, Khrushchov came forward with another important proposal to the Heads of State (Government). In this Message of Peace he called for an agreement on renunciation of force in territorial disputes. This Message met with wide support from the world public and the Governments of the vast majority of countries.
There is not a single sphere of international life to which N.S. Khrushchov has not made a fruitful contribution.

Khrushchov is an ardent champion of the complete abolition of colonialism, the granting of freedom to all peoples and the rendering of all-round assistance to the newly-independent countries in Asia and Africa in the development of their economy and culture.

Khrushchov has made an invaluable contribution to the activities of the CPSU and the Soviet Government in the strengthening of fraternal relations between the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community.

Faithful to Lenin's behest on the need to preserve the unity of the international Communist movement, Khrushchov tirelessly works to rally all Communist and Workers' parties, on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist teaching, against both right-wing opportunism and dissenters who take refuge in "left" phraseology.

Nikita Khrushchov is approaching his 70th birthday as tirelessly active as ever. "I've still got some fight in me," he says when asked about his health. He is strong, cheerful and full of energy. He likes hunting and walking in the woods. He has four children, six grandchildren and a great-granddaughter. They are all well. His wife, Nina Petrovna, is also in excellent health.

Both Nikita Khrushchov's fellow-countrymen and all people of good will send him sincere wishes for a long and happy life.
KIS EXCELLENCY

MR. NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV
CHAIRMAN
COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF USSR
MOSCOW (USSR)

ON THE AUSPICIOUS OCCASION OF YOUR SEVENTIETH BIRTHDAY I WISH TO OFFER YOUR EXCELLENCY MY PERSONAL FELICITATIONS AND WARMEST GOOD WISHES. IN MY OWN COUNTRY SEVENTY YEARS IS A MAN'S LIFE ARE DEEMED TO MARK AN EPOCH. IN YOUR EXCELLENCY'S CASE I HOPE THAT FOR MANY YEARS TO COME YOU WILL CONTINUE TO MAKE A GREAT CONTRIBUTION TO THE WELFARE OF YOUR PEOPLE. I ALSO CHERISH THE HOPE THAT YOUR EXCELLENCY WILL CONTINUE TO PLAY A SIGNIFICANT ROLE IN THE REDUCTION OF TENSIONS AND PROMOTION OF BETTER UNDERSTANDING AMONG NATIONS, IN SUPPORT FOR THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CHARTER AND IN EFFORTS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY.

U Thant
SECRETARY-GENERAL
UNITED NATIONS

cc: Mr. Gaslov
Mr. Lemieux

C. V. Harasimhan, Chef de Cabinet
Cable

Date: 25 July 1964

From: Anastas Mikoyan, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Moscow

To: The Secretary-General

Wish to thank you for cordial congratulations on occasion of my election to post of Chairman of Presidium of Supreme Soviet of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Take this opportunity to wish you good health and success in your noble work of upholding peace throughout the world.
Statement

By Khrushchev

N. Khrushchev made the following Statement to the press:

"It is seen from reports of the press in the United States and some other capitalist countries that the so-called memoirs or reminiscences of N.S. Khrushchev are now being prepared for publication. This is a fabrication and I am indignant at this. I have never passed on memoirs or materials of this nature either to the "Time" or other foreign publishing houses. I did not turn over such materials to the Soviet publishing houses either. Therefore, I declare that this is a fabrication. The venal bourgeois press was many times exposed of such lies.

N. KHRUSHCHEV"
Notes From the Russian Underground

By BERNARD GWERTZMAN
Special to The New York Times

MOSCOW, Aug. 21—A sampling of a monthly underground newsletter that circulated for nearly seven years among a small group of Soviet intellectuals has been made available for publication abroad.

The typewritten publication, titled Politicheskii Donetsk, was distributed to foreigners until its editors decided to give it all 70 issues to some Western correspondents—so that people abroad would have a better idea of what was on the mind of "liberal socialists," as one described them, living in the Soviet Union.

The Diary apparently came out regularly from the time of the ouster of Nikita S. Khrushchev in October, 1964, until late last year or early this year. It is understood that the editors—who have refused to divulge their names for publication—have suspended publication and are considering a new format.

Thinking of Intelligentsia

The issues provided to newsmen represent the thinking of at least one segment of the Soviet intelligentsia in the period of the Brezhnev-Kosygin leadership.

Totaling more than 530 pages, or some 165,000 words, the 19 selected issues of the typewritten publication often has anonymous authors, whose articles are of a genre that is usually unsigned, transcripts, or exposing Stalinist incidents excepts from unpublished books, snatches from foreign publications, and some political gossip or speculation.

The Diary falls in the category of what is known as "samizdat" (self-publishing) and reflects the virtues and drawbacks of that increasingly popular genre. Since it is un-censored, it reflects more spontaneity and more discussion of sensitive issues than the usual official publication.

But because it is put together secretly, the typical samizdat publication often has an anonymous author whom the editors have named for the sake of safety. This one includes what are said to be authentic documents, and an observer has no readily available way of checking. In general, nonetheless, the reliability of samizdat has proved quite high.

Willing to Risk Consequences

The political point of view espoused by the Diary reflects that of the liberal intelligentsia, especially those relatively few who are willing to risk the consequences of speaking out, even in this limited way.

Like most other underground publications in the Soviet Union, the Diary, which had a very small regular readership—perhaps a nucleus of 50—has had little influence on the thinking of the Kremlin leaders. On virtually every problem discussed in the publication, its editors have appeared to be at cross-purposes with the official line.

The Diary has supported the political formation of liberal thought and opinion in the Soviet Union. A typical issue consists of essays, either verbatim or paraphrased, of what were supposed to have been closed meetings; reprints of letters, editorials or documents exposing liberal causes or exposing Stalinist incidents; excerpts from unpublished books, snatches from foreign publications, and some political gossip or speculation.

The Diary has been closed meetings; reprints of letters, editorials or documents exposing liberal causes or exposing Stalinist incidents; excerpts from unpublished books, snatches from foreign publications, and some political gossip or speculation.

The Diary falls in the category of what is known as "samizdat" (self-publishing) and reflects the virtues and drawbacks of that increasingly popular genre. Since it is un-censored, it reflects more spontaneity and more discussion of sensitive issues than the usual official publication.

But because it is put together secretly, the typical samizdat publication often has an anonymous author whom the editors have named for the sake of safety. This one includes what are said to be authentic documents, and an observer has no readily available way of checking. In general, nonetheless, the reliability of samizdat has proved quite high.

Willing to Risk Consequences

The political point of view espoused by the Diary reflects that of the liberal intelligentsia, especially those relatively few who are willing to risk the consequences of speaking out, even in this limited way.

Like most other underground publications in the Soviet Union, the Diary, which had a very small regular readership—perhaps a nucleus of 50—has had little influence on the thinking of the Kremlin leaders. On virtually every problem discussed in the publication, its editors have appeared to be at cross-purposes with the official line.

The Diary has supported the political formation of liberal thought and opinion in the Soviet Union. A typical issue consists of essays, either verbatim or paraphrased, of what were supposed to have been closed meetings; reprints of letters, editorials or documents exposing liberal causes or exposing Stalinist incidents; excerpts from unpublished books, snatches from foreign publications, and some political gossip or speculation.

The Diary falls in the category of what is known as "samizdat" (self-publishing) and reflects the virtues and drawbacks of that increasingly popular genre. Since it is un-censored, it reflects more spontaneity and more discussion of sensitive issues than the usual official publication.

But because it is put together secretly, the typical samizdat publication often has an anonymous author whom the editors have named for the sake of safety. This one includes what are said to be authentic documents, and an observer has no readily available way of checking. In general, nonetheless, the reliability of samizdat has proved quite high.

Willing to Risk Consequences

The political point of view espoused by the Diary reflects that of the liberal intelligentsia, especially those relatively few who are willing to risk the consequences of speaking out, even in this limited way.

Like most other underground publications in the Soviet Union, the Diary, which had a very small regular readership—perhaps a nucleus of 50—has had little influence on the thinking of the Kremlin leaders. On virtually every problem discussed in the publication, its editors have appeared to be at cross-purposes with the official line.

The Diary has supported the political formation of liberal thought and opinion in the Soviet Union. A typical issue consists of essays, either verbatim or paraphrased, of what were supposed to have been closed meetings; reprints of letters, editorials or documents exposing liberal causes or exposing Stalinist incidents; excerpts from unpublished books, snatches from foreign publications, and some political gossip or speculation.

The Diary falls in the category of what is known as "samizdat" (self-publishing) and reflects the virtues and drawbacks of that increasingly popular genre. Since it is un-censored, it reflects more spontaneity and more discussion of sensitive issues than the usual official publication.

But because it is put together secretly, the typical samizdat publication often has an anonymous author whom the editors have named for the sake of safety. This one includes what are said to be authentic documents, and an observer has no readily available way of checking. In general, nonetheless, the reliability of samizdat has proved quite high.

Willing to Risk Consequences

The political point of view espoused by the Diary reflects that of the liberal intelligentsia, especially those relatively few who are willing to risk the consequences of speaking out, even in this limited way.

Like most other underground publications in the Soviet Union, the Diary, which had a very small regular readership—perhaps a nucleus of 50—has had little influence on the thinking of the Kremlin leaders. On virtually every problem discussed in the publication, its editors have appeared to be at cross-purposes with the official line.

The Diary has supported the political formation of liberal thought and opinion in the Soviet Union. A typical issue consists of essays, either verbatim or paraphrased, of what were supposed to have been closed meetings; reprints of letters, editorials or documents exposing liberal causes or exposing Stalinist incidents; excerpts from unpublished books, snatches from foreign publications, and some political gossip or speculation.

The Diary falls in the category of what is known as "samizdat" (self-publishing) and reflects the virtues and drawbacks of that increasingly popular genre. Since it is un-censored, it reflects more spontaneity and more discussion of sensitive issues than the usual official publication.

But because it is put together secretly, the typical samizdat publication often has an anonymous author whom the editors have named for the sake of safety. This one includes what are said to be authentic documents, and an observer has no readily available way of checking. In general, nonetheless, the reliability of samizdat has proved quite high.

Willing to Risk Consequences

The political point of view espoused by the Diary reflects that of the liberal intelligentsia, especially those relatively few who are willing to risk the consequences of speaking out, even in this limited way.

Like most other underground publications in the Soviet Union, the Diary, which had a very small regular readership—perhaps a nucleus of 50—has had little influence on the thinking of the Kremlin leaders. On virtually every problem discussed in the publication, its editors have appeared to be at cross-purposes with the official line.

The Diary has supported the political formation of liberal thought and opinion in the Soviet Union. A typical issue consists of essays, either verbatim or paraphrased, of what were supposed to have been closed meetings; reprints of letters, editorials or documents exposing liberal causes or exposing Stalinist incidents; excerpts from unpublished books, snatches from foreign publications, and some political gossip or speculation.

The Diary falls in the category of what is known as "samizdat" (self-publishing) and reflects the virtues and drawbacks of that increasingly popular genre. Since it is un-censored, it reflects more spontaneity and more discussion of sensitive issues than the usual official publication.

But because it is put together secretly, the typical samizdat publication often has an anonymous author whom the editors have named for the sake of safety. This one includes what are said to be authentic documents, and an observer has no readily available way of checking. In general, nonetheless, the reliability of samizdat has proved quite high.

Willing to Risk Consequences

The political point of view espoused by the Diary reflects that of the liberal intelligentsia, especially those relatively few who are willing to risk the consequences of speaking out, even in this limited way.

Like most other underground publications in the Soviet Union, the Diary, which had a very small regular readership—perhaps a nucleus of 50—has had little influence on the thinking of the Kremlin leaders. On virtually every problem discussed in the publication, its editors have appeared to be at cross-purposes with the official line.

The Diary has supported the political formation of liberal thought and opinion in the Soviet Union. A typical issue consists of essays, either verbatim or paraphrased, of what were supposed to have been closed meetings; reprints of letters, editorials or documents exposing liberal causes or exposing Stalinist incidents; excerpts from unpublished books, snatches from foreign publications, and some political gossip or speculation.

The Diary falls in the category of what is known as "samizdat" (self-publishing) and reflects the virtues and drawbacks of that increasingly popular genre. Since it is un-censored, it reflects more spontaneity and more discussion of sensitive issues than the usual official publication.

But because it is put together secretly, the typical samizdat publication often has an anonymous author whom the editors have named for the sake of safety. This one includes what are said to be authentic documents, and an observer has no readily available way of checking. In general, nonetheless, the reliability of samizdat has proved quite high.
The Solzhenitsyn affair came to a crisis point during a conference of the Writers Union in May, 1967, when the writer Andrei A. Yevchek was allowed to open a letter discussing censorship and harassment at that conference. This provoked a further exchange. The issue died down until November, 1969, when Andrey was expelled from the union and joined the editors of the Diary, believing threatened with arrest. But the novelist's popularity remained high. In December, 1969, the Diary published the results of a 1968 poll by Literary Gazette, whose results were suppressed. The survey of readers' preferences was mailed to one out of every four subscribers and was answered by about 10,000 people.

The most popular journals found to be Novy Mir and Yustos, and the most admired authors of recent years were Vladimir Sorokin, a chronicler of World War II; the late Mikhail Bulgakov, whose posthumously published "The Master and Margarita" was a bestseller; and Mr. Solzhenitsyn's colleagues Yevgeny Yevtushenko and Vsevolod Morozov, ranked second.

Of foreign-policy issues that concerned the editors of the Diary, the events in Czechoslovakia and the Middle East and Chinese crises seem the most important. More than passing attention was given to problems of arms control, possibly because of the editors' admiration for Dr. Andrei D. Sakharov, the physicist, who has called for greater restraint in the arms race.

Dr. Sakharov, engaged in an exchange of views with a Soviet journalist, Yevgeni Yevtushenko, was published in the Diary in 1967. In that discussion Dr. Sakharov said he and his colleagues were interested in a possible moratorium on antiballistic missile systems.

The physicist asserted that an ABM system was unworkable because of the offense it would give the defense.

Soviet policy toward the Arab countries, in particular toward Egypt, has caused some discussion among articles on the question of the Middle East crisis, especially the six-day war in June, 1967, brought to the surface long-standing Israeli-Arab resentment against Soviet involvement on the Arab side. An article published that month by an anonymous commentator probably represented a common view: "Soviet policy toward the Arab countries, in particular toward Egypt, has caused some resentment on the part of our friends in the West as the representatives of the majority of the Soviet people. It aroused a weak response among those who agreed with the editors of the Chronicle of Current Events, which has appeared every two weeks since 1965, the Diary began to carry more items about court cases and accounts of people who had been unjustly deprived of their freedom.

Typical of the disquiet was a letter dated February, 1966, and sent by an educator to Premier Kosygin. The letter, printed in the Diary, said people had "a great many questions to which they are not getting direct answers, either in the press or on the radio, in the speeches of our party and Government leaders."

"It is not surprising that many of our people are beginning to find answers in foreign radio broadcasts."

In conclusion, the celebration of the centennial of Lenin's birth in 1970 were assessed as follows: "Unfortunately, much of the activity has been of a formal and pompous character. The Lenin anniversary was not used for a profound scientific analysis of the future course and for an examination of those problems that today stand before our people and the state. Among the colossal number of publications on the Lenin theme there were few that did not repeat obvious truths or well-known facts about the life and activity of Lenin."

"The huge and expensive propaganda campaign left a lasting impression in the minds of the majority of the Soviet people. It aroused a weak response among those who agreed with the editors of the Chronicle of Current Events, which has appeared every two weeks since 1965, the Diary began to carry more items about court cases and accounts of people who had been unjustly deprived of their freedom."

Typical of the disquiet was a letter dated February, 1966, and sent by an educator to Premier Kosygin. The letter, printed in the Diary, said people had "a great many questions to which they are not getting direct answers, either in the press or on the radio, in the speeches of our party and Government leaders."

"It is not surprising that many of our people are beginning to find answers in foreign radio broadcasts."
MOSCOW, Aug. 21—Following are samples of the underground Soviet newsletter Politichesky Dnevnik (Political Diary), as translated by Bernard and Marie-Jeanne Gwertzman. The first purports to be the substance of remarks at a local party meeting in 1964 by Anastas I. Mikoyan, then a member of the Kremlin leadership, in explanation of the ouster of Nikita S. Khrushchev as party leader and Premier by the group headed by Leonid I. Brezhnev and Aleksei N. Kosygin. The second sample consists of excerpts from an unsigned article, published after the six-day Arab-Israeli war in 1967, discussing what is described as widespread opposition to Moscow’s support of the Arabs against Israel.

**Mikoyan and Khrushchev**

We cannot deny the merits of Khrushchev. They were great in the fight for peace and for the liquidation of the consequences of the cult of the personality. In the development of socialist democracy, in the preparation and convening of important congresses—the 20th, 21st and 22nd—and in the adoption of the party program.

But as time went on, Comrade Khrushchev’s mistakes and serious shortcomings accumulated in his work and leadership. These shortcomings to a significant degree were caused by his subjective attitude and his age—he already was 70—and by a sclerotic condition. In connection with this, he became short-tempered, fidgety, impatient and restless. He could not work more than three hours in any one place. He sought to be continuously on the move and on trips. He was inclined in all his actions to improvise, to solve problems on the run. His speeches contained more emotion than reason. Once he began to speak, he could not stop, You have read many of his good speeches, but the Central Committee had to correct all of them because, in the course of a speech, he departed from the theme and said much more than was in the text.

As a rule he did not confine himself to the time limit, and his speeches dragged on for an extra one-and-a-half to two hours. In his speeches he often repeated himself. Comrades from the Central Committee told him to speak a little less about himself and not to repeat the same thing, and to give others an opportunity to speak. Pawning over Khrushchev became widespread in the press. Irritability, intolerance to criticism—these features were also not to the liking of those comrades whom he moved into leadership work.

When agriculture deteriorated, serious difficulties arose. Khrushchev did not begin to look for the deep objective reasons but began harassing people, transferring them, although the reasons for the difficulties did not lie with people. Not all people are geniuses. One can abuse them, but that does not help matters.

Khrushchev suffered from an organizational itch. He had an inclination toward endless reorganizations. Why was the party leadership divided into industrial and agricultural areas and why were industrial and agricultural regions and district committees created?

When that plan was proposed to the members of the Presidium and members of the Central Committee, the motives of the division and the specialization of the party leadership seemed logically very convincing on the surface. It seemed to us that a universal leadership was less effective and that a division would raise the level of the leadership, make it concrete, bring it closer to production.

The opposite results turned out. The Lenninst-territorial leadership of our party was destroyed. The division contradicted the party rules. We have no antagonistic classes. There are friendly classes of workers and peasants. But differences remain between them, and the party must take them into account. The unity of workers and peasants is a basic law under which the leading role must remain with the working class. And what happened? Such a reorganization led not to a narrowing but to widening of the gap between the workers and peasants. In the local regions intolerable conditions were created for services for the popula-
The Six-Day War

The defeat of the Arabs was an extremely painful diplomatic setback for the Soviet Union. It was significant that despite this a significant part of the population of our country, and especially the intelligentsia, has taken a position quite different from the official view.

The position of a significant part of the intelligentsia is characterized not so much by sympathy as by unfriendliness toward the Arab leaders who suffered defeat. This is more pro-Israeli than a pro-Arab position.

I have observed no outbursts of anti-Semitic feeling. The sympathy of many of the intelligentsia for Israel explains not only the fact that there are many Jews within our intelligentsia, for similar positions were taken by the Russian part of the intelligentsia. G.F. reports that those feelings were characteristic also for the Ukrainian and Moldavian intelligentsia. A basic reason for this, it seems to me, can be found in the general opposition (partly also Western) feelings that characterize many leading intellectuals now.

To a large degree, of course, much of the information of the intelligentsia about the events is second-hand (a large number of people in June listened not to Soviet but to British and American and, to some extent, Israeli broadcasts).

There is evidence that in May 1967, the Soviet Union was against the withdrawal of United Nations troops from Arab territory and against the blockade of the Agaba Strait. But Nasser, believing in his superiority, acted independently and handed us a fait accompli. In these difficult conditions the Soviet Union, having aligned itself too closely with Egypt, lacked freedom to maneuver and had to support Nasser.

Believing that, with our diplomatic and military protection, he did not have to fear direct American intervention, Nasser evidently wanted a victory over Israel to achieve his hegemony in the Arab world. In analyzing the events in the Middle East, our press was silent about the blockade of the Agaba Strait and the pullout of the United Nations troops, which were not simply provocations but acts of aggression.

The old—new is, Shvernik and Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Kosygin, Podgorny. (3) The middle—Brezhnev, Kosygin, Podgorny. (4) The young—Shelepkin, Shelest, although in age they are not so young. Brezhnev is 56, about the same as Kosygin. Kozlov is hopelessly sick. Shelepkin and Shelest are 46. They all have great experience in party and economic work. I was a People's Commissar for 30 years.

Khrushchev was constantly on trips. Therefore, Brezhnev, in fact, directed the Central Committee organization and Kosygin the Council of Ministers.

And so a good deed was done. Now a normal atmosphere has been established in the leadership of the Central Committee. Everyone speaks freely, but earlier they were reticent. Now everyone talks, and earlier only Khrushchev spoke. Now the Leninist leadership exists in practice. The Central Committee has great experience, the changes will benefit the people and soon this will be felt in practice.

The creation of 12 committees to guide specialized sectors of agriculture—livestock, crop growing, cotton growing and separate industrial enterprises, poulty farms, etc., for every such committee there would be created its own machinery with the number of employees up to 500 to 600 men. He also proposed to create political sections under these committees, in this way to reduce the role of party organizations of the collective farms and state farms. The Central Committee explained to him that such a type of leadership in a military format resembled the Chinese method. He was shown the absurdity of his proposals. They were put aside and rejected.

It was not normal to go over to a seven-year plan. When the planning organs prepared a seven-year draft, Khrushchev proposed to Satyukov [editor of Pravda] to publish it in Pravda without preliminary examination in the Presidium of the Central Committee and in a plenary meeting. In such a way, the Central Committee was faced with a published draft and there was nothing for it to do but justify it. Now we are going on to the five-year plans.

When the Khrushchev issue was raised in the Presidium of the Central Committee, 22 people spoke, in a businesslike way, without abuse. Khrushchev defended himself. We did not make public the secret details about all this, not wanting to wash our dirty linen in public and not wanting to exaggerate it. We decided to inform the party and the people by word of mouth. I believe we acted on Comrade Khrushchev according to the rules.

The entire Presidium has remained virtually without change. There are three general secretaries: Brezhnev, Kosygin and Podgorny.
Novelist Penelope Mortimer has just returned from a holiday in Russia, where she found that life was not as rosy as it might be—as she explains in this open letter to Mr Kosygin.

Thank you for having us, but...

Kosygin meets the people—on a visit to Britain

Only in Russia does one reluctantly begin to think so.

You are proud, even smug, to have produced what you call a classless society. But this, of course, is illusion. What possible equality is there between you, in your limousine with its curtained windows, pouting out of the Kremlin on your way to your dacha, and a good dinner, and the women labourers who lean on their pickaxes to watch you pass? The barriers of privilege are insuperable in Russia, since knowledge of the outside world is accessible only to the favoured few.

The average teacher of English in your schools sincerely believes that Western literature died with Galsworthy and Hemingway, and if the professors in your universities know better, they keep it to themselves. Your young people are totally ignorant of the protest and self-criticism that goes on in Europe and America. You feature visits by American tourists to "Oliver," "My Fair Lady," and the "Forsyte Saga," which they pounce on with pathetic greed. Their cultural or spiritual hunger, which we are accustomed to acknowledge, leads them to pitiful excesses, such as paying 100 roubles for a pair of "blue-jeans" or 150 roubles for a Paul McCartney record.

Unlike their parents, they seem to have nothing to believe in, nothing to fight for or against. We in the West have—though to a lesser degree—the same problem: but then, we are decadent and our society is "hell." Your young people are to their transistor radios in the hope of hearing something, anything, However, from the outside world. Isn't it time you had the confidence to think of the outside world?

In your words at the 24th Party Congress: "We Communists say to the working people of the entire world that the welfare of the working man, the creation of conditions for the full and all-round flowering of the personality, is our main concern, our main goal." A fine sentiment, but you have yet to show that you have the courage of your convictions.

This letter is censored by nothing but the space I am allowed to use, the Kirov ballet, for your ice cream, for a spectacular storm in the Georgian mountains. I am about to send off a number of garlands to Trafalgar Square, Piccadilly Circus, and Carnaby Street to some of your compatriots who are misguided enough to think of these places as glamorous and inaccessible corners of heaven.—Yours etc.,

Penelope Mortimer.
Khrushchev: We Know Now That He Was A Giant Among Men

"Nikita Khrushchev did for the Soviet Union what Pope John XXIII did for the Roman Catholic church," a leading Western diplomat said a few months ago in discussing Mr. Khrushchev's memoirs.

Though it may seem blasphemous to some, the comparison is apt. Like John XXIII, Mr. Khrushchev, who died yesterday, evidently of a heart attack, opened the windows and doors of a petrified structure. He let in fresh air and fresh ideas, produced changes which time already has shown are irreversible and fundamental.

At the height of his power and influence, it was the damagogue of earthy and colorful phrases, dry judgment to work out with John F. Kennedy a mutually face-saving solution that ended the world crisis and permitted both sides to claim victory.

Mr. Khrushchev's peasantries—largely forgotten now and many of his gambles turned out badly. Nevertheless, from the present perspective his stature as a historical figure looms larger than ever.

For historians in the year 2,000, Mr. Khrushchev will be remembered above all for the break with Stalinism in the mid-1950's. Now that his successors have turned back the clock on some of his comparatively libertarian reforms, the sensitivity and tension that surround Mr. Khrushchev's anti-Stalinism are evidenced by one fact: Mr. Khrushchev's single most important speech is still kept secret in the Soviet Union. This was the address he delivered behind closed doors—and with foreign Communists excluded—to the Soviet Community party Congress delegates in February, 1956, revealing that the man Russians had been taught to worship as a god was in reality more akin to a devil.

And it was at the same Soviet party Congress 15 years ago that Mr. Khrushchev repudiated Lenin-Stalinist dogma of "in- evitable war" between Communism and capitalism. He came to terms with the reality of the nuclear age, which guarantees that any such thermo-nuclear armageddon must result in mutual suicide for all combatants, and perhaps for all mankind.

To replace world war as the path to world Communism, Mr. Khrushchev offered the concept of peaceful coexistence, the complex combination of rivalry and cooperation which has characterized the world ever since. To Mr. Khrushchev, a true believer if ever there was one, Soviet Communism would win by demonstrating concretely that it was superior to capitalism. The demonstration would come, he thought, in the areas of economics and science, and he toured the world untripefor eight years thereafter, boasting that Soviet economic progress would soon outstrip the United States and pointing to the Soviet Sputniks and luniks as tangible proof that Communist Soviet science was better than capitalist American science.

Ironically, Mr. Khrushchev's contributions prepared the road to his own unceremonious ouster in October, 1964. His attack on Stalin earned him powerful enemies in the Soviet hierarchy and alienated China, which saw the anti-Stalin campaign as a covert move aimed against another "personality cult"—the cult of Mao Tse-tung. Thus the groundwork was laid for the Soviet-Chinese split that has changed the entire pattern of world politics—and that formed one of the key counts in the 1964 Kremlin indictment that brought about the Premier's downfall.

Mr. Khrushchev's boast about the superiority of the Soviet economy and science boomeranged against him in two ways.

At home, his boasts about productivity about quickly surpassing American living standards aroused great expectations that were cruelly dashed when Soviet agricultural and industrial troubles brought bread lines and price increases in the early 1960's. This public disillusionment with Mr. Khrushchev's promises made his removal welcome news for most Soviet citizens when the purge took place.

But in a United States badly stung by chagrin over the Soviet priority in space, Mr. Khrushchev's boast brought a double-barreled response.

The economic policies of the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations were geared to rapid economic growth and continuing prosperity so as to frustrate any chance of a Soviet economic victory. And the Apollo program was mounted in 1961 to assure that the first man on the moon would be an American.

What Mr. Khrushchev thought of the historical ironies that dashed so many of his dreams may never be known, even though he lived long enough to witness the unforeseen consequences of the policies he had initiated. The memoirs attributed to him and published earlier this year may never be known, even though they lived long enough to witness the unforeseen consequences of the policies he had initiated. The memoirs attributed to him and published earlier this year may never be known, even though they lived long enough to witness the unforeseen consequences of the policies he had initiated. The memoirs attributed to him and published earlier this year may never be known, even though they lived long enough to witness the unforeseen consequences of the policies he had initiated. The memoirs attributed to him and published earlier this year may never be known, even though they lived long enough to witness the unforeseen consequences of the policies he had initiated. The memoirs attributed to him and published earlier this year may never be known, even though they lived long enough to witness the unforeseen consequences of the policies he had initiated.

—HARRY SCHWARTZ
Khrushchevism: a failure

By Merle Fainsod

He held out a vision of a Soviet society in which citizens could breathe more freely, officials could exercise initiative without fearing the consequences and bonds between Party and people could be strengthened.

In his days of power, Nikita S. Khruschev was shrewd, earthy, endowed with boundless energy, a bouncing self-confidence, and a quick, if coarse, wit. He was the very epitome of the self-made man in any society.

Like most self-made men, he believed profoundly that the social order which nurtured him and conferred its highest honors on him was a society whose values could not be impugned. When a Hollywood movie magnate cited his own rise from rags to riches as a symbol of the opportunities that America holds out for the lovelv, Khruschev replied:

"Would you like to know what I was? I began working when I learned to walk. Till the age of 15 I tended calves, then sheep, and then the landlord's cows. Then I worked at a factory owned by Germans and later in coalpits owned by Frenchmen. I worked at Belgian-owned chemical plants, and now I am Prime Minister of the great Soviet State."

In the course of his lifetime, Khruschev saw Russia transformed from a relatively backward country into one of the world's leading industrial and military powers, and he was understandably proud of this rapid progress and his own role in it.

He gave every evidence of believing that the Soviet Union not only embodied the most progressive and just social structure that mankind had ever attained, but that it was also blazing a trail into the future that people everywhere would enthusiastically follow.

A man of limited formal education, he found his teacher in the Communist Party. The Party provided no opportunities for foreign travel and little in the way of foreign contacts. The world outside the Soviet Union was terra incognita, to be comprehended largely in terms of Marxist-Leninist categories. His first view of the West did not come until he had passed his sixtieth birthday.

Yet there were elements in Khruschev's character that were responsive to fresh experience. He had a pragmatic bent for testing ideas by their workability. An avid learner in practical affairs and a man of wide-ranging technical curiosity, he was quite prepared to borrow techniques from the West when he thought they could advance his own purposes.

When Stalin died in March 1953, he left his successors with a host of problems. His impressive achievements in forcing the pace of Soviet industrialization, in building military power, and in expanding the Communist domain into Eastern and Central Europe were all purchased at a heavy price.

Soviet agriculture remained backward and stagnant, and the food available to Soviet consumers was monotonous, scarce, and high-priced.

Stalin's obsession with represented catastrophe for countless of Khruschev's colleagues spelled opportunity for him. With every turn of the wheel, his fortunes prospered. On those rare occasions when he suffered a temporary setback, he demonstrated a remarkable resilience in bouncing back. He obviously possessed the qualities of toughness and ruthlessness that were required to maneuver one's way to one of the top places in Stalin's entourage.

His experience until Stalin's death was narrowly provincial. His administrative duties within the Party provided no opportunities for foreign travel and little in the way of foreign contacts. The world outside the Soviet Union was terra incognita, to be comprehended largely in terms of Marxist-Leninist categories. His first view of the West did not come until he had passed his sixtieth birthday.

Yet there were elements in Khruschev's character that were responsive to fresh experience. He had a pragmatic bent for testing ideas by their workability. An avid learner in practical affairs and a man of wide-ranging technical curiosity, he was quite prepared to borrow techniques from the West when he thought they could advance his own purposes.

When Stalin died in March 1953, he left his successors with a host of problems. His impressive achievements in forcing the pace of Soviet industrialization, in building military power, and in expanding the Communist domain into Eastern and Central Europe were all purchased at a heavy price.

Soviet agriculture remained backward and stagnant, and the food available to Soviet consumers was monotonous, scarce, and high-priced.

Stalin's obsession with
Stephen M. McDonough
"At modest as any true athlete."

Football 1, 2; Northwest All-Star 3, 4; Basketball 1, 2; Track 2, 3, Co-captain 4; Sephardic Dance Committee; Student Council Representative 2

School would be great if it consisted of sports; leader of The Men; finds push-ups not too difficult; F.H.S. loses great football player.

McDONOUGH IN 1960 HIGH SCHOOL YEARBOOK

By Bob Sales
Globe Staff

FARMINGTON, Conn. — The saga of Stephen McDonough is an American dream gone sour, the story of an outstanding high school athlete who wasn’t good enough. It is the tale of a kid who decided at age 11 that he wanted to grow up to be a professional football player and found out at age 22 that his career was over before it started.

If is the story of a natural athlete, a kid who was a Little League all-star, an all-league quarterback for two seasons in high school, co-captain of the track team.

“He had tremendous confidence,” recalled a football teammate at Farmington High School. “He thought he could do anything. And he really could.”

He couldn’t make the grade with the Montreal Alouettes of the Canadian Football-League or the Bridgeport Jets of the Atlantic Coast Football League last season. Suddenly, all the years of weightlifting and rigorous exercise and careful diet were wasted. Suddenly, he was a failure as an athlete.

“He usually succeeded in what he tried,” said his father, John McDonough, superintendent of schools in this middle-class suburb of 15,000. “Things probably came too easy for him. Most people have to learn the value of patience.”

McDONOUGH, Page 24

Khrushchev dies of heart attack

By Harry Trismen
Los Angeles Times

MOSCOW — Nikita S. Khrushchev, the swashbuckling former Soviet premier who debunked Stalin, triggered the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, then vanished into obscurity seven years ago, died yesterday. He was 77.

Reliable sources said Khrushchev died quietly at noon in the Kremlin hospital of a “massive heart attack.” With him at the bedside were his wife, his daughter, Rada, and the family physician.

Khrushchev could not fulfill the expectations he aroused in the Soviet people, and that was true even of his son, Yuri, Page 2. Other stories, Pages 3, 32.

Backward land, Nikolai Sergeyevich Khrushchev became the leader of one of the two greatest nations in the world, but he died in official dishonor, the victim of a coup in October 1964, writes Stephen S. Rosenfeld of the Washington Post.

In his decade of Kremlin stewardship, he navied the Soviet Union towards effective nuclear equality with the United States and set out to fit Soviet policy in the new bipolar power. Through a string of worsening crises in Berlin and Cuba, his moves and the American responses provoked an uneasy but real mistrust.

HIS WORDS WERE BLUNT

“when you lose your head, you don’t cry over your hair.” he once said.

To a reporter who asked if he liked to fish: “Can you imagine a man of my temperament standing there like a damned fool waiting for the fish to hit?”

To Western diplomats at a reception: “We will bury you.”

To correspondents in Yugoslavia: “If anyone believes our smiles involve the abandonment of this backward land, Nikolai Sergeyevich Khrushchev became the leader of one of the two greatest nations in the world, but he died in official dishonor, the victim of a coup in October 1964, writes Stephen S. Rosenfeld of the Washington Post.

His pride was the land; his challenge the United States. His tale is more than the death of a man, it is the death of an empire — a backward land, Nikolai Sergeyevich Khrushchev became the leader of one of the two greatest nations in the world, but he died in official dishonor, the victim of a coup in October 1964, writes Stephen S. Rosenfeld of the Washington Post.

In his decade of Kremlin stewardship, he navied the Soviet Union towards effective nuclear equality with the United States and set out to fit Soviet policy in the new bipolar power. Through a string of worsening crises in Berlin and Cuba, his moves and the American responses provoked an uneasy but real mistrust.

Neighborhood polls

Hab agrees, property tax top concern

The Globe recently concluded a series of polls of Boston’s neighborhoods’ view of city problems.

Several overall conclusions were reached. The following presents these, and a chart breaks down the problems people considered “very serious”.

Boston is a city of little cities, its neighborhoods. They are varied in their attitudes, needs and problems.

As different as Boston’s neighborhoods may appear, a Becker Research Corp. poll, conducted in July for The Globe, has shown that they share common concerns — while harboring some very individual viewpoints.

With the exception of Roxbury, at least half the people polled in every major section of the city rated property tax increases most serious. The city’s tax increases this year range from 11 to 18 percent, with an average of 15 percent.

Hab agreements:

Boston Neighborhoods

Property tax increases, top concern

By Harry Trismen
Los Angeles Times
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The Boston election scene: Small turnout for candidates

By Christopher Wallace
Globe Staff

Boston City Councilman Thomas E. Atkins focused his campaign for mayor in the city's black neighborhoods yesterday.

Public response was small to events that had been billed as "a massive rally and motorcade." Earlier in the day, Atkins and four other mayoral candidates — Councilmen John L. Saltonstall, Rep. Louise Day Hicks, Councilman Joseph F. Trinity and John E. Powers Jr. — appeared at a forum in Copley Square. Only incumbent Mayor Kevin H. White was absent.

The Atkins motorcade, including about 20 automobiles and a steel band, wound through the streets of Roxbury and Dorchester. It was powered by only normal Saturday afternoon traffic.

Massachusetts schools receive 2 important lessons

School committees may lose power

By Michael Kenncy
Globe Staff

Because the parents of John Serrano Jr., a 12-year-old schoolboy in Los Angeles County, thought his public school was a victim of economic discrimination, Massachusetts' local school committees may have to give up their traditional responsibility for public education.

Serrano v. Priest — Ivy Baker Priest, the California state treasurer — was the case ruled on by the California Supreme Court, threatening a "one-man, one-vote" legislative reapportionment similar to that caused by the final US Supreme Court decision on the "one-person, one-vote" legislative reapportionment cases of the early 60s.

Attorneys for the Serranos and parents of other Los Angeles school children who were plaintiffs in the suit argued that schools' traditional role for revenue on the local level is "the most important tool that the School Committee has to carry out the teaching process and to maintain the quality of those processes."

Busing in Boston is easier said than done

By Nina McCain
Globe Staff

At week's end, prospects for a balanced Lee School were not encouraging. The handsome 80 million dollar school with its library, auditorium, swimming pool and football field was under construction in Dorchester by assigning some white students to traditional neighborhood schools and excluding some black children who live in the area immediately around the school.

The Atkins motorcade, including about 20 automobiles and a steel band, wound through the streets of Roxbury and Dorchester. It was powered by only normal Saturday afternoon traffic.

Nixon picks mid-October to reveal post-freeze plan

By Nina McCain
Globe Staff

There was no indication that the Khrushchev government was aware of the death. Those contacted by the Western newspapers expressed surprise, and offered such comments as "It's a pity" or "Too bad," with little show of emotion.

In his decade of Kremlin stewardship, Khrushchev sought to press the United States into effective nuclear equality. The United States and the Soviet Union had reached an agreement to limit nuclear testing. The Western powers had been more successful in limiting military expenditures.

The Atkins motorcade, including about 20 automobiles and a steel band, wound through the streets of Roxbury and Dorchester. It was powered by only normal Saturday afternoon traffic.

Scale arrives at N.Y. prison
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Khrushchev: a failure of expectations

By Merle Fainod

In the fall of 1952, Nikita S. Khrushchev was showered with earthly, endowed with a warmth and breadth of self-confidence that was almost shameless. He was the very epitome of the Stalinist Party. The Party provided, to him with a view of the education, he found his enthusiasm follow. Union not only embodied his own role in it. But that it was also blazing with Frenchmen. I worked at working when I learned. I worked at making my mark on the world. Then I worked at a small town, then at a larger one. And then the landlord's name; "Harebrained, impulsive, with a material and spiritual independence", Stalin's slogan was, "The development of heavy industry meant that light industry was."

He held out a vision of a Soviet society in which citizens could breathe more freely, without fearing the consequences and bonds between Party and people could be strengthened.

NIKITA KHROUSHCHEV-A MAN OF MANY PARTS

in Khrushchev's career, fortune seemed to be smiling at him, but his Pravda opponents and his position as Party leader appeared to be unsalable. He had surmounted the crisis in East-West relations, the economic and the formers, and the Party and intellectuals gave every outward appearance of having subsided.

Most important of all, he had treated the world to a startling demonstration of Soviet technological advances. On October 4, 1957, the Russians launched the Sputnik I. This dramatic development lifted Khrushchev's prestige to new heights.

Despite undoubted industrial progress and dramatic space achievements, there were limits to the pressure that Moscow could apply on the West. The United States was still a formidable nuclear power with a larger re-armed nuclear arsenal, and its containment policy was not to be ignored.

An avid learner in practical and theoretical arts, Khrushchev appeared to be at the peak of his career. Fortune seemed to be smiling at him, but his Pravda opponents and his position as Party leader appeared to be unsalable. He had surmounted the crisis in East-West relations, the economic and the formers, and the Party and intellectuals gave every outward appearance of having subsided.
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The Communist Party demanded unquestioning loyalty from all who served during the next decades. The rise in the party hierarchy experienced exploitation. Socialism on a world scale. The system of terror on which Stalin relied to enforce his regime of depopulation without necessarily calculating the consequences, and break between Party and people was grudgingly acknowledged. Khrushchev sought to create an image of himself as a man of peace, and he moved toward an easing of relations with the West. The conclusion of the Austrian State Treaty in May 1955 put an end to the cold war and adapted a formula of coexistence, not envisaging or anticipating the costs and consequences.

Khrushchev, as the son of a peasant family, followed the tenets of a radical agrarianism. Above all, he shared Stalin's idea of using armed force to strike out in new directions of development, of seizing the initiative, or of anticipating the costs and consequences. Khrushchev sought to be described as Khrushchev, to be present in the world of ideas, to be present in the world of action, to be present in the world of consequences. The policy was not necessarily calculated, but it was plausible. Khrushchev might be forced to take steps that were not necessarily consistent with the interests of the Soviet Union. But he was not necessarily afraid of the consequences.

Yet it would be less than fair to imagine a man who had broken away from Stalin's methods of rule and yet who had broken away from Stalin's methods of rule. But that it was also blazing a trail into the future that was not necessarily calculated, but that was nevertheless proud of the rapid progress and his personal contribution to the development of the Soviet Union. The high spot of the Khrushchev era, in the middle 1950s, was the formulation and adoption of the concept of detente. Detente meant that light and heat meant to experiment and to promote the well-being of society. The system of terror on which Stalin relied to enforce his regime of depopulation meant that light and heat meant to experiment and to promote the well-being of society. The system of terror on which Stalin relied to enforce his regime of depopulation meant that light and heat meant to experiment and to promote the well-being of society. The system of terror on which Stalin relied to enforce his regime of depopulation meant that light and heat meant to experiment and to promote the well-being of society. The system of terror on which Stalin relied to enforce his regime of depopulation meant that light and heat meant to experiment and to promote the well-being of society. The system of terror on which Stalin relied to enforce his regime of depopulation meant that light and heat meant to experiment and to promote the well-being of society. The system of terror on which Stalin relied to enforce his regime of depopulation meant that light and heat meant to experiment and to promote the well-being of society. The system of terror on which Stalin relied to enforce his regime of depopulation meant that light and heat meant to experiment and to promote the well-being of society. The system of terror on which Stalin relied to enforce his regime of depopulation meant that light and heat meant to experiment and to promote the well-being of society. The system of terror on which Stalin relied to enforce his regime of depopulation meant that light and heat meant to experiment and to promote the well-being of society.
manded unquestioning rise in the party hierarchy hopeless odds. His rapid during the Civil War, munism on a world scale. worker in Czarist Russia he masses from exploitation he was not an aloof, unobtrusive witness. At the September 1953 session of the Central Committee of the Party he was elected Prime Secretary. A speech he delivered on September 3, in full agricultural situation of his first independent pronouncement in the six months since Stalin's death. The speech contained a new acknowledgment of the success of the agricultural crisis that the new collective farms had achieved. The high spot of the Congress was the "secret" speech to the.ColumnHeadersHeightSizeModeers of the Party's regional and local centers. Khrushchev's pronouncement was clearly evident in the Khrushchev speech. It was a call to the Stalinist party leadership to return to the traditions of the early Twentieth Century Party. It marked the end of Stalin's era and the beginning of a new era in Soviet history.

The Stalinist purges that
Nikita Khrushchev

Nikita Khrushchev died a second time yesterday. His first, a political death, took place in 1964 when he was unceremoniously ousted from power, plunging overnight from the status of one of the world's key leaders to an unperson in the land he had ruled. His continued disgrace seven years later was emphasized by the fact that most Soviet citizens first learned of his passing from broadcasts to the Soviet Union by Radio Liberty and other foreign transmitters.

Yet the petty vengefulness of the present Kremlin rulers, many of whom were originally his protégés, cannot obscure the fact that Khrushchev was a giant in Soviet and world history. A complex and colorful figure, he must rank with Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin in any honest account of Soviet history. Indeed, on many counts, he deserves recognition as a more positive and attractive leader than any of the other three. This peasant boy who became the Czar of Communist Russia left a lasting impress on his nation and the world.

His greatest accomplishment was the break with Stalin and Stalinism. In 1956 and 1961, his blows to the Stalin cult were so effective that even the strong Stalinist forces now in the Kremlin have found it impossible to turn back the Soviet clock completely, although the Soviet Union has retrogressed significantly from the peak of Khrushchevian liberalism. He was not a believer in free speech and other civil rights as the West understands those concepts, but he appreciated that no great nation could continue to live in the Stalinist atmosphere of terror and lies.

And it was Khrushchev, too, who made Soviet ideology come to terms with the facts of the thermonuclear era. By declaring that war between Communism and capitalism was not a fatal inevitability, he reversed a fundamental tenet of Leninist theology. His understanding of the suicidal potentialities of nuclear war helped avoid disaster when the United States discovered his October 1962 effort to install Soviet missiles in Cuba.

At the time he was purged, the Soviet press was full of accusations about his "subjectivism" and "hairbrained scheming." It is true that many of his historic gambles—the Cuban venture and the gigantic corn-planting scheme that sought to transform Soviet agriculture—were poorly conceived and boomeranged. Yet, much of the fault lay in the totalitarian nature of the Soviet system, which permitted Khrushchev to embark upon these and other rash gambles without adequate debate.

Ironically, it was an effort to sound out West Germany on détente—by dispatching his journalist son-in-law there—that may have triggered his ouster. Yet Russia's new rulers have gone much further now in their treaty with Bonn and the new four-power agreement on Berlin, which Khrushchev for three years attempted to prise out of Western control by threat, bluster and military maneuvers.

It is not surprising, in view of his own Horatio Alger-like career, that Khrushchev believed his own frequent boast that Soviet superiority would permit a Communist triumph over the United States. Yet it may be suspected that this very intelligent man eventually came to have some doubts on this score. Last year, for example, was the year which he predicted a decade ago would see the Soviet living standard surpass that of the United States. The reality, of course, was quite different. Even in space, where Soviet science won Khrushchev his greatest propaganda victories, the present perspective shows that Khrushchev's taunts served chiefly to spur the United States to be first in sending men to the moon.

In both his accomplishments and his failures, Nikita Khrushchev was a giant. In different times and different areas, he was both this nation's friend and its enemy. Yet now, conscious of the years he spent in disgrace and loneliness, many here and around the world will mourn his passing. It is sad that Soviet leaders could not find the vision yesterday to surround the announcement of his death with the dignity that his contributions and career deserved.
Mrs. Khrushchev a Familiar Figure

Mrs. Nina Petrovna Khrushchev in a visit to Beltsville, Md., in 1959

The New York Times

Mrs. Khrushchev in a visit to Beltsville, Md., in 1959

Red Parties Report the Death, But With Almost No Comment

In the first comment from the Communist party representing any Communist source on the death of Nikita S. Khrushchev, a mass-circulation newspaper owned by the Italian Communist party said that his "vision was correct, but the means of applying them in practice, domestic and internationally, were outdated." His removal from the top leadership was "inevitable," the biography said.

As of last evening, this was the only commentary from any Communist party, government or newspaper—in Communist countries or in the West—on the death. The Polish radio reported that the death was rumored, but still awaited official confirmation.

In Paris and in Rome, spokesmen for the official party newspapers said that they would publish obituaries on their front pages—without commentary in the French party’s L’Humanité and with commentary in the Italian party’s L’Unita.

In New York, officials of the American Communist party could not immediately be reached by telephone, and the party itself had issued no statement.

In Hong Kong, it was reported that Peking had said nothing as of early Sunday morning. In fact, nothing about Mr. Khrushchev in 1959, recalled the Soviet leader today as a man who “did more to open up Russia for conversations and visitors than anyone before him.” Mr. Garst, who lives in Coon Rapids, Iowa, spoke in a telephone interview.

Eaton Expresses Regret

CLEVELAND, Sept. 11 (AP)—Cyrus S. Eaton, the industrialist who has maintained contact with Communist nations for many years, expressed regret today at the death of Mr. Khrushchev.

Mr. Eaton said he and his wife are sending their “deepest regrets” to Mr. Khrushchev and her children. He said he did not plan to attend the former United States Ambas-

Harriman Assesses Leader

SANDS POINT, L. I., Sept. 11 (UPI)—W. Averell Harriman, Mr. Khrushchev’s “vision was correct, but down-grading of the leninism and the harsh practice was inevitable,” the biography said.

Mr. Harriman, who met Mr. Khrushchev in Moscow in 1959, said Khrushchev had a sense of humor that made you like him. He was easier to get along with than Stalin.”

A Farmer’s Memories

WASHINGTON, Sept. 11 (UPI)—Roswell Garst, the Iowa farmer who discussed hybrid corn with Nikita Khrushchev during a visit to Russia in 1955, has maintained contact with Communist nations for years.

While they were here, they were seen everywhere together, crammed into the back seat of a limousine with President Eisenhower, meeting each other unexpectedly in a supermarket aisle, placing a wreath on the grave of President Roosevelt.

House to say good-by to Mr. Khrushchev when he left for Camp David, Md. At first, she was somewhat reserved in the face of personal questions from clamoring Western reporters, but she gradually warmed up to reveal a vivacious, witty, and self-possessed personality that won the hearts of Americans.

While Mrs. Khrushchev was here, she told reporters that she had met her husband in the city of Yuzovka, in the Ukraine, when his two children by his first marriage—a daughter, Yulia, and a son, Leonid, subsequently killed in the war—were 6 and 8 years old. His first wife, she said, died during the famine, referring apparently to the famines early in the nineteen twenties.

Three children—two daughters, Rada and Yelena, and a son, Seroj, were her own, she said.

Rada’s husband, Aleksie I. Adzhubei, was editor of the Government newspaper Izvestia and a powerful figure in the Soviet Union until he lost his post in 1964 when Mr. Khrushchev was deposed.

Mr. Harriman, interviewed by telephone at his summer home here said: “Khrushchev was a tough leader, who didn’t want to see his country blown up. The way to deal with him was to be firm and give him an opportunity to retreat.”

Such an event happened, Mr. Harriman said, during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. The United States imposed a naval quarantine on Cuba to force the Soviets to remove its missile installations there.

Mr. Harriman, who met Mr. Khrushchev in Moscow in 1959, said Khrushchev had a sense of humor that made you like him. He was easier to get along with than Stalin.”

A Farmer’s Memories

WASHINGTON, Sept. 11 (UPI)—Roswell Garst, the Iowa farmer who discussed hybrid corn with Nikita Khrushchev during a visit to Russia in 1955 and was visited in turn at home by Mr. Khrushchev in 1959, recalled the Soviet leader today as a man who “did more to open up Russia for conversations and visitors than anyone before him.” Mr. Garst, who lives in Coon Rapids, Iowa, spoke in a telephone interview.
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Khrushchev: Shift in Soviet Path

By HARRISON E. SALISBURY

A young Russian exile — a leader of underground dissidents — said a few days in New York: "President Nixon wants to make Russia more like America — and he hopes, establishment of a peaceful, conciliatory world."

He was not the only man of his ilk. But of course no one will say it unless he's dead.

What he meant was that Nikita S. Khrushchev, with all his faults, his fiery temper, his glibness, his braggadocio, had found himself to be a politician. It was time that Stalin's legacy to the Soviet Union, and to one, the young dissident, would be able to put him back again.

Some may doubt the permanence of the Soviet Union’s turn from the oppression of the Stalin era. But few in or out of the Soviet Union can doubt that the man in charge is a politician. It is the hardest, most humbling, most degrading way to spend a life. Khrushchev's fall, like that of his immediate predecessors, was publicly apparent. He had come up the hard way — almost the hardest of all — to seize power. He did not make it permanent. He could not make it permanent, because for all his boldness, his rashness — and genuine cruelty in carrying out Stalin's orders — he was not loved by Stalin. He would follow his rivals. Nor would it be done if the Soviet Union were going to be a free country, a world that has perceived that it is possible to live and work and cooperate with the Soviet Union as a world, a world of ideas.

But greater than this is the testament to the world that Khrushchev thought much about the future and about how the world would react to the U.S. In 1959 he had all but threatened toゆるるやもや決して大国を残すことはできない。彼の日本政策は、彼が世界の核の未来を支配することができるかどうかを認識し、世界とソビエト連邦間の関係を改善する必要があった。

What Khrushchev did during the seven years since he was publicly apparent. He had come up the hard way — almost the hardest of all — to seize power. He did not make it permanent. He could not make it permanent, because for all his boldness, his rashness — and genuine cruelty in carrying out Stalin's orders — he was not loved by Stalin. He would follow his rivals. Nor would it be done if the Soviet Union were going to be a free country, a world that has perceived that it is possible to live and work and cooperate with the Soviet Union as a world, a world of ideas.

But greater than this is the testament to the world that Khrushchev thought much about the future and about how the world would react to the U.S. In 1959 he had all but threatened toゆるるやもや決して大国を残すことはできない。彼の日本政策は、彼が世界の核の未来を支配することができるかどうかを認識し、世界とソビエト連邦間の関係を改善する必要があった。
A Kitchen Debate With a Future President, Coexistence and a Visit to America

Mr. Khrushchev's meeting in 1959 with President Dwight D. Eisenhower at Camp David, Md., led to a period of seemingly improved U.S.- Soviet relations.

THE NEW YORK TIMES, Sunday 12 September 1971.

A KITCHEN DEBATE WITH A FUTURE PRESIDENT, COEXISTENCE AND A VISIT TO AMERICA

Mr. Khrushchev's meeting in 1959 with President Dwight D. Eisenhower at Camp David, Md., led to a period of seemingly improved U.S.-Soviet relations.
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Mr. Khrushchev's meeting in 1959 with President Dwight D. Eisenhower at Camp David, Md., led to a period of seemingly improved U.S.-Soviet relations.

THE NEW YORK TIMES, Sunday 12 September 1971.
At his height, an area equal to the entire province of Canada—some 75 million acres—was virgin and fallow land. In Siberia and the Urals he was slow and seems to have been an army of young men sent out by the cities of Europe and Russia. Also he called for what are known as the ‘Bolsheviks’—the leaders of the Communist party—of whom he was one of the best known. His chief aim was to make Soviet Russia a model of social and political reform.

Mr. Kaganovich was sent into the party, and to raise the standards of living. Khrushchev seemed genuinely concerned about agriculture. Whereas Stalin was head of the party organization and in the new alignment under Imre Nagy announced that to keep Poland within the Moscow bloc. Mr. Gomulka, however, stood his ground, and in the new alignment, which followed a “debate” with Vice-President Nixon in 1959, the United States was to “develop an ‘amicable’ relationship with the Soviet Union.”

Khrushchev promises of a rapid advance in economic development were dashed as more and more of the funds were diverted to military spending. In October, when members of the Politburo were quietly called to a meeting, with Leonid I. Brezhnev in the chair, Khrushchev’s promises of a rapid advance in economic development were dashed as more and more of the funds were diverted to military spending. In October, when members of the Politburo were quietly called to a meeting, with Leonid I. Brezhnev in the chair, Khrushchev’s promises of a rapid advance in economic development were dashed as more and more of the funds were diverted to military spending. In October, when members of the Politburo were quietly called to a meeting, with Leonid I. Brezhnev in the chair, Khrushchev’s promises of a rapid advance in economic development were dashed as more and more of the funds were diverted to military spending.

Khrushchev flew to Warsaw and convinced Mr. Gomulka, the new party leader, to create more efficient producers and workers in his country. Khrushchev was a master of propaganda, and he used this to his advantage. He was a master of propaganda, and he used this to his advantage. He was a master of propaganda, and he used this to his advantage. He was a master of propaganda, and he used this to his advantage. He was a master of propaganda, and he used this to his advantage.

At an American desk in Moscow in 1959, Mr. Khrushchev and Richard M. Nixon, then Vice President, held impromptu debates over the merits of capitalism and Communism.

Premier Expressed Himself in Earthy Phrases

“Whither you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you!”—At a Kremlin reception in November, 1956.

Mr. Khrushchev’s meeting in 1959 with President Eisenhower at Camp David, Md., led to a period of seemingly improved U.S.-Soviet relations.

Mr. Khrushchev was faced with discrepant data at home. The living wage and corn program failed; harvests were poor. Every grain had to be imported from the United States, and in 1942 most and better prices were taken. Instead of the Khrushchev promised a real advance to plenty, the economy was contracting. All of these things came to a head in October, 1944, when members of the Politburo were gathered at a meeting with Leonid I. Brezhnev in the chair. Khrushchev gave a speech and was sharply criticized. He was sharply criticized. He was sharply criticized. He was sharply criticized. He was sharply criticized. He was sharply criticized.

Mr. Khrushchev flew to Warsaw and convinced Mr. Gomulka, the new party leader, to create more efficient producers and workers in his country. Khrushchev was a master of propaganda, and he used this to his advantage. He was a master of propaganda, and he used this to his advantage. He was a master of propaganda, and he used this to his advantage. He was a master of propaganda, and he used this to his advantage. He was a master of propaganda, and he used this to his advantage.
Mr. Khrushchev met President John F. Kennedy at Vienna in 1961. In U.S.-Soviet crisis the following year, the Premier withdrew missiles from Cuba.

The Cuban adventure cost Mr. Khrushchev his prestige in the United States and, by extension, throughout the Western world. Mr. Khrushchev's policy of peaceful coexistence was weakened, and many of his greatest enemies were now in power, including Richard Nixon, the new American president. Mr. Khrushchev was also forced to retreat from his push for a new world order, as the United States and its allies began to compete more aggressively for influence in the developing world. The Cuban missile crisis was a turning point in the Cold War, and Mr. Khrushchev's prestige and influence were never quite the same after it.
Mr. Khrushchev's Human Dimensions Brought Him to Power and to His Downfall

THE NEW YORK TIMES, Sunday 12 September 1971.

By ALDEN WHITMAN

LATY in the afternoon of Friday, Feb. 25, 1960, a short, squat, round-shouldered, graying bearded man stepped to the microphone at the concluding sessions of the 20th Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, from which all foreign delegates and reporters had been excluded. "Comrades," he began in a somewhat nasal, broken voice, "in the report of the Central Committee of the party . . . a number of questions by some comrades . . . a question of how far . . . when you have been and what the individual has and the individual has done. . . ." He was well after midnight when the session adjourned, and what the delegate had heard in Nikolai Sergeyevich Khrushchev's 20,000-word speech was less than a documented, countrystudy indictment of Josef Stalin, then dead about three years and who for a quarter-century had been held up to the living people, Communism and non-Communism, ad to Communists as the world's only effective and advanced power. Some of the people in the sanctuary were moved to tears and some to glory.

On his 1959 visit to the United States, Mr. Khrushchev's exertions in Moscow, a period in which he was visited by his successor, had been his second encounter with the world's most powerful man, the Soviet leader that the way to advance was "Be popular." Mr. Khrushchev's definition was "people-oriented" and the Czar's "people-oriented" was "class-oriented." Mr. Khrushchev's definition was an American pledge not to shoot, and that some of his enemies accused him of both. Mr. Khrushchev's exertions in Moscow, in which he was the leader of his country and Eastern Europe, so he traveled extensively in the world outside. As a Communist leader that the way to advance was "Be popular." Mr. Khrushchev's definition was "people-oriented" and the Czar's "people-oriented" was "class-oriented." Mr. Khrushchev's definition was an American pledge not to shoot, and that some of his enemies accused him of both. Mr. Khrushchev's exertions in Moscow, in which he was the leader of his country and Eastern Europe, so he traveled extensively in the world outside. As a Communist leader that the way to advance was "Be popular." Mr. Khrushchev's definition was "people-oriented" and the Czar's "people-oriented" was "class-oriented." Mr. Khrushchev's definition was an American pledge not to shoot, and that some of his enemies accused him of both.
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Speech Widely Circulated

Although this extraordinary speech was not widely circulated through the Soviet press, and the start of the 6th Party Congress, the speech was widely publicized in the West. It was the first time a Soviet leader spoke out in such a manner, and it was a landmark event in the history of the Soviet Union. The speech was published in a variety of newspapers and magazines, and it was reprinted in many languages. The speech was also broadcast on radio and television, and it was widely discussed in the media.

The speech focused on the need for a new direction in Soviet foreign policy, and it called for an end to the arms race. The speech was also critical of Stalin, and it accused him of being a tyrant and a dictator. The speech was widely seen as a turning point in Soviet history, and it marked the beginning of a new era of détente and cooperation with the West.

The speech was widely praised by the Western powers, and it was seen as a significant step forward in the history of the Cold War. The speech was also seen as a significant step forward in the history of the Cold War. The speech was widely praised by the Western powers, and it was seen as a significant step forward in the history of the Cold War. The speech was also seen as a significant step forward in the history of the Cold War.
Mr. Khrushchev was greeted by Mao Tse-tung in Peking in 1954. Their quarrels became increasingly bitter and warned split in the Communist world.

In 1956, Khrushchev's open attack on Stalin's cult of personality, his denunciation of secret party life, his dismissal and imprisonment of Stalin's henchmen in Peking, and his insistence on the development of the Chinese economy, aroused the wrath of the world Communist movement. This was the moment when Khrushchev's ideas and program became the subject of international discussion.

At the Sixth Congress of the Communist League in Moscow, Khrushchev lectured on the need for a new era of socialism, which would be characterized by greater democracy, economic development, and cultural progress. He argued that the Communist Party was not a closed organization, but a mass movement that could be opened to new ideas and new people. He called for a new spirit of openness and criticism, which would lead to a greater understanding of the needs of the people.

Mr. Khrushchev's speeches were widely publicized in the West, and they became a symbol of change and progress in the Communist world. His ideas were also adopted by other Communist leaders, and they helped to bring about a new era of socialism in the Soviet Union and other Communist countries.

On visit to U.S. in 1959, the Soviet Premier admired the United States. His visit was seen as a way to show the world that the Communist system was not inferior to the capitalist system. In particular, he was impressed by the technological developments in the United States, and he hoped that these developments could be adopted in the Soviet Union.

In 1962, Khrushchev's ideas and program became the subject of international discussion and debate. The United States in particular was concerned about the spread of Communist influence, and it took a strong stance against the Communist world. This led to a series of tensions and confrontations between the United States and the Soviet Union, which ultimately contributed to the end of the Cold War. 

On 28 October 1964, Khrushchev was ousted from power by his own party. His overthrow was the result of a series of political maneuvers and infighting within the Communist Party. The new leader, Leonid Brezhnev, was a more cautious and pragmatic ruler, and he was able to bring about a period of stability and growth in the Soviet Union.

Khrushchev's legacy is complex and controversial. He is remembered as a statesman who brought about a new era of socialism in the Soviet Union, and who helped to bring about the end of the Cold War. However, he is also remembered as a leader who was often irrational and reckless, and who was responsible for some of the most damaging events of the twentieth century. His death on 16 September 1971 marked the end of an era in Soviet history, and his legacy continues to be debated and studied by historians and political scientists.
Khrushchev Dies at 77 of a Heart Attack

Continued From Page 1, Col. 7

"I'm a pensioner. What do you want with me?"

His death was a surprise to many of those who had known him, and was the most significant event in the Soviet Union's political history in recent years.

Mr. Khrushchev had been a member of the Communist party for more than 50 years, and had been a leader in the party since the early 1930s.

Problem for Leaders

They must decide whether to follow Mr. Khrushchev's lead, or to continue with the policies that he had championed.

Mr. Khrushchev had been a moderate in his approach to foreign policy, and had been a strong advocate of détente with the United States.

A Detailed Obituary

Of Mr. Khrushchev

On Following Pages.

We're known for dropping prices 50%.

Instead of your own hair—

---
Mrs. Khrushchev in a Visit to Baltimore, Md., in 1959

Mrs. Nina Petrovna Khrushchev was in her husband's backyard when he died, remaining close to "him, as she was dying, to hold his hand to the end," according to his post mortem. Held for a full minute of silence by the citizens of Moscow, her husband's body was then taken to the Kremlin Wall, where his funeral service was held.

Mr. Khrushchev's funeral included a full battery of heavy artillery, which fired 21 gun salutes to honor the former leader. His coffin was draped in the flag of the Soviet Union and carried on a caisson pulled by a team of horses. The funeral procession made its way to the Washingto...

A Farmer's Memories

Mr. Khrushchev, as he was known, was a man of many talents. He was a farmer, a politician, and a writer. He was also a great lover of nature and the outdoors. Mr. Khrushchev spent much of his life working on his farm, where he grew vegetables and raised livestock.

He was a leader in the Communist Party, and his policies were known for their radicalism. He was a strong advocate for the rights of the working class and was a vocal critic of the policies of his predecessor, Stalin.

Mr. Khrushchev was a controversial figure, and his legacy is still debated today. Some believe he was a great leader, while others believe he was a dictator.

In the end, Mr. Khrushchev's legacy is one of a man who tried to bring change to the Soviet Union and to make it a better place for all its people. His work and his ideas continue to influence the world today.
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Portrait of the dictator as a pensioner

Khrushchev's charm lasted

Associated Press correspondent James R. Peipert was one of the last two Westerners known to have seen Nikita Khrushchev. He and another newsman had a brief chat with Khrushchev and his wife when they made their last public appearance in June.

By James R. Peipert
Associated Press

MOSCOW — "I'm a pensioner now. What can a pensioner do?"

This is how Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev, who once held supreme power in the Soviet Union, described his seven years of life after being toppled from his posts of premier and Communist Party chief.

Khrushchev made his remarks to two Western correspondents who were on hand for his last public appearance June 13, when he cast his vote at a Moscow polling place in national elections for Supreme Soviet (parliament) members.

Although Khrushchev had lived in obscurity since 1964, millions of Russians were still familiar with his rotund figure, bald head and warted nose.

"It's Nikita Sergeyevich, it's Nikita Sergeyevich," whispered a crowd of Russians gathered around the flag-bedecked polling place as a chauffeur-driven black Volga pulled up to the curb with Khrushchev and his wife, Nina Petrovna, inside.

Khrushchev, looking trim and fit despite a recurring heart ailment called "cardiac deficiency," emerged from the car and displayed a glimmer of the flamboyance that had made his name a household word around the world. He doffed his straw hat to the crowd, waved, exchanged pleasantries and walked with Mrs. Khrushchev to the school-housing polling place.

Khrushchev was wearing two of the medals he earned at the height of his power: the gold star of Hero of the Soviet Union, hanging by a scarlet ribbon on his left breast, and the gold medallion of the Lenin Peace Prize on his right lapel.

Mrs. Khrushchev, her white hair tied back in a bun, beamed as a Western photographer moved into position to snap her picture. She seemed to enjoy the attention, which was once a part of her husband's daily life.

The Russians cleared a path for the Khrushchevs to the door of elementary school No. 29, where they dropped their ballots in a box placed in the school's recreation hall.

After about five minutes in the school, the Khrushchevs emerged and strolled back to their car, smiling and greeting well-wishers along the way.

They then got back into their car, waved and drove off.

The Khrushchev's visit to the polls was closely watched by plainclothes security police, some of them the same men who had guarded Khrushchev at the height of his power. Before Khrushchev left, he chatted with the plainclothes agent in charge of his security detail.

The school at 12 Kropotkinskaya st. was the polling place for the Khrushchevs' neighborhood. They maintained an apartment in a well-kept gray stone building a five-minute walk away, near the Canadian Embassy. But they lived most of the time in a country cottage.

The neighborhood where they kept the apartment was called the Old Arbat and was the fashionable district of imperial officials and tsarist princes before the Bolsheviks seized power in 1917.

The area, with its quiet, tree-lined streets, is now the home of Russians who have done well under communism. Bolshoi Ballet dancers, writers, and retired officials live there.
Khrushchev’s Legacy

By HARRY SCHWARTZ

Will Nikita Khrushchev’s ghost haunt the Kremlin in the years ahead? The present Soviet rulers appear to fear it may. That recrimination seems the most likely explanation for theorchestrated silence the Soviet press and radio maintained about the event for most of last weekend. Only after the cables had reported the enormous and sorrowful reaction to Khrushchev’s passing in the rest of the world did a Pravda spokesman announce that this morning’s paper would report the news.

For roughly thirty hours or more the only way most Soviet citizens could find out the man who ruled their country for a decade was dead was through listening to Radio Liberty and other foreign broadcasts.

There is important evidence indicating that Khrushchev’s reputation among a significant number of Soviet citizens is far greater now than it was when he was purged in 1964.

Then he was connected in the popular mind with the economic hardships of the early 1960’s, the price increases of 1962 and the bread shortage of 1963. He was also blamed by many for the break with China, and for spending too much money in space while urgent needs here on earth went unmet.

But the seven years Khrushchev lived in obscure disgrace were long enough to demonstrate that many of the lies for which he was blamed also have been incurable for his successors.

With President Nixon scheduled soon to visit Peking, there can no longer be Soviet citizens who believe it was merely Khrushchev’s tactlessness that produced Moscow-Peking enmity.

With the break with China, and for greatly increasing the costs of the Soviet economy, Khrushchev was responsible for raost of last weekend. Only after the cables had reported the enormous sorrowful reaction to Khrushchev’s passing in the rest of the world did a Pravda spokesman announce that this morning’s paper would report the news.

The Soviet economy has increased production since Khrushchev fell. But there are now 15 to 20 million more Soviet mouths to be fed than in 1964. And while the Soviet standard of living has risen, the rise has hardly been fast enough to satisfy an increasingly consumption-oriented society. The present unexplained delay in putting the new Ninth Five Year Plan before the Soviet legislature is only one of the straws pointing toward continuing economic difficulties.

But it is among Soviet intellectuals — scientists, writers, teachers and the like — that the most positive re-evaluation of Khrushchev has taken place these last several years.

While he ruled, these elite groups tended to view Khrushchev as a crude, undisciplined and unpredictable boor. They were grateful to him for cracking the Stalin myth, for releasing millions from the slave labor camps, for lifting the Iron Curtain, and for greatly widening the area of free speech and free press, notably by permitting the publication of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn’s classic novel, “One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich.”

But they were repelled by what they considered his uncultivated behavior — notably his performance hanging his shoe at the United Nations in 1960. They resented his support of the charlatan biologist, Trofim Lysenko. And most of all they were bitten at his recurrent tendency to retreat from liberal attitudes and to denounce publicly some of the Soviet Union’s most eminent intellectuals.

Seven years of the post-Khrushchev era, however, have taught many Soviet liberals that the alternative to Khrushchev was much worse. The Brezhnev leadership has put writers and other dissidents into jail or insane asylums; Khrushchev relied on verbal chastisement. The censorship in the Soviet Union today is far tighter than it was during most of the Khrushchev era.

It is now evident that Khrushchev’s removal was a partial counterrevolution, a partial return to Stalinism which makes the Khrushchev era seem like the good old days.

Thus the possibility arises that in death Khrushchev may become the symbol of Soviet liberalism just as the dead Stalin has long been the symbol of Soviet reaction and obscurantism.

There may be great political importance, therefore, in the fact that this morning’s Pravda front page finally announces “with sorrow” that Khrushchev is dead, and reminds the Soviet people officially that he was once head of both the Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet Union.

This is already a limited and partial rehabilitation, ending his status as an unperson and assuring he will not be an un corpse. It is the first small victory for those who would like to see the best part of the Khrushchev heritage restored and extended within the Soviet Union.

The Khrushchev legacy is also likely to be a factor in future international Communist politics. This potentiality was implicit in the warm tribute the Italian Communist party paid to Khrushchev yesterday. That tribute reflected the fact that Khrushchev was the most liberal and flexible Soviet leader since Lenin.

Foreign Communists recall that it was Khrushchev who laid down the line that there are many roads to Communism and that the Soviet experience does not have to be slavishly imitated by all nations. Moreover, he set a historic precedent in 1955 when he publicly apologized to President Tito for Stalin’s excommunication of the Yugoslav Communists in 1948.

And it was in Khrushchev’s regime that a significant measure of autonomy was given the Eastern European countries, thus opening the way for the considerable degree of independence won this past decade by Romania.

The passing of Khrushchev creates a very different situation from that which evolved after the murder of Leon Trotsky. No orthodox Communist party today, not even the Chinese, pays tribute to Trotsky. By definition all Trotskyites belong to an opposition group outside the regular Communist world.

But today’s Pravda obituary of Khrushchev, despite its minimal nature, places him within the limits of permissible Communist variation. He is not considered an enemy of Marxism-Leninism, merely a bourgeois who failed to measure up to his responsibilities.

The door is therefore open for others in the years ahead to use his image, his points of view and his prestige to help move the Communist world, including the Soviet Union, toward a more democratic and more humane form of socialism than that which now exists.

Harry Schwartz is a member of the editorial board of The Times.
Red Lands Cool to Khrushchev Death

By MARTIN GANSBERG

Communist countries appeared yesterday to be slowly informing their people of the death on Saturday of Nikita S. Khrushchev, with short notices in newspapers and brief reports on television and radio.

In Washington, there was no official statement on Mr. Khrushchev's death. Other non-Communist governments issued no comment either.

In Poland, the newspapers carried articles no longer than a single paragraph on their front pages. There was no comment from the Government, and television reports used no film of the former Soviet Premier.

In Cuba, a radio station that broadcast news continuously made no announcement of the death of Mr. Khrushchev in its Saturday reports. The Cuban Communist newspaper, Granma, does not publish over the weekend.

Rumanians Quiet

Sunday newspapers in Rumania did not carry word of the death and radio and television stations also ignored the news. An official at Agerpress, the state-run news agency, said there would be no comment until today.

Spokesmen for the Communist party in the United States declined to comment on Mr. Khrushchev's death, although one man said that he thought there would be an official statement in The Daily World, the party's newspaper, this week. Editors of the newspaper could not be reached by telephone yesterday.

What reaction there was seemed to be limited in some cases to personal messages to Mr. Khrushchev's widow, Nina. Leaders of parties in several countries sent messages of condolence and mild tribute.

In Yugoslavia, for example, Marshal Tito sent a telegram of sympathy to Mrs. Khrushchev, but the text was not made public. And in Rome, Luigi Longo, secretary-general of the Italian Communist party, said in a message to Mrs. Khrushchev that her husband was "a sincere friend of our people and a passionate worker for peace and socialism."
Soviet Authorities This Morning Broke Their Silence and Avoided Any Praise of the Man He Was Ousted by the Current Leaders, Without Full State Honors.

Soviet authorities this morning broke their silence and avoided any praise of the man who had dominated Soviet political life for 11 years before he was ousted by the current Kremlin leaders seven years ago and was relegated to obscurity in his own country.

The announcement made public by Tsar, the Soviet press agency, a few hours before Pravda was to be distributed, said:

"The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, the Council of Ministers and the leadership of the party and government have decided to honor the memory of Comrade Nikolai V. Khrushchev, who died of a heart attack around noon on Saturday, with full state honors.

"Mr. Khrushchev is scheduled to be buried later today in Novodevichye Cemetery, which was his favorite place.

"It was signed by the Central Committee of the party and the Council of Ministers, and was read by the former First Secretary of the Central Committee and the Council of Ministers, special envoy of the party and government, Leonid I. Brezhnev.""

FRANCE HEARS OF KRUSHCHEV'S DEATH: Men, taking part in a festival in Paris sponsored by a Communist newspaper, listening to a radio in front of the Soviet booth.

*MOSCOW, Monday, Sept. 13-—Soviet authorities this morning broke their silence and avoided any praise of the man he was ousted by the current Kremlin leaders seven years ago and was relegated to obscurity in his own country.

The announcement made public by Tsar, the Soviet press agency, a few hours before Pravda was to be distributed, said:

"The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, the Council of Ministers and the leadership of the party and government have decided to honor the memory of Comrade Nikolai V. Khrushchev, who died of a heart attack around noon on Saturday, with full state honors.

"Mr. Khrushchev is scheduled to be buried later today in Novodevichye Cemetery, which was his favorite place.

"It was signed by the Central Committee of the party and the Council of Ministers, and was read by the former First Secretary of the Central Committee and the Council of Ministers, special envoy of the party and government, Leonid I. Brezhnev.""
or Nikolai v. Fodgorny, personally, as official obituaries usually are listed.

Nor was the time of his funeral or any information about it provided to the Soviet people as are funerals accorded high leaders who are given full state honors. Mr. Khrushchev sought to die in secret, and his death was a challenge to the national grief for the man who did not believe or refuse to believe the tabloids.

In Novodevichye are the graves of such famous Russian writers as Vladimir Mayakovsky, Aleksei Tolstoy, Nikolai Ostrovsky, and such of public figures as former Foreign Minister Maxim Litvinov, and physicist Igor Tamm. The families of Kremlin leaders are also here—Nadezhda Alliluyeva, wife of Stalin, as is the wife of Premier Kosygin.

Ironically, the man whom Mr. Khrushchev sought to discredit—Stalin—is buried next to the Kremlin wall, and only last year a bust was stalled in his honor. Stalin died in 1953 while in office, and his death was a national grief for the majority of Russians who did not believe or refuse to believe the tabloids.

The Pravda obituary differed from the usual effusive eulogies that are printed in honor of leading Soviet figures. The reference to "special pensioner" meant that upon his forced retirement he was awarded a private pension and did not have to receive only the social security benefit awarded on the basis of salary and seniority.

The cool tone of the notice was sure to be interpreted by both party propagandists and by ordinary Russians as a signal that even in his death there would be no change in the official evaluation of Mr. Khrushchev, which, since his ouster, has been quite negative.
Texts of Tributes Paid to Khrushchev at His Funeral

Special to The New York Times

Moscow, Sept. 13—Followed by a group of Donets Communists, a man who was the son of a Communist official was buried here yesterday. The funeral orations for Nikita S. Khrushchev delivered by his son, Sergei; by Nadezhda Dimanshtein, an Old Bolshevik; and by Vadim Vasilyev, a Communist and son of a purged Bolshevik, were not the official speeches. The only thing I can say is that he left few people indifferent to him. There were those who loved him, there were those who hated him, but there were few who would pass by without looking in his direction.

Nor do I want to speak about him as a great statesman. On that subject a great deal was said in the last few days, with rare exceptions, by newspapers of the entire world, by all radio stations. It is not up to me to appraise the contributions of Nikita Sergeyevich, father, father, before whom we are shedding tears, and the sky is shedding tears with us.

I will not speak about him as a great statesman. On that subject a great deal was said in the last few days, with rare exceptions, by newspapers of the entire world, by all radio stations. It is not up to me to appraise the contributions of Nikita Sergeyevich, father, father, before whom we are shedding tears, and the sky is shedding tears with us.

By Sergei Khrushchev

We have no official meeting, no official speeches. Therefore I would simply like to say a few words about the man we are burying here, the man for whom we are shedding tears, and the sky is shedding tears with us.

I will not speak about him as a great statesman. On that subject a great deal was said in the last few days, with rare exceptions, by newspapers of the entire world, by all radio stations. It is not up to me to appraise the contributions of Nikita Sergeyevich, father, father, before whom we are shedding tears, and the sky is shedding tears with us.

By Nadezhda Dimanshtein

Dear friends, dear comrades. It is a bitter honor for me to bid farewell to Nikita Sergeyevich on behalf of a group of Donets Communists. We remember Nikita Sergeyevich as an unbending proletarian, one who was to us, the younger people, an example of unyielding will, of unbending passion in defense of the party line.

We watched this man, in fighting for the party line, sweep away everything that was low, everything that served the personal interest. He was an example of a real party man, a real Bolshevik. He reared the broad masses of Donets Communists and proletarians. He reared huge numbers of people.

Later, for many of us who worked with him in the Moscow party organization, the meetings of the leadership of the Moscow city party committee constituted a real school of Bolshevism.

And that was the way we always saw him, a man who lived with the thoughts of the party's deeds, the deeds of our nation and of all mankind.

That image, comrades, will remain in the hearts of all those who had the fortune to work with Nikita Sergeyevich, all those who knew him, all those who saw him engaged in stubborn battles with our enemies, one who brought us up and led our party organization.

Let me say one last farewell to Nikita Sergeyevich on behalf of those who had the fortune to work under his leadership.

By Sergei Khrushchev

On behalf of the younger communists, if we can be called young, Vadim Vasilyev, a Communist and son of a purged Bolshevik, would now like to say a word. He knew Nikita Sergeyevich for many years and worked with him too.

By Vadim Vasilyev

Dear comrades. It is very bitter, very bitter for me to speak on this occasion, on this sad event in the life of our nation and of the entire world. It is not easy for me to speak.

Somewhere in the Taiga, the northern forest, are the graves of my father and my grandfather, who perished in the tragic year '37. It was Nikita Sergeyevich who restored honor and dignity to our dead relatives. It was deep respect for him that brought me here, and I grieve deeply for him, and with me my daughter and my wife.

By Sergei Khrushchev

It looks as if we will pronounce no more speeches. Much could be said and it would take a long time, but it seems to me that there is no need. We have bade farewell to Nikita Sergeyevich. Let us now close this meeting. My only request to you is not to crowd and to move a bit to the side. Thank you, comrades.
Lauds Khrushchev at Rites

By BERNARD GROWTEMAZ

Lauds Khrushchev at Rites

THE NEW YORK TIMES, Tuesday 14 September 1971.

Son Lauds Khrushchev

By BERNARD GROWTEMAZ

Moscow, Sept. 3—Nikita S. Khrushchev, who was in power for 10 years, was interred today in a simple ceremony from which the Soviet leaders were absent but which was marked by a statement of homage from his son, Alexei S. Adzhubei, chairman of the Communist Party of Cuba, who spoke of his father's contribution to the working class and the world.

Adzhubei paid tribute to the man who dominated Soviet political life for a quarter of a century. He spoke of Khrushchev as a critic of the Stalinist regime, of his efforts to expose Stalin's crimes, of his role in the anti-Stalin policy, and of his contributions to the world peace movement.

Adzhubei also paid tribute to Khrushchev's contribution to the world economy, pointing out that under his leadership, the Soviet economy had made tremendous progress in the development of industry, agriculture, and transportation.

He added that it was not up to the world to pass judgment on Khrushchev. It was up to history to judge his contributions.

Adzhubei ended his speech by saying that Khrushchev had been a man of peace and that his death was a great loss to the world.

Mr. Khrushchev died of a heart attack in isolation and his name was rarely mentioned. He was in power for 10 years, and his picture had been seen in public in nearly 40 years.

Soviets' leader's tombstone

The tombstone in the Novodevichye Monastery Cemetery bears the name Khrushchev, Nikita Sergeyevitch, and dates of his birth and death.

After the coffin was lowered, the ceremonial guard marched around it and then the parade formed into three groups. Then hundreds of flowers and wreaths were placed around it.

The ceremony was attended by a large crowd of people, including many representatives of the Soviet government.

The ceremony ended with the laying of a wreath by Adzhubei. He then turned to the gravesite and spoke a few words, reflecting a general attitude of indifference.

Special Passes Required

At the funeral service, special passes were required for admission.

The building, which is something like a chapel but with a something like a door to the grave, was surrounded by security forces. The building was occupied by the family and guests paid last respects. Over the wall of the funer-
Khrushchev was a plus

There are many things both good and bad that can be said about Nikita S. Khrushchev, who ran the Soviet Union for 11 years and who was buried as a "pensioner" most coolly and without full state honors in a cemetery well away from the Kremlin and Red Square.

He was coarse, earthy and sometimes vulgar. His shoe-banging at the United Nations will not soon be forgotten. He could and did miscalculate, as when he installed his missiles in Cuba in 1962. Peasant-born, he often used expressions which did not convey to more educated Russians, and even less to the outside world, what he intended to say, as when he seemed to threaten that "We will bury you."

But Khrushchev, while hardened in the Communist mold, had certain attributes. Boly-poly, beady-eyed and short-legged, he was down-to-earth and with an element of the clownish about him, at no time better exemplified than in his 1959 tour of this country with his polar opposite, the former ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge.

All that does not make a statesman. But what did, perhaps, was Khrushchev's realization that a new age existed in both Russia and the United States. Having risen in a brutal system, he could count the building of Moscow's world-renowned subway as one accomplishment. But perhaps his greatest was his unmasking of the crimes of Stalinism and his release of millions from the slave labor camps. He could, be hard on Soviet writers and intellectuals, but he let them publish and speak, which is more than can be said of his predecessors and successors.

The Cuban missile crisis was not entirely the US victory it was pictured: here; Khrushchev pulled out the missiles, but we had to promise not to try to invade Cuba again. And after all the brinkmanship, the cold war began to thaw and the earth bit by bit became a relatively safer place to inhabit.

Even after Khrushchev was deposed seven years ago, it was something that he was not, Stalin-style, liquidated. He lived out his life in peace, and that is all that most of us ask.

The evaluation of Khrushchev by the present hierarchy in Moscow is decidedly negative. But time may change that, as it has so many other things.
Ordinary Russians Pay Tribute to Khrushchev, and Some Deplore Way Officials Ignored His Death

BY THEODORE SHABAD
Special to The New York Times

MOSCOW, Sept. 14—Clusters of ordinary citizens gathered around the grave of Nikita S. Khrushchev today to reminisce about the man who led their country for 11 years until he fell into disfavor with his official associates.

As the group around the grave near the rear wall of Novodevichye Cemetery fell under threatening skies, people speaking in muted tones sought to reconstruct the details of the funeral yesterday, from which all but family and friends were excluded. "It is a disgrace," said a man in a worn leather coat. "They should have given him Red Square. After all, he did fight for his country and he planted corn."

The man was referring to Mr. Khrushchev's wartime service as a leading military commissar and to his passion for the cultivation of corn, particularly after a visit to the rich farmlands of the United States corn belt in 1959.

Except for one-sentence announcements within black borders on the front pages of Pravda and Izvestia, the principal national newspapers, the Soviet press has not mentioned the name of Mr. Khrushchev, who died Saturday at the age of 77. The death notice was not reprinted in provincial newspapers. At the grave, heaped with pine twigs and fresh flowers, Russians peered at the framed photograph of Mr. Khrushchev above a slab of white marble on which his name and the dates of his birth and death had been carved in gilt letters.

"That's an old picture," a man said knowingly. "He must have been 50 at the time." A white-haired man with a full beard noticed the lettering on a red linen ribbon that bore the name of Anastas I. Mikoyan, the only former associate of Mr. Khrushchev who sent a wreath. "Attaboy, Mikoyan!" the man exclaimed. "He was not afraid." "Oh, a traitor," someone chimed in, laughing. "So he broke with the ranks. How do you like that?"

Older people took a more positive view of the situation. "At least, anyone has free access to the grave," said a woman as a policeman stationed nearby to keep order looked on with nothing to do. Many of those who had traveled to the cemetery in a southwestern district of Moscow appeared to be sympathizers of the one-time Premier and Communist party leader. Their reactions seemed to contrast with the indifference to his death voiced by others in the last few days.

Those who appeared to be better informed than most passed on tidbits about the funeral, which was attended by about 200 people. "No one was there," said a woman, alluding to the absence of any leading officials. "Just his wife and other relatives. They brought him here straight from the hospital where he had died." It was nearly closing time. A middle-aged woman gathered up a few flowers that had fallen to the ground and carefully placed them on top of the grave before joining the crowd as it filed out. Jail Penalty for Manson

JAIL PENALTY FOR MANSON

LOS ANGELES, Sept. 14 (AP)—Charles Manson, cult leader sentenced to death for the Tate-LaBianca killings, has lost his visitor privilege for 10 days because he set fire to the bedding in his cell, according to prison authorities. Manson set fire to blankets yesterday, they said.
TO: THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Roberto & I suggest the attached revision of your draft on Jews in USSR.
Suggested changes start in the fourth chapter.

R.G.U.
21 Sep 71
Last week at the luncheon of the Memorial Scholarship Fund of the United Nations Correspondents Association, I attempted to develop the theme "The Role of the Secretary-General". In the course of my speech I said that much of my time has been spent in attempts to exercise good offices in one form or another, and the less publicity there is during or after these efforts, the more successful they are likely to be. The success of such exercise requires total discretion and the co-operation, restraint and goodwill of the parties concerned.

In many ways the Secretary-General's activities in the sphere of good offices may be compared to an iceberg; only a small portion is actually visible (if at all) and a very substantial part remains submerged. Tonight I am illustrating this point with a purpose.

For over two years the question of Soviet citizens of the Jewish faith who want to leave the Soviet Union has been receiving very wide attention. The question of human rights vis-à-vis the concept of the domestic jurisdiction of a Member State as prescribed in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter has been a perennial preoccupation of many Member States in several deliberative organs of the United Nations. This is an area where the Secretary-General may be able to help, in spite of the legal and practical limitations, by the discreet exercise of his good offices.

In the course of the last two years many requests and appeals from Soviet citizens of the Jewish faith wishing to leave the Soviet Union for Israel have been officially brought to my attention. I have received such appeals, individually or collectively, from some 800 persons, and have in all cases undertaken to do all within my power to help, while at the same
time pointing out that in such matters the greatest discretion and lack of publicity are essential.

Last month I was gratified to be informed officially that more than 400 out of 800 appellants on my list were now in Israel. At the same time appreciation was expressed for my efforts in this delicate matter. I very much hope that this favourable trend will continue.

It was far from my intention to mention this matter publicly during my tenure as Secretary-General, not least because I realize that any public statement might well jeopardize my future usefulness in this regard. However, the erroneous impression has been given that the world Organization is not concerned with such problems, that nothing is being done, and that public pressure, sometimes of a violent kind, will help to promote a solution. In fact, my office has been receiving a continuous flow of criticism and complaints, some of them violent to the point of irrationality, on this matter. This tide of uninformed abuse comes both from individuals and from organizations which accuse the United Nations of indifference, apathy, impotence and worse. In all fairness to the United Nations, and indeed to all those with whom I have dealt on this question, which is a difficult one for all concerned, it therefore seemed to me necessary now to make a brief statement of the facts of the matter. I very much hope that this disclosure will not put an end to the understanding attitude with which my approaches have been met concerning a question of great difficulty and delicacy, and to the favourable developments which seem now to be taking place.

Under my general obligation as Secretary-General to do what I can in humanitarian matters, I have tried to help in this, as in similar questions, and would hope that the above-mentioned facts and figures will speak for themselves.
Confidential. For insertion in my speech on Friday.

Last week at the luncheon of the Memorial Scholarship Fund of the United Nations Correspondents Association, I attempted to develop the theme "The Role of the Secretary-General." In the course of my speech I said that much of my time has been spent in attempts to exercise good offices in one form or another, and the less publicity there is during or after these efforts, the more successful they are likely to be. The success of such exercise requires total discretion and the cooperation, restraint and goodwill of the parties concerned.

In many ways the Secretary-General's activities in the sphere of good offices may be compared to an iceberg; only a small portion is actually visible, if at all, and a very substantial part remains submerged.

Tonight I am mentioning this point with a purpose. For over two years the question of Soviet citizens of the Jewish faith who want to leave the Soviet Union has been receiving very wide attention. The question of human rights vis-à-vis the concept of the domestic jurisdiction of a member state as prescribed in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter has been a perennial preoccupation of many member states in several deliberative organs of the United Nations. This is one area where the Secretary-General may be able to help.
In spite of the legal and practical limitations, by the discreet exercise of his good offices.

In the course of the last two years, the P.K. of Israel brought to my attention requests and appeals from the Soviet citizens of the Jewish faith wanting to leave the Soviet Union for Israel. Written appeals individually and collectively addressed to me, brought by the P.K. of Israel number approximately eight hundred. On every occasion I informed the P.K. of Israel that I would very discreetly exercise my good offices and requested him not to give any publicity to this matter. From time to time the P.K. of Israel furnished me with the list of those who had already arrived in Israel, and last month he informed me that over four hundred Soviet Jews, more than half of those who appealed to me, had been settled in Israel, and he expressed appreciation for my good offices exercised in "quiet diplomacy".

It was far from my intention to disclose these facts during my tenure as Secretary-General since I realize that such a disclosure at this time would certainly put an end to my future utility in this regard. However, I have decided to reveal it because of the continuous flow of criticism and complaints received by my office from individuals and organizations accusing the United Nations of indifference, apathy, impotence and worse. I very much regret that this disclosure will terminate my good offices in this particular area of "quiet diplomacy," but I am gratified at the knowledge that towards the end of my mandate, among other things, I have been able to make over four hundred people happier.