

CHEAP PROPAGANDA

**FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING**

**CHEAP
PROPAGANDA**

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1974

CONTENTS

Cheap Propaganda	1
The "Proposal" and After	7
Ten Years of "Disarmament" Ballyhoo, Ten Years of Frenzied Arms Expansion	12
"Detente" Smokescreen Cannot Cover Up Soviet Revisionists' Military Ambitions in Europe	20
Frenzied Arms Expansion, Mounting Foreign Loans	25

CHEAP PROPAGANDA

Commentary by Hsinhua Correspondent

The Soviet Delegation to the 28th Session of the U.N. General Assembly recently put forward a draft resolution on so-called "reduction of the military budgets," requesting the "permanent members of the U.N. Security Council to reduce their military budgets by 10 per cent in the next fiscal year as compared with 1973" and to "use a part of the funds thus saved for providing assistance to developing countries." The Soviet Delegation sanctimoniously proposed that the draft resolution be included in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly as an "important and urgent item." The adoption of this proposal by the General Assembly, the Soviet Delegation alleged, would mean an "important practical step towards slowing down the arms race," and it boasted that this shows the deep concern of the Soviet Union for the developing countries, and so on and so forth.

This draft resolution of the Soviet revisionists is nothing new. In the ten years when Khrushchov was in power, the Soviet revisionists repeatedly put forward similar proposals on "disarmament." In 1958, the Soviet Union formally proposed at the 13th Session of the U.N. General Assembly that the four powers, the United States, Britain,

the Soviet Union and France, cut their military expenditures by 10-15 per cent to provide "assistance" to the "under-developed" countries. In 1962, the Soviet Union and the United States put forward a "joint declaration on turning the funds saved from disarmament to peaceful purpose." At "the meeting for general disarmament and world peace" in July of the same year, Khrushchov clamoured for the diversion of 8-10 per cent of the total military spending throughout the world to providing "assistance to the newly established national states." In 1964, at the meeting of the 18-nation Disarmament Committee held in Geneva, the Soviet Union dished up a memorandum proposing that "agreement (be reached) among nations on the reduction of military budgets by 10-15 per cent." In fact, the trick of cutting military expenditure was not an invention by Khrushchov. Way back in 1899 at the Peace Conference at The Hague, the foreign minister of tsarist Russia put forward a proposal for keeping the status quo of armed forces and military budgets for a term of five years. Besides, since the 1950s, some old-line imperialist countries have repeatedly come up with various kinds of proposals on the reduction of military expenditure. The recent disarmament proposal of the Soviet revisionists is merely old stuff with a new label, a repeat performance of sham disarmament by Khrushchov and the old tsars.

The military budget is in fact a national defence secret in every country. Since the Soviet Union has proposed to cut military expenditure by 10 per cent, then first of all one may ask how are military budgets to be assessed? What after all is the Soviet Union's military spending every year? True, the Soviet Union published its military

expenditure every year. But it is an open secret that those figures are completely deceptive. The actual military spending of the Soviet Union is many times bigger than what the figures tell. Khrushchov as good as admitted that. According to official Soviet figures, Soviet military expenditure in 1959 was over 9,300 million rubles, or about 10,000 million U.S. dollars. In September of the same year, in a television speech in the United States, Khrushchov admitted that the annual Soviet military expenditure "approached 25,000 million U.S. dollars," or some 2.5 times the figure published. The *Washington Post* reported that two economists in Leningrad disclosed that "Soviet defence spending is four or five times greater than officially acknowledged." Data from Western sources revealed that the annual Soviet military spending in recent years amounted to 60,000 or 70,000 million U.S. dollars. What a discrepancy between this and the official Soviet figure of 17,900 million rubles (some 20,000 million U.S. dollars)! In these circumstances, how is the 10 per cent reduction of military expenditures to be calculated? No wonder that soon after the Soviet Delegation put forward the 10 per cent reduction proposal at the General Assembly, a Western diplomat remarked: "How in the world will we be able to find out how much the Soviets are spending for defence?"

For years the Soviet revisionists have been hawking disarmament day in and day out and dishing up proposals every year, while their military spending rose higher and higher and their hegemonic ambitions kept on swelling. Brezhnev has openly clamoured that "the question of national defence is placed first of all our work" and that a "large amount of funds" "will be spent on national de-

fence" so that Soviet "defence capacity (would) be maintained at the highest level." Take for example the much watered down official figures of Soviet military expenditure: In 1958 when the Soviet Union proposed at the 13th Session of the U.N. General Assembly that the four powers including the United States and Britain cut their military expenditure by 10-15 per cent, the officially acknowledged Soviet military spending was 9,300 million rubles; but by 1964 when the Soviet Government put forward a memorandum at the Geneva conference of the 18-nation Disarmament Committee on the reduction of military expenditure, the official figure of Soviet military expenditure rose sharply to 13,300 million rubles. In six years, Soviet military expenditure, far from being reduced, had gone up by 40 per cent! In 1973, when the Soviet Union once again came out with its old proposal on reduction of military expenditure by 10 per cent at the current session of the General Assembly, its military expenditure, according to the budget report of the Soviet minister of finance, has remained at an all-time high of 17,900 million rubles, an increase of 90 per cent over that of 1958. Could this be the "sincerity" of the Soviet Government about disarmament?

The huge military expenditure of the Soviet Union is the inevitable result of its frenzied arms expansion and war preparations in the scramble for world hegemony. During the past ten years and more, the Soviet Union has spent billions of U.S. dollars on nuclear weapons alone. At present, the number of Soviet intercontinental missiles is over 40 times that of 1960. The number of Soviet nuclear submarines armed with ballistic missiles in 1972 increased five times as compared with that of

1968. The tonnage of the Soviet navy has nearly doubled in the past ten years. It is about three million tons. According to statistics, in 1970 alone, the Soviet Union spent 3,000 million U.S. dollars on the construction of warships, which surpassed the expenditure of the United States for the same purpose in the same year. The Soviet revisionists are stepping up their nuclear armaments, vigorously conducting underground nuclear tests, trial-producing missiles with multiple independently-targeted warheads, and improving the quality of their strategic weapons. Recently the Soviet newspaper *Krasnaya Zvezda* has openly declared that "to make every effort to strengthen the combat capability of the Soviet armed forces" has become "one of the most important tasks" of the Soviet Union, and that the Soviet Union "is prepared to wage a war using any kind of arms." The Soviet revisionists' frantic arms expansion and war preparations inevitably increase their military expenditure. Reduction is out of the question.

Obviously the Soviet revisionists' latest proposal on reducing military expenditure is a big fraud. Their aim is to create a false sense of "detente" and lull the vigilance of the people of the world so as to cover up their intensified arms expansion and contention for world hegemony. They are also attempting to deceive some people by means of this and to whitewash their ugly features already revealed to the Third World in order to veil their penetration and expansion there. That is why the Soviet revisionists' proposal was greeted with scorn by representatives of many countries as soon as it was dished up. A representative of an African country hit the nail on the head by pointing out: "This

was Khrushchov's disarmament fraud." Another African representative said that the Soviet proposal was a "deliberately designed trick." Some Western diplomats also regarded the Soviet proposal as a pure "propaganda move."

(October 3, 1973)

THE "PROPOSAL" AND AFTER

Commentary by Hsinhua Correspondent

Since turning up with its proposal "on the reduction of military budgets" at the 28th Session of the U.N. General Assembly, the Soviet Union has been giving it much publicity, bragging that this "proposal" "means an important practical step towards slowing down the arms race" and is "in conformity with the highest welfare and happiness of the people of all countries." It pledged to "wage a positive struggle for strengthening international peace and for disarmament."

Is it true that this Soviet "proposal" is "a practical step" towards what it promised? Is the Soviet Union really eager for peace and disarmament? The answer to this can easily be found when one takes stock of Soviet words and deeds since the "proposal" was made known. The military and civil chieftains of the Soviet revisionist clique have since then continued advocating arms expansion and war preparations and increasing military strength.

On November 6, 1973, at the meeting in celebration of the 56th anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution, A. Kirilenko, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Soviet revisionist party, declared that the Soviet Union "will work tirelessly" to "main-

tain" its military forces "at the necessary standard" and "strengthen" its "armed forces."

On November 7, Defence Minister Andrei Grechko said at the military review in Red Square that the Soviet army would "perseveringly master new weaponry and technology, perfect its military training in the field, in the air and on the seas" and at the same time "strengthen the economic and defence capacity of the Soviet state."

On November 12, Grechko appeared at the garrison area of the Soviet troops in Germany to tell Soviet troops there to "keep your powder dry at all times" and "firmly strengthen combat readiness."

On November 19, Soviet Army Rocket Day, the Soviet revisionist clique seized the opportunity to brandish its nuclear strength by way of nuclear blackmail. The press extensively carried pictures of Soviet rockets and nuclear weapons and of the military training of the rocket troops.

On November 16, Vladimir Tolubko, Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet Strategic Rocket Forces, declared that these forces "now form the backbone of the Soviet army's combat might," that "the ground forces, the air force, the navy and anti-aircraft defence forces are armed with powerful rockets" and that "this determines their extensive combat possibilities."

On November 18, Chief of Staff of the Soviet Rocket and Artillery Forces Sidorov clamoured still more brazenly that Soviet rockets and nuclear weapons "can be used in military operations at any time of the year or of the day regardless of weather conditions and guarantee that mul-

multiple targets at long range can be destroyed in a most reliable manner."

Since the "proposal" came out, the Soviet revisionist clique has accelerated the pace of its nuclear armament expansion and steadily made its nuclear weapons more sophisticated.

On September 27, the day after the Soviet "proposal" was put before the General Assembly, the Soviet revisionists conducted an underground nuclear explosion at 5.9 on the Richter scale in the northern area of the Soviet Union. Three days later, another blast was set off in the Ural River basin. The Uppsala Seismological Institute in Sweden registered four successive underground nuclear explosions conducted by the Soviet Union in the three days from October 26 to 28. One of the explosions was 7 on the Richter scale and estimated to be five megatons. In mid-September, the Soviet Union set off an underground nuclear explosion with a similar force. "This was the first time in ten years," noted Marku Baath, head of the Seismological Institute of Sweden, "that the Russians had set off two such powerful explosions during the same autumn period."

The Japanese press reported that from October 3 to November 21, the Soviet Union planned four successive launches of "meteorological rockets" in Pacific waters adjacent to Japan and designated some areas as "danger zones." It was forced to cancel its scheduled plan only when the Japanese Government opposed such military activities endangering Japan's civil aviation, sea transport, fishing and other normal activities.

The Soviet revisionist clique is now stepping up efforts to improve the guiding system, perfect multiple independently targetable technology and build nuclear-powered submarines.

Since the "proposal" was brought out, the Soviet revisionist clique has made military threats against other countries through frequent demonstrations of force by its planes and military vessels everywhere.

On September 27, six of the Soviet navy's long-range heavy bombers circled over the waters northeast of Japan's Ogasawara Islands, threatening the security of the Japanese people there.

During the Middle East war in October, 30-odd Soviet military vessels were sent to the Mediterranean, bringing the number of Soviet warships there to the record high of 95. The Soviet Marine Corps boarded the Mediterranean fleet, causing grave anxiety in many Mediterranean countries.

Since October, the Soviet Union has sent an increasing number of military vessels to the Indian Ocean. Before the reinforcement it already had nearly 20 vessels there, surpassing the number of U.S. war vessels present.

On November 23, the Political and Security Committee of the U.N. General Assembly adopted a resolution urging all states to accept the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. Siding with the other superpower, South Africa, Portugal and Israel, the Soviet revisionist clique abstained from voting. The Soviet revisionists admitted that the resolution would put the Soviet Union in "an unfavourable position."

From their words and deeds in the more than one month since they submitted their "proposal" to the General Assembly, we can hardly see the slightest sincerity on the part of the Soviet revisionists for disarmament.

The great teacher Lenin said: **"We should like to see a minimum of general assurances, solemn promises and grandiloquent formulas, and the greatest possible number of the simplest and most obvious decisions and measures that would certainly lead to peace."** This is the most effective exposure and censure of the Soviet revisionist clique today.

(November 27, 1973)

TEN YEARS OF "DISARMAMENT" BALLYHOO, TEN YEARS OF FRENZIED ARMS EXPANSION

Commentary by Hsinhua Correspondent

Ten years ago, on August 5, 1963, the Soviet Union and some other countries including the United States signed in Moscow a "Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Underwater." At that time, the Chinese Government pointed out in explicit terms in a statement that this treaty "is a big fraud to fool the people of the world" and was designed to "consolidate their nuclear monopoly and bind the hands of all the peace-loving countries subjected to the nuclear threat." However, the Soviet authorities said that the treaty was signed with a view to promoting "progress in disarmament" and "curtailing" the arms race and therefore it was "the first brick laid in the foundation of the edifice of universal peace and security." During the ten years which have elapsed the Soviet Union has put forward an unending series of "disarmament" proposals and become more and more vociferous in its outcries for "disarmament," while its nuclear arms race with the other superpower has been accelerated all the time. The "test ban" architects are still continuing their tests in a big way and the Soviet revisionists' nuclear force has kept swelling. Iron-clad facts have completely punc-

tured this "partial nuclear test ban treaty" described by the Soviet Union as the "foundation brick of the edifice of peace," and fully testified to the correctness of the consistent stand taken by the Chinese Government on the disarmament issue.

In the ten years after the signing of the treaty, the Soviet revisionists conducted about a hundred more nuclear tests, reaching almost the same level as before the signing of the treaty in terms of the average number of tests conducted annually. The only difference is that since they had already carried out enough nuclear tests in the atmosphere, they conducted their tests underground instead. The past ten years also saw the testing of many Soviet rockets of various types for the purpose of improving the quality of their intercontinental ballistic missiles. Scores of rockets were launched into the high seas in the Pacific alone during the period. Meanwhile, the number of earth satellites launched annually by the Soviet Union for military purposes increased several times. In the ten years it launched a total of 400 to 500 earth satellites, many of which were geared directly to the purpose of developing strategic nuclear weapons. All this shows that the "partial nuclear test ban treaty" is aimed solely at prohibiting non-nuclear countries from developing nuclear weapons but it imposes no restrictions whatever on the tests needed by the Soviet Union for developing its strategic nuclear weapons.

Endless tests and huge military expenses have increased the Soviet nuclear armament rapidly in the past ten years. According to data given by the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, the Soviet Union had only 100 intercontinental ballistic missiles in

1963, the year when the "partial nuclear test ban treaty" was signed, but now it has over 1,500 ICBM's, showing an increase of more than 15 times compared with ten years ago. The number of submarine-launched ballistic missiles is now over five times as many as that in 1963, with military units having been equipped with the latest missiles in the last few years. During the same period, the strength of Soviet "strategic missile forces" more than quadrupled. It was precisely under the cover of the high-flown terms of "peace" and "disarmament" that the Soviet strategic nuclear armament has been expanding to such an extent in the ten years. What, then, are those terms for, if not to dupe the people of the world?

In these ten years, the Soviet revisionist clique also dished up and signed a number of other treaties and agreements on nuclear disarmament, all of which were designed to impose restrictions on others and to develop its own strength, maintain its nuclear monopoly and carry out nuclear blackmail so that it could rule supreme in the world.

In 1968, the Soviet revisionist clique came up with another treaty called the treaty on the "non-proliferation of nuclear weapons." It made a big noise about this treaty being a "treaty which can close all loopholes to the spread of nuclear weapons." In fact, the purpose was to "cut off all roads leading to the accession of nuclear weapons by those who do not have them," while the clique itself would be free to proliferate these weapons everywhere. It was precisely after the signing of this treaty that the Soviet Union equipped its navy with a large number of nuclear submarines which can launch long-range ballistic missiles. This is tantamount to

carrying nuclear weapons to all oceans of the world. As is shown by the data of the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, in 1968 the Soviet Union had only seven nuclear submarines which could launch ballistic missiles and most of them were equipped with comparatively short-range and old-type missiles. The number of nuclear submarines equipped with ballistic missiles rose to 39 in 1972, an increase of more than five times in four years. A naval chieftain of the Soviet revisionist clique boasted that "atomic submarines equipped with powerful rocket-nuclear weapons" are "masters of vast oceans." One might ask: When an increasing number of such "masters of vast oceans" equipped with a large quantity of nuclear weapons are running wild on the seas and oceans and posing a threat to various countries, is it not a clear fact that the nuclear overlord is unbridled in carrying out nuclear proliferation?

In May 1972, the Soviet Union and the United States signed in Moscow a series of agreements including the agreement on the "limitation" of offensive strategic arms. The Soviet Union declared then that these documents "are called upon to avoid another round in the strategic arms race," but before the ink on the agreement was dry, it declared once and again that "great efforts must be made to strengthen the defence capability of our country" and that it was necessary "to apply scientific gains in various military fields at the maximum." Western news agencies reported that in the short space of a little over one month, from May 26, 1972, the day the agreement on the "limitation" of offensive strategic arms was signed, to July 6 of the same year, the Soviet Union carried out seven

tests of intercontinental missiles and eight tests of submarine-launched ballistic missiles, or about once every three days. To modernize its intercontinental ballistic missiles, it made every effort to conduct tests and researches on missiles with multiple warheads so as to strengthen its nuclear striking force within the "quota" set by the agreement. E. L. Richardson, then U.S. Defence Secretary, disclosed in March 1973 that the Soviet Union was developing and testing three kinds of new intercontinental ballistic missiles and had added to its arsenal a kind of new nuclear submarine-launched ballistic missiles. It is crystal clear that far from playing its part in avoiding "another round in the strategic arms race," the agreement has been the accelerator of "another round" in the Soviet-U.S. nuclear race.

The Soviet Union's deceptive propaganda on disarmament reached a new climax after Brezhnev's U.S. visit in June 1973. The Soviet revisionists again spread the miasma by alleging that they were "resolved to do their utmost to see to it that the ominous flame of nuclear weapons should never again blaze up on earth." Hardly had these words died down when they conducted two underground nuclear tests in succession. The "flame" of nuclear weapons indeed lit up the ugly features of the Soviet revisionists stepping up nuclear arms expansion.

Ten years is only a short spell in history. But during the ten short years the Soviet revisionists gave a most revealing performance. A cursory review of this period shows that every trick the Soviet revisionists resorted to on the alleged reduction of nuclear armament became a laughing-stock. It only served to unmask themselves. Right after the signing of the "partial nuclear test ban

treaty" ten years ago, they made a number of celebrated pronouncements alleging that through the Soviet efforts, the peoples "have seen that there is a possibility of curtailing the arms race, the grave burden of which presses down on them," that, as an inevitable outcome, disarmament "will greatly reduce the arms spending. Funds thus saved can be used to develop the economy of the countries which have rid themselves of the status of colonies and dependencies," that the reduction of military appropriations by one-fifth "will enable the underdeveloped countries to attain the economic level of Italy and France in 20 to 25 years," and so on and so forth. These mouthings are ringing in people's ears to this day, but the developing countries still fail to see the Soviet revisionists using the money saved from alleged armament reduction to help them "attain the economic level of Italy and France." On the contrary, they only see a self-styled "developed socialist country" making a mess of its national economy under the heavy burden of military expenditures, and the Soviet revisionist chieftains' nauseating manners in begging for loans and aids from countries like Italy and France.

It should be pointed out that in these ten years, the other superpower, the United States, in striving to maintain its superiority, has spared no efforts in the nuclear arms race too. In this period, it spent 70,000 to 80,000 million dollars for this purpose, conducted 200 to 300 nuclear tests and expanded its strategic armed forces. As a result, the number of its intercontinental ballistic missiles has increased to more than 1,000 as compared with over 400 at the time of the signing of the

“partial nuclear test ban treaty” in 1963, and the number of nuclear submarine-launched ballistic missiles has also increased over 150 per cent. The United States has left the Soviet Union far behind in multiple independently targetable missiles and has begun to equip its forces with them. Immediately after the signing of the “Agreement on Certain Measures with Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms” in 1972, calls were made in the U.S. Congress for “action” and “improvement” on strategic offensive systems. The then U.S. Defence Secretary Melvin R. Laird said at a Congress session that “peace cannot be bought cheaply,” that “this is no time for complacency,” that “it is essential to maintain technological superiority” and that “we must continue . . . existing deployment programs.” Soon after the Soviet-U.S. talks in June 1973, the present U.S. Defence Secretary James Schlesinger said that it was essential to “ensure that we have credible deterrence . . . across the entire spectrum of risk” to check the “adventurous acts” of the Soviet Union. From these statements it can be seen that the disarmament “treaties” and “agreements” of all descriptions are not worth the scraps of paper on which they were written and can have no binding force either in respect to the U.S. expansion of strategic nuclear armament.

History is inexorable. The ten years during which social-imperialism kept clamouring for “disarmament” have been ten years of its contention with the United States for nuclear superiority, for a nuclear overlord position, and for frenzied armament expansion, nuclear arms expansion in particular. It has more and more fully exposed its true colours as a nuclear overlord and its frauds

have been shattered one after another by its own actions. Therefore it has become increasingly difficult for it to hoodwink the people of the world.

(August 4, 1973)

“DETENTE” SMOKESCREEN CANNOT COVER UP SOVIET REVISIONISTS’ MILITARY AMBITIONS IN EUROPE

Commentary by Hsinhua Correspondent

The Soviet revisionists have recently been trying their best to create an impression of “detente” in Europe and preen themselves as the most zealous “champions” of European peace. But they are using Europe as a key strategic area in their scramble for world hegemony, and are frantically carrying out arms expansion and war preparations there in their military confrontation with the other superpower. No Moscow propaganda smoke-screen can conceal this hard fact.

Europe has long been regarded as a key area by the two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, in their contention for world hegemony. To this end, the Soviet revisionists have for many years deployed most of their troops in Europe. Since the mid-1960s, they have been stretching their claws into Asia, Africa and wherever they can, and making military threats against China by steadily increasing their troops along the Sino-Soviet border. This, however, does not prevent them from constantly building up their troop strength in Europe. As pointed out in the Western press, Soviet troops in Europe have gone up almost 20 per cent since

1968, and the tactical air force, 50 per cent. In recent years, the real expenditures in the Soviet military budget earmarked for war zones in Europe have increased by 10,000 million U.S. dollars.

The Soviet revisionists have now massed three-fifths of their ground forces and over three-fourths of their air force in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union proper in Europe. Over three-fourths of the Soviet medium-range missiles are directed at Western Europe. According to statistics compiled recently by the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, 75 per cent of the major sea-borne vessels of the Soviet navy and over half of its attack submarines and missile nuclear submarines are deployed in waters around Europe. The journal of the Federal Republic of Germany *Sozialdemokratische Sicherheitspolitik* recently pointed out that without disregarding the massing of Soviet troops “against China” in the East, we must say that “the vast majority of Soviet military forces is undoubtedly directed at areas under the European Command of the (North Atlantic) Alliance.” The Austrian paper *Salzburger Nachrichten* said on November 3, 1973, that Soviet “troop deployment shows that the spearhead of its strategic offensive is still directed against the West.”

Facts over many years show that the louder the Soviet revisionist leading clique sings the “European security” and “detente” tune, the more energetically it engages in war preparations and military expansion in Europe.

In 1966, the clique dished up a proposal for a “conference on European security and co-operation,” claiming that it stood for “measures to reduce tension, first of all, military tension in Europe.” But this was followed

by the brazen armed invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia. In 1969, it once again appealed for such a conference "as soon as possible," and declared that it would take "concrete disarmament action" to "relax the situation in Europe." But the same year witnessed an increase in Soviet ground forces in Eastern Europe from 26 to 30-odd divisions.

In 1972, the Soviet-U.S. summit talks took place in Moscow. Both sides pledged "restraint" and "further efforts to ensure a peaceful future for Europe." But even during the talks, Washington announced reinforcement of armoured units and air force to Europe, while Moscow set up within the Warsaw Pact unified army and naval forces made up of those from the Soviet Union and several other states. Shortly before and after the preparatory talks on the European security conference began in November 1972, the Soviet Union dispatched massive reinforcements in the form of new-type T-62 tanks, armoured troop-carriers and artillery to Eastern Europe to augment and improve the weaponry of Soviet troops stationed there. According to reports in the Western press, half the artillery, rockets and anti-tank rockets have been replaced by new ones. As compared with 1968, Soviet artillery in Eastern Europe has nearly doubled and the number of Soviet tanks in the Democratic Republic of Germany alone has gone up 30 per cent. Recently British Foreign Secretary Alec Douglas-Home told correspondents at the United Nations that "now the Russians are still engaging in a big rearmament programme" and that they are adding troops in Eastern Europe and "improving very fast the quality of their weapons."

In addition to military expansion on land in recent years, the Soviet revisionists have drastically reinforced their military strength on the seas at both the southern and northern flanks of Europe. According to data released by the same International Institute for Strategic Studies, they have mustered 45 per cent of their main sea-borne ships and over 60 per cent of their submarines in the strategic waters off Northern Europe. Before 1963, Soviet fleets manoeuvred mainly in waters off the northern Soviet coasts and in the Baltic Sea. Beginning from the mid-1960s, they broke through the control of the West, sailed into the Norwegian Sea and the North Sea more and more frequently, and stretched out into the Atlantic strategic passage linking Europe and America.

In Southern Europe, the Soviet navy began entering the Mediterranean from the Black Sea in 1964, and since 1967 it has formally sent a permanent fleet to the Mediterranean to confront the U.S. Sixth Fleet. The number of Soviet ships constantly operating there is five times that of seven years ago. Taking advantage of the Arab people's resistance to Israeli aggression in October 1973 the Soviet revisionists carried out a massive military concentration in the Mediterranean, approximately doubling the number of their warships there. They grab naval and air bases in the east Mediterranean to establish a network of military bases there. At the same time, they strive to expand into the west Mediterranean in co-ordination with the expansion of the Soviet Baltic Fleet and North Fleet in Northern Europe, in an attempt to form a pincer movement against Western Europe. The French paper *Le Monde* pointed out that the Soviet

Union's expansion in the Mediterranean "must be considered in this context as a movement directed against the West by attempting to turn Europe's southern flank" and that "this priority of the West over the East in Soviet objectives must also be taken into account in examining the broad lines of development of her naval expansion."

The fierce contention between the two hegemonic powers also finds expression in the Soviet revisionist leading clique's repeated land, air and naval exercises in Europe, rivalling with the United States and NATO in the show of force. According to incomplete figures, the Soviet revisionists and the military bloc under their control have carried out about ten joint military exercises in Eastern Europe every year since 1966. In September 1972, when the preparatory talks on the European security conference were about to begin, the Soviet Union and other countries held a large-scale military exercise in Eastern Europe involving more than 100,000 men, while the North Atlantic military bloc headed by the United States also carried out a massive naval, land and air exercise in Northern Europe. During the preparatory talks on the European security conference as well as before and after the second phase of the conference began in Geneva, the two superpowers held a series of naval, ground and air exercises in Europe. The rumble of the tanks, aircraft and artillery of both sides mingled with Moscow's cries for European "peace" and "detente."

The Soviet revisionists' massive concentration of troops in Europe and their steady build-up of military strength there serve their ambition to consolidate and expand their hegemony in Europe. European public opinion is

more and more aware of this. The Austrian paper *Kronen Zeitung* and the French paper *France-Soir* pointed out recently that in stationing troops in Eastern Europe, the Kremlin aims at, or at least partly aims at, controlling its satellites, and that the steady increase of Soviet military strength in Eastern Europe shows that the Soviet Union is not prepared to give up its right of supervising its neighbours. The F.R.G. paper *Die Welt* wrote editorially on July 3, 1973, "Anyone who wants to impose his will on a neighbour must seek great military superiority." The Soviet Union is trying its utmost in Europe to enlarge its "lead gained from the quick tempo of its own rearmament." It is striving "to hamper the independence of Western Europe and intends to set up a Western Europe according to its own desire."

Obviously, while paying endless lip-service to "peace" and "detente," the Soviet revisionists are actually stepping up military expansion and doing everything to arm themselves to the teeth. Such double-faced tactics cannot deceive people long. With each passing day, the peoples of Europe who have gone through two world wars are seeing through the true features of Soviet social-imperialism. They are carrying out the struggle against hegemonism and for safeguarding genuine security and peace in Europe.

(November 14, 1973)

FRENZIED ARMS EXPANSION, MOUNTING FOREIGN LOANS

by Hsinhua Correspondent

Striving to be first in the armaments race, the Soviet leading clique also wants to pass itself off as the standard-bearer of the "reduction of military expenditures"; masquerading as a "benefactor" to the developing countries, it also has to bow and scrape for help and beg for loans everywhere. This revisionist nature of the Soviet leadership has become clearer and clearer to everybody.

For many years the Soviet revisionist leading clique has repeatedly harped on "cutting down military expenditures" to "provide assistance to the developing countries," but military spending has touched a new high every time it hits the high note of "reduction of military expenditures." In 1958 it proposed that the United States, Britain, France and the Soviet Union reduce their military expenditures by 10-15 per cent. Yet according to official Soviet revisionist statistics, expenditures on national defence in 1961 were 23 per cent higher than in 1958. In 1962, it made another proposal for "cutting down military expenditures" and using money thus saved for further "assistance to the newly established national states." But in 1963, Soviet defence spending was the highest in the 19 years since 1944. In 1964, Soviet re-

visionism came up for the third time with the proposal for "reduction of military expenditures." As on previous occasions, not a single ruble was cut; on the contrary, Soviet military expenditures soared year by year. In both 1969 and 1970 military spending reached 17,900 million rubles (some 20,000 million U.S. dollars), twice breaking the record in Soviet history. In the nine years from 1965 to 1973, the actual increment of Soviet defence expenditures doubled that in the period of the Khrushchov reign. Military expenditures in 1973 are about 30 per cent higher than in 1944, the highest year during World War II.

The above data are the much watered down figures published by Soviet official sources and by no means reflect the actual level and rate of increment of Soviet military expenditures. According to material from various sources, actual annual military expenditures were several times higher than what was admitted by the Soviet revisionists, and have now reached 60,000-70,000 million U.S. dollars. The share of Soviet military spending in the national income and gross national product is now higher than that of the United States.

Capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union, coupled with frantic arms expansion and war preparations, has put the Soviet national economy in an impossible predicament. Ever since the late 1950s and the early 1960s, arms production has been speeded up at a heightened tempo year after year, while the rate of growth in Soviet industrial and agricultural production has been going downhill almost yearly. Five-year plans have been unfulfilled. Soviet national income, industrial production and labour productivity plans were not ful-

filled in the past three years while annual increment rate in these fields showed a record low for the past twenty years and more. Many important sectors of the national economy have long been in a state of backwardness for lack of funds and cannot properly develop. Take agriculture and the consumer goods industry for example. Although the Soviet revisionist leading clique has always clamoured for the need to increase capital investment in these two seriously backward sectors, their plans have fizzled out time and again. Even the Soviet revisionists themselves admitted that in the Eighth Five-Year Plan (1966-70), the capital investment plans for these two sectors were only 76 and 70 per cent fulfilled respectively. The situation has been no better since the beginning of the Ninth Five-Year Plan. Agriculture failed to meet the capital investment plan for two years running.

Western news agencies and press have pointed out several times since the beginning of 1973 that "the emphasis on the military-industrial complex is held largely responsible for starving investment in other sectors of the [Soviet] economy" and that Soviet "super armaments had absorbed so much funds that investments in other departments were limited." A *Washington Post* correspondent said in a recent report from Moscow: "In private contacts with Westerners, Soviet officials and journalists often acknowledge that defence spending is an enormous burden for their economy." The report added: A Russian said, "Think how much more it must cost our [Soviet] weaker economy (than the U.S. economy), to do the same things [as the U.S.] in the arms race."

To cope with increasingly grave domestic economic difficulties, the Soviet revisionist leading clique has to ask capitalist countries for huge loans. The Soviet revisionists stated frankly that there was need to "absorb" from the West "additional material and financial resources in order to accelerate" the Soviet "speed of construction." Even the exploitation of Siberian resources requires help from other countries. For this, Soviet revisionist chieftain Brezhnev personally went on a begging mission to the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States where he flattered and fawned on members of the legislative organs, owners of big concerns and bankers. Western press comments have described the head of this superpower as a "dollar diplomat," and an "economic mendicant dressed up as a military giant."

It was no coincidence that in 1958, the year when the Kremlin "proposed" for the first time "to cut down military spending," the Soviet revisionists began to obtain long-term loans from Western countries. Since then such loans have grown year by year as Soviet military spending went up and up and domestic economic difficulties became greater and greater. According to incomplete data, the total amount of loans the Soviet Union got from the West between 1958 and 1963 came to 570 million U.S. dollars; they rose to some 1,500 million dollars in the period from 1964 to 1969. Thus the loans nearly trebled in the same length of time. In the over three years since 1970, the Soviet Union has borrowed more than 5,000 million dollars in loans, or more than three times the total amount of foreign loans it got in the previous six years. Loans from capitalist countries

since 1964 have exceeded the total amount of so-called "economic assistance" given by the Soviet Union to Asian, African and Latin American countries in the form of "loans" in the 19 years beginning from 1955. Judging from this contrast, Moscow's much-vaunted "reduction of military spending" to increase "aid" to the developing countries is sheer humbug.

The French paper *Depeche du Midi* said in June 1973: "While pointing his thousands of missiles with nuclear warheads against the capitalist countries, Brezhnev is reduced to seeking aid from them" to "ensure" "construction" in the Soviet Union. Five years ago, the Soviet revisionists persuaded one Asian country to sign the "nuclear non-proliferation treaty" by saying that "if the efforts of this country were directed to the production of only several Hiroshima-type bombs, then the living standards of every citizen of this country would be lowered by 3-4 per cent at least." People cannot help asking: Since you have preached like this to others, why don't you produce less ammunition and cut down a tiny fraction of your military spending which amounts to tens of thousands of million dollars a year so as to save you the trouble of begging for loans from others?

The answer is quite simple. The purpose of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism is very clear: On the one hand it spends large sums of its own funds on armament expansion and war preparations to contend for hegemony with U.S. imperialism and carry out expansion abroad, and on the other hand it borrows Western funds to boost up its economy which is heavily weighed down by the armaments race. As to the so-called "reduction of mili-

tary spending" to "aid" the developing countries, this is merely like selling horse-meat as beef steak — a trick to deceive the Soviet people and the world's people, those of the Third World countries in particular.

(December 15, 1973)

廉价的宣传

*

外文出版社出版(北京)

1974年(32开)第一版

编号:(英)3050-2529

00020

3-E-1320P

