

What Does the Situation Show One Year After the European Security Conference?

by Jen Ku-ping

IT is a year since the European security conference closed. What changes have taken place in the entire European situation and what do these changes signify?

The stark facts of the situation point to only one conclusion: with contention between the two super-powers in Europe growing fiercer and Soviet social-imperialism stepping up its arms expansion and war preparations, Europe has become more unstable and the threat facing the West European countries more serious. This shows that the Final Act cooked up at the European security conference in Helsinki a year ago is a mere scrap of paper and the so-called European security conference is in reality a European insecurity conference. Today, dark clouds of war hang over the countries in Europe. To oppose hegemonism and safeguard their independence and security remains their grave task.

Mounting Threat to West European Countries

It is still fresh in people's minds that the Soviet revisionists had made a great fuss to boost the European security conference in the days immediately preceding its convocation and following its conclusion last year. They gave free play to the value of the Helsinki conference, holding it up as "a new stage of detente" and "the dawn of peace and co-operation" in Europe. As an earnest of their bona fide intentions they vigorously asserted that they would "steadfastly set an example to others in realizing the agreements of the all-European conference." However, their actions belie their words.

It was in the 12 months following the European security conference that the Soviet Union continued to mass troops in Central Europe and exert pressure at every turn. Preparing for an "offensive war," it has beefed up the Soviet forces in the region, streamlined their military setup, strengthened their logistics, equipped them with sophisticated weapons and greatly increased the amount of conventional and nuclear arms. Manoeuvres with the occupation of Europe as the goal have been frequently held to gain "the necessary experience" for overrunning Europe when the day comes.

Whether it is military confrontation all along the front or in the battle of words at the negotiation table, the Soviet revisionists are consumed with a desire to maintain or sharpen their military edge over the West. The din of the European security conference had yet to fade away when Moscow signed with undue haste a new treaty with the German Democratic Republic to replace the treaty of "friendship and mutual assistance." This is an important measure taken by Moscow to accelerate its war preparations in Europe.

It was in the space of these 12 months that the Soviet Union steadily stepped up its military pressure in

Northern Europe. In areas adjacent to Northern Europe, military deployments were intensified; strategic highways were built and double-track railways laid; a canal to the sea was expanded; military exercises with North European countries as the hypothetical enemy took place one after another, and the sphere of military activities of every description was constantly widened. The airspace and territorial waters of the North European countries were time and again violated by Soviet aircraft and warships. For the first time, a special naval task force was sent to the North Sea with a view to controlling the sea lanes stretching from the Baltic and Barents Seas to the Atlantic Ocean. By virtue of Soviet military superiority on the northern flank of Europe, the masters sitting in the Kremlin set their minds on "striking at the heart of the West European defences from the far north."

It was also in the space of these 12 months that the Soviet Union showed its teeth and braced up its aggressive posture menacingly in Southern Europe and the Mediterranean. A Southern Europe command was added to the Warsaw Pact headquarters. The Soviet naval presence in the Mediterranean was swollen to more than 70 ships. Its first aircraft carrier, the *Kiev*, sailed into the Mediterranean in a show of force, a move to use military blackmail against the coastal countries. Full advantage was taken of the political turmoil and national feuds in certain South European countries where Moscow tried its utmost to have a finger in the pie and fish in troubled waters. The aim could only be to put a knife into the "soft under-belly" and act in concert with operations in Northern Europe so as to hem Western Europe in from north and south.

Again it was in the space of these 12 months that the Soviet Union bestirred itself more actively than ever to grab strategic points in the Middle East, which flanks Europe, and in Africa. Only a few months after the European security conference, the Soviet revisionists unsheathed their butcher's knife in Angola in a bid to entrench themselves in that country and thus threaten the sea lanes between Western Europe and the United States and establish control over the South Atlantic. In recent weeks, the Soviet Union has been busy exerting its influence in some Middle East countries and trying to cash in on the turbulent situation in the Lebanon and expand its sphere of influence in the Middle East region.

In short, in the year following the European security conference, Soviet social-imperialism's threat to West European countries has grown unmistakably. Not only has it carried out infiltration in these countries and squeezed them on all sides, but it has also steadily thrown a strategic encirclement around them on the exterior lines. A glance at Europe today, whether from

the north, east, south or west, and whether in regard to air, land or naval forces, shows that the Soviet Union is all too ready to pounce on the victim. Never in the post-war years have the West European countries been confronted with such a grave threat. The so-called "new stage of detente" in Europe is nothing but a "new stage" of expansion by Soviet social-imperialism. The acts of the Soviet revisionists have given the lie to their spurious rhetoric. If the European security conference has brought "detente" to Europe, then why are they so frantically engaged in arms expansion and war preparations after the conference? Since they are so blatantly carrying out infiltration and expansion, then what European "detente" and "security" is there to talk about?

"Detente" Cannot Cover Up Expansionist Designs

The Soviet Union has been loudly singing a "detente" lullaby while posing its threat of expansion to Western Europe over the past year. This has not escaped people's attention. Facts prove that the "detente" touted by the Kremlin is nothing but a move to cover up the traces of its arms drive and war preparations, its expansionist activities against Western Europe and contention with the United States for hegemony. It is precisely because of this that the "detente" offensive mounted by the Soviet Union is a real threat to Western Europe indeed.

To push its expansion behind the smokescreen of "detente," Moscow has tirelessly harped on the theme that "detente" benefits both sides, that "detente" "is not one-way traffic," that "there are no winners or losers." But what are the facts?

Behind a heavy smokescreen of "detente" to cover up its arms expansion and war preparations, the Soviet Union in the past year has made a big effort to get the West European countries to drop their guard, hoping that they would entertain illusions and lower their vigilance. It has openly preached the nonsense that while it is "right" for the Soviet Union to increase its armed strength it is "wrong" for others to look to their defence. As West European public opinion has pointed out, the Kremlin aims to "gradually disarm the West" politically, and psychologically under the signboard of detente so as to accomplish its "task of achieving military superiority."

Under the pretext of "detente" the Soviet Union has blatantly plotted and schemed to sow discord and divide the West European countries in an attempt to weaken and wreck their trend towards union. Moreover, it has openly attacked the proposal of the West European countries to form a union as running "counter to the Helsinki spirit." Unfurling the banner of "all-European co-operation," it has tried to cotton up to Western Europe and infiltrate it in all spheres while doing its utmost to squeeze out U.S. influence there. The aim is to establish exclusive Soviet hegemony over the whole of Europe.

In hawking its shoddy ware of "materialization of detente," the Soviet Union has left no stone unturned to get large sums of capital, loans, technical knowhow and

equipment from Western Europe through so-called "trade exchanges" and "mutual benefit and co-operation" so that it can ease its economic difficulties, speed up its arms expansion and war preparations, and beef up its military setup.

For the Soviet Union, "detente" is clearly a means of attack, a lethal instrument that kills insidiously. It is fraught with danger for Western Europe. "Detente" has not got the Soviet Union to withdraw a single soldier from the European region, still less stopped the Soviet war chariot of aggression and expansion in its tracks. "Detente" has not prevented the Soviet Union from extending its sinister tentacles to Portugal nor has it stayed Moscow's butcher's knife in Angola. "Detente" can in no way check Soviet expansionist acts, much less get the Soviet revisionists to give up their wild ambition of European hegemony. The attempt to use "detente" to keep Soviet expansionism in check, the belief that the Soviet Union, as the "Sonnenfeldt Doctrine" makes out, would be satisfied with its so-called "organic relationship" with Eastern Europe and would not attack Western Europe, are policies of appeasement which Soviet expansionist activities over the past year have proved illusory. The Soviet revisionists have repeatedly clamoured since the Angolan incident that "detente" does not mean "freezing the status quo" nor does it mean that "every corner of the globe" is beyond their "consideration." This makes it crystal clear that the Soviet Union's global strategic offensive would not slacken, let alone stop. It has been this way in the past, and so it will be in the future. In these circumstances, can Europe have security? So long as the Kremlin's rulers do not give up the desire to lord it over Europe, Europe cannot hope to have even a day of tranquillity.

Irresistible Trend to Unite Against Hegemony

In the face of the sharpening contention between the two superpowers in Europe and the threat of Soviet expansion, what are the European countries to do to safeguard their independence and security — strive for security through struggle, or reach a compromise and get a temporary respite? Serious thought and attention ought to be given to this question on which a decision of historic importance must be made today.

The people of the European countries, which have experienced two world wars, are most concerned about peace and security on the continent. That is only natural. But hopes cannot take the place of reality. Unless properly handled, things may turn out to be just the opposite of one's hopes. Such instances can be found in Europe's history. Before World War II the fervent aspirations of the people of the European countries were to oppose wars of aggression and maintain security. But Chamberlain and his likes carried out a policy of compromise and appeasement and sought accommodation with the international outlaws. The result was that the Hitlerite aggressors were allowed to nurture insatiable appetites, and for this the people of Europe had had to pay dearly.

Today, the Soviet social-imperialists are following in the footsteps of Nazi Germany. The Brezhnev clique's greed and ambition far surpass Hitler's. It is noteworthy that in recent years some political figures in the West are inclined to follow an appeasement policy. In one sense, the European security conference is as much an outcome of Soviet machinations as a product of the trend of thought in the West originating from the Munich sell-out. Such a phenomenon has aroused the attention of Western public opinion which points out: "Aggressors can never be placated. A policy of appeasement has never succeeded in history." "It will be ridiculous to think that the Soviet Union would alter its policy if concessions were made to it."

People are the masters of history. Europe's destiny is in the hands of the people of the European countries. Events in the year following the Helsinki conference show that the conference did not solve, nor could it solve, the question of European security and that written agreements can in no way safeguard peace and security in Europe. The only sure way to deal with the Soviet revisionists' menacing aggression and expansion is to heighten vigilance, strengthen unity, make practical preparations and wage resolute struggle.

Moscow's acts of aggression and expansion have taught the people of Europe by negative example and served to show them, little by little, where the main threat to Europe comes from. If the "detente" peddled by the Soviet revisionists still had a few buyers a year ago, then today the "detente" hoax is on the verge of bankruptcy. More and more prominent figures in the West have come to realize that Soviet military might is developing at an alarming rate and that the "real danger is a false sense of security induced by the European security conference and 'detente.'" They listed facts, weighed the pros and cons, worked out counter-measures and spoke in favour of "drawing lessons from events since the European security conference" and

taking steps in all fields to counter the threat of Soviet expansion. For some time now countries in Western Europe are steadily strengthening their armed forces to cope with outside aggression, reorganizing and improving their military strategy and deployment, propelling the trend of economic and political union of West European countries and their common struggle against hegemonism. Today, many West European countries, including some smaller ones which have all along taken a position of neutrality, are bolstering up their forces to resist aggression so that they can deal with eventualities and safeguard their independence and security.

Events in the past 12 months show that the situation in Europe has not developed as Moscow wishes. Despite blustering Soviet threats of expansion, the people of the West European countries are steadily heightening their awareness to oppose Soviet aggrandizement. This struggle is growing daily and the trend of uniting to fight hegemonism cannot be checked. Though Soviet social-imperialism is flexing its military muscles and looks powerful enough, it is actually beset with a host of difficulties. One need not be frightened, for Soviet social-imperialism is tough outside but brittle inside. By stretching its tentacles to all parts of Europe and throwing its weight about, the Soviet Union will only sow the wind and reap the whirlwind and rouse the people of the European countries to greater resistance. A year after the European security conference, the Kremlin was obliged recently to confess that the harder it tried to palm off the "detente" hoax in Europe, "the greater has become the resistance." This clearly shows that all is not well with the Kremlin's rulers who are pushing their policy of expansion and aggression in Europe. If the people of the European countries further heighten their awakening, strengthen their unity, and press on with their struggle, Soviet social-imperialism's wild ambition to seek hegemony in Europe is sure to end in ignominious defeat.