

---

**Foreign Ministry  
Ministry of Defense  
Top Secret! Prepared in 4 copies  
1 copy: 5 pages  
Copy no. 1  
Sfsz: F/44  
Report  
To the [HSWP] Political Committee  
On the meetings between the Warsaw Treaty deputy foreign ministers in Berlin  
and the Warsaw Treaty deputy defense ministers in Moscow**

I.

On a mandate from the HSWP's [Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party's] Political Committee, the Chief of Staff, General Károly Csémi, took part in a conference held from 4 through 9 February 1966 in Moscow; and deputy foreign minister Károly Erdélyi attended a meeting held from 10 through 12 February 1966 in Berlin; both conferences had been initiated by the Central Committee of the CPSU.

At both conferences, the deputy ministers represented the viewpoint approved by the Political Committee.

II.

With the exception of the Romanian deputy foreign minister, all the delegates in Berlin agreed to a discussion of the issues raised by the Soviet comrades.

With the exception of the Romanian representative, every delegate voiced similar views, save a few insignificant details.

The Romanian delegate declared that he was against holding a discussion on the points suggested by the Soviet comrades. In his opinion, the main flaw in the operation of the Warsaw Treaty Organization so far derived from the fact that the principles of the Treaty had not been put into practice. Among others, the principle of consultation was violated. As an example, he mentioned the case of the shipping of missiles during the Cuban crisis, along with the submission to the United Nations of draft proposals about general disarmament and an agreement to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The principle of equality was again violated in August 1961, when the Albanian delegation was excluded from the concurrent session of the Political Consultative Committee for failing to send delegates at the highest level. The Romanian delegate demanded that the resolution be withdrawn and the Albanian People's Republic be notified. According to the Romanian representative, further violations of the fundamental principles took place, when the PCC exceeded its authority on several occasions in the past, pretending to be above the heads of the member states; as an example, he brought up the point that the Commander in Chief of the Unified Armed Forces had to report to this organization.

The Romanian delegate stressed the point on several occasions that every party and every government should take sole responsibility for its foreign policies both in the eyes of its own people and in the face of world opinion. Consultation between the parties was necessary only in questions, which also involved the responsibility of the other members. Such consultations could be held even within the existing framework – the visits of party and government delegations, bilateral meeting of ministers, consultations during the UN sessions - , implying that the PCC sessions only constituted one form of consultation. There was no need to put the meetings of the Warsaw Treaty Countries' Political Consultative Committee on a regular footing. The level of representation should be up to the individual countries to decide. The Council of Foreign Ministers was unnecessary. The consultation within the framework of the PCC provides the

guidelines for the actual form of the consultations between the foreign ministers or their deputies. There is no need for a Permanent Secretariat.

The Romanian delegate strongly urged for the compliance with the basic principles of the Treaty in the future, demanding consultation in every issue that concerns the member states. To this effect, improvements must be made in the preparations for the PCC sessions. A nonpermanent secretariat of a technical nature should be set up for the task of preparing the sessions, and the task should be carried out by the foreign ministry of the country, which has been designated to organize the next session. The PCC sessions should be held in the member states on a rotational basis.

It became clear at the Berlin conference that the Romanian side had no intention to engage in a discussion about the issues raised by the Soviet comrades. At the same time, the Romanian delegate made it clear that in future they would be willing to participate in discussions at the Political Consultative Committee's sessions about issues that had interest to them. At the meeting, the delegates agreed to brief the central committee and the party of their respective country about the exchange of views taking place.

### III.

The specific items that were on the agenda of the meeting of deputy defense ministers included the legal status of the Commander in Chief of the Unified Armed Forces and the definition of the authorization and organizational structure of the office of the Commander in Chief of the Unified Armed Forces (CCUAF).

As a result of the consultation, the delegates came to a rough agreement about the following points:

- the legal authority of the Commander in Chief should be based on the strategic planning of the armed forces under the command of the CCUAF, along with the work of coordination of the joint maneuvers;
- the establishment of either a Military Consultative Council under the PCC or a Military Council under the High Command;
- the appointment of the deputies of the Commander in Chief selected from the armies of the member states;
- the establishment of the staff of the CCUAF selected from the generals and the officers of the armies of the member states both in peacetime and in war;
- the establishment of a Technical Committee for coordinating development work in military technology;

With regard to the role and authority of the CCUAF, several delegates proposed that in peacetime the CCUAF should be planning the strategic employment of the troops under its command, and in war it should actually conduct the military operations.

According to the Soviet position, the CCUAF should play an auxiliary role, acting as a liaison between the Soviet staff and the armies of the other member states, and therefore it can only have a coordinative function.

Against the majority view shared by most of the delegates, whereby the establishment of a Military Consultative Council under the PCC would be desirable, the Romanian delegation proposed that the Military council should be subordinated to the CCUAF, and that, on the principle of parity, it should make collective decisions in every questions within the authority of the CCUAF. The Romanian delegation was also adamant that the plans and measures originated at the CCUAF should only take effect after the approval of the government of the member states. Against the opinion shared by the majority of the delegates, whereby the Commander in Chief and the Chief of Staff should be selected from the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union, the Romanian delegation firmly held the view that the army officers of other member states should

also be eligible for the posts of both the Commander in Chief and the Chief of Staff, and that the two officers should not belong to the same armies.

The delegations' opinion was split on the question whether the Commander in Chief should be allowed to assume a post in his army, too, or whether he should be truly independent. With regard to the number of deputies the Commander in Chief should have, together with the issues concerning the number of staff officers and the organizational structure the joint staff, and also the precise figures of the member states' contribution to the staff, the position of the various delegations differed.

In the course of the debate – and actually going beyond the preset agenda of the meeting – another problem emerged in connection with the political/military direction of a coalitional war, which also divided the delegates' views. According to the Soviet position, the ultimate command of the war should rest with the Supreme High Command, which should effectively be based on the working apparatus of the Soviet Chief of Staff. In the Romanian delegation's opinion, such a command would be irreconcilable with the sovereignty of the member states. The delegates agreed that the question of military command in war posed a serious problem, which would definitely require clarification and could only be resolved at the highest level of decisionmaking. At the end of the conference, the approved principles to form the basis of further work were recorded in the "Minutes" authenticated by Marshal Grechko. The delegates were to report the content of the meeting to the leaders of their party and government. Members of the conference all agreed on the point that the work should continue in the interest of resolving the debated issues.

#### IV.

The overall conclusions drawn from the work of the conference is as follows:

1/ The proceedings at the Berlin conference made it clear that at the moment there is little hope for convening a session of the Political Consultative Committee to hold a discussion about the points raised by the Soviet comrades. Therefore, it seems sensible that we should use the bilateral talks with the Romanian side to persuade them to give up their position, which is unacceptable for us. This issue should be added to the agenda of the Hungarian party and government delegations for their forthcoming Romanian visit.

2/ Although at the conference of the deputy defense ministers, the Romanian delegate admitted the need to strengthen the Unified Armed Forces, and he even made concrete proposals to resolve the problems on the agenda, as a whole, these proposals were not aimed at the strengthening of the joint military command; on the contrary, to some extent they seemed to be steps in the wrong direction in relation to the existing practices. Nevertheless, the Romanian delegate himself concurred in the continuation of the negotiations.

Therefore, some of the military issues hold out the prospect of further talks, and so it would be wise to continue the work started at the conference. We should nevertheless anticipate the existing differences of opinion between the political bodies also to pose difficulties in the resolution of the fundamental military issues.

Budapest, February ... 1966

János Péter Lajos Czinege

*[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.”