Foreign Ministry Strictly confidential! M-KS-288:f. 5/354. Prepared in 27 copies (15 December 1964) Approved by Comrade Dezso Nemes R E P O R T To prepare the forthcoming session of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty, the deputy foreign ministers of the Warsaw Treaty members conducted talks in

Warsaw on 10

December 1964.

I.

1.) In the course of the discussions regarding the western powers' objectives, the participants concluded that despite the existing differences of views and opinions within NATO, the development of a multilateral nuclear force poses a real danger. In the future, the development of a multilateral nuclear force, probably in a form slightly modified in comparison to the existing plans, is a definite possibility. For this reason, it is both necessary and expedient that the Political Consultative Committee is convened. 2.) During the discussion, the deputy foreign ministers agreed that the process of developing a multilateral nuclear force was far from complete. The differences between the NATO members and the anxieties stirring in the western world seem to suggest that the resolute, calm and constructive measures on the part of the Warsaw Treaty members might exert a sobering and restraining effect on advocates of a multilateral nuclear force, thus mobilizing world opinion and reinforcing the reservations against the American and West-German plans, while also planting the doubt into those who have not yet formed an opinion.

3.) At the present our joint activities against the development of a multilateral nuclear force should be channeled in three directions:

a.) Member states should make individual diplomatic steps towards the NATO countries and nonaligned nations and, in accordance with the situation of the individual states, they should present their positions in a differentiated manner.

b.) At its January session, the Political Consultative Committee should form a joint position in connection with the multilateral nuclear force and the suggestions regarding the agreed tasks.c.) After the January session it also seems expedient that members of the Warsaw Treaty have the proposal "The Prevention of the Spread of NATO's multilateral nuclear force and atomic weapons" added to agenda of the 19th General Assembly of the United Nations.

India has already submitted a proposal to the 19th General Assembly about the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons. If our proposal is accepted, it is possible that the General Assembly will decide to merge the two items. The participants were of the opinion that this would be a favorable outcome for us, because in this way we could invest India's proposal aimed against China with a different, anti-imperialist character. Although it is unlikely that a resolution satisfactory to our demands would be passed, it still seems prudent to submit the proposal, since by doing that we can put the Americans and the other advocates of the multilateral nuclear force in a difficult spot.

The deputy foreign ministers agreed that the problem could be discussed in substance at the January session.

II.

In discussing the questions relating to the January session, the deputy foreign ministers, with the exception of the Romanian representative, assigned high priority to the convening of the Political Consultative Committee's session and, therefore, avoided laying emphasis on the differences of opinions. 1.) All the sides agreed to convene the Political Consultative Committee in Warsaw for 10 January 1965 (Tuesday). The duration of the event was provisionally set at two days. Since the deputy foreign ministers were authorized to agree on the date of the event, the date set for the

Copyright 1999-2006 Parallel History Project on NATO and the Warsaw Pact (PHP). All rights reserved If cited, quoted, translated, or reproduced, acknowledgement of any document's origin must be made as follows: "Parallel History Project on NATO and the Warsaw Pact (PHP), www.isn.ethz.ch/php, by permission of the Center for Security Studies at ETH Zurich and the National Security Archive at the George Washington University on behalf of the PHP network."

beginning of the session could be regarded as accepted.

At the request of the participants, the Polish comrades undertook to coordinate the tasks associated with the preparation and organization of the session.

2.) With the exception of Romania's representative, all the participants agreed that the various member states be represented by the party's first secretary, the President of the Ministerial Council, the ministers of Foreign Affairs and Defense, as well as any other persons the individual member states thought necessary.

The Romanian representative held to the view that the level and composition of the deputation representing the various countries at the session of the Political Consultative Committee were matters for the individual parties to decide. It appears that the leaders of the Romanian party reserve the right to decide the level of representation at the January session.

The Romanian view deserves attention on two counts. First, it is well known that the Albanian People's Republic placed itself outside the framework of the Warsaw Treaty when, in contrast with the other member states, the first secretary of the Albanian Workers' Party and the President of the Ministerial Council of the Albanian People's Republic declined to attend the actual session of the Political Consultative Committee. If we were to accept the Romanian view now, we would implicitly abrogate our resolution of 1961 on Albania's membership.

Second, the endorsement of the Romanian view would allow certain member states to paralyze the work of the Political Consultative Committee and to render it ineffective by sending low-level deputations. Despite the Romanian position, the rest of the member states agreed to delegate their own deputations in the outlined composition.

3.) Poland's representative submitted a proposal to hear Commander in Chief A. Grechko's report on the activities of the Unified Armed Forces and on the military implications of the development of NATO's multilateral nuclear force.

The Romanian representative abstained from forming an opinion. The rest of the participants were favorably inclined to the proposal, emphasizing that this was in compliance with both the founding document of the Warsaw Treaty and the previous practice of the Political Consultative Committee. Since the deputy foreign ministers were not authorized to settle this question, they agreed that the member states would inform the Foreign Ministry of the Polish People's Republic of their respective positions in connection with the proposal.

I recommend that we inform the Foreign Ministry of the Polish People's Republic of the following: the Hungarian People's Republic agrees to Commander-in-Chief Grechko's attendance at the Political Consultative Committee's session. If it is thought necessary at the meeting, Comrade Grechko can be asked to give his views on the military implications of the development of NATO's multilateral nuclear force.

4.) The representative of the Romanian People's Republic expressed his regrets that not every member state of the Warsaw Treaty had been invited to attend the preparatory talks of the deputy foreign ministers' meeting. In his opinion, the January session of the Political Consultative Committee will only be a success, if every member state is represented.

In the discussion of this point the deputy foreign ministers emphasized that it would be useful if all the member states took part in the work of the Political Consultative Committee. There was no formal obstacle to Albania's participation. How much political reality the Romanian proposal had was a different question.

Albania's invitation would pose certain difficulties. The Albanian side had not taken part in the Committee's work for years. The leaders of Albania's Party and government had different views on a number of important international issues. Among others, they do not agree with our passing over the issue of the German peace treaty; also, they view the Moscow nuclear test-ban treaty as a sellout, and do not share our views on preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Copyright 1999-2006 Parallel History Project on NATO and the Warsaw Pact (PHP). All rights reserved If cited, quoted, translated, or reproduced, acknowledgement of any document's origin must be made as follows: "Parallel History Project on NATO and the Warsaw Pact (PHP), www.isn.ethz.ch/php, by permission of the Center for Security Studies at ETH Zurich and the National Security Archive at the George Washington University on behalf of the PHP network."

Despite all this, the participants agreed, in principle, to invite the representative of the Albanian People's Republic to the meeting. At the same time, they emphasized that Albania's rejection of a possible invitation should not paralyze the work of the Warsaw Treaty, nor should it lead to the postponement of the session.

The Soviet Union, Poland, and the German Democratic Republic agreed to Albania's invitation. Leaders of the Czechoslovakian Communist Party and the Bulgarian Communist Party have not yet discussed the question. According to the final agreement, on receipt of a positive response from all the member states, the Polish comrades entrusted with the work of preparation would invite, on behalf of the Warsaw Treaty, representatives of the Albanian People's Republic.

5.) In a general manner, the Romanian representative hinted at the possible connection between the resumption of the Warsaw Treaty's normal functioning and the question of the countries with observer status in the Political Consultative Committee.

The participants of the preparatory meeting thought that, in view of the complex nature of the question, the proposal should be transferred into the jurisdiction of the Political Consultative Committee, and so the participation of observers at the January session seemed implausible.

Since the Geneva convention would not permit the participation of the two Vietnams in military blocs until the country's unification, it seemed prudent not to invite the Vietnamese comrades. Cuba's special geographical and political situation recommended caution in connection with this socialist country's participation. As regards Yugoslavia, the country's peculiar foreign political principles made it unlikely that it would welcome our invitation.

For the Hungarian delegation the most prudent course in discussing this issue at the January session of the Political Consultative Committee would be to agree to the invitation of the representatives of the People's Republic of China, the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Mongolian People's Republic, in the capacity of observers at the forthcoming sessions of the Political Consultative Committee.

The invitations could be issued after the next session by the Polish People's Republic on behalf of the Warsaw Treaty. The Polish side could express a hope that the participation and activity of the observers would be in complete harmony with the principles accepted by the member states.

6.) An agreement has been reached on the topic of the Political Consultative Committee's next session: "The Position of the Warsaw Treaty Members on the NATO Plans to Establish a Multilateral Nuclear Force".

The session will be opened by the representative of the Polish People's Republic, followed by Comrade W. Ulbricht's brief introduction in which he will describe the purpose of the meeting and present the view of the German comrades. This will be followed by a free exchange of opinions, the speeches by the delegations and the hearing of Marshal Grechko's report.

7.) The Romanian representative was against the idea that the representatives of one or more countries should be asked to prepare a preliminary draft of the public statement about the January session and, therefore, he also objected to the acceptance of the German comrades' draft proposal as a basis for negotiation. In his opinion this task should be performed by the deputations at the meeting. Until then the various delegations should carry out the preparatory work separately.

Presumably, the Romanian side will object to the idea of joint preparation until it sees Albania's invitation guaranteed.

8.) In connection with the proposal drafted by the German comrades, views were exchanged on the main features of the statement to be issued. There was agreement on the point that, instead of a lengthy propagandistic piece, the statement should be a concise and carefully worded document. The statement must be directed against the multilateral nuclear force and its advocates. Our conclusions and constructive proposals must be based on calm and composed reasoning. It seems plausible that, as a constructive alternative to the multilateral nuclear force , we recommend the acceptance of the Gomulka–Rapacki plan, the mutual reduction of military expenditure and armed forces personnel, or perhaps some other ideas.

Copyright 1999-2006 Parallel History Project on NATO and the Warsaw Pact (PHP). All rights reserved If cited, quoted, translated, or reproduced, acknowledgement of any document's origin must be made as follows: "Parallel History Project on NATO and the Warsaw Pact (PHP), www.isn.ethz.ch/php, by permission of the Center for Security Studies at ETH Zurich and the National Security Archive at the George Washington University on behalf of the PHP network."

The closing section of the statement must contain references that clearly indicate to the NATO countries that if they decide to go ahead with the development of a multilateral nuclear force, we shall meet that situation with adequate measures.

9.) The Romanian delegate objected to the issue of a communiqué on the 10 December meeting of deputy foreign ministers. In his opinion, the publication of such a communiqué would be contrary to the goal of deepening the conflicts between the NATO countries.

10.) Our Polish hosts provided extremely favorable conditions for the conference.

Budapest, 14 December 1964.

Károly Erdélyi

III.

DRAFT RESOLUTION

1.) The [HSWP] Political Committee accepts the report on the Warsaw meeting and once again approves the date 19 January 1965 as the date set for the start of the Political Consultative Committee's session. It instructs the Foreign Ministry to prepare the draft of the Hungarian statement to be presented at the meeting.

2.) Comrade János Kádár will lead the Hungarian delegation at the Political Consultative Committee; the other members will be comrades János Péter, Lajos Czinege and Károly Erdélyi. If the delegations of the other countries include their Warsaw Ambassador, then the Hungarian delegation will also include Comrade Ferenc Martin.

3.) The Foreign Ministry is to inform the Foreign Ministry of the Polish People's Republic of the following: The Hungarian People's Republic does not oppose the invitation of the Albanian People's Republic's representatives at the January session of the Political Consultative Committee, and we also agree to the participation of Marshal A. Grechko in the meetings of the Political Consultative Committee. If the Committee thinks it necessary, Comrade Grechko should inform the participants about the military aspects of NATO's development of a multilateral nuclear force.

[Translated by Ervin Dunay, Central European University]

Copyright 1999-2005 Parallel History Project on NATO and the Warsaw Pact. All rights reserved. If cited, quoted, translated, or reproduced, acknowledgement of any document's origin must be made as follows: "Records of the Meetings of the Warsaw Pact Deputy Foreign Ministers, ed. by Csaba Békés, Anna Locher, Christian Nuenlist. Parallel History Project on NATO and the Warsaw Pact (PHP), www.isn.ethz.ch/php, by permission of the Center for Security Studies at ETH Zurich and the National Security Archive at the George Washington University on behalf of the PHP network."