



UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



Distr.  
GENERAL

A/4550  
26 October 1960  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: RUSSIAN

Fifteenth session

LETTER DATED 21 OCTOBER 1960 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF  
THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS TO THE UNITED NATIONS TO  
THE PRESIDENT OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

I have the honour to enclose herewith the text of a speech delivered by  
Mr. N.S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Soviet delegation to the fifteenth session  
of the United Nations General Assembly, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of  
the USSR, at a meeting of working people of Moscow held on 20 October 1960 and  
devoted to the work of the Soviet delegation at the General Assembly session.

Please have this text circulated as a United Nations document.

(Signed) V. ZORIN  
Permanent Representative of the USSR  
to the United Nations

SPEECH DELIVERED BY N.S. KRUSHCHEV AT A MEETING OF WORKING  
PEOPLE OF MOSCOW HELD ON 20 OCTOBER 1960 AND DEVOTED TO THE  
WORK OF THE SOVIET DELEGATION AT THE FIFTEENTH SESSION OF  
THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Dear muscovite comrades!

Dear comrades and friends, listening to me on the radio in other towns and villages of our great homeland!

I should like to let you have our impressions of our participation in the work of the fifteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly and, in conformity with established tradition, give an account of the work done there.

If the question is asked: was it worth while travelling to New York to this session, it can be said without any reservations that it was not only worth while but necessary to go there. It is now acknowledged throughout the world that the current session of the General Assembly is of exceptional importance.

The Soviet Government deemed it necessary that the most pressing, vitally important problems of our time should be discussed at the session. We considered that the most responsible statesmen should attend the United Nations General Assembly. The Government of the United States and its allies sought to discredit this idea, but, as you know, nothing came of this.

Our position has met with the warmest support in all socialist countries, with a broad response and understanding on the part of the Governments of many countries of the world. In order not to become isolated, the President of the United States, the Prime Ministers of the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and some others of their allies were compelled, as one says, to change horses in midstream and rush to the session.

As world public opinion rightly points out, the fifteenth session of the General Assembly has been the most representative international meeting ever held in modern history. The Heads of State, the heads of Government and leading statesmen from more than thirty countries met there.

Many highly important international problems have been submitted for consideration at this session. The delegation of the Soviet Union proposed for discussion such urgent matters as the question of general and complete disarmament, the abolition of colonialism and the granting of independence to all peoples and

countries, the aggressive actions of the United States of America against other States, and the necessity of changing the structure of the executive organs of the United Nations. The agenda also includes such questions as the restoration of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, the Algerian issue and many others.

The attendance at the session of delegations of the socialist countries, headed by the leaders of those countries, and also the attendance of the Heads of State and heads of Government of many other States Members of the United Nations produced considerable results.

In the spacious hall of the General Assembly delegates listened with great attention and interest to the speeches made by many outstanding statesmen of our time. A profound impression was made by the speeches delivered by the chairmen of the delegations of the countries of the socialist camp: the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Comrade Antonin Novotny; the Chairman of the Polish delegation, Comrade Wladyslaw Gomulka; the Chairman of the Romanian delegation, Comrade Gheorghe Gheorghiu Dej; the Chairman of the Hungarian delegation, Comrade Janos Kadar; the Chairman of the Bulgarian delegation, Comrade Zhivkov; the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Albania, Comrade Mehmet Shehu. The session was addressed by the leaders of the delegations of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Comrade N.V. Podgorny, and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Comrade K.T. Mazurov.

The speeches made by the leaders of the delegations of the socialist countries resounded as the voice of a new, just world bringing to the peoples happiness and prosperity on earth. At the same time their speeches were a severe condemnation of imperialism, colonialism - a world which clings to everything outlived and, doomed by history, creates a threat to the peace and the security of the peoples.

A major contribution in the struggle for peace, for the abolition of the colonial system detested by the peoples, was made by the speeches of the President of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah; the President of Guinea, Sekou Touré; the President of Indonesia, Sukarno; the Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru; the President of the United Arab Republic, Gamal Abdel Nasser; the Head of State of Cambodia, Norodom Sihanouk, and other representatives of independent States. A great impression was made by the vivid speech delivered by Fidel Castro, the heroic son

of the Cuban people and Prime Minister of Cuba. Many constructive proposals were also made in the speeches of other statesmen.

The representatives of the imperialist countries and the defenders of colonialism sought in every way, often overtly, but even more often covertly to uphold, to defend their position. And, as you already know, quite frequently, such battles flared up at the session as this international Organization has not known since its inception.

Our journey was also useful because we had many meetings and exchanged opinions with statesmen from various countries on a whole series of vitally important international problems. All this promotes better mutual understanding and the establishment of closer relations between States.

During the long years of its existence, much has accumulated in the United Nations which needs resolute revision and adjustment in conformity with the present deployment of forces in the world. It can be said that the principal line in the proceedings of the first stage of the fifteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly was the struggle between the new, the progressive and the old, the obsolete, retarding the development and growth of the new.

Permit me now, dear comrades, to dwell in somewhat greater detail on the principal factors in the present international situation and the work of our delegation to the fifteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

#### I. Changes in the world since the establishment of the United Nations

Comrades,

The fifteenth session of the General Assembly is regarded by many people as a special session. This is quite justified. The session summed up some results of what has been done in the United Nations since its foundation.

It was rightly pointed out at the session that great political and social changes have taken place in the world in the last fifteen years.

These changes lie, above all, in the growth of the powerful camp of the socialist countries. Now more than one thousand million people live and work under the banners of socialism. The emergence of the world socialist system is of decisive importance for the development of all mankind, for its destinies.

After the Second World War, at the time when the United Nations was being set up, the capitalist system was still dominant in the world, the colonial system was still firmly entrenched. Great social changes had taken place in the fifteen post-war years. A number of socialist States emerged in Europe and Asia. They not only emerged, but rapidly gained in strength, upheld their revolutionary gains and demonstrated superiority over the capitalist system in the advance of the economy and well-being of the mass of the people, in the progress of science and culture.

It is precisely the socialist countries that hold the lead in rate of expansion of production, in the exploration of outer space, in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

We Communists were charged with being oppressors, with being able to organize people only in order to seize power, with trampling underfoot the freedom of the individual, with being unable to create, to organize the work of industry and agriculture. Our enemies tried to prove that we would not advance science and culture. They said that the revolution destroys but does not create. Where are these gentlemen now, where are these sorry prophets? They have their tail between their legs and are silent! What else can they do but keep silent!

Now it is clear to the whole world that genuine freedom, a fast rate of economic development and cultural progress are to be found where the people triumph, where the new in the organization of society prevails, that is to say, where socialism triumphs. In conditions of socialism a free people is building a new life on the foundation of the teachings of the great thinkers of mankind - Marx, Engels and Lenin. The fruits of this teaching can now be seen by everyone, except, perhaps, the politically blind.

The colonial world also underwent tremendous changes during this period. Colonial empires are crumbling. It can even be said that the colonial empires have crumbled and that their fragments are now cracking. India, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon and other countries in Asia cast off the colonial yoke. The exceptionally tempestuous process of the liberation of the peoples of Africa is now taking place. The long suffering peoples of Africa are, at last, acquiring human rights.

All these great changes that have taken place in the world cannot be ignored. When the United Nations was founded after the Second World War, the political map of the world was different, and this map determined the structure of this international Organization.

During those years the United States of America dominated the entire world. That country was the richest and economically the strongest. Evidently, this also predetermined the fact that the United Nations, its Headquarters, was set up in the United States of America. Geographically, this creates great inconveniences, to say nothing of the fact that the order existing in the United States does not favour the location there of such an international Organization. If a site for the Headquarters of the United Nations were to be selected now, the peoples of Africa, the Negroes would hardly agree to the Headquarters being situated in a country where Negroes are not regarded as human beings, where they are the victims of savage discrimination that goes as far as lynching.

All these and many other factors in international affairs indicate that a reappraisal of values, a new approach to the solution of highly important world problems, is now required.

When the United Nations was founded, its main purpose was rightly envisaged as the safeguarding of peace, the settling of those issues which create tension and can lead to the outbreak of a third world war. The emphasis was laid on creating a body which could cope with difficulties and conflicts arising between States. It was with this object in view that the Security Council was set up.

The Security Council, very rightly at that time, was made up of eleven members, five of them being permanent members. It was laid down that the United States of America, the Soviet Union, China, the United Kingdom and France were to be the permanent members of the Security Council.

I should like to emphasize that it was precisely these five States, each of which was regarded as a great Power at the time, that entered the Security Council as its permanent members. The wisdom of the political leaders of that time who were the organizers of the United Nations was that they accorded equal rights to each great Power in the Security Council, though the socialist countries were in an absolute minority in the world at that time. The Soviet Union and the

Mongolian People's Republic were the only socialist countries at that time. But the same rights were accorded to the Soviet Union, a socialist State, as to the other permanent members of the Security Council. Recognition of this equality found expression in the fact that the United Nations Charter laid down the principle of the unanimity of the great Powers, the right of veto. No one, even if it was a question of four States against one State, could take any cardinal decisions detrimental to the world, detrimental to any of the five great Powers.

In short, it was the capitalist countries that were predominant in the world in those days. But the founders of the United Nations were right in believing that the United Nations would be able to cope with the tasks with which it was charged only if the majority, and it was the capitalist countries and the colonialist Powers that were then in the majority, did not abuse their position vis-a-vis the minority. Only on that condition could the United Nations exist, develop and fulfil the role for which it was established.

What, however, was the political map of the world at the time the fifteenth session of the General Assembly opened? This picture, I repeat, is widely different from what it was when the United Nations came into being.

To begin with, as I said before, there has arisen a world socialist system embracing countries with over one-third of the world's population. The socialist nations have enormous economic potential. They are producing even today over one-third of the world's total output and nearly half of the world output of some key items of industrial and agricultural production.

From the ruins of the colonial system there have emerged many independent States which are pursuing a policy of avoiding military blocs and alignments. These States are India, Indonesia, Burma, the United Arab Republic, the Republics of Ghana, Guinea and Nigeria, and others.

The position of the former great colonial imperialist Powers has also changed fundamentally. By what right can the United Kingdom be considered a great State today, while India cannot? By what right? In the old days whoever had a big stick was considered great. It is the United Kingdom that used to be the major colonial Power at one time. It brought other nations into submission by force of arms and ruled them by brandishing its stick. It seized all but half

of the world and that was the measure of its power. Today the situation is different. Since the end of the Second World War, the United Kingdom has had to rest content with less than it had before. And the fact that it still retains and oppresses some colonial countries through force and violence signifies the decline, and not the rise, of its power. Its soldiers still march the way they did in the time of Queen Victoria, and some in the United Kingdom do not want to realize that the times have changed. The United Kingdom has long since ceased to be the workshop of the world and the mistress of the seas.

France is another imperialist and colonial Power, which has built up its might in the same way, that is, by conquering and ruthlessly enslaving the African peoples and the peoples of Asia. This great Power has been at war with Algeria for over six years now and has so far failed to show its greatness by stopping its piratic policy. The times have changed. Today the peoples are fighting a life and death struggle for freedom against their oppressors, the colonialists, and are waging a successful struggle to defend their human rights.

Why, then, is France regarded as a great nation, but Indonesia is not? Why have India and Indonesia been placed in a position different from that of the United Kingdom and France in the United Nations; why, for instance, are they not permanent members of the Security Council?

Or take the United States of America. It is still the mightiest capitalist Power. But whereas in the old days the United States had a force of attraction, as the land of ascendant monopoly capital and as the land that had a democratic bourgeois Constitution, it has since forfeited this position. Today the United States is a reactionary State dominated by monopoly capital, a State which is pursuing an imperialistic policy, which is bound up with, and is the leader of, the colonialists.

Everything in the United States is forced into a state of submission to capital and militarism, although a semblance of democracy is still preserved. Monopoly capital is in possession of everything: the means and implements of production, such powerful ideological tools as the Press, publishing houses, television, broadcasting and cinema are all being used to break the will of the people and to deceive the masses.



In the past the United States had an economy and power that were in sharp contrast to those of the rest of the world. It is separated from Europe and Asia by the oceans, and those were an insurmountable barrier during the wars that raged in Europe and Asia. The United States experienced no horrors of war, no famine, no destruction. Today the oceans are no longer an unassailable natural fortress of the United States. The United States is losing its exceptional economic position too.

The Soviet Union and all the socialist countries have scored tremendous successes in their economic development. We have surpassed the United States in a number of sciences, in the field of education, culture and art, to say nothing of the superiority of the political and social system which has been won by the peoples of the socialist countries.

The United States has lost the power of attraction it once had. On the contrary, there are factors in operation today which make the United States repugnant to other peoples and States. This is an essential change. It has not yet been grasped in full by the Americans themselves. One may say it has not as yet been grasped by many people in the world, but they feel it, although they have not drawn conclusions from the changed situation. This is why the United States of America is no longer as great a nation in the world arena as it used to be, although it is still economically and militarily the strongest capitalist country in the world.

China, at the time the United Nations was created, was broken up and was thought little of. The reason why the countries of monopoly capital seated it in the Security Council must have been to tie China to the capitalist world so as to prevent it from being infected with socialist, marxist-leninist ideas. The imperialist powers wanted to keep the Great Wall of China intact, for monopoly capital to use it as a bastion separating the world of socialism from the world of capitalism.

But the Chinese people decided to live as they saw fit. The Chinese people, under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, won a great victory in the heroic struggle for their liberation. The Chinese people effectively used the favourable situation which arose after the Second World War, when the fascist forces had been routed in Europe and militaristic Japan had been defeated. The Chinese National Liberation Army was given a rear it could rely on. It smashed

the army of Chiang Kai-shek who had by then gone over altogether to the side of the United States of America, the side of imperialism.

Ever since China became a People's China, Chinese in the true sense of the term, and its Government began genuinely to reflect the will and aspirations of the people, the monopolist and imperialist Powers do not recognize it. The imperialists do not recognize a Chinese China, but do recognize as China the Island of Taiwan occupied by the United States. People's China has not even been admitted to the United Nations and is not occupying its rightful seat.

Why does this happen? Has China disappeared? No, it has not! China does exist! Is it not as great as it was? Yes, China has become great indeed today, economically and politically a more powerful nation. China is not recognized because it has become a socialist State. The fear caused by the emergence of a socialist China knocked all sense out of the imperialists and they began to deny the existence of Chinese China.

Well, we know what this means from our own history. Indeed, for a long time the most rabid imperialists treated the Soviet Union as no more than a geographic entity instead of as a great nation. The United States of America did not recognize the Soviet Union for sixteen years. So, I repeat, we know what this means.

Latterly, it is true, even some bourgeois statesmen have come to realize the senselessness of United States policy with respect to China and deplore it. Each year it is becoming more and more difficult for the United States to uphold its policy of non-recognition of People's China. At every session of the General Assembly the mechanical majority is whittled down and the policy of this mechanical majority in relation to China is laid bare. Plainly, this policy will collapse completely before long. If God does not punish the government leaders of the United States and deprive them of reason, the best thing for them would be to support the restoration of China's rights in the United Nations and the expulsion of Chiang Kai-shek's puppet. Will the United States statesmen be able to use the gift of God or not? We shall not try to guess. Time will tell. But if they should fail to act sensibly, they will have in the near future to swallow the most bitter pill for their policy with respect to People's China.

People's China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Burma and other Asian States are playing an ever-increasing role in world affairs and world politics.

Vast changes have taken place in Africa, too, over the past few years. There were only three independent States in Africa when the United Nations was established. The entire territory of that continent was divided among the colonialists who had oppressed the African peoples for decades. The Africa of today is an entirely different place. There are twenty-six independent States on that continent today which have a population of over 180 million. A very significant point is that the independence of the overwhelming majority of these countries - sixteen out of twenty-six - was proclaimed this year, in 1960.

The representatives of the young African States at the United Nations General Assembly said that 1960 was the year of Africa. The whole of Africa is aflame with a national liberation movement. Yet over twenty countries and Trust Territories on the African continent are still under colonial rule. These countries have a population of over 50 million. The peoples of the colonial and dependent countries are fighting against foreign oppression and, beyond all doubt, will win their independence.

These are some features of the social and political map of the world fifteen years after the establishment of the United Nations.

The imperialist States - the States of monopoly capital - which belong to the military blocs of the Western Powers, wish to rely on their armed strength in order to perpetuate the predominant position in the United Nations which they had at the time the United Nations was founded. They wish to retain this predominance at any cost, although history has, in fact, deprived them of these rights and - and this I would say is the main thing - has deprived them of such opportunities. The former economic superiority which once enabled the imperialist States to exert pressure on many nations of the world is being lost. The imperialist Powers have likewise lost their former military superiority on which they relied in carrying through their "policy of strength".

Yet the ruling circles in the imperialist countries continue to nurse the illusion that they still retain their former supremacy.

It is quite natural and logical, therefore, that the delegation of the Soviet Union should have pointed out at the fifteenth session of the

General Assembly that the structure of the United Nations is outdated. This structure corresponded to the relationship of forces and to the role and importance of the States as they were at the time the United Nations was established, that is, in 1945. But it is entirely out of keeping with the present situation. It has become necessary to modify the United Nations structure in accordance with the new relationship of forces of the three major groups of States in the world - socialist, imperialist and neutralist. This statement of the question has found support and understanding among many representatives at the current session.

We have not made any specific proposals as yet, but we have put forward some points of principle with regard to this question.

The reason we have raised the question of changing the structure of the United Nations executive organs is not that we want to have some privileges in the United Nations. Our position - the position of the socialist countries - is generally known today, and no sensible person can deny the importance of the countries of socialism in the United Nations.

The United Nations itself cannot exist without the socialist countries in it. Why? Some may say that the socialist nations are in the minority today. But it is silly to judge the importance of this or that group of States in the United Nations by the number of countries these groups include. Unless one-third of the world's population, possessing half the power of the entire world, is represented in the United Nations, the United Nations will, indeed, become meaningless as a world organization.

The triumphs of socialism have a power of attraction even for those who do not recognize our system, but who can no longer shrug it off and ignore its sweeping progress. To ignore this is something which only a blind man can do, who says there is no light and no sun, and that what the others say about light and the sun is just a fairy tale.

We consider that the United Nations should be improved as an international instrument created to prevent a new world war. For this the first thing to do is to revert to the ideas and principles which were laid down at the time the United Nations and its Security Council were established, that is, to recognize the principle of equal terms for all States and, above all, for those on which it depends whether there will be a new world war or not.

Whereas only five countries - the United States of America, the Soviet Union, China, the United Kingdom and France - were listed as great Powers at the time the United Nations was established, today the list of these great Powers is, quite naturally, much bigger. One cannot, of course, while including the United Kingdom and France in this list, fail to include India and Indonesia, not to speak of the restoration of the rights of the People's China.

The imperialist colonial Powers, pursuing their own selfish group interests, have managed to spoil something of what was done when the United Nations was established. They have started acting in contravention of the United Nations Charter. The Charter provided that the Security Council was to solve the most important problems by applying the rule of unanimity of the five great Powers - the permanent members of the Security Council. Whenever the representatives of the Western Powers failed to push through any resolution of theirs, they bypassed the Council by bringing those issues direct before a session of the General Assembly.

Thus, the Security Council's most important principle of unanimity, laid down in order to ensure peace, is being violated by them. They have bypassed this principle and wish to get such issues settled by a mechanical majority or a two-thirds majority in the General Assembly, in the hope that the voting machine will rescue them. But this is no way out of the situation. All they are doing is to open a valve through which there can break out such a conflict as will bring mankind to a global war disaster.

This situation increases the danger that the United Nations itself may push the world to the brink of war or indeed into the very cauldron of war. It is necessary strictly to comply with the United Nations Charter with regard to the principle of great-Power unanimity in settling the most complicated international problems in the Security Council. But this is only one side of the matter. Account should also be taken of the altered conditions in the world, the new balance of forces in the world arena. It is already clearly insufficient for only five great Powers to be represented in the Security Council as permanent members.

Consequently, the organizational structure of the United Nations must now be so arranged that the three groups of States - socialist, imperialist and

neutralist - should be on an equal footing in the solution of international problems on which the issue of peace or war largely depends.

Those who insist on the old, who wish to preserve the old and do not recognize the new, do not understand that the old does not lead to the strengthening of peace. The old here is fraught with a great danger of war. Those who do not take account of the interests of all the three groups of States and wish to exploit the international organization in the interests of one group, namely the group of States of monopoly, imperialist capital, are not guided by the interests of strengthening peace.

That is why the structure of the United Nations must be altered and its executive organs made to fit the requirements of life, to accord with the principle of equal representation for all three groups of States. Otherwise it will not be the United Nations, but rather the disunited nations.

I have spoken of altering the structure of the Security Council. This, of course, fully applies to the executive organs of the United Nations, to its Secretary-General. No one man, however brilliant, can objectively express the interests of three groups of States simultaneously.

It is quite natural that, since the United Nations is now dominated by the United States of America and its allies - the United Kingdom, France and other countries of monopoly capital which pursue an imperialist, colonialist policy - they nominate their candidates to the principal United Nations posts. Whose candidate is the present United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Hammarskjold? It is clear to all that he is the candidate of the United States of America. The Swedes say that he is a representative of Sweden. True, he is a Swede by birth, but by his political views he is a representative of the United States of America, and he serves the United States. Let not the Swedes be offended by this. We too have our own Hammarskjold in the United States - Kerensky. He is Russian by birth, but whom does he serve? He serves American imperialist capital, and the Russian people have been getting along rather well without him for many years now.

Of course, each group of States would like to have its own candidate hold the post of Secretary-General. That is natural, but unrealistic. Each group of States wishing to introduce its representative into the United Nations executive organ wants to dominate, but our thesis is that there should be no domination by any one group of States in the executive organ of the United Nations - the Secretariat.

Consequently, the most radical and just solution of the question of both the United Nations Secretariat and the Security Council would be to apply the principle of equal rights, equal opportunities, equal representation. The United Nations Secretariat must consist of three secretaries.

The objection may be raised that it will then be extremely difficult to settle questions. It is difficult to do so in the parliament of a single country too, especially in the parliaments of bourgeois countries, as antagonistic classes exist there, and each class has its own party and its own representatives. The ruling classes pursue their own policy, that of suppressing the other classes. In so doing, they rely on capital, and capital is a great force. It seemingly does not vote, but it bribes and thus makes its voice heard through representatives of other classes whom it has bought over. But this happens within a single State.

To apply such a parliamentary system to an international organization is quite unjustifiable. The United Nations embraces about a hundred States, and three systems of States stand out sharply in the world today. To start suppressing this or that group would be to embark on the course of employing force, the course of preparing for war. But it was not to wage wars that the United Nations was set up. It was established as an instrument for ensuring peace.

To ensure lasting peace, it is necessary that the interests of none of these groups of States should be violated, that international problems should be settled with due regard for the interests of all three groups of States. Only then can peace be ensured.

If a one-sided policy is followed in the United Nations, in the Security Council, the Assembly and the Executive, if the interests of all three groups of States are not observed, the United Nations will commit suicide. In those circumstances, its decisions will not be respected by all States. In that event, no group of States can oblige other States to carry out the decisions adopted. Such a situation may raise international tension to the breaking point, and the conflagration of a world war might be set off by even an accidental spark.

World War II left the German question still unsettled. Large and small countries are taking part in the United Nations, but the German people is not.

Italy has been admitted to the United Nations and so has Japan, formerly a militaristic State. Even Spain and Portugal, which are fascist States, have been admitted. Why then is not the German people represented in the United Nations? Because there is no peace treaty with Germany. The imperialist States are artificially postponing the conclusion of a peace treaty. They are trying by this means to avoid recognizing the German Democratic Republic. But this is a foolish policy, because the German Democratic Republic has existed and has been developing for eleven years now. It is necessary to put an end to this state of affairs and conclude a peace treaty with Germany. It is necessary to solve this question, to place on record the conditions and changes that have been brought about by the war, so that the German people should be represented in the United Nations Organization on a basis of equality.

I repeat, the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany is of great importance for the relaxation of international tension. The continued existence of the state of war with Germany does nothing but poison the atmosphere, because all the questions to be settled in connexion with the signature of a peace treaty have already found solutions that have received de facto recognition.

It is now clearly necessary to solve them as they stand; it is only necessary to place on record the existing state of affairs - the existence of two German States and the inviolability of the frontiers established after World War II.

No sober politician expects that anyone will give up or renounce the achievements of socialism in the German Democratic Republic. Nor does anyone think that West Germany will today renounce its political and social system. Therefore it is necessary to give de facto recognition to the situation that has already taken shape and to place it on record in an appropriate treaty.

With regard to West Berlin, too, we have time and again proposed a reasonable solution.

The German question is now being used for political aims; it is being exploited in some States in the course of election campaigns.

A presidential election is now approaching in the United States of America. The German question is an inevitable feature of the election campaign. Will the situation in Germany change or not? That is, will a peace treaty be signed with the two German States or will the present situation continue? This subject crops up continuously in the election debates. The aggressive circles, which are bent



on preserving this hotbed of war, are trying to exploit the German question for the purposes of their "positions of strength" policy. But a trial of strength on such an issue is dangerous.

West Germany, too, is exploiting the question of a peace treaty with Germany. And here is what happens. For example, the line is taken in 1960 that it is impossible to raise the question and to reach agreement on the German problem because the presidential election in the United States is an obstacle to this. We are dropped a hint that we should pay no attention to the talk about the German question during the election campaign, but that once the elections are over, it will be possible to reach agreement.

But there will be elections in West Germany in 1961. There, too, the aggressive circles, the representatives of monopoly capital, are exploiting the German question, and there, too, some leaders hint that Chancellor Adenauer cannot be expected to abandon his point of view because, if he does, Brandt will win the election. Have patience, therefore, till the elections are over and conditions may then arise for a more realistic approach to the solution of the German question.

So the extremely important question of the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany is being continuously postponed, a question which requires solution and which is fraught with grave military danger if left unresolved.

This question must be settled. And it must apparently be settled in 1961.

Common sense must prevail. It is necessary to sign a peace treaty, and the climate in Europe will then be entirely different.

The steps West Germany has taken against the German Democratic Republic, which include the violation of trade agreements, tend to aggravate the situation, because the German Democratic Republic can also take corresponding steps and all these factors taken together, are not conducive to an improvement in the relations between countries. It is necessary, therefore, as we agreed with the Western countries after the United States brought about the failure of the Paris conference, that no steps should be taken which would have the effect of exacerbating relations. We proposed a summit meeting after the presidential election in the United States so that fresh efforts could be made to settle the issues in dispute, to reach agreement on the conclusion of a peace treaty with the two German States and, under that treaty, to solve the question of West Berlin by making it a free city.

We abide by these positions. But if another policy is forced on us, the responsibility for this will rest with the imperialist Powers of the West.

General and complete disarmament - the way to enduring peace

Comrades, the Soviet Union has declared repeatedly that the question of disarmament is the crux of all the vital international issues of our time.

Mankind has been endeavouring for decades to solve the problem of ridding the world of destructive wars, the arms race and the competition in developing weapons of annihilation. In the past, such endeavours were foredoomed to failure. In circumstances in which the exploiting classes exercised undivided sway, society was rent apart by irreconcilable class contradictions which imperialism had carried to the extreme limits, and more than half of mankind was under the colonial yoke, continuous wars between States for a redivision of the world were a constant feature of the life of society.

Before the emergence of the world system of socialism, all attempts to get rid of wars were pious illusions and dreams. Sometimes they also served as a means of deluding people. It may be recalled, for example, how the bourgeoisie asserted during World War I that the war had to be won by the Entente Powers so that there should be no more wars. We know, however, that World War I was followed by many others and, finally, the fascists, with the connivance of the imperialists of the United States, the United Kingdom and France, started the even more destructive World War II.

Now that science has discovered weapons of unheard-of destructive power, any new world war would bring mankind untold calamity and suffering. We are convinced that mankind will not perish in the event of a new war. It will merely cast off, finally and resolutely, the rotten capitalist system, which gives birth to wars. The question arises, however: need the victory of the new be achieved at such a fearful cost? Must the establishment of a new system on the ruins of the old be paid for in the blood of hundreds of millions of people? Is there no other way?

All reasonable people understand the necessity of creating conditions which would preclude the possibility of the outbreak of wars waged for the sake of enriching some countries at the expense of others. The Marxists-Leninists see such a possibility.

We, Marxists-Leninists are well aware of the full complexity of questions of war and peace. Wars developed simultaneously with the division of society into classes. The danger of wars and the basis for their outbreak will be finally and irrevocably eliminated with the abolition of the division of society into rich and poor, into haves and have-nots, into exploiters and exploited, with the establishment of a social system which is not based on the brutal bourgeois principle that man preys on man.

Such a world will have nothing in common with the world of capitalism governed by the law under which the strong robs and exploits the weak. In the countries of imperialism, those who have the capital have everything, while the ordinary people who work and create all the material and spiritual assets but who have no capital and are deprived of the means of production, are subjected to exploitation and discrimination.

The ruling circles of the United States describe the so-called American way of life as a model for the "free world". But what kind of freedom is involved? It is freedom to exploit, freedom to rob, freedom to die of starvation in the presence of surpluses, freedom to be unemployed when productive capacity stands idle. Freedom in the United States is freedom for monopoly capital to oppress the working people, to bamboozle people with the bipartisan system and to impose its will on their partners in military blocs. Such a society provides a basis for wars between countries because the tendency towards reaction inside the country and towards expansion and aggression outside is characteristic of monopoly capital, of imperialism.

To preserve peace under conditions in which imperialism exercises undivided domination would have been impossible. But the situation changed with the emergence of a new social system - socialism, which is taking the place of capitalism. The socialist system is a more progressive one; it establishes new laws in the relations between people, new laws in the relations between nations and States. Our conviction is that all mankind will come to accept socialism, communism - a harmonious society which will know no antagonistic classes and will be based on the most humane principle that man is a brother and a friend to man.

After the victory of the working class and working peasantry, there will be neither social, national, nor any other causes for the outbreak of war in any

country. This will come about in circumstances of the complete supremacy of the socialist, communist system throughout the world. Mankind will then represent a true commonwealth of equal nations.

This was said long ago and was scientifically proved by the founders of Marxism-Leninism.

The liquidation of the capitalist system is the crucial question in the development of society. But only gamblers can believe that a change in the social system can be brought about by unleashing wars between States. Social revolutions are not for export. They cannot be carried by bayonets or rockets. Just as we cannot admit the idea of anyone imposing on us their own way of life, which is alien to us, we similarly have no desire to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, because it is the unalienable right of every nation to choose its own way of life. The decision regarding the social conditions they wish to live under is a matter for the nations themselves; it depends on the internal development and the ripening of conditions in each individual country. The system that is to exist in one or other country - whether it is to be socialism or capitalism - is not a question of international relations nor is it a matter for discussion in an international forum such as the United Nations in which countries with different social systems are represented. It is a matter to be settled by the peoples themselves within every State.

It is necessary to take account of the real state of affairs, of the world as it is. The present world consists of the countries of socialism, the countries of capitalism affiliated to the military blocs of the United States, and the countries not affiliated to any military blocs and following a neutral policy. Consequently, we must search for solutions of the cardinal international problems that would take into consideration the conditions now obtaining - the simultaneous existence of antithetic social systems in different States - and, given that situation, would create conditions that would rule out the possibility of another world war. Nuclear war would cause unprecedented destruction of cities, factories and plants. It would lead to the loss of hundreds upon hundreds of millions of human lives. It would destroy assets created by the labour of many generations and would affect all countries, all peoples. Its consequences would have grave effects on the life of the generations to come.

We would commit a crime against present and future generations if we accepted such an unenviable fate and made no effort to ward off the menace of a world war. It would also be unpardonable because socialism has given the working class, the whole of the working people, such strength, such possibilities for defence that were inconceivable before the emergence of the socialist States.

Such is our position on questions of war and peace.

It would be naive to think that the capitalist countries would agree to disarmament if they were stronger than socialism. The situation now is such that the world system of socialism is, at least, no weaker than the countries aligned by the United States in such aggressive military blocs as NATO, SEATO and CENTO. The socialist countries now possess hitherto unheard-of means of influencing the capitalist countries and, if you will, even compelling them to accept a disarmament agreement.

Having regard to the movement for national liberation, the strength of the popular movement for disarmament and peace in all countries, and also the existence of peace-minded elements in a certain section of the bourgeoisie, it may be said that disarmament is favoured not only by our physical capacity to meet any attack on the socialist countries with a shattering rebuff, but also by the support given by all the peoples of the world to our struggle for peace and the termination of the arms race.

This is why the Soviet Government relies upon concrete political, economic and moral factors in submitting its proposal for general and complete disarmament. World war can be averted if all the peoples fight for peace, for general and complete disarmament, for the destruction under the strictest international control, of the means of waging war.

Is all this possible? It is. No one denies that it is a difficult matter, but war, if it does break out, will be even harder for the peoples. This is why the question now is: should we, communists, retreat in the face of these difficulties and consequently follow in the wake of those imperialist forces which stand for the continuation of the arms race - and if this is continued, it will result in war - or should we, without sparing our strength create a dam, a barrier to such a course of events. We are against fatalism, against inactivity on questions of war and peace. We should not underrate, and still less should we overrate, the capacity of those imperialist forces which stand for the preparation

of war. As long as imperialist States exist, as long as they are ruled by monopoly capital with its inherent urge for aggression, for imperialist wars, the danger of a new war will exist. But this is precisely the force that we can and must counter with a still greater force - the preparedness of the peoples to avert war, their determination resolutely to curb any imperialist aggression.

There is such a force ranged against imperialism - this force consists of the socialist countries, which are guided in their policy not only by the interests of the peoples of their own countries, but also by the interests of the peoples of all countries, of all toilers. And these forces rely not only on socialist humanism. They rely on their socialist economy; they have mighty armed forces to defend the State interests of the socialist countries.

Our strength lies in the fact that the interests of socialist countries coincide with the interests of toilers of all countries, including the working people of capitalist countries. The toilers of capitalist countries take that stand on the principle of the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence. We should add to all this the fact of the continually increasing number of new States which have freed themselves from colonial oppression and which as a rule adopt a policy of non-alignment, that is, the course of a peaceful policy, thus destroying the former hinterland and reserves of imperialism. And although the imperialist States are trying to use the neutralist policy of a number of countries for their own purposes and although the neutralist countries sometimes join in singing a particular passage in their chorus, this is a temporary phenomenon.

There can be no neutrality on matters of war and peace, because all the peoples want peace and therefore all the peoples must fight for peace, against the threat of a new war. The process of demarcation between the forces of peace and the forces of war will accelerate and develop. And this process will increase the forces which stand for peace.

The peoples of non-committed countries face a historic choice. The imperialist camp is attempting to involve them in the arms race, to place the manpower and material resources of these countries at the service of war. Imperialism offers them nothing for the elimination of the economic backwardness they have inherited from the colonial past. It is not desisting from attempts

to interfere in their internal affairs with a view to imposing a new colonial yoke upon them.

The socialist community of peoples offers the young States a different path - the path of non-participation in the arms race, of developing their economy and culture, of tolerating no interference in their internal affairs.

Is there any need to say what the choice of the peoples will be? Without doubt they will choose the path of peace and freedom and not the path of war and of new enslavement. And this choice immeasurably increases the forces which stand for peace.

As a result of the growth of socialism and the forces of peace, the balance of forces on the international scene is not in favour of imperialism. At present it would be wrong to gauge the demarcation and balance of forces between socialism and peace on the one hand, and imperialism, on the other, by applying the parliamentary yardstick. It is not the number of States ranged on this and the other side, on the side of socialism and on the side of imperialism, that ultimately determines the balance of forces.

Many factors must be taken into account in assessing the balance of forces: the economic and military potential, population and many other factors of a material and moral nature. In this connexion, simple arithmetic may be gravely misleading.

The arithmetical yardstick does not give a clear idea even of the balance of forces within a State which has antagonistic classes. As we know, it is not the number of parliamentary seats that determines the actual balance of forces between parties and classes in any particular capitalist country.

The constitutions and election systems in bourgeois countries are framed in such a way that they give numerous privileges to the ruling, exploiting classes and not to the exploited classes, the working classes. This is exemplified by France, where the communist party won 3,888,204 votes and 10 seats in the latest parliamentary elections, whereas a right-wing bourgeois party, such as the Union of Defence of the New Republic won 3,608,958 votes and 188 seats. Just compare 10 seats with 188. Such a parliamentary system is, I should say, of no use for the purpose of determining the balance of forces within any particular bourgeois State with any degree of accuracy.

What then is the basis of power in bourgeois countries? Why is it that proletarian parties, which have enormous support among the masses, frequently do not have a corresponding number of representatives in parliament? Simply because the bourgeoisie resorts to various electoral machinations and leans for support on the forces of suppression - the police, the army, the judiciary and legislation - which serve monopoly capital. These are the mainstays of the power of the bourgeoisie. This power is based on the fact that the ruling classes own the means of production, the means of ideological propaganda and the means for suppressing democracy and the revolutionary progressive movement. This is, in fact, the dictatorship of monopoly capital.

If such parliamentary methods are used to determine the balance of forces between the socialist and the imperialist countries, the figures can easily be misleading and give an incorrect picture. How then can one explain the fact that the young socialist State born in the October Revolution, which was the only one in the world, was able, though weak and frail, to uphold its right to existence. Is it not a fact that our country was then attacked by fourteen States? Our land was ravaged by the troops of the United States of America, France, the United Kingdom, Germany, Japan and other States. The young Soviet State crushed these forces and ejected them.

We must always remember Lenin's advice: politics is not a matter of arithmetic. The Soviet Union then leaned for support not only on its internal forces, on the working class and the toiling peasantry, but also on the international support of the working class and the progressive sectors of society in bourgeois countries. This is how it was as long as forty-three years ago.

Now the situation is entirely different. The Soviet Union has grown into a tremendous force. Our economy is flourishing. We have a mighty and well-equipped industry capable of producing most up-to-date means of defence in the quantities required. We have an efficient State apparatus. We have a great army of highly skilled engineers, technicians and scientists capable of solving any problem. We have a first-rate modern army equipped with rockets and nuclear weapons. All the world is aware of the great progress attained by Soviet science and engineering.

Furthermore, we are not alone. In Europe and Asia there are other countries which have embarked on the road of socialism and are advancing successfully along its road. These new socialist countries have already made great progress both



in consolidating their statehood, in constructing socialism, and in building up their armed forces.

I had already said that more than a third of the countries which have adopted neutralist positions represent the former hinterland of imperialism, the suppliers of manpower and raw material resources. Imperialism has lost these reserves and will not be able to bring them back to the colonial past.

All these conditions should be taken into account in determining the balance of forces and it will then become clear that the forces of peace are now not weaker but stronger than the forces of war. This fact should be clearly appreciated in order to form a realistic estimate of our forces to avoid underrating our own possibilities in defending the policy of peace.

Now, as before, the Soviet Union stands for peaceful coexistence between States with different social systems. But we are not begging for this peaceful coexistence. We are proposing such a policy on the basis of a sober appraisal of the present balance of forces in the world.

All peoples will come to socialism, to communism. Such is the law governing the development of society. Some might say that if our forces are not smaller but even larger than those of our enemies, why should we not decide the issue by war? Why not accelerate the course of history? But history is not a horse, it cannot be driven with a whip. When bourgeois politicians say that the Soviet Union needs peaceful coexistence only as a temporary measure, that we, communists, are only biding our time to touch off a war and thus change the political and social system in other States, we say that they are lying. Marxism-Leninism asserts that the question of the balance of forces between this or that class is decided in every State by the class struggle. And when the revolutionary proletarian forces increase, the proletariat settles the question of political power and the social system as it sees fit, that is in the interests of the proletariat, in the interests of the revolutionary class, the particular method of settlement depending on the specific conditions that exist and the methods used against the proletariat by the old ruling classes.

If we were to admit the legitimacy of war between socialist and capitalist countries in order to solve internal political and social problems, we would simply be playing into the hands of the enemies of socialism. The enemies of socialism would use this against Marxist-Leninist teaching, against the socialist countries. They would then be able to say: you see, what kind of a

progressive system, what kind of a progressive teaching this is, if it has to be imposed on the peoples by force.

Socialism is strong by virtue of its vitality, by virtue of the fact that it corresponds to the vital interests of the mass of the people. This has been proved by the whole practice of the construction of socialism and communism. No coercion is needed for the dissemination of the ideas of socialism among the masses - this is a truth known even to schoolchildren, but one which our enemies - the enemies of communism - are continually trying to distort.

What could better arouse sympathy for socialism than the example of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries! Everyone knows what a backward country Tsarist Russia was. And everyone knows how far our country has advanced and how mighty it has become in the years of socialist development. Our once backward country has become a mighty, highly developed socialist power. Socialism has created conditions for economic development, for the flowering of culture and science, which were unthinkable in conditions of capitalism. Even our enemies admit this.

The force of example is a great force. The more prosperous our affairs, the higher the standard of life in socialist countries, the quicker we shall win minds over to socialism. And this is a force which cannot be measured by arithmetic.

Returning to the question of the possibilities which the socialist countries possess for averting a new war, it should be said that this important question is decided not by the number of countries which stand for peace and the number of countries which belong to the military blocs of the Western Powers. It is a well known fact that, at present, the number of capitalist countries vastly exceeds that of the socialist countries. And if we base ourselves on an arithmetical estimate, this might only mislead us politically.

The present balance of forces enables us to raise the disarmament problem and to press for a practical solution. The idea of complete and general disarmament represents a powerful weapon for rallying the peoples in the struggle for preserving peace and averting a new war. This is why it is the duty of every individual and every people to uphold this idea, to fight for it, to fight for peace.

The Soviet Government has worked out in detail its position on disarmament and has laid it before the United Nations. These proposals have been sent to all countries in writing. The object of these proposals, as I have already said in New York, is to prepare the way for the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament.

Our idea is that, as early as the first stage of disarmament, all means of delivering nuclear weapons to their targets must be destroyed, military bases on foreign soil must be dismantled, military aircraft eliminated, etc. We also suggest the prohibition of nuclear weapons and the discontinuance of the manufacture and testing of those weapons and the destruction of all stockpiles. In short we stand for genuine disarmament under international control.

In New York, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Sir Harold Macmillan said something to the effect that disarmament talks might take five or ten years.

But the arms race is not coming to an end. Today three or even four States have nuclear weapons. And what will the position be in five or ten years' time? Many countries will have such weapons.

We are against procrastination on so important a problem as disarmament and we shall not agree to take part in deceiving the peoples by means of interminable negotiations. Though Sir Harold Macmillan, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, is a Scotsman, I do not want to hurt his feelings in using the word "volynka". "Volynka" is the Russian word for his national music instrument, the bagpipes, but I am using the word in its other meaning of procrastination on major problems. Our proposals are quite realistic. We are pressing for talks of a kind which would yield useful results and we are against talks of a kind which only confuse and deceive the peoples.

Some people in the West say that the Soviet Union has submitted its proposals to the Assembly for propaganda purposes. We are not afraid of such charges: it is not to war that we are calling; we are demanding the creation of conditions for a lasting peace. And we shall continue to conduct such propaganda. It is not detrimental to the peoples. But if the Western Powers are afraid of propaganda in favour of peace, we are ready to forego speechmaking.

There are our comprehensive disarmament proposals. Let the Western Powers present theirs. Let us get around a table and discuss point by point, in a businesslike manner, what is acceptable and what is not.

I would add that the responsibility for ensuring peace and, therefore, for reaching agreement on disarmament and the destruction of weapons cannot be attributed only to the countries which possess nuclear weapons. This is wrong and dangerous.

There are no peoples indifferent to the solution of the disarmament problem. If any industrially under-developed countries refrain, because they do not possess sufficiently powerful armies, from contributing their share to the solution of the disarmament problem, they will not diminish but increase the danger of bringing down upon themselves, upon the peoples of their countries and upon all the world the military disasters of an unparalleled nuclear war. Every people, large or small, every State, strong or weak, must now display the same interest and the same persistence in the struggle for the solution of the disarmament problem and for the destruction of weapons as they are displaying in the struggle for their freedom and independence.

The other day the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Sir Harold Macmillan, spoke at the Conservative Party Conference. He expressed satisfaction over the fact that he had gone to the General Assembly, to this remarkable meeting, to quote his words, which was attended by representatives from nearly one hundred States. He admitted that mankind was now facing a choice between the path of violence or the path of negotiations for the solution of outstanding issues. Sir Harold Macmillan favours negotiations on outstanding issues for the purpose of reducing tension.

The Soviet Government agrees with such a position and we have repeatedly argued that the policy of peaceful coexistence is not a tactical device but the Soviet Union's general line in foreign policy, a line bequeathed to us by the great Lenin. It was our position in the past and it will be our position in the future.

But if Sir Harold Macmillan's statement about his desire to reduce tension is not to remain a pious wish, practical action is called for by the Western Powers. Sir Harold admits that, where the question of disarmament is concerned, discussion does not develop into action. An enlightening admission.

If, as Sir Harold Macmillan has said, the United Kingdom Government really wants disarmament and control simultaneously, so that there would be disarmament and control at every stage, this is acceptable to us.

The Soviet Government has stood and still stands for real disarmament and has proved this by deeds, by effecting repeated unilateral cuts in its armed forces. If the United Kingdom and its allies - the United States, France and others - display a similar real desire to disarm, the main and most important obstacle to agreement on disarmament will be removed and the road to disarmament will be open.

If everything Sir Harold Macmillan said was designed to solve the disarmament problem, let us, at long last, proceed to practical action and let us not delay the solution of this burning question indefinitely.

If this is his own opinion and the opinion of his allies, let us then have his amendments to our proposals or his own comprehensive proposals, if he does not like ours simply because they have been advanced by the Soviet Union. Copyright is unimportant to us; what is important to us is to reach agreement on disarmament, which would deliver mankind from the danger of a catastrophic world war. The main thing for us is disarmament and not who was the first to advance this or that proposal on this question. Before leaving New York, I made a special statement on disarmament at the fifteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly. Our proposals have been published in the Press and are known to the public.

We have also submitted to the United Nations a draft of the basic clauses of a treaty on general and complete disarmament, which also contains provisions regarding a strict and detailed system of international control and inspection to ensure compliance with the terms of the treaty.

A favourite expression in the West is: "Let's put our cards on the table". To us disarmament is not a gamble. But as they want it this way, we have put our cards on the table.

It is now up to the Western Powers to act. True, these Powers have submitted new proposals to the Assembly, after our departure from New York. One of them, submitted by the United States, the United Kingdom and Italy, contains what its authors conceive the principles for the solution of the disarmament problem. Another, submitted by the United Kingdom, provides for the establishment of a committee of experts to study - surprisingly - the question of control!

Sir Harold Macmillan as an orator calls for a concrete approach to discussion on the problems of disarmament. Yet in fact there is no such concrete approach. How are we to take such people? But life will teach them a lesson; it will

teach a lesson to Sir Harold Macmillan and other gentlemen like him. We can wait. We told him, if you, gentlemen, want to test the might and endurance of the socialist State once again, we shall show you what's what, as they say. Today we are strong and tomorrow we shall be stronger still and you, gentlemen, will not live to see the day when you can rejoice at our weakness. Soviet workers and peasants and Soviet scientists will give you, day to day, and year by year, cause for disappointment by reason of the growth and consideration of the forces of socialism, the growth of the forces of communism.

This has been a slight deviation from the prepared text of my speech, but I think it will do no harm to those who are unwilling to heed the voice of reason today. As if the fifteen years which have been spent on discussing questions of disarmament, including that of control, are not enough.

Both these proposals show that the Western Powers are still not ready to adopt a serious approach to the solution of disarmament questions, that they are still using discussions on disarmament, including those at the current session of the Assembly, as a screen for the policy of the arms race. Judge for yourselves! How else can one assess the proposal I have mentioned concerning the principles for disarmament, when it does not say a word about the liquidation of military bases on foreign territories, when it does not say a word about the time and duration of the execution of particular disarmament measures. It is a proposal essentially providing for control over armaments, which was advocated by President Eisenhower in the General Assembly, and not disarmament under control, for which the Soviet Union has been pressing for many years.

The aforesaid Western proposals do not augur well for the future.

If the Western Powers refuse to adopt the path of general and complete disarmament, we shall be entitled to draw the conclusion that they are not ready to disarm now, but do not want to say so openly to their peoples, because the peoples of the West - the peoples of the United States and the United Kingdom, all the peoples of the world - want disarmament. The Soviet Union will continue to fight steadily and persistently for disarmament, for the strengthening of peace and the security of the peoples.

I repeat, we stand for real disarmament, and everyone who stands for this will find a common language with us.

The peoples place great hopes in the United Nations. They want it to settle outstanding international problems and to bring about conditions under which world peace would be reliably ensured.

/...

But I can only say that if things continue as at present, the United Nations will not achieve substantial results. The cart of the United Nations has cut a deep rut, is travelling along this rut and is having difficulty in getting out of it.

But had you seen the way in which many delegates speak and behave at the General Assembly, you would have reached the conclusion that the United Nations may not justify the hopes the peoples are placing in it.

Often the hall is almost empty. The places reserved for the delegations of a number of countries are occupied by delegates "on duty". Actually, they do not take part in the work of the Assembly but sit there, apparently, only to vote if a vote is taken. Such a representative "on duty" is like a robot or an automatic machine tool, which operates according to a schedule. He does not need to think, he does not need to exert himself; only one thing is required of him: to vote "yes" or "no" on some particular question. It is impossible to influence the thinking of such an individual; he acts strictly in conformity with the instructions he has previously received.

This convinces us even more of the justice of our appeal to the Heads of Government of States Members of the United Nations to approach with all seriousness the vital international problems facing the world - the question of the abolition of the colonial regime, of the restoration of China's lawful rights, of the aggressive actions of the United States and other questions, but above all, the overriding international question - disarmament - upon the solution of which the safeguarding of world peace primarily depends.

It goes without saying that all these questions cannot be solved during one General Assembly session. Therefore if we really desire to ensure a lasting peace, it is essential that the participation of Heads of State or Heads of Government should become a regular practice in the work of the General Assembly.

As I have already said in New York, the disarmament problem will clearly not be solved at this session of the Assembly. Therefore we consider that it is essential to hold an extraordinary session to deal specifically with this question. It seems to us that such a session could be convened next March-April. If the Heads of State or Government who take part in the work of the session achieve a solution in principle to the question of general and complete disarmament under

strict international control, further work will obviously be needed in a smaller body. For instance, the Heads of State or Government could give directions for the work of a fifteen-nation committee which we have suggested should be established.

But, I repeat, the questions of principle, the main questions of disarmament cannot be solved without the participation of the Heads of Government or State, because the mistrust among States has become too great and the same applies to the differences in the approach of Governments to the solution of this problem. We must adopt a sound and bold approach and display statesmanship in order to get the cart of the United Nations onto the right course. Who can do this? This can be done only by those invested with the full trust of their people, of their Government.

### III. Freedom and independence for the colonial peoples!

Comrades: at the fifteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly, the Soviet Union has with the utmost firmness called for the complete and immediate abolition of colonialism - that abominable legacy of the barbarity and savagery of past ages. True to its policy of supporting the struggle of oppressed peoples for national independence, the Soviet Union has called upon the United Nations to raise its voice in defence of the just cause of the liberation of the colonies.

The declaration of the independence of colonial countries and peoples has been welcomed and approved by many delegations in the United Nations, and has been warmly supported by all freedom-loving peoples.

The colonial Powers and their allies in the aggressive military blocs stop at nothing to prevent the peoples of the colonies from attaining independence and freedom. As a result, the discussion on the granting of independence to the colonial countries at the United Nations General Assembly has been marked by sharp differences.

The freedom-loving peoples scored a great success. The General Assembly recognized the question of the abolition of colonialism raised by the Soviet Union as a most important problem and placed it on the agenda for the plenary meetings of the Assembly. The recognition of the importance of this question is a great moral satisfaction to the Soviet Union, a great victory for the forces fighting against colonialism.



The situation at the General Assembly was such that even the imperialist and colonialist States had to agree to the discussion of this question at plenary meetings of the Assembly. I admit that before going to New York, when our Government was discussing the problems of the General Assembly session, we conceded the possibility that the United States might vote with the Soviet Union for the discussion of this question at plenary meetings of the Assembly.

In the discussion on the General Assembly's agenda, the United Kingdom representative was the first to oppose the Soviet proposal. He attempted to prove that the colonialists' sole care was the progress and liberation of the colonies. Indeed, he all but raised his hands to the heavens, invoking as witness the Almighty, who, so to speak, blessed the colonialists' "civilizing" mission in the colonial countries. But who does not know that this activity was expressed in the enslavement of peoples and the extermination of indigenous populations.

The blood curdles in one's veins when one reads about the kind of "civilization" the colonialists brought to the colonies. Within a half a century of Belgian domination, the population of the Congo had been reduced by punitive expeditions, hunger and disease almost to half. And the Congo is no exception. In sixty years of French rule, the population of Madagascar fell by more than half. The child mortality rate in the colonies is frightful. In Nigeria, for instance, more than one out of every two children dies under the age of six. The colonies have the longest working hours, the lowest wages, the lowest life expectancy, the highest death rate.

And all this is taking place in our century, a century of progress and supreme scientific discoveries, when people have split the atom, are successfully conquering outer space and are expanding their power over the forces of nature with extraordinary speed. Meanwhile, the representatives of Powers which claim the first place in the development of culture boast of their "civilization", and speak of the benefactions of the colonialists. Listening to these "benefactors", one almost expects them to ask the Assembly to express gratitude for their "civilizing", i.e. colonialist, policy of slavery.

But the representatives of the peoples which have freed themselves from colonial slavery spoke differently. The General Assembly was addressed by representatives of India, Indonesia, Ghana, Guinea, Ceylon, Liberia, Morocco,

Nigeria and many other countries; and all of them demanded that this question be discussed at plenary meetings of the General Assembly and stressed the necessity of abolishing the colonial system.

The representatives of the United States kept silence; they almost seemed to be absent. But they could not keep silence all the time; they had either to vote for the Soviet Union's proposal that this question be discussed at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly or come out in support of their allies - the colonialists. Of course, the United States imperialists are actually colonialists themselves; they impose enslaving treaties and exploit peoples of many countries. This policy is well known to the peoples of Latin America and of other countries.

A heated debate developed on this question, and nearly all the speakers were in favour of the Soviet proposal. At last the American representative took the floor. I am very sorry that he did not complete his speech. The United States representative made slanderous attacks on the socialist countries, against which their representatives protested vigorously. Romanian representative Comrade Mezincescu mounted the rostrum and gave the American the deserved rebuff. He called upon the President of the Assembly, Mr. Boland, not to permit insults. A rather curious scene followed. The President showed excess of zeal: he did not expect his main instrument - the gavel - to fail him and he rapped it on the desk with such force that it broke to pieces. Having lost this token of power, the President made haste to declare the meeting closed.

It is a pity that the meeting was closed. I believe that the representative of the United States would have completed his speech by supporting the colonialist Powers. However, the night passed, and was apparently spent in meditations as a result of which the Americans came to the conclusion that the lesser evil should be chosen. It became clear that to come out in direct and open support of the British, Spanish, Portuguese and French colonialists would mean self-exposure. Therefore, the Americans decided to feign a noble gesture and support the proposal of the Soviet Union and the countries which are fighting against the colonial system. The United Kingdom representative, taking the floor for the second time, also had to pretend that he was meeting half-way those representatives who were pressing for discussion of this question at a plenary meeting.

The unanimous decision for the discussion of this issue at plenary meetings of the General Assembly is a major victory of the forces fighting for the eradication of the colonial regime.

But I must warn you: it would be naive to accept the votes of the imperialist Powers at their face value. It may be said that the unanimous vote was wrested from the colonialists under the pressure of an overwhelming majority. The representatives of the imperialist States decided to vote in favour of having this issue discussed at plenary meetings; but this does not yet settle the real issue. On the real issue there has never been and never will be any unity with the colonialists.

We stand for complete and immediate liquidation of the disgraceful colonial system, for condemning colonialism past and present, for preventing the colonial system from appearing in any form anywhere in the future.

The imperialists are trying to lend the colonialist policy "a noble aspect". They are not even averse to speaking of rendering assistance to the countries that have freed themselves from colonial oppression. But what kind of "assistance" is that? Take, for instance, the speech made by the President of the United States at the session of the General Assembly. It contained no constructive proposals. The President declared that the United States was prepared to allocate to the United Nations programme 100 million dollars for assistance to the African countries that have gained independence. But if this sum is divided among the entire population of the African countries which have gained independence, there will be 55 cents per person. But, as they say, this would not take you very far. In the United States 55 cents would not even buy you two packs of cigarettes.

The imperialists used to plunder and want to continue plundering the African countries and now they are offering mere handouts. A dollar taken, a cent returned. They are offering handouts in the same way as the kulak used to give five kopecks at Christmas to his labourer whom he had mercilessly exploited throughout the year; or as a capitalist used once in a while to provide a bucket of vodka for a whole artel.

The imperialists may even pay lip service to the necessity of liberating colonial peoples, but most probably they will suggest such a plan as will protract

the granting of freedom and independence to the peoples of colonial countries for many years. They will plead that no cadres are available, that the people have not been educated, have not been prepared for self-government, and put forward other "theories" of the slave dealers. Listen to the fine reply given to these inventions of the colonialists by a representative of a young African State. He said: if you want to be convinced that a man can walk, break the chains that fetter him!

All the nations which truly adhere to the position of denouncing colonialism and liberating colonial peoples must press resolutely for complete and immediate cessation of colonial slavery. All must raise their voices against the colonialists, expose their designs no matter in what disguise they appear.

It is natural that the oppressed peoples should be intensifying their struggle for liberation since the colonialists oppose the granting of independence to the colonial peoples. And they will win their freedom! There is no doubt that the freedom-loving peoples will offer a helping hand to those who are fighting against the colonialists, these suppressors of the freedom of peoples. Nothing can avert the collapse of the colonial regime doomed by history. The knell of colonialism has sounded, the peoples of the colonies will be free!

Comrades, the Algerian question is an important component of the problem of abolishing the colonial system, but it will be discussed in the General Assembly as a separate item of the agenda.

For over six years the Algerian people have been waging a heroic war for their liberation from foreign oppression. The French colonialists are trying to suppress the Algerian desire for freedom and independence with sword and fire. But they have not broken and are unable to break the will of the people who have risen to fight for their liberty. The noble struggle of the sons and daughters of the Algerian people is finding steadily increasing international recognition and support. In France itself a movement of true French patriots who are actively opposing the colonial war in Algeria is gathering momentum.

The Algerian question has more than once been taken up at sessions of the General Assembly, but each time the colonialists succeeded in reducing these discussions to insignificant resolutions which gave no real assistance

to the Algerian people. The French colonialists, supported by their allies, and first and foremost by the United States and the United Kingdom, emerged victorious, so to say, from the discussion of this issue. This time the struggle in the General Assembly will be much sharper and the colonialists will find it more difficult to reduce the matter to yet another toothless resolution.

What is the Soviet Union's position on the Algerian question? It is absolutely clear. We have always been in favour of self-determination for all peoples, in favour of every people choosing the social and political structure of its State. This fully applies to Algeria, too.

We have repeatedly expressed our views on this question to French representatives. I recall our talks with former Prime Minister of France Guy Mollet and Minister for Foreign Affairs Pineau during their stay in the Soviet Union in May 1956. We said then to the French leaders: if you fail to heed the lessons of Viet-Nam you will undoubtedly find no way out of the deadlock you have reached in Algeria. The only way out for you is to recognize the Algerian people's right to self-determination. It is only on this basis that the Algerian question can be settled.

Guy Mollet and also Pineau tried to prove that France cannot give up Algeria because 2 million Frenchmen live there. This, according to their logic, gives sufficient ground for believing that Algeria must be French. We replied to the then leaders of the French Government: you speak of the 2 million Frenchmen in Algeria (and actually they are fewer than that), but the 9 million Algerians cannot be ignored.

We tried to make the other parties see this problem in the correct light. Guy Mollet and Pineau claimed that the loss of Algeria would mean the loss of France's greatness. We tried to prove to them that the greatness of France does not lie in colonial plunder, in the oppression of other peoples. Apparently, however, the supporters of the colonialists do not want to reckon with the facts because they are continuing their old bankrupt policy.

If the French colonialists do not now renounce their attempts to retain Algeria as their colony by force, they will lose it as a result of a military defeat which is inevitable.

Soon after General de Gaulle came to power as a result of a military putsch he made a statement to the effect that France recognized Algeria's right to

self-determination. But later, under pressure from the extremist reactionary colonialist forces, he went back on it and began talking about the right to self-determination, but only such "self-determination" as would determine in advance that Algeria would remain part of France. The most rabid French colonialists are demanding integration, that is, the complete absorption of Algeria; they want to do away with Algerian Algeria and convert it into a French province in North Africa.

The peoples of the Soviet Union, of the socialist countries, firmly follow Lenin's precepts that every people must have the right to self-determination, to organize their State as they see fit. Our sympathy, our support are therefore with the Algerian people who are waging a just war for their liberation from colonial oppression.

There are different kinds of wars. We are against rapacious imperialist wars, like that which the French colonialists are waging in Algeria. But we recognize and support the just wars of peoples for their liberation. The peoples of the oppressed countries are rising up to throw out the colonialists because the latter will not withdraw from the colonies of their own free will. These peoples do not balk at taking up arms, if necessary, to win their freedom and independence. The Algerian patriots are now waging such a struggle and we wish them success.

We have already spoken of the Soviet Union's de facto recognition of the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic and we wish now to repeat this statement. This Government has earned recognition by the whole world, including France. The French Government has more than once established contacts and entered into negotiations with the Government of the Algerian Republic, which is now regarded everywhere as the representative of the Algerian people, as its leader in the struggle for national freedom and independence.

The General Assembly adopted a decision to discuss in plenary also the question of the Congo. In their speeches in the Assembly, the Soviet delegation, the delegations of other socialist countries and also many representatives of Asian and African countries correctly assessed the situation now obtaining in the Congo and the unseemly role played there by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Nothing can remove the shame with which the United Nations has covered itself as a result of the policy pursued in the Congo by the United Nations Secretariat under the leadership of Secretary-General Hammarskjold. Thanks to the efforts of Mr. Hammarskjold and his representatives, the lawful Parliament elected by the Congolese people, the Government headed by Mr. Lumumba, set up by the Parliament on the basis of the Constitution, were disorganized and paralysed.

And who are these representatives whom Mr. Hammarskjold sent to the Congo? They are Mr. Cordier and Mr. Bunche. Both are Americans. But you should not be surprised, because Mr. Hammarskjold himself is a servant of American monopoly capital. It was no accident that the United States Secretary of State Mr. Herter gave Mr. Hammarskjold a cheque for \$5 million to be used in the Congo at his discretion to consummate the evil deed and covertly restore the system which had existed there under the Belgian colonialists.

Development took a tragic turn for the Congolese people. But at the same time they tore the mask from the face of the imperialist colonialists and of those who serve them, from the face of the United Nations Secretary-General. Everyone now sees that he is pursuing a reactionary colonialist policy, expressing the interests of the imperialist group of States headed by the United States. The developments in the Congo will help to enlighten the colonial peoples, will help them better to understand who their friends and their enemies are.

The failure of the policy of the colonialists is beyond any doubt. The time will come when the Republic of the Congo will stand surely on its feet and firmly ensure its independence. The earnest of this is the selfless struggle the Congolese people continue to wage and will carry on until victory is won. The socialist States, all freedom-loving nations take the side of the embattled colonial peoples, the side of the embattled people of the Congo.

Comrades, throughout our delegation's voyage in the "Baltika" to the shores of America and while we were in New York we were constantly aware of the attention and support of the Soviet people, of our great Soviet Homeland.

We received thousands of letters and telegrams from different corners of our country. They were messages from the personnel of enterprises, collective farms, scientific institutions, Party, Soviet, trade union and Komsomol organizations, from numerous workers, collective farmers and intellectuals. These letters conveyed the most cordial wishes for success in the work of the Soviet delegation and expressed confidence that our delegation would do everything in its power that the General Assembly session might strengthen the people's faith that a relaxation of international tension would be achieved, that mankind would be saved from the armaments race, from shameful colonial slavery.

Soviet people gave unqualified support to the position of the Soviet Government, demonstrated profound concern for the settlement of the most important international problems for the benefit of all peoples longing for peace, tranquillity and happiness for themselves and for the generations to come.

All these kind messages gave us great confidence and inspired us to struggle for the strengthening of world peace, for the solution of the most urgent and vitally important problems of our time.

Permit me, on behalf of the Central Committee of our Party, on behalf of the Soviet Government and myself personally, to express the warmest gratitude to the collectives of the working people, to all Soviet citizens for their kind wishes.

Our delegation also received thousands of letters and telegrams from foreign countries wishing us success in our work for the benefit of peace. Many letters and telegrams were received from Americans, who also expressed the hope for the establishment of better understanding between nations, for the strengthening of world peace.

Permit me to thank all our friends abroad for their kind wishes, for the support they rendered our delegation in its work at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly.

I should like to offer cordial thanks to the crew of the turbo-electric ship "Baltika" commanded by Captain P.A. Maiorov, to thank the crew of the TU-114 aircraft and its commander, A.K. Vidkovsky, for their fine work, for their perfect service performance. On board the "Baltika" we crossed the Atlantic and arrived in New York and the TU-114 brought us back to our beloved Moscow in ten hours.



It took us ten days to cross the ocean in the "Baltika" while only ten hours were needed to return from New York to Moscow in the TU-114 aircraft. What progress in technology! A different level, different possibilities!

It is for the Soviet people to judge how the Soviet delegation fulfilled its mission in the General Assembly. We tried to represent the interests of the Soviet Union with honour and dignity. We did not waste our time, fully realizing that we came to New York to work and not to eat pancakes. The more so since the United States Government, as you know from the Press, had no intention of meeting us with bread and salt. But this did not embarrass us and we did our job, as our sense of our great responsibility and our conscience as Communists - fighters for peace on earth - prompted us.

I should like, Comrades, to let you have my impressions of New York. This is a very big city. Gorky called it the city of the yellow devil. But more than fifty years have elapsed since Gorky was there and during this time New York has become still more repulsive. It seems to embody the ugliness and degeneration of capitalism. People living there doom themselves to something like penal servitude for life, and immure themselves in stone cells. Tall buildings are often torn down and replaced by new skyscrapers. The city seems to be crawling upwards.

Down below, trees have been planted in some streets. But they cannot grow, they wither and probably perish. In their place new ones are planted, but they too will soon perish.

It is painful to watch children who are deprived of many joys of childhood because they have no chance to run about or even to walk outdoors, as every human being has to be able to do. The streets are literally jammed with a vast number of motor cars. And motor cars, as is known, use petrol for fuel. As a result, the entire atmosphere is poisoned. In short, New York is a horrifying city in this respect.

The people who are responsible for the trend in urban development are unable to check the city's further degeneration because neither the Government nor the political leaders determine how the city is to develop; this is done by each owner who has a plot of land. If it is to his advantage to tear down a 15-20 storeyed house and to build a house with 40-60 or even 100 storeys on a busy street, he tears down the old and builds the new.

The main thing in this city of the yellow devil is not man but the dollar. Everyone thinks of how to make more money, how to get more dollars. Attention there is focussed, not on people, but on profits, the quest for capital.

The capitalist trend in city planning takes little account of the vital requirements of the people. I could not but feel proud comparing this with our socialist town development, where planning and building is subordinated to man, to solicitude for him and his greater comfort.

Back at home, in Moscow, I literally delight in the fresh, invigorating air our people breathe. Our capital is a splendid city, especially now, when it is being transformed, when new sections are building. Moscow is becoming an ever more splendid city with comfortable houses, with broad streets, squares, boulevards adorned with greenery, with playgrounds for children, with ponds and parks.

Comrades, I have already said that the United Nations in its present form does not justify the hopes of the people for liberation from the threat of war, from the armaments race. But we believe that common sense will prevail, truth will triumph, good seeds will give an abundant crop. The time will come, and it is not far off, when under the pressure of the peoples the Governments will realize the necessity for the peaceful coexistence of States, will arrive at the conclusion that general and complete disarmament under strict international control must be carried out. For our part we shall do everything to have the United Nations reorganized in the spirit of the demands of our time, to make it an effective and universal instrument of world peace.

It must be admitted that the international situation continues to be tense. Aggressive quarters in the United States have not abandoned their aggressive acts, the provocative flights of planes over other countries' territories, and first and foremost over the Soviet Union. As you know, we submitted to the General Assembly for its consideration the question of the aggressive actions of the United States against the Soviet Union. This item has been put on the agenda.

A report recently appeared in the Press to the effect that the Pentagon had decided to send submarines equipped with rockets and nuclear weapons to cruise off the shores of the Soviet Union.

American generals and admirals must surely know that our country also has atomic-powered submarines equipped with rockets.

What would happen if we took the same course and our submarines started cruising off American shores?

This is the criminal "policy of brinkmanship" proclaimed by Dulles and pursued by his successors. This is the path of the "cold war" which may develop into a shooting war.

Our relations with the United States have deteriorated of late but not through any fault of ours.

But no matter how cold our relations with the United States are today, we shall carry on the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence. We are sure that the time will come when relations between our States, our peoples, our Governments, will improve.

But in order to bring this time nearer and to discourage the Pentagon and American aggressive quarters from staging provocations against the Soviet Union it is necessary for our economy to develop at a rapid pace, for our science to be at an adequate level, for our army to have the most up-to-date armaments.

We must do everything possible to bring about a constant rise in the productivity of labour, to ensure the growth of the economy, of science and culture, to raise the living standards of the people so as to demonstrate in practice, in peaceful competition with capitalism, the great advantages of socialism, the great force of Marxist-Leninist teaching.

Our successes at home are convincingly illustrated by the recent report of the Central Statistical Board on the results of the fulfilment of the national economic plan for the first nine months of this year. These results hearten the Soviet people, the indefatigable builders of communism, and inspire our friends abroad.

Socialist industry, developing at an extremely fast rate, is surpassing its target figures year after year. This year industrial production will increase by over 140,000 million roubles. It should be noted that only a few years ago, before the reorganization of management in industry, the annual growth of industrial production amounted to approximately 100,000 million roubles.

You will remember that at the beginning of 1946, when drawing up the plans for the post-war development of our economy, the Party set the task of trebling

industrial production and achieving an annual output of 60 million tons of steel and 60 million tons of oil. It was estimated that fifteen years, and perhaps more, would be required to achieve these goals.

How has the Soviet people coped with this task? Fifteen years have passed, and industrial output in our country has increased not threefold, but sixfold. The Soviet Union now produces 65 million tons of steel and upwards of 145 million tons of oil a year. Equally fine progress is being made in our agriculture and cultural construction.

The Communist Party and the Soviet Government devote special attention to training skilled cadres. Our country's successes in the training of cadres have amazed the whole world. The opponents of socialism have even produced an absurd theory that the more engineers, scientists, doctors and teachers the Soviet Union gets the greater the difficulties we shall experience in our onward march. Well, we are facing these "difficulties" with courage.

Allow me to quote some highly indicative figures. In 1926, when we were about to regain the pre-revolutionary levels of our economy, the Soviet Union had 168,000 students in higher educational establishments and little more than two and a half million white-collar workers and intellectuals. Last year we had 2,200,000 students, that is 13 times as many, while the number of white-collar workers and intellectuals has increased eightfold and now exceeds 20 million. The number of engineers, technicians and agronomists has increased 18 times, and of scientific workers 23 times over.

The number of persons with secondary and higher education among manual workers has increased considerably. Before the Revolution there were no people with secondary, let alone higher, education among the workers and peasants, while today, according to the latest census, 32 per cent of manual workers have secondary or higher education, including 39 per cent among workers and 21 per cent among collective farmers.

Thus, in the years of Soviet rule, we have built up an army of over 20 million white-collar workers - a truly popular intelligentsia, flesh and blood of the workers and peasants. Even more significant is the fact that almost one third of the Soviet people engaged in manual labour, including two fifths of the workers and over one fifth of the collective farmers, have secondary or even higher education.

All this shows convincingly that we have already achieved very tangible results in gradually eliminating the essential differences between manual and mental work.

I could quote many other equally convincing examples attesting to the outstanding achievements of our motherland, which is advancing confidently toward our great goal of communism.

Dear comrades, in little more than two weeks we shall be celebrating the 43rd anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution, the greatest revolution in the history of mankind.

It is fine and heartening to realize that the Soviet people, the great builder of a new communist world, has achieved outstanding successes under the leadership of its own Communist Party.

True to the all-conquering teaching of Marxism-Leninism, we are marching forward courageously, and no force in the world can arrest this advance of the peoples to their glorious goal.

Long live our Leninist Communist Party, the inspirer and organizer of the building of communism!

Long live our socialist motherland, the pride and glory of all progressive mankind!

Long live the mighty camp of the countries of socialism!

Long live enduring peace throughout the world!

-----