

---

**Transcript of the Meeting of the Executive Committee [Politburo]  
of the Romanian Communist Party, 20 May 1970**

**Participating** at the meeting are comrades Nicolae Ceausescu, Ion Gheorghe Mauer, Emil Bondaras, Paul Niculescu-Mizil, Gheorghe Pana, Gheorghe Radulescu, Ilie Verdet, Maxim Berghianu, Manea Manescu, Dumitru Popescu, Dumitru Popa, Leonte Rautu, Miron Constantinescu, Mihai Dalea, Mihai Gere, Ion Stanescu.

Also **invited** are comrades Stefan Voicu, Vasile Vlad, Vass Ghizela, and Constantin Mitrea.

The meeting started at 10:00 am and ended at 12:00 pm.

Cde. Nicolae Ceausescu:

In regards with the discussions we had with the leadership of the CPSU in Moscow, the best thing would be to get the minutes of the conversation done and give it to all the comrades [of the Politburo of the Central Committee] to read.

Cde. Ion Florescu:

They are working on the minutes of conversation.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

In regards with the way we were received..., generally this was done properly. Upon arrival, we sat down and had a cup of tea in the airport. Yesterday we began the discussions at 9:00 am, Bucharest time, 10:00 am Moscow time.

We spoke first and, in an hour and some we spoke, in the spirit of our discussion here in the Executive Committee, regarding some of [our] general concerns, of course, stressing the economic problems, especially those connected to the last meeting of the COMECON, the issue of bilateral relations, [suggesting that] what was decided upon [with us] is below what had been decided [by them] with other countries.

After that we expressed some general issues regarding the need to [further] develop the relationship between our parties.

Cde. Emil Bondaras:

And with exchanges of delegations, their make-up, etc.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

I finished with that and then [CPSU Secretary General Leonid] Brezhnev started speaking. He begun with a history of the relationship between the CPSU and the PCR, that there were many positive elements [of the relationship]: he mentioned the exchanges of delegations in the past year-7 from us [Romania], from them the participation [of delegations] to ideological reunions-also exchanges of technical documentation-they

gave us 3000 [pages] and we gave them 1200 [pages of technical documents]-as well as cultural exchanges-what we gave them and what they gave us. [He also mentioned that] there are issues of common interests, that both them and us appreciate the leading role of the party. After that he said that there are also a number of disagreements, especially as they are the concerned of the political realm. And he began by saying that that is a consequence of the fact that the position of Romania is opposed to the position of the Socialist countries. [He added that] of course, it is the right of every party to establish its own, general, political line, the direction of its foreign policy, but that in vital issues we should come to a consensus. [He said that] there are instances in which Romania took a common position, but that there are issues in which Romania did not act in common [with the Soviet Union and the other East European nations] and even acted demonstratively.

Cde. Stefan Voicu:

Twice or three time he underlined "demonstratively."

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

And he begun with the Federal Republic of Germany; that it is true that at the consultative meeting in 1966 that was discussed, that after all [diplomatic] relations with [West Germany] were [meant as an] encouragement to the FRG government (veneau în întâmpinarea guvernului RFG), that, of course, maybe you had economic incentives. [But that] underlines more the policies of [West German Prime Minister Willy] Brant and not [the policies] of the GDR and that it will be necessary that in the future we should consult [with them] in the spirit of what had been decided in December of 1966.

After that he mentioned the issue of the Middle East. He begun again with causes of the conflict with Israel, that we did not qualify Israel as an aggressor state, that after all this is encouraging the aggressor. [He mentioned] that we did not participate at the meeting in Prague. [He said] that they have information that a lot of Jews are emigrating from Romania, some of them young males who are eligible for military service; that Romania received [financial] credits from Israel, etc. More so, the formalization of the relationship with Israel [by establishing mutual embassies] shows that Romania is distancing itself from the class position in this issue.

Then there was Nixon's visit [in 1969], that this was a slap in the face for the progressive movement. That at the time when there's a war in Vietnam, when the Americans are doing this and that in Vietnam, that is the time when we received him, that we received him right before the [PCR] congress and that we even postponed the Congress in preparation for this visit. Considering this, how was he [Brezhnev] supposed to come to Romania-I did, among other things, complain that he did not visit Romania.

[He said] that he knows we used to help Vietnam but that at this time he does not know if we still do, that this might imply that Romania is "getting cozy" (cocheteaza) with imperialism.

Cde. Paul Niculescu-Mizil:

That this has the characteristics of "getting cozy" with the leaders of imperialism.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

Then he said that he does not know what Romania is getting from the Americans, what economic incentives, but that he has to say that this has created a breach in the Romanian prestige, that this is the reason why some

---

foreign delegates at the [PCR] Congress had taken a number of positions, and that these actions [the Romanians are taking] are proof of an isolation from the other Socialist countries.

After that he started talking about European security, of course, after he mentioned that we are all in favor of [European] security, that even in 1966 it was decided, but that Romania came up with the initiative of organizing a conference [on this subject]. The agreements reached at that conference had also been violated, and the fact that these proposals did not accomplish anything are also detrimental to the Romanian prestige—he was very preoccupied with Romania's prestige.

Then he said that we raised objections to the conference of the foreign affairs ministers on the subject of European Security and insisted a lot on this subject of European security, of military blocks, including the policy of dissolving alliances, thus also of dissolving the Warsaw pact.

[He mentioned] that NATO discusses, and that we too have the right to discuss all issues, [we too have the right] to hold summits. [He said] that it would be good thing if the foreign affairs ministers met after the [foreign affairs] ministers of NATO [countries] meet in May.

Then he talked about the differences [between our positions] in regards with issues in the Communist and Worker's movement. [He said] that in this case Romanian is not seeking [resolution] to some of the common problems; rather it is following some social interest. He begun with some problems, that we said at first that we will not participate at the consultative meeting [of the Communist and Workers parties] and that we participated in the end. Then he talked about the participation of the Chinese Communist Party. [He said] that the materials of the conference were not widely publicized in Romania and that this should be done since these are common materials and not of one single party and that they have a great importance everywhere.

[He said] that the publishing of the Journal "Issues of Peace and Socialism" is being done tendentiously, with some articles being taken out or some passages being censored. Yet this is a common Journal [of the Socialist world].

[He said] that Romania did not want to participate at the meeting for the preparation of the world anti-imperialist congress. As a matter of fact that was just an introduction since he then went on to discuss the issue of China, our position vis-à-vis the Chinese, [saying that] Mao does "I don't know what" and we are adopting a position of neutrality.

Cde. E. Bondaras:

That the position of our party is not consistent with the danger of Maoism.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

[He added] that we have we had published in Romanian newspapers some pictures from the Sino-Soviet border conflict, [and done that] in an unilateral fashion, using only Chinese sources while censoring the [Russian] sources.

[He said] that in regards with the Warsaw Pact we carry out a policy of duplicity, that we agree with all the documents but in reality we do not enforce the decisions. Then he raised the problem that we do not want to participate in [military] exercises. That we are generally raising the issue of doing away with [common] military exercises and [asked] how can we argue for such a thing, that look at the Arabs what happened when they no longer carried out military exercises; that the imperialist [forces] had [joint military] maneuvers.

That Romania is advocating the immediate dissolution of military blocks but that the Warsaw Treaty was established as a response to the establishment of the imperialist military alliances and that we do not make any difference between rattling weapons.

He said then that we had refused the proposals for the formation of a commission of the ministers of foreign affairs [of the Warsaw Treaty member nations]. Then or at some other time, he raised the issue that, after all the Warsaw Treaty has a clause requiring the consultation in regards with issues like this, such as [establishing] diplomatic relations, and that we have violated the terms of the treaty. Thus, [he went on] are all those fact aiding to the strengthening of the alliance or [are they] leading to its weakening? Maybe Romania does not want to be a member of the Warsaw Pact and in this case it should openly say so-and we can say this: it was suggested that it would be better if we were to leave the Warsaw Pact.

He also mentioned the relationship of Romania with Socialist countries. Even if in the beginning he gave us some numbers, that 90 per cent of coke we get from [the Soviet Union], that 40 per cent of cotton we also get from them, after that he began saying that the [commercial] relations have been greatly diminished, that they are not growing, that the COMECON decisions are not respected, that international organizations and joint ventures are resisted and that we do not want to participate, that for example we did not want to participate in INTERCHIM - the organization for computing technology. [He added] that we are experiencing a adjustment of Romania's economic relations towards the West, that we are establishing joint ventures with Western countries, such as in Copper with countries like Italy, France, Great Britain and at the same time we refuse to participate in the proposed joint ventures [with socialist countries]. He came up with a quote from a foreign correspondent who said, after I received Schiller, that Romania decided to accept [foreign] investment. [He said] that this economic policy is not in the national interests of Romania, since this will create problems [along the way] that [we have] already taken credits, that there is a negative balance [of trade], that he can show us that other countries passed through the same pains. [He said that] maybe the Romanians desire to reorient themselves towards the West.

Cde. P. Niculescu-Mizil:

That Romania should make this clear [if it is so].

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

When I responded to this, he said that he did not say such a thing, that there is no way his words could be interpreted this way.

Then he said that he would like very much to hear about good relations between our two parties and two people, but that, unfortunately, various scholars, historians, under different ways-he even gave some names among which Oprea was one-are trying to re-asses the relationship between Russian and Romania, to under-appreciate [Tsarist] Russia's role in the Balkans. Also, there are attempts to negate the participation of Romania in the anti-Soviet war. There are also attempts [to reopen the discussion] with regards to the events previous to World War II-and here he went back and forth regarding the politics of 1939.

[He said] that the role of the Soviet Army in the war and in the liberation is being underestimated. [here he added] of course, it did not have any connection with the previous idea, that he liked very much what was done with the reconsideration of certain historical events.

Cde. P. Niculescu-Mizil:

[He] shares the preoccupation of Cde. Ceausescu in regards with some issues which have been reconsidered.

Then he started talking about the plenary [session], that it would be positive if everything that was good in the past be maintained. That the class characteristics of past regimes must be taken in consideration.

Then he said that a series of cultural institutions of the Soviet Union [in Romania] have been closed, for example the Museum, the Russian-Romanian Institute at the [Romanian] Academy, the Maxim Gorki Institute and book store, that the activity of the ARLUS has been reduced, but that at the same time there are new libraries opening up in cooperation with western states-he gave the example of the US library. He then turned his attention to Mannheim, that this cannot be considered an issue of protocol.

[He said] that [the situation got so bad that] there are now antagonistic inscriptions on the Soviet embassy [in Bucharest].

This were, in general the issues raised, he ended with mentioning that graffiti [on the walls of the embassy].

Then he raised the issue of the Romanian position in regards with the issue of Czechoslovakia. After all, by the position adopted, Romania had caused damages [to the Soviet government], etc. [He said] that he does not understand where Zhao Enlai got the idea that there is a threat directed towards Romania, when they, who are neighbors with Romania did not know of any such threat. Of course, a lot of time passed since then and one can draw the conclusion that we [the Soviets] have acted justly in helping Czechoslovakia, since now the Czechoslovak people are thanking us.

Cde. E. Bondaras:

[He said that] the Romanian comrades, even though so much time had passed, are still criticizing the actions of the socialist countries, even during the congresses of other parties.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

And of course, this only complicates the relationship among our people. Of course [he said], the reasons for these disagreements must be searched in the past.

Cde. E. Bondaras:

He then listed [what he believes] are the causes.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

[He said] that before there were friendly relations [between the Soviet Union and People's Republic of China], but that some differences appeared during Khrushchev's leadership, since [Khrushchev] spoke more freely, did not have a lot of self control, but that all that should have been resolved long ago.

Maybe the Romanians [he continued] want to obtain some economic advantages by bringing up all these issues. It would be great if they said so. After all, you [the Romanians] should not take [economic aid] only from the Americans, we [the Soviets] would also offer [aid]. Of course, this [unilateral orientation] cannot lead to collaboration and that in the West there is the hope that Romania will lean towards the West, that a chain [of events] in created that we do not want to simplify (se creaza un lant pe care noi nu vrem sa-l

simplificam). The Romanians will [certainly] appreciate the patience [displayed] by the Soviet Union in relation to this issue, that we [the Soviets] want to develop this relationship and that we will respect the [concept of] equality of rights, mutual advantage, the sovereignty and national interests of Romania. Of course, we do not believe that it goes contrary to Romania's interests to have [friendly] relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. We believe that this meeting, today, can represent a turning point in the development of this [bilateral] relationship between our two countries. [He added that] it is necessary [for the Soviet Union] to carry out an advantageous trade [policy] and that it must be understood that in the last years Romania has no longer supplied [the Soviet Union] with a series of goods, copper [among others] but at the same time wants from [the Soviet Union] goods [worth] hard currency. [We understand] that Romania needs hard currency, but we also need it. In the future we need to keep in mind the need to develop these [bilateral economic] relations.

It would be good-he had said that before-if shortly following [this meeting] Maurer and Kosygin would meet to discuss this economic issues.

He ended, somewhat, on this note.

We took a 15 minutes break after that, and then I started speaking.

At one point, [Emil] Bondaras made the proposal to take a longer break, to go to the embassy, but these problems are so old, some of them we know so when, that they no longer surprise us. After the break we responded to the points made by Brezhnev. We too began with history. From the very beginning I said that, in his speech, Brezhnev made a series of accusations, insinuated a number of things in regards with [the actions] of the Romanian Communist Party with which we do not agree. We reject them and we hope that we are to discuss things openly, say what we mean. [I said] that if they are to start accusing us, branding us, there can be no friendship [between our parties].

Then I spoke about all these issues regarding history, regarding what we are doing now and that we too, as much as them, appreciate the role of the party and the state. But you will see that in the minutes of the conversation.

Cde. Emil Bondaras:

As far as that statement that Romania is isolated, we showed him how [much that is not] true.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

On all this issues that Romania has taken positions which oppose the positions of the socialist community, that [Romania] has taken unexpected positions, I replied that I must say that these statements cannot be accepted since they are not true. On the contrary, [I argued,] Romania is guiding its actions on the basis of the unanimously adopted documents, and here I too began with the Declaration of 1957. [I said] that in all our agreements, including in 1966, we have decided to act for the developing of [friendly] relationships with the FRG, and that not only did we put that in writing, but, even more so, in all our discussions, we have decided to act towards this goal. [I said] that we had discussed this issue in November as well; that [the Romanians] did inform [the Soviets] that we were moving ahead with the negotiations-other [countries] were even farther ahead with their negotiation, but no one made an issue out of that. Not only did Romania not violate [the previous agreements], but it acted constantly in support of the documents and declarations we

[the Socialist camp] agreed on. I explained to him that the stability of the relationships did not hurt, but it aided [the socialist camp], including the GDR. He said that [this action by the Romanian government] is isolating the GDR, and gave me the example of the Zeiss factory, of the lawsuit.

Cde. Ion Gheorghe Maurer:

Meaning that from a perspective of the law, the FRG is in the right in this case, and that the [lawsuit] was postponed so that we do not have to make a decision.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

We will send somewhat to see [what the situation is]. I told him that, on the contrary, we have helped [the socialist camp] by [adopting] this positions. As we have agreed upon in Moscow, [the communiqué said] that there was a positive change in the government of the FRG. It is true that the paragraph was introduced at our request, but they [all] signed it.

We are the only socialist country that spends the most time concerned about the relations with the GRD and some members of the Politburo [of the SED] thanked us for the diplomatic help we gave [them].

As far as the war in the Middle East is concerned, we presented once more our position, why at the time we thought it wise not to accept that declaration and what is our position at this time. [I said] that it is surprising to us that [the Soviets] are not trusting Romania and that they are viewing us with suspicion, that [too much] faith is being placed on very reactionary Arab [political] circles.

I told his that as far as our relationship with Israel is concerned, they are not at all more extraordinary that that of other countries, even among those countries that broke relations with Israel. More so, we have even more developed relations with the Arab nations and it surprises us that so much weight is placed on what some reactionary [Arab] circles are saying [about us].

In regards with Nixon's visit, if there are to be questions about what was discussed there, than many things could be also questioned. For example, [I said,] we could question what is being discussed between the Soviet Union and the United States in Vienna, since we do not know what is being said there and we have not been consulted [in this respect].

Cde. Stefan Voicu:

[When Cde. Ceausescu said that] they turned green.

Cde. Paul Niculescu-Mizil:

Yes, but we do not ask that question.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

When they heard that we are no about to ask that they breathed easier.

As far as [the Democratic Republic of] Vietnam (DRV) is concerned-I went on-we have given and we are continuing to give the most aid [to the DRV] after the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. [I told him] that we told Nixon that [the US] must leave from [South] Vietnam and that our position was also clearly expressed in the declaration about Cambodia.

If there are question about what Romania is receiving [from the US], we must say that the relations between

Romania and the US are not as developed as those of some other socialist countries, [some of] which even received credits. [That] includes the GDR, which has a gross trade balance with the US far greater than that of Romania.

[I said] that we are pleased to see that Comrade Brezhnev is so concerned with the prestige of Romania, but that Romania's prestige has not suffered at all, that it is very big, and that he must not worry himself on this account.

As far as the [PCR] Congress is concerned, [his perception] of this problem is once again false. There were 70 delegations present at the congress in Bucharest. We also received 14 [support] messages [from parties]. In regards with the fact that [some delegations] raised the problem of Nixon's visit, we have copies of the speeches they had prepared before their arrival, which do not contain a single word about this thing; we also have copies of the speeches they gave after they visited the embassy of the Soviet Union.

Cde. P. Niculescu-Mizil:

[At this,] Basov jumped up and said that nothing was worked on at the embassy. Afterwards however he recognized that there was a meeting held at the embassy.

Cde. Ghizela Vass:

With the Czechs.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

In regards with the issue of European security we have expressed our position, starting with 1966.

As far as the meeting of the Foreign Affairs Ministers is concern, we have raised this issue in Prague and in Budapest; [the Soviets] never gave a response at the time, saying that they will inform the governments, but nothing came of it. After that, when Macovescu went to Moscow he received an answer on this [issue], but the other socialist country did not receive an answer to this day. We all agreed with respect to a meeting of the European Nation, that all countries interested [in this issues] should participate. And this is against what we have decided must be done not [negotiations] between [alliance] but all countries interested [in finding a resolution to this issue] participated. Of course, Romania had made its point of view know, informing the European governments, stating that Romania is ready to participate at any [schedule] meeting. We are surprised that such a clear-cut issue is being described in this way-that Romania is against [participating in] a meeting of the foreign affairs ministers to discuss this issue. On the contrary, Romania [always] had a different position, and I do not understand who has the interest to present this issue in such a way. We have raised objections to the fact that there had been three meetings of the foreign affairs ministers, [and] a meeting of the First Secretaries [of the communist parties] in December, where a communiqué was made public, and, because we are concerned for the prestige of the foreign affairs ministers, we were wondering what they will be discussing if they have another meeting. In any case, we said at the time that if they plan to meet in May our foreign affairs minister will not be able to participate since he will not be in the country, but that we will send his deputy as our representative. However, from this one cannot draw the conclusion that we are against this meeting. We support [the idea] that the foreign affairs ministers meet as many times as is necessary, but we will like to set an agenda. We are not opposed to them meeting and discussing after the NATO [foreign affairs ministers] meet.

As far as the Warsaw Treaty is concerned, it is written in the documents that is the other alliance blocks will



---

dissolved, so will it. Romania acts only in the letter and spirit of our commonly [agreed upon] documents and positions. Why [else] did we participate at the Moscow conference?

After that I said that we have published, generally [speaking] the materials [concerning] the conference, even the fairly long summery [of opinion]. [Brezhnev] replied: yes, but you did not [published] everything that was said against [the People's Republic of] China. I said: of course, we only [published] what we considered [correct].

In regard with the [issues of peace and socialism], I said that we agreed, when it was created, that this will be a journal [for facilitating] an exchange of ideological opinions, that it will not [be a spring board] from which to attack other parties. We would like to keep it that way. However, as long as it will continue to attack other parties, we will not agree [with this policy].

In regards with the anti-imperialist congress, I said that this is another issue that is not thoughtfully described. Why are facts presented falsely, when it was Romania who called for the participation of all parties who would like to take part in the preparation [of the congress], and opposed [the formation] of a [non-representative] commission? And, after all there was no final decision taken [on this issue]. In any case, Romania was not part of the commission as it was proposed, and thus, it could not participate in a commission it was not part of. We are for participating in this congress and have supported this participation.

Then, I went to the issue of China. I said that it is true that the [current] situation worries us; that something must be done so an agreement is reached, that differences are smoothed over. [I said] that this is not a question of neutrality that we are not at all neutral. We have criticized the Chinese when they intervned in the internal affaires of other parties. We believe that through our action we are doing. A good thing, and that the time will come when [the Soviets] will be grateful to us. We desire that an agreement be reached, and we believe this to be the duty of every communist party. I told him that I do not know and I would like him to provide us with the newspaper in which the Chinese photographs were published. Later it was proven that that was all just a misunderstanding on their part.

Cde. Vlad Vasile:

Even during the meeting, Katushev, while speaking with Rusakov, told him: you have made a mistake here, [the issue is] some photographs of ours which we wonted to published in our own journal, Aurora and the Romanians refused. Yes, Katushev criticized them right there in the meeting.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

We said that we are standing firm on the line of the Warsaw Treaty as far as military readiness is concerned, in regards with the preoccupation of introducing military equipment, of receiving military equipment. But, at the same time, we are taking into consideration the fact that we have to take action in the direction of reaching a reduction in military forces. [Here] I raised the issue of military exercises, with the rattling of weapons, that this in is agreement with our common position. Again I brought up the declarations made in 1957, 1966, including the proposals for arms reductions made by the Soviet Union. Thus, we only act in support of this [idea]. Just as yourselves, we are proposing arms reductions. Of course, we do not believe that this can be done unilaterally, and as long as this [goal] will not be reached, we must take so [protection] measures.

Since the issue of military exercises was raised here... this very month there were three military exercises organized: one with the naval forces, two for the, air forces and one for the air defense system.

As far as the military exercise that Cde. Katushev is speaking about-[I said]-this is once again false. Not only were we not opposed, but we were [part of the] organizers. We sent the [Romanian] Chief of Staff [to the organizational committee], we gave him power to sign, so that the military exercise could take place, and he was told [by the Soviets] that they cannot go on with the exercise. Thus, it was not the Romanians who were opposed to this military exercise. However, as you [the Soviets] well know, we did told you, since 1966, that we will not participate in such military exercises except on the basis of government-to-government agreements.

As far as this commission of the foreign affairs ministers [is concerned]. This is an issue that is still being discussed, beginning with 1959-1960. We do not consider [this commission] to be of any value. The foreign affairs ministers could meet, and are meeting even now often enough. They stay two months at the UN, they have [plenty] of time to talk. At this [Soviet Foreign Minister Anatoly] Gromyko replied that he spend less time there [than two months].

Once again we said that we do not understand this issue [being raised here]: that Romania should make its position known on whether it would like to participate or not in the Warsaw Treaty Organization. This issue makes no sense, especially considering the position of Romania.

Then I moved on to the COMECON, to this issue of international organizations. I explained that we have contacted [the Soviets] and other socialist countries [regarding this issue]. There are many issues still in negotiation. We had an agreement with the Poles in regards with copper, and [then] they said that they are negotiating with the French, that for coke they are negotiating with the Japanese. Then we too made inquiries in other parts. For us it is more [economically] sound to take coke, copper, [natural] gas ad oil from you [the Soviets]. But you said that you couldn't give us any oil so we had to look somewhere else; we asked for [natural] gas and you said that you cannot see how that would be possible.

Cde. P. Niculescu-Mizil:

[We said] that you [the Soviets] are giving [oil and natural gas] to other [countries].

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

I said: you are exporting [oil and natural gas] to Bulgaria, you can also export it to [Romania]. Of course, I did not want to say that they are exporting to the FRG.

As far as [our] participation in a series of [international] organizations we talked [about it], debated it, and came to the conclusion that we should remain on the position we agreed on a year ago. We are for participating [in those organizations] in which we think [our participation] would be justified. Of course, along the way, [Brezhnev] said that they did not say this or that, that we misunderstood their position. In regards with this organization for computer technology I told him that we had reached agreement on all issues but that we have been stomped by some organizational problems. They said that they only raised the issue, that it is up to us if we want to participate or not, that they are not criticizing us.

We said that we would be satisfied to import from Socialist countries, we even handed them a list [of the goods we need], but they told us that some of those [goods listed] are not available. Then, of course, we will take from where we can. In any case, we have decided to ensure the future development of the Romanian economy, and if we cannot resolve [the issue of our import needs] with the socialist countries, we will resolve [this issue] through any means available to us.

After that, I told them that all these joint ventures [we are part of at this time] are [created] on the principle of equality [among partners], that they do not have any political conditions [attached], and we will not accept, under any circumstance and from no one, any sort of political conditions [for our participation in this ventures]. [I said] that one cannot talk about and we cannot agree with what was said [i.e.] that there is some sort of economic orientation of Romania towards the West.

I would like to thank Cde. Brezhnev for his preoccupation regarding Romania's economic condition, [his point] that [this perceived orientation] it is not in Romania's national interest. I must say however that the situation is not as he described, that we have accepted this credits deliberately, that we could easily solve this problem by reducing the volume of investment [in the country]. That however would be a mistake. Then Podgorniy said: it would be a mistake to [continue] do so. [I said] you should not concern yourself [to much] with Romania's balance [of payments] since [Brezhnev] alluded that at some point we too, just like others, will come begging [to them].

We will have our own program [of economic development] to insure that the balance [of payments] will also show improvement, but over time so that we can insure future [economic] development. Then I said that I do not understand what Cde. Brezhnev wanted to say when he said that maybe the Romanians want to re-orient [their economy] towards the West. If I was to think more about it-I said-it would mean [that Brezhnev thinks] that Romania should re-orient itself towards a market economy, but then [Brezhnev] said no, he did not say such a thing.

Cde. P. Niculescu-Mizil:

[Brezhnev] said: why are you interpreting [my words] this way? I never said that.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

As far as bilateral relations are concerned, I said that they were always good, but that historians can always interpret one event or another, and that this is their role. While we do not negate the role of the Russian army in the Balkans, one cannot negate the role of the Romanian army there either, that we have cemeteries of fallen Romanian soldiers there [in the Balkans] as well as the letter asking for help. After all, of course, everyone can interpret [these facts] in their own way. But I find it surprising that we are talking here about the progressive role of Tsarist government, that I do not want to start quoting here Lenin with respect to this [so called progressive] role. Suslov then intervened and said [they are saying that about Czarism] only at this time, [speaking only] generally, [referring] to the Balkans.

Cde. Stefan Voicu:

[They said] that the [Russian-Turkish] Balkan Was had a class dimension.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

After that I said that we do not try to negate the participation of the bourgeois Romania in the anti-Soviet war, but it is a known [fact] that the communist opposed the Romanian bourgeoisie. The Romanian

---

Communists were the ones that organized the fight [in Romania] against this war, and the fact that Romania switched sides in this war underlines the indictment of the Romanian bourgeoisie for its participation in [the anti-Soviet] war.

I said that we appreciate the participation of the Red Army, of the Soviet Union [to the liberation of Romania]. Unfortunately, it cannot be said that as far as Romania is concerned facts are truthfully presented, even though its role is known, and that the king of Romania [Mihai I] was among the few state leaders that received the Star of Victory for [Romania's] contribution [to the war effort].

As far as the Museum is concerned, [I said that] we took those measures in order to better show the value and establish some order [in the museum's holdings]. In our own History museum there is an exhibit, which displays our relations with Russian and the relations with the CPSU. In regards with the Russian language, instead of [maintaining] an institute with poor results, we have incorporated the study of the Russian language and literature in the university.

As for ARLUS, they have a palace in [Romania], and in some of the bigger cities they have some cultural centers and I do not know if in the Soviet Union there is an equivalent thing. As far as I know, it does not. I told him that ARLUS publishes a newspaper that is sold in bookstores, under the Russian Book [section]. After all, Cde. Brezhnev mentioned that in Romania there were 20 million book published. As far as the libraries are concerned, we have contacted all the socialist countries, just as we do in France and in other countries. We are interested that libraries be opened in Romania and that we open up [libraries] in other countries. To this they said that they understand [our position] and raise no objections [to it].

Then we discussed the issue of the graffiti. I told him that I do not know how this happened, that only 15 days before this meeting someone placed graffiti on the fence of the embassy, that I don't even know how someone found a spot to write on the fence since the fence is made of iron bars. But even if we admit that there is such a person, he is a madman, and what does this prove [after all]? We never said that a number of Soviet officials are saying this publicly. We believed that these are occasional problems and that it is not worth wasting time on them.

On the issue of Czechoslovakia, I don't want to talk about it. I must say that we, even now, hold the opinion that the intervention in Czechoslovakia was a mistake. [I added] that not only things have not gotten back to normal but that they continue to grow in complexity. We would like very much things to get back to normal [in Czechoslovakia] but as far as we know things are far way from normal. I also emphasized that, of course, all this are making bilateral relations more complicated, and that it would be better to ask ourselves what are the causes of the of the differences and misunderstandings. [I said] that, in my opinion, [these causes] cannot be limited or reduced to the idea that Khrushchev had problems controlling himself. Of course, with Cde. Khrushchev we had our own problems. Many we have discussed [before]. But those are not the causes. Here we are talking about the idea that beginning with 1960, 1962, a new type of relationship was introduced among socialist states. [I am referring to] the idea of economic, political and military integration [of the socialist nations], which means [of course] [giving up sovereignty] which Romania cannot and will not accept. These are the causes, which led to this situation, and this is why it is necessary to bring clarity [to the situation]. We are for cooperation, [in the form] to which we have agreed, but we will not accept, a Romania will never will not sign such agreements.

As far as what the West thinks [of Romania]... If we are to think about what the West thinks, there are many things being said about the Soviet Union, but we believe that we should discuss about what the Western media or about what the west thinks [in general], when we are discussing any disagreements among ourselves.

Then I said that I did not understand and do not understand what Cde. Brezhnev refereed to when he said that the Romanians will appreciate the patience of the Soviet Union in these issues.

Cde. Stefan Voicu:

Good will and patience, [that's what] he said.

Cde. Dumitru Popescu:

This is what is important: "patience."

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

[I asked:] What was Cde. Brezhnev referring to? He replied that he did not say this here. Rusakov also jumped in and said [that Brezhnev] was referring to the Chinese. I told him: You said this [refereeing] to both the Chinese and [to us]. He replied that there are the minutes of the conversation, you will read and you will see that I said no such thing.

After that I praised Brezhnev's declaration regarding the respect for the equality of rights, respect for sovereignty and independence [among parties and states]. [I said] that for collaboration [to take hold] it is necessary to have mutual respect and [only] on this basis can [parties] act and that we want to act, to discuss to come to an agreement [with the other parties]. We would like to see this meeting become a turning point towards the normalization and future development of [bilateral] relationships. I said that we agree with the idea that trade should be advantageous [to all parties involved], that we can't even think of it in a different way. We understand that not even the Soviet Union can sustain a trade [policy that is to their disadvantage]. We agreed that [Romanian President of the Council of Ministers, Ion Gheorghe] Maurer and [Soviet President to f the Council of Ministers, Annatoly] Kosygin should meet.

In regards with the issue of gathering information, I told [the Soviets] that I was thinking of dropping the issue, but that the comrades in the delegation are insisting that I tell them [our opinions]. I asked what is the reason behind the fact that a number of Soviet officials are contacting [private] Romanian citizens and requesting information on various issues? [I said] you know very well, and we told you this in 1964, and even after that, if you have any questions ask through official channels and we will tell you everything. [I told them] that we do not like being forced to take measures against various citizens.

Cde. P. Niculescu-Mizil:

To this they replied: we don't even have something like that in [the People's Republic of] China. There was a decision of the Politburo [of the CPSU] in this issue and we do not practice such things.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

He replied right away. As a matter of fact this was the only time when Brezhnev interrupted me in the middle of a sentence. I told him: we are asking you to ask your citizens-we will do the same-indications to no longer do such a thing.

This was the end. Of course, I also made another ending [to my speech], I could not very well end the conversation talking about the agency. We took another 20 minutes break. They consulted among themselves.

When they returned they began by saying that I tackled some of the issues based on the notes I took [during Brezhnev's speech] and that it is likely that I could not take down all the ideas, everything that was said, but that after I will read the minutes of the conversation I will see that some things that I responded to were never said my him. [They said] that this is understandable, that I took notes during the time he spoke but that I could not write down everything, that after I will read the minutes of the conversation I will reconsider some of my conclusions.

[They said] that for relations to improve we must liquidate everything with might [adversely] effect there relations. [They said] that I said that everything are problems connected to the issue of protocol, including the visit of Nixon. Based on that [they said], one can draw the conclusion that we [the Soviets] are mistaken in everything and that you [the Romanians] have been right in everything [you did]. We could understand if you came and said, of course comrades, we have our own weaknesses, but we will analyze, we will think about [them]. However, instead of this, you came over and rejected everything.

Cde. P. Niculescu-Mizil:

[They said] that we see in some things normal protocol issues but that they see those same issues for a political perspective.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

[They said:] We see [these issues] from a political [perspective] while you see them as issues concerning protocol, organization. These are the differences. In [regards with] China, we understand [Romania's] relations with [the Chinese] but we see them from a political perspective. In India you have relations with two [communist] parties.

Cde. P. Niculescu-Mizil:

[The Soviets] would like to see how does Romania view China? This is what they want to know: on whose side is Romania?

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

And then they came back to the information gathering issue. [They said] that they do not carry out such activities anywhere and that if we catch a Soviet or Romanian provocateur, we can take any measures we want against them.

Cde. P. Niculescu-Mizil:

[They said:] Take note of the declaration [of the CPSU Politburo], that there were instructions given out that there are to be no more of such activities. If you catch a Soviet or Romanian provocateur, [you can] take measures [against them].

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

In regard with Czechoslovakia, [they said that] of course, there are complications, that what the opportunists

and the counter-revolutionaries have done in a year and a half cannot be undone [over night] and that of course they should be helped.

Cde. P. Niculescu-Mizil:

[They also said] that they Romanian Communist Party should no longer use its point of view [in regards to the situation there] as propaganda.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

In regards with the economic issues, they said that they are not thinking of putting any type of pressure on Romania, that they want to develop the bilateral relations. After that we came to an agreement on the meeting between Maurer and Kossigyn. [Brezhnev] brought up the issue of the Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Assistance, that we should sign it [at that time], and we came up with a number of dates [at which the meeting could take place]. Finally we settled on 6 June [1970]. They first said 22 June but we said that we cannot [since] Maurer leaves for West Germany and then the Padishah of Iran comes [to Romania].

[The discussion] ended in a relaxed atmosphere, making jokes and [talking] about hunting.

Cde. Stefan Voicu:

Podgornii was from time to time intervening with jokes, relaxing [the atmosphere].

Cde. Emil Bondaras:

After that they organized a dinner.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

We agreed, again upon departure, that we should accomplish what we had agreed upon.

We believe that the way things developed [from beginning to] end was positive. Of course, at first they attempted, as they have always done, to start from an [uncompromising,] unyielding position. When they say that nothing can be accomplished that way, they changed their tune and declared themselves in accord [with us], [saying] that the most important thing is to learn from the past and to look to the future. As Podgornii said, let's get back to the old friendship. Very well-I said-we agree. This is how we ended [the discussions].

I don't know, do the comrades who were part of the delegation have anything more to add?

Cde. P. Niculescu-Mizil:

This was indeed a very successful visit for our party. It lead to a discussion in which we made our position clear and it created the possibility for [further] developing the relationship in the future.

Cde. Ceausescu gave a response to all issues [raised there]. The fact that the response was immediate, the fact that he responded firmly yet at the same time maintaining complete calm, but especially since [our] positions were supported with arguments were extremely important [factors]. They presented some things, came up with facts which were easily disproved. We could have proved at any time that our newspapers did not publish any Chinese pictures [regarding the Sino-Soviet border clashes]. To some things they recognized that we were right.

Cde. E. Bondaras:

It was a heavy hit, [it was] pathetic for them, who were putting so much faith in what the [party] apparatus gave them, that their arguments were disproved on the spot and that their complete incompetence and weakness were proven. It was a major surprise for them the competence and clarity with which the presentation made by Cde. Ceausescu, who, unlike them, had the advantage of having a good grasp of all the issues. As much as they are the prisoners of the [party] apparatus, they have found themselves in front of a party leader which had a good grasp on all issues, and immediately [was able to] quote the date and the year, what one or another said, what happened [at that time]. This was the most valuable part of the discussion. Also, [of great advantage was] the uncompromising resolve, especially where the analysis of the causes are concerned. There [it was] pointed out: here is the cause, the re-orientation of the nature of the relationships among socialist countries, in the [attempts to] integrate politically and economically [the socialist countries]. We are for cooperation but we are unequivocally opposed to integration and we will not sign any document of economic, political or military integration.

Cde. P. Niculescu-Mizil:

We understand the idea of open discussions, but even in these open discussions it is inadmissible that such accusations can be used, [that] such insinuation against a party [can be made]. There must be trust.

Cde. Stefan Voicu:

They put together a big file, which took them weeks or months [to compile], with things that happened over the years and which, presented in such a way, after their own liking, to show that a position without [basis] in class [struggle], to show that Romania is not taking a class position. The replies and arguments made by Cde. Ceausescu disappointed them, as we say in Romanian, it burst their bubble, since it was a very logical argumentation, [delivered] immediately. It was probably better that we did not go to the embassy, [and] that showed the ability of the [Romanian Communist] Party and of its leader to immediately adopt a position. Cde. Ceausescu spoke for three and three quarter hours with perfect logic, [raising] issues that could not be argued against on the spot. What they wanted to contest immediately was the issue of information gathering, but [even then] they were unable to. [Soviet Foreign Minister] Gromyko was restless for over two hours but could not say a thing. This was a very important thing [that they said]well, you say you have no fault, only we are at fault.

Cde. E. Bondaras:

Of course, I left with a bit of sorrow [in my heart] leaving behind a collective that was behind [the times]. As the discussions progressed, they were getting more and more defensive.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

Are the comrades of the Executive Committee in agreement with the position adopted by the delegation [to Moscow]?

(All comrades are in agreement)

After all, you will also see the minutes of the conversation. Generally, this was the position. I believe that, in the spirit of the agreements reached [in Moscow] we should take a number of measures. We must initiate, today, contact with them so that we can set a date for the meeting next week. We need to prepare the discussion well, to think of what issues to raise there, aside from developing [of relations] in



general. Of course, the comrades need to go and set this [agenda]. Cde. Gogu [Gheorghe] Radulescu should go.

In what their return visit is concerned, [visit] with we decided upon, it should be a governmental visit, and not just for the signing of the [Friendship and Mutual Assistance] treaty but also, generally speaking, an official visit. We must prepare for it. Of course, we must see [and] implement some measures, to send a note to the embassy, to inform them of this, [of this] agreement for this and that.

When we will have the plenary session [of the central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party] we will have to inform them of the meeting we had [in Moscow]. We will need to decide if we will give them the minutes of the conversation as well.

Cde. P. Niculescu-Mizil:

No, there is no need to give them the minutes of the conversation. Yu should make a short presentation.

Cde. Gheorghe "Gogu" Radulescu:

It would be better if you were to make a short presentation.

Cde. N. Ceausescu:

We believe that we must act, as a result of the discussion [held in Moscow], of what was decided [there] in the direction of developing the [bilateral] relations, of passing certain obstacles, of course, while preserving [our] principles.

[Do you] agree?

(All comrades are in agreement.)

Cde. Ceausescu:

The meeting is adjourned.

*[Source: National Central Historical Archives (ANIC), Fund: Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party, folder 59/1970, pp. 5-27. Translated by Mircea Munteanu]*