
**Eastern European Leaders' discussion during the Crimean meeting,
30 - 31 July 1973**

[Source: Central State Archive, Sofia, Fond 1-B, Record 35, File 4300]

STATEMENTS
At the meeting in Crimea

At the meeting in Crimea after the Report of Comrade Brezhnev statements have been made by Comrades Edward Gierek, Erich Honecker, Janos Kadar, Andrey Gromyko, Nicolae Ceausescu, Todor Zhivkov, and [Yumjaagiyn] Tsendenbal.

All comrades (with the exception of Comrade Ceausescu who on some issues took another stance, different from the common point of view) welcomed the initiative of the Soviet comrades for summoning a Crimean meeting, expressed full agreement with the report of Comrade Brezhnev and his concrete proposals on pressing issues of the international situation and on the cooperation among the brotherly socialist countries, expressed their attitude to the main issues, subject of the discussion at the current meeting in Crimea.

Therefore, we shall briefly point out only some moments and aspects in the statements of the comrades at the Crimean meeting.

EDWARD GIEREK:

[...]

Comrade Gierek informed about his talks with Pompidou, about the impending visit of Pompidou in Poland and about the forthcoming visit of the French Foreign Minister, which will take place this autumn.

He focused on the situation in Great Britain, which wants to join the all-European movement although in the beginning it made efforts to make difficult the solving of the problems of the European security. Now Great Britain is trying to come out of the isolation, to improve its relations with the socialist countries. They explore the ground for an eventual visit of the British Prime Minister Heath in Poland. Comrade Gierek thinks that they should do that.

In this way Poland wants to influence on Italy, too. The Polish Foreign Minister will visit Rome and the Vatican, which will be useful.

[...]

How are we to form further our relations with the FRG?

[...]

We have to be on the alert to the nationalistic, revenge-seeking and military powers in FRG, whose strategic goal remains the unification of the German people. Even Shell in Helsinki hinted about this goal of the FRG. Coordinated actions are necessary for consolidation of the position of the GDR. They outline measures for

development of economic collaboration and industrial cooperation between Poland and the FRG and in this way further to involve the FRG in the process of normalizing of the relations with the socialist countries.

[...]

Some special issues:

About the establishing diplomatic relations with Spain: This issue will arise before us. Is the negative standpoint of the leaders of the Spanish Communist Party correct?

About the European Conference: there is a necessity to create a common range for intensifying of the process of détente in the international affairs. The ideas of the Conference will be not only ideas of governments, but also will become ideas of people.

[...]

In the overall balance prevail positive elements. But there will be difficulties and dangers.

About China: caution is needed to the actions of China, which is trying to impede the relaxation of the international tension. The nuclear test of China is not accidental. They implement policy against our countries. In Europe the Maoists support the Cold War powers. They draw closer to the extreme nationalistic powers in FRG. They call upon consolidation of NATO and the Common Market. They aspire to resumption of the Cold War in Europe. All this requires unanimous attitude on our part to the negative course of Beijing, to its ideology of extreme nationalism and chauvinism. We need coordinated policy and actions of our socialist countries.

About the Common Market: he shares the common assessment. He agrees that it is necessary to establish contacts between the two economic groups and supports the idea for unofficial negotiations between COMECON and the Common Market.

ERICH HONECKER:

He underlined the favorable reflection of the political discussions of Comrade Brezhnev in Bonn for the development of the relations between the GDR and the FRG. He focused on the positive contacts of the GDR with the West German Bundestag.

[...]

He expressed gratefulness to the socialist countries for the help rendered to the GDR and especially thanked Bulgaria and Hungary, which up to the solving of the problem between the GDR and the FRG did not established diplomatic relations with Western Germany.

[...]

He denounced the policy of Beijing on the German issue: the Chinese leaders implement the old policy, directed against GDR, but with a new cover. The positions of China match the positions of the West German revanchists and they try to exploit this issue in order to incite a new conflict in Europe. Similar is the attitude of the Maoists to West Berlin, to Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America - everywhere they make attempts to increase their influence. They try to oppose the socialist countries to the Soviet Union and to each other. We need on a more extensive scale, more actively and more co-ordinately to denounce the Maoism in theoretical and political aspect and by no means to allow Maoist ideas to penetrate in the countries members of the Warsaw Pact.

[...]

He spoke in details about the development of the relations between the GDR and the FRG on the main issues in this sphere. He pointed out the intense confrontation with the bourgeois ideology, the role of the West German television, the deployment of the telephone lines for ideological influence, the enticement of scientists from the GDR in the FRG through big material gains and so on. The SED party in the GDR successfully copes with the new situation.

[...]

JANOS KADAR:

In connection to Vietnam he declared that Hungary, together with Poland, participates in the Control Commission for Vietnam, that the situation in South Vietnam is very complicated, that the regime in Saigon has come out of the war stronger than ever. It is proper to be found organizational forms for closer participation of Democratic Republic of Vietnam in joint work, in the affairs of COMECON, as was the position of Yugoslavia, and so on.

He posed two international issues for consultation:

The first issue is about the diplomatic relations with the FRG: they are ready together with Bulgaria to declare an establishment of diplomatic relations with the FRG.

The second issue refers to the establishment of diplomatic relations of the socialist countries with Spain. This question stands out after the GDR declared that it is ready to establish diplomatic relations with Spain. The Spanish Communist Party has protested against it. He thinks that it is correct to be established diplomatic relations with Spain, but not hurriedly.

About Portugal: it is out of question to establish diplomatic relations under no form and kind.

Focusing on the work of COMECON, he posed the question about the prices, about common currency and more flexible attitude to the Common Market.

He informed about his talks with leaders of the British Labor Party.

About China: He accentuated that we need to lead struggle in the literal sense of the word against the anti-Marxist activity of the Chinese leaders. Once, some people said that after the October plenum of the Central Committee of CPSU in 1964 and the policy of dismissal of Khrushchev, the relations with China would normalize, that Chou Enlai would visit Moscow and everything would be in order. Obviously, the things here are much deeper and affect principle issues.

ANDREY GROMYKO:

Comrade Gromyko made a statement on two issues:

First - about the visit of Leonid Ilych Brezhnev in the USA and about the foreign policy of the USA.

Second - about the European security and the European Conference.

Comrade Gromyko assessed the visit of Leonid Ilych in the USA and the whole work, preceding the visit, as a rather bitter political struggle, a real political battle.

[...]

At the talks on the issue of the Middle East, for example, Leonid Ilych displayed our position for arranging the problem. He called things with their proper names. He called Israel aggressor and the USA - helper of the Israel aggressor. The American presidents have had and still have a lot of meetings. But they do not often hear from their interlocutors such pungent assessments of the real behavior and acts of the USA.

[...]

In his talks with Nixon, Leonid Ilych adopted such an approach: he was analyzing our proposals on the issues and at the same time - analyzing the American proposals. He did the same with the issues of the European security, and with other problems.

In the very beginning of the first talk Leonid Ilych straightforward declared to Nixon: We are different people, the systems of our countries are different, and our ideologies are different. Of course, I have no intention whatsoever to try to make a communist out of you. Before us, at our talks, on the issues posed, there is one alternative: either to put aside the differences of opinion under the table, or war. There is no other way.

[...]

Comrade Gromyko focused also on the issue of Nixon's personality as a functionary and a president. The situation about him is very complicated, lately around his personality there is a big turmoil. Nixon's behavior during the visit of Comrade Brezhnev was a behavior of a host in his house. Our impression is that he was at the bottom of the accepted course of the relations between the Soviet Union and the USA. Hardly will there be found after the Second World War such a president of the USA who displays such an initiative and implements such a course of understanding with the Soviet Union like President Nixon. If in the White

House there is such a president like Nixon, who is ready to sign such agreements with the USSR like the already signed, this is good for us. And now this assessment for President Nixon is valid.

[...]

The second issue, which Comrade Gromyko focused on, referred to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. He declared that we walked out well from the first stage of the European Conference. We came to the table in Helsinki with solid luggage, with documents and concrete proposals. Our socialist countries walk a few paces before the Western countries. The positive side of this fact is that we clearly posed our positions and suggestions. The negative side - the others did not propose anything or almost nothing and discussed only political issues.

The third moment, to which Comrade Gromyko drew attention, refers to the inviolability of the frontiers in Europe. This principle was acknowledged in the bilateral treaties with FRG. It would have been better if it receives an all-European sanction, too, in the documents of the Conference. In Helsinki this principle was acknowledged and accepted.

The fourth moment, on which Comrade Gromyko concentrated, concerned the economic and cultural issues of the Conference, as well as some difficulties in the further work.

He underlined that it is necessary to be on the alert, to prepare well for the second and the third stage of the Conference, to act in accordance and unanimously, to send experienced people, politically reliable and well oriented on the issues.

NICOLAE CEAUSESCU:

In his extensive (almost two hours) statement Comrade Ceausescu expressed his attitude to all issues and posed his considerations. On a series of problems he has expressed some differences from our common point of view. We shall point out only some aspects and moments of his statement.

First. About the character of the Crimean meeting. He thinks that the meeting is unofficial, that it is expedient to exchange thoughts about the international situation and about the cooperation in the economic and the social sphere, but not to adopt any decision. The detailed information of Comrade Brezhnev contains a lot of proposals for the international activity and for cooperation. He declared that he was not acquainted with these issues beforehand and he had no mandate to participate in adopting decisions on them or to give his consent for a document for the work at the Crimean meeting. Previously, nobody mentioned any decision, but in the beginning of the meeting such had been made by Comrade Brezhnev.

After the meeting he will inform the Executive Committee and the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party about the issues posed, they will adopt decisions on them in a suitable form and then they will participate in the discussion.

[...]

He welcomed the treaty about the nuclear arms between the USSR and the USA, but it is only a step forward, because there are other nuclear nations. The treaty about the nuclear arms interests the other socialist countries, as well, especially Romania, therefore, the Soviet Union had to consult them in advance.

Third. In connection with the changed correlation of the powers at the international arena, an important positive role plays China and its activities: the beginning of the normalization of the relationship of China with the USA, Nixon's visit in China. There is no doubt that all this also is a contribution to the easing of the tension in the international relations. China displays willingness and in this early stage of the new relations at the international arena to cooperate for the amelioration of the situation.

[...]

About the Warsaw Pact. In two years the Warsaw Pact will become twenty. It is necessary to think about what to do in the future. Why don't we express willingness to dissolve the Warsaw Pact simultaneously with NATO? This is noted in the Warsaw Pact treaty, too. It is necessary to undertake certain steps in this direction. We have to work not for military but for political consolidation of the Warsaw Pact.

[...]

He thinks that the summoning of a new international communist meeting and the posing of this task as practical will be a mistake. According to Comrade Ceausescu at the moment there are no conditions for the implementation of such a meeting. We have to ask ourselves: what do we want to achieve, who to participate and what to conclude such a meeting with.

A meeting at which some parties will be criticized and denounced is out of question. The tenth congress of the Romanian Communist Party has decided: the Central Committee must not criticize other parties, must not give judgements to other parties and must not interfere in the affairs of other parties. They will adhere to this decision. Therefore, the meeting should abstain from all criticism of other parties, which is hardly probable.

Besides, there are a lot of issues that need continued work for their clarification. In many parties there is vagueness and even special considerations and stipulations about the new course. Can we discuss these issues at the meeting? It means a long discussion, at that without criticizing and insulting other parties.

Therefore, it is necessary not to hurry with the meeting, in order to avoid misunderstandings and not to obstruct the consolidation of the solidarity among the parties.

In conclusion Comrade Ceausescu declared that he did not focus on all issues which were posed at the meeting. But not speaking about them does not mean that he fully approves everything said up to here. He underlined once again that the leaders of his party were going to consider all issues and then they would adopt an attitude on them.

GUSTAV HUSAK:

He gave a high assessment to the position of Bulgaria and Hungary in connection with the negotiations of Czechoslovakia with the FRG, which did not establish diplomatic relations with the FRG, submitting their own national interests to the mutual interests. He assessed this as a brotherly international approach to the issue, as a brotherly international help for Czechoslovakia.

He pointed out that in the new international situation we could not decrease the attention to the defensive powers of the Warsaw Pact and of the separate socialist countries.

[...]

In connection with an exchange of experience among the brotherly parties, he proposed to be found a way for exchange of reports before the plenums of the Central Committees of the separate parties, which are not published in the press.

TODOR ZHIVKOV:

[YUMJAAGIYN] TSEDENBAL:

In his statement he devoted a great deal of attention on the policy to China and on the Mongolian - Chinese relations and the numerous actions and provocations of Beijing to the Mongolian People's Republic.

He declared that China implements against Mongolia a great-nationalistic, chauvinistic policy, which the leaders in Beijing have not betrayed this course and that they adhere to it. In support of this he gave numerous facts:

Along the border of Mongolia, the Chinese concentrate a great deal of military power, they carry out manoeuvres at 30 - 50 meters from the border, they systematically breach the border and Chinese military units encroach on Mongolian territory. The goal is to involve Mongolia into a military conflict. Mongolia displays patience and protects itself from military collisions with the Chinese.

In this situation, can we speak about any contribution of China for the lessening of the international tension? We can not. Such position is incomprehensible to us. We need to intensify the struggle against Maoism. This struggle is an ingredient part of the struggle against imperialism.

[Translated by Julia Cherneva; Edited by Dr. Jordan Baev]