

---

MINUTES  
Of the Meeting of the Deputy Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Treaty States  
held on 19 June 1970

[PART 1]  
First session, 19 June, 3:00 P.M.

**Comrade Puja:** opened the meeting and asked the participants to vote on the system of chairmanship.

**Comrade Ilychev:** suggested that our Hungarian friends, as hosts, should chair the meeting. Other delegations: agreed with the suggestion of Comrade Ilychev.

**Comrade Puja:** thanked them.

He delivered his introduction in Russian. (The text of his speech is enclosed in Hungarian).

**Comrade Macovescu:** In the name of the Government and the Foreign Ministry of the Romanian People's Republic he expressed his gratitude for the invitation, especially to the Government and the Foreign Ministry of the Hungarian People's Republic for the good organization of the work and for their hospitality. He greeted the delegations of the participating Warsaw Treaty members.

Due to the time constraints he immediately started the discussion by stating that he agreed with the proposal of the Hungarian delegation. He had some comments, mainly regarding the draft of the communiqué. He agreed with the draft proposal; however, he pointed out that in Romanian the terms "questions and problems" mean the same. Therefore, he recommended the following: "... discussion of some timely problems regarding the preparation of the meeting to be held on Security and Cooperation in Europe."

**Comrade Ilychev:** Expressed his gratitude to the Foreign Ministry of the Hungarian People's Republic, especially to Comrade János Péter for organizing the meeting, for the cordial reception and hospitality. He conveyed the greeting of Comrade Gromiko and the Foreign Ministry of the Soviet Union.

He thought that the draft of the communiqué was acceptable, but suggested the addition of the phrases security and cooperation. He suggested that the text should be as follows: "The meeting of the foreign ministers of the Warsaw Treaty states will be convened on 21-22 June 1970, with the purpose of discussing the current problems related to the organization of an all-European meeting dealing with issues of security and cooperation." He added that if it sounded all right in Hungarian, he agreed with the original.

Concerning the agenda he stated that the Soviet delegation had no objection.

In relationship with the documents to be endorsed during the meeting he suggested that the deputy ministers should not decide which documents were to be accepted by the foreign ministers. He suggested that the deputy ministers should identify the recommendations and discuss the documents to be submitted to the meeting of the foreign ministers.

**Comrade Macovescu** said that in order to speed up the work of the meeting he agreed with the Soviet suggestion.

**Comments of the leader of the Polish delegation:**

He greeted the Hungarian delegation and the participants of the meeting, thanked for the hospitality and the good organization of the meeting. He revealed that eleven years ago he had been Ambassador to Hungary, which was why he could cooperate with Hungarian comrades especially well.

The opinion of the Polish delegation was that the meeting of the deputy foreign ministers

fulfilled its goal, which was to prepare the documents for the meeting of the foreign ministers.

His comments on the published draft were the following:

- Agenda: no comment, except regarding point 3 where they agree with Comrade Ilychev. It is difficult for the deputy foreign ministers to decide what the ministers should discuss. Therefore, he suggests that Comrade Ilychev's recommendations be incorporated.
- Communiqué: they do not have any problem with translating the text to Polish. He suggested that the word "cooperation" be added. After the endorsement they will forward the communiqué to the Polish press.
- Regarding the proposed agenda of the foreign ministers he proposed the inclusion of the word "cooperation" in addition to the word "security".

**Comrade Fischer:** The address of the head of the German delegation.

On behalf of the German delegation he thanked the Hungarian organizers for the warm and friendly welcome, voicing an appreciation for their being able to provide proper working conditions within such a short time for the meeting of the deputy ministers as well as for the meeting of the ministers. In his opinion the Hungarian comrades succeeded in creating the right "atmosphere" for the work.

He conveyed to the participants the greetings of the Party and Government of the German Democratic Republic.

In relation to the proposed documents he stated that the delegation agreed with both the draft communiqué and the inclusion of the word "cooperation"; regarding the proposed agenda of the meeting of the foreign ministers he emphasized that it was a proposal, because in his opinion the meeting could not dictate to the minister comrades what issues to address at their meeting.

In his opinion the proposed documents comprise the problems, which would be recommended for the minister comrades to discuss, therefore he thinks that the proposed agenda, as a concrete recommendation, could be presented to the minister comrades.

In his opinion it is clear for all participants what the meeting of the ministers should discuss.

In the proposed documents the actual problems are clearly stated.

**Comrade Grigorov:** Described how happy he was that the deputy foreign ministers of the Warsaw Treaty members convened in the capital of Hungary in order to discuss these important questions. He thanked the organizers for the cordial reception and the attention and hospitality shown towards them. He greeted the other delegations and joined them in their greetings. The preliminary communiqué was accepted by the Bulgarian delegation with the addition of the expression "cooperation". He also agreed with the proposed date of publishing the preliminary communiqué. Regarding the agenda of the meeting of the deputy ministers he agreed with the corrections proposed by Comrade Ilychev. He also agreed with the agenda recommendations of the minister's meeting.

He stated that their delegation was authorized to discuss all issues that may come up. He thanked for the attention and wished good work to everyone.

**Comrade Klusák** greeted the participants of the meeting and expressed his appreciation for the good organization and excellent hospitality. Their Party and Government approved that these questions were discussed at a meeting in Budapest. He conveyed the greetings and good wishes of Comrade Foreign Minister Marko and the Czechoslovakian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The agenda of the meeting of the deputy ministers matched their earlier expectations.

Regarding Item 3, he agreed with the suggestion of Comrade Ilychev. He also agreed with the draft of the preliminary communiqué and the agenda of the meeting of the ministers.

**Comrade Puja** stated that Conference was already in the position to make a decision regarding the proposed two questions. One of them was the preliminary communiqué which should read as

follows: “The Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the Warsaw Treaty will meet in Budapest on 21-22 June in order to discuss the issues related to the convening of an all-European meeting dealing with the questions of security and cooperation.”

Regarding the Romanian comrades’ concerns related to the expressions, he thought that the meeting could endorse their point, avoiding the repetition of phrases in accordance with the uniqueness of their language.

He announced that the communiqué was to be published at 7:00 P.M.

The third question was the discussion of the minister’s meeting’s agenda. He emphasized the importance of reaching consensus in this question; if the Ministers accepted it, then it was all right; if not, then they would alter it, as it was naturally their right. He asked the opinion of the other deputy ministers.

**Comrade Ilychev:** The proposed agenda was acceptable, except the already mentioned addition of the word “cooperation”.

**Comrade Fischer** had no objection, accepted the addition suggested by Comrade Ilychev as logical and correct. In addition, they had a further proposition. He had authorization from Comrade Winzer to make suggestion for a new agenda item.

This is the following:

“Fight for enhancing the international position of GDR and the relationship between GDR – FRG”

The comrades may say that this question could be discussed as part of the other agenda item, but Comrade Winzer thinks that this issue should be discussed in a special way. Comrade Winzer’s idea is based on the idea that these problems are of interest for everyone.

**Comrade Ilychev:** Regarding the request of Comrade Winzer and the comment of Comrade Fischer, he recommended to talk about the enforcing and not the enhancing of positions. The proposal was interesting, if it entailed exchange of opinions in this question then he agreed with the proposal. The question could be discussed either at the meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs or when they discussed the content of the first agenda item. In one word, the question should be discussed later.

**Comrade Puja** asked if the conference agreed with the idea of discussing the three proposed documents, which were 1) the draft of the Soviet-Hungarian joint communiqué, 2) the draft of the Soviet memorandum, 3) that Soviet suggestion which dealt with the questions of cultural relations and the human environment. Only after this should the content be discussed. He added that the Hungarian delegation agreed with this.

**Comrade Ilychev** agreed in that the participants should discuss the three proposals.

**Comrade Macovescu** agreed with the above, the Romanian delegation did not have other suggestions; it was open to discussing other suggestions if there were any.

**Comrade Puja** proposed that the Soviet -Hungarian communiqué be discussed paragraph by paragraph.

**Comrade Ilychev** suggested that it should first be discussed as a whole and then in its details.

**Comrade Macovescu** stated that he could not comment on substantial issues as he only received the draft three hours before. He would only tell his opinion the following day, because he had to study it. Nevertheless, they were willing to listen to the other delegations’ views, which would be helpful in forming their own opinion.

**Comrade Puja** suggested that as there had been no objections, the discussion could be started.

**Comrade Willmann** asked whether the draft communiqué was to be discussed first. He would agree with that.

**Comrade Puja** said that since the participants were co-authors, they should agree with the draft overall and in its details.

**Comrade Ilychev** agreed with the draft overall and in its details.

**Comrade Willmann** asked for a thirty-minute break in order to familiarize himself with the draft.

**Comrade Puja** ordered a thirty-minute break.

[...]

**[Editors' note: The minutes of the second session on 19 June 1970 (10 pages) have not yet been translated.]**

**[PART 2]**  
**[Morning session, 20 June 1970]**

**1) Comrade Frigyes Puja:**

Briefly opens the second day of the meeting. Then he moves on to talk about the Hungarian delegation's views on the draft Memorandum submitted by the Soviet delegation. In his introduction he states that the Hungarian delegation agrees with everything the leaders of the delegations said about the draft Memorandum, the activities of their countries related to the preparation of the all-European security conference, and their evaluation of the Rome meeting of NATO's Council of Ministers.

In relations to the Rome meeting of NATO's Council of Ministers he mentions that there are some characteristics, which have caught our attention:

- NATO is attempting to take the leadership out of the hands of the socialist countries with respect to the convening of the all-European security conference;
- They pretend to basically agree with the suggestions of the socialist countries
- By pretending to agree they attempt to put our countries on the defensive and strive to rekindle the differences in opinion, which, according to them, exist among the member countries of the Warsaw Treaty.

In relations to the NATO meeting significant changes did not take place, although some new elements appeared in NATO's attitude towards the security meeting. By making apparent concessions, the USA practically forced its opinion on the member states.

Differences among the NATO member states surfaced during the NATO meeting and some only reluctantly accepted the USA's opinion.

The United States has introduced new, negative elements into the NATO opinion (by voicing various mutual concessions), by which they try to delay the preparations for the security meeting until eternity. Content to keep the talks at the stage of measuring up the opponents, they would like to make it dependent on the success of other negotiations, which are taking place between the Socialist and Western countries, among them SALT negotiations.

Our recommendations regarding the agenda of the all-European security meeting, which had been accepted during the minister's meeting in Prague, became softened by their adding elements of subversion and intervention in the domestic issues of our countries.

The issue of mutual and balanced reduction of the troops is considered the test paper of the preparatory rounds. The procedure they suggested for the preparation of the conference would hinder, rather than facilitate, the process.

Despite the negative phenomena we must also see the new elements.

- In the final communiqué the all-European security meeting is concretely discussed, which until now has not been included in any of the NATO documents;
- They thought it possible to skip the bilateral discussions of measuring each others' intentions up and enter straight into multi-lateral discussions in order to prepare for the meeting;
- They now talk about the establishment of a permanent body;

- Although they try to soften our suggestions regarding the agenda, they at least discuss them;
- They do not link negotiations about the meeting to the negotiations about the mutual and balanced reduction of troops; it appears that they are ready to have parallel discussions on these issues.

NATO is led by one main goal, i.e. that of delaying the convention of the meeting and putting the blame for this on the Warsaw Treaty countries.

Our tasks derive from NATO's tactic:

- 1) We cannot allow them to seize the initiative from us in the subject of convening the meeting.
- 2) Regarding the organizational issues of the meeting, we must make new suggestions that NATO cannot turn down without a loss of face.
- 3) We must take advantage of the conflicts between the NATO states (USA-FRG and others).

Regarding the Draft Memorandum submitted by the Soviet comrades, he declares it to be good one, well considered and perspective. The Hungarian delegation agrees with Comrade Ilyichev's arguments presented the day before yesterday, in which he analyzed the points of the proposal.

Furthermore, in our view the content of the draft memorandum makes it suitable for the Warsaw Treaty members' purposes: it retains the initiative and increases the tension between the NATO members.

The Hungarian delegation has welcomed that the Memorandum declared: During the course of the bilateral consultations a consensus has been reached regarding the list of participants; thus the GDR and the FRG will have equal rights and obligations, and so will the United States and Canada.

Another positive element is that, instead of a single event, the draft mentions a series of meetings, since it has already become obvious that the first meeting will not solve all the problems, and at best will only outline the forthcoming tasks.

The draft has a new element, i.e. the establishment of a new body to address the issues of European security and cooperation.

The recommendation for reducing the number of foreign troops stationed in Europe can also put an end to the Western powers' game of "hide and seek".

The recommendation for the additional point in the agenda of the all-European security meeting includes our consensus reached in Sofia.

One of the strongest points of the draft memorandum is that we have introduced new elements in the most important issues and the NATO will have a hard time rejecting these.

In the Hungarian delegation's view, if the minister comrades accept the draft Memorandum, our countries will acquire a powerful weapon in their efforts to make the convocation of the conference a success.

In connection with the publication of the Memorandum, the Hungarian delegation is of the opinion that thorough preparations are necessary for the presentation of the document, both locally and at higher levels. We suggest that the document be handed over simultaneously to all countries and be published on the following day in the socialist countries. As to the actual dates of the hand-over and publication, the Hungarian delegation will make a proposal at the end of the preparations.

Finally, Comrade Pujá took the opportunity to express his thanks for the excellent cooperation that developed among the participants of the present meeting.

## 2) Comrade Fischer:

On behalf of the Soviet delegation, Comrade Ilyichev was very convincing in describing why these documents were necessary and important. I agree with his argument. Here are a few comments on what has been said so far:

a) The meeting of foreign ministers is timely, because it promises well and it ensures that the initiative stay firmly in our hands. The memorandum and the other documents offer some orientation as to what course of action would be appropriate. This helps rallying public opinion for holding the conference on security and cooperation in Europe. In this way the Warsaw Treaty countries will contribute to the cause of preserving peace and reveal the true intentions of the imperialists.

b) With the help of these documents the work of preparation is shifted to practical issues. He supports the Hungarian proposal regarding the timing of the handing over and the publication of the documents as recommended by Comrade Puja. In this way we stay on the offensive not only in diplomacy, but also in the area of informing and influencing public opinion.

If possible, he would like to add concrete proposals to the draft memorandum.

**3) Comrade Puja:**

In view of the fact that the discussion so far has been centered on general observations, he suggests that these should be concluded first. Yesterday we agreed that this morning we would first conclude the general discussion, then would come to the draft communiqué and finally discuss the draft memorandum paragraph by paragraph. He asks for further speeches. In case there are no more speakers, he wants to know whether this means that the Romanian and Polish comrades agree with everything that has been said so far.

**4) Comrade Macovescu:**

If he understood correctly, the general debate came first, followed by the discussion of the concrete issues. He reserves the right to speak in the concrete discussion.

**5) Comrade Willmann:**

He first wants to make a few general comments and would like to speak in more details in the discussion of the concrete issues. If that is acceptable, he wants to say that he is satisfied with the course of the discussion so far. He is especially delighted to see that every delegation wants to contribute to the success of the conference on security and cooperation in Europe with concrete and effective proposals. He paid special attention to Comrade Ilyichev's speech and argument; he fully agrees with these. He is of the opinion that the Soviet drafts will provide an essential contribution to the efforts dedicated to security and coordination in Europe. He is convinced that the most important guarantee of our work's success lies in the unity of the socialist countries as manifested on this occasion.

The diplomatic activities launched by our countries during the last few months have enjoyed a widespread and positive reception in the small and medium sized European countries, NATO members and non-members alike. They welcomed the idea of an all-European conference, the full status of the GDR and Helsinki as the location. Partly under pressure from the USA, some European NATO members tried to question the sincerity of the socialist countries' intentions in connection with the all-European conference. What they would like to achieve by this is to take away the initiative from us and to add new items to the agenda, which are against our interests. On the other hand, NATO tries to make the results of the talks with the socialist countries and the GDR and of four-power discussions about Berlin a precondition for the all-European conference. The Rome session of NATO's council of ministers has revealed the state of affairs within NATO. Two new concepts emerged at the session about the desirable nature of the dialogue. One is the so-called "Atlantic concept", which is supported by the more aggressive NATO countries, most notably the USA. The other is the more flexible and softer position recommended by the Scandinavian countries and in certain respect also supported by Belgium and France. In any case,

the documents of the NATO council demonstrate certain steps towards the broadening of the dialogue, while at the same time can also be seen as an attempt to postpone the all-European conference and to put the blame on the socialist countries.

**Comrade Willmann (continuation):**

The NATO council's session effectively witnessed the birth of a compromise between the various western positions. Some of its elements can be exploited by the socialist countries. These are:

- Stating a willingness to hold a conference, or a series of conferences, on security and cooperation in Europe at a suitable date.
- Emphasizing the significance of a treaty on nuclear test ban, of further reduction of nuclear weapons, of a ban on chemical and biological weapons, of the associated inspection on site, and of the issues of human environment.

These constitute important boundary conditions from the viewpoint of any new initiatives by the socialist countries. At the same time, another task is the unveiling of the NATO countries' true intentions about the dialogue. The section within the draft memorandum, which addresses the reduction of troops stationed in foreign countries, could offer great help in this task.

The Polish delegation believes that the proposed documents (memorandum and communiqué) would work towards making progress and could be used to put pressure on the western countries.

Most of the western European countries are interested in the discussions about the development of trade and economic relations and scientific and technological cooperation. These proposals also work towards neutralizing the forces of cold war. Cooperation seems especially important at this point in time, when the integration of western countries is moving ahead rapidly, integration that at the same time means a discrimination against the socialist countries. Despite the outwards signs of conflicts, the integration process is strengthening, gradually turning into an economic pact. It might be enlarged soon by the entry of Great Britain, Denmark, Norway and Ireland. We can also expect other western European countries joining the treaty later on. In this regard, Sweden, Austria, Switzerland and Finland are coming under pressure. At the moment 18 African countries have already been affiliated with the European Common Market.

Presumably, the economic commonwealth of East-African states will also join, while similar tendencies can be observed in the cases of Israel, Turkey, Greece and Yugoslavia, as well as Morocco. This process is contrary to the interests of the socialist countries. One way of fighting this tendency is to increase the economic cooperation among the European socialist countries, as well as the liquidation of existing contradictions.

**Comrade Willmann (2nd continued):**

The enlarged topics in the documents offer an even broader scope for influencing the smaller European countries. Very significant is the proposal about the environment, which covers the fight against pollution of both water and air, against erosion in the mountains, and the efforts to save the forests and the wildlife. Any progress in these areas requires an all-European cooperation. In this area there is scope for counteracting the negative tendencies. In this respect the socialist countries do have the advantage, because their planned economies permit a practically limitless protection of the human environment, while any similar effort in capitalist societies that strive for maximum profit is hindered from the start.

At the Sophia meeting of deputy foreign ministers we concluded that the development of cultural cooperation could not be overlooked, either. According to the NATO's communiqué, the capitalist West wants to improve the dialogue with us in the name of the free exchange of ideas and in the interest of increasing the ideological influence. To counter the Western world's tactics, the socialist countries should develop a concrete plan to encourage cooperation in the areas of culture, science and public education. The principle of this cooperation could be based on the

covenant of the United Nations, emphasizing that this activity should not be directed against the interests of the various countries. The West wants to use the same type of cooperation for ideological subversion.

Our plan should foster cooperation in the areas of culture, science and public education, and it could be extended to cooperation between trade unions, youth organizations and other associations.

The draft memorandum creates the preconditions for developing the dialogue under the aegis of the committee for security and cooperation in Europe, a body to be set up by the first all-European conference. The same committee could discuss other issues, broader and more specific alike, related to the problems of security and cooperation in Europe.

In our view at some future date we should also discuss the draft treaty for the security and cooperation in Europe. We could submit the basic principles at the first all-European conference, which could then be discussed in the committee.

**Comrade Willmann (3rd continued)**

The text drafted by the Polish comrades and distributed during the latest consultation in Moscow could form its base, to which several socialist countries have already responded in detail. The draft of the treaty's principles contains the main guidelines, which correspond to the spirit of the meetings held in Bucharest in 1966, in Karlovy Vary in 1967 and of the Budapest Call issued in 1969. The draft has the following positive points:

- 1) The socialist countries' initiative would have a favorable reception not only among the progressive elements of the NATO countries, but also within the neutral states. The various social organizations reacted favorably to it.
- 2) The broad-based character of the proposal would enable the start of a useful dialogue with the NATO countries, in accordance with the given international situation.
- 3) Since the West could not reject it without a loss of face, the program could prove to the world that the West and the NATO have no alternative concept for the problem of security and cooperation in Europe.

Therefore, we would like to present the draft of the principles at the first all-European conference, the task of which would be to explore ways of reducing the number of troops stationed abroad.

The draft memorandum contains another important proposal to establish, at the first all-European conference, a committee for exploring the possible ways of reducing the number of troops stationed abroad. Such a committee would allow the European countries to examine this most important issue. The proposal offered, therefore, a constructive alternative to the utopian idea of mutual and balanced reduction of armed forces. Our proposal could mobilize public opinion in both the smaller NATO countries and the other European states. This is flexible plan to foil the western powers' plans to use the reduction of troops deployed abroad for the development of their national armies, especially in West Germany. In the Polish delegation's view, the ratification of the nuclear test ban by the member states of EURATOM, most notably by FRG, is also very important.

**Comrade Willmann (4th continued)**

Speaking on the preparations for the conference on security and cooperation in Europe, he supports the proposals formulated in the plans and the speeches. Without wishing to set the seal on the discussion of the organizational matters ahead of the time, he is of the opinion that a preparatory plan cannot replace the discussions and cannot be used to postpone the all-European conference, regardless of attempts to that effect on the part of the West.

The proposed meeting of accredited ambassadors and envoys in Helsinki deserves a separate mention. Such meetings could invigorate debates and allow the work of the preparation



to take a practical turn. The equal status of the GDR at the negotiations has been self-evident from the start. In his view, the main tasks of these meetings are as follows: to assess and sum up the dialogues, to come to an agreement on the agenda, the date, the location and the level of representation.

He is convinced that the approval of the proposed documents will once again demonstrate our unity based on solidarity, cooperation and dedication to peace and security. He is especially grateful to the Soviet delegation for submitting such an important document. He hopes that the approval of the drafts will launch a new offensive for the socialist countries.

Later on, during the discussion of the finer points, he will ask to speak again.

**6) Comrade Puja:**

I suggest that we resume the discussion of the communiqué!

**7) Comrade Macovescu:**

He proposes to have a break until 2:00 p.m.

**8) Comrade Puja:**

He is concerned that there will be not enough time for the discussion of the texts.

**9) Comrade Macovescu:**

We can continue the talks all day today and tomorrow, well into the night. He hopes, however, that the debate will not be exhausting.

**10) Comrade Willmann:**

In his view, it would be possible to finish the debate on the communiqué. Perhaps the Romanian comrades will not object to its discussion.

**11) Comrade Ilyichev:**

He had much rather we continue discussing the communiqué. The time factor is important to us. If possible, we should submit to the ministers an approved text, and so we should discuss the communiqué now and the memorandum next, if that is acceptable to the Romanian comrades. My understanding yesterday was that everyone approved the communiqué and we even altered Paragraph IV unanimously. Yesterday we agreed that the Romanian comrades would deliver their speeches this morning, but right now we ought to get the discussion of the communiqué out of the way.

**12) Comrade Fischer:**

I agree with the proposal about finishing the discussion of the communiqué. Time passes quickly, and we all know how time-consuming the editing can be. With regard to Comrade Ilyichev's comment, I would like to point out that we did indeed agree on the text of the draft communiqué. We must submit to the ministers a text as complete as possible and for this we need the cooperation of the Romanian comrades.

I went through the documents in front of us one more time, along with the material of the Rome meeting of the NATO ministers. In specific, I checked section 8, and I believe that our communiqué completely meets the requirements. Section 8 of the Rome text talks of the support lent to the FRG by its allies. Our allies also support us, but perhaps we should re-emphasize this support by our allies in section 8. Comrade Winzer will discuss the relations between the GDR and the FRG and in connection with this it would perhaps be useful to insert in the communiqué a pertinent paragraph. The European public opinion will find it interesting, if we point out the growing respect and broadening foreign relations of the GDR. By doing so, we would support European peace. The relations based on international law between the FRG and the GDR could constitute an important factor in European security.

With your consent, I could draw up a paragraph to this effect, and we could discuss its best placement within the communiqué later. On the basis of the NATO communiqué, it would be useful to touch on the European status quo as well as the inviolability of the borders. The reason

why this is necessary is that the debates carried out in the Bundestag actually questioned these. Please, consider whether it would be appropriate to give voice to these ideas in the communiqué. I agree with the work we did yesterday, but these thoughts came to me since then.

**13) Comrade Puja:**

A new suggestion has been submitted. Comrade Fischer recommends that two more items be added to the agenda. I feel that the character of the communiqué would not readily admit the addition of these two issues. We touched on the GDR in the memorandum. In our communiqué we should only be concerned with the conference on security in Europe, in other words, with issues addressed at the meeting of the ministers.

**14) Comrade Ilyichev:**

I agree with having a break.

I believe we should not use our statement to react to the NATO's communiqué. If we choose to react to it item by item, then we will have to address not only this item but many others, too. We have to consider the problem carefully. The communiqué's aim is to brief the public on the meeting of the ministers. We must settle between ourselves how important it is to address these issues either in the communiqué or in any other document.

By way of a preliminary inquiry, I would like to know what you think of the suggestion that the above-mentioned paragraph 8 contains one of the preconditions of summoning the all-European conference. We ought to explore this possibility.

**15) Comrade Puja:**

In accordance with the proposal, he announces a lunch break.

[PART 3]

(Afternoon session, 20 June 1970: 2:00 pm – 8:00 pm.)

**16) Comrade Puja:**

Recommends that they continue the work and asks the participants to discuss the draft of the communiqué paragraph by paragraph.

**17) Comrade Macovescu:**

The Romanian Communist Party and the Romanian government have always paid marked attention to the issues of European security. They took part in the Prague and Sophia meetings and decided to attend this conference in order to do everything in their power to promote the socialist ideals in unison with the other socialist countries. It is an indubitable fact that the call the European socialist states (the Warsaw Treaty countries) have issued for a conference on security in Europe has been enjoying growing support. Now we are in the position to make one step forward. In this respect we have cooperated, and shall be cooperating, as members of the Warsaw Treaty.

In matters related to the conference on security in Europe we, members of the Warsaw Treaty, must not let the initiative slip from our hands. We, the participants of the meeting of the deputy foreign ministers, must bear this in mind in preparing the ministerial conference. The Romanian delegation is grateful to the Hungarian and Soviet comrades for the preparation of the documents. These documents will enable us to form a joint position, since they can form the basis of the discussion. In connection with this, we would like to put forward a few suggestions.

- 1) The communiqué must assert – in addition to what it has said – that the countries participating in the work of the conference have examined all those measures that are thought necessary for the appropriate preparation of the security conference.
- 2) All the states concerned should discuss the draft resolutions about the preparation and the agenda of the European security conference in the form of bi- and multilateral meetings;

furthermore, it is vitally important that the countries that have participated in this work so far should take part in every stage of the preparation for the conference. In order to proceed, or to win the support of European public opinion, we must win over as many European governments as possible. Every country concerned must take part in the preparations. In other words, in our opinion - and we feel very strongly about this - a preparatory meeting must precede the conference itself, and we consider the form and the location of that preparatory meeting unimportant: it is only the convocation of the meeting that matters. All the more so, since we know of the existence of various initiatives, such as the agreement between the governments of the Soviet Union and Finland or the Belgian government's idea known as the "open salon."

3) In the communiqué we must emphasize that the countries taking part in our meeting are ready to discuss, either in bilateral or in multilateral form, any proposal concerning the convocation of the conference on security in Europe, underlining that we want cooperation with the European countries in the interest of convening the conference on security in Europe.

4) Our ministers must stress that, either by themselves or in cooperation with other countries, their governments would do everything to ease the tensions and to improve European security, fully respecting the principles of sovereignty, national independence, territorial integrity and non-intervention in other countries' domestic affairs.

Finally, I would like to discuss the draft communiqué's last chapter, sincerely hoping that my words will be clearly understood, especially by the Hungarian comrades. In my view, this last chapter could safely be dropped. Just as in Prague, we could agree that we would leave it to the governments represented at this meeting to present these documents to all the countries concerned. I just want to remind you that in Prague we asked the Czech comrades to pass on the documents that had been approved at that meeting. The other governments used their own channels to do the same. In this way an intense diplomatic effort developed to help the cause of European security.

In the above I expounded my general views in connection with the draft communiqué.

Later in the course of the discussions I intend to make specific comments about the text of the communiqué.

**18) Comrade Puja:**

Comrade Macovescu gave us his general comments about the communiqué; nevertheless, I recommend that we discuss it paragraph by paragraph, and everyone can tell us their views and suggestions there. Everyone agrees with the title and Paragraph 1 and 2 of the communiqué.

Paragraph 3:

**19) Comrade Macovescu:**

Suggests that we use the complete designation of the all-European conference as agreed in Prague: All-European Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

**20) Comrade Ilyichev:**

While the Romanian comrade's proposal is acceptable in principle, if it was applied in the paragraph indicated, this long designation would be written down twice, regardless of the fact that the first part of the paragraph essentially describes the same.

**21) Comrade Puja:**

Agrees with Comrade Ilyichev's point.

**22) Comrade Macovescu:**

Without insisting on the actual phrasing, he recommends that this principle be observed in the communiqué.

**23) Comrade Puja:**

Calls Comrade Macovescu's attention to Comrade Ilyichev's argument regarding the first part of the paragraph.

**24) Comrade Macovescu:**

Without insisting that their expression be used in the paragraph, he calls attention to the point that the expression adopted in Prague should be used in general.

**25) Comrade Puja:**

Proposes that the participants of the meeting endorse Paragraph 3 in the proposed form and take into account the Romanian comrades' comment in other places in the text or, alternatively, that the Romanian comrades make their suggestions there.

Chapter 4 was already approved with the said modifications at yesterday's meeting.

Suggests that the participants start discussing Paragraph 5.

**26) Comrade Macovescu:**

Would like to return to Paragraph 3 with a proposed modification of its first sentence to read: "The ministers have underlined that all the countries concerned should take part in every stage (period) of the preparation, organization and administration of the all-European conference on security and cooperation in Europe on the basis of equal status."

**27) Comrade Puja:**

Asks whether everyone agrees with the modification.

**28) Comrade Ilyichev:**

Wants to know what the modification is meant to signify.

**29) Comrade Puja:**

Personally understands what the Romanian comrades mean but regards the modification unnecessary, as the conference could not be organized and held in any other way than on the basis of the participants' equal status.

**30) Comrade Macovescu:**

Since everything is self-evident here, the communiqué would not in fact be needed at all.

But as he has already indicated, the preparations are at an evolutionary phase at the moment, when there is a chance to win a large number of officials from the western countries over to the idea of the conference. Therefore, new phrasings are needed and the formula he has suggested has not been used in this form.

**31) Comrade Fischer:**

Understands Comrade Macovescu's idea but calls his attention to the fact that the second sentence of paragraph 6 conveys the same meaning.

**32) Comrade Klusák:**

Agrees with Comrade Fischer's comment and explains the meaning of the second sentence of paragraph 6 in considerable detail to show that it covers exactly the proposal of the Romanian comrades.

**33) Comrade Puja:**

Asks whether Comrade Macovescu still insists on his proposal.

**34) Comrade Macovescu:**

Declares that his fellow deputy foreign ministers have thoroughly convinced him.

Addressing Comrade Klusák, he explains how important it is for all the participants to take part in every stage of the organization of the all-European conference. Turning to Comrade Fischer, he declares that the import of paragraph 6 corresponds to the modification he has suggested only vaguely, rather than concretely. In his view the socialist countries cannot afford to leave such an important issue in such a vague form. He believes that this point must be clarified.

**35) Comrade Ilyichev:**

Feels he still has not received answer to his question regarding the point of Comrade Macovescu's proposed modification. Perhaps Comrade Macovescu feels that the preparation of the conference has not been conducted on the basis of an equal status. If, on the other hand, he

only has in mind the method of preparation and organization, then the second part of paragraph 6 makes a reference to that. Admittedly, not all the possible methods of the preparation are revealed there, since there are so many of them. He suggests that the Romanian comrades reconsider their proposal, because their amendment would only be a repetition. Should they feel it necessary to emphasize the significance of the idea they have proposed, then this could be achieved in the second sentence of paragraph 5 by inserting the expression “countries concerned” and by using the conference’s official designation.

**36) Comrade Puja:**

Asks Comrade Macovescu whether Comrade Ilyichev’s proposal is acceptable to him.

**37) Comrade Macovescu:**

Finds paragraph 3 acceptable in its original form and wishes to respond to Comrade Ilyichev’s proposal during the discussion of paragraph 5.

**38) Comrade Puja:**

Recommends that paragraph 3, along with paragraph already agreed upon yesterday, be approved in the proposed form.

**39) Comrade Puja:**

Suggests that they turn to paragraph 5, taking into account Comrade Ilyichev’s comment.

**40) Comrade Macovescu:**

Proposes to replace the expression “countries’ governments” in the paragraph’s first sentence with the words “foreign ministers,” as that could convey the level of the meeting more accurately.

**41) Comrade Ilyichev:**

Points out that it is not themselves that the foreign ministers represent, but their governments, of which they form an organic part.

**42) Comrade Willmann:**

Recommends to keep the word “governments,” as this expression was used at all the previous meetings and nobody has so far objected to it as controversial.

**43) Comrade Ilyichev:**

Recommends to keep the word “governments” on the consideration that later on in the text proposals are discussed which will be decided upon by governments, not ministers. In his view, it is not a mistake to submit the proposals on behalf of “governments.”

In view of the Romanian comrades’ comments, he then proposes to change the second sentence of the paragraph to read as follows: “they have come to the conclusion that the present time is favorable for placing the preparation of the all-European meeting on security and cooperation in Europe on practical grounds with the active cooperation of all the countries interested.”

Therefore, the expression “countries interested” will be used on four occasions in the communiqué, which he believes is sufficient.

**44) Comrade Puja:**

Asks whether Comrade Ilyichev’s phrasing satisfies Comrade Macovescu.

**45) Comrade Macovescu:**

Regrets that the modification proposed by Comrade Ilyichev’s cannot satisfy the Romanian delegation. He insists that a few points be clarified in the communiqué so as to avoid further misunderstandings. He would like to put down in paragraph 5 the following sentence: “The ministers have stressed the need for all the interested countries’ participation in every stage of the preparation, organization and running of the all-European conference on security and cooperation in Europe.”

**46) Comrade Puja:**

---

Wants to clarify where exactly Comrade Macovescu would like to insert the sentence.

**47) Comrade Macovescu:**

Since he has accepted the original phrasing of paragraph 5, he would think it appropriate to insert it in paragraph 5.

**48) Comrade Puja:**

Suggests that we suspend the discussion of paragraph 5 and asks the Romanian comrades to put their proposed modification in writing and hand it over to the secretariat of the conference for photocopying. We should return to the discussion of the paragraph after the modified text has been distributed to the delegates. He recommends that we turn to the discussion of paragraph 6.

**49) Comrade Macovescu:**

The Romanian delegation agrees with the content of paragraph 6, but calls the attention of the members of the conference to the point that our western partners might try to twist the meaning of the expression “we have passed decisions” and therefore he advises to replace it with the phrase “there have been agreements between us.”

If the delegates find it more appropriate, the proposed modification to paragraph 5 could alternatively be incorporated in paragraph 6.

**50) Comrade Puja :**

Asks the Romanian comrades to put their proposed modification to paragraph 6 into writing and hand it over to the Secretariat for distribution among the delegates; furthermore, he appeals to the Romanian delegation to determine precisely the place within the communiqué, where they want their modifications to be placed.

He recommends that the delegates turn to the discussion of paragraph 7.

**51) Comrade Macovescu:**

Recommends the insertion of another sentence before paragraph 7:

“At the same time, the ministers underline their governments’ determination to make steps, individually as well as in cooperation with other countries, towards warmer European relations and security and cooperation in Europe, on the basis of independence and sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-intervention in domestic affairs.

The governments of the countries partaking in the conference are ready to examine any constructive proposals by the countries concerned, which are directed at the organization of the all-European conference.”

Furthermore, he recommends to modify paragraph 7 so that the participants of the meeting appoint the Hungarian government “in its capacity as the organizer of the conference” to forward the documents to the recipients.

**52) Comrade Puja:**

Suggests that the Romanian comrades put this proposal in writing and in order to be able to do this, he motions to have a break.

**53) Comrade Willmann:**

Agrees with the proposal that they should have a break to enable the Romanian comrades to put their concrete proposals in writing and to make them available for the delegates.

Nevertheless, he wishes to point out that the Romanian comrades’ proposal regarding our “readiness to consider further proposals” could be misconstrued, as we have already stressed our willingness in this directions on more than one occasion and the western partners put forward several proposals

- cultural cooperation, economic cooperation;
- proposals regarding the environment;
- the reduction of the number of troops stationed in Europe, as well as other issues.

Our western partners could easily feel that we invite them to make further proposals and then they

could further postpone the convening of the conference. I ask the Romanian comrades to rephrase this sentence so as to eliminate the risk of misunderstanding.

**54) Comrade Puja:**

Orders a break.

**55) Comrade Puja:**

Has everyone had a chance to study the Romanian comrades' additional proposals? The Romanian comrades have come up with further modification regarding the proposed changes in paragraph 6.

Furthermore, they have proposed to add a supplementary note to paragraph 3 that we have already approved. Has any of the delegates anything to say on that?

**56) Comrade Klusak:**

Only wants to make a few observations, because these supplementary notes contain elements that partly have already featured in earlier documents and partly form no part of the subject of our discussions at this stage of the process. He thinks that the documents approved in Prague, which reflected our position at the time, continue to be valid.

In the wake of the developments we now have to lay down the road forward. To paragraph 3:

It is the aim of all of us to hold an all-European conference that is in the interest of, and attended by, all the countries concerned. But his much we have said in our earlier documents. Since the Romanian proposal adds certain unclear elements to the communiqué, we would much rather keep the original version.

**57) Comrade Grigorov:**

Agrees that the various Romanian supplements repeat what has been stated in Prague, as in the case of paragraph 5 where they would prefer the phrasing "the governments are ready to discuss any constructive proposals." This has already been contained in the Prague statement, and since this document is not meant to be a repetition of that one, there is no need to reiterate. To paragraph 3: In his opinion the supplementary comment is not necessary. The proposal regarding the participation of all the countries is, again, a repetition. In any case, he does not think that the participation of every country should be a precondition, and at the moment we do not even know what methods will be chosen for the preparation. Therefore, he is against the modification proposed by the Romanian comrades.

**58) Comrade Fischer:**

The communiqué should be brief as well as generally mobilizing and forward-looking in character. This is the essence of it. There are other documents, such as the draft Memorandum, which already address concrete issues. There is no need to go into details in the communiqué. Therefore, he agrees with the comrades who spoke on paragraph 3 before him.

**59) Comrade Willmann:**

Similarly to Comrade Fischer, he would like to stress that the communiqué ought to reflect the brief content of the ministerial conference. And since we have reached certain new agreements, he, too, is of the opinion that there is no need to repeat those elements that have already been contained in earlier documents. We have long accepted the universality of the conference and the possible participation of all the countries concerned as our basic principle in the preparation and organization of the event. We have subscribed to this principle from the start, and this is why I think that the supplementary comment added to paragraph 3 is redundant. He proposes to leave paragraph 3 in its original form.

**60) Comrade Puja:**

Agrees with Comrade Willmann, as he, too, believes that the insertion proposed by the Romanian comrades is both superfluous and ambiguous. But should the Romanian comrades

insist on it, he suggests that the problem be referred to the ministerial meeting for decision.

**61) Comrade Ilyichev:**

Explains that it would be advisable to keep the discussions on a rational course. It appears that now we are going back to the communiqué that we accepted yesterday. In his view this is not a very productive way. It should be noted that, rather than making an announcement, we are only preparing a communiqué to list the points that the ministerial meeting has covered. In connection with this he would like to raise two points:

1) The ministers reiterated their conviction that in the current situation it would be important to make steps to ease the tension. For this reason they thought it necessary to determine these new steps. They have exchanged information on the progress made so far in the preparations of the all-European conference and have come to the conclusion that the time was now ready to make practical preparations and effect concrete steps. Therefore, if we accept the principle that we only state in the communiqué what the ministers have said at their meeting, then the original version of the draft will be perfectly suitable. There is, however, another solution, also: if we were to issue some kind of a second declaration in the communiqué, then we would have to expand it. This is, however, quite unnecessary in his view. We should not invite our partners repeatedly to re-negotiate issues that have already been discussed and settled. There is no need to renew our offer to discuss any newly emerged problems, either. In his view it makes no sense to approach our western partners for further proposals. It all depends on whether we want to speed up or slow down the progress in the preparations. So far we have tried to speed it up. With the help of the proposal set out in the draft Memorandum we have neutralized the western proposition about the mutual and balanced reduction of armed forces, but at the same time we have accepted the proposals about cultural and environmental issues. If we were to invite newer proposal, we would effectively postpone the conference and draw the enemy fire upon us, when we have the chance to direct it at our enemies.

2) On the issue of participation at every stage. By dividing the process into stages, we make our own proposal amorphous and loose. It is well known that earlier on there had been a three-phase concept, but that has now been outmoded. The issue of equal status has been settled. If we were to reiterate it now, it would appear that for some reason we wanted it to be redefined. References to the equal status of the GDR are also a step backward, because this question has been settled. The Romanian comrades want to return to an item regarding the preparatory meeting, which the Sophia meeting of the foreign ministers had already discarded and which, with a few exceptions, the other countries had also rejected. As the negotiations between the ambassadors are already under way in Helsinki, the proposition regarding the preliminary meeting would, again, appear to be a step backwards. We could go ahead with the bilateral talks, but our partners still have not formulated their conceptual framework. On that score, too, we made our position clear in Sophia. In any case, it is doubtful whether there is a need for that, considering that the work is already under way. It would only make sense to call for increased activity, if we have not done a good job so far. Every document has an inherent logic. If we deviate from this logic, then something different will result. But if the structure stays the same, then it will only admit substance that belongs there.

The Romanian comrades' proposal mentions sovereignty, territorial integrity and nonintervention in domestic affairs. But these constitute the backbone of the Prague Declaration. For this reason, it is unnecessary to return to these issues.

On the basis of the above, I cannot accept the Romanian proposals.

**62) Comrade Puja:**

We return to paragraph 3. We don't agree with the Romanian amendments and I propose that if they insist on it, we leave the Romanian amendments to the ministerial conference to



decide.

**63) Comrade Macovescu:**

If we followed the course of logic in the debate, then I would have to be the last one to speak. But since some general comments were voiced in the recent speeches, we would also like to make some general observations. To make use of the free and easy atmosphere of our discussion, I would like to tell you a story: “An old woman visits her son who has been called up for military service. She watches him marching with his company and notes that he is out of step. The way the old woman views this is that it is all the others who cannot keep step, not her son.” Listening to you, I can almost believe that our proposals are wrong. With all respect due to you as representatives of your countries’ foreign ministries, I must say that your argument could not dissuade me from our position. I arranged your arguments in groups to make it easier for me to decide. You are saying that our proposals repeat what has already been said in earlier documents, and even in this communiqué. I would hate to repeat that repetition is the mother of knowledge. Tell me, is it wrong to repeat things in our struggle for security in Europe, which bring us closer to the final victory? When you made concrete references, you failed to convince me. You spoke frankly and I took no offense. You posed me questions, and now I’ll do the same. Can you name any “Warsaw” document that contains with the same clarity the amendment that we would like to attach to paragraph 3? You are saying that the Romanian proposals are vague, but unfortunately I could not locate these places.

You are talking about the security in Europe at the present stage of development. I agree with Comrade Ilyichev and all the other comrades in that we must move forward, in other words, the socialist countries must clarify their views. They must let us know how they feel about this stage. Without actually disclosing our strategy, we must explain how we imagine the conference and how we want to proceed. You are saying that the communiqué is not a declaration, and it should not reflect the events of the ministerial meeting. But how can we be sure that it will not be discussed? My minister will in all probability touch upon it. So this, too, must be taken into consideration.

In the socialist countries the communiqués indicate what have taken place and what will come. The Constitution itself is a reflection of both the past and the future. Our communiqué, too, will be such. It might be beyond my grasp, nevertheless it is not clear to me why we should not write that the countries concerned can take part in every stage of the preparations. Isn’t it all about this? At the time the idea came from the Soviet Union, from Comrade Ilyichev. We thank them for proposing this back then in Bucharest. We, members of the Warsaw Treaty, all have endorsed this idea. We have endorsed it and now it is ours. (And I am not speaking merely of the socialist countries.) Repetition cannot be a hindrance. Why don’t we emulate the western countries and submit new proposals about forms that we have already agreed upon? Every document has its own logic. But this logic follows from real things, rather than from some Janus. It would be totally appropriate to add to the communiqué new items that could advance the cause of security in Europe.

I appeal to the comrades to revise objectively their views on our proposals, and I hope that in the end they would find them acceptable and our ministers will not be put in the impossible situation and will be able to watch the finals of the football world cup, knowing that we have given them document that are comprehensive.

**64) Comrade Puja:**

The issue of work method has been raised. We do not accept the Romanian amendment to paragraph 3. I suggest that we leave this issue to the ministers’ meeting, as the wonderful speeches did not bring us closer to an agreement. We shall record that all parties agreed with paragraph 3 and attach the Romanian amendment. Otherwise we shall be still here debating until

tomorrow morning. I repeat: We have accepted paragraph 3 and attach the Romanian amendment with the comment that the other delegates did not agree with it. And now we can turn to the amendment related to paragraph 5.

**65) Comrade Ilyichev:**

I recommend replacing the Romanian suggestion with the following text to be inserted at the end of paragraph 3. "The ministers reiterate their respective governments' determination to work, individually and in cooperation with the other countries, towards the reduction of the tension, the improvement of security and peaceful cooperation in Europe." This is essentially what the Romanian comrades have expounded in their proposal. We only took as basis the Prague document.

**66) Comrade Macovescu:**

Am I to understand that you have rejected our proposed amendment to paragraph 3 without even holding a debate on it?

**67) Comrade Puja:**

Comrade Ilyichev said that he suggested the text as a replacement for the Romanian amendment.

**68) Comrade Macovescu:**

This is still unclear to me.

**69) Comrade Fiscjer:**

I understand Comrade Ilyichev's intention, as he submitted his proposal based on the Romanian suggestion and incorporating its essence. Nevertheless, I find it unnecessary to include these types of text in the communiqué. But if the Romanian comrades accept Comrade Ilyichev's version, I will accept it, too.

**70) Comrade Willmann:**

They will accept Comrade Ilyichev's proposal, if the Romanian comrades accept it too.

**71) Comrade Macovescu:**

I propose that in typing out the communiqué, the Romanian version be added between brackets as a proposal rejected by the other delegates, as it had been the case in Geneva. We do not accept Comrade Ilyichev's proposal.

**72) Comrade Puja:**

In that case, the Soviet delegation withdraws its proposal. Let's turn to paragraph 5. If I understand the Romanian comrades correctly, they accept paragraph 5 of the draft communiqué and propose to add to it their supplement.

**73) Comrade Macovescu:**

Correct.

**74) Comrade Puja:**

Therefore, we have all accepted paragraph 5 of the original draft communiqué and now we shall discuss the Romanian proposal.

**75) Comrade Willmann:**

Before today's session we already discussed the Romanian position related to the preliminary conference with the Romanian comrades. In one of my previous speeches I have already indicated that the Polish delegation assigns great significance to the preliminary conference of the ambassadors in Helsinki. In this regard we have listened to the Soviet comrades' account of the Soviet-Finnish negotiations, and a few minutes before this session Comrade Ilyichev also described these to all the participants. In view of the fact that the discussions on the planned meeting of the ambassadors are still under way, it would be ill advised to mention the actual form of the preliminary conference in the communiqué. In our opinion this proposal could only postpone the conference. As their friends, he would like to assure the

Romanian comrades that this proposal would not be acceptable by the West, either. Although there are two or three countries that agree with this, the majority support the so called “open salon” of the ambassadors.

The delegations sitting here yesterday and today all agreed on holding preliminary talks, but failed to come to an agreement on mentioning them in the communiqué, since this does not correspond with the actual situation. The Polish delegation asks the Romanian comrades to revise their position.

**76) Comrade Puja:**

Announces that the Romanian comrades have submitted a modification to correct a typing error, as they meant “agreement” instead of “participation” in the text. In other respects they agree with the Polish comrades’ comments.

Our efforts to convince the Romanian comrades that the insistence on the preliminary conference was, and would still continue to be for some time, an unrealistic demand proved futile already back in Sophia. He does not understand why the Romanian comrades want to keep this item on the agenda.

At the meetings our government held with the representatives of the western countries our western partners mentioned that they had been aware of the Romanian position and could not approve of it. He finds it ill-advised to insist on the phrasing at a moment when the possible outlines of a preliminary meeting of the ambassadors in Helsinki are beginning to emerge, as this could only confuse the situation.

He asks the Romanian comrades to reconsider their position.

**77) Comrade Macovescu:**

Announces that the reason he insist on his phrasing is that now the prospects of the meeting between the ambassadors looks promising.

**78) Comrade Puja:**

The form of the preliminary meeting of the ambassadors is different from what the Romanian comrades propose in the communiqué.

**79) Comrade Fischer:**

The German delegation has also studied the call for a preliminary meeting. They welcome the idea of an ambassadors’ meeting in Helsinki as an interesting and appropriate move. In their view, however, we must not address this issue ahead of the appropriate time, because we might achieve the opposite effect of what the Romanian comrades expect. The basic preconditions of a preliminary conference are still unclear at the moment. Only when work has started on it should we address the question in a concrete form.

In accord with the other delegations, the German deputation recommends that the Romanian comrades withdraw their proposition, all the more so since at the end of paragraph 5 the communiqué will essentially, and in a general form, address the question. It is not necessary to list all the concrete measures in the communiqué.

**80) Comrade Grigorev:**

The Romanian comrades have essentially repeated the proposal they had put forward in Sophia, the only difference being that on this occasion they made mention of neither the level of representation nor Sophia as the location of the preliminary conference. This proposition was supported neither in Sophia nor in the West. This is why we cannot comprehend their reasons in insisting on it. We could not persuade Comrade Macovescu, and he could not persuade us.

Since the talks about the Helsinki meeting of the ambassadors have not yet yielded any concrete results, it would be pointless to use such phrasing in the communiqué.

In line with the Soviet comrades’ position, he is of the opinion that if the ministerial conference chose to approve the communiqué in its original form, that would generate a favorable

response in European public opinion.

**81) Comrade Klusák:**

In his opinion the present situation is not appropriate for calling attention to the importance of the preliminary conference. Such phrasing would only block the road to the all-European conference. Already enough time has been spent on exploring this possibility in Sophia. Neither the western partners nor we see any sense in such a conference. A new situation has emerged, creating an opportunity for organizing the meetings between the ambassadors. The Romanian comrades' phrasing could easily jeopardize this opportunity. In a period of tentative inquiries it would be inopportune to talk about the concrete details of the preliminary meeting. By dropping this amendment, the communiqué would lose nothing of its merits, since we have talked about the multiplicity of the preparations in the Memorandum and paragraphs 5 and contains a summary of this.

**82) Comrade Ilyichev:**

He agrees with the comrades speaking before him; he is also of the opinion that the situation is not ready for putting forward the idea suggested by the Romanian comrades, all the more so since paragraph 6 of the communiqué essentially contains this.

**83) Comrade Macovescu:**

Would like to emphasize that in their proposition they explained the appropriateness of such a preliminary conference.

**84) Comrade Puja:**

Declares that it was precisely the inappropriateness of the conference that the other delegates of the meeting pointed out.

**85) Comrade Willmann:**

All those present regard the Helsinki meeting of the ambassadors appropriate, nevertheless they do not find it appropriate to mention it in the communiqué.

**86) Comrade Puja:**

Motions that in case the Romanian comrades continue to stand by their proposed modification, the conference adopt the draft communiqué in its original form and submit it to the ministerial meeting together with the Romanian comrades' proposed modification. He recommends that they now turn to discuss the Romanian modifications related to paragraph 5. Apparently we all agree with the substance of the first amendment in principle. But since this would only amount to the repetition of the Budapest Call, we do not think it appropriate to return to the subject.

In connection with Comrade Macovescu's comment whereby repetition is the mother of all knowledge, it must be pointed out that simple readers might find too much repetition rather boring, and so we must make every effort to use brief, lucid and concise phrases, avoiding unnecessary repetition. There is no point in arguing about principles, since we all agree on them.

**87) Comrade Klusak:**

Recommends that if the Romanian comrades sustain their proposal, the amendment be submitted to the ministerial conference.

**88) Comrade Grigoriev:**

In relation to amendment no. 3, he confirms that the participants of the meeting have already rejected it.

**89) Comrade Klusak:**

Explains that amendment no. 3 is not only superfluous but also explicitly detrimental, insofar as the proposal intimates that we expect the western partners to come up with new proposals, when in fact they have already made such propositions. They might get the impression that we have failed to consider the proposals they had made so far and would only be willing to

study their subsequent proposals.

**90) Comrade Puja:**

Since amendment no. 3 by the Romanian comrades essentially repeats the content of the Prague Declaration, he asks the Romanian comrades to withdraw their proposal.

**91) Comrade Macovescu:**

Demands that their proposal be submitted to the ministerial conference.

**92) Comrade Puja:**

Announces that the participants of the meeting agree with this and at Comrade Willmann's request motions to hold a 15-minute break.

**93) Comrade Puja:**

The proposed Romanian modification to the original 6th paragraph: "Taking this into consideration, the ministers have examined the measures that are thought necessary for the thorough preparation, good work and success of the all-European conference." Then the original text continues. Are there any comments?

**94) Comrade Klusak:**

Since we are talking about a Memorandum, which must be approved similarly to a resolution, the word "examined" is not sufficient and should be followed with "accepted". If this is only a difference in usage, then there is no problem; otherwise the expression is not appropriate. He continues to support the first version.

**95) Comrade Ilyichev:**

If the change is merely editorial, then the modification does not improve the text. If it concerns interpretation, then he wants some clarification before making any comments, because the intention is not clear.

**96) Comrade Macovescu:**

Gladly gives the answer, but there are, perhaps, other questions also.

**97) Comrade Puja:**

Believes that with the exception of the Romanian comrades, everyone agrees with Comrade Klusak, so we could proceed.

**98) Comrade Ilyichev:**

We must be clear on the intended meaning before we could make comments.

**99) Comrade Macovescu:**

Could best describe the intended meaning of the modification by pointing out that not just the countries represented here would guarantee the calling of the conference, but others, too.

**100) Comrade Puja:**

We passed the resolution on the preparations for calling the meeting. These are facts and texts that cannot be misconstrued.

**101) Comrade Ilyichev:**

The suggestion that we were to decide on behalf of all the other European countries is a rather strange interpretation of the original text. It is quite clear that the text refers to the ministers present. This might be written down. We do not regard the issues settled by us as being binding on everyone. If they do not agree with this, they should say so, because otherwise the modification is incomprehensible. If we regard our measures important, then we must write that these are important measures, but if not, then we must explain why we don't regard them as important.

**102) Comrade Macovescu:**

Asks Comrade Ilyichev to repeat the phrasing he mentioned in his speech.

**103) Comrade Ilyichev:**

"Taking this into consideration, the ministers have come to an agreement in all the

---

important measures...” Then the original text continues.

**104) Comrade Macovescu:**

Agrees.

**105) Comrade Ilyichev:**

The Russian phrase must be clarified stylistically. He proposes his own version.

**106) Comrade Puja:**

Declares paragraph 6 approved. Paragraph 7 of the Romanian modification is identical with the original and can, therefore, be regarded as approved. The Romanian comrades propose to replace paragraph 8 with two new paragraphs.

**107) Comrade Fischer:**

Why does Comrade Macovescu oppose the 8th paragraph of the original text?

**108) Comrade Macovescu:**

The reason they submitted the modification was that, in harmony with the Prague accord, their government would like to handle the documents at its own discretion.

**109) Comrade Grigorev:**

The penultimate paragraph recommended by the Romanian comrades is unnecessary. In accordance with the practice of international relations, the host of the conference hands over the documents to the parties concerned. This was the same with the NATO documents: the Italian Ambassador handed over the communiqué and the statement, the others came to the Foreign Ministry not in order to hand over the documents again, but to negotiate. It would be rather ridiculous, if these documents were delivered over and over again. But of course, if the Romanian comrades insist, they, too, can hand over the documents of the ministerial conference separately.

**110) Comrade Puja:**

We agree. He is in favor of rejecting the Romanian amendment. The practice is that every government acts in a manner thought best.

**111) Comrade Ilyichev:**

In handing over the documents, NATO followed the protocol set by us in Prague. The Romanian amendment would give the impression that the original concept was different. Coming back to the last paragraph, he recommends that we insert into the Romanian text the expression “...the country’s capital where the ministerial conference took place...”

**112) Comrade Macovescu:**

Agrees with Comrade Ilyichev’s idea, but insists on modifying the previous paragraph as proposed by him.

**113) Comrade Puja:**

Since there is no agreement in this, he recommends that the ministerial meeting decide in the matter.

**114) Comrade Ilyichev:**

As a personal and friendly gesture, he asks the Romanian comrade to withdraw this proposal, as the paragraph has a very bad ring to it from the viewpoint of international practice, sounding almost as odium.

**115) Comrade Macovescu:**

Similarly, as a personal gesture, he turns to Comrade Ilyichev to consent to the two paragraphs so that everyone know what to do. The NATO example is different, but as an act of camaraderie, he asks the Soviet delegate not to interpret differently the Romanian proposal.

**116) Comrade Puja:**

We do not interpret differently, just don’t understand.

**117) Comrade Ilyichev:**

There is no such clause in the Prague communiqué.

**118) Comrade Macovescu:**

In Prague the handing over of the documents went according to an internal agreement. This time we ask the Hungarian comrades to hand over the documents. If the last paragraph is judged necessary, then both should be included.

**119) Comrade Puja:**

The agreement is that the ministerial meeting will decide in this matter. With that the debate on the draft communiqué has come to an end. Next comes the debate on the draft memorandum. But before coming to that, he orders a ten-minute break at Comrade Ilyichev's request.

Break from 8:00 p.m. to 12:00 p.m.

[...]

**[Editors' note: The minutes of the night session, beginning at 00:00 on 21 June 1970 (21 pages) have not yet been translated.]**

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, Christian Nuenlist, Anna Locher. 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."