

UGLY

FEATURES

OF SOVIET

SOCIAL-

IMPERIALISM

**UGLY FEATURES
OF SOVIET
SOCIAL-IMPERIALISM**

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS

PEKING 1976

CONTENTS

THE SUPERPOWER LABEL FOR SOVIET REVISIONISM CANNOT BE REMOVED Fan Hsiao	1
THE BREZHNEV CLIQUE IS FOLLOWING IN HITLER'S FOOTSTEPS Commentary by Hsinhua Correspondent	10
A BLACK LINE RUNNING THROUGH TWO DYNASTIES — <i>On new tsars justifying old tsars' aggression and expansion</i> Commentary by Hsinhua Correspondent	19
SOVIET UNION — SUPERPOWER AND SUPER-EXPLOITER Commentary by Hsinhua Correspondent	27
C.M.E.A. — SOVIET REVISIONISM'S INSTRUMENT FOR NEO-COLONIALISM Commentary by Hsinhua Correspondent	33
SINISTER PROGRAMME OF NEO-COLONIALISM — <i>Soviet revisionists' vicious motives in peddling theory of "international division of labour" in Third World</i> Chai Chang	41
HONEY ON LIPS, MURDER IN HEART — <i>Social-imperialist nature of Soviet revisionists' "military aid" to Egypt exposed</i> Fan Hsiu-chu and Chung Tung	48
WHERE IS THE "DAWN OF PEACE AND CO-OPERATION"? Mei Ou	58

WARSAW TREATY ORGANIZATION — SOVIET SOCIAL- IMPERIALISM'S TOOL FOR AGGRESSION Ming Sung	63
ESSENCE OF SOVIET REVISIONISTS' "ALL-EUROPE ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION" Cheng Wei-min	71
OUTRIGHT DECEIT, ULTERIOR MOTIVES — <i>On Soviet revisionists peddling "Asian collective secu- rity system" in Southeast Asia</i> Commentary by Hsinhua Correspondent	78
REPULSE WOLF AT FRONT GATE, GUARD AGAINST TIGER AT BACK DOOR Jen Ku-ping	84

THE SUPERPOWER LABEL FOR SOVIET REVISIONISM CANNOT BE REMOVED

by Fan Hsiao

Some time ago, Leonid Brezhnev talked drivell when meeting a group of foreign reporters, alleging that "someone has invented the term 'superpower.' I don't know whether you can explain what 'superpower' means. In my opinion, this word was born in China." He also said that "it was fashionable at one time to write about a kind of 'limited sovereignty,'" claiming that this was also "invented" by the press somewhere. Brezhnev then made a clumsy self-exposure by asserting that "the term 'superpower' and the content with which people try to invest it have nothing to do with" the Soviet Union.

The term "superpower" has in recent years become almost anathema to the Soviet revisionist renegade clique. The Soviet revisionist bigwigs and the Soviet press have on many occasions vociferated that classifying the Soviet Union as a superpower is "groundless" and "fictitious," that this is intended to equate the Soviet Union with imperialism. The reason why once again Brezhnev came out himself to make such a self-justification is none other than to try to remove the label of superpower from Soviet revisionism. He laid the blame on China, alleging that the latter invented the term "superpower." China is indeed unworthy of Mr. Brezhnev's "compliments." For how

can China "invent" such a big superpower as Soviet revisionism?

In Lenin's well-known words: **"We judge a person not by what he says or thinks of himself but by his actions."** The best criterion in judging whether Soviet revisionist social-imperialism is a superpower is its own actions.

Like U.S. imperialism, Soviet revisionism is today a world nuclear overlord and military hegemonic power. Though the total value of its national product is only just over half that of the United States, yet it pursues a policy of giving priority to guns over butter despite the difficulties in its national economy, so that its actual military spending approaches that of the United States. It feverishly expands nuclear armaments and conventional arms to serve as its "backing by strength" in committing aggression and expansion abroad and scrambling for world domination. The Soviet revisionists have in the past few years spent hundreds of thousands of millions of U.S. dollars in producing nuclear bombs and guided missiles. In an attempt to gain nuclear monopoly, they regard the possession of nuclear weapons as the exclusive right of the superpowers, and would forbid other countries' having them. They have often boasted that Soviet strategic rockets "are ready at all times to be launched at once," openly threatening and blackmailing the people of the world with nuclear holocaust.

The Soviet revisionists bank heavily on the "doctrine of sea power," believing that whoever controls the seas dominates the world. They have inherited and developed the gunboat policy of old-time imperialism. To challenge the United States for maritime hegemony, they have over the years stepped up the building of marine warships including aircraft-carriers and long-range nuclear

submarines. Fleets of Soviet warships now prowl the Indian Ocean, the Mediterranean, the Pacific and other oceans. Brezhnev insists that since the United States regards the presence of its fleet in the Mediterranean as normal, it is naturally a matter of course for Soviet fleets to frequent the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean and other seas. This is only saying that whatever one superpower can do, the other, i.e., Soviet revisionism, can do too. Does this not amount to demanding that the Soviet Union also be recognized as a superpower?

In contending with U.S. imperialism for spheres of influence, Soviet revisionism has, like the United States, exercised military control over other countries and carried out military expansion against them by rigging up military blocs, establishing military bases and stationing troops abroad. Today, it is only the Soviet Union and the United States that maintain large numbers of troops on the soil of other countries. Strategically the focus of Soviet-U.S. contention is Europe. To wrest important strategic points and plunder oil and other strategic resources, the Soviet Union and the United States have contended fiercely in all parts of the world, especially in the Middle East. To confront the U.S. forces stationed in Western Europe, the Soviet revisionists maintain scores of divisions of troops in Eastern Europe, which are also used to control the latter region and threaten the former. They openly supported the Indian expansionists in their armed aggression against and dismemberment of Pakistan. They have grabbed from a number of Asian and African countries the right to use their naval and air bases and harbours, and have also sent contingents of military "advisers" to some Asian, African and Latin American countries, where these personnel issue orders

and lord it over the people. Relying on its vast military machine, Soviet revisionism has stretched its claws into every part of the world to expand its spheres of influence. Who but a superpower could do this?

The Soviet revisionists have used economic and military "aid" as an important means in colonial expansion. They have extended loans at usurious interest rates which are exacted in disguise. They supply arms to other countries for a price. Soviet revisionism and U.S. imperialism are now the two biggest merchants of death in the world. From 1955 to 1972, sales of Soviet arms totalled 28,500 million U.S. dollars' worth. The Soviet revisionists raked in huge profits during the Middle East war in October 1973 by selling arms to the Arab countries at high prices and demanding cash payment. Under the signboard of "economic aid," they exploit and plunder Third World countries by selling them old, outdated machinery and equipment at high prices while buying their raw materials at low prices. The Soviet revisionists extort various privileges while giving their brand of "aid" to other people. Punishment is meted out to any who fail to follow their dictates. Their milder punishment includes withdrawing experts, exerting pressure for the payment of debts and cutting off "aid"; more serious is their massing of troops along others' borders and launching armed intrusion. Has life not given plenty of such instances?

When the Soviet revisionists' attempts at expansion into other countries by deception fail, they will try conspiracy against them, even plotting to subvert their governments. In the past decade or more, close to 40 countries have announced their expulsion of Soviet diplomats for espionage and subversive activities.

Thailand's *Asian News Review* pointed out that the havoc played by spies from Moscow is no less heinous than by those of the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States.

When the Arab countries' just war against Israeli aggression broke out in the Middle East in October 1973, what the Soviet revisionists did was out-and-out, undisguised imperialist power politics in action. All along opposed to the Arab countries' anti-aggression war, the Soviet revisionists hastily on the eve of the October War withdrew their military experts together with the latter's family members from Egypt and other Arab countries. Then immediately after the outbreak of the war they spread rumours and schemed to force Egypt and other Arab countries to agree to a ceasefire, meanwhile keeping up their enormous flow of manpower to Israel. But, contrary to the Soviet revisionists' expectations, the army men and people of Egypt, Syria and Palestine fought through to an excellent situation. So the Soviet revisionists, looking out for their own interests, sold a certain amount of arms to the Arab countries, for they feared that otherwise they might lose control of Middle East developments and forfeit their say on the Middle East question. When the Arab countries' anti-aggression war went beyond the state of "no war, no peace" created by the two superpowers, however, the Soviet revisionists in collusion with the U.S. imperialists hurried to pressure the Arab countries into accepting a "ceasefire in place." The two superpowers thus jointly stamped out the leaping flames of the Arab people's just war. Then began a new round in the contention between Soviet revisionism and U.S. imperialism for seizure and control of the Middle East. Has

not Soviet revisionism been acting as an imperialist superpower?

All these acts of the Soviet revisionist superpower are open to view and irrefutable. So how can they be erased by Mr. Brezhnev simply by saying that China "invented" them? The experience of many small and medium countries has shown ever more clearly the aggressive and expansionist nature of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism. As *Al Rai Al Aam* of Kuwait rightly pointed out, under the camouflage of hypocritical slogans and taking advantage of the strong desire of the people of the Third World for liberation and progress, the Soviet Union has penetrated developing countries that have already been enslaved for several centuries under colonialism; it acts in accordance with its ambitions and intrigues as a superpower.

As to the fashionable "theory of limited sovereignty," it is a thoroughly fascist "theory" in the "Brezhnev doctrine," "invented" by Brezhnev himself. According to this "theory" the sovereignty of other countries is "limited" while Soviet revisionism's right to manipulate them is "unlimited." Brezhnev openly shouts that the formation today of a "big fraternal community of socialist countries" is "in principle" the same as was "the merging of all Soviet republics into a unified Soviet Union." This is absurd! The relations between the Soviet Union on the one hand and some East European countries and Mongolia on the other are those between sovereign states. How can these relations be considered in the same category as those between the union republics of the U.S.S.R. itself? Brezhnev's utterances clearly reveal the Soviet revisionists' aim of taking member states of their "big socialist community" as the U.S.S.R.'s union republics

Nos. 16, 17. . . . Little wonder these Soviet revisionist gentlemen think they are as entitled to send their tanks into Prague as to dispatch their troops into the Ukraine and Caucasus!

Further, the Soviet revisionists extend this "theory of limited sovereignty" to small and medium countries outside their "big socialist community," utterly ignoring the sovereignty of these countries. A number of these countries have declared a 200-nautical-mile limit for their territorial waters and special economic areas, but to this the Soviet revisionists say no, insisting that the "limit" must not exceed 12 nautical miles. As regards straits located within their territorial waters, a number of small and medium countries hold that no change should be made in the status of these straits as territorial waters, but the Soviet revisionists insist that these straits should be "internationalized" and that there should be "free passage" through them. A number of these countries want to safeguard their oil interests, but the Soviet revisionists have gone so far as to declare that Arab oil is "international property," implying that they, too, are entitled to a share in the resources of other countries. At an international conference the Soviet revisionists even advocated that "the sovereignty of developing countries over their natural resources" "depends on the capacity of their industries for utilizing these resources." In other words, highly industrialized countries should have more sovereign rights than industrially backward countries. This fallacy, that "strength decides everything on the sovereignty question," is nothing but an extension of Brezhnev's "theory of limited sovereignty." Who could bluff and bluster so but the spokesman of a superpower?

Soviet revisionist gentlemen, the conclusion people draw from objective facts is that the present-day Soviet Union is a superpower. Never can the appellation superpower be erased whether by Brezhnev pretending ignorance, shifting the blame onto China, or flying into a rage.

The interesting thing, and a point worth pondering, is the fact that the Soviet revisionists used to take pride in having the Soviet Union called a superpower. They themselves have often boasted about the Soviet Union as "a big country in the world," "a world power," etc., etc. Gromyko boasted blatantly to the Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany that the Soviet Union was "a European superpower." Why then, one may ask, are the Soviet revisionists so anxious now to disclaim this status? Their anxiety shows that their heyday is over, and that things are going worse and worse with them. Their plight can be aptly expressed by this line from a Chinese poem: "Flowers fall off, do what one may." Beset with difficulties, Soviet revisionism cannot match its ambitions with strength. In order to contend with U.S. imperialism for world hegemony, it has feverishly stepped up arms expansion and war preparations, resulting in the impoverishment of the Soviet people, exhaustion of its financial resources and deterioration of its economy. It even goes begging to the West for loans and sells its national resources so as to fill in its fund shortage, thus further revealing its inherent weakness. It has reached out its tentacles into other countries everywhere, hitting snags everywhere and revealing its true features as a superpower ever more clearly before the whole world. The torrential struggle waged by the people of the world and the small and medium countries against superpower hegemonism is mounting. Soviet

revisionism, finding itself ever more isolated, is trying a thousand and one ways to disclaim its superpower status and masquerade as a friend of the small and medium countries. Why? To deceive people as to its nature and go on throwing its weight about as a superpower. But this duplicity, which will get Soviet revisionism nowhere, is only the more revealed by Brezhnev's clumsy attempts at concealment.

(Published in *Renmin Ribao*, April 5, 1974)

THE BREZHNEV CLIQUE IS FOLLOWING IN HITLER'S FOOTSTEPS

Commentary by Hsinhua Correspondent

The Brezhnev clique is following in Hitler's footsteps in seeking world hegemony. Compare the Soviet revisionists' words and deeds with Hitler's and you can see that they are not only indulging in a Hitler-like pipe dream of world domination but are behaving in a strikingly similar manner to achieve this wild ambition.

Hitler openly clamoured for the Germans to take over the whole world after he set up a sanguinary fascist dictatorship in Germany. He madly embarked on arms expansion and prepared for war, asserting that only the strong had the right to enforce his will.

Since usurping Party and state power in the Soviet Union, the Brezhnev clique has also pursued a policy aimed at world hegemony. A TASS report of May 19, 1975 publicly called for "transforming international relations" in accordance with the Soviet revisionist "programme." Ranking Soviet revisionist figures also clamoured that in foreign activities they would "launch an extensive, real general offensive," and that they would "back up" their foreign policy with "military might" and "organize on a large scale" their production of missile nuclear weapons to "gain superiority in strength." One of them, putting on the airs of a world maritime overlord, blustered that "navigating all areas of the world oceans

is our inalienable and legitimate right" and that "the national interests of our motherland demand that we do so," while another echoed, "The long-cherished dream of our people has come true. The flag of the Soviet fleet is flying in the farthest corners of every sea and ocean."

When Hitler stepped up his arms programme and war preparations for aggression and expansion, he invariably professed a sincere desire for "peace" in order to lull the people of all countries into a false sense of security.

Isn't the Brezhnev clique today resorting to the same tactics?

Hitler repeatedly expressed his intention of "unconditionally upholding peace," prating about arms reduction and particularly "restrictions on air battles, noxious gas and submarines." But at the same time he was expanding armaments in a big way and accelerating the manufacture of aircraft, gas bombs, submarines, etc.

Brezhnev, too, talks glibly about "guaranteeing real and lasting world peace for generations" and advocates the realization of "general and complete disarmament," particularly the "prohibition of nuclear weapons." But at the same time he is pushing the arms build-up, especially nuclear armaments, to a level never seen before.

Hitler fabricated all sorts of absurd pretexts to justify his invasion and occupation of other countries and deceive the world's people. When the *Reichswehr* invaded Norway, Hitler used the pretext of "ensuring the Norwegian people's freedom" and "preventing the British and French troops from occupying bases in Norway." And he unblushingly declared, "Neither at present nor in the future does Germany intend to take action in

violation of the territorial integrity and political independence of the Kingdom of Norway.”

When the armed forces of the Brezhnev clique invaded and occupied Czechoslovakia, this was declared an act to “safeguard socialism in Czechoslovakia” and “preclude encroachment by West German militarist forces with their daily-growing revanchist ambitions.” The Brezhnev clique did not blush either when it professed respect for Czechoslovakia’s “territorial integrity” and “non-interference in its internal affairs.”

Before the outbreak of World War II, Hitler resorted to the tactic of “making a feint to the east while attacking in the west.” He declared time and again that “Germany had no intention of waging war against Britain and France” and that Germany would “co-operate with all European countries.” But in fact he directed his attention first and foremost to Western Europe. Hitler calculated that only by taking Western Europe and relying on its economic strength and resources could he go on to conquer the world. Taking advantage of the British and French government leaders’ fear of war and their appeasement policy, Hitler gobbled up Czechoslovakia and other countries, battenning on the conquest. As a matter of fact, it was Germany’s war with Britain and France that ignited World War II.

Today, the Brezhnev clique tirelessly puts itself on record shouting that the Soviet Union is out to “ensure peace and security on the European continent” and to “have good-neighbourly relations and co-operation” with West European countries. In fact, the clique considers Europe the key point in its efforts to achieve world domination. It is constantly strengthening its military deployment there and covetously eyeing the West

European countries. Like Hitler, the Brezhnev clique exploits the fear of war and desire for peace on the part of certain people in the West to further its expansion.

Hitler started militarizing Germany’s national economy on a big scale for aggression and expansion soon after coming to power. The Brezhnev clique acted in the same way. In a speech on July 6, 1967 Brezhnev clamoured that “the question of national defence takes first place in all our work.” The Soviet revisionists make no bones about following Hitler’s policy of guns instead of butter and “call on the Soviet people to make material sacrifices” and “use a large portion of the national income for national defence.” The militarization of the Soviet national economy has reached a new high. Reports say that about 60 per cent of Soviet enterprises are geared to war production and Soviet military expenditures are climbing steadily. Estimates put the Soviet Union’s present military expenditures at about one-third of its state budget, or around 20 per cent of its national income.

As was the case in Hitlerite Germany, the Soviet national economy has, to a large extent, been put in the orbit of a war economy. *The Question of Methods of Military Theory and Practice*, a book which came off the press in 1969 in the Soviet Union, admits that the Soviet policy calls for “an economy which can guarantee the waging of a war by either nuclear fragmentation means or conventional weapons.” Press reports show a 15-fold increase in Soviet inter-continental missiles in a decade and a 50 per cent increase in military aircraft from 1968 to 1973. There has also been a rapid increase in the number of tanks, artillery pieces and other conventional weapons. The Soviet journal *Communist of the Armed Forces* (No. 6, 1975) feverishly advertised that “the fire

volume of [Soviet] cannon and mortars of the motorized infantry divisions has increased over 30-fold in postwar years." Moreover, the Soviet Union is doubling its efforts to develop MIRVs (multiple independently-targeted re-entry vehicles) and build aircraft carriers. In the last 10 years or so, Soviet expenditures on nuclear weapons alone amounted to over 100,000 million dollars. Why are the Soviet revisionists producing military hardware on such a big scale? Because, as they themselves admit, they want to "gain military technical superiority," "effectively support Soviet foreign policy" with "military action," "fulfil offensive tasks" and even make active "preparations for waging a war with every type of weapon."

What warrants attention is the expansion of the Soviet navy. The tonnage of Soviet naval vessels nearly doubled in the last decade and the number of nuclear submarines increased over 5.5-fold in the past four years. In a speech on July 25, 1969, Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet Navy S. G. Gorshkov bragged that the Soviet naval fleets were already able to "fulfil their offensive tasks anywhere in the world." The afore-mentioned issue of the *Communist of the Armed Forces* boasted that the Soviet Union's navy "has already outgrown its coastal waters and inland seas and become familiar with the vast oceans" and that it "has all the necessary facilities to engage in long-term military operations simultaneously on all oceans," "can hit naval and ground targets at a long distance" and "swiftly land on the territory of its enemy."

One important aspect of Hitler's preparations for his wars of aggression was poisoning the minds of the German people by spreading the racist Herrenvolk theory and giving them heavy doses of militarist education.

Today, the Brezhnev clique is also frenziedly poisoning the minds of the Soviet people by inculcating in them Russian big-nation chauvinism and militarism as part of its "all-round war preparations in advance." During the past few years, Brezhnev & Co. have developed a particular mania for advertising the so-called "immutable Russian spirit." They have openly boasted that at no time and "nowhere in the world is there anything comparable to the character of the Russian nation." History has indicted E. P. Khabarov and such aggressors, but the Brezhnev clique reveres them as "fine sons of the Russian nation" and calls on the Soviet people to carry on the "glorious fighting traditions of their predecessors" in tsarist Russia.

Lenin pointed out that the social-chauvinists and social-pacifists glorified "**the imperialist war, describing it as a war for 'defence of the fatherland.'**" Today, the Brezhnev clique is glorifying its preparations for aggressive wars also under the pretext of "defence of the fatherland." It says that "the training of youth to defend the fatherland is of great significance" and that it is necessary "to carry out sufficient and effective patriotic military education among the youth." The Soviet revisionists have their "military affairs offices" in all middle schools, secondary vocational schools and technical schools, where military instructors drill the students in military activities. The revisionist authorities also direct their paid agents to produce large numbers of novels, films, plays, paintings, etc. with so-called "military patriotism" as the theme to dope Soviet youth. But what is this "military patriotism"? The novel *Dawn Here Is Quiet . . .*, published in the Soviet journal *Yunost* [Youth], No. 8, 1969 and highly

acclaimed by the Soviet revisionists, is revealing. The chief character in the novel, extolled as a model for young people, is a man who "carries out orders all his life." He never gives a thought to where his own actions "will lead and what consequences will ensue." The Soviet revisionists aim to train and turn Soviet youth into automatons like the soldiers of Hitler's Wehrmacht who, thinking only of "carrying out orders," will never think where their actions will lead, nor the consequences. The Soviet revisionists want to mould Soviet youth into people who can "be sent anywhere their services are needed, including remote and desolate areas and even foreign territories" (as editorialized by the Soviet paper *Krasnaya Zvezda* on September 28, 1971) to act as faithful tools in the social-imperialist aggressive wars. "Fundamental attention should be given to the training of youth to prepare for a big nuclear war" — this remark in the Soviet journal *Voprosy Istorii K.P.S.S.* [Problems of the History of the C.P.S.U.], No. 4, 1971, is a confession by the Soviet revisionists of what their "military patriotism" is aimed at.

Lenin pointed out that **"modern war is born of imperialism."** In the era of imperialism, the expansion of any imperialist country, as Lenin said, **"could take place only at the expense of others, as the enrichment of one state at the expense of another. The issue could only be settled by force — and, accordingly, war between the world marauders became inevitable."**

Before World War II, Germany found its feet again as an imperialist power after its defeat in World War I. It tried hard to capture the positions of the old-line imperialist powers, and this set off another world conflagra-

tion. Hitlerite Germany became the source of World War II.

The two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, are today the biggest international oppressors and exploiters. U.S. imperialism has forcibly occupied many parts of the world. Though it has long since toppled from its pinnacle, it tries desperately to hang on to what it has wrested. In the case of Soviet social-imperialism, which became the other superpower after joining the world's imperialist ranks, it has been doing everything in its power to squeeze into and take over the U.S. spheres of influence. The fierce contention between the two will lead some day to another world war. They are the sources of a new world war. Motivated by their wild ambitions, the Soviet social-imperialists are maintaining a posture of "general offensive" and stepping up mobilization and preparations for a war of aggression. They even threaten to launch a "pre-emptive attack." As a source of a new world war, Soviet social-imperialism is, therefore, the more dangerous.

The Chinese people's great leader Chairman Mao Tsetung has pointed out: **"The Soviet Union today is under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, a dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie, a dictatorship of the German fascist type, a dictatorship of the Hitler type."** Chairman Mao also said that **"all the reputedly powerful reactionaries were merely paper tigers. The reason was that they were divorced from the people. Was not Hitler a paper tiger? Was Hitler not overthrown?"** **"The revisionist Soviet Union is a paper tiger too."** Over 30 years ago, Hitler, a paper tiger, not only failed to gain world hegemony, but was reduced to ashes in the flames of the

anti-fascist struggle of the people of all countries. Earth-shaking changes have taken place in the world since that time. Following in Hitler's footsteps, the Brezhnev clique, another paper tiger, will meet an even more miserable end than Hitler's.

(Published in *Renmin Ribao*, July 2, 1975)

A BLACK LINE RUNNING THROUGH TWO DYNASTIES

— On new tsars justifying old tsars'
aggression and expansion

Commentary by Hsinhua Correspondent

It is common knowledge that tsarist Russia perpetrated unbridled aggression and territorial expansion for a long time in history. These atrocities of aggression were indignantly exposed and condemned by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, revolutionary teachers of the proletariat. But today, the Soviet revisionist leading clique openly tampers with and falsifies history and strives to reverse the historical verdict on the old tsars in an effort to justify its own social-imperialist policy of aggression.

I. It denies the scramble for world hegemony by tsarist Russia and describes its seizure of colonies as an effort to prevent expansion by other countries and to enable the indigenous people to free themselves from foreign enslavement.

Speaking of the policies of tsarist Russia, Marx pointed out in his time: **"Its methods, its tactics, its manoeuvres may change, but the polar star of its policy — world domination — is a fixed star."** Engels also said that tsarist Russia **"uses the continually changing goals of the competing Great Powers for the attainment of its own single, never-changing, never lost-sight-of objective: the domination of the world by Russia."** In his work

Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, Lenin showed in a table that in 1914 tsarist Russia was second only to Britain in the size of its colonies with a total area larger than all the colonies of France, Germany, the United States and Japan put together. However, an article in the Soviet magazine *Modern and Contemporary History*, No. 1, 1973, maintains that "there is no evidence" in support of "the assertion that tsarist Russia's goal was to achieve world hegemony." It says, "In the entire world history before 1917, Russia had been erroneously described as a major, and almost the only, force of aggression."

Referring to the scramble for colonies among the imperialist countries, Lenin said: "**The more capitalism is developed, the more strongly the shortage of raw materials is felt, the more intense the competition and the hunt for sources of raw materials throughout the whole world, the more desperate is the struggle for the acquisition of colonies.**" He also pointed out that the rivalry between tsarist Russia and Britain in Central Asia was a "**division of the spoils**" between imperialist powers. But the *History of the U.S.S.R.* published by the Soviet revisionists in the 1960s maintains that tsarist Russia's invasion of Central Asia was to "resist British colonial expansion in the Middle and Near East." Volume 12 of the *Great Soviet Encyclopaedia* published in 1973 declares that thanks to tsarist Russia's annexation of Kirghizia, "the working people of Kirghizia shook off the cruel oppression by the feudalists of Khokand Khan and were saved from enslavement by other backward eastern countries and from the threat of British expansion."

II. Tsarist Russia's encroachments upon and attempts at conquest of other countries are described as pursuance

of a policy of "good-neighbourliness" and support for "liberation." Tsarist Russia is even described as "a victim of aggression."

Referring to tsarist Russia's seizure of vast tracts of Chinese territory south of the Outer Khingan Mountains, Marx said that "**from Tsar Alexey Michaelovitch down to Nicholas, she (Russia) has always attempted to get it.**" Lenin also pointed out that "**the policy of the tsarist government in China is a criminal policy**" and that "**the European governments (the Russian government perhaps the first) have already started to partition China.**" However, the *Modern History of China* published by the Soviet revisionists in 1972 openly asserts that "unlike the Western powers, the Russian government pursued another kind of policy towards China, striving to establish good-neighbourly relations with it" and that "the tsarist government had not imposed on its own initiative unequal treaties on China, nor had it upheld of its own accord the treaties signed after 1860." The Soviet revisionist *History of the U.S.S.R.* holds that after the Treaty of Aigun and the Treaty of Peking had been signed, "tsarist Russia's policy towards China remained unchanged, that is, on the basis of peace."

Marx said: ". . . **the destruction of which** (the Romanian nation) **has never ceased to form an object of her** (Russia's) **intrigues and her wars.**" But the *History of the U.S.S.R.* asserts, "A Romanian kingdom emerged with the support of Russia, merging Moldavia and Walachia." Tsarist Russia is thus presented as the great benefactor of the Romanian nation! Engels in his time denounced tsarist Russia's vaunted "liberation" of Bulgaria as a "**tsarist variety of liberation**" and a "**conquest under the cover of liberation.**" Yet the *History*

of the U.S.S.R. stresses that "the Russians have shed much blood to help the Bulgarians gain liberation from the Turkish yoke."

On the relations between Russia and Persia (Iran), Marx pointed out that Russia had "**invaded Persia,**" and that tsarist Russia had not only "**stripped Persia of several additional districts**" through the Gulistan Treaty and the Turkmantchai Treaty, but also "**interdicted her from the navigation on her own shores along the Caspian Sea.**" Engels pointed out that "**the Treaty of Turkmantchai has converted**" Persia "**into a vassal of Russia.**" Volume 49 of the *Great Soviet Encyclopaedia* published in 1941 also points out clearly that the deterioration of Russo-Persian relations sprang from tsarist Russia's "expansion of her frontiers," "her effort to take possession of the Caspian Sea" and her "invasion of Persia." It says that the Gulistan Treaty and the Turkmantchai Treaty are "unequal treaties," the achievements of tsarist Russia's "colonial policy of plunder in Persia." But the *World History* published by the Soviet revisionists attributes the war to Persia's "anti-Russia actions" and to its "aggression" against tsarist Russian territory. When touching on the above-mentioned treaties, the book avoids mentioning that they were unequal treaties; on the contrary, it virtually turns them into equal and mutually beneficial treaties by laying emphasis on "the right to free trade enjoyed by merchants of the two sides."

III. The forcible annexations carried out by tsarist Russia are described as "voluntary incorporation."

As is known to all, many union republics and autonomous republics of the Soviet Union today were annexed by tsarist Russia by force. Referring to tsarist Russia's territorial expansion, Marx pointed out "**the acquisitions**

of Russia" since Peter the Great. Engels said: "**Although Russian chauvinism may still have had a few pretexts — I will not say justifications — for the conquests of Catherine II, this was certainly no longer true for the conquests of Alexander. . . . Here we are dealing with the naked conquest by force of foreign territories, with robbery pure and simple.**" He also pointed out tsarist Russia's "**conquest of Central Asia.**" But the Soviet revisionists allege in their press and other publications that among the Kazakh, Kirghiz, Turkmen, Bashkir, Azerbaijan, Armenian, Georgian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Moldavian and other peoples, some "joined in the Russian empire of their own free will," others "applied for Russian nationality" and still others even waged a "struggle for incorporation into Russia again." It sounds like invitations coming right and left for invasion and occupation by tsarist Russia! But Volume 30 of the *Great Soviet Encyclopaedia* published in 1937 has long exploded this lie. The so-called "Kazakh people's 'voluntary subordination,'" it writes, was only a "palpable lie" and a "myth" "feverishly spread by the great-nation chauvinists and Kazakh bourgeois nationalists." This hits the Soviet revisionists of today at their vital spot.

IV. The colonies ruthlessly oppressed by tsarist Russia are described as "a happy paradise."

In his work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Lenin showed by a table that out of Russia's total area of 22.8 million square kilometres in 1914, 17.4 million square kilometres were colonies. He pointed out more than once that tsarist Russia was "**a prison of peoples**" and "**set a world record for the oppression of nations.**" Stalin also pointed out that "**the aggressiveness of Russian nationalism**" had been combined with "**tsarism's**

role of executioner in regard to the non-Russian peoples."

The *History of the U.S.S.R., Turkmenistan and Dear Ukraine* published by the Soviet revisionists, however, claim that "Russia brought an era of happiness to the land (Central Asia)," that tsarist Russia was "the saviour and protector" of Turkmenistan, and that the annexation of the Ukraine by tsarist Russia enabled "the Ukrainians to free themselves from miseries and begin a new period of happy life." In order to present tsarist Russia as "a happy paradise" for the various peoples, the Soviet revisionists have openly tampered with history. It is stated in Volume 32 of the *Great Soviet Encyclopaedia* published in 1936 that "the colonial policy of tsarist Russia has brought growing poverty and destruction to the Kirghiz. The population of Kirghizia decreased by 7-10 per cent in the decade from 1903 to 1913." But a Soviet revisionist chieftain asserted in a public speech in 1964 that tsarist Russian domination of Kirghizia "freed the Kirghiz from the threat of extermination as an independent nation." The *History of the U.S.S.R.* published in 1954 still admitted that after its annexation by tsarist Russia, a "one-sided agricultural economy" took shape in Moldavia and its "industrial development was very weak" because it was "conditioned by its status as a colony." But in 1968 the Soviet journal *Historical Problems* alleged that the annexation of Moldavia by tsarist Russia "ensured the Moldavians the possibility of a faster economic and cultural development." On the basis of such falsified history, the new tsars reach the conclusion that "incorporation (into tsarist Russia), be it by force, might still be progressive in history." This is indeed a typical instance of the logic of colonialism and an undisguised justification for aggression.

Instances of the Soviet revisionists negating the theses of the revolutionary teachers and tampering with and falsifying history so as to justify the aggression and expansion by the old tsars are too many to be listed here.

Brezhnev and company are fond of painting themselves as "Marxist-Leninists," "students of and successors to Lenin." But their pronouncements concerning the Russian tsars could not be farther removed from Marxism-Leninism. The lies of the Soviet leading clique are no different from the utterances of the old tsars and their generals, ministers and hack writers. If today's new tsars of the Kremlin are any different from the old tsars, it is that the latter sometimes gave the show away whereas the former are more stubborn and brazen in telling lies. Concerning the tactics of conquering Kazakhstan, Peter the Great said, "If a mere treaty may lead to the acceptance of protection from the Russian empire, we would not grudge the spending of huge sums, even if it amounts to millions." This revealed the truth about "voluntary incorporation," to which Brezhnev and company persist in clinging. Tsarist Russia's minister to China Putyatin admitted that the area south of the Outer Khingan Mountains "indisputably belongs to China in accordance with the treaty." N. Muravyev, tsarist Russia's Governor of Eastern Siberia, also admitted that there were "Chinese officials and posts" in the area. But Brezhnev and his like assert that the inhabitants in the area "were not under the jurisdiction of anyone," that "the land south of the Oudi River had not been demarcated," that "there were no administrative organs of the Ching Government there," and so on and so forth. This is truly a case of "pupil outdoing teacher," of the new tsars outdoing the old!

Why are the new tsars going out of their way like this to justify the aggression and expansion by the old tsars? The answer can be found in what Engels pointed out: “. . . any Russian who is a chauvinist will sooner or later fall on his knees before the tsar.” Two dynasties — the Romanov dynasty and the Khrushchov-Brezhnev dynasty — are connected by a black line, that is, the aggressive and expansionist nature of great-Russian chauvinism and imperialism. The only difference is that the latter dons the cloak of “socialism,” though it is social-imperialism in the true sense of the term.

(Published in *Renmin Ribao*, August 26, 1973)

SOVIET UNION — SUPERPOWER AND SUPER-EXPLOITER

Commentary by Hsinhua Correspondent

Like the other superpower, Soviet social-imperialism is a super-exploiter of the Third World. One of its stock-in-trade methods of exploitation is loan-sharking, which goes by the name of economic “aid.” Loans give it the leverage to export commodities and push sales of high-priced manufactured goods. Through exchange of unequal values it plunders the raw materials of the “aid”-recipient nations and fleeces the Third World countries in international trade.

Soviet revisionism, which styles itself the “natural ally” of the developing countries, is actually an extortioner through loans, the developing countries’ “natural” exploiter. The Brezhnev clique, which often approaches the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan hat in hand for credits, feverishly extols its own loans to Third World countries as “disinterested aid” and “an effective way to strengthen the national independence of the ‘third world’ countries.” (*Pravda*, April 3, 1974.) But Soviet loan-making is really a means of exploitation, plunder and extortion. As revealed by Western press reports, Soviet social-imperialist loans to Third World countries, nominally low-interest and special “preferential development funds,” are accompanied by many harsh conditions and so they are in fact

a variant of usury, fetters on the debtor nations. Speaking of the avarice of imperialism of his time, Lenin said that it was concerned **“with skinning the ox twice.”** As for today’s Soviet social-imperialism, it tries, by means of loans, to skin its “aid” recipients thrice. First, it forcibly sells them obsolete but costly machinery and equipment; second, it compels them to repay debts in raw materials and industrial and farm products at depressed prices, or even exacts cash repayments in foreign exchange; third, it attaches harsh terms to its loans.

First, let us discuss its dumping of out-of-date machines through loans. In granting a loan, Soviet revisionism usually stipulates that it must be used by the debtor nation to buy Soviet machinery and equipment. In other words, the loans are made in the form of outdated Soviet machines, which are known for their poor quality and exorbitant prices — in some cases 20 to 30 per cent above the world market prices. Soviet revisionism’s “trade credits,” stripped of their frills, are nothing but sharp practices of selling commodities at higher-than-world-market prices, extremely predatory practices.

Moreover, the Soviet revisionists are old hands in the game of extending loans to grab raw materials. And so one of the strings attached to their loans is usually that the debtor nation must repay its debts with “traditional” commodities, which are often tagged 10 to 15 and sometimes even 30 per cent below the world market prices. The gap between the prices of manufactured goods and raw materials, which stems from imperialist monopoly, has nothing whatsoever in common with exchange of equal values. Now to this exchange of

unequal values the Soviet revisionists add another, thus extorting at low prices a colossal amount of goods from developing countries, ranging from dressed non-ferrous ores, petroleum, natural gas, long-staple cotton, natural rubber, leather and oil to clothing, furniture, rice, coffee and tropical fruits. Soviet revisionism often takes advantage of its position as a creditor nation to force debtor nations to go into “orientated production.” This means that it requires them to assign certain factories to turn out products it prescribes and sell them at prices lower than those on the world market as repayment for the Soviet loans.

Soviet revisionism is an adept in extortion even when the debt is stipulated to be repaid in cash. For instance, under the pretext of currency devaluation, it often raises the amount to be repaid or demands repayment in foreign exchange so as to extract more. Thus, “revenue in foreign exchange from debt repayments by the developing countries has increased year by year, which makes an important contribution to the Soviet Union’s balance of international payments.” (From an article by S. A. Skachkov, Chairman of the Soviet State Committee for External Economic Relations, carried in *Pravda* of March 29, 1973.)

Another important objective in such loan-making is economic infiltration, interference and control of other countries. The Soviet revisionists claim that their “credits for development plans” for developing countries are extended to help the “aid” recipients develop their economies. But in fact they are used to manipulate these countries and make them dependent on Soviet revisionism. Almost all enterprises built with Soviet loans, from designing, construction and production to management,

are controlled by the Soviet experts working on the "aid" projects. They behave like bosses of the enterprises, draw high salaries, live in luxury villas, get special allowances and free travelling and medical services, and enjoy many other privileges. In addition, when they and their families go home on furlough the "aid"-recipient countries have to foot the bills for their travel. It is truly a heavy burden for these countries to feed and look after these bosses. Statistics show that expenses for their upkeep often eat up 20 per cent of the Soviet loans. In other words, whatever the results of the Soviet-"aid" projects, one-fifth of such loans finds its way back to Soviet revisionism's coffers.

Nor is this all. Soviet revisionism knows how to capitalize on others' difficulties to carry out political interference and gain control, demanding repayment for debts when it meets with resistance. During the 1973 Middle East war, for example, Soviet revisionism held up the delivery of arms and demanded payment of 80 million U.S. dollars of interest on the Soviet loans in order to force Egypt to accept a ceasefire. When Bangladesh was hit by serious floods in 1974, Soviet revisionism demanded repayment of the 200,000 tons of wheat on loan. The *Financial Express* of India reported that in violation of an agreement reached with India, Soviet revisionism asked it for an upward revaluation by about 4,000 million rupees in the repayment of its outstanding credits and interest on the plea that the rupee had been devalued.

Fleeced by the two big creditors, the Soviet Union and the United States, many developing countries are caught in vicious spiralling debts. Repayment of loans and interest has become a crushing burden. To pay off debts, the developing countries have to divert to the creditor

nations 10 per cent, in some cases even 30 per cent, of their most precious foreign exchange income earned through trade and other channels. Some have to incur new debts to repay old ones, and the new loans may not even cover the old debts. Statistics of the Indian Ministry of Finance show that in the 1973-74 fiscal year Soviet "aid" to India totalled 139 million rupees, whereas the accumulated principal and interest that India paid Soviet revisionism that year amounted to 567 million rupees. India had to make up the deficiency with money obtained elsewhere or with materials.

Long and bitter experience has made the developing countries increasingly aware that foreign loans cannot help them shake off foreign economic exploitation and control, but that their economic development and progress would only be impeded by such debts. Today, they focus their attention on how to break out of the fetters of foreign debts and have begun exposing and denouncing usury exploitation in many ways. Those most victimized by Soviet revisionist loan-sharking are in the van of fighting pressure for debt repayment and blackmail. The Egyptian people have won broad sympathy and support throughout the world in their denunciation of the Soviet revisionists' shameful acts of pressing for debt repayment. Indian public opinion has also begun to make its voice heard, and even Indian parliament members worry lest heavy indebtedness mortgage India to the Soviet Union and force their country into a dependent position.

The Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order adopted by the 6th Special Session of the U.N. General Assembly strongly calls for appropriate urgent measures to "mitigate adverse consequences for the current and future development of

developing countries arising from the burden of external debt contracted on hard terms." This reflects the universal demand of the Third World countries.

Meanwhile, the developing countries are actively engaged in mutual aid in order to overcome the shortage of funds. With a view to reducing borrowing from abroad, they attach particular importance to accumulating capital for expanded reproduction and raising funds for development through self-reliance, by tapping new resources and cutting expenses. This correct approach, which is being understood and accepted by more and more developing countries, opens up broad and bright prospects for them to free themselves from exploitation by foreign loan sharks and to develop their national economies independently.

(Published in *Renmin Ribao*, July 11, 1975)

C.M.E.A. — SOVIET REVISIONISM'S INSTRUMENT FOR NEO-COLONIALISM

Commentary by Hsinhua Correspondent

In its speeches and articles the Soviet revisionist renegade clique keeps harping on such old tunes as "friendship," "co-operation," "equality" and "sovereignty" in relations among the members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and glorifying C.M.E.A. as a "model of international socialist economic contacts."

What kind of "model" is C.M.E.A.? This is clear in the minds of Brezhnev and company, while other C.M.E.A. members have had their own bitter experience over the years.

Controlled by Soviet revisionist social-imperialism, C.M.E.A. has long become an instrument for the Soviet revisionists to control, exploit and plunder other C.M.E.A. countries and to practise neo-colonialism over them.

From Khrushchov to Brezhnev, painstaking work has long been done to effect so-called "economic integration" in C.M.E.A. in an attempt to put the national economies of the other C.M.E.A. members totally into the orbit of the Soviet economy. Under the manipulation of the Soviet revisionists, C.M.E.A. in July 1971 adopted a so-called "comprehensive programme for economic integration" stipulating that all C.M.E.A. members effect, in stages within 15 to 20 years, "integration" in production, science and technology, foreign trade, currency and fi-

nance. In addition, organs such as the "international organization for metallurgical co-operation," the "organization for peace power," the "organization for co-operation in transport and telecommunications," the "international centre for scientific and technical information," the "international bank of economic co-operation" and the "international investment bank" have been set up in C.M.E.A. to serve as tools for carrying out "economic integration." Through these supra-national setups, the Soviet revisionists have gained control over the major economic sectors and the economic lifelines of other C.M.E.A. members, such as industry, energy, communications, science and technology and finance.

For many years the Soviet revisionists have pushed their so-called "co-ordination of plans," "international division of labour" and "specialization of production" in C.M.E.A. on the pretext of "economic integration." They have interfered in the internal affairs of the member countries and flagrantly opposed the latter's "artificially restricting the process of expanded reproduction to the framework of their own countries." They demand that these countries "rearrange" their national economies in the light of the so-called "international division of labour." Their "co-ordination of plans" has even covered the five-year plans and long-term (10-20 year) plans of other C.M.E.A. members, involving the latter's entire economies, their major economic sectors and variety of products. Under the pretext of the "co-ordination of plans," the Soviet revisionists have even directly planted their men in the economic sectors of some C.M.E.A. nations to establish what they call "direct ties" and "direct co-operation." For instance, many Soviet government ministries set up their "representative" organs in relevant

departments in Mongolia. These "representatives," "advisers" and "experts" can even veto the views of Mongolian ministers on important economic questions. In this way, the Soviet revisionists have put the economies of the other C.M.E.A. nations under their long-term and total control, depriving these countries of the right to draw up their national economic plans independently.

Such big-power hegemonic behaviour by the Soviet revisionists has aroused general dissatisfaction from other C.M.E.A. members. Published in Hungary in 1972, the book *To What Extent Has C.M.E.A. Integration Developed?* meaningfully says: "The Soviet Union is a world power. To serve its political interests, non-economic factors will surely play a greater role in its economic policy." The book points out that the "sovereignty of some small countries" is "limited" because of the enforcement of "economic integration."

In carrying out "economic integration" and the "international division of labour" in C.M.E.A., the Soviet revisionist leading clique acts as a metropolitan state and regards other C.M.E.A. members as its economic dependencies. Boasting of the Soviet Union's "high degree of economic and scientific potentialities," this clique openly urges other C.M.E.A. members to recognize the Soviet Union's "leading role" in the economic field and opposes them independently establishing their economic systems according to specific conditions and needs. It declares that it is "unnecessary and futile" for countries such as Bulgaria and Mongolia to "develop certain industrial departments," for the Soviet Union "has built up such industrial departments." It truculently stipulates that there is no need for "those countries which have insufficient resources" to "trial-produce products the needs of which

may be met by the supply of other countries." It asks these countries to rely on the supply of these products from "other more developed countries" like the Soviet Union. According to this "theory," the Soviet revisionists have for many years compelled some C.M.E.A. members to reorganize their industrial and agricultural production structures and develop only those economic sectors in which they are allowed to "specialize" under the "division of labour" according to Moscow's needs. This has in fact turned these countries into Soviet revisionism's affiliated processing plants. An article in the Bulgarian journal *International Relations* raised the objection that such "international division of labour" "will spawn one-sidedness and dependence in the development of various countries" and "will aggravate inequality among countries." The Polish press also has on many occasions openly complained that the "international division of labour" and "specialization of production" enforced by the Soviet leading clique in C.M.E.A. have brought about a reduction in the variety of Polish products, do not match Poland's productive potentialities, are "unfavourable (to Poland) in terms of technical progress, raw materials and investments," and "have not become an important factor for the promotion of (Polish) economic development."

Restricted by natural conditions, other C.M.E.A. members lack certain important industrial resources. In the past, they relied on imports from various sources to solve the problem of industrial raw materials and fuel. Under the pretext of the "international division of labour" and "fraternal co-operation," the Soviet revisionists in the past 10 years and more have gradually monopolized the supply of fuel and raw materials to these countries. According to statistics, East European C.M.E.A. members

now import from the Soviet Union almost all their oil and iron, 80-90 per cent of their iron-ore and timber, three-quarters of their oil products, rolled metal and phosphate fertilizer and over three-fifths of their cotton, coal and manganese ore. The "friendship" oil pipeline, "peace" power network and "fraternity" gas pipeline, which stretch from the Soviet Union to the East European countries, have become the main energy supply lines for these countries. As a result, they have been reduced to depending on the Soviet Union for raw materials, fuel and energy, and the Soviet revisionists are thereby able to meddle in the economies of these countries at will and exert political pressure on them.

In the last decade or so, the Soviet revisionists have used these tactics to blackmail the East European countries into providing them with loans, equipment and labour to help the Soviet Union tap its own resources and build factories. According to press reports, in the 1960-70 period, Czechoslovakia alone provided the Soviet Union with loans and capital investment totalling about 2,000 million rubles to exploit iron-ore, oil, non-ferrous metals and natural gas and to lay natural gas pipelines. In "co-ordinating" the 1971-75 national economic plans, the Soviet Union signed agreements with the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria on building new industrial projects for fuel and raw materials in the Soviet Union. Under the agreements, these countries have had to provide the Soviet Union with long-term "special loans" exceeding 1,000 million rubles. Such Soviet revisionist blackmail and extortion have put heavy financial burdens on these countries. Bulgaria has expressed concern that "the redistribution of its agricultural investment to the raw

materials departments of other countries will drastically slow down its own agricultural development." Hungary has called such loans "unreasonable" and said that they "will do great harm to the inherent proportion of reproduction."

While making the other C.M.E.A. members dependent on the Soviet Union for basic raw materials and fuel, the Soviet revisionist leading clique has tried by every conceivable means to plunder their rare metals and strategic raw materials. According to press reports, exploitation of uranium ore in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic and Bulgaria is almost completely under the control of the Soviet revisionists. They have seized the right to exploit a copper-molybdenum mine in Mongolia and looted 50 per cent of its exports of tungsten ore and fluorite. Forty-three per cent of Poland's zinc exports and 94 per cent of Bulgaria's barytes exports and 49 per cent of its lead ore go to the Soviet Union.

In addition, the Soviet revisionist social-imperialists have gradually over the years extended their control to other C.M.E.A. members' foreign trade through so-called "economic integration," and reduced them to markets for dumping Soviet commodities and supply bases for imports of specified commodities. Statistics show that in recent years over 50 per cent of exported Soviet machinery and equipment were dumped in these countries while over 70 per cent of machinery and equipment, transport vehicles and daily necessities imported by the Soviet Union came from other C.M.E.A. nations. In trading with these countries, the Soviet revisionists have truculently forced them to open wide their home market to defective Soviet goods while invariably finding fault with the quality of goods extorted from them. The

Soviet revisionists have made enormous profits by every means, fair or foul, buying cheap and selling dear and engaging in exchange of unequal values. According to data published by the Soviet revisionists themselves, in the 1961-71 decade the Soviet Union netted 1,160 million rubles from Czechoslovakia alone through exports of oil, iron-ore, hard coal, pig iron and ginned cotton by monopolizing price disparities, as compared with prices of the same Soviet exports to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Another Hungarian book points out: "The increased prices for raw materials and the reduced prices on machinery in C.M.E.A. have brought serious losses to some states, while bringing great profits to others." A book published in Bulgaria vocally demands that "ways must be found to correct the unfavourable disparity in prices between industrial goods and agricultural produce as well as foodstuffs, which exists in the capitalist market and has been mechanically applied in trade among the C.M.E.A. members."

The contradictions between the Soviet Union and other C.M.E.A. members on the question of prices are growing sharper by the day.

Lenin pointed out: "**Imperialism means the progressively mounting oppression of the nations of the world by a handful of Great Powers.**" From the Soviet revisionist renegade clique's actions over the years in C.M.E.A. and the dissatisfaction and denunciation repeatedly voiced by other C.M.E.A. members against the Soviet revisionists, it is not difficult to see that the Soviet revisionist social-imperialists have subjected so-called "fraternal states" to ever fiercer oppression through C.M.E.A. If C.M.E.A. is a "model of international economic contacts," it is only a "model" of robbery, control

and exploitation of other countries and the pursuance of big-power hegemonism by the imperialist superpowers in international economic relations; it is a "model" of oppression and enslavement of small and medium nations by the new tsars in Moscow.

(Published in *Renmin Ribao*, June 23, 1974)

SINISTER PROGRAMME OF NEO-COLONIALISM

— Soviet revisionists' vicious motives in peddling theory of "international division of labour" in Third World

by Chai Chang

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique has for a long time insidiously advocated its theory of the so-called "international division of labour." It has raised a hue and cry about "international division of labour" for "the achievement of industrialization," "high-speed economic development," the elimination of "the difference in the level of economic development of various countries," "promotion of the well-being of the labouring people," and so on and so forth. In recent years it has been trying its utmost to spread this theory to the Third World, alleging that only by "co-operating" with Soviet revisionism can the developing countries "establish independent national economies."

What after all is this "international division of labour"? The Soviet revisionist new tsars have been feverishly pushing the policy of expansion and plunder abroad since the 1960s. Their "international division of labour" is the product of their neo-colonialism, or social-colonialism. Their hired scholars have claimed that such "international division of labour" shows mainly in "specialization and co-operation in production," and that it will "lead to

specialization in the entire national economy, lead to the establishment of a national economic complex” and finally result in the “economic integration” of various countries. It is this “theory” that Soviet revisionism, in serving its own needs, has used to force some East European countries under its control to reorganize their industrial and agricultural production structures and to renounce their right to develop their economies independently. The result is that some countries with a comparatively developed industry in the past have been compelled to serve as accessory factories making spare parts for Soviet industries. Other countries, in the name of “meeting the needs of other socialist countries for farm products,” have been forced to become supply-orchards and market gardens as well as livestock farms for Soviet revisionism. It is obvious that this so-called “international division of labour” is nothing but an out-and-out neo-colonialist plan designed to colonize members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance under Soviet revisionist control.

However, the aggressive Soviet revisionists’ rapacious ambition cannot be satisfied when national economic planning remains “within the sovereignty” of some C.M.E.A. members. To deprive these countries of what remains of their sovereignty, the Soviet revisionists demand “co-ordination” of national economic plans, clamouring that only through such “co-ordination” can “international division of labour” be “more profound and effective.” Openly and shamelessly distorting the Marxist-Leninist theory on planned and proportionate development of national economy, they have proposed the establishment of so-called “international proportional relations” and, with ulterior motives, preach that “in the

development of the production sections of national economies, the international proportional relations will grow unceasingly.” Thus, they insist, the various countries’ indices of volume of production, variety of products, capital investments, extension of credit, ect. should all be subject to “co-ordination.” By “co-ordinating” the plans, the Soviet revisionists have undermined the national economic planning of C.M.E.A. countries and crippled their industries, heavy industry in particular, so as to meet the new tsars’ needs for loot. As a result of such “co-ordination,” some East European countries have been forced to renounce production of traditional products, close newly built factories or rebuild a large number of factories to cater to Soviet revisionist needs, thereby causing these countries huge economic losses.

The main organizational form of the Soviet revisionist “international division of labour” is to establish a cartel-type “organization of economic co-operation,” to be followed by the setting up of an “international economic complex.” To date many such “organizations of economic co-operation” have been set up by C.M.E.A. countries under Soviet pressure. Through these “supra-national” economic organizations, the Soviet revisionists have directly controlled the key national economic sectors of these countries. For example, through the “international metallurgical industry co-operation organization,” they have taken over direct control of the whole process of the metallurgical industry in some East European countries, including ore-mining, production, sales, and building blast furnaces. By means of these “organizations of economic co-operation” the Soviet revisionists try to lay a foundation for their “international economic complex,” a huge highly monopolized combine which will be run in

accordance with a joint international plan with its labour force, finances, products and services "freely mobile." Once such a "complex" is founded, the Soviet revisionists' claim that they "respect state sovereignty and territorial integrity" and national independence becomes utterly nonsensical.

Apart from implementing this colonialist policy in Eastern Europe, the Soviet revisionists are now peddling it in the Third World. A long article in the Soviet journal *Kommunist*, No. 8, 1973, openly demands that the developing countries "gradually and step by step participate in the international socialist division of labour." Running Soviet revisionist "joint-stock enterprises" in these countries to "gradually deepen specialization and co-operation in production" and to "perfect even more the international division of labour" is the "new form of co-operation" which "more and more resolutely" has been given priority. In addition, the "economic integration" plan of the C.M.E.A. has been "opened" to the developing countries. In short, the Soviet revisionists want to extend to the Third World the neo-colonialism it has practised over some East European countries.

Soviet revisionism has always regarded the Third World countries as targets for plunder. In the last decade or so, through its so-called "aid" and "economic co-operation," it has siphoned off large quantities of minerals and other industrial raw materials and farm products at the lowest possible prices from Asian, African and Latin American countries. In the period 1960-71, the Soviet revisionists robbed from these countries an estimated 6,700 million dollars' worth of cotton fibre, natural rubber, non-ferrous metals and foodstuffs, of which foodstuffs accounted for 3,200 million dollars, and natural

rubber, 1,700 million dollars. They also use "aid" and "economic co-operation" as a means to control the industrial sectors of Asian, African and Latin American countries. In India, which has rather close "co-operation" with the Soviet revisionists and rather thorough "specialization" in production, they have set up iron and steel, machine-building, power and some other major industries through "aid." These industries must proceed with production in accordance with the standard, variety and quantity stipulated by the Soviet revisionists and must sell the products to them at dictated prices. As a result, 30 per cent of India's steel, 60 per cent of its oil, 60 per cent of its power equipment and 85 per cent of its heavy machine tools have fallen under Soviet revisionist control. This is what the Soviet revisionist magazine *Kommunist* really means when it claims that Soviet revisionist "co-operation" "is helpful in solving" "one of the sharpest problems — the problem of marketing products" which Asian and African countries face.

However, pilfering products and raw materials by low prices through "aid" and "economic co-operation" is limited to a certain period of time. Once debts have been repaid, the prerogatives might possibly vanish. To forestall this, the Soviet revisionist *Kommunist* treats the opening of "joint-stock enterprises" as "a new form of co-operation," the main form of co-operation with the developing countries. To put it bluntly, the so-called "joint-stock enterprise" means in reality a change from disguised "aid" to crude capital export, and from enjoying the privilege of exchanging machinery and armaments for raw materials at low prices to exercising long-term control and monopoly over the economic lifelines of Asian,

African and Latin American countries. Isn't this out-and-out imperialist theory and practice?

Moreover, the Soviet revisionist journal *Kommunist* says that the so-called "comprehensive programme for socialist economic integration" cooked up at the 25th regular meeting of C.M.E.A. has opened up tremendous "possibilities" for enhancing "co-operation" between the Soviet revisionists and the developing countries. This "comprehensive programme" stipulates that within 15 to 20 years C.M.E.A. countries should practise "integration" not only in production, but in science and technology, foreign trade, currency and finance. One may easily imagine that once the developing countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America are trapped, to speak of any national independence and sovereignty for them would be so much empty talk. What has been described shows the mad ambition of the Soviet revisionists in their vain hope of establishing a world empire!

The Chinese people's great leader Chairman Mao Tsetung has pointed out: **"Imperialism has prepared the conditions for its own doom. These conditions are the awakening of the great masses of the people in the colonies and semi-colonies and in the imperialist countries themselves. Imperialism has pushed the great masses of the people throughout the world into the historical epoch of the great struggle to abolish imperialism."**

With the awakening of the people of the Third World and with the ferocious features of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism being constantly unmasked, more and more countries and people have come to realize the reactionary essence of the Soviet revisionists' "international division of labour." Many developing countries regard the policy of developing their national economies inde-

pendently and through self-reliance as a reliable way of ridding themselves of control and plunder by imperialism and big-power hegemonism, a reliable way to shake off poverty and backwardness. Even India is not happy about what the Soviet revisionists are doing. Indian public opinion and some Indian political personages have pointed out that the economic agreements signed in 1973 between India and the Soviet Union compromising Indian independence and sovereignty are only a variation of co-ordinating national economic plans after the C.M.E.A. pattern, and that India would become a supplier of raw materials and primary products serving mainly the Soviet Union.

Countries want independence, nations want liberation and the people want revolution — this great historical trend is irresistible. Gone forever are the days when one or two superpowers could force their will on the world's people. The Soviet revisionist gangster theory of the "international division of labour" is going bankrupt and will certainly be consigned to the garbage heap of history.

(Published in *Renmin Ribao*, March 5, 1974)

HONEY ON LIPS, MURDER IN HEART

— Social-imperialist nature of Soviet revisionists’
“military aid” to Egypt exposed

by Fan Hsiu-chu and Chung Tung

Aggression, interference, bullying, attempts at control and subversion — such are the counter-revolutionary activities the Soviet social-imperialists carry out day in and day out against Third World countries. In speeches, statements and official documents, however, they are benevolent virtue personified; they say the nicest things but never speak the truth. A case in point is the “aid” given Third World countries by the Soviet revisionists, who have honey on their lips but murder in their hearts.

As Moscow would have it, there is no aid like Soviet revisionist “aid”: “disinterested,” treating recipients as “equals,” having “no political strings attached,” “not used as a means to bring pressure” on recipients, not used as a means to “interfere in other countries’ internal affairs” or “seek benefits or privileges for itself.” Soviet revisionism also vows sanctimoniously that it is “the natural and reliable ally” of the developing countries and “has always sided with the champions of national liberation and independence.” Such moving words the Soviet revisionists have been spreading here, there and everywhere.

However, deception is short-lived. From their own experience, a growing number of Third World countries have come to see ever more clearly the social-imperialist

essence of Soviet “aid.” In recent years, government leaders and the press in Egypt have brought to light a host of shocking facts showing how the Soviet Union has exercised control over Egypt and meddled in its internal affairs by means of “aid,” “military aid” in particular. These facts expose convincingly the Soviet revisionists’ wickedness in using other countries’ difficulties to control and bully them. They are negative examples which serve as positive eye-openers for the people.

USING ARMS SUPPLIES TO BIND EGYPT HAND AND FOOT

The Soviet revisionists began their “military aid” to Egypt in the mid-1950s. For a decade and more they turned the tap on and off as they pleased. However, whether to give a little or not to give anything, when to give and when not to give, what kind of weapons to give and what not to give — all these decisions bear sinister motives.

One of the Soviet revisionists’ sharp practices is to ban arms supplies in times of need. On the eve of the 1973 October War when the Egyptian people were making preparations against aggression, the Soviet revisionists time and again held up delivery of the arms promised. Towards the end of the war when Israel, equipped with numerous U.S. planes and tanks of the latest design, penetrated into the west bank of the Suez Canal, the Soviet revisionists did not hesitate to turn down Egypt’s repeated requests for recoupment at the

critical moment of its struggle, compelling Egypt to accept a ceasefire. Throughout the 14 months following the October War, Egypt got no arms replenishment worth mentioning from the Soviet Union. Such is the truth about the much vaunted "powerful" Soviet support for Egypt during its most difficult days.

Another sharp practice of the Soviet revisionists is to restrict the right of using the weapons. Delivery of weapons is accompanied by the stipulation that they must not be used without prior Soviet permission. In 1971, for instance, the Soviet Union promised to send Egypt "II" bombers, but on the precondition that they must not be used without an order from Moscow. What absurdity! It is as good as buying a heap of scrap iron to pay for weapons in cash but not be allowed to use them to fight aggressors. Suppose Israel again attacked Egypt's heartland, as President Sadat aptly asked at the time, was it conceivable that he must wait for Moscow's order before he could counter-attack? In order to keep their hands on the weapons they sold, the Soviet revisionists have repeatedly refused to sell spare parts, besides cutting down munitions supplies. As a result, the Soviet arms which cost Egypt huge sums in foreign exchange have become, in the eyes of the Egyptian people, no more than a stockpile of "bric-a-brac."

Still another sharp practice of Soviet revisionism is to demand high prices and reap fabulous profits. The costly arms and munitions sold to Egypt, some poor-quality hardware, have to be paid for in cash. Moreover, the Soviet revisionists have often jacked up the prices at will to wring more foreign exchange out of Egypt. The prices of Soviet weapons were doubled, reports say,

in less than two years' time before the October War. Then, in the heat of the war, they went up again, cash down of course, revealing Soviet revisionism as a total blood-sucking merchant of death.

These practices are part of Soviet revisionism's counter-revolutionary designs to place Egypt under its thumb and so further its contention for hegemony in the Middle East. Egyptian leaders have pointed out that Moscow has tried to use its arms and munitions supplies as a "political means" to influence Egypt's actions. That means attempting, through monopoly of arms supply, to bind the Egyptian people hand and foot and force Egypt to bend and obey Moscow's orders. These arrogant and high-handed practices have compelled Egypt to decide to buy weapons from various other sources and reject the Soviet revisionists' terms on the use of weapons that abridge its sovereignty.

SEEKING BASES AND ATTEMPTING TO ESTABLISH A STATE WITHIN A STATE

The Soviet revisionists have long been casting a covetous eye on Egypt's and other Middle East countries' ports along the Mediterranean coast. When Soviet revisionist chief Podgorny went to Cairo soon after the 1967 June 5 war, he brazenly demanded in talks with Egypt "the establishment of a commanding centre and a shipyard in Alexandria" "to be guarded by the Russian navy." He went a step further by demanding that "the whole area — the commanding centre, the shipyard and the living quarters for the guards — be put at the disposal

of the Russians” and that “the Soviet flag be raised in the area.” This is a barefaced claim to a piece of Egyptian territory and an attempt to establish a state within a state. The President of Egypt at that time, Nasser, suspended the talks at once and resolutely rejected the Soviet demand. He pointed out indignantly: “It’s all but imperialism. It means that we provide you with a base!”

But the rapaciousness of the Soviet revisionists knows no bounds. They raised repeated demands for the use and forcible occupation of Egyptian bases. They sought privileges which meant control of Egyptian airports, namely, “the permanent right to taking off and landing” and “the right to the facilities of Egyptian airports.” Again, when Soviet brasshats Grechko and Gorshkov visited Cairo in 1970, they pressed their claims for “facilities for Soviet fleets” in Port Matruh on the southern coast of the Mediterranean and Port Berenice on a bay of the Red Sea. Was not all this designed to seek “benefits” and “privileges” for social-imperialism?

To contend for water areas and control the Mediterranean was a long-cherished expansionist dream of tsarist Russian imperialism and an important step towards realizing its ambition of founding a world empire. Marx many times exposed the tsarist empire’s frenzied attempts “**to get access to the Mediterranean**” and seize some Mediterranean naval ports for Russia. The old tsars’ ambitions were not realized. A century later, the new tsars appeared on the Mediterranean scene in an even more aggressive stance than their forbears, to contend with the other superpower for Europe and the Middle East. This is a main reason why

Soviet social-imperialist civil and military chieftains have tried repeatedly to obtain Egyptian military bases. Soviet revisionist chief Brezhnev once lamely denied having any selfish interests whatsoever in the Middle East. A typical, clumsy self-exposure indeed!

SENDING “EXPERTS” TO LORD IT OVER

On July 17, 1972, Egyptian President Sadat decided to terminate the mission of the Soviet military experts and advisers in Egypt, and sent some 20,000 such Soviet personnel packing. This decision was a reflection of the firm resolve of the Egyptian people to be masters of their own destiny.

In the wake of the 1967 June 5 war, under the pretext of rebuilding the Egyptian armed forces and supporting the Egyptian people against Israeli aggression, the Soviet revisionists sent hordes of military experts and advisers to Egypt’s various military departments, from the supreme command down to battalions of the conventional forces and special arms companies. These Soviet personnel stopped at nothing in their attempt to control and manipulate Egypt’s military operation planning, training and equipment.

To this end, the Soviet revisionists played tricks of various kinds. An Egyptian-Soviet agreement stated that Soviet experts and advisers should return home on completing the training of Egyptian military and technical personnel. But when Egypt reminded Soviet revisionism of this at the appropriate time, the latter simply ignored the agreement. The excuse was that this would

leave a "bad impression" on the Soviet experts, who accordingly stayed on.

When the Egyptian Government announced its decision to expel the Soviet military experts and advisers, Soviet revisionism again resorted to tricks, suggesting that a group of 80 Soviet experts be assigned to the Egyptian Defence Ministry to take up "matters of cooperation and training." Egypt saw through the move and, concluding that it was "a military mission under a different cloak," rejected it.

Soviet revisionism then took advantage of Egypt's need for arms to keep pressing for consent to the return of the Soviet military experts. President Sadat's reply was: We shall always remain independent. The old days of the Soviet experts — that was the last chapter between us and the Soviet Union.

The behaviour of the Soviet military experts and advisers on Egyptian soil revealed the true colours of Soviet revisionist hegemonism to the full. At Moscow's beck and call, they threw their weight about and interfered in Egypt's internal affairs. They asked for all kinds of privileges and acted the boss. They controlled Egypt's military establishments and bases, cordoning them off so tightly that Egypt's own officers, and even its highest-ranking leadership, were not allowed to enter as they wished. The Soviet military experts and advisers lived in luxury at the expense of the Egyptian people, who had to foot the bill in hard-earned foreign currency. They often refused examination by the Egyptian Customs when leaving the country and thus smuggled out large quantities of gold and jewellery. What a mockery of the so-called "disinterested" aid bragged about by the Soviet revisionists!

THE DEVIL WHO DUNS

In the October War, the Egyptian and other Arab people tore asunder the superpower shackles and the state of "no war, no peace," demonstrating a strong will to fight against aggression, regain lost territories and safeguard national independence and sovereignty. But at the time of the struggle and after, Soviet revisionism, besides forcing Egypt to accept a ceasefire and playing the role of arms dealer and speculator, was shameless in dunning Egypt relentlessly for debt repayment. An Egyptian leader said by way of exposure: "Can you imagine that they [the Soviet revisionists] asked me for 80 million dollars of interest on loans in the same week when the U.S. Congress approved of 2,200 million dollars for Israel?"

To the Egyptian people this was almost incredible. Their country had to spend about 400 million dollars annually for debt repayment and interest to Soviet revisionism, and this at a time when Egypt was seriously threatened by the Israeli aggressors and had to concentrate on reinforcing national defence, at a time of economic difficulties. And yet the Soviet revisionists, finding Egypt burdened with difficulties, tried to throttle it by pressing for the payment of debts. Is the nature of such behaviour not apparent?

One recalls a similar historical episode which took place in the socialist Soviet Union some 50 years ago. In 1921, after the new-born Soviet state had smashed the 14-power armed intervention and put down the counter-revolutionary revolt at home, famine stalked the land and brought unprecedented difficulties to the nation. It was at this juncture that the imperialist powers of the

West used every means to press the Soviet Union for debt repayment, though some persons declared that taking advantage of the famine to raise the question of old debts would be a devilish thing to do. Lenin was indignant. He said: **"I am not so sure that the devil is worse than modern imperialism. What I do know is that in actual fact, despite the famine, they did try to recover their old debts on particularly harsh conditions"** to have the socialist Soviet Union **"tied hand and foot."**

One can hardly believe that half a century later it is the Soviet revisionists who are now playing this devil's role. They have insistently pressed for debt repayment from the Egyptian people who have paid so much for their resistance to aggression. This is truly the devilish imperialist behaviour condemned by Lenin, behaviour through which the Soviet revisionists of today are trying to tie the Egyptian people hand and foot.

Egypt has exposed yet another devilish act of the Soviet revisionists. In the year after the October War, Egypt managed to repay them tens of millions of Egyptian pounds, but in view of economic difficulties requested a "period of grace" for repayment of the rest of the debts. The request was turned down by the Soviet revisionists who, strange to say, slanderously accused Egypt of "imposing conditions upon others." They are, after all, not a "reliable ally" but out-and-out political scoundrels who try to strangle others and moreover make false counter-charges.

For years the Egyptian people have waged an arduous struggle against Israeli aggression, a struggle which took the lives of many of their fine sons and daughters. In no circumstances should the fighting Egyptian people be pressed for repayment of debts. It stands to reason that

all the debts to Soviet revisionism incurred for defence purposes should be written off.

* * *

Through practice one can tell true friends from false. In revealing the imperialists who professed sympathy with China during the anti-Japanese war, Chairman Mao Tsetung said that **"such friends can only be classed with Li Lin-fu, the prime minister in the Tang Dynasty who was notorious as a man with 'honey on his lips and murder in his heart.'"** The Soviet social-imperialists of today profess sympathy with the Egyptian and other Third World peoples, but in fact they are false friends with "honey on their lips and murder in their hearts." They are counter-revolutionary double-dealers and, as such, more dangerous than undisguised enemies.

Soviet revisionism's "military aid" has taught the people a useful lesson and given the lie to its honeyed words. The Egyptian people are an indomitable, heroic people who will never bow before the threat of Israeli aggression, nor will they ever submit to the superpowers' blackmail. They will certainly keep to their fighting course and carry to the end their struggle to recover their lost territory and safeguard their national sovereignty and independence.

(Published in *Renmin Ribao*, July 3, 1975)

WHERE IS THE "DAWN OF PEACE AND CO-OPERATION"?

by Mei Ou

The three-day third stage — summit — of the European security conference wound up on August 1, 1975 in Helsinki. With much effort, this conference which the Soviet revisionist leading clique had for years taken great pains to convoke rigged up a so-called "Final Act." Regarding this, Leonid Brezhnev declared that "we need a document" which "we must specially treasure." And Moscow's propaganda machine has been advertising the document as a "charter of peaceful coexistence in Europe" which has allegedly given rise to a "new system" of European "security and co-operation" and the "dawn of peace and co-operation" over the continent. So, take Europe — a bone of contention between the two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States — and add the Soviet revisionists' fine words, and it becomes a garden of everlasting peace.

The Soviet revisionists' boasting about the "success" of the European security conference is itself pure deception. As is known to all, the "Final Act" of the conference is anything but a "charter of peaceful coexistence in Europe." The threat to European peace and security stems from the Soviet-U.S. contention for hegemony there, and in particular from the military expansion of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism. Ensuring peace and

security in Europe requires opposing superpower aggression, interference, subversion and control. But not a single word in the 120-page "Final Act" touches on the military threat by the superpowers. A number of reasonable proposals in the interests of European peace and security were placed before the conference by certain small and medium countries, but these were actually suppressed by the superpowers. A "charter" which goes on at length about security without pinpointing the military threat by the superpowers, Soviet revisionism in particular; a "charter" that talks about peace without mentioning struggle against superpower aggression and expansion — obviously, such a "charter" can in no way serve security and peace.

The "Final Act" goes on and on with its stream of high-sounding words — "respect for sovereignty" and "refraining from the threat or use of force," etc. — but it is generally taken as nothing more than a "declaration of intent" which "binds no one" at all. In other words, it may or may not be observed by the two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, and it may be interpreted one way or another to suit the "intent" of each for hegemony. Moreover, to meet their own needs, the imperialists may sign a treaty today and tear it up tomorrow. This is a lesson of history which the people of the world, the European people in particular, have had more occasions than one to learn. Had not certain West European countries signed numerous treaties declaring their opposition to the settlement of international disputes by war? But did these prevent the iron heel of Hitlerite fascists from trampling into every corner of these countries? Did not Brezhnev sign in Bratislava a joint statement of "respect for sovereignty" and "ter-

ritorial integrity"? Still, in less than a month, the tanks of Soviet revisionist social-fascism charged wantonly into the streets of Prague. History and present-day reality all testify to the truth as pointed out by Lenin, that **"treaties and laws are worth nothing but a scrap of paper in the face of international conflicts."**

It is downright deceit to claim that a "new system" of "security and co-operation" will arise in Europe out of such a scrap of paper. Everybody can see that what Soviet revisionism terms the "charter of peaceful coexistence" has not affected a single soldier or gun of the two superpowers in Europe, nor has it done away with their threat of force and military confrontation there. The European reality remains as before. What's more, in the new circumstances, the two hegemonic powers have launched into another round of rivalry more intense than ever, infiltrating and undermining each other's spheres of influence and, under the cover of "detente," trying to outdistance each other in military superiority. Where, then, is the "new system" of European "security and co-operation"?

The Soviet revisionists have gone out of their way trumpeting this false "new system" solely to deceive world public opinion and throw dust in the eyes of the Europeans. They vowed in all seriousness to "implement" the principles of "security and co-operation" in their "daily routine" and make "contributions" towards this "new system." So we would like to ask the Soviet revisionist overlords: Are you prepared to dismantle all your military bases abroad and withdraw all your million troops now trampling other countries and suppressing their people, your thousands of tanks and planes and numerous nuclear weapons, as well as your fleets now

ploughing the territorial waters of other lands? Are you prepared to stop bullying, blackmailing, subverting and undermining the small and medium European countries? Are you prepared to call a halt to your mad arms expansion and war preparations and give up your wild ambition of contending for hegemony in Europe, together with your policy of aggression and expansion? All of this is definitely impossible for the Soviet revisionists to do, for their social-imperialist nature determines their course of plunder and expansion from which they can never depart.

The setting up of the "new system" as advertised by the Soviet revisionists is not for the purpose of bringing Europe genuine security and co-operation. People certainly know what they've got up their sleeve! The Soviet revisionists have for many years been hawking their sinister stuff of European "security and co-operation" while incessantly building up their military might and hurling threats. They openly declare that for the West European countries "the only realistic way is to enter the stage of all-Europe co-operation for common benefit." They use this "security and co-operation" as a wedge in their attempt to disintegrate West European defence and unity, squeeze out the United States and camouflage their own aggression and expansion in Europe. It is crystal clear that their "new system" means realizing their long-time dream of dominating Europe. And much more: To serve their counter-revolutionary global strategy, they want to extend their "new system" to Asia and other regions of the world by applying the "experience" of the European security conference.

All this is only wishful thinking, however. While the Soviet revisionists have been lavishly lauding the European security conference, small and medium European countries one after another point to it as a trap set by Soviet revisionism. They describe it as another "Munich." The fact is that the European security conference which the Soviet revisionists praise to the skies has long since been thoroughly discredited in the eyes of the people. Many public figures in Western Europe point out that, to defend national security and independence, their countries should stress maintaining the military balance of power rather than trusting the fine words in any documents, or of any summits; and that they cannot afford to ignore the vise placed around their necks by the Soviet revisionists. Many European countries are endeavouring to strengthen their defence and vigilance against Soviet revisionist infiltration and expansion carried out under the smokescreen of "security" and "co-operation."

Facts stand as testimony that the European security conference did not bring Europe the "dawn of peace and co-operation" as asserted by the Soviet revisionists. The false detente they have fabricated out of that conference is being seen through by more and more people. As pointed out by the European press, "detente" may vanish at any time like the flame of a candle.

(Published in *Renmin Ribao*, August 5, 1975)

WARSAW TREATY ORGANIZATION — SOVIET SOCIAL-IMPERIALISM'S TOOL FOR AGGRESSION

by Ming Sung

Soviet revisionist social-imperialism is now carrying out desperate aggression and expansion in fierce contention with U.S. imperialism for world hegemony. Strategically, the key point of this contention is Europe where the Moscow-controlled Warsaw Treaty Organization plays a special role in the rivalry.

Since Soviet revisionism embarked on the road of social-imperialism, the Warsaw Treaty Organization, founded in 1955, has become more and more a tool in its hands to go the United States one better in Europe, a tool for expansion and aggression there. It has over the years used this organization to intensify its control and enslavement of Eastern Europe and as a threat to Western Europe in its expansionist efforts there, trying to edge out the United States so that it can dominate Europe. The Warsaw Treaty Organization has long since become an aggressive military bloc controlled by the Soviet revisionist renegade clique.

I

Under the "socialist community" signboard, Soviet revisionism has reduced some East European countries

to its dependencies and colonies, and made the Warsaw Treaty Organization a tool to prop up its colonial rule there, subjecting these countries to military control and occupation.

The joint command of the Warsaw Pact armed forces has all along been in the hands of Soviet revisionism; its commander-in-chief is always a Soviet deputy defence minister and its chief of the general staff always a Soviet high military officer, while representatives of other member states function merely as deputies. Within the command, it is only the Soviet military chiefs' words that count, while other member states' representatives have to do as they are told. A former Czechoslovak minister of security once complained that the defence ministers of the Warsaw Pact countries did not have equal footing with their Soviet counterparts in the joint command and were actually deprived of their say. With the power of the joint command firmly in its hands, Soviet revisionism in fact has placed the armed forces of some East European countries under its thumb.

Soviet military personnel are permanently stationed in other Warsaw Pact countries as "representatives of the joint command" to discharge the function of "relaying" the "directives" of the commander-in-chief to the defence ministers of the countries where they are stationed and to take part in various activities of the armed forces of these countries, directly interfering in the internal affairs of these armed forces. In addition, large numbers of Soviet military "advisers" and "experts" have found their way into these armed forces to keep them under strict control.

With a view to tightening its grip on the armed forces of these countries, Soviet revisionism has pressed for

"military integration," demanding that they operate under "unified command, training and formation" with the Soviet armed forces. Soviet revisionism, in the name of the Council of Defence Ministers and Military Council of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, calls meetings of the military chiefs of some East European countries every year. Combat preparedness and training of their armed forces are discussed at the meetings and assignments made under an overall plan, enabling the Soviet revisionists to exercise control over these matters. Soviet revisionist military chiefs openly advocate that "with a view to fighting joint operations on a joint battlefield," the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact countries can be organized into unified "campaign army groups" under Soviet supreme command.

Using the pretext of "international division of labour" and "co-ordination" of military economic plans, Soviet revisionism also controls arms production in some Warsaw Pact countries, incorporating their economies into its own militarized economy. The result is that these countries are permitted to manufacture weapons only according to Moscow's "standard" and "specifications" and not to have an independent and comprehensive defence industry of their own. They are thus forced to rely mainly on the Soviet revisionists for armaments.

Through the Warsaw Pact and bilateral treaties, the Soviet revisionists have not only gained final say in the military affairs of some East European countries but have occupied these countries by military force. According to Western news reports, the Soviet Union at present has 31 divisions in Eastern Europe, 20 of which are sta-

tioned in the German Democratic Republic, 2 in Poland, 4 in Hungary and 5 in Czechoslovakia. The Soviet troops enjoy extraterritorial rights in these countries. A Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty, for instance, stipulates that Soviet military personnel who commit offences while on duty in areas in their charge shall be dealt with by Soviet law courts, procuratorial organs and other institutions functioning under Soviet law, and that the countries where Soviet troops are stationed have no right to intervene.

The Soviet revisionists often conduct military exercises to threaten the people of some East European countries who resent their control. They have many times marshalled troops on the Balkan Peninsula through the Warsaw Treaty Organization, carrying out military exercises to apply open pressure on certain Balkan states. These moves have seriously threatened the independence and sovereignty of these countries.

To maintain its colonial rule in Eastern Europe, Soviet revisionism even went to the length of resorting to force through the Warsaw Treaty Organization and launching undisguised military aggression against a member state. In August 1968, in the name of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique lined up some East European countries and dispatched large numbers of troops, aircraft and tanks in a blitz-type military invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia. The Czechoslovak authorities were then forced to sign an enslaving treaty stipulating "terms for the temporary stationing of Soviet troops on the territory of Czechoslovakia," which in fact legalized the armed aggression and envisaged long-term military occupation. All this thoroughly exposes the aggressive and reactionary na-

ture of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, and bares the sinister motives of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism in manipulating the organization.

II

The Warsaw Treaty Organization serves Soviet revisionism as a tool not only for controlling some East European countries and consolidating its colonial rule there, but for threatening Western Europe, carrying out expansion and contending with U.S. imperialism for hegemony in this region.

It is well known that Soviet revisionism has always cast a covetous eye on Western Europe and deployed most of its armed forces against that region. According to Western press reports, the Soviet Union now has three-fifths of its ground forces and over three-fourths of its air force in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union proper in Europe; over three-fourths of its intermediate-range missiles are directed against Western Europe; three-fourths of its surface naval ships and over half its submarines are in waters around Europe. By controlling the Warsaw Treaty Organization, Soviet revisionism sees to it that the armed forces of some East European countries are attached to the Soviet forces mentioned above, forming a military bloc and thus tying these countries to the Soviet war chariot for its aggression and expansion in Western Europe.

Soviet revisionism asserts that the Warsaw Treaty military bloc under its manipulation is "defensive" in nature. This is outright deceit. For, according to Western press reports, Soviet revisionism's troops sta-

tioned in Eastern Europe are "extraordinary" in number, far more than necessary to safeguard its security interests in Europe. Furthermore, the 31 Soviet divisions in Eastern Europe are all units of first-class combat readiness. Brought up to full strength or three-fourths of it, they can launch a blitz "full-scale offensive," for they maintain a posture of trying to wrest quick victory, each division having 75-80 per cent of its troops ready for combat duties. Of the 31 divisions, 16 are tank divisions and the rest motorized infantry divisions. This shows that they are ready for offensive, rather than defensive, operations.

In recent years, the Warsaw Treaty Organization has repeatedly held joint military exercises aimed at Western Europe. According to Western military experts' analyses, these exercises usually take place with "overall offensive" as the main theme. Through these, Soviet revisionism hopes to show the West European countries its military strength and blackmail them. Such exercises are designed at the same time to improve the capability of the Warsaw Pact armed forces in co-ordinated fighting, enhance the ability of their commanding officers and step up war preparations.

While exploiting the Warsaw Treaty Organization to facilitate its arms expansion and war preparations, Soviet revisionism also uses it as a means to back up its position of strength and as a counter-weight in diplomatic negotiations with the United States and other NATO countries for a so-called European "detente," which is a political fraud.

Through the summits and foreign ministers' conferences of the Warsaw Pact countries, Soviet revisionism has published "communiques," "declarations,"

"statements," "memoranda" and "proposals" on the convocation of the European security conference. Since its convening, Soviet revisionism has taken further steps to "co-ordinate" the "joint actions" of the Warsaw Pact countries inside and outside the conference. It has tried to manipulate the Warsaw Treaty Organization and negotiate with the Western countries through the European security conference to consolidate its status of hegemonic overlord in Eastern Europe and lull and divide the West European countries and squeeze out the United States so as to make way for its expansion and infiltration into Western Europe.

As to the so-called Central Europe "forces reduction" conference, it was convened between two blocs — the Warsaw Pact countries and the NATO countries. Through these negotiations, Soviet revisionism hopes to maintain the Warsaw bloc's superiority in conventional military strength and weaken the military strength of the United States and other Western countries; at the same time, it tries to use these negotiations to cover up its military reinforcements in Eastern Europe and its renewal of weapons and equipment. What it has done both at the European security conference and the Central Europe "forces reduction" conference fully exposes its ugly features of promoting sham detente and working for actual expansion in Europe.

* * *

The use of the Warsaw Treaty Organization to carry out aggression and expansion in Europe by the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has aroused increasingly strong opposition among the people of various European

countries. Following the Soviet revisionists' armed invasion of Czechoslovakia, Albania determinedly announced its withdrawal from the organization, dealing the Soviet revisionist renegade clique a head-on blow. The Czechoslovak people's angry tide against Soviet revisionism's colonial rule is rising. Again and again some East European countries have expressed their determination to uphold their independence and sovereignty and have taken concomitant measures. Meanwhile, the West European countries have come to see more clearly the expansionist policy being pushed by Soviet revisionism behind the smokescreen of "detente"; they are heightening their vigilance against it. The tendency is that their unity in opposition to Soviet revisionist hegemonism is being continuously enhanced. The Soviet revisionists' fond dream of achieving hegemony in Europe will definitely end up like a pricked balloon.

(Published in *Renmin Ribao*, December 24, 1974)

ESSENCE OF SOVIET REVISIONISTS' "ALL-EUROPE ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION"

by Cheng Wei-min

The contention between the two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, has extended over the whole world. Strategically important Europe, with its concentration of modern industry, banking and trade, is like a choice morsel and has always been the focal point of all-out contention in the two superpowers' global strategies for world domination. The rivalry between these two hegemonic powers rages in Europe in the political, military as well as economic spheres.

To step up its bid for Europe, Soviet revisionist social-imperialism is spreading the smokescreens of "security in Europe" and "forces reduction in Central Europe" in an effort to create among the European people a false impression of "detente." At the same time it is intensifying expansion and infiltration in Western Europe under the signboard of "all-Europe economic co-operation," while tightening its control, exploitation and plunder of some East European countries. Taking advantage of the extremely serious postwar economic crisis in Western capitalist countries, the Soviet revisionists are all the more energetically hawking their "all-Europe economic co-operation" with an eye to furthering their economic penetration of Western Europe and thus elbowing out

U.S. influence and shaking off their own economic difficulties.

So-called "all-Europe economic co-operation" is actually just another variant of the "socialist integration" and "economic co-operation" which the Soviet revisionists have advocated in the "socialist community" of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. The Soviet revisionists' aim is not only to continue their domination over Eastern Europe but to undermine the West European Common Market and place obstructions in the way of the West European countries' achieving union, and thus extend their sphere of influence from Eastern Europe to the whole continent.

In selling "all-Europe economic co-operation" to Western Europe, Soviet revisionism first of all has in mind the acquisition of West European capital and technology. This is because Soviet revisionism is in the grip of a dislocated national economy, capital shortage and technological backwardness in many key production sections, all the result of its frantic arms expansion and war preparations and its malignantly inflated military budget in order to contend with the United States for world domination. Brezhnev has taken the field himself in an effort to extricate Soviet revisionism from its plight, and is hawking the idea that West European countries should develop "mutually beneficial, long-term and large-scale economic co-operation" with the Soviet Union in industry, science and technology and in other spheres. Since 1973, the Soviet revisionists have been in a fever to sign 10-year agreements on industrial, economic, and scientific and technological co-operation with some West European capitalist countries. They

have boasted that their industrial and commercial contacts with Western Europe "have entered a new stage."

Soviet revisionist social-imperialism styles itself "developed socialism." But it has been begging for loans everywhere, especially long-term, low-interest loans from Western Europe. Figures show that in the period 1964 to April 1974 it borrowed over 8,000 million dollars from the West, mainly from West European countries. In 1970 it secured a loan from France of nearly 1,000 million dollars. In 1970 and 1972 it obtained from West German banks two loans of 1,200 million marks each to pay for the large-calibre steel tubes, machinery, bulldozers and other equipment purchased from West German corporations. And in 1973 it was granted an Italian loan of 350,000 million liras. According to incomplete figures, in the four months beginning October 1974, Brezhnev personally contracted loans totalling some 5,000 million dollars from France, the Federal Republic of Germany and Britain.

Soviet revisionism is also using West European technology to equip its own enterprises through so-called "co-operation in production." For example, it courted West European monopolies' partnership in building large enterprises beyond its own capability, such as the Volga and the Kama auto plants. The "Zhiguly" cars which the Soviet revisionists have paraded with pride in recent years were turned out with Italian loans totalling 360 million dollars and equipment provided by an Italian monopoly, the Fiat Company. Another example. To build in Kursk an urgently needed large ferrous metals combine using the direct steel-making methods, Soviet revisionism agreed to pay, in instalments, a West German corporation an amount of cash

equivalent to 1,200 million dollars. It ordered 2,700 million dollars' worth of machinery and equipment from Western countries in 1973 for the purpose of introducing Western technology. Partial statistics show that between January and October 1974 it pushed through orders for complete sets of equipment from the West to the tune of 5,000 million dollars. Western Europe accounted for the lion's share in all these deals.

Utilizing the West European countries' thirst for energy sources and other raw materials, Soviet revisionism offers oil, natural gas and other resources as bait in obtaining their technology and capital for exploiting its own domestic resources. This has become an important means in its "economic co-operation of mutual benefit" with Western Europe. A big hullabaloo has been raised in recent years over the exchange of Soviet natural gas for West European steel tubes. In 1972 Soviet foreign trade departments signed a bulk barter contract with West German corporations stipulating that Soviet revisionism supply the Federal Republic of Germany with 120,000 million cubic metres of natural gas within 20 years in exchange for West German steel tubes and equipment. In doing this, Soviet revisionism aims with ill intent to increase its energy supply to Western Europe and thus make the latter dependent on it economically.

While redoubling its efforts to procure West European capital and technology, Soviet revisionism vies to expand its export of commodities to Western Europe, and this had led to growing rivalry for the West European market between the two hegemonic powers, the United States and the Soviet Union. While Western Europe still ranks first as buyer of U.S. exports, Soviet revisionism has been trying desperately for more than a decade to infiltrate

that market and has in fact registered a steady increase in trade with West European countries. The volume rose more than fivefold, from 1,100 million rubles in 1958 to 5,600 million rubles in 1973. Western Europe already accounts for 18 per cent of the total volume of Soviet foreign trade, second only to Eastern Europe. Though lagging behind the United States in terms of absolute volume of exports to Western Europe, Soviet revisionism has surpassed it in terms of growth rate. From 1965 to 1972, the average annual growth rate of Soviet exports to Western Europe was 9.2 per cent as against 6.8 per cent for the United States.

Soviet revisionism has used all possible means to expand the volume of its exports to Western Europe. It has repeatedly requested that the West European countries provide preferential treatment and lower tariff rates for imported Soviet commodities and thus open their doors wide to Soviet goods. It also tries by hook or by crook to get in on the construction projects of some West European countries and run "joint companies" in "co-operation" with West European corporations locally or in third countries. In France, for example, Soviet foreign trade departments have co-operated with certain big local enterprises in opening several "joint companies" selling Soviet-made cars, tractors, metal-cutting machines, forging equipment and optical instruments.

Apart from the above "new forms" of "economic co-operation," the Soviet revisionists canvass Western Europe for more extensive "scientific and technological co-operation" in the fields of atomic energy, space, oceanography, the environment, medicine and computing technique. Moreover, they ask West European countries

for more patents, advanced technological methods and exchange of technical information.

Setting up a banking network in the financial centres of Western Europe is also an important part of intensified Soviet revisionist penetration of the region. In its search for capital, foreign exchange and expanded economic penetration in Western Europe, the Soviet revisionists have opened banks in such big cities as London, Paris, Frankfurt and Zurich.

It is obvious that Soviet revisionism aims to kill two birds with one stone in stepping up its economic infiltration in Western Europe. It would like to alleviate its economic difficulties and increase its economic power in the scramble for world hegemony by passing the burden of its own crisis on to others. At the same time it does its best to break up the West European countries' economic alliance, edge out the United States and expand further in Western Europe.

The Soviet revisionist social-imperialists have, however, failed to achieve their aim. The United States has taken retaliatory measures to deal with the Soviet manoeuvres to undermine its interests in Western Europe. Taking advantage of some East European countries' tendency to drift away from the Soviet revisionists, the United States is stepping up its infiltration of Eastern Europe and does its best to prevent Western Europe from exporting advanced technology to the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile, the West European countries have become increasingly aware of the Soviet plot to wreck their unity. They are also becoming more vigilant against Soviet revisionist economic infiltration and have taken counter-measures against it. In 1974, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Britain, Italy and other West European coun-

tries signed a "gentlemen's agreement" with the United States and Japan on the administration of loans to other countries. Under the agreement, the interest on such loans should not be less than 7.5 per cent, and it was specially stipulated that loans to industrial countries must be repaid within three years. This naturally is a blow to the Soviet revisionists, who want long-term loans from the West at low interest rates. Moreover, in view of the serious inflation, the West European countries are demanding higher prices for machinery and equipment exported to the Soviet Union, and deferring or refusing to grant loans to the Soviet revisionists.

But, despite these setbacks, the Soviet revisionists' established strategic objective of dominating Europe will not change. The serious political and economic crises gripping the two hegemonic powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, dictate the increasing intensity of their economic, political and military contention for Europe.

(Published in *Renmin Ribao*, March 15, 1975)

OUTRIGHT DECEIT, ULTERIOR MOTIVES

— On Soviet revisionists peddling “Asian collective security system” in Southeast Asia

Commentary by Hsinhua Correspondent

Soviet social-imperialism has been working overtime to tout its “Asian collective security system” in Southeast Asia. Now that the United States has readjusted its strategy in Asia following its defeat in and withdrawal from Indochina, the Soviet Union is making a fresh attempt to step into its shoes and establish hegemony in Southeast Asia.

Soviet envoys in Southeast Asian countries have been particularly profuse these days in talking about the benefit of having an “Asian collective security system.” No less enthusiastic are Soviet newspapers and radio stations. This so-called “security system,” which has long been rejected by the Southeast Asian countries, would, according to Soviet propaganda, turn Southeast Asia into “a region of lasting peace.” A TASS commentary on July 21, 1975 had the effrontery to describe the European security conference as an “example for other parts of the world, including Asia.” It made known Soviet revisionism’s intention to cash in on the Helsinki conference to peddle so-called “collective security on the Asian continent.” Particularly noteworthy is the fact that Moscow

has linked the “Asian collective security system” with the proposal for the neutralization of Southeast Asia put forward by the five member countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (A.S.E.A.N.). The attempt is to confuse fish eyes with pearls by alleging that the two “have many points in common with regard to the objective of safeguarding the security of Asia” and are even “consonant” with each other. After the Indochina war, Moscow asserted, acceptance of the “Asian collective security system” is “particularly realistic” and “urgent.” Such is its avidity to place the whole of Southeast Asia under its hegemony.

What “common points” and “consonance” are there, after all, between the Soviet “Asian collective security system” and the proposal for the neutralization of Southeast Asia? A cursory comparison and analysis of the two will show up the sinister designs on Southeast Asia harboured by the Soviet Union as a superpower.

As is well known, the proposal for the neutralization of Southeast Asia was formally tabled at the A.S.E.A.N. Foreign Ministers’ Meeting in Kuala Lumpur in 1971. The Kuala Lumpur Declaration signed by the Foreign Ministers of Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, Singapore and Indonesia clearly states that the five countries are determined to make Southeast Asia “a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality, free from any form or manner of interference by outside powers.” This has been reaffirmed time and again by leaders of the five countries who went on record to make the whole of Southeast Asia “a region free from the contention and conflicts of all big powers,” to put “an end to foreign interference in our internal affairs” and to “establish regional co-operation and build a new Southeast Asia free from foreign domination

and influence." Over the years the five A.S.E.A.N. countries, to speed up the neutralization of Southeast Asia, have forged closer relations among themselves, strengthened their economic co-operation, and actively developed relations of friendship and co-operation with other Third World countries. Together with them, they pressed forward their just struggle to oppose superpower hegemonism and power politics and safeguard their national independence, sovereignty and economic rights and interests. This shows that the proposal for a zone of neutrality in Southeast Asia reflects the desire of the countries and people in this region to rid themselves of superpower interference and control and thus has won the sympathy and support of many Third World countries.

The "Asian collective security system" dished up by the Soviet social-imperialists under the signboard of "peace" and "security" is designed entirely to serve their policies of aggression and expansion. It is contrived for the purpose of contending with the United States for hegemony in Asia, dividing the Asian countries, and bringing the small and medium Asian countries into their sphere of influence. Lenin said: **"We judge a person not by what he says or thinks of himself but by his actions."** Now let us list some of the Soviet actions and see how the Soviet Union has threatened and undermined the independence and sovereignty of countries in Southeast Asia.

For years the wildly ambitious Soviet social-imperialists have been scheming to secure military bases in Southeast Asia. They have sent large numbers of warships to sail between the Pacific and the Indian Ocean in a show of force, threatening the peace and security of the Southeast Asian countries. Back in 1969, Malaysia and Indonesia

each declared a 12-nautical-mile territorial water limit to ensure their sovereignty over the Strait of Malacca. In 1971, the governments of Malaysia, Indonesia and Singapore together issued a statement declaring joint control of the Malacca and Singapore Straits. However, ignoring the strait countries' sovereignty, the Soviet Union obstinately insisted on the right of "free passage" for its warships through the Strait of Malacca. And on many occasions Soviet vessels did sail through the Strait of Malacca without prior permission, taking the territorial waters of the strait countries as the high seas and thus baring Soviet social-imperialism's expansionist ambitions and hegemonic stand.

To achieve its objective of expansion and penetration, the Soviet Union has also been stepping up espionage in the Southeast Asian countries. It has collected political, economic and military information, groomed pro-Soviet forces and interfered in the internal affairs of these countries. Official Thai sources disclosed that the number of Soviet spies in Thailand has more than trebled since the U.S. defeat in Indochina. Soviet spy ships of various descriptions have intruded into the territorial waters of Southeast Asian countries to gather intelligence. In the first half of 1975 alone, there were three illegal intrusions by Soviet ships into Indonesian territorial waters. The military commander of the Nusatenggara Region was compelled to bar all Soviet crews from going ashore and to take measures against their illegal activities.

Moscow has all along tried to sabotage the proposal for the neutralization of Southeast Asia. In 1971, shortly after the Kuala Lumpur Declaration was signed by the five A.S.E.A.N. Foreign Ministers, it was slandered and attacked by the Soviet Union, which asserted that the

proposal "provides no answer to the problem of security of that continent," and that turning this area into a zone of peace and neutrality "cannot be implemented without a reliable system of guarantees." *The China Press*, a Malaysian paper, pointed out penetratingly that the Soviet Union's sarcastic reference to the proposal as "a battle on paper" "shows that in the mind of the Soviet Union, there is no place for any proposal from another nation or group of nations except 'Brezhnevism.'" But now Moscow has changed its tune and says that the neutralization proposal is "consonant" with its "Asian collective security system." Does this not give one food for thought?

The proposal for the neutralization of Southeast Asia and the "Asian collective security system" are two diametrically opposite ideas. There are no "common points" or "consonance" whatsoever between them. The Soviet Union's design is, in its own words, to have the neutralization proposal "included in the framework of the idea of an Asian collective security system." In fact, it is attempting to bring Southeast Asian countries into the orbit of its "Asian collective security system."

Today, the increasingly awakening Southeast Asian people have come to see more clearly than ever that the bitter rivalry between the two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, especially the intensified Soviet social-imperialist expansion and penetration in Southeast Asia, is the source of disturbances and unrest in the region. A recent issue of the Thai weekly *Mahana-kon* said editorially: "The fact that Thailand demands a U.S. pull-out does not mean that she will open her door to the Soviet security system." The Brezhnev clique "has really underrated the wisdom of the Asian people

when it tried to use its 'Asian collective security system' as bait to lure Asian countries into the Soviet trap." A Philippine paper, *The Orient News*, stated: "The Kremlin's sinister designs cannot be covered up for good. Public opinion in Asia has seen through ever more clearly the essence of the 'Asian collective security system.'" A Malaysian paper, *Kuang Hua Yit Pao*, said editorially that the Soviet Union's real aim in trying to set up an "Asian collective security system" is "to achieve its design of contending with the other superpower for hegemony in Asia."

Countries in Southeast Asia have long seen through Soviet social-imperialism's machinations to supplant U.S. imperialism and establish hegemony in Southeast Asia. Keeping sharp vigilance, they are determined to prevent the situation in which the tiger is let in through the back door while the wolf is repulsed at the front gate.

(Published in *Renmin Ribao*, July 30, 1975)

REPULSE WOLF AT FRONT GATE, GUARD AGAINST TIGER AT BACK DOOR

by Jen Ku-ping

Engaged in a frantic scramble for worldwide hegemony, the two superpowers — the Soviet Union and the United States — which are like a ravening tiger and a wolf respectively, leave no place in peace as they vie for supremacy. The Soviet social-imperialists are particularly avaricious and their tentacles stretch far and wide. In order to safeguard their national independence and security, the peoples of various countries are pressing forward steadily in their struggle against hegemonism.

New changes have taken place in the situation of Southeast Asia. With the support of the people throughout the world, the heroic Indochinese peoples, through prolonged and courageous struggle, have finally defeated the U.S. imperialists and compelled them to withdraw from Indochina. The U.S. forces of aggression are also greatly weakened in the rest of Southeast Asia. The Soviet social-imperialists jump at the opportunity of supplanting the United States and are trying their best to worm their way into the region. This reminds one of the old Chinese metaphor: Letting the tiger in through the back door while repulsing the wolf at the front gate. This is something that cannot but draw people's attention.

Southeast Asia, rich in natural resources, occupies an important strategic position. Besides Europe, the major

arena of their contention with the U.S. imperialists, the Soviet revisionists cast covetous eyes on Southeast Asia and would like to swallow it up at one gulp. In recent years they have frequently dispatched warships to the Pacific and the Indian Ocean where these run wild in a show of force. The Soviet revisionists have also established thinly disguised military bases in the region of the Indian Ocean. They insistently call for "internationalization" of the Strait of Malacca in order to control it and to open a sea lane for the Soviet navy to sail from the Black Sea in the west through the Indian Ocean and the Pacific to the Soviet Far East. The Soviet revisionists' expansion in Southeast Asia is an important step in their quest for hegemony in the Indian Ocean, the Pacific and the whole world.

With "socialism" as signboard and "natural ally" as cloak, the Soviet social-imperialists play the swindler in Southeast Asia. They carry on "smiling diplomacy" with an "offensive by bankroll." They do everything in their power to engage in political cajolery and economic expansion in the Southeast Asian countries. You want to develop shipping? All right, we will run joint "sea transport companies" with you. You lack funds? Well, we will supply you with loans on "preferential" terms. Perhaps you are afraid of our warships entering your ports? Then we will only berth our "freighters" and "fishing fleets" at your ports for refuelling and maintenance. You want "peace and neutrality"? Then our "Asian collective security system" is just what you need for Asian "peace and security." The sweetness of reason drips from the lips, but perfidy lies at the heart. If the Soviet revisionists are allowed to force the door and get a foothold today, they are bound to take a step further

tomorrow. They will miss no chance to expand their influence and steadily grab the natural resources, ports, straits and military bases in Southeast Asia. Actually, as far as the Soviet revisionists are concerned, infiltration follows trade, "aid" is a means of control, "loan" is synonymous with capital export, and merchant ships are but the heralds of military vessels. Isn't this what is happening in the Middle East, North Africa, the Indian Ocean and elsewhere in the world? While clamouring hypocritically that there is no "vacuum" in Southeast Asia, the Soviet revisionists are avidly expanding their influence in that region and trying their utmost to fill what in fact they regard as a "vacuum."

While one imperialist power has left the scene in defeat, another is taking its place. This is not the first time in the history of Asia and Africa that the tiger arrives when the wolf leaves. In the Middle East, when British and French influence was greatly weakened after World War II, the U.S. imperialists were on hand to fill the so-called "vacuum." But even before the U.S. imperialist force was driven out, the Soviet revisionists massively infiltrated the region. Not long after India freed itself from British colonial rule, the United States extended its influence into that country in the name of providing "aid." The Soviet revisionists subsequently tried to elbow out the United States, steadily intensifying their plunder and control of India and subjecting the Indian people to Soviet social-imperialist ravage. After the Japanese aggressors met with disastrous defeat in 1945, the U.S. imperialists swaggered into Southeast Asia and turned it into a U.S. sphere of influence. The same is true of Indochina. When the French withdrew upon the conclusion of the 1954 Geneva agreements, the Yankees

arrived on their heels. Now, more and more people are aware of many Third World countries facing the danger of "letting the tiger in through the back door while repulsing the wolf at the front gate."

The Southeast Asian people who have accumulated rich experience in their protracted struggle against imperialism will never allow history to repeat itself. The proposal put forward by the Southeast Asian countries in recent years for establishing a zone of peace and neutrality in their region accords with their national interests and reflects the desire of the Southeast Asian countries and people to safeguard their sovereignty and independence and to oppose the contention between the two hegemonic powers. Recently, public opinion in Thailand stressed that Soviet social-imperialism, like a hungry tiger coming out of its mountain lair, poses an even greater threat to the Southeast Asian countries and people than declining U.S. imperialism. That is why it is particularly important to heighten vigilance against the Soviet Union, the source said. The Philippine press also pointed to the Soviet Union as going all out to replace the United States as the overlord in Asia. These sources of public opinion clearly show that the Southeast Asian people have come to realize the necessity not only of repulsing the wolf at the front gate but, what is more imperative, of guarding against the tiger at the back door.

The world today is no longer one where tigers and wolves can roam at will. The historical current of the world people's struggle against hegemony surges irresistibly. The two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, are in an impasse, beset as they are with difficulties at home and abroad. Although the tiger from the far north is baring its fangs, it is essentially very

weak. So long as the Southeast Asian people close their ranks, strengthen their unity with the people of other parts of Asia and the whole world and wage a firm struggle against superpower aggression and expansion and for safeguarding their own sovereignty and national independence, they are sure to gain ever new victories.

(Published in *Renmin Ribao*, July 29, 1975)

苏联社会帝国主义的丑恶面目

*

外文出版社出版(北京)
1976年(32开)第一版
编号:(英)3050-2673
00040
3-E-1393P