

# ***Zürcher Beiträge***

*zur Sicherheitspolitik und Konfliktforschung Nr. 72*

Xiaoyuan Liu and Vojtech Mastny (eds.)

## **China and Eastern Europe, 1960s–1980s**

**Proceedings of the International Symposium:  
Reviewing the History of Chinese–East European  
Relations from the 1960s to the 1980s  
Beijing, 24–26 March 2004**

Hrsg.: Andreas Wenger  
Forschungsstelle für Sicherheitspolitik  
der ETH Zürich



# Inhaltsverzeichnis

Preface	5
The Editors	7
OPENING SESSION	19
SESSION ONE: Chinese–Eastern European Relations within the Context of the Sino–Soviet Split	29
SESSION TWO: China, Eastern Europe, and the Vietnam War, 1964–1973	53
SESSION THREE: The Effects of the Cultural Revolution on the Relations between China and Eastern Europe, 1966–1969	81
SESSION FOUR: Chinese–Eastern European Relations after Czechoslovakia and the Sino–Soviet Border Clashes, 1968–1972	101
SESSION FIVE: The Impact of the Sino–American Rapprochement on Chinese–Eastern European Relations, 1968–1972	131
SESSION SIX: The Mutual Effects of the Reforms in China and Eastern Europe, 1978–1989	147
SESSION SEVEN: The Road to Normalization in Chinese–Eastern European Relations, 1976–1989	173
ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION	195
CLOSING SESSION	221



## Preface

On 24–26 March 2004, the Parallel History Project on NATO and the Warsaw Pact (PHP) held an international seminar on “Reviewing Relations between China and East European Countries from the 1960s to the 1980s” in Beijing. Of particular interest were topics such as the security implications of the US-Chinese rapprochement, China’s policies toward the Warsaw Pact and NATO, Soviet perceptions of China as an ally of the West, bilateral relations between China and the member states of the Warsaw Pact other than the Soviet Union, and Sino-Albanian relations.

The seminar brought together a selected group of Chinese and East European officials who were involved in the mutual relations as diplomats or party officials in the 1960–80s. The conference was organized by the Party History Research Center of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and the Parallel History Project, in cooperation with the Cold War International History Project (CWIHP) at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, the George Washington University Cold War Group (GWCW), both in Washington, DC, and the Cold War Studies Centre at the London School of Economics. It was the first time the Chinese Party History Research Center organized an international conference with a foreign partner. The conference proceedings will allow interested scholars and an interested wider public to follow the fascinating roundtable discussion of former Chinese and East European diplomats and Western and Chinese scholars.

The Center for Security Studies launched the Parallel History Project on NATO and the Warsaw Pact (PHP) in late 1998, together with the National Security Archive at George Washington University and the CWIHP, both in Washington, D.C. The aim of the project is to provide new scholarly perspectives on contemporary international history by collecting and analyzing formerly secret governmental documents from both NATO and Eastern and Central European archives.

Coordinated by Vojtech Mastny, Senior Fellow of the National Security Archive, the Parallel History Project evolved into an international consortium of more than twenty partners, bringing together leading Cold War historians, archivists, and government officials. PHP researchers have collected thousands of pages of material on security related issues from the Cold War period. They present their findings to the academic community at conferences

and through print and online publications. The PHP has organized several major international conferences on war planning and intra-bloc tensions. On its website ([www.isn.ethz.ch/php](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php)), the PHP has published a large number of online documents on central issues such as mutual threat perceptions and alliance management, including a collection on “China, the Warsaw Pact, and Sino-Soviet Relations under Khrushchev and Mao” (October 2002).

The Center for Security Studies is very pleased to publish the English version of these important proceedings in its series “Zürcher Beiträge zur Sicherheitspolitik und Konfliktforschung”. Its Chinese version is available in full-text on the PHP website.

October 2004

Prof. Dr. Andreas Wenger

Director of the Center for Security Studies (CSS)

## The Editors

XIAOYAN LIU (xyliu@iastate.edu) is Associate Professor of History at Iowa State University at Ames. A specialist in Chinese nationalism, ethnic conflicts in Chinese Central Asia, Chinese- American relations, and East Asian international history, he is the author of *Frontier Passages: Ethnopolitics and the Rise of Chinese Communism, 1921–1945* (Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Stanford University Press, 2004).

VOJTECH MASTNY (mst3696@aol.com) is a Senior Fellow at the National Security Archive in Washington and PHP coordinator. A specialist in European international history, he has been professor at Columbia University, University of Illinois, US Naval War College, Boston University, and the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies. His *The Cold War and Soviet Insecurity: The Stalin Years* (Oxford University Press, 1996) was the winner of the American Historical Association's 1997 George L. Beer Prize.

The proceedings of the seminar, conducted in English and in Chinese, were recorded on tapes and interpreted simultaneously. In addition, a Chinese stenographic record was taken. Xiaoyuan Liu transcribed the English parts from the tapes and translated as well as transcribed the remaining parts of the proceedings from the stenographic record. Vojtech Mastny edited the transcribed text.

The Chinese stenographic record of the proceedings is available on the PHP website, [www.isn.ethz.ch/php](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php).



## Beijing Seminar on China and Eastern Europe in the 1960–80s

The PHP held its second major international conference on March 24–26, 2004, in Beijing, under the title “Reviewing Relations between China and East European Countries from the 1960s to the 1980s” (see Program). Organized jointly with the Party History Research Center of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, the seminar brought together former Chinese and East European diplomats for a roundtable discussion with Western and Chinese scholars. The London School of Economics Cold War Studies Centre, Cold War International History Project of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (CWIHP) and the George Washington University Cold War Group (GWCW) were the cooperating institutions. In the early stages of the preparation, the Modern History Research Center and Archives and the School of International Relations, both at Peking University, had also been involved.

The seminar was the first time the Chinese Party History Research Center organized an international conference with a foreign partner. One of the participating Chinese diplomats commented that “When I first heard of the proposed seminar I could not believe my ears.” The goal was to engage in a structured and focused open discussion aimed at identifying, analyzing, and interpreting the main issues of the relations between China and the Soviet Union’s Warsaw Pact allies during their most turbulent period, as remembered by veteran diplomats from both sides. The seminar achieved that goal beyond expectations.

The discussion, arranged chronologically, was moderated by Professor Odd Arne Westad, of the London School of Economics, and Zhang Baijia, Senior Research Fellow at the Party History Research Center and director of its Third Research Department (responsible for research on the period since 1978). The Chinese side was represented by seven former ambassadors, the East European side by three former ambassadors and three other high-ranking diplomats (see List of Participants). The countries involved were Poland, East Germany, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, and Albania. No suitable participant could be located in former Czechoslovakia.

In advance of the seminar, the National Security Archive had prepared a CD with a selection of declassified US documents on the American-Chinese rapprochement in the 1970s.<sup>1</sup> A further selection of documents, obtained by the PHP from former East German, Czechoslovak, and Romanian archives, had been posted on the PHP website, [www.isn.ethz.ch/php](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php);<sup>2</sup> a few had been translated with support from the CWIHP, with more translations to be added later. Numerous additional documents had been made available by the GWCW at its landmark November 2003 conference in Budapest, of which the Beijing seminar has been described as a “most perfect follow-up.” Although no new Chinese archival documents had become available for the years covered by the seminar its coincidence with the unprecedented release by the Chinese foreign ministry of about 30% of its records up to 1955 augured well for the future.

The proceedings of the seminar were recorded in both Chinese and English. Both versions are published on the PHP website. The seminar broke new ground by offering insights into perceptions and assessments of policies, their making and implementation. Following is a summary of some of the most important findings with regard to Chinese-East European relations in their larger historical setting.

Ever since the onset of the Sino-Soviet rift, China differentiated between its policies toward the Soviet Union and the East European countries. It acted on the assumption that those countries, though extensively dependent on Moscow, nevertheless had interests of their own that could be exploited by China to help isolate the Soviet Union. Beijing therefore never publicly criticized their leaders and eventually had normalized relations with them earlier than it did its relations with the Soviet Union.

The East European diplomats agreed that the communist regimes they had served had interests of their own. The pursuit of those interests, however, differed depending on how much leeway Moscow was prepared to grant its dependent states at any given time as well as on how much those states

1 See the collection, “China and the United States: From Hostility to Engagement, 1960–1998,” on the National Security Archive website, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/nsa/publications/china-us/index.html>.

2 “Document Reader for the International Conference on Reviewing the Relations between China and East European Countries: From the 1960s to the 1980s, 24–26 March 2004, Beijing/China,” [http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/conferences/PreviousEvents/2004\\_beijing\\_docs.htm](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/conferences/PreviousEvents/2004_beijing_docs.htm).

were prepared to make use of the leeway. The former Romanian ambassador observed that in relations with China attitudes mattered more than issues.

Assessments by Chinese representatives abroad often differed among each other as well as from those by Beijing. In 1956, for example, the local representatives of the Xinhua press agency regarded the Polish reform movement as legitimate whereas the Warsaw embassy judged it reactionary, and thus worthy of suppression by the Soviet Union. China's opposing such suppression while abetting it in the case of the Hungarian revolution reflected Beijing's assessment of the Polish situation as involving rectification of an "unequal treaty" relationship with Moscow whereas in Hungary a violent overthrow of communist rule was at issue.

According to the Chinese diplomats, China's establishment in the early 1960s of its "special relationship" with anti-Soviet Albania—mainly at Albanian initiative—did not rule out reconciliation with Moscow until the Kremlin disappointed Beijing's hopes for a rapprochement in the aftermath of Khrushchev's ouster. The diplomats cited the 1965 Mao-Kosygin meeting as a turning point. Disagreements between the two countries about support for North Vietnam in its war against the United States—a war neither Moscow nor Beijing initially believed the Vietnamese could win—fueled Chinese mistrust not only of the Soviet Union but also of its allies. China opposed Polish attempts at mediating the Vietnam War as untimely and remained aloof to Warsaw's apparent interest in establishing a "back channel" to Beijing.

The Chinese and East European diplomats agreed in their assessment of the Cultural Revolution as a disaster for China's foreign policy and its image in the world. The policy spun "out of control" as different factions fought one another in the foreign ministry. Albania alone continued to back China on international issues but there was no convergence between the two countries on domestic policies. Unlike in China, Enver Hoxha's campaign against "bureaucratism" targeted only the government, not the party establishment. When Albanian officials visiting China offered to join in public castigation of high-ranking victims of the Cultural Revolution, notably Liu Shaoqi, they were spurned.

In 1968, China never managed to formulate a policy toward the Czechoslovak reform movement, vacillating between its assessment as resistance to Soviet domination and a variety of "revisionism." Beijing nevertheless reacted strongly to Soviet military intervention in Czechoslovakia, fearing an ominous precedent. Zhou Enlai's assurances of support to Romania against the threat of Soviet intervention, voiced publicly at Mao's instruc-

tions at the Romanian embassy reception on August 21, went even farther in a private conversation with the ambassador. But when Albanian defense minister Beqir Balluku came to Beijing two months later to propose an anti-Soviet alliance, Mao was evasive, dwelling on the importance of Yugoslavia as an “indirect ally.”

The seminar elucidated but did not resolve the crucial question of how close China and the Soviet Union came to war in 1969. The Chinese and East European testimonies lent support to the growing scholarly consensus that the border clashes had been the result of the chaos brought about by the Cultural Revolution rather than of any deliberate decisions by either the Chinese or the Soviet government; once the clashes occurred, however, the excessive Soviet use of force made matters worse. Both sides geared themselves for war, exaggerating each other’s readiness to wage it. Each side remained more restrained than the other thought.

East European, particularly Hungarian and Polish, diplomats revealed that their governments disbelieved Moscow’s allegations of Chinese aggressiveness. While frightened at the prospect of a Soviet-Chinese War that could draw their countries in, they never really believed the Kremlin leaders would be so foolish as to start a war with China. On the vexing question of Soviet plans for a pre-emptive strike against its nuclear facilities, which was the subject of much Western speculation, the diplomats did not recall any hints from Moscow at the time.

The Chinese participants reported that later in 1969 Mao tried to defuse tension, and consequently disapproved of the mobilization order No. 1 that his anointed successor Lin Biao had presumably issued on his own. The Chinese rebuffed Soviet attempts at reconciliation because they thought the time was not ripe but possibly also because no one was in a position to take the necessary responsibility. Under these circumstances, the importance of the Chinese-American rapprochement appears even larger that it would have been otherwise.

According to Hungarian testimony, East Europeans had expected the development but were still surprised when it came. The rapprochement strengthened China’s relations with Romania, which had been instrumental in facilitating it, but strained Beijing’s relations with other East European countries, albeit in different degrees. Bulgaria condemned it in strong terms, apparently at Soviet behest, as did Albania, which regarded it as a betrayal of international communism. Consistent with the policy of differentiation

between the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries, the Chinese responded in a low key.

Much like the Brezhnev leadership, Beijing misjudged the Soviet Union's apparent global ascendancy during the first half of the 1970s. The Chinese misinterpreted the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe as a Soviet ploy to weaken Western Europe's defenses and exaggerated the benefits Moscow could derive from West Germany's new *Ostpolitik*. The management of China's relations with Eastern Europe during Mao's last years was thus not as sophisticated as his admirers have been inclined to think, nor did it immediately change after his death. Only the advent of reform under Deng Xiaoping in 1978 did provide China's foreign policy with the necessary admixture of "rationality and courage" that was the prescription for success.

China's turn toward reform was generally welcomed in Eastern Europe even while Beijing continued to view the Soviet Union as the enemy number one. Hungary came to regard China as a "partner in reform" although the preferred Chinese reform model was rather the Yugoslav one because of its more developed market features. Beijing's relations with Albania plummeted because of the undiminished Albanian commitment to ideological orthodoxy, leading to the termination of Chinese economic aid though not to public recriminations by Beijing.

The Chinese diplomats offered a convincing account of their government's commitment to the "Three Respects" principle—respect for the Eastern European countries' particular foreign and domestic policies, for their special relationship with the Moscow, and for whatever ways they would choose in pursuing mutual relations.

China adopted a remarkably restrained attitude toward the Solidarity crisis in Poland, regarding it as the country's internal matter, and felt vindicated by the manner in which the Polish military seemed to have mastered the crisis. Its outcome, however, made Beijing less sensitive to the challenge Eastern Europe's communist regimes would subsequently face from their peoples. Bent on good relations with both the reform-minded regimes, such as Hungary's, and the reactionary ones, particularly East Germany's and Romania's, Beijing was unprepared when all of them collapsed.

The seminar raised the question of the effect of the June 1989 Tiananmen Square events on East European developments. The Hungarian representative remembered demands in his country for the transfer of diplomatic recognition from China to Taiwan. There was concern in Eastern Europe

about Chinese support for local hardliners and especially about a possible Chinese attempt to rescue Ceaușescu. These were unwarranted concerns. The former Bulgarian ambassador recalled Premier Li Peng having asked party chief Todor Zhivkov with apparent levity whether he had his “Egon Krenz” ready.

Romania’s former ambassador was alone in voicing a critical view of the dissent that led to Tiananmen; for their part, the Chinese diplomats emphasized Tiananmen’s irrelevance for the course of China’s relations with Eastern Europe. One of them described the shock that the subsequent collapse of communism nevertheless meant for the Chinese who, having been “emotionally attached to socialism,” now began to wonder about its meaning. The foreign ministry encountered criticism for its “hands-off” policy—exemplified by its letting Eastern European diplomats decide whether they preferred to be addressed “Comrade” or “Mr.”—but the spirit of the “Three Respects” prevailed.

In taking stock of the results of the conference, the participants praised its spirit of open and substantive discussion as a good omen for further cooperation. The Party History Institute expressed interest in such cooperation in the study of China’s past relations with other parts of the world as well. For the PHP, this provides an opportunity for a follow-up especially with regard to the countries of Western Europe, NATO, and the European Union.

Vojtech Mastny  
PHP Coordinator

“20世纪60—80年代  
中国同东欧国家关系历史回顾”  
国际研讨会会议日程

**Reviewing the History  
of Chinese-Eastern European Relations:  
From the 1960s to the 1980s**

会议主办单位

organized by

中共中央党史研究室政党政治研究中心

Center for Party Policy Studies, Party History Research  
Institute,

Chinese Communist Party Central Committee

and

北约华约平行史项目

Parallel History Project on NATO and the Warsaw Pact

会议协办单位

威尔逊国际学者中心冷战国际史项目

乔治华盛顿大学冷战项目

in cooperation with the

Cold War International History Project  
of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars,  
the George Washington University Cold War Group,  
and the LSE Cold War Studies Centre

## Yue Yuan Hotel, Beijing, March 24–26, 2004

### PROGRAM

3月23日全天  
与会人员报到

Arrival of participants

3月24日

7:45 早餐 Breakfast

9:00– 9:45 开幕式 Opening session

党研室领导致欢迎词 Welcoming remarks by leaders of the  
Party History Research Institute

1. 威尔逊中心冷战项目主任致词 Remarks by Vojtech Mastny,  
PHP Coordinator

3. 中方协调人章百家致词 Remarks by Zhang Baijia, Senior  
Research Fellow and Director of the Third Branch, Party His-  
tory Research Center, Chinese side coordinator

9:45–10:00 与会正式代表照相 Photo session

10:00–10:15 茶歇 Tea break

10:15–10:25 开场白 Introductory remarks 讨论协调人 moderators 章百家,  
阿诺·威斯塔特 (文安立) Zhang Baijia and Arne Westad

10:25–12:00 第一议题: 中苏分裂背景下的中国同东欧国家的关系

#### SESSION I CHINESE-EAST EUROPEAN RELATIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SINO-SOVIET SPLIT

---

Introductions: 李凤林 (Li Fenglin), Romulus Ioan Budura (15 mins. each;  
followed by discussion)

12:15 午餐 Lunch

14:00–15:45 第二议题: 中国, 东欧与越南战争(1964–1973)

#### SESSION II CHINA, EASTERN EUROPE, AND THE VIETNAM WAR (1964–1973)

---

Introductions: Joachim Schröter, 刘琪宝 (Liu Qibao)

15:45–16:00 茶歇 Tea break

16:00–17:45 第三议题: ”文化大革命”对中国与东欧国家关系的影响  
(1966–1969)

SESSION III THE EFFECTS OF THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION ON RELATIONS  
BETWEEN CHINA AND EASTERN EUROPE (1966–1969)

---

Introductions: 范承祚 (Fan Chengzuo), Muhamet Kapllani

18:30 欢迎晚宴 Welcoming banquet

15:25 日

7:45 早餐 Breakfast

8:30–10:15 第四议题: 苏军侵捷与中苏边境冲突后的中国同东欧国家的  
关系 (1968–1972)

SESSION IV CHINESE-EAST EUROPEAN RELATIONS AFTER CZECHOSLOVAKIA  
AND THE SINO-SOVIET BORDER CLASHES (1968–1972)

---

Introductions: Jan Rowiński, 朱安康 (Zhu Ankang)

10:15–10:30 茶歇 Tea break

10:30–12:15 第五议题: 中美关系正常化对中国与东欧国家关系的影响  
(1969–1972)

SESSION V THE IMPACT OF THE SINO-AMERICAN RAPPROCHEMENT ON  
CHINESE-EAST EUROPEAN RELATIONS (1969–1976)

---

Introductions: 陈德来 (Chen Delai), Ottó Juhász

12:15–13:45 午餐 Lunch

14:00–15:45 第六议题: 中国改革与东欧国家改革的相互影响  
(1978–1989)

SESSION VI THE MUTUAL EFFECTS OF THE REFORM PERIODS IN CHINA  
AND EASTERN EUROPE (1978–1989)

---

Introductions: Doncho Donchev, 白寿绵 (Bai Shoumian)

15:45–16:00 茶歇 Tea break

16:00–17:45 第七议题: 中国与东欧国家关系的正常化 (1976–1989)

SESSION VII THE ROAD TO NORMALIZATION IN CHINESE-EAST EUROPEAN  
RELATIONS (1976-1989)

---

Introductions: TBA, and 刘彦顺 (Liu Yanshun)

15:26 日

7:45 早餐 Breakfast

8:30-10:30 自由讨论 Roundtable discussion

10:30-10:45 茶歇 Tea break

10:45-11:45 总结 Summing-up session

Introductions: 章百家 (Zhang Baijia), Arne Westad

11:45 会议闭幕 Closing

12:15 午餐 (Lunch)

## Opening Session

(9:00–9:45, March 24)

*Zhang Baijia*: Distinguished delegates and guests, the international symposium, “Reviewing the History of Chinese–East European Relations: From the 1960s to the 1980s,” is now in session. Please allow me to introduce the leading officials of the Party History Research Center and the participants of the symposium.

Present at our opening session are Director Sun Ying and Deputy Directors Wang Weihua, Li Zhongjie, and Gu Anlin of the Party History Research Center of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee. We also have another deputy director, Zhang Qihua. She will arrive in a moment. These two gentlemen are Research Fellows Huang Xiurong and Huang Xiaotong. The latter is also a member of the Administrative Committee of the Party History Research Center and director of the Center’s Scientific Research Department.

Now let me turn to the other participants of the symposium: Vojtech Mastny, coordinator of the Parallel History Project on NATO and the Warsaw Pact; Li Xiangqian, director of the Party Politics Center of the Party History Research Center; Shen Zhihua, Professor at the Eastern History Seminar; Chen Jian, Professor of University of Virginia; Yu Hongjun, director of the Research Branch, the Liaison Department of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee; Yu Sui, Senior Research Fellow of the Central Liaison Department; Li Danhui, Research Fellow of the Institute of Contemporary China; Ye Tong, former Hungarian Ambassador to China; Chen Delai, former Chinese Ambassador to Romania; Zhu Ankang, former Chinese Ambassador to Hungary and Yugoslavia; Joachim Schröter, former East German military attaché in China; Bai Shoumian, former Chinese Ambassador to Bulgaria; Liu Yanshun, former Chinese Ambassador to Poland; Malcolm Byrne, deputy director of the National Security Archive in the United States; Lorenz Luthi, Assistant Professor at McGill University, Canada; Sergey Radchenko, doctoral candidate of the London School of Economics; Bernd Schaefer, Research Fellow of German Historical Institute in Washington, D.C.; James Hershberg, Associate Professor of History at the George Washington University; Christian Ostermann, director of the Cold War International

History Project, Wilson Center; Odd Arne Westad, Professor at the London School of Economics. I am Zhang Baijia, director of the Third Department of the Party History Research Center. Director Sun Ying will now make a welcome speech.

*Sun Ying:* Distinguished delegates and guests, it is a honor for me, on behalf of the Party History Research Center, to welcome you to participate in the international symposium on “Reviewing the History of Chinese–East European Relations: From the 1960s to the 1980s.” This symposium is cosponsored by the Party Politics Research Center of the Party History Research Center, and the Parallel History Project on NATO and the Warsaw Pact based at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich. It has also received support from the Cold War International History Project of the Wilson Center in the United States and the Cold War Group of the George Washington University. In reviewing the Chinese–East European relations from the 1960s to the 1980s and studying historical experiences, we may strengthen today’s dialogue and cooperation and also promote peace and development in the world. Among the participants, there are veteran Chinese and East European diplomats who personally participated in and witnessed this historical period. There are also established Chinese and foreign historians who have undertaken in-depth studies of this history. I am confident that the dialogue among the participants of historical events and between them and historians will advance our understanding of many important events in this period. As the host I wish the symposium great success.

Next I will briefly describe the organization and operations of the Party History Research Center. The Center was established in 1980 as a research office of the CCP Central Committee. The Center has three departments. The First Department is responsible for studying Chinese Communist history from 1921 to 1949, covering 28 years. The Second Department studies the period from 1949 to 1978, that is, from the foundation of new China to the eve of the reform and opening era. The Third Department studies the party history after 1978, or history since the beginning of the reforms. In addition we also have three specialized offices. The Party Politics Research Center, a co-organizer of this symposium, studies foreign parties’ conditions and related issues. The other two offices are separately responsible for collecting historical materials pertinent to the CCP history and for conducting educational and propaganda work related to the party history. We publish a journal, *Zhonggong Dangshi Yanjiu*. We also have a press that publishes books and materials on the CCP history. Altogether the Center

has 200 employees, including 51 research fellows at the ranks of professor and associate professor. The Center's student body includes 12 doctoral candidates, 53 in master's programs, and 59 studying toward the bachelor's degree. In the past two decades we produced many monographs and essays on the CCP history. In collaboration with some other organizations, we also produced television series on special topics. Books published by us, such as *Zhongguo Gongchandang de Qishinian* (Seventy years of the Chinese Communist Party), *Zhongguo Gongchandang Lishi* (History of the Chinese Communist Party) volume one, and *Zhongguo Gongchandang Jianshi* (A brief history of the Chinese Communist Party) have aroused tremendous scholarly and public interest.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a good time now to enjoy spring breeze and sunshine in Beijing. Again, I wish the symposium a perfect completion, and good health to everybody. We warmly welcome our friends and look forward to using this cooperation as a starting point for maintaining close and friendly contacts. Thank you!

*Zhang Baijia*: The next speaker is Professor Vojtech Mastny, director of the Parallel History Project on NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

*Vojtech Mastny*: Ladies and gentlemen, it is a special pleasure for me to welcome all of you here on behalf of the Parallel History Project, which is one of the two organizers of this symposium. I would first of all like to express my thanks to our hosts, to the Party History Research Center, and thank them for the great work of organization that advancing the preparations for this seminar. We are grateful to them for all their efforts. They have created optimal conditions for us and it is now up to us to fulfill the expectations that have been raised by organizing this seminar.

It is a special occasion for the PHP, the project that I am heading, as much as it is a special occasion for the Party History Research Center. It is also a special occasion for me personally. It is a first in many ways. It is, I think, the first time that the Party History Research Center has become engaged so extensively in a scholarly interchange with Western scholars, particularly with those dealing with this period of the Cold War. And for us, for the Parallel History Project, it is also the first opportunity to cooperate with Chinese scholars.

Let me follow the example of my predecessor and tell you something about the PHP itself, how we got involved, and what we expect to accomplish. The PHP was established about five years ago, in 1998, at the initiative of several of us who had been working with the Cold War International History

Project for several years and, particularly, of the two institutions that ever since have played the most important role in the project. One of them, the National Security Archive, represented here by Malcolm Byrne, the other, the Center for Security Studies in Zurich, which is part of the Federal Institute of Technology in Switzerland.<sup>3</sup> These are the two major partners. We have additional partners, particularly in Western Europe, the most important of which are Norwegian Institute for Defense Studies and the Machiavelli Center of Cold War Studies in Italy.<sup>4</sup> When the project was established, we took advantage of the opportunity of, first of all, the incipient opening of the NATO archives in Brussels and also of the availability of funding, in this respect particularly from Switzerland, which joined NATO's Partnership for Peace and contributed a certain amount for research on security issues. The Parallel History Project joined this larger undertaking as the historical dimension of the so-called International Relations and Security Network. The International Relations and Security Network is the largest electronic database on security issues that provides information about security from open sources.<sup>5</sup>

When the project was first established, we decided to focus on the history of two alliances during the Cold War, the history of NATO and the history of Warsaw Pact, in a parallel fashion, to study the parallel developments of the two. Hence the word, "parallel," in the name of the project. And it was also our intention to bring in as participants in various ways scholars from Western Europe and Eastern Europe. Since the establishment of the project we have acquired approximately twenty associated institutions or ad hoc groups of scholars in both the former countries of NATO and the former countries of the Warsaw Pact. We have conducted systematic research on the history of the two alliances and much of the result of the research has been published on our website.

I would emphasize here particularly the importance of the PHP website for the dissemination of the results of our work. It is our principle to put on the website documents as soon as they become available, and as soon as they could be useful to scholars. We put them on in facsimile form and in their original languages, and then try to translate them into English later as

3 See the National Security Archive website, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/>, and the Center for Security Studies website, <http://www.fsk.ethz.ch/>.

4 See their websites, [www.ifs.mil.no](http://www.ifs.mil.no), and [www.machiavellicenter.net](http://www.machiavellicenter.net).

5 [www.isn.ethz.ch](http://www.isn.ethz.ch).

funds become available. We have followed the same pattern also in preparing some documents for this seminar. You will find on our website documents on the relations between Eastern Europe and China in the 1960s and 1980s, particularly from East German, Romanian, Czech and, to some extent, Bulgarian archives. We have also organized several conferences dealing with the larger aspect of the rivalry between NATO and the Warsaw Pact during the Cold War. Particularly, in the last year we had a major conference dealing with threat perceptions, military doctrines, and military plans of both alliances. We had this conference in Norway and a book is in the process of being prepared and will be published.<sup>6</sup>

The seminar that we are holding here is something new for us. This is the first time that we have organized a seminar that follows this concept. That is to say, bringing together the veterans—those diplomats and other officials who were participating in the mutual relations at the time—bringing them together from both sides to see each other again and to meet with scholars. This is new for us but there are precedents of this kind of conferences. Let me mention just a few of them. Several years ago a conference on the Cuban missile crisis brought together the Soviet, American and Cuban officials who were involved in interaction with scholars, with historians. Later on there was a project dealing with the American–Soviet relations during the Carter–Brezhnev period. There was this sort of conference on the war in Afghanistan. In all these instances the veterans, spoke to each other, they spoke to historians, and they addressed the documents assembled for the occasion. So this is the pattern that we are trying to follow here as well.

Let me just mention briefly how this seminar developed, and at the same time thank those people who were responsible for making this happen. It started about two years ago during my visit to China. I had a conversation with Shen Zhihua and it was at that time that the idea came up. Couldn't we have something about the Cold War in Asia and the relations between the Warsaw Pact and China, and bring together the participants, or the veterans? Then Niu Jun from Peking University followed up the idea in cooperation with us. He came to one of our anniversary meetings in Zurich about two years ago. And then we decided to get together the group. The important turning point in the preparations was the participation of the Party History Research Center. It was decided that the Center would be the major spon-

6 For details on the conference, see [http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/conferences/PreviousEvents/2003\\_spitzbergen\\_conference-report.htm](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/conferences/PreviousEvents/2003_spitzbergen_conference-report.htm).

sor. And here we are particularly grateful to Zhang Baijia for his help and of course for organizing this event. During the last year I have been frequently in contact with Li Xiangqian. In particular I should mention here that there was something I was always looking forward to in every morning that when I opened my e-mail: would there be e-mail from him? Sure enough, more often than not there was one, and it made a good day for me.

I should also mention the fact that we can meet here, the way we do, much thanks to the marvels of the Internet. This conference was really prepared by e-mail. You may not believe it but I had not met anyone of the diplomats until now, until we all met here in Beijing. I had not met our Chinese organizers until actually I came here. Yet, I felt that I knew all of you from our repeated correspondence.

And there also are very many thanks due on the PHP side. It is very much the numerous associates we have in Eastern European countries who helped us identify the suitable persons who would be able and willing to come and who would be in the position to share their knowledge with us. So these unnamed collaborators of ours should be thanked as well. Let me mention here a few other persons who have been helpful in making this seminar happen. First of all, my friend Odd Arne Westad from the London School of Economics, who agreed early on to be the moderator. I think I should divulge no secret when I say that he was one of the moderators also in one of the previous similar conferences, the one on Afghanistan. He decided on this format. I realized that in this area we could not hope to find anybody better than Arne. So I was very happy when he accepted.

I would also like to thank here to Jim Hershberg of the George Washington University's Cold War Group. He was the organizer last November of what can be considered as the predecessor of this meeting, the conference he organized in Budapest. It was a pioneer effort on his part and those who worked with him, a pioneer effort in researching Eastern European archives for documents on relations with China in 1960s. Several important papers were presented at the Budapest conference, and the documents have become available. You can also get them from the website. We decided then that this seminar would focus on the subsequent period of the seventies and eighties, although we are not to draw a rigid line and we certainly will talk about the 1960s as well.

Finally, let me thank Christian Ostermann, director of the Cold War International History Project, for at least starting translations of some of the documents we got together for the seminar here. I should mention that there

will be many more translations. This will be really a seminar in progress for quite some time. As of now we have documents translated from Romanian, which was done through the PHP. We also have documents from Bulgaria. What is in progress with the Cold War International History Project is the translation of documents from German. Another person who should be thanked here is Bernd Schaefer. Also his wife is a translator who does the translation from German and she will do many more. And there will be additional translations coming from Prague, translations from Czech. Unfortunately they could not be ready for the seminar but will be ready in subsequent days, weeks, and months.

I would like to emphasize, however, that the focus of this seminar is not on documents but on testimonies by you, the veterans. Of course we would like to think that this seminar will also provide impetus for declassification of more documents, particularly from the Chinese side. We are encouraged in this hope by the fact that we happen to be meeting at a time when the Chinese government has started systematic declassification, we are told, of documents from the Cold War period.

The time period that we are focusing on is the period that can be described as one of the worst deterioration in Soviet–Chinese relations, but a period that was followed by a happy ending, the end of the Cold War. The period of the 1970s and 1980s was also that of the American–Chinese rapprochement, one of the major developments of our time. And, later on the 1970s saw the entry of Western Europe into relations with China, the establishment of China’s diplomatic relations with the then European Community, and even relations with NATO, all of which our participants will talk about.

What we expect from this seminar is a better understanding of why and how things happened in the 70s and the 80s the way they did. We would like to hear about the dangers of the period but also about the potential and hope for improvement and eventual conclusion of the Cold War in the late 1980s. We will be able to publish the proceedings both on our website once they are edited, and also in print as a publication by the Zurich Center for Security Studies, and then widely distribute these results within the international scholarly community. Let me conclude by expressing the hope that twenty or thirty years from now, scholars will look at the seminar as an important juncture in the scholarly understanding of the Cold War period, just as we now look at the period of the 1970s and the 1980s as an important juncture in political history. Again, let me extend my welcome to you on behalf of

the PHP, and thanks to the hosts. Looking at these beautiful flowers [in the center of the conference room], may our seminar flourish and bloom.

*Zhang Baijia:* The next speaker is Li Xiangqian, director of the Party Politics Research Center.

*Li Xiangqian:* Distinguished delegates and guests, Director Sun Ying and Mr. Mastny just made excellent speeches. I am going to make some remarks on behalf of the Party Politics Research Center. As the Chinese side of the organizers, I wish to express gratitude to many people whose assistance makes the symposium possible. At first I want to thank Professor Mastny, Shen Zhihua, and Niu Jun. They proposed this gathering two or three years ago. Especially I want to thank Professor Mastny for spending much energy and time in organizing this symposium. From inviting the diplomats and scholars to providing numerous archival documents, his work has effectively resulted in today's meeting. All the participants, including the Party Politics Research Center, will benefit from these fresh and important sources and will be able to advance our research. We also want to thank Christian Ostermann, director of the Wilson Center's Cold War International History Project, and Professor Hershberg of the Cold War Group of the George Washington University. Both lent strong support to this undertaking.

Next I want to thank every participant, especially our senior former diplomats. They are in advanced ages and not all in good health. But they agreed to spend part of their valuable time with us. They made careful preparations for this symposium. We are deeply moved. I believe that the dialogue among the participants in the historical events and between them and the scholars will make for a very rich content of this symposium. In the end, I wish to thank the leadership of the Party History Research Center. They supported us fully in this undertaking and provided guidance and assistance at every important step during the preparations for the symposium. On behalf of the administrative and service personnel for this conference, I want to express my deep gratitude to the Center's leadership and comrades involved. As we started this conference, we accomplished many "firsts." Our guesthouse for the first time received foreign guests, our new auditorium opens for the first time to an international symposium. Actually, this is the first international symposium organized by the Party History Research Center and the Party Politics Research Center. I expect that these "firsts" will lead to more and richer scholarly activities, and I hope that the scholarly circles at home and

abroad will continue to support us and pay attention to us. I wish the symposium great success. Thank you!

*Zhang Baijia*: The opening session ends now.

\* \* \* End of Opening Session \* \* \*



## **Session One: Chinese–Eastern European Relations within the Context of the Sino–Soviet Split**

(10:15–12:00, March 24)

*Zhang Baijia:* Now we begin the first topic of the symposium. The session will last from 10:15 to 12:00. Before we start, Mr. Westad will make some remarks on the procedure.

*Odd Arne Westad:* My old and new friends in Beijing, this is a very important yet difficult conference. It is important because it is the first time an event like this taking place in Beijing, and it is difficult because the issues that we are going to be discussing are difficult. Some of the issues may even be considered today as being difficult to handle because of the involvement of the people who are here today at the time. What I would say is that this is a good thing. These difficulties are challenges that we would want to overcome. The only way of overcoming them, as we addressed during the opening session, is by historical openness, now that we have a chance to discuss with each other what really happened back then, and try our best to learn from it.

As Professor Mastny said during his introduction, I had been lucky enough to help moderate several discussions like this with American, Soviet, European, East Asian leaders earlier on. There is one thing I learned from that. It is that the most important aspect of the job that my old friend Zhang Baijia and I would be doing here is to make sure that everyone who wants to speak has a chance to speak. This means that we will have to introduce certain limitations with regard to time. The introductions for each of the sessions should be no more than 15 minutes per person. So for instance, in the first session Ambassador Li and Ambassador Budura will be speaking for 15 minutes each. After that the other participants in the conference—by participants here I mean the veterans, those who actually worked and served at the time from the Eastern European and the Chinese sides—will be invited to comment and to ask questions.

One system which was invented, I think, by Zbigniew Brzezinski, former American National Security Advisor, during one of our conferences, is

a system whereby you can use one finger to show us up here if you want to make a general statement, if you want to use up to 3 minutes to make your general statement. If you have a quick question to something that has been said early on by a previous speaker, you could show two fingers and then you would be able to ask questions directed to the former speaker. We get entertainment. Is that clear to everyone? Good. OK, so that is the way we will try to practice here.

For the sake of the organizers all the sessions will end exactly when they are supposed to end. We do not have much leeway here in going overtime. That might mean that not all the people who want to speak for each session will be able to do so. In those cases we'll make sure that your name is noted down for the next session and you will have a chance to address the issue then. For the scholars, the historians and others who are here, your role is to ask questions. That means that you would have to be quick and to the point. These are the rules that we will have to follow. We want to hear the ambassadors and the former diplomats to speak. We want to follow through with questions. Then, perhaps over dinner or later on, we can hear those scholars to explain what the ambassadors have been saying. OK, I will turn back to Zhang Baijia who will be the chief moderator for the first session.

*Zhang Baijia:* The main speaker on today's first topic is Ambassador Li Fenglin. The topic is Chinese–Eastern European relations within the context of the Sino–Soviet split.

*Li Fenglin:* Two moderators, it is a great honor for me to be the first speaker. Hopefully my talk will not make for a bad beginning. The process of the Sino–Soviet split is well-known. I think that the relations between China and Eastern European countries were inseparable from the Sino–Soviet relationship. It is therefore necessary to talk about the Sino–Soviet relationship as a background. There are different views on the causes and the starting point of the Sino–Soviet split. Briefly I will outline my own opinion in making several points.

First, the fundamental reason for the split was Soviet chauvinism. The Soviet Union assumed a patriarchal position among socialist countries and wanted to control everything. It applied pressures and imposed big hats upon whoever did not want to obey its orders, and even used military force to interfere in others' internal affairs. The Sino–Soviet disagreement existed as early as in 1921 when the Chinese Communist Part was just organized. But Mao Zedong took a stand of tolerance and concession. In 1956 the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress of the Soviet Communist Party became a fuse leading to intensification of the

disagreements. Ideological disagreements occurred. The Soviet leadership did not use reasonable discussion to deal with these ideological disagreements but extended them into inter-state relations. The Soviet behavior of tearing up the agreement on cooperation in nuclear weapon and withdrawing experts from China had the most serious consequences.

Secondly, the Chinese side made several attempts to reach compromise, and the situation indeed became relaxed several times. But the Soviet side did not reciprocate and several opportunities for improving relations were lost. These opportunities happened in 1957, 1960, and 1965. Mao Zedong did not want to see a rift between China and the Soviet Union. This can be verified by some of Mao's internal speeches published recently. But the Soviet side insisted that it itself was always correct.

Thirdly, both sides made mistakes in causing the split. In their ideological disputes, both sides uttered some empty words. With regard to foreign policies, the two countries' international status and environments were different, and the problems could be solved through discussions. But the Soviet side demanded that the Chinese should obey its global strategy and could not tolerate any different opinion. This was wrong. On the other hand, China was wrong in completely rejecting Soviet foreign policy.

Lastly, Mao's and Khrushchev's personalities contributed to the Sino-Soviet split. This is the first issue that I want to talk about.

The second issue is about the relations between China and the eight Central and Eastern European countries. Generally speaking, these were subordinated to the Sino-Soviet relationship. China's basic attitudes toward these countries were determined by the Soviet factor. Since these countries adopted different attitudes toward the Sino-Soviet disagreement, China devised different policies toward these countries. Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, and Poland, these five countries took the Soviet side. Albania was opposed to the Soviet Union. Romania tried to mediate. Yugoslavia was a unique case. At the beginning China opposed Yugoslav revisionism, but in the 1970s China and Yugoslavia normalized their relations on the common ground of opposing the Soviet Union. Albania was the first coming out in objecting to Soviet revisionism, and, consequently, the Sino-Albanian relationship was very close for a while. But in the 1970s Albania disliked the improvement of the Sino-American relationship and accused China as revisionism. Afterwards the Sino-Albanian relationship collapsed. Romania maintained a neutral stand in respect to the Sino-Soviet

disagreement, and its relations with China were always good. This is the second question that I want to talk about.

Thirdly, if we examine the Sino–Soviet relationship and the Sino–Eastern European relations within the larger context of international relations, then it should be pointed out that China’s real concern was national security. From the 1960s to the 1980s, China made several foreign policy readjustments, and the core motive of all these was national security. The question was to decide from which direction the main threat to China was coming. Mainly, this was a question regarding the Sino–Soviet–American triangle. After the Chinese and Soviet parties severed their relationship in 1965, China was opposed to the American and the Soviet hegemonic powers at the same time, a policy termed *fandi bi fanxiu* (“anti-imperialism necessarily goes with anti-revisionism”). By the 1970s, the Vietnam War had escalated but the United States did not show any intention of attacking China. Meanwhile the Soviet Union adopted a series of measures that threatened China’s security. Under the circumstances Mao devised a posture for China that was offensive toward the Soviet Union and defensive toward America. The ensuing strategic orientation was one of capitalizing on [the enemies’] contradictions, winning over the majority, isolating the minority, and defeating the enemies one by one. This was the so-called *yi tiao xian, yi da pian* thinking (“a line of alliance and a large group of supporters”) aimed at establishing an anti-Soviet united front. In public the policy was depicted as one of opposing the two hegemonic powers with an emphasis on struggle against the Soviet revisionists.

China also made careful preparations for fending off possible surprise attacks launched by external enemies. As early as in 1964, in following Mao’s directives, the General Staff drafted a report on national economic construction and prevention of enemy surprise attack. A working group was also established. After the Zhenbao Island incident of 1969, Western press spread a story that the Soviet Union was likely to launch a surgical strike against China’s nuclear facilities. On August 28 the Central Military Commission issued an order on preparedness for war. In September an all-army working conference on war preparedness was held. On October 8, Lin Biao issued “Order Number One.”

Now I want to talk about some concrete events that may help us understand the situation at the time. When the Zhenbao Island incident took place, I was working in the embassy in Moscow. According to a piece of information from China, Chief of General Staff Huang Yongsheng believed that

a Sino–Soviet war was inevitable. The conflict could possibly be a big, a medium, or a small one, but a medium conflict was most probable. In the embassy’s opinion, however, at the time the Soviet Union would probably not attack China. Another episode can be mentioned. In 1997, in Moscow, I had a conversation with General Nikolaev, the commander of the Russian border defense forces. We talked about the situation in 1969. At that time he had been a regiment commander stationed at a location opposite to Hulin on the Sino–Soviet border. He told me that the Soviet army did not enter high alert but, instead, received an order on keeping close surveillance of the other side’s activities. In addition, there is a declassified Soviet document dated August 18, 1969, which is part of a daily report from the Soviet General Staff to the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee. About China, I am citing my translation of the Russian document, the report said that along the Soviet and Mongolian borders the Chinese forces’ order of battle, deployment, and activities did not change significantly.

Another thing worth mentioning is that after Lin Biao’s “Order Number One”, the Chinese side entered the highest level of alert. Some of our troops called the situation a “swimming duck.” I do not know whether or not you understand this. When a duck is swimming, its feet move frantically but its body above the water is steady. What the soldiers meant is that you leaders high above moved us frantically and wanted us to be ready for war, but in reality it was quite calm at the top level. I want to use this as an example to illustrate that at the time both the Chinese and the Soviet sides were worried about the other side’s attack. Obviously, both sides made wrong assessments of the situation.

As for the Chinese–Eastern European relations at the time, the policy was to use the contradictions [between Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union] to isolate Soviet revisionists. This was based on Mao’s theory about the “intermediate zone.” Mao believed that there were two such zones and both were against American control. In East Europe there was also a question of opposing Soviet control.

The fourth and last question is that after 1979, during the Sino–Soviet negotiations for normalizing relations, at the core of the disagreements was the well-known “three great obstacles.” At the time ideology already became irrelevant, and China’s concern was to remove any threat to its security. China wanted to create a peaceful environment for economic construction. In comparison, there was no conflict of interests between China and Eastern Europe in the first place. And, in this period normalization of state relations

between the two sides was achieved naturally. In this regard, Eastern European countries actually went ahead of the Soviet Union. Thank you!

*Zhang Baijia:* The next speaker is Luo Ming [Romulus Ioan Budura].

*Romulus Ioan Budura:* Dear colleagues, the topic I was assigned to put before this conference is just as compelling for historians as it is instructive for statesmen. It is equally a complex topic since it involves the developments, shapes and transformations of the international life of those thirty years. This is not the place to deal with all that, for given the time limits we will end up only with very general considerations. But since we are addressing very nearly all the relations between socialist countries, we cannot ignore the basic reasons why they were perceived as being of a new type unprecedented in the history of humankind.

It was said that these relations were established between nations governed by the same interests for which disputes, litigation, and conflict were out of place, and that they were based on the common objective of building socialism and communism on the basis of the Marxist–Leninist ideology and socialist internationalism, the cornerstone of which was loyalty to the Soviet Union. In that system, ties between parties, the ruling political forces in the respective countries, were essential, having a decisive impact on the respective countries' relations. The system was meant to force exemplary cohesion on the aforesaid community, the destiny of which allegedly was its extension until the final switch from capitalism to socialism as an inevitable conclusion of the entire process. It was no accident, though, that ideological controversy played such an important role in the relations between these states, or that vilification of one party or another as dogmatic or revisionist held a considerable, often confusing, relevance.

Admittedly, these basic reasons generated uncontested act of solidarity that really made history. Also they proved vague and imprecise, subject to all sorts of interpretations, and definitely unfit for international relations in the contemporary world. Furthermore, they could not prevent controversies, litigations, or conflicts. Gradually the doctrinaire approach to interstate relations lost ground and the principles of law regained their place in regulating relations between the nations of the socialist community at that time. The actual drive of material forces proved more powerful than the will of governments.

For a better grasp of the subject, it would be appropriate to recall here that the Soviet Union was regarded as the first socialist state ever. And its experience was paramount in laying out the traits of the society and the

organization of economic development. The Soviet Union was equally considered as the great power that had liberated all the Eastern European states and contributed to the liberation of Manchuria. Also we should remember that China had proclaimed itself a people's republic despite the Yalta arrangement, and was ready to establish relations with all states willing to treat it according to the rules of international law, and that it leaned to the Soviet Union only after Washington had spurned its overtures. It is similarly necessary to bear in mind that Yugoslavia, just like Albania, had freed itself from German occupation, and that Romania had turned arms against the Axis and, alongside the Soviet army, liberated the territories under German-Hungarian occupation. We should further note that over the years, the countries mentioned were headed by leaders of various types with different cultures and traditions as well as personal life experiences and outlooks on the shifting realities.

I believe that the Sino-Soviet split must be interpreted in this system of reference. It was a Sino-Soviet divorce within the frame of a matrimonial arrangement, or, in other words, a process of China's relinquishing the obligation and servitude assumed at the time of proclaiming the People's Republic and taking the position of a junior ally within the camp of peace, democracy and socialism. Actually the split process began before 1960, the year when our retrospect starts. Let us not forget that the polemics had began earlier, in 1956, in connection with the reassessment of Joseph Stalin's personality, and with the events in Hungary and Poland, and later had taken a more drastic turn against contemporary revisionism, the foremost fault of which was a conciliatory attitude toward the United States of America and opportunist cooperation with American imperialism. We should also bear in mind that divergences, litigations, and disputes accumulated between the two countries as of 1950, and that these were likely to poison the relations between the two states.

We should not forget that in those years, China was ostracized by the United States and its allies, subject to a strong embargo and all kinds of pressures, prevented from getting reunited, and taking its rightful place in international bodies. Therefore, the People's Republic of China felt tempted to adopt a militant foreign policy, while the Soviet Union, bearing the brunt of the Cold War with the United States, could not ignore the least chance of promoting international detente. In that context, from China's point of view, Yugoslavia was out of the rank of the socialist countries. The Sino-Yugoslav relationship became extremely difficult, while Albania discovered its call of

inciting Beijing's opinions. The other Eastern European countries kept up working relations with China, though the ideological differences somehow stayed above economic, commercial, cultural, and scientific exchanges.

The split process was to be accomplished after many years, at some point between the 1970s and 1980s, when history would recall the decline of the socialist international dimension of the [Sino–Soviet] Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance signed on February 14, 1950, when history would recall that the Soviet Union was treated as the representative of social imperialism alongside the United States as imperialism that was outside the reference frame mentioned above, when history would recall the commencement of the normalization of the Sino–American relations and the extension of China's relations with other countries of the world, and when, finally, history would recall China's legitimate rights being established in international bodies and its return to the international arena as an independent great power.

Now let's return to 1960 when our retrospective of Sino–Eastern European relations starts. Early that year the relations between China and the Eastern European countries, except Yugoslavia, were good. They involved normal party contacts and ties, regular mutual visits between governments and institutions, working together in international organizations and conferences, commercial exchanges with a big weight in China's foreign trade balance, significant economic cooperation for industrialization partnership, projects for scientific, technological, and cultural collaboration, exchanges of students, sportsmen, etc. The authorities seemed happy with these relations that were integrated into the reference system mentioned above. The process of Sino–Soviet split in the 1960s was marked with significant events that occurred one after another between the publication of the brochure, *Long Live Leninism*, in 1960 and the armed conflict along the Sino–Soviet border in 1969. It manifested itself particularly in the public quarrels about problems of Marxist–Leninist ideology and problems of party and state relations. Against this background, one can notice that the Sino–Eastern European relations were influenced so much by the positions taken on the disputed themes as by the Eastern Europeans' attitudes toward the two parties in the split.

Yugoslavia, the country on which the accusation of and incrimination for revisionism concentrated from the very beginning, was treated differently. Since the autumn of 1964, the Yugoslav League of Communists pronounced itself against convening a commission of 26 parties with the view

toward punishing the CCP [Chinese Communist Party]. The Workers' Party of Albania would get together with the CCP from the 1960 Bucharest Conference onward not only by embracing Beijing's point of view but also by associating itself actively in the campaign against the Soviet party. So Albania would enjoy continuously the recognition by the PRC as a socialist country, as well as substantial grants and assistance with credits by the PRC for the development of the Albanian society.

The Communist Party of Romania avoided involvement in the political and theoretical disputes, nor even trying to mitigate the sensational public debate, and cultivated normal relations with both parties in the confrontation. So the Sino-Romanian relations would suffer but insignificantly as the result of the split, and after 1968 would gain a privileged status in the capitals of both China and Romania. The ruling political parties in Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Bulgaria in different degrees would associate themselves with the Soviet Union in leveling criticism against the CCP as well as in adopting negative attitudes toward the PRC. Consequently, although after 1964 China diminished its criticism of these countries, they would no longer enjoy the status of socialist states in its eyes. Relations with these countries would be severely affected until the beginning of the 1980s. Nevertheless, all these countries made outstanding contributions to restoration of the PRC's legitimate rights in the United Nations and other international bodies. By then Sino-Eastern European relations had become ordinary relations between nations, motivated not by doctrinaire considerations but by national material interests. Thank you.

*Zhang Baijia:* The two main speakers observed the time limit well and we have enough time for discussion. Questions please.

*Sergei Radchenko:* Thank both ambassadors for their extremely interesting presentations. I have a question to Ambassador Li Fenglin. The situation in 1969 is well known, thanks to very interesting works by Chinese scholars. One thing that is interesting for me is what happened in 1979. In early seventy-nine there was a small war between China and Vietnam. In response to that, the Soviet Union over a period of one night sent thousands upon thousands of troops to Mongolia, to the Chinese-Mongolian border, which was an unprecedented operation, so large. Nobody actually knows much about this. I am interested in the Chinese reaction to this Soviet operation in 1979.

*James Hershberg:* Thank you. I also very much enjoyed the presentations by both ambassadors. I have one brief question for each. For Ambassador Li Fenglin, from our conference in Budapest that Professor Mastny

referred to we were able to find and translate many documents from the Polish archives on Polish–Chinese discussions between 1957 and 1964, including records of the meetings between [Władysław] Gomułka and Zhou Enlai and Liu Shaoqi. From these records it is clear that China tried to convince Poland that because China supported Poland in 1956, Poland should sympathize with China in the Sino-Soviet split. I am wondering how seriously the Chinese officials believed that they had a chance to split Poland or any other Eastern European countries from the Soviet bloc in the context of the Sino-Soviet split, because clearly in the case of Poland these efforts were not successful. Thank you.

*Lorenz Lüthi:* Thank you for the presentation. I have a question to Ambassador Budura. I am interested in the year 1964. There were two Romanian delegations going to China in March and September 1964. We know very little about the first delegation, the members were [Nicolae] Ceaușescu and Ion Maurer. Can you tell us something about the content of this delegation? Why they went, content of their conversation, and what they achieved? Thank you.

*Westad:* Just a practical point before you continue. A reminder to all speakers: speak slowly and into the microphone because it makes the role of the interpreters so much easier. We are all relying on their assistance.

*Shen Zhihua:* Ambassador Li mentioned two very important events and I hope you can clarify two things further. First, what was the exact time of the General Staff report of 1969? Second, about the disagreement between the embassy and Chief of General Staff Huang. When did Huang voice his opinion and when did the embassy learn about it?

*Zhang Baijia:* We ask the two ambassadors to respond to the questions before they get too many questions.

*Li Fenglin:* With regard to Soviet troops in Mongolia, in general the Chinese side was very concerned. Eventually the issue became a major obstacle to the improvement of the Sino–Soviet relations. This question is not the focus of this symposium and may be discussed on a different occasion. The second question is about the Sino–Polish relationship. I want to make several points.

First, in early 1957, after the Polish incident took place, China indeed supported Poland. The main reason for China’s attitude was to oppose the Soviet behavior like a patriarchal party and Soviet interference in the internal affairs of other brotherly countries. Mao Zedong emphasized this point many

times at the time saying that the relations among brotherly parties should be equal and must not be like one between father and son.

Secondly, I mentioned that China's basic policy was to treat Eastern European countries differently. But I need to emphasize that to my knowledge China did not make any special effort to separate certain countries from the Soviet bloc. On the contrary, China adopted a very cautious attitude toward Eastern European countries. For instance, although these countries and their leaders criticized China many times in public polemics, Chinese newspapers and Chinese leaders never mentioned these countries critically by name or criticized their leaders.

As for Professor Shen's question, Huang's opinion was included a message coming through a private channel. There was no official document. Therefore this episode is for reference only and is unlikely to be verified by any document.

*Shen Zhihua:* The month?

*Li Fenglin:* After the Zhenbao Island incident.

*Budura:* I am trying to answer the last question regarding the presence of the Romanian delegation in China in 1964. The demarche, which the first delegation made in March 1964 here in China, was a result of the communications between Chinese and Romanian leaders at the beginning of 1964. I suppose it was in January. There was a meeting between our ambassador and vice chairman Liu Shaoqi. In accordance with the idea of having a discussion regarding the situation in the international communism movement, the Romanian party leadership started by sending the delegation, which was headed by prime minister Ion Gheorghe Maurer and included Emil Bodnăraș, vice chairman of the Council of Ministers, Chivu Stoica secretary of the party, and Nicolae Ceaușescu, also secretary of the party. I remember that I was involved in that arrangement as an interpreter

The main objective, I would say the only objective of that demarche, was to stop the public polemics. Because Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, the first secretary of the Romanian Communist Party, said that we could not clarify all the disputes. It was impossible for two big parties to do that. We were a small party. We could not do that and we had no time because the development in the international communist movement was already very dangerous and the risks were very serious. So when the delegation came here, the problem of stopping the public debate was put forward by Ion Maurer. And then Ceaușescu developed the idea and pleaded for such results. Then, Chivu Stoica in his intervention also mentioned the agreements that we had with the

Soviet Union on the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance. Chivu Stoica said that we had very serious disagreements with the Soviet Union, but we were not putting them on the street and disputing with them. Then it was Bodnăraș who raised the question of Yugoslavia and recommended to the Chinese leaders to reconsider their attitude toward Yugoslavia and to take into consideration the independent position adopted by this country during the years. And it was also important for Romania because Yugoslavia was just next to us and it was important from the strategic point of view.

But we did not succeed. As I remember, Chairman Mao Zedong said that you did not demolish our fortress and you did not demolish our home. But the result was a positive one. The dialogue began, and then we had many opportunities to discuss the problems. As I said in my paper, the issues in dispute were very important from the theoretical, ideological point of view. But much more important was the attitude adopted by a particular country toward China and the Soviet Union. That was much more important.

As far as the second delegation is concerned, I have to bring to your attention the fact that at the beginning the Chinese leaders decided to invite only some socialist countries to send delegations to China for the festivities on the first of October. But then, after, I would say, two weeks we received another communication and were told that all socialist countries were invited to send delegations to the festivities on the anniversary of the proclamation of the republic. And so we sent our delegation, and, as far as I remember, many of the socialist countries in Europe also sent delegations. But everybody may recall the fact that Romania sent the delegation because that was an important event. After our delegation had visited China in March, a Chinese delegation headed by vice premier Li Xiannian visited Romania. The second delegation, in October, was headed again by prime minister Ion Gheorghe Maurer and included Emil Bodnăraș and Paul Niculescu-Mizil. Again the delegation had the opportunity to meet Mao Zedong, Zhou Enlai, Liu Shaoqi. All the conversations were quite positive.

*Zhang Baijia:* Please pay attention to two things. First, we have many participants in these events here, so let's not just focus on the two speakers. Second, we have arranged discussions of other issues at different sessions, so please reserve your questions about those issues for the time being. Now, who has questions pertinent to this session's topic? Please be brief.

*Chen Jian:* I have two short questions. Ambassadors Li and Budura talked about two issues. Ambassador Li and other ambassadors personally witnessed the Sino-Soviet split and the relations between China and Eastern

European countries. China's relations with Hungary began to improve in 1970. The form of address, "comrade," began to appear in congratulatory telegrams between the two sides and financial donations were made. Why this time?

Another question is for Ambassador Budura. There are two questions in the Chinese–Romanian relations relevant to your talk. During the Cultural Revolution, in 1967, the president of the Romanian State Council visited China and offered to mediate not only in Sino–Soviet but also Sino–American relations. Would you please comment on this? The second question is that in June 1976 President Ceaușescu visited China. This was viewed at the time as a very important development after the Sino–Soviet split. Was this, on the Romanian side, somehow connected with the Czechoslovak incident?

*Li Danhui:* I have a question for Ambassador Budura in connection with the topic of this session. As we all know, after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968, a reception was held in the Romanian Embassy on August 23. Premier Zhou Enlai came to the reception and made an important speech, in which he called the Soviet Union a "social imperialist" power. Originally the Chinese side arranged for Guo Moruo, vice-chairman of the People's Congress, to attend the reception. But then Zhou Enlai decided to go. When did the Romanian Embassy learn about the change? Zhou would surely talk about the Chinese stand on the Soviet action, and the stand could be expected to be very stern. Soviet and other Eastern European participants in the reception could not avoid making some responses. I hope to learn whether or not the Romanian side had some plans and took some measures to deal with such a situation.

*Niu Jun:* My question is close to Li Danhui's. My impression is that after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, both Romania and Albania expressed their attitudes to the Chinese. I believe that these two countries' positions actually influenced the Chinese leaders' perception of the Soviet invasion.

*Zhang Baijia:* Again, please pay attention to your question's relevance to this session's topic.

*Yu Sui:* Ambassador Budura mentioned that the Eastern European countries had different attitudes toward the Sino–Soviet split. This was indeed the situation. I have a question for not only Ambassador Budura but also the other former Eastern European diplomats here. Poland, East Germany, and Bulgaria followed the Soviet Union in taking a hostile stand against China. At the time, within these countries' leading circles, did different views exist in respect to the Sino–Soviet relationship and the Soviet Union's anti-Chi-

nese stand? Are there any archival documents that can clarify this question? Ambassador Budura and other ambassadors, please comment on this.

I also hope to learn how these countries dealt with their own discontent about Soviet chauvinism. How did they reconcile their policies of following the Soviets in opposing China and their own dissatisfaction with their Soviet comrades? I would believe that different opinions existed and am hoping to learn some information from archival material.

*Bernd Schäfer:* I have a follow-up question about the remarks by Ambassador Li. He talked about his “threat perception” when he was at the Chinese embassy in Moscow. After the 1969 border clashes, through the meeting between Kosygin and Zhou Enlai, the Soviet Union and China started border negotiations. During the negotiations the Soviet side put forward a so-call draft of a non-aggression treaty. How did China react to this proposal and why did China not sign such a treaty with the Soviets in the years after 1969?

*Radchenko:* A question to the Romanian Ambassador. In May or June 1966, Premier Zhou Enlai visited Romania. According to Soviet leaders, this visit failed and there were many conflicts between Ceaușescu and Zhou at the time. The Soviets were very happy about this. Was this wishful thinking on their part?

*Hershberg:* First of all I want to point out that the Cold War International History Project has obtained the Romanian records of their delegation’s visit in China in September and October 1964, and also in regard to Li Danhui’s question about the cables from the Romanian embassy in Beijing in August 1968. Both will be published by the CWIHP and we are looking forward to comparing these with Chinese records. However, we are unable to locate the record of the January 1964 conversation with Liu Shaoqi that Ambassador Budura mentioned, and the March 1964 delegation visit. We would be very interested in that.

But my question concerns the ouster of Khrushchev in October 1964. What were the expectations on the Chinese and the Eastern European sides as to the impact of the change of leadership in Moscow on the Sino–Soviet split? Some of records we have obtained from Eastern European archives indicate that in November 1964 Zhou Enlai visited Moscow with some expectation of improvement but was very disappointed after his conversations with Soviet leaders.

*Zhang Baijia:* We may allow the last question.

*Niu Dayong:* In 1956 the Polish and Hungarian incidents happened one after another. We know that the CCP Central Committee was opposed

to Soviet military intervention in Poland. But, in less than a month the Hungarian incident took place. The CCP Central Committee changed its attitude, and even persuaded the Soviets to carry out military intervention. Why such a drastic change in such a short time? I hope a Chinese ambassador here can explain.

In addition, to my knowledge, when the Polish incident took place, the prevailing opinion in the Chinese embassy, including the ambassador's, was that this was a counterrevolutionary event and should be suppressed. But there was also a different opinion. According to Li Shenzhi's recollection, a New China News Agency reporter Xie Wenqing and others believed that it was not a counterrevolutionary event but reflected unsolved contradictions between the masses and the party. The embassy reported both opinions to the center, and the center accepted the second judgment. In connection with the first question, why was the judgment about Hungary to the contrary, seemingly a reversal of perception? This certainly influenced the center's policies toward these incidents. How should this be explained?

*Jan Rowiński:* Ambassador Li's introduction was very interesting. What I want to ask you is about the four marshals' report, which was prepared in March 1969 and revised in August and September. They discussed the possibility of war between China and the Soviet Union. But, because of the time limit, we may return to this question later.

I cannot agree with you on one issue. During the Cultural Revolution, especially during its first stage, I was working at the Polish embassy in China. I have to say that at the time China did not help us and had many problems with us regarding the Soviet Union. I remember that when I left Warsaw in 1965, our foreign minister told us that you should strive to preserve all possible contacts with China. From the end of 1965 or 1966 to mid-1969, I know this was an internal issue. China actually used all possible means to unify us with the Soviet Union.

*Otto Juhász:* I am very glad to hear Ambassador Li's view. I believe that it is incorrect to view Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Bulgaria as the same.

*Zhang Baijia:* Two ambassadors, please respond briefly.

*Budura:* I have to admit that I cannot remember all the questions and the wordings of those questions. First of all, it was mentioned that in 1967, Ion Maurer led a delegation to visit China. I have to tell you that it was not an official visit in China. During 1967 and 1968 we had two or three delegations that visited Vietnam. They were motivated by the idea of assisting

communication between the Vietnamese and the Americans. These delegations made stopovers in Beijing, two of them. At the time the Romanians had already been approached by the Americans, such as Averell Harriman, Dean Rusk, and other officials of the American administration, for information that would be helpful for a dialogue between China and America with a view toward normalizing their relations. In spite of the fact that I was not so important at that time, I was then the consul general in Sydney, I was also personally approached by the Americans on these issues. Would Romania be interested in helping the dialogue between China and the United States? I said yes, and thus also made my personal contribution to that.

As far as Ceaușescu's visit in 1971 is concerned, it was a very important visit. But it was the result of accumulated capital, so to speak. In 1968, as you know, Romania was very solemnly and officially assisted by the statement made by Premier Zhou Enlai at the reception at the Romanian embassy in China, on August 23, 1968. Before that, Premier Zhou talked with our ambassador and talked even more about the support. That support became important for our future position regarding the events in Czechoslovakia and regarding our relations with the Soviet Union. Then, in 1970, the vice chairman of the council of ministers Emil Bodnăraș visited China. It was a very important event. In the year the vice prime minister Gheorghe Rădulescu also visited China. So, when in 1971 Ceaușescu visited China, he already had very good conditions for his visit.

We have to recognize that the visit was satisfactory to both the Chinese and the Romanian sides. We not only re-established "ancient" relations but also the party relations, and we developed widely cooperation in different fields. In 1966, Premier Zhou visited Romania. You asked the question whether or not it was a failure. It was not. But I have to admit that there was a small incident during that visit, which was linked to the fact that Romania did not accept unfolding debate on Romanian territory. At that meeting, Zhou Enlai and Ceaușescu spoke freely without a paper in front of them. That resulted in an agreement that on the territory of Romania there would be no of public debates. As far as other results were concerned, we were very happy and the Chinese, I presume, were also happy.

As for disagreements among Hungary, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Poland with regard to attitudes toward China, I suppose there were disagreements. I have to remind you that after Khrushchev had been removed from his position, Novotný and Gomułka were also removed from their positions. I agree with my colleague Otto Juhász that these five countries

were not a solid bloc of unity. I mentioned in my paper that in different degrees [these countries criticized China]. I remember that several times members of the Chinese delegation approached the Hungarians in different ways. In Bucharest in June 1960, Peng Zhen, head of the Chinese delegation, approached the Hungarian delegation and asked: “Why are you not standing with us?” Then in Moscow the same was said to the Polish delegation. But, in my opinion, it was very difficult for these countries to change their position. These delegates’ personal views were important but the whole structure of their countries’ relations with the Soviet Union had to be taken into consideration. Those relations were quite well established and it was very difficult for them to take different positions. I am not sure that I answered even half of the questions.

*Li Fenglin:* Among the questions concerning me there is one about the Polish and Hungarian incidents. I will not talk about them because there are two ambassadors here who can discuss these with great authority. I will discuss the Sino–Polish relations. Our Polish friend mentioned that China used all possible means to alienate Poland from the Soviet Union. The point I want to make is that China’s policy was aimed at isolating the Soviet Union. In final analysis, the so-called “all means” were no means at all on the Chinese side. The most important fact was that the Chinese side hoped to maintain a relationship with Eastern European countries as normal as possible. I do not feel that we had illusions about our ability to change these countries’ views. It was difficult in practice for these countries not to agree with the Soviet stand. We had no illusions. Ambassador Budura also touched on this issue.

As for the issue of a non-aggression agreement that emerged during the Zhou Enlai–Kosygin negotiations in 1969, it happened during the border negotiations between the two sides. In responding to the Chinese suggestion that the two sides withdraw their troops from the disputed areas in order to have a peaceful atmosphere, the Soviet side brought up the idea of a non-aggression agreement. The reason for the Chinese rejection of the idea was simple. At the time the Chinese side still regarded the Sino–Soviet relationship as one of alliance, based on the Treaty of Friendship, Alliance, and Mutual Assistance. Under the circumstances conclusion of another special non-aggression agreement would have been absurd. In the end the idea was not included in the agenda at all.

The last question is about the expectations on the Chinese side when Khrushchev fell from power in 1964. China’s first concern was to find out

for what reasons he fell and whether or not his fall was connected to the Sino–Soviet disagreement. Then, if indeed his fall was related to Sino–Soviet relations, the next question was whether or not this opened an opportunity for improving the relationship. Therefore, China’s greatest expectation was about improvement in the two countries’ relations. Yet, the negotiations with the new Soviet leadership clearly indicated that its attitude toward the Sino–Soviet relationship had not changed in any way, not even in details. They used a Russian word to express this very rigid stand, meaning that they would continue Khrushchev’s China policy. We were really disappointed.

Today I said that 1965 was an opportunity. The year of 1964 seemed another one. In 1965 Kosygin made a stop in Beijing when returning from a visit in Vietnam. On this occasion the issue of Vietnam was discussed. But for the Sino–Soviet relationship, the most important issue was China’s hope that the Soviets would not call a preparatory conference for a congress of selected communist countries. The Chinese side clearly indicated that such a meeting would mean split between the two parties. But the Soviet Communist Party still held the meeting in March 1965, though it was renamed as consultative conference. In my opinion, this conference was a landmark in the Sino–Soviet split.

*Zhang Baijia:* Ambassadors Li and Budura answered many questions. We should let them rest for a while. Our scholars have raised many good questions, and those questions about the period of the Polish and Hungarian incidents stand out. Why did the Chinese policy change at this time? How were the different opinions conveyed to the leaders at the top? Another question is whether or not disagreement occurred inside Eastern European countries at the time of the Sino–Soviet split. May we ask the other ambassadors to discuss these two interesting questions?

*Liu Yanshun:* In October 1956, the Polish incident took place. Why did this happen? At the time a change of leadership was underway in Poland. Gomułka, who in 1948 had been denounced as a rightist, came out again and became the first secretary of the Polish United Workers’ Party. This troubled Khrushchev because the Soviet Union often interfered in other parties’ internal affairs like a patriarchal party. The Soviet Union would not tolerate other parties’ personnel changes without their approval. Khrushchev did not approve of Gomułka’s appointment as first party secretary. On October 19, when the Polish party’s central committee opened its eighth plenum, Khrushchev suddenly flew to Warsaw with a huge delegation, which included all the important members of the politburo and the defense min-

ister. Poland was not notified in advance. The Soviets wanted to land and demanded to participate in the conference of the Polish party. The conference had to adjourn and Gomułka and some others were selected to go to the airport to receive Khrushchev. There are different stories about the episode. It has been said that Khrushchev's airplane circled in the sky for one or two hours because the Poles did not permit its landing. Then the Soviets said that the airplane ran out of fuel and would crash if landing permission were not granted. The Polish side had no choice but to allow Khrushchev to land. At the same time, Soviet troops stationed in Poland and around the country began to move on October 17. If the Polish leaders refused to obey him, Khrushchev was prepared to use military force. The Soviet side informed the CCP of the development.

At the time I was studying at the Institute of Diplomacy in Warsaw. The situation was indeed very tense. College students in Warsaw could not continue their classes. Some went to the streets and some held discussions of the situation on campuses. Many people connected their fate with Gomułka. Under this tense circumstance, our embassy became concerned about the conditions of the Chinese students and told us to be careful. We also visited the embassy quite often to check out what was going on. We were just young students and had no knowledge about the social and political conditions of Poland. The embassy did some explanation for us. I remembered one thing. On October 23 or 24, when I went to class, a Polish classmate shook my hand and said thanks to me. He said that the Chinese Communist Party supported us and we were grateful to the CCP and to the Chinese comrades, as if he were representing Poland and I China. The masses were in high spirit and were very excited. They all believed that the CCP supported them.

The CCP indeed supported them. In Beijing Mao Zedong expressed his disagreement with Khrushchev's attempt to intervene Poland with military force. Mao said no. This was an important event in the relations among socialist countries. Comrade Wu Lengxi's memoir on the ten-year dispute [with the Soviet Union] has an excellent description of the episode. Mao said no in the evening when he received Soviet Ambassador Iudin after a politburo meeting. He invited Iudin to his place and Iudin came with his assistant, a counselor, as note taker. Chairman Mao was in his pajamas and talked with Iudin in his bedroom. Iudin was very nervous. Chairman Mao said that China did not agree with the forcible approach of using troops against Poland, and he asked Iudin to report this to Khrushchev. On that occasion Iudin did not stop nodding and saying "yes," and repeatedly used his handkerchief to

wipe sweat off his forehead. This is an excellent description of one of the episodes in the ten-year dispute.

About the situation the Chinese embassy in Warsaw made a judgment different from that at the center. Most of us in Warsaw sensed the emotion among the Polish people as discontent about the Soviet Union. At the time the Soviet Union was the big brother in the socialist camp. Everybody wanted to be friendly with the Soviets and could not criticize them. Now the Poles complained about the Soviet Union, and this was viewed by the Chinese embassy as an unhealthy emotion. Therefore, when the embassy was making its report to the center, different opinions occurred. Some comrades wanted to say in the report that the Polish emotion reflected a demand for equality and sovereignty and against Soviet chauvinism. But some others believed that this was an anti-Soviet emotion. As a student, I listened to a report made by Ambassador Wang Bingnan after the Polish eighth plenum. He admitted frankly that the embassy misjudged the eighth plenum and the Polish situation, and that the embassy's judgment differed from the center's and was criticized by Chairman Mao. As a young student, I was very much impressed by comrade Wang, a senior ambassador, who unequivocally admitted the embassy's mistake in front of the people. This gave me a very good impression of comrade Wang. Our diplomats were not afraid of truth and not afraid of correcting mistakes.

*Rowiński:* Ambassador Liu is very familiar with the conditions in Poland, and I have nothing to add. At that time I was in Beijing and sometimes served as an interpreter for the embassy. I remembered that one day our ambassador to China, Kiryluk, called me, saying that Chairman Mao asked him to go to Zhongnanhai at 1:30 after midnight. This is one thing that I know. Later on, Ambassador Wang Bingnan told me the same thing. But he added one comment, saying that at the time, after the eighth plenum, he was the most welcome guest in the White Palace, which was the location of the Polish party's central committee. If he came to the place, the Soviet ambassador would leave immediately. This was a unique time.

*Zhang Baijia:* We have five minutes left and can allow two people to ask questions.

*Hershberg:* I very much appreciate the description and I have a brief question. A colleague of mine has written extensively on the 1956 incident of Poland. He has speculated that the reformist communists in Poland around Gomułka informally communicated with China before October of their

intention to elevate Gomułka to power. He has wondered whether there was a back channel between the Warsaw reformers and the Chinese government, such as Dr. Flato, who was a friend of the Chinese. I would be interested if you could describe whether there was an advanced warning in Beijing of the Polish event. Also you mentioned that there were different points of view in the embassy, quite different points of view. These make it all the more important that one day we would be able to read some of the original telegrams from the embassy describing the event, so we can reconstruct this debate more fully. Thank you.

*Shen Zihua:* I have a question for Ambassador Rowiński. At the time the Polish Defense Minister Konstantin Rokossovskii informed Khrushchev that the reformers intended to reshuffle the politburo and kick the pro-Soviet clique out. What was his real purpose? This was crucial to the Soviet decision about using military force to deal with Poland. If the situation was indeed like what Gomułka said later, that is, since they were not against the Soviet Union and the matter only involved internal disagreements in the party, this was the reason why the Soviet Union did not use force. But the original information Khrushchev got was that the reformers wanted to strike down those pro-Soviet people, and this was the reason for his wanting to use force. What was the actual situation in Poland?

My second question is similar to Hershberg's. Before Gomułka took power, did he make contact with China?

*[Zhang Baijia]:* Ambassador Liu, please elaborate on the different judgments made by the Chinese embassy and Beijing.

*Liu Yanshun:* As I said, at the time I was just a student and could not know what the embassy's exact judgment was. Later I learned from some materials that according to the embassy's judgment, the Polish incident was caused by anti-Soviet emotions among the people, and its target was the Soviet Union. The judgment did not make clear what the Polish tried to do. Anti-Sovietism was the main point. Gomułka had been criticized in 1948 as a rightist. The so-called rightist nationalism at the time meant anti-Sovietism. Gomułka believed that Poland had to take its own path in constructing socialism. This could not be tolerated by the Soviet Union, and therefore he was removed, criticized, and even imprisoned. Did his return to power mean a reversal of the verdict on rightist nationalism? This question may have occurred in the embassy. The center had different opinion. According to some materials, at a politburo conference Chairman Mao said these words: "The embassy had one opinion and the New China News Agency had another

opinion,” which was just identified here as voiced by Xinhua reporter Xie Wenqing, “but it seemed that the minority was correct. The Soviet–Polish relationship was unequal, and therefore they wanted to oppose inequality. The embassy was probably influenced by the Soviet ambassador.” This was the Chairman’s criticism.

*Rowiński:* First, I was also a student in China. Second, what was the Chinese center’s view? When Chairman Mao talked to Ambassador Kiryluk, he always emphasized that construction of socialism must be based on our own countries’ conditions and histories. This was the basic point and was different from the Chinese embassy’s view on rightist nationalism. Third, in September 1956 a Polish party delegation headed by [Adam] Ochab visited China to participate in China’s eighth national congress. He talked with Chinese leaders. What information was not published? That which came through special channels. The fourth question. OK, if you were a Soviet marshal such as Malinovskii or Zhukov and served as the defense minister of the People’s Republic of China, what would be your reaction? For a long time we could not react. But the emotion was clear and once the conditions were ready. This was the foremost question.

*Juhász:* A question has been raised. Why did the Chinese leadership change its attitude toward the Hungarian incident? It seems that during the first few days the event was not viewed as counter-revolutionary but then it was viewed so. How should this be evaluated? At the time I was a student here. A Hungarian student could support the development in Hungary. We did not sense any negative steps taken by the Chinese government.

*Zhang Baijia:* Ambassador Zhu, please respond briefly.

*Zhu Ankang:* Why did the Chinese side act differently with regard to the events in Poland and in Hungary? The Polish incident happened in the second half of October. Afterward, Hungary was influenced by Poland. On October 23, hundreds of thousands people demonstrated in the streets. At the beginning the demonstrations were peaceful and just expressed discontent toward the party policies and Rákosi’s personal cult. But later, after the 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup>, the situation went out of control. Some people started shooting and killing. Some communist party members and security forces were killed. Thus the nature of the event began to change. At the time a Chinese delegation under Liu Shaoqi was in the Soviet Union and discussed this issue with the Soviet leadership. We told the Soviets that the Polish incident was caused by incorrect Soviet attitude toward a brotherly party, but the nature of the Hungarian incident was changing. Weapons were used to kill

people. Therefore, the Soviet Union needed to adopt a different approach this time. What we said was limited to these words. Khrushchev said that they had to discuss this first. When the Liu Shaoqi delegation was about to leave Moscow, the Soviet politburo held a meeting and decided to send troops to Hungary. We were informed of the decision under these circumstances, and we supported the decision. Later the story would be distorted as if we insisted on Moscow's sending troops to Hungary. This is not right. Our analysis of the situation led to a different perspective of the Hungarian development. In retrospect, at the time we did not know the whole process of the Hungarian incident. But even if we had not supported use of force, the later development of the Hungarian situation would probably still have caused the Soviets to use force.

*Zhang Baijia:* We are five minutes behind schedule. Two main speakers, please make very short responses.

*Budura:* First of all, I tried to make it clear that the Sino–Soviet split was a historical process, legitimated by some material forces in movement, which overcame the dogmatic and ideological conventions and limits. Then I tried to explain that under this background, the relations between China and Eastern European countries were motivated not especially by positions toward the disputed themes, but by the attitudes adopted by different countries toward China or the Soviet Union.

*Li Fenglin:* The question under discussion is extremely complex. It involves many issues in the Sino–Soviet relations and further study is necessary. I wish to emphasize that now we are reviewing history. A review of history requires us to consider fully the historical conditions of the time, the larger background of the international relations, the international status of the Soviet Union and that of China, and the Sino–Soviet relationship. Especially important is the position of the Warsaw Pact in the bipolar confrontation. Our review of history must not depart from this bigger background.

*Zhang Baijia:* We had a very good beginning this morning. The participants in these historical events offered a lot of valuable information. The morning session now concludes.

\* \* \* End of Session One \* \* \*



## **Session Two: China, Eastern Europe, and the Vietnam War, 1964–1973**

(2:00–3:45, March 24)

*Westad:* Let me welcome all of you to the second session of our conference. The topic of this session is China, Eastern Europe and the Vietnam War from 1964–1973. This is a very important session because we are dealing with one of the key issues within the larger eastern, southeastern Asian region in respect to the Cold War. This is an issue in which both China and Eastern European countries had substantial and very important involvement. There are a number of issues that we would like to deal with in this session. I am sure more issues will come out in the presentations. Some of these issues are connected to the support of the Vietnamese revolution and resistance against the United State that was given by China and by the Eastern European countries. So we are looking in a way for evidence of how the conflicts in Indochina were seen by the Chinese side and by the countries of Eastern Europe. But we also want to look at the Vietnam War in a slightly wider context. That context is the relations between China and the Eastern European countries in light of the war in Vietnam and of the conflict between China and Soviet Union.

I have spoken to several of the former diplomats who are here. We have a great deal of interests in knowing more about the decision making within the countries that we will be looking at, both the Eastern European countries and China, with regard to the support for Vietnam and contradictions that existed between these European countries and the Soviet Union on the one hand and China on the with regard to the support of Vietnam. So, in other words, we are both looking at the international context and we are looking at the decision making in terms of the support for Vietnam and how it developed over time from the decisive era of American intervention in 1964 and up to the accords of 1973.

We have two speakers to open up this session. Joachim Schröter will go first and Ambassador Liu Qibao will go second. And then, as we did in the last session, we will be open to brief interventions and brief questions,

primarily from the veterans, former ambassadors and other diplomats themselves, and quick brief questions from historians and other scholars who are here. We are looking to finishing this session a little bit ahead of schedule, around 3:35, because we'll have to leave a bit earlier than we were told for the restaurant this evening for the welcome banquet. So we have to take about ten minutes off this session in total. That means we have to encourage everyone to be as quick as possible, both in terms of the presentations and in terms of questions and comments.

We now start with the presentation by Joachim Schröter.

*Schröter [written text]:* For a better understanding of the official positions of the GDR concerning the Vietnam War it seems important to me to begin with some ideas about our values regarding this conflict.

We estimated the Vietnam War from the political and military view of the Indochina region as well as from the strategic view and field of interests of China and the Soviet Union. That required us to work out our own conception about the political and military aims of the opposing sides, both the South Vietnamese and, in particular, the USA. Therefore we had to take into consideration not only the eventualities of the expanding of the conflict but also their natural political and strategic factors of limits, meaning the imaginable political and military latitudes of action of both sides. For us the decisive questions were: What effects might the Vietnam War have to Europe? What consequences would it have for our foreign, military and security policies in the Warsaw Treaty alliance and in cooperation with the PRC? How could we influence this conflict in terms of our interest?

Back to the subject: The second Vietnam War from 1964 to 1973 was the central conflict of the Indochina Wars in the time between 1946 and 1989. The Indochina Wars influenced more than 20 years of the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in various ways. The Vietnam War did not proceed from Vietnam on its own. The first Vietnam War, from 1946 to 1954, had been evaluated by us as an anti-colonial national war of liberation. At the same time it was an anti-imperialist war of self-defense against an outside intervention for defeating the aim of a socialist state. The Conference of Geneva (April 26 to July 20, 1954), with the decisive contribution of the PRC, marked the end of this part of the Indochina Wars, which was mainly a French–Vietnamese conflict.

After the Conference of Geneva, in both parts of Vietnam a political fight started to overcome the separation of the country at the 17<sup>th</sup> parallel. For this purpose the Convention of Geneva had provided for elections in

both parts of Vietnam within two years. But in 1956 President Ngo Dinh Diem rejected free elections and had the “Republic of South Vietnam” proclaimed. This developed into an inner Vietnamese conflict at a new level. In 1960 the 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Congress of the “Workers Party of Vietnam” voted for a double strategy: building up of socialism in the North and liberation of the South. The foundation of the “National Liberation Front” (NLF) in South Vietnam followed. Finally the political situation in South Vietnam escalated into a civil war.

When the inner political situation developed more and more in favor of the NLF, which was supported by the DRV [Democratic Republic of Vietnam], the US government decided to step in massively in the military fields, and, for the present, to support the South Vietnamese government. But soon the engagement of the USA got its own dynamics: The US Army de facto took over the command with the objective to militarily liquidate the NLF, which was generally known as “Vietcong”. In March 1964 there were the following proportions of forces:

- US troops: 425,000
- US allies: 65,000
- Government troops of South Vietnam: 319,000

On the opposite side:

- “Vietcong” and their support from the DRV 287,000

As of April 1969, the concentration of forces of the USA escalated to 540,000 men. But these figures do not reflect the real military forces. The proportions of the technique of arms, the extermination capacity available, the transport capacities, the mobility of the troops and supply, and the volume of the disposable resources were incomparable in dimensions that made it impossible to try a rational calculation. The military proportion as a whole was incomparable in quantity, and concerning the quality comparable not even in attempt.

From the point of view of all experiences so far concerning the wars in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Vietnamese had no chance to win this war, in considering the comparison of the forces and means available. This was not only the conviction of the USA and their allies, but also the reason for a deep concern of the Soviet Union and China about the possible results of the war. The foreseeable risk was not appropriate for any optimism. This was also the reason for serious diplomatic activities of the USSR and the PRC

for the limitation and termination of the second Vietnam War by means of negotiations. Although China and the USSR did not act united and did not even coordinate, but it was in the same direction and the same aim.

This also referred to the acting of the Soviet and the Chinese sides facing the leadership of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Both sides wanted to limit the damages. Both sides tried to win the Vietnamese for a solution of the conflict by negotiations. Considering this we have to reflect on the travel of Soviet Prime Minister Kosygin in the beginning of February 1965 to Hanoi and Pyongyang, what means at the beginning of the air attacks of the US Air Force against the DRV. At his stopover in Beijing Kosygin met Zhou Enlai on February 6 and Mao Zedong and Liu Shaoqi on February 11. From the duration of his stay we can guess about the extent and the intensity of the discussions. However, the result in regard to a common action for the support of Vietnam was modest.

But there are also Vietnamese sources proving that among others Deng Xiaoping urged the Vietnamese leadership not to take a military risk, which could not be calculated and better try to find a solution by negotiations on the basis of the documents of the Conference of Geneva. On March 4, 2004, at 20:15, in the German TV ZDF there was a telecasting report about Vietnam, where the former Defense Minister of Vietnam, Army General Giap, said literally in French: "Deng Xiaoping and Kosygin advised me not to start a war against the USA, because we could not win it."

Concerning the Chinese position, we have to take into account that in the Chinese leadership there was no homogeneous opinion in the sensible questions in connection with the Vietnam War and the position of China to the Soviet Union or the USA. But about this our Chinese hosts do know much better than I.

The second Vietnam War was not a local conflict. Most of all it affected the strategic interests of and the intergovernmental relations between the USSR, the PRC, and the USA in complicated ways. The countries integrated in the alliance of the Soviet Union or the USA were especially affected by the decisions of their leading authorities. For the Eastern European countries additionally, their contractual State and Party relations with the USSR and China were a factor of first range to observe. Since the sixties dramatic changes took place in the world communist movement. After Yugoslavia in the forties removed from the Soviet Union its claim for leadership, in the fifties more attempts by Eastern European countries followed. The most radical break was performed by Albania, while Romania started to practice

a moderately critical course towards the USSR. With the attitude of the GDR I will deal later on.

However, the most important matter was the conflict between the Communist party of China and the Communist Party of the USSR. It had escalated since the middle of the fifties, especially after the 20<sup>th</sup> Party Congress in 1956, and affected the whole complex of governmental relationship of both sides. This bilateral conflict de facto affected all problems of international relevance as well as the decisions of the policy in the foreign, security and military fields not only of the PRC and the USSR but also of the USA and all other states being in any relations of alliance, agreements or interests to the USSR or China.

The international importance of the Soviet-Chinese conflict resulted from the complexity of its subject matter. Fundamental questions referred directly to the second Vietnam War. The central point was the controversy about the way to “restoration” respectively “new establishment” of the unity of the Communist World Movement of that time.

The Soviet party aimed at the “restoration on the approved basis of the proletarian internationalism of the fifties”. That meant not only from the Chinese point of view the restoration of the unlimited and centralized leading role of the Communist party of the USSR in the world communist movement and the transfer of this centralized principle to the governmental relations within the socialist community. Thus, the Soviet leadership, in spite of all former experiences of the world communist movement, oriented itself toward the “restoration” of the status quo of the forties and fifties. This proved the political and mental torpidity in the obsolete mentality of the Soviet leadership and their inability for a real perception of changes. The necessary change of paradigm came too late and was followed by results, mostly unwelcome.

The Chinese part, however, orientated themselves toward a “new establishment” of the unity of the world communist movement and had made an own draft: the “proposal for the general course of the international communist movement”. This proposal from June 14, 1963, was also named 25-point-program. The Communist Party of China required an international discussion about this proposal. The Communist Party of China made it the conditions for the normalization of the Chinese-Soviet relations that the Soviet policy be corrected in several fundamental questions, among them the termination of the, from the Chinese point of view, “unprincipled peaceful coexistence with US imperialism”.

This was the situation at the beginning of the second Vietnam War. In the following period the Soviet Union, the PRC and the Eastern European countries acted in two main directions: the first direction was determined by the organization of the support for the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in material-technical fields. The second direction concentrated on the mobilization at all diplomatic levels for the territorial limitation of the conflict and from the Soviet side to the preservation and intensification of the process of relaxation of tension after the turbulence of the Cuba crisis.

Immediately after the outbreak of the fighting after the Tonkin incident, but also already before, when conflict had been expected, the Soviet Union and the PRC, as well as the USA, made efforts via diplomatic and other official channels to learn as accurately as possible the intentions of the other side. For the PRC the aim was to avoid a military threat to China as a result of an escalation of the conflict, but also to make it clear to the USA where there were limits not to overstep to prevent China to step in into the conflict.

The USA on their part did warn China to take action in the conflict and threatened with military and non-military actions against China. (*Peking Review* 1965 /42, p. 13) After the beginning of the air warfare by the US Air Force against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the PRC strengthened its efforts for defense, especially in the southern military districts, and intensified armament production, including the nuclear and missile program. Mainly in South China military airbases were expanded and the presence of the air force in this region was increased. According to our information (report by the military attaché of the GDR in Hanoi), after the Tonkin incident China had transferred a group of MIG-17 to Vietnam. This led to the assumption in the Pentagon that China would take over the air defense of the DRV. The USA threatened with retaliatory attacks against Chinese territory. Nevertheless, Washington had to take into account the Soviet Pact of Mutual Assistance from 1950, particularly since the Soviet Union confidentially had pointed this out to the American side. In July 1965 the PRC refused all common action with the Soviet Union. China decided to send engineering troops for building railways, bridges and roads and also stationed ground-supported air defense forces. These forces came into action in autumn 1965.

Until the seventies the Vietnam War remained a permanent controversial subject in the persistent strategy debate within the Chinese leadership. The center of it was the relationship of China to the Soviet Union and the USA. Thus it was the question of how China could overcome the international isolation and assume the rank in the international community which

belonged to China as a great power and victor in World War II, for instance in the UN Security Council. That Taiwan represented China in the Security Council was an anachronism in contradiction to the real international correlation of forces.

Still unsolved was the transport problem of relief goods for Vietnam via Chinese transportation routes. After protracted discussions a way acceptable for all partners was found. On December 5, 1965, the PRC and the DRV signed an agreement for the transit of goods to Vietnam. According to this agreement Vietnam took over the relief goods formally already on the territory of the “giver nation”. Thus the goods could pass the Chinese transportation routes as Vietnamese property. As per the agreement the Chinese side was willing to guarantee the transport of weapons, ammunition and other “urgently required armaments” via railway without any cost. Other relief goods should be sent to Vietnam by ship. However, in special cases such transports should go partly via Chinese harbors or overland routes. In these special cases payment should be made according to the usual tariffs as agreed among the socialist countries.

The relief goods from the GDR were mainly non-military goods. That caused a problem. The GDR handed over an aide-mémoire to the Chinese chargé d'affaires in Berlin and applied for the possibility of transporting “all equipment and relief goods” via railway. This had to be clarified separately in discussions with Poland, the Soviet Union, China and the DRV. A problem was the special gauge of the Soviet railway which required the goods to be reloaded twice (Political Archive of the Foreign Office, C1058/73, page 161f.). On December 14, 1965 the Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs of China, Wang Bingnan, handed over an answering aide-mémoire to the ambassador of the GDR in China, Korth. This document referred to unsolvable transport problems (limited capacities for railway carriages) and referred to sea transportation. Discussions about an agreement between the four states were refused. In the aide-mémoire it was said: “You turn under the command baton of the new leadership (of the Communist Party of the USSR) and take part in their new anti-Chinese chorus. . .” (Political Archive of the Foreign Office, GA 361, no page number.) After that bilateral annual agreements were signed between China and the GDR. In 1966 the United Workers’ Party of Poland proposed to deal with the transport problem in a multilateral discussion of the parties on the highest level. The Communist Party of China refused that.

In the following period every year in autumn the military attaché of the GDR and a representative of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Trade signed annual agreements. The military attachés acted on behalf of the Vice Minister for National Defense for Technology and Armament, Lt. Gen. Fleissner. The signing ceremony took place in the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Trade. Later on the military attaché got a document about the fulfilling of the agreement of the previous year with all details of the transportation results from the Chinese side, including cost of the deliveries. The document always finished with the formula that the PRC considered those results as a solidarity contribution to the struggle of the Vietnamese people and did not make any financial charges towards the GDR.

Carrying out the transportation nearly always made problems, which were not caused by the Chinese side. Per courier from the Ministry of Defense in Berlin the military attaché got a list of the deliveries, the number of carriers and the expected time of arrival in Manchuria. The military attaché handed over this list to the Chinese side. For the Chinese this was the basis for the planning of the supply of carriers. Moscow should confirm the date to us. That was our problem. The Soviet side obviously had great difficulties to supply carriers for the Trans-Siberian line. That required a number of further inquiries. The Chinese side supplied the carriers in time and suffered remarkable losses of transportation capacities.

When the loading date was fixed the military attaché sent two colleagues to the reloading station in Manchuria. On the Soviet side the transport was given over to the GDR and was examined according to the lists. Differences between the listed and the actual amounts were registered, the new actual amount signed by both sides. Then a second list with the new actual amount was given to the Chinese side. After that the goods were reloaded to Chinese carriers. From our internal sources I knew that the supplies of the GDR were handed over to the DRV always without any losses.

With the beginning of the bombing by the US Air Force in February 1965, the Air Defense Forces of the DRV faced a problem they were not prepared for. For instance the US Air Force was operating in altitudes that could not be reached by the available ground supported defense weapons of the Vietnamese. The Soviet Union and other Socialist countries delivered modern air defense weapons, among these modern air defense missiles and the corresponding electronic systems for the early detection, pursuit and effective fight of the target. But at this time in the Vietnamese forces there

were very few specialists who were in a position to handle such complex technology.

In this situation the GDR offered to send volunteers from the Air Defense Forces of the National People's Army. They should instruct Vietnamese officers and soldiers according to the principle of learning by doing. In the Warsaw Treaty the GDR had the most compact system for Air Defense and the state of training was thought of very highly. The DRV refused the assignment of volunteers. But it asked for help for the training and for specialists for building-up and organizing a modern system of Air Defense. In 1965 advisers were sent from the National People's Army for building-up and organization of a comprehensive Air Defense system, among them specialists for the use of anti-aircraft missiles. In the group of these specialists was Col. J. John, who later on from October 1967 till 1970 was the military attaché in Hanoi. His assistant, Col. Boehme, also was an officer of the Air Defense Forces and became his successor until 1973.

At the same time Vietnamese officers were trained in the GDR. An unexpected but serious problem was their limited physical capacity concerning moving weights. The Vietnamese Air Defense Forces therefore required nearly double manpower to fit in the technical-tactical standards of the National People's Army of the GDR. Despite all difficulties a system of Air Defense was built up in short time in North Vietnam that was, also in Western judgment, the second tightest system of the East after the GDR. The Vietnamese officers and soldiers were not only extremely motivated, but also learning extremely quickly, so that the planned time for their training could be shortened.

The years 1966 and 1967 were the most complicated in the bilateral relationship between the PRC and the GDR. In February 1967 the Chinese ambassador was recalled from Berlin and had a successor only in 1970. In Beijing, the GDR kept the level of ambassador. The GDR leadership was in a complicated situation. On the one hand there were traditionally good relations between the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Communist Party of China, with useful effects on governmental relations for both sides. For instance until the sixties China was for the GDR and the GDR for China vice versa the second important trading partner. On the other hand the GDR, because of its strategic position in the center of Europe and as part of a divided nation, was under extreme political dependence on decisions by the victor nations. At the western border of the GDR, there ran the confrontation line between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. At the eastern side the GDR was

the heart region for the dislocation area of the main military forces of the Warsaw Treaty, the Western Group of the Soviet Army.

Finally the existence of the GDR as a real-socialist state was dependent on a close alliance with the Soviet Union. This was different from the situation of Poland, Hungary or Romania. Like no other state of Eastern Europe the GDR was in need of direct protection by the USSR. This specific dependence also existed towards the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Soviet ambassador in Berlin was also the High Commissioner for the former Soviet Zone of Occupation. He claimed access to all levels of leadership of the Party and Government at all times. The GDR government had the de facto obligation to give any information at any time. Beyond it there was a closely meshed Soviet system of control and supervision on the upper level of leadership and in all areas of relevance for security policy.

There existed an obligation for consultations in all decisions in foreign policy that could concern Soviet interests. That was applicable also for the relations of the GDR to the PRC. For instance: Premier Zhou Enlai during his visit to the GDR in 1954 had invited Prime Minister Otto Grotewohl for a reciprocal visit to China. In the beginning of 1950 such a high-ranking visit was considered as not opportune. The situation changed in the second half of 1955 as a result of the conclusion of the Basic Treaty with the Soviet Union and the incorporation of the GDR into the Warsaw Treaty. Soviet Minister for Foreign Affairs, Molotov, on November 17, 1955, in Berlin had himself informed by Prime Minister Grotewohl about the planned visit to China, the Korean Democratic People's Republic and Mongolia, including the intention to suggest to the Chinese side the conclusion of a Treaty of Friendship. Molotov agreed to this project, expecting a continuous report to the Soviet side. (Political Archive of the Foreign Office, A 6618, page 188 ff., A 14682, page 72, and A 6618 page 161 ff.) The official visit of Prime Minister Grotewohl in the PRC took place in December 1955. On this occasion the said Treaty of Friendship was signed. A similar situation occurred in the eighties. The leadership of Party and Government of the GDR since 1980 and even under Secretary General Gorbachev was not given assent for a visit of Erich Honecker to the PRC as well as to the FRG. That led the Socialist United Party of the GDR to establish unofficial contacts to the Communist Party of China. Only in 1986 did the Soviet Union give its approval for an official visit of E. Honecker in Beijing from October 21 to 26, 1986. But it caused a loss of confidence and led to a serious resentment of the Soviet leadership.

I have to add that although the leadership of the GDR, not only under Walter Ulbricht but also under Honecker, always lamented the break between China and the Soviet Union, but never really understood its nature. The GDR leadership wanted the restoration of the unity of the Socialist Community to mutually benefit by mastering the strategic challenges in the confrontation of the systems. Thus it was not only chained to the Soviet Union because of its actual specific dependence but also because of the political and ideological conviction that the Soviet way for “restoration” of unity of the world communist movement was the most promising one. The subordination to the Soviet leadership was considered unavoidable but of secondary importance. In addition to this there was the hope of being able to expand the latitude of action within the centralistic system of connections through the consolidation of relations of confidence. The attitude of the GDR leadership additionally was determined by illusions about particular possibilities of mediation to influence Chinese and Soviet decisions. To put it simply: the Soviet-Chinese conflict was reflected as a controversy about the leadership of the world communist movement and the Socialist Community.

What was never understood was the fact that China in general refused a bipolar or unipolar world order that was based on centralism of political power; the fact that China strived for a state system open to all sides and capable of acting in all directions, in the frame of which the countries with socialist orientation could coordinate their mutual interests to defeat harmful influences together. However, the Chinese side did not really make it easy for the Eastern European countries to understand the core of the matter. For instance the attitude of the GDR leadership was extremely confused by the permanent contradictory strategy debate within the leadership of the Communist Party of China the result of which were dramatic changes in the Chinese leadership several times. But in my opinion, the most important realization of the last 50 years should be: in the long run as partner and as a neighbor you *cannot be successful against but only with China*.

It could really be interesting to reflect on the basis of the Chinese strategy debate in the sixties and seventies about the connection between the final stage of the second Vietnam War, the motives of the Nixon Administration for the formulation of the Guam doctrine and the process of the Chinese-American balance, the provisional result of which were the Shanghai communiqué of February 27, 1972, and the entry of the PRC into the Security Council of the UN. These are milestones in the changes of the world situation in the second

half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century that were caused also by the second Vietnam War. But such reflections exceed the frame of my subject and my time limits.

*Westad*: Our next speaker is Liu Qibao.

*Liu Qibao*: Many ambassadors here can speak much better than myself because I have a very strong accent. Originally I was prepared to talk about the Vietnam War, but to save time I will not discuss this subject and turn in my materials to the symposium. I just want to add a few things to our German friend's talk. The first is about Chinese leaders' considerations of the Vietnam War. Indochina had a period of tranquility after the Geneva Conference of 1954, but then conflict began in Vietnam, mainly in South Vietnam. The North supported the struggle by the progressive and revolutionary forces in the South. Under this historical circumstance, China also actively supported the South Vietnamese people's struggle. During a considerable time period, we regarded the struggle as one of national liberation. The Vietnamese people demanded national unification and social reforms. Under this struggle the South Vietnamese regime could no longer continue, and consequently foreign support of it grew and the conflict began to expand. When the Vietnam War started in this manner, China and all other socialist countries, including the Soviet Union, supported the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. To China, its struggle was a just one.

In retrospect, the Soviet Union at the time also supported the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Although the disputes between China and the Soviet Union already began, they had no disagreement on supporting Vietnam. Vietnamese leaders, principally Ho Chi Minh, enjoyed very high prestige among socialist countries. He maintained a neutral attitude toward the Sino-Soviet disputes, hoping that the two sides stop the polemics, support Vietnam and construct socialism in one. This was his thinking. He also had misgivings about the Soviet party, especially about Khrushchev's denouncing of Stalin. But in general he maintained a conciliatory stand between China and the Soviet Union and was able to receive assistance from both countries and from other socialist countries as well. This was the basic situation.

I am not familiar with the information discussed by our German friend. In my view, at the time neither China nor the United States wanted to stage a direct confrontation. China's support to Vietnam differed from that to Korea where we got into the fight. This did not happen in Vietnam. The Americans bombed North Vietnam but did not bomb the Chinese side of the border. Therefore this was a limited war and did not cause a direct conflict between China and the United States. I don't think that China wanted to contain the

Vietnamese people's liberation struggle. China supported their struggle. There might be some problems regarding concrete tactics, but it is difficult for me to comment or make a judgment because I have not seen specific documents. On the other hand, according to the materials that I have seen, the Vietnamese people's struggle mainly relied on themselves and achieved victory. Meanwhile, their long and arduous struggle was indeed inseparable from other countries' support. China's assistance to Vietnam was a fact. Deng Xiaoping once told some foreign friends that from the beginning to the end China provided twenty billion dollars' worth of assistance to Vietnam.

In addition, although not participating directly in the war, China used different means to support Vietnam. For instance, Chinese workers helped them repair damaged roads and factories. During the war some 1,400 Chinese workers sacrificed their lives in Vietnam. I want to add that originally I intended to discuss in some detail an important question in the Sino-Vietnamese relationship. That is to say, after 1975, the third Indochina war took place. But this is a different question and I do not want to discuss it today. It involved very complicated factors, of which the Soviet Union was very important. The Soviets supported Vietnam to annex Cambodia. Ho Chi Minh died in 1969. When he was still alive, Le Duan was the first secretary of the party central committee. Le Duan relied on the Soviet side. In July 1986, Le Duan died, and his successor was Nguyen Van Linh. The changes in the Vietnamese leadership, the internal situations in the Soviet Union and in China, and the entire international environment transformed the landscape of Indochina. Especially, after Gorbachev became the Soviet leader, the third Indochina war was settled by political means.

But here I want to talk about Eastern European countries' contribution in the second Indochina war. They supported Vietnam. At the time China was engulfed in the Cultural Revolution and its domestic conditions were chaotic. We made great effort to assist Vietnam. As just mentioned by our German friend, at the time the overland transportation of material assistance from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union had to go through China. We did the transportation free of charge. China organized a special force to guarantee the smooth operation of the transportation.

I don't want to go beyond my time limit. I hope that in our discussion Eastern European ambassadors can talk about how your countries provided assistance to Vietnam and how you see the issues discussed today.

*Westad*: I would take questions and comments. Before I do so I will abuse the moderator's privilege and ask some questions myself. And this is

going to the Chinese side, both Mr. Liu and others who were working in the Chinese foreign ministry at the time. Did the Chinese side really believe that the main reason why the Soviet Union and some of these Eastern European countries supported Vietnam in its struggling against the United States was to get influence in Vietnam and help turn Vietnam against China? If we look at the very few documents that we have available so far from the Chinese side, that seems indeed to have been the main view on the Chinese side. Was this a generally held view or was this something that basically came out of what Ambassador Liu was referring to, the specific political events in the Cultural Revolution and the highly ideologized climate connected to that? If Ambassador Liu wants to respond to that now or some other Chinese-side person, I would allow that person. Then I will be taking other general questions.

*Liu Qibao:* This issue concerns Chinese leaders' view of Khrushchev and other Eastern European leaders, their roles and positions in history, and their merits and shortcomings. This is a complex question. At the time we admitted that the Soviets supported Vietnam. But the question was how they viewed the situation. At the beginning Ambassador Li Fenglin offered a brief discussion of this question from a higher level of perceptions. I agree with his view. We must not see a question in separation from its historical context and conditions. New interpretations can emerge. The farther away from the events we get, we may have even newer perceptions. The new perceptions do not mean negating the old ones but they are deeper and can reveal the internal connections of issues. The history of the Soviet Union is well known. It no longer exists. The reasons for the Soviet Union's disappearance are complicated. We have to understand the issue in historical contexts. At the time Chinese leaders also understood the question historically. Another question, raised also by our German friend, is whether Chinese leaders had disagreements on this question. During China's Cultural Revolution, the Chinese leadership situation was very complex. But in respect to the Vietnam War and assistance to Vietnam, in my view, there was no disagreement in China. The decisions were made by Zhou Enlai and Mao Zedong, and these were carried out.

*Westad:* Ambassador Li, please.

*Li Fenglin:* I have some comments. Now we are discussing events in 1965 and the Sino-Soviet relationship in connection with the Vietnam War. Perhaps some background information will be helpful. I want to mention two concrete facts regarding Soviet and Eastern European material assistance to Vietnam after 1965. At the time China transported material assistance to

Vietnam free of charge, as already mentioned by Mr. Schröter. China had an office for assistance to Vietnam, which was headed by Li Qiang. I also worked in the office. We had some arguments with the Soviets over certain specific issues. For instance, sometimes the Soviets provided to the Vietnamese certain military materials not needed by the Vietnamese at the moment. They were reluctant to tell the Soviets that these were not needed. So they asked us to keep these materials in China for a while. This put China in a very difficult position because every time the cargos were clearly listed. Later, as well known to historians, this caused the Soviet leadership, including their defense minister, to accuse China for blocking their material assistance. Another fact is quite interesting. Soviet materials were transported via the railroads. According to regulations the cargos should have been covered up. But occasionally the Soviets refused to cover them up. The Chinese became very suspicious about their intentions. Did you want to show these to the Americans? What I wish to explain is that in the Sino–Soviet cooperation in assisting Vietnam, the Chinese were sincere. I have read many works, including those by Professor Li Danhui, on China’s assistance to Vietnam. These include very detailed descriptions of the number of people and amount of materials involved.

In my opinion, the Eastern European countries also actively and sincerely assisted Vietnam. But where was the disagreement? In my view, the Sino–Soviet disagreement, unlike what you suggested, was not caused by a Chinese belief that the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries wanted to use their assistance to control Vietnam. This is a misunderstanding. The question occurred probably because later the Vietnamese attitude toward China and the Soviet Union changed. This is a separate question. Changes in Vietnam caused the change in the Sino–Vietnamese relationship. This question should be discussed separately. As for the Sino–Soviet disagreement on the Vietnam War, it should first be pointed out that after 1964 the Soviet attitude toward the Vietnam question changed. This is well known and I do not need to discuss it. On the Chinese side, the main point of disagreement was that at the time China regarded Vietnam as a predicament for the United States and wanted the United States to be caught in it. But the Soviet Union wanted to find a way out for the United States, as reflected in the Kosygin–Zhou Enlai conversation in 1965. I believe this was the principal disagreement over Vietnam between the two sides. Under the circumstances, both China and the Soviet Union faced a big and extremely complex problem of judging the other side’s intention. The Soviet side on

the one hand wanted to help the United States to find a way out in order to avoid a superpower confrontation and, on the other, supported Vietnam. Therefore, in my view, the Soviets had to make a choice in such a contradictory situation. In other words, they must support Vietnam but this could not be done too much and too firmly lest it upset the Americans. This is my view of the Chinese and the Soviet positions and their different judgments on each other's intentions. Thank you.

*Westad:* Thank you very much. That is very useful indeed and goes along with the line that you want to develop in this discussion. I definitely want to draw Li Danhui, Chen Jian, and Shen Zhihua into the discussion. They have worked on this. I first take a question from James Hershberg who has been waiting for sometime, and then I would like to turn to the Eastern European ambassadors who are here to respond to what we have heard from the Chinese side about their attitudes to the problem. I could turn to one of you after James.

*Hershberg:* Thank you, Arne. I will be as brief as possible but this is the subject that is very close to my heart, because I am working on a book on Eastern European diplomacy and the Vietnam War. So I have two very brief questions but I need to present a very brief background to help the discussion. Because the Soviet Union was afraid of criticism from China for helping the United States, the Soviet Union refrained from direct mediation between Washington and Hanoi between early 1965 and early 1967. So during this period the Eastern European countries were able to take the lead in trying to get the peace talks started between North Vietnam and the United States. In particular Poland and Hungary played very active roles in transmitting messages between Washington and Hanoi during the bombing pause in December 1965 to January 1966 and in the fall of 1966. However, these efforts failed and Polish and Hungarian leaders blamed China. For example we have record of a long conversation between Kádár and Gomułka in January 1966, in which they blamed China. And a Polish diplomat, Jerzy Michałowski, who visited Vietnam carrying American proposals, said that China blocked his travel to Vietnam in order to send a messenger ahead of him to convince the North Vietnamese not to agree to the American proposals. So I have two questions, one is, can the Chinese participants or the Eastern European participants shed lights on how China attempted to block Eastern European diplomatic initiatives to try to get peace talks started in 1966? And second, at what point did Hanoi tell Beijing that it intended to

move to peace talks? Because the Polish sources indicate that there was a secret visit to Beijing by Le Duan in November 1966, telling Chinese leaders that they intended to move toward peace talks. But so far we have no Chinese sources on this.

*Westad:* Very good and brief simple questions, James. Could I turn to someone on the Eastern European side now to respond to the presentations from our Chinese friends? Anyone who would like to make a brief intervention on this? Ambassador Juhász.

*Juhász:* At that time I worked for our foreign ministry, in the territorial department. My personal impression, I want to emphasize it is my own impression, is that, because Hungary supplied goods, a lot of them [to Vietnam.], on the Chinese side, especially during the Cultural Revolution, sometimes the transportation seemed blocked. But in the end China transported all goods to Vietnam. This is my own impression.

*Westad:* Thank you. Anyone would like to follow up on that? Yes, please.

*Budura:* I remember a discussion that Premier Zhou Enlai had with our leaders in June 1966. I was really surprised to find out that the main subject the leaders of the two countries discussed at that time was the war in Vietnam. Premier Zhou Enlai made two very important points. One was that the socialist countries were supposed to give assistance as much as possible, materially, politically, and diplomatically to Vietnam, that is to say, North Vietnam and South Vietnam as well. And I reached a conclusion that this discussion between Premier Zhou Enlai and Romanian leaders led to an increase, substantial increase, of assistance even by the Romanian government to the Vietnamese. So from this point of view, I would like to point out that the Chinese side was interested in assisting Vietnam.

Another point I want to make is that Premier Zhou Enlai mentioned the attempts made by different countries, I suppose here referring to Hungarian or Polish attempts, to promote an idea of negotiating a solution in Vietnam. The Chinese side suspected that such a move would be premature and too hasty. My understanding is that according to China's strategic tradition, a proper time should be selected when the negotiations were supposed to start. If it were too early and the changes on the ground were not sufficiently helpful, then the result of the negotiations would be nil. So I think that the Romanian leaders at that time, in the summer of 1966, did not think the time was right to start negotiations. But then I have to add that because of the interest of the American side and some other information, the Romanians started to

take part actively in this process in 1967 and 1968. As I remember, there were three Romanian delegations to Hanoi. And the main subject was how to promote a peaceful solution of the conflict there.

I also remember that, may I say according to the oriental strategy, the Romanian delegation was advised to be very harsh and critical toward the American position. And by this the Vietnamese could maneuver and gain some concessions from the American side. We understood that and played the role because, I have to tell you, of the fact that the Vietnamese were very popular in Romania. This was so not because of moral or political values, but because the Romanians themselves had at that time the feeling that in that way they were also expressing their resistance to the other big power. So there was some kind of reason, a moral one, or spiritual one, so the Romanians were very much in favor of the struggle of the Vietnamese. Thank you.

*Westad:* Thank you. Ambassador Donchev and then Li Danhui.

*Donchev:* I would like to say that the period of the Vietnam War was also the period of the Cultural Revolution of China. They happened at the same time. So there was very little cooperation between our Eastern European countries and China during that time. The relations were very limited. We only had very small trade with China and very symbolic cooperation. Another field of cooperation was the support to Vietnam at that time. I was then a young diplomat in China dealing with consular affairs. As a consul I went several times a year to Manzhouli, which was China's border station, to receive goods, military equipments, ammunition, and weapons from the Soviet side. We kept the same kind of agreement that Mr. Schröter mentioned with China to deliver military goods to Vietnam. So I received the goods from the Russian side and then I gave them to the Chinese side. I could see that the Chinese were very polite. That was a terrible time for them, but they were very polite and strict. We counted every item several times, the quantity of the weapons and so on. Then we signed documents with the Chinese side for them to deliver the goods to Vietnam. We never got any claim from the Vietnamese side about the transportation, meaning that the goods were really delivered to Vietnam. As I already said, this was one of the few fields left for cooperation between our two countries. This was also one of the fields where we got a similar position with China on international issues. So we were not only together but also in the same direction of giving assistance to the Vietnamese people's struggle.

*Westad:* So, Bulgaria didn't see the same as the Soviet Union which openly claimed that China was trying to hinder the support coming through?

*Donchev:* No, never. We didn't. Not the Soviet side, not the Beijing side. We received the goods and transported them.

*Li Danhui:* I have a question for Mr. Schröter. You talked about the issue of East Germany's stand on sending volunteers to Vietnam. In March 1965, Brezhnev made a speech in the Red Square and promised that if necessary the Soviet Union would send volunteers to North Vietnam. I am wondering whether East Germany expressed its attitude at the same time. Did the Soviet Union and the other members of the Warsaw Pact ever discuss the question of coordinating their action and how to take a public stand on the issue of sending volunteers to Vietnam? The second question concerns your statement on the training of pilots for North Vietnam in East Germany. Did any other Eastern European countries help Vietnam train pilots, and how many trainees? How many trainees did receive training and in what locations in East Germany? Thank you.

*Liu Qibao:* The Vietnamese were able to use ground-to-air missiles in their air defense system. This kind of missiles, made in the Soviet Union, played a very important role in the war. Regular weapons could not bring down so many enemy aircraft. East Germany had many weapons of this kind and it could help with the training.

*Yu Sui:* Because at the time my work was related to the Soviet Union, I wish to add a point to the question just raised by the moderator. With regard to assistance to Vietnam, the Soviet Union, China, and Eastern European countries did the same. In the period material assistance to Vietnam had to go through China. The Sino-Soviet dispute was therefore extended to the question of assistance to Vietnam. For reasons not caused by China, the Soviets accused China for creating obstacles to the assistance. At times China also criticized the Soviets for not providing the Vietnamese with their most needed weapons. This kind of quarrel was a fact, but it did not affect the two countries' assistance to Vietnam per se. I also want to point out that the target of China's argument was the Soviet Union. For instance the Chinese side indeed published an article to repudiate the Soviet revisionists' "joint action." But China's attitude toward Eastern European countries was different and more tolerant.

*Westad:* Luthi, a quick question.

*Luthi:* A quick question about the differences between attitudes toward aid to Vietnam, based on different opinions on the strategy and how Vietnam should conduct war. I remember that in 1965, Mao Zedong actually proposed to fight a guerrilla war whereas the Soviet Union proposed to fight

a modern, technological war. This influenced the discussion of what aid should be sent through China.

*Schröter:* Our country never trained pilots. We only trained ground-based personnel for air defense purposes. Specifically, we trained soldiers and officers who were engaged with the new type of air defense missiles. We trained personnel for technical reference assistance. Because a missile is not only a missile but also a system. The system must always be in good conditions. Therefore those we trained in the GDR were never pilots. I know that pilots must have been trained somewhere, maybe in the Soviet Union. They had a similar problem because the highly sophisticated Russian fighters must have been too difficult for Vietnamese farmers. They couldn't master it. After that we had to make selections from among Vietnamese pilots. Only very few Vietnamese pilots were able to use this kind of modern type of fighters. But that was not a problem in our country. That was a problem in the Soviet Union and others, maybe in Czechoslovakia. I personally prepared a man from our air defense for his work in Vietnam. He later on became our military attaché in Vietnam. And his assistant even came from this ground-based anti-aircraft reference system. Whether other countries engaged in this kind of training? I don't believe so, because during some conferences I talked to several of our military attachés in Vietnam at that time. None of them told me that other people were engaged in the same field. The opinion at that time was that the GDR in this field was very highly sophisticated. So it was specialized for our country.

*Westad:* Thank you. Ambassador Li, do you have a specific point on this? Chen Jian, you first.

*Chen Jian:* Ambassador Li mentioned this morning that 1965 was a turning point in the Sino-Soviet relationship. Actually, an important question was how to interpret the question of Vietnam. An important reason for the Soviets' insistence on holding the March conference in Moscow was about "joint action." Kosygin visited Vietnam first and then talked with Mao Zedong in China. An important subject of this February conversation was Vietnam. Kosygin, taking a certain risk of causing problems in the Soviet party, proposed "joint action" to Mao, but Mao rejected the idea. We all know what happened next within the Chinese party. In 1966, Japanese Communist leader Miyamoto Kenji came to China after visiting Korea and Vietnam. He also brought up the question of "joint action." His discussion with Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping resulted in a preliminary agreement. But

Mao Zedong showed up in the last moment, saying that Liu's and Deng's words did not count.

In my view, in studying this subject we need to consider two large questions, one concerning the Sino–Soviet relations and the other China's foreign policy. The Chinese attitude at this time was closely connected to the full-scale left turn of China's foreign and domestic policies. The turn resulted in three impossibilities. First, it became impossible for the socialist countries to take joint action in assisting Vietnam. Secondly, the Sino–Soviet relationship became even more complicated, and Kosygin left China extremely disappointed. It can be said now that in the recent Budapest conference the original record of the Mao–Kosygin conversation was disclosed. Thirdly, both Vietnam and Eastern European countries were faced with a very difficult question as to how to deal with the Sino–Soviet dispute. China and the Soviet Union were the two dragon heads of the socialist countries but now their relationship was in big trouble. From this perspective, we may have a clearer understanding of the general background. In general, if the Cultural Revolution was a ten-year disaster for China, its impact on China's foreign policies should be carefully studied. We need to consider how the full-scale turn to the left in China's domestic and foreign policies affected the Sino–Soviet relations and the events during the Vietnam War. Our veteran ambassadors on the Chinese side should be able to tell us more in this regard.

*Westad:* Ambassador Li.

*Li Fenglin:* Professor Chen raised a very important question worth further exploration. I just have some simple comments. During this period, until 1969, there was no disagreement between China and Vietnam on the Vietnam War. At least in 1965 the Vietnamese side did not want to negotiate with the United States. Between China and Vietnam there were many high-level contacts concerning this issue, and the two sides had the same stands. The beginning of the Soviet intention to negotiate has to be ascertained with documentary evidence. The Vietnamese disagreed with the Soviets in this matter but could not publicly express their view. In my view, this was the general situation at the time and should be taken into account.

Aside from this, there were some smaller questions. For instance some comrades just mentioned that the Chinese side tried to prevent Polish and Hungarian diplomats from visiting Vietnam. This is a too insignificant and unlikely detail. It would have been improbable and unnecessary for the Chinese to do such things. Such a situation absolutely could not take place. The Soviets maintained high-level and direct contact with the Vietnamese. There

was absolutely no need for other countries to serve as intermediaries. Instead, I wish to ask Eastern European ambassadors how your countries coordinated with the Soviet Union in policies toward Vietnam. In other words, whether the Soviets clearly informed them of their stand on the Vietnam War? This is a question relevant not only to the volunteer issue but also to the general policy coordination between the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries. I am very interested in knowing this.

As for the turn in 1965 mentioned by Professor Chen Jian, including Kosygin's disappointment, I would like to see the document that you just talked about. I participated in the negotiation as an interpreter. If you can show me the document, then I may make a judgment about its accuracy. I remember the conversation and questions discussed clearly, including the question of Vietnam.

*Westad:* I could not possibly leave that, Ambassador Li. Could you give us some of those recollections from that meeting? We will return to that, you can be sure. Niu Jun.

*Niu Jun:* A question occurred to me. Mr. Yu Sui talked about Eastern European countries' assistance to Vietnam, suggesting that the Sino–Soviet dispute affected assistance to Vietnam but that China's attitude toward the Eastern European countries was different and more tolerant. This is the first time for me to hear this. I wish to know what the principal difference was between the Chinese attitudes toward the Soviets and toward the Eastern Europeans. Then, if such a difference indeed existed, whether or not China's policymakers had such a clear policy of treating Soviet and Eastern European assistance to Vietnam differently. Finally, what was the point in making such a difference?

*Westad:* Again a very important question. We are running a bit short of time. I want to turn to Professor Rowiński first in responding in part to the questions from Ambassador Li if possible. Then I will take one more question or comment, and then we will have to go back to the presenters. Professor Rowiński.

*Rowiński:* You know this is so big a question. It is very hard to answer especially about our role in those events involving members of Indochina, Vietnamese communists, Canada, and India. Poland organized this common action to support Vietnam. Poland had a few secret missions in Beijing to organize such a movement. Then the big question is why we were so active. There is another question—what is our point of view about this war and

the possibilities of resolving it? It is very hard to answer all these questions quickly.

*[Passages in italics are from Mr. Rowiński's prepared written presentation.]*

*Here the emphasis was on two major lines of action: First, diplomatic measures (secret mediation missions) aimed at arranging direct Vietnamese-US contacts with the purpose of starting peace negotiations and stopping the conflict. Second, coordination of activity by socialist states (not just confined to parties to the Warsaw Treaty Organization), with a view toward providing effective help to Vietnam. It was sought in contacts between party leaderships and within the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organization. China was in firm opposition to both of these lines.*

*China was adamant in opposing any mediation effort (including by Poland, whose position and activity were influenced by her being a member of the Vietnam Commission, with India and Canada). Initially, as I see it, these were pretty naive attempts to prevent an outbreak of Vietnam War (the measures taken in 1963–64, mentioned by anusz. Michałowski in his report). Given, on the one hand, the international situation after the Cuban crisis, the relations between the two superpowers, an escalating Soviet-Chinese conflict, the direction of China's internal evolution (accompanied by an abrupt radicalization of a "revolutionary" foreign policy) and the determination of the DRV's leadership to "liberate the South and unify Vietnam", and—on the other hand—a steadfast US position to prevent that from happening (the domino theory), the Indochina conflict was in fact doomed to break out. Beijing, Moscow and Washington followed their own motives and plans which by far transcended that particular operating theatre (North and South Vietnam, and later Indochina). With some simplification, it can be said that China sought a radical change of the status quo, while the Russians and the Americans would rather have it frozen, with some modifications. The factors working for the conflict to erupt were incomparably stronger than those working in the opposite direction. In my opinion, the "Tonkin Gulf incident" was inevitable—and the only questions left open were about the pretext, the place and the timing. For Warsaw, coming up with mediation initiatives, Beijing's stance remained a certain unknown, even if its key role was fully realized. (Exacerbating disputes within the leadership of the Communist Party of China were mostly over domestic policies, while vis-à-vis Moscow a concerted position was being taken.) What was known was the differences of opinion within the Vietnamese leadership.*

First of all, the first question about diplomatic measures, the secret mission, the Marigold mission aimed to arrange talks with the Vietnamese. There were two big operations. One was the Lumbago operation from December 1965 to January 1966. Ambassador to China Michałowski visited Moscow and talked with Gromyko, and then in Beijing, with vice foreign minister Wang Bingnan. Then he flew to Hanoi to talk with *Foreign Minister Nguyen Duy Trinh, Prime Minister Pham Van Dong, Defense Minister General Vo Nguyen Giap and, finally, with President Ho Chi Minh*. And the Russians, I think, Gromyko in Moscow, gave him full support.

*While receiving full backing from Moscow, the mediation was firmly opposed and “chastised with indignation” by Beijing which caused a one-day delay in the Polish diplomat’s departure for the DRV (under the pretext of US bombing of Hanoi) and which sent its own emissary there to prevail upon the hosts to reject the 14-point US proposal. During his Hanoi talks, Ambassador Michałowski presented in detail the US proposals and the reasoning behind them, and he argued—citing the position of the PUWP Politburo—that initial acceptance of Washington’s proposals as a basis for starting talks would be advisable. Hanoi rejected the proposals—presumably under pressure from Beijing—and used arguments almost identical with those of Wang Bingnan, even if presented in a more polite form.*

I remember this because I was the second secretary at our embassy. I did not attend these talks. But I told our ambassador Michałowski that I knew vice minister Wang Bingnan, a very clever person, and I thought I could explain our point of view. I said that you knew that this was not the right situation, especially the internal situation in China. China was under the Cultural Revolution after the article of Yao Wenyan. We all know what really happened in China. Wang Bingnan was in a very difficult position. After this talk we were all upset. Practically the position of Wang Bingnan was absolutely clear and against any such action. I have not mentioned the reason for our talk to Hanoi. The ambassador flew to Hanoi and tried to explain to the Vietnamese the document of the Americans’ 14-point position. You see, you tried and tried. If in some way you use it, it would be up to you. Maybe there were some possibilities on some occasion.

The Vietnamese answer was more or less the same as Wang Bingnan’s, but much more polite. After that Michałowski came and stayed in Moscow on January 14–15, 1966, for talks with Alexander Shelepin, First Deputy Foreign Minister Vasilii Kuznetsov, and CPSU CC Secretary in charge of ideology, Leonid Ilichev. But practically this was not the time for starting

Vietnam talks. In my personal opinion, if you look at this period, the mission was pretty naive in trying to prevent the outbreak of the Vietnam War. This is how I think about the measures between 1963 and 1964, which the Michałowski report mentioned about. On one hand, after the Cuban crisis, the international situation between the two superpowers, the escalation of the Soviet–Chinese conflict, and the direction of China’s internal evolution closely influenced China’s foreign policy. On the other, there was the American side of the situation. Hanoi leaders’ position was to liberate the south and unify the country. And there was the American point of view on a domino effect. All were connected together.

*Ending in a similar failure was another mediation attempt (Operation Marigold’s continuation, or second stage), taken by Ambassador Janusz Lewandowski between June and December 1996. He is said to have presented US proposals (10 points) to Prime Minister Pham Van Dong, in a meeting on June 6. During another meeting, on November 22, the DRV Prime Minister is said to have been inclining to possibly establish direct contacts with the Americans in search for a political solution to the conflict—despite Beijing’s continuing firm opposition.*

*Also worthy of mention are two other important initiatives of that time, both meting with strong criticism from Beijing. These are the talks held in Hanoi in early 1996 by Alexander Shelepin, CPSU Politburo member and KGB chief, and by János Péter, the Hungarian foreign minister—they were aimed to encourage the DRV leaders to look for politico-diplomatic solutions as well as the military instruments. The accounts of the hosts reactions are imprecise or sometimes outright contradictory. Their position, it seems, was that the conditions were not yet ripe for the military pressure to be supplemented—still less replaced—with a search for political solutions.*

*It cannot be ruled out that the Russians—competing with the Chinese for influence—took that into account and refrained from pressure, offering an increase in military aid. That factor certainly did not help our efforts. Polish assessments of the situation stressed that contacts with the Chinese had to be maintained, their arguments heard and their role taken into account, and also that the situation must be avoided where efforts by other socialist-camp countries aimed to arrange Vietnam-US talks might be seen by Beijing as a Russian intrigue, directed against China. (This aspect is said to have been taken up in talks with the GDR and Bulgarian leaderships).*

*The essence of our position in those highly complex and difficult efforts to mediate between Hanoi and Washington—strongly affected by the grow-*

*ing Sino-Soviet dispute and the hardliners' ascendancy within the DRV leadership—was reflected in the words of Polish Foreign Minister [Adam] Rapacki, speaking to the US ambassador to Warsaw, John Gronouski, on December 13, 1966: “Neither the postman nor advocate: what we want is peace.” Considering the objective circumstances, the position of the DRV's major allies and of the Hanoi leadership, Operation Marigold stood no chances of success. Conditions were not yet ripe for negotiations.*

*The Chinese leadership criticized and firmly opposed any coordination of socialist countries' activities and assistance towards Vietnam—a reflection of its strong desire to weaken and do away with Soviet influence in North Vietnam. This topic—a stock theme in public polemics—is well known and widely treated in literature. The Chinese made an unequivocal public presentation of its principal position and harsh replies to Soviet proposals. For tactical reasons (especially in the initial period of 1964–66), the Chinese usually avoided public criticism of numerous pronouncements on this subject by socialist countries and communist parties, and they passed up in silence the DRV's appeals for precisely such action. That these caused their irritation is known from accounts by their interlocutors.*

*Among all countries in the “camp,” the efforts taken with regard to this matter by Poland were the most vigorous and most enduring (e.g. in the autumn of 1965, then again in 1966 and in the summer of 1967, during a secret visit to Beijing and Hanoi by the No. 2 and Gomulka's close associate, Zenon Kliszko and Secretary Liu Ningyi in Beijing. I and my friend translated the conversation. Very brutal talks. In the end Liu Ningyi took out the *People's Daily* of May 4, 1967. I remembered every word vividly. Here I only want to mention that in a very brutal way he said that Poland “pursued a policy of servitude toward contemporary Soviet revisionism” and that “there is no longer anything that unites us but everything that divides us, as we were standing on the opposite sides of the barricade.” Well, once this was said. . . . [interrupted by moderator]. Various attempts were also made to delay the special airplane's flight from Beijing and then from Nanning, to Hanoi. It may be noted that Moscow was skeptical of Gomulka's initiative from the start, and it warned that it saw no chances of success.*

*How to explain Poland's position and activity? This came as a result of a host of objective and subjective factors. On the one hand (leaving aside the consequences of ideological dogmas and assumptions), there was the need to take account of the obvious politico-military and economic realities within the Soviet block. In these circumstances, virtually all initiatives were*

*subject to prior consultation with Moscow. Poland was convinced that that war was not in its interest; on the contrary it was deeply feared that a further escalation of the Indochina conflict and both superpowers' involvement in it could exacerbate East-West relations, pose a threat to détente, and relegate to the back seat the questions of key importance to Warsaw, namely those pertaining to European security.*

*Warsaw was quite understandably worried by China's clear suggestions that the best form of assistance to Vietnam would be offered if the Russians exerted military pressure on Americans in Berlin and on West Germany, thus creating tensions in Europe that would prevent the US from sending troops to Vietnam. For example, there were such suggestions by Li Xiannian in a conversation with Shelepin in Beijing in January 1966, and by Liu Shaoqi, Deng Xiaoping and Peng Zhen during talks with a CPY CC delegation in March 1966.*

*Nor did Warsaw like the prospect of the Polish economy being increasingly burdened with growing assistance to the DRV. Furthermore, a sharpening up of the Soviet-Chinese dispute could lead to a greater Soviet control in Central and Eastern Europe, thus restricting still more the already narrowing room for maneuver. Not inconceivably, faced with a "threat of fighting on two fronts," Moscow might seek agreement with Bonn at the expense of Warsaw's interests.*

*An important factor had to do with "face-saving," or Polish credibility as a Commission member. It must have been played by the US administration, when it asked Warsaw for intermediation. The US realized that, among all Commission members, Poland was best suited for direct contacts with Hanoi's top leadership, and best informed of Moscow's and Beijing's positions and tactics in this respect. The Polish leadership, who remembered China's positive role in the October 1956 events in Poland and who reacted so much differently to the 1956 uprising in Hungary, the position taken by the Chinese leaders on the Vietnam question was not understandable (especially in the first half of the 1960s, when China was not yet engulfed by the chaos of the Cultural Revolution.)*

*Although documents throw no light on the subject, one can hardly dismiss the impression that for some time the PUWP leadership (or its part), and Gomułka in particular, cherished (illusory) hopes of winning Beijing over to their arguments. Gomułka took various efforts to prevent a fissure between Moscow and Beijing, and as long as it was possible he sought to maintain normal relations with China. It may be recalled that Poland ada-*

mantly opposed Khrushchev's 1963 proposal to admit Mongolia into the Warsaw Treaty Organization, arguing that the Chinese would see the move as directed against them.

*In my opinion, China's Vietnam policy was primarily a logical consequence of Mao Zedong's new strategy to transform his country into "a center and an armory of the world revolution" and to take up fight on two fronts, against US imperialism and Soviet revisionism. As regards the causes and motives behind the CCP leadership's behavior and lines of internal and external policy evolution of the PR of China in the 1960s and 1970s (including their influence on Beijing's stance on Vietnam), I personally share much of the analysis and conclusions presented by Professors Qiang Zhai and Chen Jian. I believe they require renewed critical reflection, based on disclosed archive materials, especially the still least known archives of the PR of China.*

*Westad:* Sorry, we have to conclude. We will get back to you. Now concluding remarks. Ambassador Liu Qibao, please.

*Liu Qibao:* Many people made a lot of good comments, but this question cannot be clarified easily. It can be discussed further later on. I myself learned a lot. My own talk stressed a quadruple relationship among China, the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and Vietnam. This relationship had a close connection with those changes and developments in Vietnam and in the Soviet Union. In respect to that period and its background, we still have many questions to discuss.

*Westad:* Thank you. That was an excellent philosophical point on that question. Ambassador Schröter.

*Schröter:* Yes. Vietnam War was a very complex issue involving the interests of the powers concerned and their allies. The key of the issue was to find a way out without losing face for any party. It is impossible to discuss this complicated issue in such a short time. But it is my impression that some important points have been made.

*Westad:* This is the end of the session. Let me thank all of the presenters who participated in the debate. I also think that we can make one step further in trying to outline how the views developed on both sides. What I think we need more on, from both the European and the Chinese sides, is the decision making that actually took place and generated the policies, in this case regarding Vietnam and later in regard with other topics. If you can penetrate that level, to deal with both the diplomacy and such decisions that created the diplomacy, then we can move to a better understanding.

\* \* \* End of Session Two \* \* \*

## **Session Three: The Effects of the Cultural Revolution on the Relations between China and Eastern Europe, 1966–1969**

(4:00–5:45, March 24)

*Zhang Baijia:* We will use this session to discuss the impact of the Cultural Revolution on Chinese–Eastern European relations, covering the years from 1966 to 1969. The Cultural Revolution had a very strong influence on China’s foreign policy and foreign relations. We have many participants here who can speak with authority on this question. Our discussion begins now and will end at 5:30. The first speaker is Ambassador Fan Chengzuo.

*Fan Chengzuo:* Colleagues and scholars, according to the conference agenda, I should talk about the influence of the Cultural Revolution on China’s relations with Eastern European countries. Between 1966 and 1976, the Cultural Revolution took place in China. As we all know, this was not a cultural revolution in the traditional sense but a political revolution. Its theoretical basis was continuous revolution under the proletarian dictatorship, the so-called basic line according to the CCP Central Committee at the time. Specifically, it was alleged that classes and class struggles continued to exist in socialist countries and the bourgeois class existed in the power-holding communist parties. Therefore the struggle was directed toward those capitalist roaders in power. This theory and its practice during the Cultural Revolution shook the Soviet Union and most of the Eastern European countries. Their general attitude was to oppose this. Maintaining its neutral stance between the Soviet Union and China, Romania did not openly oppose the Cultural Revolution but did not support it either. Albania had very friendly relations with China, but its leadership could not understand the Cultural Revolution either at the beginning. It is generally believed that Albania supported China’s Cultural Revolution from the beginning to the end. But let me tell you, they did not understand the Cultural Revolution at the beginning.

At first I would like to talk about how Albania rapidly warmed up to China’s Cultural Revolution. At the end of April 1966, the eve of the Cultural Revolution, Albanian Prime Minister [Mehmet] Shehu and Labor Party

secretary [Hysni] Kapo led a party and government delegation to visit China. China and Albania shared the same goal in opposing imperialism and revisionism, especially Soviet hegemony and Soviet revisionism. They held meetings with Chinese State Chairman Liu Shaoqi, Premier Zhou Enlai, and CCP Secretary General Deng Xiaoping. In their meeting with Mao Zedong, the two sides reached agreements on international situation and their bilateral relations. But Albania disagreed with China about domestic issues.

The Albanians admitted that class struggles continued in Albania's socialist society because there were still remnants of reactionary classes. But they denied the existence of the bourgeoisie and of a bourgeois-proletarian struggle in Albania. Therefore, in their country the revolutionary movement was aimed at rooting out bureaucratism. The Albanians only voiced support for China's socialist revolution and socialist construction but avoided the Chinese concepts of classes and class struggle. They said that China had its unique conditions and that they had to study these to achieve an understanding. Obviously, the Albanians had reservations about the idea of continuous revolution under proletarian dictatorship and about the imminent Cultural Revolution.

This situation began to change after June 1966. After the Cultural Revolution flared up, the Albanians closely watched the developments in China. In the end of October, [Enver] Hoxha told Kang Sheng, who was then head of the Chinese delegation to Albania's fifth party congress, that he welcomed China's Cultural Revolution. This was Albania's cautious official stance made in public. In February 1967, Albania sent two delegations to China simultaneously, a party delegation under party secretary Kapo, and a military delegation under Beqir Balluku, deputy prime minister and minister of defense. A main item in their agendas was observing the Cultural Revolution. In these delegations' separate meetings with Mao Zedong, Zhou Enlai, and Jiang Qing, they expressed support to the Cultural Revolution. This time they expressed "support."

A few months later, in July 1967 when the Cultural Revolution was at its peak, Albania sent a huge party and government delegation to China under Prime Minister Shehu and party secretary [Ramiz] Alia. During this visit they indicated active support for the Cultural Revolution, escalating from the general support expressed earlier. In China the Albanians divided themselves into groups and went to mass meetings organized in different provinces and cities, openly propagating their strong support for the Cultural Revolution. I want to disclose a fact hitherto unknown to the public. In his

conversation with Zhou Enlai, Shehu offered to name Liu Shaoqi as China's "biggest capitalist roader" in his public speech. At the time, the "biggest capitalist roader" was repudiated in China without naming his name, but everybody knew who he was. Shehu offered his help in making the name public. Premier Zhou Enlai disliked the idea and answered nonchalantly: "You have to ask Chairman Mao about this." Of course Shehu did not ask. These facts show how Albania's attitude toward the Cultural Revolution gradually changed.

Secondly, I want to point out that the Albanian support for the Cultural Revolution was an important landmark in the two countries' unique relationship. We all know that the relationship between China and Albania was unusual and special. Albania's attitude toward the Cultural Revolution changed from puzzlement to cautious welcome, and then from general endorsement to active support. Hereby Albania became the only country in the world that supported China's Cultural Revolution in the name of the state. This action became one of Albania's "three supports" for China. These were, first, support for China's opposition to Soviet hegemony, secondly, support for the Cultural Revolution, and, thirdly, support for China's recovery of its rights in the United Nations. In retrospect, the third support, that for China's rights in the UN, was the most consistent, most effective, and also most valuable. Yet Albania's support for the Cultural Revolution highlighted its special relationship with China and significantly enhanced the development of this relationship. This can be illustrated in the following aspects:

*Lavish mutual praise of the relationship.* The Chinese side asserted that Albania was the socialist beacon of Europe. According to the Albanians, the Chinese–Albanian friendship was solid like steel and pure like crystal. Both sides believed that the development of their relationship reached one peak after another, vouching that they would unite together, fight together, and win victory together.

*Frequent mutual visits by senior leaders and frequent exchanges of people.* On the Chinese side, Premier Zhou Enlai visited Albania successively in 1964, 1965, and 1966. During the Cultural Revolution, many Chinese party, government, and military leaders visited Albania. These included politburo member Kang Sheng, Deputy Premier Li Xiannian, Cultural Revolution leading group member Yao Wenyuan, PLA [People's Liberation Army] Marshal Xu Xiangqian, PLA Chief of Staff Huang Yongsheng, Chief of the PLA Political Department Li Desheng, and others. On the Albanian side, Hoxha visited China during the CCP's eighth national congress in 1956. After that

he made no other visit to China. Actually, after his participation in the Moscow conference of 1956, Hoxha stopped going abroad. All other Albanian leaders, without exception, visited China several times. The exchanges of people were even more frequent. There was even a Red Guards delegation to Albania. Until World War II China and Albania did not have any contact, but now the two peoples became known to each other in every household on both sides. Present in today's symposium are people who were in their adolescence at the time. In those years China's movie theaters showed many Albanian films. The degree of mutual knowledge was very unusual.

*Full-scale, significant increase of Chinese assistance to Albania.* China and Albania established diplomatic relations in 1949 and sent ambassadors to each other's capitals in 1954. During the twenty-four years from 1954 to 1978, when China stopped assistance to Albania, China provided assistance of a total ten billion RMB. In the 1970s this amount, if converted into the American currency, was six billion dollars. The assistance during the first six years of the Cultural Revolution (1966–72) was 80% of the total. The year of 1968 was especially important, which was mentioned many times in this morning's discussion. In that year, China's Cultural Revolution reached its peak, the Soviet Union invaded Czechoslovakia, and, to protest the Soviet invasion, Albania withdrew from the Warsaw Pact. In this year at one time China provided thirty complete projects to Albania. In this period China satisfied every request from Albania. During the Cultural Revolution, helped with Chinese assistance, the living standard of the Albanian people was improved remarkably.

Now we come to the third part of my talk. I just said that the Albanian support of China's Cultural Revolution was a high mark of their relationship. But it was not the basis of the relationship. Even when the two countries had a very warm relationship due to Albania's support of the Cultural Revolution and the two countries' common action in repudiating the Soviet Union, they also had disagreements and quarrels. In 1969 Soviet Prime Minister [Aleksei] Kosygin made a stop in the Beijing Airport when returning from his visit to Vietnam. Albania was displeased with China's receiving Kosygin and Zhou Enlai's meeting with him. Obviously their respective relations with the superpowers were a sensitive issue between the two countries. As I remember, because of this Kosygin affair, Albania lowered the rank of its delegation to the celebration of the PRC's twentieth anniversary. Instead of sending their prime minister, they sent a deputy prime minister to head the delegation.

In the late 1960s, Soviet hegemony expanded viciously. The Soviet Union invaded Czechoslovakia, it later occupied Afghanistan, and posed a greater threat to China, Romania, and actually also Albania. Under the circumstances China seized opportunities in opposing both American and Soviet hegemony and struggling against Soviet revisionism. In 1971 China received Dr. [Henry] Kissinger and in 1972 welcomed President Nixon's visit for the sake of a common effort against the Soviet Union. These were the formative years of normalization of the Sino-American relations. China's orientation was contradictory to Albania's consistent stand against any compromise in the anti-American and anti-Soviet struggles. For this reason, during the spring of 1971 and of 1972, Albania criticized the important readjustment in Chinese diplomacy, and published many unfriendly articles to repudiate China, though these did not directly name China. Soon, in 1976, Mao Zedong, Zhou Enlai, and some other first-generation PRC leaders passed away, and the Cultural Revolution ended. The disagreements between China and Albania deepened and their relations became increasingly aloof.

Chinese assistance to Albania stopped in 1972, which was another key year. Some articles have mentioned that there were four seasons in the Sino-Albanian relationship. Spring was when their diplomatic relationship was established. Summer was the time when they made common effort in opposing revisionism until Nixon's visit to China in 1972. From 1972 to 1978, when experts were pulled out, this was autumn. After that the Sino-Albanian relationship entered winter. In dealing with the anti-Chinese waves in terms of ideology and state relationship on the Albanian side, China followed the course of not cursing back and not arguing with them. In the fall of 1978, China decided to stop assistance and pull out its experts from Albania. To this Albania reacted strongly. Then, until the mid-1980s, Albania's attitude toward China was almost hostile. Between 1978 and 1985, the two countries maintained a mere nominal relationship and endured a long and snowy winter.

The last point I want to make is that the Sino-Albanian relationship cracked but was not broken. Let me point out that the developments and changes in interstate relations are often determined by political, economic, military, and ideological factors. But which factors among these are more important than the rest? Specifically, without doubt the Cultural Revolution used to be an important factor in the Sino-Albanian relationship in those years, and it gave the relationship a powerful push. Yet the principal Albanian leaders stressed even more the ideological element in the relations with the

Soviet Union and the United States. They asserted that this was the basis of the Sino–Albanian relationship and they could not tolerate destruction of this basis.

In retrospect, any observant person in those years could see the continuous escalation of Albania's anti-Chinese rhetoric. I used to say this: Who opposed Mao Zedong most fiercely? One was Jiang Jieshi [Chiang Kai-Shek] and another was Khrushchev. But the principal Albanian leaders not only opposed Mao and Zhou, they also opposed Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping with a very strong rhetoric in those years. They continuously published many articles in accusing China. This was not known in China because we did not publicize the situation and did not curse them back. Yet such an anti-Chinese tendency inevitably would lead to the suspension of China's economic assistance to Albania. They did not care about such a consequence in damaging the two countries' relations.

People may ask why Albania did not repeat what it had done to the Soviet Union in 1961, or why it did not break diplomatic relations with China. In my view, there were three reasons. First, at the time China stuck to its policy of not cursing back and not arguing with Albania. This avoided further intensification of the contradiction. If we had reciprocated Albania with accusations, the contradiction would have certainly become intensified and the diplomatic relationship would have collapsed. Secondly, unlike the Soviet Union, China did not have naval bases in the Mediterranean and did not constitute a military threat to Albania's territory and sovereignty. And, thirdly, the Chinese side took the initiative in proposing that, even though technical assistance and experts were suspended, experts in the cultural field would not be withdrawn and the normal trade relations and cultural exchanges with Albania would continue. Therefore, the tone on the Chinese side was rather warm.

Lastly, I want to say that from the 1950s to the 1980s I personally witnessed and experienced the four seasons described above. In reviewing this period, it can be said that since the death of Hoxha, who died nine years after Mao and Zhou, both countries took the initiative in gradually improving their relations. From the middle to the end of the 1980s, I completed my last tenure in Albania. I sensed that the winter was ending and an early spring was coming. Afterwards, our colleagues continued to make effort and the spring indeed arrived again. Currently, the relations between the two countries are healthy and friendly. This ends my talk about the impact of the Cultural Revolution on the Sino–Albanian relationship. Thank you.

*Zhang Baijia:* Ambassador Fan made a very interesting presentation on the Sino–Albanian relationship and evaluated this historical process from a Chinese perspective. Now we invite Mr. Kapllani to discuss the subject from an Albanian perspective.

*Kapllani:* Thank you. After Ambassador Fan’s speech, my task is much easier. He gave a very vivid and thorough description of the Cultural Revolution and its profound influence on Albania. He fired most of bullets and I will not repeat because most of them are historical facts. My very modest contribution to the discussion will be a few remarks on Albania’s leadership, the Sino-Albanian relationship under Hoxha, and Hoxha’s role in Albanian foreign policy and entire policies of Albania for nearly forty years.

As Ambassador Fan said, the two countries had no relations before World War II. The two sides started their contact at the conference of international communists in Moscow after the death of Stalin. Then Hoxha visited Beijing and met with Mao Zedong. This was their first contact. They got some information about each other and some views on international relations. I read some reflections written by Enver Hoxha. He described his talks with Mao in 1956, saying that Mao asked him about Yugoslavia, “Tell me something about Yugoslavia. Why are your relations not good with Yugoslavia?” Hoxha explained to Mao that Yugoslavia wanted to make Albania its seventh republic, to gobble up Albania. We could not allow that, so we could not have good relationship with Yugoslavia. Mao’s reaction was quite interesting. He said that it was neither your fault nor Yugoslavia’s fault, and that it was the fault of the Soviet Union. From today’s point of view, to Mao, the Cominform’s kicking out Tito reflected Moscow’s arrogance toward other countries of the so-called socialist camp.

In 1956, after his meeting with Mao, it is difficult for me to believe that Hoxha was fully aware that he planted the seeds of a great friendship. Later, after the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, the secret report on Stalin was the starting point of Albania’s disagreement with the Soviets. Then, in 1960, at the Bucharest and Moscow conferences, Khrushchev wanted to denounce China, and Hoxha and the Albanian Party of Labor came to the Chinese side and defended China. He thought that it was not right for Khrushchev to denounce China in such a rash manner in Bucharest. He used these words, saying: “You could not even expel a pupil from school like that. And not a big communist party from the rank of the international communist movement.” Anyhow, these were the days when the two sides intensified their contacts and got to know each other better, and in 1960

Hoxha came out openly to oppose Khrushchev. He labeled Khrushchev as revisionist and criticized revisionism and adopted a very hostile attitude toward American imperialism.

After that, as Ambassador Fan pointed out correctly, Khrushchev made a grave mistake in extending the ideological disagreements into the interstate relations, which was not right. In 1961, it was due to Soviet initiative that the diplomatic relations were severed. So I want to make a very slight correction of what Ambassador Fan said. He gave three reasons why the Sino-Albanian relationship was not broken up. These are very good reasons, but it is important that China did not take action in initiating any severing of the relations. It was to the credit of China that it showed greater tolerance to other parties and other countries. Between 1972 and 1974, when the Sino-Albanian relations went sourer and sourer, if China had done the same as the Soviets did, Albania would have had no way out. China showed maturity, a sign of a civil attitude toward other countries of the socialist camp.

I would like to mention some developments to show what Hoxha and the Party of Labor did in imitating or copying China's Cultural Revolution. I fully agree with Ambassador Fan's statement that at the beginning the Albanian leadership was baffled by the Cultural Revolution and could not comprehend it. But then there was an evolution of our attitude from bafflement to cool support and then to strong support. There was such a metamorphosis of the Albanian stand, which can be explained by several reasons. First, Hoxha felt that it was an international obligation for Albania to support China, the only ally after the breakup with the Soviets. Secondly, Hoxha used the Cultural Revolution as an effective instrument to counter internal and, particularly, external pressures on his dogmatic rule, that is, to block any avenue of liberalization in the country. Thirdly, in the radicalism of the Cultural Revolution, the Albanian leadership found a very good excuse for undertaking a revolutionizing movement in the party and the society. Ambassador Fan gave very good examples of these developments. In those years, the fight against bureaucracy and manifestations of bureaucratism was a way for Albania to copy or cross-breed some of the Cultural Revolution ideas. This fight had cost the Albanian society dearly. Thousands of high government and party officials were dismissed and were sent to the production front doing manual labor. Many never returned. There were cases in which working-class control groups directly controlled government institutions.

In this regard, I want to point out a nuance or shade of the Albanian situation. Hoxha did not approve any attack on the Party of Labor as Mao approved “bombardment of the headquarters”. Because Hoxha had a firm grip of the party and controlled it with an iron fist, he needed the party to his advantage. What he feared and suspected was the government administration. He sent workers into the state’s administrative departments and there they did away with people who were considered infected with bourgeois concepts and manifestations. It was never called cultural revolution, but rather “revolutionization of the life of the country.” A very important moment in the movement was a fight against religion and religious institutions. They instigated high school students in the same manner as the Red Guard of China. The students stormed churches and mosques and closed them down. Religious practices were banned by law, and then Albania was proclaimed an atheist state in its constitution, which was perhaps a unique case in the world at that time. This was done under the Marxian thought that religion was the opium for the people. So do away with it.

Another aspect of our small “cultural revolution” was to eradicate private property and private activities in the economic front. Even small lots of gardens and small numbers of farm animals in the villages were collectivized. The state undertook to produce everything, from tractors to buttons. As a matter of fact, the market did not have even basic commodities for consumption.

The decisive moment that disrupted the Chinese-Albanian honeymoon was the normalization of the Sino-US relations. After Nixon visited China and established relations with China, the Albanian leadership totally disapproved of this development, viewing it a betrayal of the socialist cause and of Marxism-Leninism. In fact, Hoxha, who dominated the Albanian party and government for nearly four decades after World War II, regarded himself as the guardian of the purity of Marxism-Leninism. He did it in 1947 in denouncing Tito when Tito was kicked out of the Cominform by Stalin. When Khrushchev reached a rapprochement with Tito in the 1960s, he condemned the act and saw it as a breach of the relationship with the Soviet Union in 1960 and 1961. After establishing a fully developed relationship with China and receiving significant assistance from China, which no other country did and for which the Albanian people were very grateful, after all that, Hoxha could not accept China’s rapprochement with the United States. So he condemned it. Thus the souring of the relationship with China began, and in the end only diplomatic relations remained between Albania and China.

We call this period “bunkerization of Albania.” Both speaking figuratively and literally, Albania was isolated completely. Our economy went down, people’s living standard deteriorated, and people were dissatisfied.

After Hoxha’s death, people hoped that his successor Alia could change things to the better and start reform. Some called him Balkan Gorbachev. But he failed to meet people’s expectations. In the early 1990s, after the Berlin Wall fell, the winds of change also reached the Albanian fence. If the Berlin Wall had fallen, how could one expect the Albanian fence could remain upright there and standing? This is what we have now. As for our relationship with China, I want to say that today we have very good relations. We are able to say that they are built on a new foundation free from the ideological baggage of the past. They are based on mutual interests and benefits that guarantee their future development and are also part of the post-Cold War culture. The Albanian people are looking forward to having greater, and more intensive and substantial relationship with China, which will be profitable for both our countries and their peoples.

My story is short and I want to meet our chairman’s requirement about time, so we may have questions and answers. Thank you!

*Zhang Baijia:* We have had two excellent presentations on a history that we have paid great attention to but known very little. Now we open to questions.

*Mastny:* I would like to ask both presenters to elaborate more on the origins of the Albanian-Chinese rapprochement. It seems to me that Hoxha’s support for China in 1960 at the two meetings was already the result of something that must have happened before. Were the origins of the rapprochement to be sought in the controversy between Albania and the Soviet Union with regard to the Valona base, which was later manifested at the meetings of the Warsaw Pact? Who initiated the contact? Was it from the Chinese side or from the Albanian side, and why at the very beginning?

*Luthi:* I have two questions about the Cultural Revolution. In 1966 when the Chinese Cultural Revolution began, several Eastern European parties, including the Vietnamese party, linked the Red Guards to the Petöfi Club, members of which were labeled by China, the Soviet Union, and other Eastern European countries as counter-revolutionaries. My question is whether all Eastern European countries regarded the Cultural Revolution as a counter-revolution or a leftist variation of revolution. My other question is whether East Europeans saw the Cultural Revolution as a power struggle within the Chinese party or a model of organizing a new state.

My last and larger question is that after 1969 China reemerged in the international scene as a more rational and less dogmatic actor. I just reviewed the records of meetings between the Soviet party and Eastern European parties between 1967 and 1980. The Soviets at these meetings tried to impose on other countries a uniform outlook about relations with China. What I found amazing is how much the Soviets actually missed the changes in China after 1969. I am wondering whether or not the East Europeans had a more subtle view of China after 1969.

*Westad:* Let me follow up with a few questions to the Chinese presenters. They are about the effect of the Cultural Revolution on China's foreign relations. The first question is regarding eastern and southeastern regions of Asia. We know that the relationship between China and the North Koreans became much worse almost immediately after the Cultural Revolution started. We saw from some recent reports that there were isolated border incidents between the two sides. How was this seen in Beijing? Was this seen as North Koreans' defection from the support that they gave to China during the first phase of the Sino-Soviet dispute?

The second question is about the general direction of Chinese foreign policy during the Cultural Revolution. This is an understudied subject. We know very little about it and would certainly like to know more. Some foreign scholars have said that what China really did during the Cultural Revolution was to turn inward and away from its foreign contacts. For instance, with regard to Vietnam, as we have already discussed. How would you see the impact of the Cultural Revolution to this specific and very important support that China was giving to Vietnam? Would you see this as the key problem that came up in the relationship between the two countries? Or, would you, like Ambassador Li pointed out early on, locate the main sources of the conflict between China and Vietnam as being related to the political changes in Vietnam in 1969? These are the questions I hope that the Chinese side can answer.

*Shen Zhihua:* My question is similar to Professor Mastny's but concerns a different period. I wish to know what role Hoxha played in the Sino-Soviet split. In the 1940s when the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia split, Hoxha's attitude played a rather delicate role and contributed to the distrust between Stalin and Tito. According to the Chinese sources, from 1960 to 1961, the Sino-Soviet split was connected to the Soviet base in Valona of Albania and also to the split between Albania and the Soviet Union. Yet it is not clear to us whether Mao used Hoxha or Hoxha used Mao's disagreement with

Khrushchev. Which one between the two was scheming in advance and was anticipating the results? Perhaps from the Albanian archives or from other people you have learned about how the Albanian Party of Labor considered the Sino–Soviet relations.

*Li Xiangqian:* My question is for Mr. Kapllani. You just talked about a counter-cultural revolution in Albania. My question is not about Sino–Albanian relations, but about, as you said, Hoxha’s belief that he was a genuine Marxist and acted as a pure Marxist. Would you please elaborate further why in the 1960s and 1970s he turned the Marxist idea about eliminating private ownership and religions into practice? As we know, in China there was this “great cultural revolution” and in Albania there was also the so-called small revolution. In addition there was the issue of Cambodia. What caused this phenomenon? Their cultural traditions, or influence of Stalinism, or their own systems? This is a question worth careful analysis. In the case of Albania, what were the origins of Hoxha’s ideas?

*Li Danhui:* I have two questions. One is whether, during Balluku’s conversation with Zhou Enlai on October 1, 1968, Zhou proposed to him that an anti-Soviet and anti-intervention alliance be established to include China, Romania, Yugoslavia, and Albania. The second is why, after Albania and the Soviet Union broke their diplomatic relations in 1961, the Soviet Union did not expel Albania from the Warsaw Pact. In September 1968 Albania itself quit the Warsaw Pact. What was the consideration on the Soviet side about Albania?

*Chen Jian:* Since in this session we are discussing the Cultural Revolution and the Chinese–Eastern European relations, I was admonished severely by Zhang Baijia for diverting from the topic in this morning. I was also a participant in the Cultural Revolution, but as Ambassador Fan said, we belong to the younger generation and are scholars now. During the Cultural Revolution, China’s foreign policy was reflected clearly through its relations with other socialist countries. As just mentioned, after the Cultural Revolution took place, China’s relations with Korea, Vietnam, and Cuba all deteriorated. For a while in this world only China and Albania were still “genuine socialist countries.”

It is quite interesting that after 1970–72, the Cultural Revolution went downhill, and Premier Zhou visited Korea between March and April of 1970. China’s relations with other socialist countries began to improve. Its relations with Romania began to warm up remarkably in 1971 and with Yugoslavia began to improve significantly after 1972. As I said in the morn-

ing, in the late 1970s, at the time I read newspapers very carefully. At one point the newspaper began to address Hungarians as comrades again! This is a big question. In light of this general background, the Sino–Albanian relationship became an anomaly in Chinese diplomacy. The Chinese made a mess at home during the Cultural Revolution, but China’s relations with Albania could not have been better. But when China began to improve relations with other countries, its relations with Albania began to decline. How should we understand this?

*Zhang Baijia:* We save the last question for Niu Jun.

*Niu Jun:* My question is related to the discussions this morning. Now I cannot remember this clearly, but three or four years ago, at an academic conference, I heard a Chinese scholar saying that during the Zhenbao Island clash in 1969 China believed that after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia more than one Eastern European countries hoped China could do something to oppose Soviet expansion. They sensed the threat. I checked this period and found out that both Romania and Albania sent delegations to China at this time. My question to the Albanian ambassador is: After the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, what expectations did Albania have about China and what was expressed during these visits? Or, what did Albania expect China to do in dealing with the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia?

*Chen Jian:* Another point. Ambassador Fan said that China sent a party-government-military delegation to Albania. This was unprecedented and no such delegation had been sent from the PRC before this point.

*Zhang Baijia:* Many questions have been raised. I’d like to divide them into three categories. At first, Chinese ambassadors may answer questions about China’s foreign policies during the Cultural Revolution. Then, we’ll invite Eastern European ambassadors to discuss Eastern European countries’ opinions about the Cultural Revolution. And lastly, Mr. Kapllani may answer those questions addressed to him. Which ambassador wants to evaluate China’s foreign policies during the Cultural Revolution?

*Li Fenglin:* In my view, during the Cultural Revolution, Chinese diplomacy was basically out of control. At the time the whole country focused on dealing with problems and chaos at home. In the foreign ministry the rebels also seized power briefly. Under such abnormal circumstances and under the extremist revolutionary tendency, diplomacy became impossible. There were some very specific policies to be implemented but under only one slogan or orientation—“anti-imperialism necessitates anti-revisionism.” But what was the real focus? The real focus was anti-revisionism.

Anti-revisionism involved both domestic and foreign policies. The issue of anti-revisionism was introduced into relations with other socialist countries, and consequently the relations with Korea, Vietnam, and Cuba deteriorated. Another development in Chinese diplomacy at the time was its ideologization. The task of diplomacy became one of propagating Mao Zedong's thought throughout the world. This is how I understood Chinese diplomacy in these years. Please correct me if I am mistaken. Professor Yu has studied this issue extensively and he may explain.

*Liu Yanshun:* An example to show how diplomacy was out of control in those years. In the summer of 1967, I was working at the embassy in East Germany. Several comrades drove a car to another city and had an accident. Only one survived. Without asking for any instruction from Beijing, the embassy decided that our Chinese comrades were murdered in a revisionist conspiracy. A big character banner was displayed at the gate of the embassy, saying "down with German revisionism; blood for blood." Obviously this was just a traffic accident. German deputy foreign minister came to our embassy to offer condolences. But he was stopped at the embassy entrance and abused verbally. Later this became known at home, and Premier Zhou immediately issued a directive, saying that the accident would be investigated by a team from home and any conclusion should be made only after the investigation. In his view, it was very unlikely that the German side planned the incident. For this Premier Zhou was accused for being soft by "rebels" in the foreign ministry. In an interview with these "rebels" Premier Zhou recalled that during the anti-Japanese war, our comrades were also killed in a car accident. At the time it was suspected that this was manufactured by the [Kuomintang] secret police. But after investigation, it became clear that a shooting happened during the accident without intention of killing our people.

This kind of out-of-control cases did not just occur in the embassy in East Germany. In many instances they happened not because the center adopted a new policy, but because of the general political line or the way in which Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai handled diplomacy at the time. These concrete cases happened because those comrades on the spot took anarchic actions. In addition, under the circumstances, many relations became irregular, and Eastern European countries became alarmed in dealing with us. Here is another example. We had a party member in the East German party. He used to be a merchant in Tianjin during the 1930s. After the anti-Japanese war began, [he began to cooperate with the CCP?] Then, after the libera-

tion [1949], he returned to East Germany and became a member of the SED. He had a very deep affection toward China and was unwilling to criticize China. The German leadership saw this as a serious issue and sent a member of the central committee to talk to him, asking him to “draw a line” between himself and Mao Zedong. But he refused to do so. The central committee member said to him that you were a good comrade in every other aspect but you refused to stand with the central committee on this matter, so you had to leave the party. He was allowed to return to the party only after the Sino–East German relationship became warm again.

Under the general background, many ordinary people’s lives were affected. An East German student married a Chinese girl in 1966 and then both returned to East Germany. The couple maintained contact with the Chinese embassy and myself, but in that period we did not have a very good opinion about them. Because of many factors, their life in East Germany was very difficult. The husband was able to revisit Beijing only fourteen years after their marriage, and the wife could not return to China until seventeen years after their marriage. I wrote an article about their life and published it in a journal. Many people found the story very interesting and asked me many questions. In a word, the situation had great impact.

*Zhang Baijia*: Mr. Rowiński, please.

*Rowiński*: I am a scholar, not a diplomat. I want to comment on how we in Eastern Europe saw the Chinese Cultural Revolution. Two Chinese phrases are my starting point: *jiushi lunshi* [deal with a matter on its merits] and *kukou liangyao* [good medicine has a bitter taste]. Now I speak in English.

The Cultural Revolution, especially in its most hysteric period between 1966 and 1969, devastated China’s credibility and prestige in Central and Eastern Europe not only among the ruling elites but also in the societies of the socialist countries. We must remember the esteem for Chinese culture, civilization, and art in this part of the world. Second, it was perceived as a repetition of Stalinist practice in China. Actually the Cultural Revolution helped strengthen the hardliners and conservatives in Moscow and in the other capitals in Central and Eastern Europe. It became much harder to make any reform in these countries. The internal development in China was perceived as an attempt to impose on China “war communism” or Stalinist rule with Chinese characteristics. I am sorry to be using these strong words, but this is how we then looked at the developments in China. It was comparatively

less attractive to East Europeans than their own systems, even than the Soviet realities. There was a joke at that time: a Soviet special type was one who was more optimistic than the Russian but more pessimistic than the Chinese. This was about the possibilities of choice.

The Chinese foreign policy to us was a duplication of Soviet foreign policy from Lenin's to Stalin's times. That was exporting world revolution, national liberation movement, and process of decolonization for the purpose of building their own power position. This was especially clear in the famous article by Lin Biao, "Long Live the People's War." Misgivings were provoked by the Chinese position on war and peace, as reflected in Chinese leaders' speeches and articles in periodicals like *Renmin Ribao*, *Hongqi*, *Jiefangjun Bao*, on issues such as détente, arms control, disarmament, and non-proliferation, and of course, by the practical activities of China in the international arena of this time.

It took many years for the Chinese leadership to understand these relationships, with the process taking an evolutionary course (its stages are reflected in the reactions to developments in Poland in 1970, 1976, 1980–81, in the whole of Central and Eastern Europe in 1989, and in the USSR during its break up in 1990–1991). That could not be possible without the historic switch of December 1978, involving both internal policy (reforms and transformation) and foreign policy (opening up to the outside world). It also required a major change in the ways of thinking, in the traditional and ideologically-driven perception of the world, and in the practical approach (abandoning utopia and wishful thinking, coming back to the realities). It was pragmatic thinking and coming back to the roots: "Practice is the only test of truth."

*Zhang Baijia*: We have five people who want to make comments. Please limit your comments to two minutes. Mr. Schröter, please.

*Schröter*: I remember an episode about the Cultural Revolution. Some people told us that the Social Science Institute tried to understand the cause of the Cultural Revolution. The Soviet Union banned the discussion and East Germany also officially banned it. But it was possible to discuss it. We wanted to understand the Cultural Revolution. A problem was how to prevent conservative factors in the policies of the socialist system. The system was highly centralized and controlled every aspect of the society. Under such system it was impossible to correct problems like under the Western democracy. We understood the Cultural Revolution as an effort, instead of the Western open system, at preventing conservative factors internally in

the party and in the socialist system. But soon the discussion was stopped by the authorities because there could be consequences even to our society. It could not be allowed.

*Yu Sui:* A very simple comment. It would probably better to use “chaotic” to summarize the general situation of Chinese diplomacy during the Cultural Revolution. Because of the chaotic situation at home, the leadership of the foreign ministry was also in a chaotic condition. But there were several occasions, which involved important issues of strategic significance, when Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai personally took charge. Clearly, these included the important issue of dealing with the Soviet Union and also the development of the Sino–American relations, in which the small ping-pong ball activated the big ball. On the other hand, I agree with Ambassador Li’s opinion that China’s relations with other socialist countries were basically out of control. But this is not to say that China had huge conflicts or bizarre incidents with all these countries. In general, under the chaotic situation, certain matters became out of control. In another field, in this period China’s relations with a great number of developing countries did not change much. This was a period of doing nothing and no breakthrough was achieved. It seems to me that such a depiction of the Cultural Revolution period is more accurate.

*Budura:* I have to recognize that the characterization made by Ambassador Fan regarding the relations between Romania and China during the Cultural Revolution was fairly accurate. Romania did not involve itself in any way in the Cultural Revolution. Romania did not support the Cultural Revolution as Albania did. So we did not know the spring and winter of the relations between Romania and China. We succeeded in maintaining, even after 1976, good relations with China. At the same time, we did not associate with the countries that criticized the Cultural Revolution in China in any way. You have to notice the fact that during the ten years from 1966 to 1976, in Romanian newspapers and other publications there was not any critical mentioning of China’s internal affairs. This was not merely an expression of the fact that we believed in the principle of not interfering in others’ internal affairs but also an expression of the fact that we did realize that we were powerless in front of such a grandiose phenomenon. It was not up to us to influence or to modify the dynamics of this process.

During those ten years, between Romania and China we had a lot of visits, important visits. We received assistance and credits from China. Particularly during the flood in Romania in 1971, we received very generous aid that was very well received by the population. At the same time Romania

participated in different ways in assisting China to normalize diplomatic relations with many countries, including the United States, Austria, Italy, and northern European countries. After 1971 and 1972, especially after 1972, Romania played a very important role in helping China to return to the international community. The last thing I want to mention is that Romanian culture, music, and movies had important influence in China. I have seen some Chinese friends in Shanghai and Xinjiang, and they still remembered Romanian music and movies. Even during the Cultural Revolution, Romanian art performances took place in China. Our cooperation had some achievements and benefited both sides.

*Kapllani:* I will speak very briefly about those questions addressed to me. One is about Hoxha as a pure Marxist. Why did he think so and what role did he play? Western scholars made a comparison between Hoxha and Pol Pot, for both received education in France. Therefore it is believed that their extreme leftist tendencies had French origin. This point has been made but I do not know whether or not it is valid. In Albania, Hoxha gained his reputation from the Second World War as a leader of the partisan war, just like Tito in Yugoslavia. After that he kind of built up his authority in absurd proportions. No one could question him about anything. This is disastrous, of course. As we all know, power corrupts, but absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Another thing, which was mentioned here by Li Danhui, was the visit by Zhou Enlai in the Balkans. He proposed an alliance between Yugoslavia, Albania, and Romania. And then she [Li Danhui] asked why Albania was not expelled from the Warsaw Pact by the Soviet Union and Khrushchev. About the alliance, as far as I know, Hoxha resisted that on the grounds that he would never ally with Tito's Yugoslavia, because he had labeled Tito as a Trojan horse, a Trojan horse of the communist movement and of the socialist camp. So you cannot make a common cause with a Trojan horse, he would say.

As for the expulsion from the Warsaw Pact, I would say that both sides were cautious. After the breakup of the relations with Soviet Union, even the diplomatic relations, the military base, and the navy base in Albania were still there. But in 1962 Hoxha grabbed the submarines. He said: "These are our submarines." There were only two Russian submarines. They left the base. And the other four or five remained in Valona. The Russians did not expel Albania, but it remained in the Warsaw Pact just formally. In 1968 Hoxha thought that it was the proper time to withdraw from the Warsaw Pact

because the Soviet Union had invaded Czechoslovakia. That gave him a good excuse to say that we had no more business with the Warsaw Pact. This was well received domestically and internationally as far as I know.

Another matter is where we are to find the origins of the rapprochement. I would say in the case of Albania and China that it was a two-way thing. There was an ideological affinity that grew more and more with the passage of time. Both parties accepted the view, though there was vacillation on the part of the Albanian leadership, that you need a kind of permanent revolution to keep the system safe from getting rotten from bourgeois influence. So [because of] this ideological affinity and also the pragmatic view that Albania was kind of getting off the Soviet Union, and it had no more anybody to rely on, especially in terms of economic system, Albania looked at China as a great ally in terms of ideology but also in terms of state relations. China was a great power and China could really help Albania. So it worked actually that way. So there were both ideology there and pragmatism at the same time. And I would say that it was true for both sides.

*Budura:* As I remember in 1961, the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty adopted a resolution preventing the participation of the Albanian representative in the session. Romania was part of that. Then the Romanians recognized that they made a mistake. Just because of that the observers of China, North Korea and Vietnam did not participate. This was 1961. In January 1965 during the Warsaw session of that committee the Romanians tried to invite once again the Albanians and also the observers of the other three countries. They did not succeed because the others were against it.

*Zhang Baijia:* I have to declare that we must end this meeting. We are five minutes late. The drive will be long and now it is rush hour. We must leave early. We have delicious roasted ducks waiting for us.

\* \* \* End of Session Three \* \* \*



## **Session Four: Chinese–Eastern European Relations after Czechoslovakia and the Sino–Soviet Border Clashes, 1968–1972**

(8:30–10:15, March 25)

*Westad:* Let me start by thanking our hosts for the wonderful welcome banquet that we all enjoyed yesterday. It was indeed a wonderful occasion. This took me back to probably the first restaurant that I have ever visited in China when I first came here 25 years ago. There were many restaurants around then, but the Big Duck certainly was known as the best of them.

Before introducing our first session today, I would like to make some general remarks about the discussion and the direction our deliberations based on what we achieved yesterday. I think everyone involved in organizing this conference said that yesterday was a very good beginning through all discussions. Everyone worked very hard, got involved, and the scholars asked a lot of good questions. The ambassadors and diplomats from both China and abroad were very open in some of their responses, and very straightforward. We appreciate that. There are two difficulties that I'd like to point out, and I think we should try to work on them today.

The first one is that we intended to be too polite to each other. We dealt with a time period that was full of conflicts, problems and difficulties on both sides. And I think that we stood a little bit too much on politeness in going to explore some of the causes and some of the reasons behind these conflicts. Particularly in China here everyone knows it is time for politeness, and it is time for showing one's absolutely best behavior, and particularly I think from Eastern European side, our gratefulness to the hosts for putting these together. But that occasion is not at this table when exploring historical issues. Because if we do not make use of this opportunity when we are here to tell about things as they really were, and the way you, as the participants, really saw them when you were working, we will miss out, for us who were not there, the very important historical dimension of what happened. So that is my first request and first comment on what happened yesterday. Let us try to be more direct and open and speak frankly about

things even when they are difficult, and therefore that's how we will explore the reasons behind them.

Secondly, I point this out mainly for scholars here. I think some of the scholars were quite good at this yesterday, trying to ask precise questions, trying to ask questions that were about specific events and recollections of the specific events, and events that some of the participants around this table were involved at the time. Let's try to move the discussion forward in that way. Now, you will have seen some questions that are prepared in advance. I found those questions to be very helpful, those by Donchev and by Lorenz Luthi. I'd like for them to think which of those questions they would like to put into the panels today. Make sure to alert us whenever you want to come in and ask some of those precise questions that will be distributed beforehand. OK. Do you have something to say, Baijia?

I think we should go straight to session four, our opening session today, which is on Chinese–Eastern European relations after Czechoslovakia and the Sino-Soviet border clashes, 1968 to 1972. The way I see it, we have three main issues that we want to discuss overall in this session. On the Chinese side we want to look at the perceptions and decisions that were made in Beijing after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, and especially how the effects of the Sino-Soviet border clashes in 1969 affected the policymaking in Beijing. I would also like them to keep in mind how that worked out with the regard to some of the decisions we are going to discuss in the next session about Sino–American rapprochement. Now let's not use this session to discuss the Sino- American relationship but let's keep it in mind in terms of the decisions made in 1969 and 1970s especially.

Second point on the European side, this is very important: how close did the Eastern European diplomats think that we actually were to war between the Soviet Union and China in 1969? If you think and thought back then that the war was imminent and it was likely, what kind of positions your governments, the Eastern European governments, were taking with this eventuality in mind? Certainly, about the attempts by the Chinese and the Eastern Europeans, we knew that there were several, particularly in the 1971–1972 period, to start a slow, if not normalization, at least relaxation of tensions. Were there any specific initiatives from the Eastern European side that you were aware of in this crucial period to try to reduce tension with the Chinese, maybe even to try to discuss this with the Soviet Union? And on the Chinese side, how did the Eastern European countries figure in terms of the Chinese desire to reduce the overall tension in the early 1970s.

So those are the broad questions with which I would like to frame this session. We have two introductions. Professor Rowiński will go first, and then Ambassador Zhu.

*Rowiński:* Thank you very much. At first I want to talk about the question of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, and then I will discuss the Sino-Soviet border conflict in 1969. Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia and suppression of the “Prague Spring” movement reflected the growing degeneration and crisis of the USSR and the whole socialist system, and their inability to make critical assessment of the conditions and present programs. The Prague Spring came as a dramatic attempt to break away from the vicious circle of standstill and impasse in Europe and in the meantime to reject the Maoist model of socialism. The limited reform demands presented in Prague were seen in Moscow, not without reason, as a betrayal of the position and interests of the ruling *nomenklatura*. It is in the same context that one should see the misgivings of the conservatives and pro-Soviet factions in the Eastern European leaderships. The reforms tried to foster a greater degree of independence in the socialist camp, with Romania as a stimulus. By Romania, I mean its foreign policy, not domestic policies. The Soviet intervention reflected a desire to keep the status quo, to nip the reform in the bud, and to prevent the Prague Spring from spreading.

What worried the Kremlin was that the Prague Spring was not a spontaneous, grass-roots movement that could be easily labeled as a counter-revolutionary attempt to topple the system. On the contrary, differing from the development in Poland in the 1950s, it developed peacefully under the guidance of the communist leadership and enjoyed universal public support. The reform programs wanted to provide socialism with a human face and they were formulated by the communist leadership around Alexander Dubček. The Soviet armed intervention of Czechoslovakia was aimed to frighten and effectively discipline the elites. The Brezhnev doctrine of limited sovereignty and supremacy of community interests was supposed to provide a rationale.

China categorically condemned the intervention. But, I have to be frank and am sorry to say, that in contrast to protests voiced by Western and developing countries, that position was widely viewed in Central and Eastern European countries not so much as Beijing’s defense of fundamental principles of international law but as its tactical move in competing with Moscow for leadership in the international communist movement. Another

factor that undermined China's credibility in the sectors of the public and the ruling elites of the Warsaw Pact countries was its accusation leveled at the deposed and persecuted leaders of the Prague Spring, who were cast as anti-socialist renegades seeking to restore capitalism in Czechoslovakia and taking the same path as their Soviet companions, or even more to the right, "*bi suxiu geng you*" ("even more rightist than the Soviet revisionists"). Even in Czechoslovakia the occasion was a conspiracy of the revisionists in both countries. The whole event was allegedly a result of the collusion between Soviet and Titoist revisionists. Accusations like these of course influenced the assessments by Eastern European ruling elites and the societies of the Chinese position on the armed intervention of Czechoslovakia. I say this frankly that the Prague Spring was our hope.

Another question is very important. Many people in the society and the former rulers remembered your position in 1956 on the Hungarian affair. As for the question of participation in the Soviet armed intervention, some Eastern European leaders were critical of the Chinese stand and participated in the so-called "internationalist help" to Czechoslovakia. This was a great shame for us. But the intensity of these countries' condemnation of Beijing depended on, for instance in Hungary, such factors as a belief in the necessity of such intervention and the degree of resistance to the Soviet pressure to join. Poland was a little bit different. We had our small cultural revolution in March 1968. There was a small group opposing Gomułka, and practically Brezhnev saved Gomułka. The small group was said to have nationalist tendency. Brezhnev told Gomułka that one Ceaușescu was enough for us. It is not clear to me why Brezhnev chose Gomułka. So in such a situation, because of his own experience, Gomułka was so active in this intervention.

Participation in the armed intervention positioned the four countries' leaderships as critics of the Chinese stance. But the intensity of the campaign to condemn Beijing depended on factors such as beliefs about its necessity, the degree of resistance to Soviet pressure to join, the moods and reactions among society, the internal situation and the ruling circles' awareness of the consequences of the "Czechoslovak case"—which in a peculiar way "legitimized" the enforcement of "limited sovereignty" and provided justification for an "internationalist dictatorship in the name of defense of socialism" or, in other words, Moscow's right to armed intervention in its zone of influence, east of the Elbe. Taking all these factors into account, it must be said that the reactions from Budapest and Warsaw were toned down, compared to those from Sofia and East Berlin. Support for the position of China came

from Romania (which categorically refused to participate in the intervention, and which, as a Warsaw Treaty member, saw itself as being the most threatened) and also Albania and Yugoslavia. Albania and Romania were not presented by China with charges of revisionism, while in respect of Yugoslavia—long the prime object of public criticism—these charges were muted after August 1968.

Now, the issue of the Sino-Soviet border clashes in 1969. This is a very difficult subject for me to talk about. We have specialists like Li Danhui, Niu Jun, and Yang Kuisong who published many articles on the subject and know it much better than I do. So I will just make some general remarks. From our perspective, the rise of the border conflict was not the cause of the problems between China and the Soviet Union but the other way around. To certain degree, the Sino-Soviet border conflict was logical and inevitable. If you look at other cases, India in the 1950s and 1960s, North Korea in 1967, and later Vietnam, all followed more or less the same logic. The Sino-Soviet dispute reflected the growing rivalry between Beijing and Moscow for leadership in the socialist camp, in the international communist movement, and, to certain degree, in the anti-colonial and national liberation movement as an instrument of consolidating the USSR and building its power position.

These different positions and interests were translated into fundamentally different strategies. For both societies and citizens of both countries, the ideological quarrels remained incomprehensible as long as they were not translated into issues affecting their existence, security, and territorial integrity. All wars in world history are the same and this was not different or new. As for the consequence, the rise of the border conflict served as a natural instrument of their choice. It played a crucial role in the domestic front, helping get rid of opponents, one-time elites, and also helping to get things in order, diverting attention from problems and difficulties, to create an atmosphere of a besieged fortress, to mobilize the society to make sacrifice, and to stir patriotism or nationalism.

The process on both sides had a mutually reinforcing, feedback effect. Obviously the problem acquired a life of its own, becoming an element of internal infighting that strengthened the position of the army and security services and influenced the policy pursued by the leadership. It became a justification for accelerated armament buildup. Its instrumental use had no direct connection with the subjects in the Beijing-Moscow disputes. It was a very important internal instrument for both sides.

The form in which the border revision question was raised by Mao in a July 1964 conversation with the Japanese socialist delegation has caused great misgivings in Poland—especially with regard to the passages on Poland’s frontiers with her eastern and western neighbors. It was viewed as a revision of Beijing’s previous position, accepting the post-war borders in Europe. The Polish foreign ministry sent a *démarche*, demanding explanations. That took up around three months. The Chinese side corrected Chairman Mao’s statement. The correction was reflected in a message signed by Mao Zedong, Liu Shaoqi, Zhu De and Zhou Enlai, in which they thanked the Polish leaders for their wishes on the occasion of China’s national day. The message said, *inter alia*, that the People’s Republic of China “extends firm support to the Polish western frontier.” Characteristically, the question of the eastern border was passed up in silence.

The bloody border incidents in the spring of 1969, and especially the Zhenbao (Damanski) encounter, came as a result of many factors, not yet fully disclosed. It is very difficult for us to know how at the time each side discussed the matter internally. What were the considerations on the Soviet side, and what debates? At the time they debated about one issue: how far they should go in a military conflict, to what extent could the Czechoslovak invasion of 1968 be repeated, and whether or not a preemptive strike should be launched against China’s nuclear facilities. On the Soviet side, it could have been a test of how far they can move and whether a “Czechoslovakia 68”-type operation was at all possible, a demonstration targeted at the United States, showing the readiness to conduct a preemptive “surgical operation” to hit Chinese nuclear centers (which, incidentally, was also suggested to Washington to be conducted as an agreed, or even joint operation). Very likely the threat of an outbreak of Soviet-Chinese war was perceived as a factor sharpening up the feuds within the top Chinese leadership over an inevitable revision of the chosen strategy of “struggle on two fronts: against US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism,” which was turning suicidal for Beijing, and as such could no longer be continued. On the domestic front, the Soviet Union sought modernization and expansion on its military potential in the Far East.

On the Chinese side, such reaction and the choice of the incident’s timing and venue came as no accident. The Chinese action was supposed to discourage Moscow from adventures of this kind, while permitting—in large measure—no control the conflict’s scale and territorial extent. In an atmosphere of hysteria and preparation for war, this action offered an oppor-

tunity—and provided justification—nor a state of emergency in which the army could, as soon as possible, restore law and order in a country shaken by the anarchy of “local civil wars.” And that just a month before the opening of the 9<sup>th</sup> congress of the CCP (the first in 13 years).

For Warsaw Treaty countries, the prospect of a Soviet-Chinese war was more than frightening, as they had only minimal influence—or rather none at all—in the course of events on the Sino-Soviet border. Given its international repercussions (especially after the Czechoslovak intervention) and the political, economic, military, social and doctrinal consequences on the domestic front, such a conflict would spell catastrophe for these countries. In a varying degree, that found reflection in the prior consultations over, preparations for, and finally the course of the Moscow Conference of 1969. The goal was, in essence, to prevent the conflict, i.e. to make diplomatic arrangements and open regular, unrestricted, direct channels of communication (negotiations), to help take the situation under control. These efforts were, to some extent, helped by the changes and shifts in emphasis which, starting from mid-1969, began to emerge gradually in China’s internal and foreign policies.

The factors that greatly influenced the further course of events included a realistic assessment of the pattern of forces along the 7,300-kilometre-long Soviet-Chinese border. In no way could a blitzkrieg be achieved, with its outcome (especially in the Far East) determined by an attack on Chinese nuclear centers. That was the decisive factor. And after Czechoslovakia, the state of Moscow’s relations with the West did not guarantee the latter’s neutrality, to say nothing of any form of acceptance for such an operation. The Americans, already engaged in Indochina, had no liking for an operation that would spread into China. The Soviet allies in the Warsaw Treaty Organization were against a military adventure in the Far East. Recognizing the Soviet threat as the major one and remembering about Czechoslovakia, China made a strategic turn in its relations with the US. And so Beijing’s position and its categorical opposition to peace talks in Vietnam came up for review. Quite unexpectedly, there emerged a situation which was highly favorable to US plans to withdraw without losing face from the “Vietnam quagmire,” make a breakthrough in hostile relations with communist China, and get that country’s backing in action against the main enemy, which remained to be the USSR.

The background of the Sino-Soviet disputes remains rather murky to us even today. We do not know the Chinese leaders’ considerations. The Chi-

nese stand at the time was to oppose American imperialism and to oppose the Soviet Union, especially Soviet revisionism. But it was impossible to struggle against both for a long time. We have to wait for an answer to the China question. Our Chinese friends can explain this much clearer. From our point of view, we were very afraid of a war between China and the Soviet Union. From our national interests, we hoped to stop such a war. To members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, the prospect of a Sino-Soviet war was more than frightening. Yet they had only minimal influence, or rather none at all, over the course of the Sino-Soviet border clashes. Considering together our international and domestic conditions, the earlier Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, the political and economic situations of the countries involved, and the public emotions, we could see that a Sino-Soviet war would have catastrophic consequences for our country. In a large degree, this feeling led to consultations and preparations that finally caused the conference in Moscow in 1969 to find a diplomatic solution and negotiations to help put the situation under control. This effort, to some degree, started changes and shifts in China's internal and foreign policy in 1969.

*[Passages in italics are from Mr. Rowiński's prepared written presentation.]*

*On October 20, 1969, negotiations were started in Beijing at the level of deputy foreign ministers (Qiao Guanhua and Vasilii Kuznetsov); the ambassadors (V.Tolstikov and Liu Xinquan) came back after 6–7 years' absence, air and sea connections were resumed, and annual sessions reopened of the Mixed Commissions for Inland Waters and Coastal Navigation. There was a perceptible calming-down of the situation on the border, where both sides had deployed huge forces and had been intensively expanding their military operations.*

*This provided a green light for other Central and Eastern European states to make similar little steps—in close coordination with Moscow and under its watchful eye. Starting from the 1960s Soviet embassies in Central and East European countries (and elsewhere, too) included sinologists, usually among the senior staff (counselors, first secretaries), with the task of carefully watching the entirety of the host country's relations with China (in the fields of politics, economy, social relations, science, and culture). They kept regular contacts with party and state institutions. Towards the end of the 1960s, on Soviet initiative, a system of regular consultation and concurrence was instituted with regard to policy towards China (Interkit). It included Warsaw Treaty states, except for Romania and Mongolia. The*

*major lines were defined at regular meetings of CC secretaries. Detailed plans and coordination were the responsibility of CC Foreign Departments' leaderships. The first Interkit meeting was held in Moscow in 1968, the next in Berlin in 1969. Special groups and teams for propaganda, scientific research and publishing were set up.*<sup>7</sup>

*On May 1, 1970, speaking on the Tiananmen rostrum with heads of diplomatic missions from Central and East European countries, Mao Zedong expressed the wish for normalization and development of relations, despite the existing differences. Over 1970-71, ambassadors returned to their missions, and ministerial level contacts were resumed after a six-year break. The Chinese mass media began to print stories with information on these countries' internal and foreign policy developments without a negative spin that had been the hallmark over the preceding seven years. Trade went up.*

*There was a visible change in the Chinese approach, as reflected in a return to the tactics of differentiation between the USSR and the Central and East European countries, which involved focusing the attacks on Moscow while avoiding them towards Soviet allies, playing up their differences and the independence-oriented centrifugal forces, and exposing the CMEA (Comecon) and Warsaw Treaty Organization as instruments for subordinating the countries in the camp to the Kremlin's policy. This policy found reflection in the pattern of trade exchanges, awarding the attitudes perceived as conducive to China's policy. An important element helping to improve the atmosphere was the unequivocal support which Central and East European countries gave to China's request for UN representation, when voting at the 16<sup>th</sup> Session of the UN General Assembly's position which they had invariably presented since becoming UN members, irrespective of the quality of relations with China.*

*The changes taking place in China's internal policy—reflecting Premier Zhou Enlai's attempts to normalize the country's situation, restore order, and remove Lin Biao and some leftist extremists linked to the Group for Cultural Revolution; the beginning of old cadres' rehabilitation, certain changes in the tone of the propaganda, an end to the numerous excesses targeted at foreign diplomatic missions; and the country's withdrawal from self-imposed isolation, as indicated by the return of Chinese ambassadors to their missions, improving relations with many countries affected by the*

7 See Interkit records on the PHP website, [http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/conferences/PreviousEvents/2004\\_beijing\\_docs.htm](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/conferences/PreviousEvents/2004_beijing_docs.htm).

*excesses of the Cultural Revolution, renewed contacts with the outside world, broader extent of diplomatic recognitions, and a changing stance on many major international issues, such as Vietnam peace talks.*

*All these changes were conducive to only limited improvement in relations. On key issues, the positions of China and its Central and East European partners remained divergent. The most important, even if not the only, factor behind this state of affairs remained to be the relations between Moscow and Beijing. The Chinese tactics towards the Central and East European countries in that period were marked by a drive to isolate the USSR, encouragement aimed at weakening their dependence on Moscow, winning for them greater autonomy and strengthening centrifugal tendencies, and a greatly intensified criticism of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, Comecon, and the concept of a socialist community as instruments of enslavement. Differentiation and diversified approach were the features of that campaign.*

*The scale and development of contacts with a given state depended primarily on the assessment of its relations with the USSR, its position in the camp, position on the international scene, relations with Western powers, and China's particular interests in respect of the given country or region. Only interstate relations were maintained. These countries' internal policies were branded revisionist and subjected to heavy fire (as "even more right-wing than the Soviet Union's, aiming at restoration of capitalism"). That found reflection in internal bulletins and information conveyed to cadres and society at closed-door meetings. For tactical reasons, unlike in the preceding period, public criticism in the mass media was avoided, although in many cases this rule was skipped—or example, with regard to the December 1970 and June 1976 events in Poland. These happened to be played up for propaganda purposes at a time when radical forces around Kang Sheng and Jiang Qin were mobilized, and the power play heightened. On the other hand, inter-party relations were maintained with Romania, Albania (till 1977) and Yugoslavia (from 1978), regarded as socialist countries.*

*Westad:* Thank you, Professor Rowiński. I welcome this very much. It is an excellent starting point for our discussion afterwards, in terms of your frankness and going directly to the point, and it is very helpful. Before turning to Zhu, we have agreed that Ambassador Juhász has prepared a quite bit of his remarks on the Sino-Soviet border conflict. After Ambassador Zhu's presentation and before our discussion, we will ask Ambassador Juhász to make some comments. Then we'll open for general discussion. This probably

means that we will go a little bit longer with this session. But then we will rely on Ambassador Juhász to limit his comments for the following session, where he is supposed to do one of the introductions.

*Zhu Ankang:* I will principally talk about our relations with Eastern European countries and leave other issues to the discussion. After the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia and the Sino–Soviet border clash, the Sino–Soviet relations further deteriorated. China’s relations with Eastern European countries also changed in different ways. Our relations with Romania made some progress, relations with Yugoslavia began to improve and became normal, but relations with Albania changed from good to bad and gradually deteriorated. Our relations with the other five Eastern European countries went through a process of changing from coldness to warmth.

Let me first talk about the Romanian relations. In this period several events played important roles in the Sino–Romanian relationship. One was the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. Before this happened, Romania informed China several times of the imminent Soviet invasion, hoping to know China’s attitude. On the evening of August 21, 1968, Romanian leader Bodnăraş called our chargé d’affaires for an urgent meeting, and there he informed us that Soviet troops had already invaded Czechoslovakia and Romania was also faced with a huge Soviet force. The Romanians believed that a war was imminent, and they were determined to resist the aggression to the end. The Romanians wanted to know whether or not they could count on China’s support.

On the evening of August 23, at 6 o’clock, the Romanian ambassador [Aurel] Duma urgently requested an interview with Premier Zhou Enlai to inform China of new developments and to raise related questions. After consulting with Chairman Mao, Premier Zhou Enlai decided to attend in person the national day reception held by the Romanian embassy. At the reception Zhou strongly condemned the Soviet Union and expressed firm support for the just struggle of the Czechoslovak people. Meanwhile, he stressed that Romania was currently facing a danger of foreign intervention and aggression, and that the Chinese people supported firmly the just struggle of the Romanian people. Later the Romanian prime minister said in a speech that Premier Zhou’s statement provided the most crucial support to Romania at the most crucial moment.

Another event was the flood in Romania in 1970. Soon after the flood, an earthquake happened and caused more severe damages. At the time Romania asked the international community for help. The Soviet reaction was cold

and some people in the Soviet Union even wanted to use the opportunity to put pressure on Romania. China provided free material assistance worth more than 50 million RMB. In December, in response to a Romanian request, China also provided a long-term, interest-free loan of 200 million RMB and a free foreign currency loan of 100 million dollars. In 1971, when President Ceaușescu visited China, another loan of 60 million dollars was added. From the leadership to the people, Romania was very grateful to China and believed that China sincerely assisted Romania.

The third event was Romania's active promotion of normalization of the Sino-American relations in this period. As early as in the 1960s, Romania helped convey American messages to China. On September 29, 1970, President Nixon expressed his hope to visit China in a public statement. On October 1, Chairman Mao Zedong and American journalist [Edgar] Snow appeared together above the gate of Tiananmen. Following these signals, in late October, when meeting separately with Ceaușescu and Pakistan president Yahya Khan, Nixon again expressed his hope for improving the Sino-American relations. In November, [Ion] Iliescu, vice chairman of the Romanian council of ministers, visited China and informed Premier Zhou of the meeting between Nixon and Ceaușescu. He delivered a message that Nixon was keenly interested in pursuing normalization of the Sino-American relations and he wanted Ceaușescu to tell the Chinese that the United States was prepared to negotiate with China through any channel, at any time, and in any location for improvement of their bilateral relations. Ceaușescu asserted to Nixon that currently any important international issue could not be settled without China's participation. Nixon expressed his understanding of and agreement with this view. Premier Zhou told the Romanians that there was no other problem between China and the United States more important than Taiwan, and that if Nixon really hoped to solve the question and had means to do so, China would welcome a special American envoy, or Nixon himself, to come to Beijing. These developments led to Kissinger's and Nixon's visits to China, and Romania's contribution was obvious. In addition, Romania consistently supported the one China policy and supported China to regain its rights in the United Nations. During the period Romania actively lobbied some countries for this and made great efforts in persuading some Western countries to establish diplomatic relations with China. China was very grateful to Romania for this help.

China and Yugoslavia began to normalize their relations after 1964 but for a period no significant progress was made. The Soviet invasion of

Czechoslovakia helped speed up the two sides' steps in this regard. On October 1, 1968, over the gate of Tiananmen, Chairman Mao Zedong sent the first important signal, telling Albanian defense minister Balluku that Yugoslavia could become our indirect ally. Meanwhile, in the welcome banquet for the Albanian delegation, for the first time the Chinese side did not criticize Yugoslavia in public speeches. After the Sino-Soviet border clash in May 1969, the Chinese government's statement on the clash for the first time blamed the Soviet Union for threatening Yugoslavia. On May 1, 1970, Chairman Mao met the Yugoslav chargé d'affaires and shook his hand. Chairman Mao wished well for Yugoslavia's development, and the chargé d'affaires congratulated China's successful launching of a man-made satellite into the sky. After these signals, President Tito expressed internally his happiness about the two sides having found common grounds. After that, the open polemics between the two sides gradually stopped, new ambassadors were sent, trade and economic cooperation were strengthened, mutual visits increased, and cultural exchanges were restored.

After his arrival in 1970, the new Yugoslav ambassador stressed that China could regard Yugoslavia as its ally in anti-imperialist struggles, and that the by-gones be let by-gones and we should look into the future. In June 1971, Yugoslav foreign minister visited China. This was the first political visit between two countries since the breakup of their relationship. During the conversations both sides confirmed that the five principles of peaceful coexistence should serve as the basis of the two states' relations. The Yugoslav side stressed that the two sides' common interests far exceeded their disagreements. The Chinese side pointed out that in dealing with problems in bilateral relations, we should seek commonality and reserve divergence. On October 6, 1975, the chairman of the Yugoslav federal executive committee visited China and successfully paved the way for Tito's visit to China. I will not discuss Tito's visit.

Yesterday Ambassador Fan and Mr. Kapllani discussed clearly the Sino-Albanian relations and I do not have much to add. I will talk about China's relations with other Eastern European countries. After the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, initially the five Eastern European countries intensified their attacks on China and the relations became stagnant. In September 1969, China's premier and the Soviet prime minister met. Then, in coordinating with the Soviets' peace demarche and also out of self-interest, the five countries became more positive about improving relations with China. These relations began to warm up. In this period, these countries' attacks on China declined

somewhat and demands for restoring and developing relations with China increased. These countries' exchanges with China recovered gradually and trade increased significantly. They continued to insist on the one China policy and on restoration of China's legal rights in the UN.

At the time, we adopted a policy of differentiated treatment of Eastern European countries. We also gradually overcame the interference by the extreme leftist tendency and could increasingly handle foreign relations with reasonable means. We separated ideology from interstate relations, avoided mentioning [ideological] disagreements, and talked about interstate relations only. We also separated inter-party relations from interstate relations, cautiously dealing with the former and actively promoting the latter.

Lastly, we separated politics from economy. While pursuing political relations prematurely, we fostered economic relations with greatest effort possible. We were very conscious about not imposing our will on other people, seeking only the possible and making more substantive deeds than talking empty words. In general we avoided taking the initiative lest we cause misunderstandings or create difficulties on the other side. Hungary was an example. In June 1970, the Hungarian prime minister expressed his hope to visit China, or to have a meeting with Premier Zhou in Beijing when he would be on his way to Vietnam. Soon we indicated that he was welcome to visit China. But afterwards the Hungarian side raised the matter several times. We analyzed the situation internally and came to the conclusion that János Kádár and [Jenő] Fock were moderate or even friendly in their attitude toward China, but they had their own difficulties and might not be able to come to China.

In February 1972 Fock visited Vietnam but did not come to China because of other people's opposition. But in September Hungary's vice prime minister visited Korea and he requested a visit to China. During his visit, his attitude was friendly and limited his talks to development of bilateral relations and to the two sides' common grounds but avoided international issues and the two sides' disagreements. In February 1973, the Hungarian foreign minister participated in the Paris international conference on Vietnam. He indicated three times his hope to meet our foreign minister and to visit China. He stressed that his action was endorsed by the party, government, and people of Hungary. Around this time, state visits between the two countries at the minister and vice minister levels happened many times. The volume of the trade between the two countries reached 23 million Swiss francs in 1970, a 27% percent increase from 1969. Our policy of differentiated treatments was

reflected in these aspects and achieved good results not only with Hungary but also with other countries.

*Westad:* Thank you very much, Ambassador Zhu. Sorry I have to cut you a bit shorter, so that we may leave as much time as possible for questions and discussion. It was a very useful presentation, particularly on the Sino–Romanian relations and Sino–Yugoslav relations, things we haven't heard before. It will be very interesting for us to ask questions and to follow up. I am sure that precisely we will be doing that and ask questions about decision-making and about the perceptions of the Eastern European countries directly connected to the Sino–Soviet border clashes. This is a very good starting point for those discussions. I will then turn to Ambassador Juhász. Could I suggest no more than 7 or 8 minutes?

*Juhász:* I wish to complement Ambassador Zhu's and Mr. Rowiński's presentations. I am very pleased to do so because until now our symposium has not discussed the issue of the Sino–Hungarian relations. This is a unique issue and we do not have time to discuss it in detail. But, Ambassador Zhu, on our side the policy was also one of differentiation. When the Sino–Soviet polemics started, our party central committee and foreign ministry instructed us not to confuse inter-party relations with interstate relations. The foreign ministry instructed its diplomats to avoid disputes with Chinese diplomats. This was to make a distinction between polemics and diplomacy. In a conference in 1978, Kádár made it clear that although we struggled against China in the field of ideology, this was a theoretical, not diplomatic, task. These were his words. According to his view, China's domestic and foreign policies should be viewed separately and China's domestic conditions should not be a target of our criticism. Perhaps this view reflected his strategic thinking and considerations of Hungary's own domestic and foreign policies. This was also connected to his firm objection to the exclusion of China from socialism.

The most special aspect of our relationship is that for a period we treated each other as reform partners. In 1978 Sun Yefang wrote to us requesting that Hungary receive a delegation of Chinese economists for inspecting the reform experiences of Hungary. In 1979 they came, and the Hungarian side arranged for them to see nearly forty projects. The delegation was satisfied. The Soviet Union strongly opposed this cooperation. In January 1980, the chief of the foreign affairs department of the Hungarian Workers' Party stopped in Moscow when returning from Japan. The head of the international section of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee

strongly denounced our cooperation in reforms. Nevertheless, the cooperation continued.

*Westad:* Sorry, we are getting a little bit on the side of the main content of this topic now. Could you please return to dealing with the Sino–Soviet border clashes and the Czechoslovak intervention? What you have on the Hungarian side on that will be useful. Then the rest of us could return to it in the following session.

*Juhász:* Another point. The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 also affected the Sino–Hungarian relationship, for the Chinese side condemned Hungary for participating in the invasion. At the time I had a feeling that the Chinese side did not foresee Hungary’s involvement in the military action and was therefore not very happy. Kádár talked to Dubček several times and asked him to make some concessions, for their [Soviets’] action could be expected. But Czechoslovakia refused to budge. At the time I and my colleagues were very clear that the military intervention in Czechoslovakia was also a warning to reformers in Hungary. Thank you.

*Westad:* Thank you very much, Ambassador Juhász. After consulting with Zhang Baijia, we hope to discuss these issues separately. At first let us discuss the Soviet intervention of Czechoslovakia and then we will turn to the other issues. But let me first thank the presenters. Now we discuss the influence of the 1968 events on the relations between China and Eastern European countries.

*Mastny:* I have a question for Ambassador Budura about the statement by Ambassador Zhu who mentioned that the Chinese were informed by the Romanians about the imminence of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. It is my understanding, from the Romanian documents that I know, that the Romanians were surprised by the invasion and that they did not expect it to happen at the time it did. Could you please comment on this?

*Budura:* I am entirely in agreement with what Ambassador Zhu said about the meetings between the Romanian and the Chinese leaders. At what extent were we surprised by the invasion of Czechoslovakia? We knew a lot about their [Soviets’] preparations, we knew a lot about the imminence of their attack, but we did not know exactly when this would happen. You have to remember that in August, at the beginning, Ceaușescu visited Czechoslovakia. It was not only an expression of our support for the course taken by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, but also an expression of solidarity. So we were already prepared morally and politically for such a possibility. So the surprise was when this became a fact.

I remember that in that night, it was just after 12:00 o'clock, Niculescu-Mizil, who was the secretary in charge of the foreign affairs, received a phone call from Prague, from a correspondent who had been sent by him personally to follow the situation there. That person, Eugen Ionescu, told him that Soviet troops were already in the airport area and were just coming to the central committee where a session was in development. Just in few minutes he conveyed this message to Ceaușescu and also organized the first meeting of the politburo of Romania. That was around two o'clock after midnight. Only after two hours, a messenger from the Soviet embassy came to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Romania and delivered a letter informing the Romanians that the invasion was going to take place. So I would like to repeat that morally and politically we were prepared for such an event. The Romanian army was already on alert. We already concentrated some troops along the border with the Soviet Union. But we did not know exactly when this would happen.

*Westad:* Thank you very much, Ambassador Budura. I like to turn the same question over to the Chinese side in terms of the immediate reaction at the political level in Beijing, if possible, to the Soviet Union invasion of Czechoslovakia. Some historians have been arguing that the Chinese political leadership, including Chairman Mao, saw this as a potential prelude to a dramatic increase of Soviet military pressure against China. Is there anyone on the Chinese side among the ambassadors, former diplomats, who could give us more information about that? Yes, very briefly James, please, while someone on the Chinese side prepares for an intervention.

*Hershberg:* Arne's question is very similar to mine and it is basically how the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia affected the Chinese threat perception regarding the Soviet Union. In that context, whether that threat perception was influenced by the Soviet–Mongolian treaty of 1966, which advanced a large number of Soviet troops to the Sino–Mongolian border. In that sense, did they really fear that the Czechoslovak invasion heralded Soviet military pressure or did they see that Soviet invasion as an opportunity to reap political gains?

*Westad:* Thank you, James. It is very relevant. Who on the Chinese side would like to respond to this? Let me restate the question. The question is about the immediate Chinese reaction to the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia and in particular what, as Professor Hershberg pointed out, together with other moves that had been made by the Soviets in the immediate preceding period, got the Chinese leadership to think that what had happened actually

strongly increased the chance that the Soviet Union would put military pressure on China. Ambassador Li first, and then Shen Zhihua.

*Li Fenglin:* It can be certain that these two events led to the escalation of the Sino–Soviet antagonism. Without doubt they also significantly incited China’s preparations for the possibility of a Soviet attack on China. Yesterday I said that in terms of diplomacy, these events helped shape China’s security assessment that began to treat the Soviet Union as the obvious main threat. The ensuing actions and later developments indicated that diplomatically China began to stress struggle against Soviet revisionism. Out of security considerations, China began to consider improving relations with the United States. This was the policy consideration after 1969.

As for the Zhenbao Island incident, I have some information for your reference. Was the border clash between China and the Soviet Union a consequence or a cause of the deterioration of the Sino–Soviet relations? I think that it was both. I don’t mean to make a sophistry. What I mean is that at certain point the Soviets extended the ideological disputes between China and the Soviet Union to interstate relations. One of the developments was the border clash. The clash was provoked by the Soviet side, and it was the cumulative result of many border conflicts from 1960 to 1969.

As for the question to what extent Lin Biao used the Zhenbao Island incident to manipulate domestic conditions, I feel that further studies are needed. This is relevant to what I said yesterday about Chief of Staff Huang Yongsheng’s estimate of the possibility of a Sino–Soviet war, or whether his remark reflected Lin Biao’s or Mao Zedong’s view. Mao Zedong had misgivings about Lin Biao’s Order Number One. But were his misgivings caused by the fact that Lin, vice chairman of the Central Military Commission, took the action without authorization by himself, the chairman of the commission, or by the two’s different views of the situation? This is a question for historians to study.

Lastly I have a question for Eastern European ambassadors. When the Sino–Soviet border clash began, how did you understand the origins of this clash and what were your views of the historical formation of the Sino–Soviet borders?

*Westad:* Thank you, Ambassador Li. That is exceptionally useful. That is exactly the kind of information that we are looking for and the kind of questions we all have. May I ask you a question about your personal role? Where were you at the time when the border clash took place, where were you stationed and what was your job?

*Li Fenglin:* At the time I was in Moscow because since 1964 I had been participating in the border negotiations. Therefore I am familiar with the problems concerning the Sino–Soviet borders. Since you asked, I may talk about some concrete events such as the Zhenbao Island incident. The clash over the island began in early March. The main feature of the clash is that it took place on an island in the eastern end of the Sino–Soviet border along the Ussuri and Heilong [Amur] Rivers. The cause of the clash was Sino–Soviet disagreement on how the border should be demarcated in the island. The disagreement began in 1861 when a Chinese–Russian border agreement was concluded and a map was attached. The map drew a red line. Because the map was made with a very small scale, according to international law the red line could only mean that the river was the border between the two states. This happened in 1861 and could not possibly decide the ownership of the island. The Chinese stand was that the center navigation line should be the border. Therefore Chinese people usually conducted daily activities, such as fishing, in these islands. Yet the Soviet map included all these islands in Soviet territories and drew the border along the riverbank on the Chinese side. The Soviet border troops used maps of 1:100,000 or 1:50,000 scales to decide and control the border. When China and the Soviet Union were still on friendly terms, Soviet border troops did nothing about Chinese activities on these islands. But after the relationship deteriorated, the Soviet side began to tighten border control according to their map. They interfered with Chinese activities very harshly and even killed many of our people. After many such incidents the military clash took place in 1969. This is the general course of the events. Therefore, in my opinion the border clash was both a consequence and a cause of the deteriorating Sino–Soviet relations.

*Westad:* Thank you very much, Ambassador Li. It is very useful. I will go to Chen Jian first, he has been waiting for a long time. Then while Chen Jian is speaking, perhaps someone from the Eastern European side could reply the question that Ambassador Li just asked.

*Chen Jian:* Actually my original question was already asked by Westad. I nevertheless have a follow-up question. The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 had a very profound impact on China's foreign policies and influenced a series of considerations concerning domestic and foreign affairs. This event caused a development in the fundamentals of China's domestic and foreign policies. That is, the conception of social-imperialism was established. A result of this conception was to provide a theoretical basis for the relaxation of the Sino–American relations in the

next stage. Since social-imperialism was the most dangerous enemy, American imperialism became secondary and relaxation with it became possible.

In the meantime, a full-scale retreat of the Cultural Revolution seemed to begin simultaneously. At the time China was making preparations for the party's ninth congress. Chairman Mao was adjusting the Cultural Revolution, an obvious movement of which was to "fight selfishness" when the Soviet invasion took place. How should we understand the Zhenbao Island clash, which was just described by Ambassador Li, in connection with this string of events?

Judging from materials from different sides, the Zhenbao Island incident was a result of the evolving Sino-Soviet border question. The incident itself involved a move by the Chinese People's Liberation Army, which had been in preparation for a while, to teach [the Soviets] a lesson at this location. Especially, the event of March 2 was intended to settle the problem with fighting. Afterwards, the event was followed by a full-scale preparation for war in 1969. From such a perspective, the issue became much more complicated and China's foreign policy could not be explained only by the development in Czechoslovakia. This has always been a question to me. It has a very broad connotation involving not only the evolution of China's policies toward the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe but also the direction of China's entire domestic and foreign policies. In this regard I wish to learn more from Ambassador Li and other ambassadors. In your opinion, how should this be understood?

*Westad:* I turn to Shen Zhihua, because I know it is a related question. Then I will turn to the Eastern European side.

*Shen Zhihua:* I will ask a more concrete question. The CCP Central Committee and Mao Zedong certainly reacted to the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, but it would not be realistic to ask the ambassadors here to describe the reaction. Therefore I may ask a concrete question. That is, after the Czechoslovak incident took place, did you at Chinese embassies in Eastern European countries receive any instructions, decisions, or information? From this angle we may be able to understand and analyze the Chinese reaction to the development. The same question may also be directed to Eastern European ambassadors. The invasion of Czechoslovakia was an operation by the Warsaw Pact countries. Before the operation was implemented there must have been plans and arrangements. Then, what information did you get from Moscow during the planning process? We

may analyze the information to learn whether or not the Soviets considered China's reaction to the operation.

*Westad:* Thank you very much, Shen Zihua. That is a very useful question. Who on the Eastern European side would like to respond? Ambassador Juhász.

*Juhász:* At the time we were not clear why the border clash took place and which side was active and which reactive. Then how did we explain the conflict? We believed that the military conflict must be evaluated against the background of the Cultural Revolution. Therefore we thought that it was first and foremost related to China's internal struggle. We almost did not have any information from the Chinese side but had a lot of information from the Soviet side. (*Li Fenglin:* Did you believe information from the Soviets?) That was another question. I just said that Kádár himself was suspicious of the information and materials provided by the Soviet side. For this reason he said that we should not always criticize China's internal conditions. But as far as the border conflict was concerned, we believed that the principal background was China's Cultural Revolution and the ongoing internal struggle in China.

*Westad:* That goes quite far in the direction. We would like more substantial way as Chen Jian pointed out because time will run out. We need to turn to the Chinese side to have a response to this, but let me go to Ambassador Budura first.

*Budura:* As far as the Romanian government was concerned, we regarded the conflict on the Soviet-Chinese border from two points of view. One was the problem of the frontiers, the line between the two states; and another was that of the clashes. I remember that regarding the clashes, we were regularly informed by the Chinese side. I remember that from 1964, our leaders had permanent contacts with Chinese ambassadors. When our leaders came to China, they discussed the problems of the frontier, of the border as well as the line, as well as the clashes. I remember that Bodnăraș, who was a military man and was then vice chairman of the council of the ministers, said: "I am sure that the Soviets are not so stupid to launch aggression, to launch a war."

So from this point of view, I believe that the Romanian leaders did not think that there was a real possibility of a large conflict, or a large war between the Soviet Union and China. This is the aspect of the clashes. As far as the line between the Soviet Union and China was concerned, we were very sensitive to the problem because we had our own problem with Bessarabia. Since

1962 this problem became an issue on the agenda of discussion between the Romanian and the Chinese leaders. I remember that I personally translated a brochure, a pamphlet, edited by the Chinese authorities, on border problems between the Soviet Union and China. That became a documentary material for the Romanian leaders. We tried to make use of that opportunity to explain to our colleagues in China the history and the realities as far as Bessarabia and northern part of Bukovina were concerned.

*Westad:* A quick two-finger question from Radchenko, and then to ambassadors.

*Radchenko:* A question to Ambassador Li. I was looking at the Soviet KGB records in the foreign ministry from 1964 to 1969. They indicated complete Soviet surprise about what was called the provocation by the Chinese along the border—unless the KGB was trying to deceive the foreign ministry diplomats. I am wondering, you kind of confirmed yesterday when you talked about the situation in the embassy in 1969. You thought that the war was unlikely with the Soviet Union. Did you or did the embassy try to influence the decision-making in Beijing? If they did, why were they so utterly unsuccessful? Because obviously the decision makers in Beijing thought the war was imminent.

*Li Fenglin:* The question is about how we estimate and interpret the Czechoslovak incident. At the time I participated in drafting articles for repudiating Soviet social-imperialism. According to my recollection, which is not necessarily accurate, we reached these conclusions. First, we believed that the action reflected a vicious expansion of Soviet hegemony. The threat from the Soviet Union was becoming more dangerous. We put the hat of social-imperialism on the Soviet Union in order to enhance our defense against the Soviet Union. We however did not believe, as just suggested by someone, that the action was directly aimed at China itself.

Secondly, we thought that the action was caused by some Eastern European countries' centrifugal tendencies. The Soviet Union wanted to tighten its control of the socialist family. Its way of doing this was *sha yi jing bai* ("to execute one as a warning to a hundred").

Thirdly, we believed that the contradiction between the Soviet Union's exercising control and the Eastern European countries' opposing control became intensified. This afforded us an opportunity to improve relations with some Eastern European countries and to use the policy of differentiation to isolate the Soviet Union further.

Lastly, to a large extent the incident pushed China to readjust its relations with the United States. This is how I remembered our view at the time. Now I wish to raise a question and hope to get an answer from Eastern European ambassadors, if we have time. Premier Zhou's clarification of China's attitude at the Romanian Embassy caused very strong reaction in the world. How did the Eastern European countries evaluate his speech internally?

*Westad:* Thank you very much. Do you have a very brief comment, Ambassador Fan?

*Fan Chenzuo:* I will be very brief. After the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, in theory, as some colleagues just mentioned, we put a new hat of social imperialism on the Soviet Union, and in diplomacy we began to relax relationship with the United States. This was called, as I said yesterday, opposition to both hegemonic powers with an emphasis on striking against Soviet revisionism. This orientation started at this time. Albania can be easily overlooked. As I mentioned yesterday, after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, Albania took a serious action and withdrew from the Warsaw Pact. The Chinese side highly praised and actively supported this action of Albania's.

It has been pointed out that some measures were adopted between China and Romania. Similarly some important measures were also adopted between China and Albania. In that year Albania sent a party and government delegation to China under defense minister Balluku. The Albanian delegation was of military character, though it was different from China's party-government-military delegation sent in return, as Professor Chen Jian pointed out to me yesterday. The Chinese arrangement was rare, that was, after meeting with Chairman Mao Zedong, Balluku was also arranged to meet with Lin Biao, who was on the rise at the time. This unusual development indicated that military cooperation between China and Albania would be significantly strengthened. Yesterday I mentioned that after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, in one deal we offered Albania more than thirty complete sets of projects. Many of these were military projects. In our total assistance to Albania, which had a value of 10 billion RMB plus 6 billion US dollars, a third was military assistance.

Immediately after Balluku's October visit, China in November sent an even weightier delegation to Albania. In responding to the situation and for assisting Albania, China sent a party-government-military delegation headed by Chief of Staff Huang Yongsheng. Huang differed from other chiefs of staff in the past. Under the particular circumstances, he was an unusual chief

of staff, being simultaneously a member of the CCP Central Committee's ad hoc body on the Cultural Revolution. This ad hoc body was directed by Zhou Enlai and the other members were directly under him. Huang therefore occupied a very important position and had military power. The delegation also included Wu De. Wu was the first deputy director of the municipal revolutionary committee of Beijing, but actually he was also the first deputy political commissar of the Beijing Military District. The navy chief was also included. This was a delegation of a very strong military nature. Albania's reaction was of course rather enthusiastic.

My last words: I would like to liken Albania to a nail in the eyes of the Soviet Union, Romania to a thorn, and Czechoslovakia to a mere grain of sand. But the Soviet Union chose to deal with the sand. The thorn was not touched because China and Romania cooperated closely. The Soviet Union also had to consider Albania's resolve. Therefore they chose to deal with the sand but not the thorn and the nail.

*Westad*: Thank you very much, Ambassador Fan. We have 15 minutes left of this discussion. I want to concentrate those fifteen minutes squarely on the issue of Sino-Soviet border clashes. Because I think this is by far the most important issue that we are dealing with in this session. I am going to go back to Professor Rowiński and Ambassador Zhu at the end. Because we are running short of time now, I'd like them to have their comments at the end. I am going to turn to the other Eastern European representatives now. I am going to turn to whomever else on the Eastern European side would like to answer this crucial question. How close were we to war in 1969 between Soviet and China based on the information that you received? For instance, Joachim Schröter, who was serving as military attaché, maybe is in a better position to answer this. But first a two-finger question from Li Xiangqian, and then Vojtech Mastny. Then we will turn to Joachim Schröter. Remember we have to be very brief now.

*Li Xiangqian*: After the Zhenbao Island incident, the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee circulated a notice about the incident to different countries. The notice to East Germany said that because the Soviet Union was making preparations for the European security conference, China intended to show its existence and assert influence through fighting the battle. My question to Mr. Schröter is, what was East Germany's reaction to the notice?

*Mastny*: The border clashes coincided in March 1969 with a very important meeting of the Warsaw Pact, that of the Political Consultative Committee (PCC) in Budapest. There were rumors at the time that as a result of the

clashes, the Soviets were putting pressure on the Warsaw Pact members to extend the validity of the Warsaw Pact to Asia. I have seen no evidence of that from the record of the meetings themselves of the PCC. My question to the Eastern European diplomats: Are you aware of any initiatives of the Soviet side in that direction at the time? To the Chinese diplomats: Was there concern or fear on the Chinese side that the Soviets might attempt to extend the validity of the Warsaw Pact to Asia? Specifically, a repetition of what was attempted in 1963 with regard to Mongolia, entry of Mongolia into the Warsaw Pact?

*Schröter:* GDR's comments about the border clashes could only be reflections of the information from Moscow. I want to say that before I came to China in 1971, I had a short meeting with our minister of defense. He ordered me to find out the real situation behind the border clashes, specifically on the Zhenbao Island, the Ussuri River. That means they got information from Moscow, only official reflections or public announcements that suited Moscow. But they had no real information from our part. So, one of my first tasks in China during my first year was to build up my own impression about this problem.

When I returned to attend a conference in Berlin in 1972, the defense minister and I had a personal discussion of questions concerning China, and especially this issue. I could see that our sources were limited. The defense minister was a member of the politburo but he had no other information, neither from the Chinese side nor from the Soviet side, maybe a little bit internal information from the Soviet side. But information from neither side was really accepted by our authorities. I would prefer to say that these clashes were secondary. The main problem was the internal debate about strategies inside the Chinese leadership. There was one question about people's war, to lead people's war or not to lead people's war. There were also questions about how to handle relations with the Soviet Union and the United States. Regarding these questions there were many contradictions inside the Chinese leadership. Therefore I believe it was basically a political decision, not a military one.

*Westad:* Thank you very much. Malcolm, very quickly please.

*Byrne:* Thank you very much. I want to extend the question from Vojtech and also from you about how close the Eastern Europeans believed the war was. There was also, I believe, in March 1969 a meeting in Warsaw at which Brezhnev specifically urged the Eastern Europeans to denounce China for the border clashes and to be prepared for possible use of force in the Far

East. I wonder how the Eastern European governments reacted to that. But more specifically, we know that in August 1969 Soviet diplomats approached Henry Kissinger with the idea of possibly conducting a preemptive nuclear strike against China. We have documentation of this on the US side. I wonder what level of awareness was on the Eastern European side about that idea. And also for that matter what was the reaction on the Chinese side?

*Westad:* Thank you very much. Bernd, very quickly please.

*Schaefer:* I think it is very important not just to look at the Soviet action toward the Chinese at the border clashes but also at the extent of the Soviet reaction. My question would be, what do we know about the Soviet military strike against Chinese forces? I think it is very important to consider the numbers of the casualties. Maybe we could shed some light on that. According to my information, the Soviets suffered in March 1969 about 58 casualties, whereas the Chinese side over 3,000. The Soviets must have launched a massive military strike and be very hard hitting, which sent a message to the Chinese that the Soviets were indeed a major threat. Maybe the Chinese participants could reflect on that. What do we know about the number of Chinese casualties and how did this affect China's perception of the threat?

*Westad:* Ambassador Liu for a very brief intervention.

*Liu Qibao:* As I remember, at the time China had a basic estimate of the Soviet Union's policy toward China. That was, the Soviet Union wanted to use pressure to stimulate internal changes in China. This was how we estimated their basic policy. But we also made preparations for the worst scenario—large-scale Soviet invasion of China. But we believed that such a possibility was unthinkable. Of course in China there were also people who had a different opinion. Our basic policy, as outlined by Mao Zedong and other leaders, was to strive for the best possibility and to prepare for the worst possibility. The slogans at the time were *beizhan, bei Huang, wei renmin* ("be prepared against war and natural disasters, and do everything for the people") and *shen wa dong, guang ji liang, bu zheng ba* ("dig deep holes, store a lot of grains, never claim hegemony"). These reflected our internal estimate. It would be very difficult for the Soviets to carry out a large-scale offensive against China. Such an offensive was inconceivable because at the time both the Soviet Union and the United States had their strategic focus in Europe.

I have one comment about the Zhenbao Island incident. Many friends have talked about the inevitability of the incident. But the incident itself also

happened by chance. According to materials that I know, neither of the two sides planned to fight such a battle on a certain date, and the fighting happened mostly by chance. Very soon Kosygin and Zhou Enlai met each other at the Beijing airport. This reflected the fact that neither side had the strategic intent of launching a large-scale, direct military conflict. Otherwise Kosygin would not have come to Beijing and Zhou Enlai would not have wanted to meet him in the airport. Although the meeting did not produce much and some oral understandings reached there would not be implemented later, it indicated the improbability of a big war between China and the Soviet Union at the time. Both sides wanted to avoid such a war.

*Westad:* Thank you very much, Ambassador Donchev for a very brief comment.

*Donchev:* I like to make one remark. When we are discussing the problems, the relations between China and the Eastern European countries, the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the border clashes between China and the Soviet Union, we always come to the question of the Soviet–Chinese relations. This relationship seemed behind our attitude toward China and behind the relations between Eastern Europe and China. For example, when we are dealing with the border clashes as mentioned by Ambassador Li, it seems very clear and simple as a development from the treaty of 1861. But I don't believe that it is clear and easy because it was negotiated for so many years with one government on one side and the other government on another side. It is a mistake for the organizers not to invite the Soviet side to this meeting. So we are only listening to one side. It is the same mistake that we made in the past when we only listened to the Russians about these problems and we were subject to the Soviet propaganda. This is my remark for the future.

*Westad:* Thank you very much, Ambassador Donchev. That may be a very good advice indeed. I turn to Ambassador Zhu for concluding remarks and then to Professor Rowiński.

*Zhu Ankang:* I want to comment on the Zhenbao Island incident. I agree with Mr. Liu Qibao that it was an incident by chance. It happened at a time when the relationship between the two countries was very tense. Both sides were prepared for such an incident but neither wanted enlargement of the incident into a big war. This point can be verified with evidence. After the incident, Kosygin hoped to contact us and to meet with Premier Zhou. Chairman Mao issued an internal directive to the effect that we must fight back resolutely but should also be prepared to negotiate. We would not have taken this orientation had we intended to enlarge the incident. "Fighting back resolutely" because,

in our view, the incident was provoked by the Soviet side. We had to fight back. But we must be prepared to negotiate. At the time Premier Zhou told Chen Xilian, commander in chief of the Northeast Military District, that we must not show weakness in this controversy provoked by the Soviet Union, but we must be strong yet reasonable, and that we should realize that this was a local conflict and it must not spread. It seemed that both sides shared this view of not spreading the conflict. But since the incident already took place, both sides were willing to talk to find a solution.

There was a small episode. After the Zhenbao Island incident Kosygin used a hotline to call our foreign ministry. The hotline had existed for many years but had never been used. He used it this time. He called and requested a meeting with Premier Zhou or wanted to speak directly to Chinese leaders on the phone. Our telephone operator was then under the influence of the extreme leftist tendency. He did not ask for instruction and answered Kosygin on the spot, saying that you were a revisionist and not qualified to talk to our great leaders. Then he hung up. He reported what happened only afterwards. Premier Zhou Enlai severely criticized this matter, but it already caused a misunderstanding on the Soviet side. They thought that China was unwilling to talk.

Kosygin was a moderate among Soviet leaders, and his approach created an excuse for the hardliners. These hardliners advocated a surgical nuclear strike against China. Other measures against China were also adopted, such as the Asian collective security system aimed at isolating China. Consequently, the Sino–Soviet relationship became even more neurotic. But, then, Ho Chi Minh died in September. Returning from his trip to Vietnam to offer condolences, Kosygin used the opportunity to meet with Zhou Enlai in Beijing. After this meeting, the relations between the two sides became relaxed. For the Zhenbao Island incident, the Chinese side attributed the responsibility to the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union to China. Now this issue is very difficult to clarify because the two sides have told different stories. But one thing is certain: the Zhenbao Island is Chinese territory and the incident took place within the Chinese territory.

*Westad:* Professor Rowiński to conclude.

*Rowiński:* I will try to speak as briefly as possible. I have a question but not an answer. I only try to explain how we should try to understand all that happened at this time. First, the question from Ambassador Li: How did we believe the Soviet argument about the border problems with China? If you look at all the countries having borders with Russia and the Soviet

Union, the historical and practical experiences are so rich. So, maybe it is extremely hard to believe the Soviet argument about border questions. As for information, just like Ambassador Donchev and Mr. Schröter explained, we had only Soviet information, nothing from the Chinese. We knew only *Ren Min Ribao* (People's Daily) or information in press. But you know, what was the real meaning of this information about the Zhenbao Island? So, all of our analyses came from the press and from the internal situation in China. If we looked at the Zhenbao Island as a place and as a time connected to the situation in China just before the Ninth Party Congress, we took this as a measure to resolve some internal Chinese problems which were much more serious than the border clashes. But we were really afraid of the possibility of a war, of a preemptive attack on China's nuclear centers. As far as I know, there was no such information. Frankly we received some information from the Americans, not from the Russians. Maybe the higher Warsaw Pact military authorities had some information. But it is very hard for me to tell.

*Westad:* Thank you very much. I agree with what you said about this session. We have more questions than answers. Some of the questions have been very good questions and that is the starting point, as has been pointed out by several, for further discussions. I would like to remind everyone though that these are points we may return to later.

There are increasingly two versions developing of the border clashes incident in 1969. One is that the Chinese political conditions led to the heating up of the atmosphere, that this was the direct background of the first of the border clashes, and that then the Soviets themselves struck back with a degree of force that was unprecedented in the area which was complete unexpected by the Chinese side. This is the version that is supported by Soviet documents that have been declassified and also documents from some Eastern European countries, particularly from Eastern Germany. Unfortunately we do not have access to Chinese documents yet on this. But it is also the version that is supported by increasing number of scholars, Chinese and foreign, who have had some limited access to documents.

And there is another version which basically said either that it was a Soviet attack on China, or that it came to a multi-conflict that existed at the border and in some unknown way this flashed into a conflict. So it is not that we do not have narratives, we do not have concepts of what happened. The problem is that they are, to some extent, in conflict. It is only through further research, and particularly, I must say this, through access to the

Chinese source materials that actually tell us something about what was going on on the Chinese side, that we would be able to get closer to a real account of what took place.

Now we will turn to the next topic after tea break. I suggest that we reassemble here at 10:45. We need a little bit of break now. Then we are in a better position, thankfully on the Chinese side as well with regard to some documentary sources. We will be drawing on those in our discussion. Thank you.

\* \* \* End of Session Four \* \* \*

## **Session Five: The Impact of the Sino–American Rapprochement on Chinese–Eastern European Relations, 1968–1972**

(10:45–12:15, March 25)

*Zhang Baijia:* Now we begin the discussion of the fifth topic, the impact of the normalization of the Sino–American relations on Chinese–Eastern European relations. We have many questions from the last session, but these can be fully discussed only if we hold more conferences. We do not have much time left for this session. We have only one hour fifteen minutes. Therefore I think that we should begin our discussion of the topic immediately. For this topic we may need an American counterpart. But here we do not have an American ambassador to China. Our focus should therefore be on how the normalization between China and the United States influenced China’s relations with the Eastern European countries. Now we invite Ambassador Chen Delai to make an introductory presentation.

*Chen Delai:* Until now our symposium has progressed remarkably well. Our two moderators have presided excellently, and the discussion has been very lively. This puts some pressure on me. Within the time limit I need to talk concisely yet to clarify the topic as clearly as possible. The following are some of my simple opinions on the topic, the influence of normalization of the Sino–American relations on Chinese–Eastern European relations.

After the PRC was established on October 1, 1949, the United States adopted a policy of blockade, embargo, and isolation against China. The two countries became relatively segregated from each other and staged mutual confrontations. Beginning in October 1969, out of consideration of American strategic interests and competition with the Soviet Union for global hegemony, American president Nixon repeatedly sent out signals for improving relations with China. Chairman Mao Zedong and Premier Zhou Enlai seized the opportunity and facilitated the historical breakthrough in Sino–American relations. At first, in July 1971, Dr. Kissinger visited China as a special presidential envoy. His visit made preparations for President Nixon’s visit to China. A half year later, in February 1972, President Nixon visited China. Out of their respective strategic considerations and national

interests, Chinese and American leaders demonstrated great statesmanship in realizing the first handshake across the Pacific after twenty years. The issuance of the Shanghai Communiqué opened the door for friendly exchanges between China and the United States, and began to normalize their relations. At the welcome banquet for President Nixon on February 21, Premier Zhou Enlai pointed out:

President Nixon accepted the Chinese government's invitation and came to visit China, and hence the leaders of the two countries are able to meet face to face to seek a normal interstate relationship and to exchange opinions on issues of common concerns. This is a positive move that reflects the desires of the Chinese and the American peoples. This is a pioneering accomplishment in the history of Chinese–American relations. After the common efforts made by both the Chinese and the American sides, now the door for friendly exchanges is finally opened.

Normalization of the Sino–American relationship caused significant international impact and profoundly influenced Chinese–Eastern European relations as well. I will talk briefly about the different consequences of the event in Eastern European countries. First, it further consolidated and promoted Chinese–Romanian relations. After the Sino–American relationship became normalized, Romania highly praised the development. Many Romanian newspapers reported and positively evaluated the event. These commentaries pointed out that the development would not only benefit China and the United States but would also profoundly influence international relations. The party organ also editorialized that this marked the victory of Chinese diplomacy and the bankruptcy of America's attempt to isolate China. As early as in the 1960s, Romania enthusiastically transmitted American messages to China, sincerely hoping that the two countries normalize their relations as early as possible.

In November 1970, when [Gheorghe] Radulescu, member of the Romanian Communist Party Central Executive Committee and vice chairman of the council of ministers, visited China, he informed Premier Zhou Enlai of Nixon's visit in Romania and his conversation with President Ceaușescu. He also conveyed a message for Nixon. According to Radulescu, President Ceaușescu instructed him to inform the Chinese that President Nixon was very interested in finding a way to achieve a normal relation with China. Nixon asked Ceaușescu to inform the Chinese side that the United States was prepared to negotiate with China through any channel, in any location,

and at any time, in order to improve Chinese–American relations. If the Chinese side agreed, the United States was willing to develop economic and technological relations with China. Radulescu also said that Ceaușescu pointed out to Nixon that any important international question could not be settled without China’s participation. Nixon expressed his understanding of the point and said that he held the same view.

On December 16, 1978, after China and the United States completed their negotiations on establishing formal diplomatic relationship, deputy foreign minister Han Nianlong informed the Romanian ambassador of the development. On December 22, President Ceaușescu sent a congratulatory telegram to Chairman Hua Guofeng, highly praising the contemporary and historical significance of the establishment of the Sino–American diplomatic relationship. During the 1970s the Chinese–Romanian relations achieved a full-scale development. The two sides conducted frequent high-level exchanges, the volume of bilateral trade increased significantly, and cooperation in the field of production grew. Trade unions, youth leagues, and women’s federations on both sides visited each other frequently. In June 1971 and May 1978, President Ceaușescu twice visited China, and the Romanian prime minister also visited China in September 1975 and September 1978. In August 1978, Hua Guofeng, chairman of the CCP Central Committee and premier of the State Council, visited Romania. Li Xiannian, member of the politburo and vice premier, visited Romania in August 1974. In addition, delegations of deputy prime ministers and ministers from the two sides visited each other many times. Of course, the growth of the Chinese–Romanian relations had many reasons, and normalization of the Sino–American relations was just one of the factors that should not be ignored.

As for the Chinese–Albanian relationship, it deteriorated along with the improvement of the Sino–American relations. Albania was unhappy about the improvement of the Sino–American relationship. It did not welcome the development and, internally, was opposed to the development. Its news media merely issued simple news about President Nixon’s visit to China and did not make any comment. Its report on the Chinese–American communiqué was a brief summary. Albanian officials avoided talking about this matter with the Chinese side. At the time there was an internal instruction in Albania that allowed cadres and the masses to watch foreign television programs on Nixon’s visit in China but warned against making any comment on the event in front of the Chinese. From the time onward, the relations between the two countries became increasingly cold. Albania began

to criticize China more frequently. The Albanian authorities believed that China wallowed in the mire [*tongliu hewu*] with the United States and the CCP became a revisionist party. Ambassador Fan Chengzuo is very familiar with this situation and he is an authoritative expert on the Albanian question. I would expect him to add some concrete remarks to this topic.

Yugoslavia evaluated the normalization of the Sino–American relationship positively. The Yugoslav news media widely and approvingly reported President Nixon’s China visit. It was generally believed that the event was highly significant. It was viewed as the greatest event of the decade and the most sensational state visit of the contemporary era. The Yugoslav authorities welcomed the improvement of the Sino–American relations. A deputy prime minister of Yugoslavia told Ambassador Zeng Tao that Nixon’s China visit was a great event of the century and marked America’s recognition of the achievement of the Chinese revolution and construction. Although some people had reservations about the development, everybody agreed that this was a huge event. Yugoslavia believed that no influence could stop the Chinese people in playing their historical role. According to this deputy prime minister, this was the official view of the Yugoslav leadership.

Hungary appeared ambivalent about the development of the Sino–American relationship. The Hungarians welcomed the development but had some worries. They recognized its significance but tried to limit its influence. Hungarian newspapers made some critical remarks about Nixon’s visit in China but did not want to appear excessively anti-Chinese. The reaction was calculated and measured. Hungary indicated appreciation and endorsement of the Sino–American agreement on using the principle of peaceful coexistence in dealing with interstate relations and international disputes, believing that this would be helpful in reducing tensions in the world, and this was the main significance of Nixon’s China visit. Meanwhile, the Hungarians were worried that improvement of the Sino–American relationship would lead to further deterioration of the Chinese–Soviet relationship and cause the Soviets to tighten their control of Hungary and other Eastern European countries. This would make their life more miserable. Therefore, Hungary made an effort to belittle the importance of the Sino–American negotiations and to limit the impact of the event, asserting that Nixon’s visit in China did not and would not shake the world.

The other countries, such as Poland, Bulgaria, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia, followed the Soviet Union in opposing China. They were not happy

about normalization of the Sino–American relationship, did not welcome the development, but did not go to the extreme either. Therefore their relations with China did not change much. The Polish news media reacted relatively strongly to Nixon’s China visit. From early February to mid-March, 1972, the principal newspapers and televisions of Poland issued more than seventy anti-Chinese articles and commentaries, slandering China for colluding with the United States and selling out Vietnam. Nevertheless, Poland realized that Nixon’s visit to China already caused a huge change in international relations. They believed that an era of Chinese–American–Soviet triangle began, and that the rapprochement between China and the United States made the international situation much more complex than in the 1960s. After Nixon’s visit to China, Poland intensified studies of China and established a new research branch in the Polish Academy of Sciences.

Bulgaria actively coordinated its action with the Soviet Union. In reacting to Nixon’s China visit, Bulgaria used its entire propaganda apparatus to launch a large anti-Chinese wave. In less than ten days, its central organs published more than 150 anti-Chinese articles. Sometimes more than thirty articles were published in one day. Bulgaria also blamed China for colluding with American imperialism and selling out Vietnamese and Indochinese peoples’ anti-imperialist struggle. But it should be noted that in this anti-Chinese propaganda, none of the Bulgarian leaders made any comments in public. Therefore, on the one hand Bulgaria followed the Soviet Union in expressing opposition to Nixon’s China visit and to normalization of the Sino–American relations, on the other, it scrupulously left some room for maneuvering.

East Germany only made simple daily reporting in respect to Nixon’s visit to China. In the meantime the American atrocities in bombing Vietnam were reported in great numbers and detail, suggesting that Nixon’s visit to China enabled the United States to escalate the bombing in Indochina. East German newspapers slandered China for changing policy toward the United States and thus undermining normal international relations and world peace. They attacked China for being friendly toward the United States and hostile to the Soviet Union, and asserted that normalization of the Sino–American relationship would damage the cause of peace and social progress. On February 28, the foreign minister of East Germany said to the press in Cuba that Nixon’s visit in Beijing was harmful to world peace because on the one hand Nixon upheld peace in rhetoric but on the other he ordered escalation of war in bombing Vietnam and massacring women and children.

The news media of Czechoslovakia also published anti-Chinese articles in reacting to Nixon's China visit. It was asserted that China encouraged American imperialism to bomb Vietnam, and sold out the interests of the Vietnamese people. It was alleged that Nixon's visit had its origin in China's foreign policy that was beneficial to American imperialists' global strategy against socialist countries. It was stressed that Nixon's visit was aimed at establishing a Chinese–American alliance against the Soviet Union within a Chinese–American–Soviet triangular relationship.

In general, after the normalization of the Sino–American relations, Albania's relations with China deteriorated but the other Eastern European countries' relations with China remained normal. Romania and Yugoslavia followed independent and peaceful foreign policies, and their relations with China achieved good development. The other countries, as members of the Warsaw Pact, were tied to the Soviet Union politically and economically. For instance, Hungary hoped to develop relations with China but had some concerns. Poland, Bulgaria, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia followed the Soviet Union more closely, and dared not to go beyond the limit in developing relations with China. But they also hoped to develop interstate relations with China.

Especially after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia and the Zhenbao Island incident at the Chinese–Soviet border, Premier Zhou Enlai put a hat of social imperialism on the Soviet Union at the national day reception held by the Romanian ambassador. From then on China paid greater attention to the work in Eastern Europe. As Professor Yu pointed out, a centrifugal tendency in Eastern European countries also began to grow. Actually Eastern European countries were quite clear in their minds that they benefited from the normalization of the Sino–American relationship. The development at least put more constraints on the Soviet Union and hence increased Eastern European countries' living and development space. They got a greater room of maneuvering. Furthermore, although Eastern European countries were overshadowed by the Soviet Union, they could see that China's great power status and role in the international arena were strengthened day by day. Therefore, in public or in private, they were unwilling to ignore relations with China. On the contrary, they all sought means to maintain and develop relations with China.

It is worth mentioning that during this period, among all Eastern European countries, Romania had the best relationship with China. This was because of the two countries' mutual needs and also because of the international

and regional circumstances at the time. In 1968, the Soviet Union invaded Czechoslovakia and also increased pressure on the Romanian boundaries. This led Romania to believe that China was the most trustworthy friend. Then, in the flood and earthquake of 1970 and 1977, Romania suffered twice from catastrophic natural disasters, and the damage to human lives and property was severe. The Soviet Union was not only reluctant to provide help but also tried to take advantage of Romania's crises. At the key moments it was China that provided significant material assistance and moral support to Romania, and showed Romanians the sincerity and reliability of their Chinese friends.

Lastly, in the 1970s the contradictions between Romania and the Soviet Union became intensified. In the Warsaw Pact, the Soviet Union wanted not only political integration but also military integration. The attempt caused Romania's strong resistance. While it became increasingly difficult for Romania and the Soviet Union to solve their contradictions, Romania was even more determined to develop actively friendly relations with other great powers, especially China. Obviously, in developing relations with China and the United States, Romania intended to counterbalance the Soviet Union. My time is up.

*Zhang Baijia:* Ambassador Chen discussed comprehensively the Chinese perspective on Eastern European countries' reactions to the normalization of the Sino-American relations. Now we invite Ambassador Juhász to comment on the topic.

*Juhász:* I just want to make two simple points. First, normalization of the Sino-American relationship had a contradictory impact on Eastern European countries. This was similar to China's foreign policy as a whole, which also had contradictory influence. On the one hand, China's foreign policy made it more difficult for these countries, especially Hungary, to develop their relations with Western countries for the sake of reforms. Leaders of the Eastern European countries were often forced to clarify their attitudes even when they did not want to. They had to participate in so-called collective consultations to coordinate their opinions. The Sino-Soviet confrontation, the Sino-American normalization, and, more important, the appearance of China's theory on the division of the three worlds in 1974, all had very negative impact.

I want to tell our friends here that China's anti-revisionist line actually strengthened the anti-reform elements within the Hungarian party. Sometimes they believed that they could rely on China's support in resisting reforms at

home. I agree with Ambassador Chen's remark that objectively, confrontation tends to have the positive effect of promoting representation and realization of national interests. China's criticism was coming from a socialist country. I believe that this was extremely important. This was one of the reasons, as our friends may already know, why Hungary and other socialist countries strongly opposed expelling China from socialism. China's stand catalyzed the entire communist movement. The appearance of Eurocommunism shook the Soviet party's position as the patriarch. Therefore, China's role was a contradictory one. I also agree with Ambassador Chen's view that after the Sino-American normalization, Central European countries feared that the Soviet Union would be provoked to tighten its control of the region.

Secondly, how Hungary reacted to the Sino-American normalization? Of course, inevitably, criticism was conducted, especially from 1974 to China's twelfth congress when an independent development line was adopted. This was a turning point. But I wish to emphasize here that Hungary's criticism of China's normalization of relations with the United States and other Western countries was directed at the Sino-American strategic cooperation, but not at the normalization policy per se. This was not by accident. From the early 1970s Hungary began to develop relations with the West, and, in 1979, it refused to obey the Soviet Union in severing relations with Western countries. To the contrary, these relations continued to grow until 1981 when Hungary, ignoring a warning from the Soviet Union, entered the International Monetary Fund. Therefore, as Ambassador Chen clearly pointed out, Hungary would not oppose China's policy toward the West as a whole. Thank you.

*Zhang Baijia:* Mr. Juhász described Eastern European countries' reactions to the normalization of the Sino-American relationship and Hungary's policy toward the development. He also raised a question. As I understand it, his question reflects his view of Chairman Mao's three-worlds theory and one-line strategy. This may be discussed. Or, any scholar has a question?

*Hershberg:* Thank you. I have a few very brief questions both to the Chinese and Eastern European participants. First of all, in the United States some commentators and analysts interpreted the border clashes in March 1969 as a deliberate signal to the new American administration that the Sino-Soviet split was irrevocable and serious, and that the United States' rapprochement with China should be accelerated. One question is whether this interpretation was common among the Chinese and the Eastern Europeans at the time, and therefore whether any of the Eastern European countries anticipated the Sino-American opening that took place in 1971?

A second question concerns the role of the third party mediators. The Romanian and Chinese participants have mentioned the roles of Romania and Pakistan as intermediaries between China and the United States. There is some evidence that at the same time in 1969 and 1970, Romania and Pakistan also transmitted messages between Beijing and Moscow. In particular, we would be very interested if the Chinese can provide evidence or the Romanian ambassador can provide evidence about the role of the third countries in mediating the Sino-Soviet border clashes.

And finally, to the Eastern European participants, just coming from Ulaanbaatar, we would be very interested if Mongolia played a special role in interpreting these events in Sino-Soviet border clashes to the Eastern Europeans or whether they simply repeated the views of Moscow. Thank you.

*Li Danhui:* I have a question for Ambassador Juhasz and another for Mr. Schröter. One is connected to Mr. Byrne's question in the last session. On March 17, 1969, the Warsaw Pact countries held a summit meeting in Hungary. Both Brezhnev and Kosygin were present. My question is whether in this meeting Brezhnev asked the other member countries to take common military action with the Soviet Union in pressuring China. In other words, did the Soviet Union ask the other Warsaw Pact countries to send troops to the Sino-Soviet borders?

The second question is also related. After China adjusted its policy toward the United States and was allied to the United States in resisting the Soviet Union, did or did not the Soviet Union intend to use the Warsaw Pact to pressure China? The Soviet Union wanted to induct Mongolia into the Warsaw Pact. Its purpose, I believe, was to deal with China. In the 1970s, after China adopted a policy of allying with the United States and resisting the Soviet Union, did other Warsaw Pact countries receive any relevant proposals from the Soviet Union, and, if they did, what were their reactions to these proposals?

*Radchenko:* A quick question for the Eastern European ambassadors, especially for Mr. Schröter. Following the Lin Biao incident in 1971, was there any discussion between the Soviets and the Eastern Europeans about the nature of the incident, or was it perhaps linked to the improvement of China's relations with the United States?

*Byrne:* There are many aspects of the decision-making process on the Chinese side that would be of great interest. But in consideration of the participants here today, I am curious about the decision on having a rapprochement with the United States. Clearly it was a very complex decision

with ideological and policy considerations. Who were the experts that the Chinese leadership relied on in deciding the policy implications of rapprochement? Were there any of you or any of your colleagues, specifically consulted about the impact on the Eastern European relations? Or, did Lin Biao's removal from the scene have an impact in favor of rapprochement with the US?

*Zhang Baijia:* Any participant is willing to answer these questions?

*Schröter:* It would be nice having some Russian people here. They could answer those questions better than me. As I understand the situation in the Russian leadership, after the Zhenbao incident they were very confused about the military situation in the Far East. From a military point of view, please understand, Vladivostok is the main Soviet naval base in the Far East. They believed in the possibility that China would take it against the Siberian railway. That meant to cut the direct way to Vladivostok. Of course, if there were no good relations between the two countries, it was the military's task to think over such problems. It doesn't mean the political leadership got such an aim, but it was in preparation.

This way we have to look at Mongolia. The Soviet side made a proposal to take Mongolia into the Warsaw Pact. But the Eastern European countries refused that, first Romania, followed by others, sooner or later, stronger or weaker, East Germany too. Because we looked at the confrontation in Europe and we were never interested in jumping over to another confrontation. Therefore our, meaning Eastern European, argumentation was accepted by the Russians and they took their proposal back, and concluded a pact with Mongolia for bilateral assistance. On the basis of this pact, as I remember, two Russian divisions, even air defense forces and electronic systems for protecting air routes, were established in Mongolia.

Someone mentioned the point that the Zhenbao incident might have been a signal to the United States. I myself made an estimate and gave it to Berlin that this Zhenbao Island incident, from the point of China's interest, was not necessarily against the Soviet Union, but it was necessary to create distance against normalization with the United States inside the Chinese leadership.

*Hershberg:* Are you quoting this from the document, if you wrote it at the time?

*Schröter:* I wrote it, but this document cannot be found now. Yes, in this way I told Berlin. On the same occasion, I did not prefer saying "rapprochement with the USA," because I did not believe that China wanted a

“rapprochement” with the USA. I would better to say normalization, because the international situation was not normal before the establishment of the relationship between China and the USA. From my point of view it was a question of normalization. But to the Soviet side, it was a jump over from the socialist camp to the side of US imperialism. This interpretation was taken over by our leadership and in our government’s propaganda. But I knew that inside our leadership discussions about this existed.

At the same time, when our officials talked about this jumping over to the American side in connection to the Vietnam War, I sent information to Berlin, suggesting that the Chinese military orientation moved slowly to another priority, and the Chinese emphasis moved more and more from north to the south sea. For the main question of China’s international normalization was to solve the Taiwan question, and other territorial questions in the South China Sea. This was my view at this time and it was accepted in Berlin without any opposition. In the military policy of China, the navy got more attention, not the ground force. China’s security and military policy started slowly to modernize its air and naval forces. These were new priorities, modernization in another way and with other aims. These are questions I answered from my point of view.

*Zhang Biajia:* Thank you, Mr. Schröter, for describing the reactions of the GDR. At this symposium, he is also best qualified to talk about the Soviet perspective. Now, Ambassador Li Fenglin, please.

*Li Fenglin:* I would like to make some comments on the question of the Sino–Soviet war. I think it is proper to say that after the Zhenbao Island incident, both sides made preparations against an offensive by the other side. The Soviet Union had a military base in Ulan Ude. In the suburbs of Ulan Ude, headquarters for the Eastern Theater were established. In the time of war, they would command the three military districts in the Far East and Siberia. These headquarters were not abolished until 1997. The Soviets stationed troops in Mongolia with an intention to push the front line farther from its own boundaries. This would allow for preventing China from attacking Soviet territories.

As for the Warsaw Pact, I believe that the Soviet Union discussed within the organization the possibility of Chinese offensive or military operations in the Far East. There must have been two goals in doing so. First, the Soviets wanted to unify Warsaw Pact countries’ opinions, and secondly, they hoped to use the act to pressure China. Therefore, it could be seen that after the Zhenbao Island incident both China and the Soviet Union made careful

preparations against a possible attack by the other side. This may indicate that the political leadership on neither side intended to start a war. This was confirmed by Mr. Schröter and Ambassador Chen. On September 11, 1969, Zhou Enlai and Kosygin met at the Beijing Airport, and the most important point made by both sides was that no war should be started. Ambassador Zhu already talked about China's internal considerations and Mao Zedong's directives. After the September meeting between the two prime ministers, the border negotiations in Beijing, which had been suspended since 1964, were soon resumed. These were the actual circumstances of the time.

Finally, I have a question for our American friends. At the time the news media alleged that the Soviet Union was prepared to launch a surgical attack against China's nuclear facilities. The American side has many materials on this. My question is about the authenticity of these materials. I also hope to ask Eastern European ambassadors, whether or not you have documentation that can verify such an idea or plan by the Soviet political and military leadership. Or, was this just a rumor spread by the United States? What was the reality? I hope to know whether or not the Chinese scholars here have relevant Soviet documents. These are my questions.

*Schröter:* Of course I have no documents. But I have recollections. Very often I got questions from Berlin on Soviet-Chinese relations, but I never got any question about Russian strike against China's nuclear bases. That means if the Russians had asked or informed of Berlin about such thinking, then I would straightly have gotten an order to do research here. That also means if I did not get such a serious question from Berlin, Berlin had never got such information from Russia.

Otherwise, don't forget the first incident in international military history when Israel struck against the Iraqi nuclear base in peacetime, not in wartime. So because of the incident, all military general staffs in any time and in any country, from the United States to China or from the Eastern European countries to Russia, had to think over such a possibility. In this case I believe, and I can image that Russia thought over the possibility of striking against China in peacetime. What could have happen? When? This is only theoretical. But on the political level we never really discussed such a war.

*Zhang Biajia:* Any other veterans are willing to comment?

*Juhász:* Professor Hershberg, short question and short answer. It seemed to us logical, quite logical. But the timing was surprising for us. Now, the Warsaw Pact and China, after 1963 and 1968, nobody in Central Europe, perhaps the Czechs, I don't know, nobody would accept this idea. It was

impossible. The Hungarian leadership was firmly against this idea even in 1963. At the same time Mr. Kádár knew that in the Hungarian society this idea was totally unacceptable. At that time he enjoyed high reputation and he did not want to destroy this reputation in the society.

*Luthi:* Can I just follow up with a comment on the American proposal to the Soviet Union in the summer of 1963 about a joint strike against China's nuclear facilities? At that time Harriman was in Moscow and Kádár was also visiting in Moscow at the same time. It was crucial telling Kádár about Harriman's attempt to convince the Soviets to join the Americans in such a strike.

*Rowiński:* You know, recently I reviewed again the old politburo materials from the 1960s to the 1970s, and there is no such material.

*Westad:* This is a question for the Eastern European side. If we look at the slightly larger picture, this is something that the Russians had been discussing quite a bit, at the time and later on. We have the situation in the early 1970s, when China was making its opening to the United States. Of more than fifteen years had been gone when the Chinese government had been lambasting Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union exactly on that point, for trying to make compromises with the United States. Do you remember that this was of course the central issue and what the Sino-Soviet split was about in the first place? Now China itself had done exactly what it accused the Soviet Union and Eastern Europeans of doing early on, namely having a too close and too friendly policy toward the United States.

In the Eastern European capitals, what was the thinking with regard to the Sino-American rapprochement? Was it seen, as it's been said early on, a natural step, something that could not be avoided? Or did many people in Eastern European capitals think that China had not been sincere anyway about all the rhetoric and all the accusations before? And all of that, as the Soviet Union recollected, were just preparations for striking their own friendship with the United States? I am particularly interested in this, because we know that through the research done by Sergey Radchenko and others, this was the Soviet line from the mid-1960s in that China was actually preparing itself for some kind of re-accommodation with the United States. Was that also the view in Eastern Europe?

*Zhang Baijia:* This is a philosophical question. Who would like to answer it?

*Juhász:* You know, to us at that time, it did not look serious. Once you were against Yugoslavia but then had a friendly relationship with it; once

you were against the [1975] Helsinki agreement, but then you had good ties with the Western countries. So I don't think that the Hungarian leadership at that time considered that the Chinese position would be a starting point for the Hungarian foreign policy.

*Westad:* My question was not that. My question was rather, was this something that the Hungarian leadership had expected? Did they see this as coming out of the Chinese foreign policy in the 1960s or as a logical progression?

*Juhász:* Yes, it was a logical progression. But the timing was surprising for everybody.

*Budura:* May I have a word regarding this question? First of all I would like to underline the fact that diplomats and statesmen are supposed to make a very vigorous distinction between declarations and facts. So I think that declarations are part of a policy. This was the reason why we Romanians at that time did not involve ourselves in the debate about declarations. We took into consideration the facts.

I would like to point out two facts: when the discussion between Ceaușescu and Nixon started, the first sentences of Nixon about China were critical, very critical. He said that China was an aggressive power and so and so. Then Ceaușescu pointed out to Nixon that you had to take into consideration the real position of China. China was now under pressure, was subject to an embargo, and was subject to different kind of pressures, and so you had to understand the position of China. When Ceaușescu met with Brezhnev in 1965, Brezhnev also said that China was so and so. Ceaușescu again told him that you had to take into consideration the real situation that China was surrounded by. So I think that when we are talking about this rapprochement, or normalization of relations between China and United States, we have to discuss and understand it at the level of the realities—of facts, not of the statements.

*Zhang Baijia:* It's time for us to conclude. But I should allow two more questions. Mr. Schröter and Mr. Rowiński, please be brief.

*Schröter:* I remember that after the normalization between China and United States, I got an order to collect information about China's policy toward Vietnam, whether there was any change in China's policy about Vietnam. Later I learned from my colleague in Hanoi that he got the same question. Of course, the only answer that we could give was no, there was no change. And I believe this was a very important piece of information to our leadership, because if they awaited the official Soviet interpretation

about the normalization, then this question would play a very important role. After that you found East German propaganda was leveled down slowly but continued. The relationship between East Germany and China slowly went up in the beginning of the 70s.

I must tell you one more point, in this time we had the same problems as the Chinese. We also wanted to have normalization. Our normalization meant the relations with West Germany and official relations with the United States. We had the same interest. Therefore we had to look at the situation differently from Moscow.

*Rowiński:* There is a Chinese saying, *ting qi yan, guan qi xing* (“judge people by their deeds, not just by their words”). Accordingly, China’s policy can be seen from two aspects. China had a security problem and this was logically its goal. But the ideological explanations of and propaganda about this goal were rather contradictory at different times. In terms of propaganda, we had one kind of reaction, but then in terms of analyses of China’s actual conditions, we had another kind of reaction. It should not be forgotten that after 1970 our country was in a unique period. Our first party secretary hoped to implement reforms and also policies of opening. Therefore, in my personal opinion, our internal analyses and public propaganda were different. At the time, it was very difficult to have such a policy or to realize our opening to the West. Our evaluation of the Sino–American relations should be understood in this context.

As you may or may not know, from the early 1960s, we had a Sinologist in each of our embassies in other Eastern European countries. His or her most important task was to analyze this country’s relations with China, including cultural, commercial, political, and economic relations. When our leaders raised the issue in their meetings with Soviet leaders, we were admonished. They wanted to have a very tight control over this matter. Thus, to the Eastern European countries, the Sino–Soviet relationship was one of our most important relationships.

*Zhang Baijia:* Now we ask the two presenters to make brief concluding remarks. Ambassador Chen, please.

*Chen Delia:* Our discussion of how the normalization of the Sino–American relationship influenced China’s relations with Eastern European countries led me to consider a question. The Sino–American relationship affected the Sino–Soviet relationship, and, inevitably, it also had impact on China’s relations with the Eastern European countries. When we are dealing with the latter, these countries’ environments must not be overlooked. The Eastern

European countries' historical, current, and future international environments necessarily influenced and will continue to influence their considerations of relations with the Soviet Union, the United States, China, and other great powers. I learned this point through our discussions here.

As our Polish friend pointed out, because of their special circumstances, especially their relations with the Soviet Union during those years, the Eastern European countries' deeds and rhetoric were often different. We need to note not only what they said but, even more important, also how they acted. What they said often differed from how they thought and acted. This was determined by their environment. The Eastern European countries are rather special. They were so during the period under discussion. Currently, according to my study of these countries, such a situation continues to exist.

*Zhang Baijia:* Lastly, Mr. Juhász, your comments please.

*Juhász:* You asked whether Mongolia had its own position. They didn't have an official position. But when I talked with my Mongolian friends, they said that they had, you know, a tit-tat position.

*Hershberg:* I don't think you can stop there. What was that tit-tat position?

*Schröter:* I remember, it must have been 1973, that I got an order to give a lecture to our colleagues in the defense ministry about Chinese affairs. I openly said my opinion, not in line with the official position. Nobody was against it except the chief of the political branch of our ministry of defense. He announced to me that this was your opinion, but no more. Our minister of defense smiled and said that it was fine with me. So I continued.

*Zhang Baijia:* Very briefly, please.

*Donchev:* I want to comment on the issue of Mongolia. When Nixon visited China, I was the second secretary at our embassy in Beijing. After 1972 I attended all the [. . .?] meetings. In 1982 I was appointed ambassador to China. So I can say that the Mongolian side never expressed their own stand or attitude toward the Soviet stand. In 1971 and 1972 they did not express their attitude.

*Zhang Baijia:* We can finally end our discussion. Some of the participants here are in their advanced ages but they are very devoted to the discussion. But our chef cannot wait any longer.

\* \* \* End of Session Five \* \* \*

## **Session Six: The Mutual Effects of the Reforms in China and Eastern Europe, 1978–1989**

(2:00–3:45, March 25)

*Westad:* Welcome back and please be seated. Welcome to the sixth session that is on the mutual effects of the reforms in China and Eastern Europe, roughly in the years from 1978 to 1989. I would suggest that those years should be a framework for our discussions rather than a strict date for us to stick to. The purpose of this session is twofold: on the one hand we want to look at the influence that the period of opening and reforms in China had on East Europe. This has been referred to by Ambassador Juhász and others. But we also want to look at the impact that the relationship with Eastern Europe had on China in this period, because what we are looking at here is a rather complicated time line. Similar reforms, not on the same scale as was undertaken in China after 1978, had been tested out in Eastern Europe well before the reforms got underway in China. On the other hand, the reforms in China, during the 1980s especially, went much further than what had been attempted anywhere in Eastern Europe. It is that reality, that mutual effect that we want to look for at this conference. How did it shape on both sides, China and Eastern European countries, their influence on each other? In a way together they created a completely different road, which is really what happened during the 1980s, when changes took place here and changes took place in Eastern Europe.

What we will be discussing this afternoon is a very important topic which has broad effect not just on the countries involved here, but also on the international system as a whole. We have two main speakers, 15 minutes for each introduction for this session. First Ambassador Donchev, and then Ambassador Bai who will be speaking second. Then we will have general discussion. I have been asked to try to have a slightly longer break in the afternoon because this session is what some people have called the graveyard shift. This is the most difficult of all sessions during the day because everyone has been preparing to have a little rest after lunch and haven't got enough of it. I know that certainly goes for me. So we compensate that by

trying to extend the tea break a little bit in the afternoon, so at least we can get a decent cup of coffee or whatever else we need. Now we are going to the session, Ambassador Donchev.

*Donchev [written text]:* Honorable Mr. Chairman, esteemed moderators, dear colleagues and friends, ladies and gentlemen. First of all I would like to thank the organizers of the seminar for giving us, the representatives of the Eastern European countries, who have devoted our lives and careers to China and our Chinese colleagues from the Ministry of foreign Affairs and from the research institutes, the opportunity to meet after so many years and also to meet our colleagues and researchers from the western European countries and the United States who have expressed a deep interest in the relations between our countries and China.

I have prepared a fairly broad material about the period of the reforms and opening up policy of China, the adjustment of the Chinese politics towards Eastern European countries and the normalization of the relations with this countries, that I can present in written to your attention and now I will try to summarize it in the time allocated for my speech.

The eleventh congress of the Communist Party of China held in August 1977 and the session of the National People's Congress held in February and March 1978 outlined the task of transforming China into a "great and powerful" state until the end of the century, but at that time the right way to achieve this task was not yet found out. That happened during the third plenary session of the Central Committee of CPC in December of 1978. It was at that plenary session that under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping the Chinese reforms and the opening up policy were given a start. The session adopted the suggestion of Deng Xiaoping to shift the major work towards the building of the economy. The leitmotiv of the theory of Deng Xiaoping was building in China a socialism with Chinese specifics. The theory is connecting Marxism with the present Chinese conditions and is the leading ideology of the Chinese reforms and opening up.

After the third session (December 1978), within the framework of the adopted opening-up policy, a positive change in the relations between China and Eastern European countries can be noticed. But still the approach to the different countries is clearly different. In the report of Hua Guofeng during the 11<sup>th</sup> congress of CPC he mentioned that the Chinese leadership will "strengthen the bond of the socialist countries, but it still leaves the opportunity to define which country is a truly socialist and which is not. Later, in 1982, in the report of Hu Yaobang during the 12<sup>th</sup> congress of CPC the socialist

countries are mentioned only in the context of the cooperation with the so called “friendly socialist countries”—DPRK, Romania and Yugoslavia. Other eastern European countries mentioned in the report are not deemed socialist. It is stressed that “the five principles of peaceful coexistence are applied in the relations between China and all countries including the socialist ones”. The socialist countries are divided into the so called “three worlds” according to the new division of the world adopted by the Chinese leadership. The attitude toward the different Eastern socialist countries is quite different, according to the assessment given by the Chinese of how close the country is to the USSR and its willingness to go out of the agreed framework to coordinate the Chinese question set between the parties and the governments of the countries of the Warsaw Pact and Council for Mutual Economic Assistance [Comecon]. The above-mentioned assessment is exactly the basis of the so called “small steps” Chinese tactics towards the countries of Eastern Europe during this early stage of the opening-up policy in China.

According to some sources, the Chinese stipulations regarding that question were developed during a meeting in the Central Committee of CPC in April of 1982 which was attended by top Chinese leaders and during which the actual task “to split the unity between the USSR and its allies” is still reiterated (information about that is slipping to the foreign media, for example the French newspaper *Le Matin* of 22 November 1982). The Eastern European countries are basically considering the “small steps” as tactics for a gradual development and normalization of bilateral relations with PRC. Below I will try to follow on the example with Bulgaria the actual growth of those “steps” and their gradual development into bigger ones and at the end the full normalization of the bilateral relations including the inter-party relations.

Our embassy in Beijing in its annual reports for 1977 and 1978 already pointed out the noticeable change of attitude in China towards our country. Printing of negative information about Bulgaria had been removed from the Chinese media and there were more and more positive publications. Also the embassy was given greater opportunity to arrange meetings and visits. During the presentations of the credentials of our new Ambassador to the vice-chairman of the NPC [National People’s Congress] Tan Zhenlin on 29 August 1977 the latter declared that there were “better conditions and opportunities to develop the relations between PRC and PRB [People’s Republic of Bulgaria] in the fields of trade, science and technology and culture” after the just concluded 7<sup>th</sup> congress of CPC. During meetings with our diplomats

it was stated that there were no unresolved disputes between our countries that could harm the development of mutual relations. The level of the official guests attending the receptions held in the embassy was gradually increasing. The Bulgarian side was responding reciprocally. The Chinese association for friendship with foreign countries was playing an important role in the development of the relations.

The embassy of the PRB in Beijing stated in its annual report for 1981 that the relations with PRC should be reevaluated considering the new environment, and it also pointed out that the other Eastern European countries, including the USSR, for some time had been undertaking initiatives to reestablish the unofficial cultural exchange and the so called “small steps” and that the Chinese side was responding positively. Material of the Bulgarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs from 3 December 1963 underlined that the “small steps” policy was forming as a separate stage in the development of bilateral relations with China and also pointed out that we were falling behind the “small steps” of other Eastern European countries. As to the different forms of those “steps,” the foreign ministry thought that both visits as guest to the ambassadors and direct contacts are possible, but every case should be decided separately and negotiated with the Chinese side. It was suggested that there should be considered some concrete initiatives in the field of the trade and economic relations, science and technology, sports and others, as well as exchange of students and scientist as well a gradual reestablishment of relations between the high state organs. Some initiatives from both sides were actually taking place as early as in 1982.

In 1983 and 1984 the practice of the “small steps” was increasing and including new areas. During June of 1983 the head of the “USSR and Eastern European countries” department Ma Xushen was taking a visit to Bulgaria as a guest of the Chinese ambassador. He was received in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and held some high level talks. He also invited his counterpart P. Chernev to visit China as his guest. This visit was realized in October. Chernev was received by the deputy foreign minister, Qian Qichen. Quite a few Bulgarian proposals were presented in the field of the exchange of scientists, specialists, cultural and sports representatives.

On 29 October 1983, during the session of the UN General Assembly in New York, a meeting between the foreign ministers of Bulgaria and PRC took place. On our request China had supported the candidacy of Bulgaria to host the UNESCO General Assembly in 1986. During 1984 the development of the relations between China and the Eastern European countries

was continuing. In the report by Zhao Ziyang before the annual session of NPC in May the conclusion was made that there was a “broad perspective for development of friendly relations between China and the socialist countries of Eastern Europe”.

During the 31<sup>st</sup> session of the UN General Assembly in New York in September the Chinese foreign minister was meeting his colleagues from Poland, Hungary, USSR and Bulgaria. China was putting in the center spot the development of economic ties. The amount of trade between China and the Eastern European countries including Bulgaria was increasing every year. During this year the ministers of foreign trade of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and the minister of chemical industry of the GDR all visited China, and the member of the State Council and minister of trade and economic cooperation of China Chen Muhua visited Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the GDR, and Bulgaria in September and signed protocols to create bilateral commissions for economic and scientific-technological cooperation.

During February the first deputy minister of foreign trade of Bulgaria P. Bashkarov went on a visit to China and during March the deputy minister of the Economic Commission of PRC Zhu Rongji was visiting Bulgaria as a head of the economic delegation. A protocol was signed to reconstruct with our help a factory for forklifts in Tianjin and also a wine factory in Qingdao. This marked the beginning of cooperation in manufacturing between the two countries, which was a new stage in the relations between them. In November 1984 Jiang Zemin, at that time minister of electronics industry visited Bulgaria, Poland, and the GDR. In May on a visit to Bulgaria was Wang Bingan, chairman of the Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries. During June the deputy foreign minister of China Qian Qichen was visiting Bulgaria as a guest of the Bulgarian foreign ministry.

In the autumn of 1984 the national holidays of both countries and the 35<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between Bulgaria and PRC were officially celebrated. The receptions at both embassies were attended by very high-level guests. Telegrams were exchanged at the highest level. A lot of articles were published in the media and there were also some movies shown. In Bulgaria the Group for Friendship with China was restored. Also a lot of initiative in the cultural, sports and other fields took place. In these fields high bilateral visits took place and also exchange letters of intent were signed. Some draft agreements were exchanged.

But even considering many initiatives in the above-mentioned areas and the increase of bilateral trade and scientific-technological cooperation

between PRC and Bulgaria, the scale of the ties between the two countries was modest compared to those between the PRC and the other Eastern European countries. The same conclusion was reached by the Bulgarian embassy in its annual reports for 1983 and 1984 and also by the foreign ministry in its analysis of the Chinese-Bulgarian relations. In its “differentiated approach” the Chinese leadership was considering Bulgaria as the closest ally to the USSR. Bulgaria on its side was considering very cautiously every Chinese and Bulgarian initiative from the point of view of the existing agreements between the countries of the Warsaw Pact and the Comecon for a unified stance on the “Chinese question”.

Some Eastern European countries developed much broader and deeper relations with PRC, and their trade with China grew very quickly and also new forms of economic and scientific-technological cooperation were established. The GDR and Poland established contacts on the party level too, although it was on a lower level. This gave the Chinese side reason to conclude that not China but actually the Eastern European countries were taking a “differentiated approach” to the development of the relations with PRC.

In 1985 and 1986 new levels were reached in the development of the relations between Eastern European states and China. The “small steps” stage had already passed; some high level visits were exchanged. Exchanges in the fields of trade, science and technology, culture, sports, and education were growing even faster. Between Bulgaria and China there were a lot of different initiatives in the development of bilateral relations. That gave an opportunity to consider that the “process of normalization of the ties between PRC and the People’s Republic of Bulgaria was entering into a new stage, conforming with the stage in the relations of the socialist community with PRC” (see the Annual Report of the Embassy for 1985).

For the first time in more than 25 years deputy premier Li Peng visited Bulgaria in the end of 1985 as the head of a big delegation. He was received by Todor Zhivkov and was holding talk with his counterpart Andrei Lukanov. A lot of concrete agreements were made, for the first time a long-term trade agreement was signed for the period of 1986–1990 and also an annual protocol for financial settlement and trade. Trade relations were put on a long-term planned basis. In November 1985 the chairman of the State Planning Committee of China Sun Ping visited Bulgaria. In October in New York a third meeting between the foreign ministers of the two countries took place.

In May the Bulgarian minister of industry [Ognian] Doinov was visiting back Jiang Zemin. He was received by the vice premiers Wan Li and Tian

Ziyun, held talks with ministers and provincial leaders and also opened a big representative exhibition of Bulgarian machinery in Beijing. In November, in time for the session of the bilateral commission for economic, scientific-technological and trade cooperation, the Bulgarian Minister of Foreign Trade Hristo Hristov signed a protocol of the session with concrete tasks, including the Bulgarian participation in six reconstruction projects in PRC. In the autumn Bulgarian deputy foreign minister L. Popov visited back Qian Qichen. A few Chinese and Bulgarian deputy ministers were visiting both countries.

Another major event is the visit to China of the Chairman of the Bulgarian Parliament [Stanko] Todorov. He was received on a very high level—by Peng Zhen and Li Peng. For the first time a meeting was held with the general secretary of the CPC Hu Yaoban. The relations between the two parliaments were reestablished. During the same year a series of visits of major scientists, artists, musicians, sportsmen and journalists took place.

In 1986 the further development of the Chinese-Bulgarian relations evolved into even deeper long-term trend. The scope of relations was broadened and contacts and exchange were deepened. The 13<sup>th</sup> congress of Bulgarian communist party expressed a readiness for normalization and further development of Sino-Bulgarian relations. There were positive changes also in the Chinese position toward major international affairs including approach toward USSR and the Eastern-European countries.

During the same year major steps were achieved in the field of the political relations. In September in New York there was a fourth meeting between the two foreign ministers. In October, by invitation from Li Peng, the first vice-premier of Bulgaria Andrei Lukanov made an official visit at the head of a major delegation, which included several ministers, deputy ministers and heads of trading companies. He was received by Li Xiannian and Yao Yilin and also held talks with Li Peng. The members of the delegation engaged in separate talks with their Chinese counterparts. Five documents in different fields were signed including trade, scientific-technological cooperation, education, and the reception in Bulgaria of young Chinese workers for professional education and work.

From the Chinese side the following high visits were realized: chairman of the State Economic Committee Liu Dun (April—a protocol on cooperation and development was signed), governor of Jiangsu Province Gu Xiulian (August—protocol on direct economic and trade cooperation between Bulgaria and Jiangsu was signed), minister of textile industry Wu Weining

(a protocol on cooperation and participation by China in the reconstruction of our textile factories and imports of textile factory equipment from PRC), minister of electronics industry Li Tiejun (September), minister of light industry Yang Ho and co-chairman of the bilateral commission for economic cooperation (December), Chinese parliamentary delegation, delegation of the Chinese labor unions and delegation of the ministry of air transport.

For the first time since the beginning of the Cultural Revolution, the Bulgarian ambassador, following a direction from the central committee of the Bulgarian communist party, visited the international department of the CPC central committee and met there with deputy chief of the department Li Shuzhen.

At the end of 1986 an agreement was reached that the Bulgarian party general secretary and chairman of the State Council Todor Zhivkov would visit China in the first quarter of 1987, upon an invitation from the acting general secretary of the CPC Zhao Ziyang and PRC president Li Xiannian. The Bulgarian side was also informed that in 1987 Zhao Ziyang would visit Bulgaria and several other Eastern European countries.

As a result of these developments, the Bulgarian Embassy in Beijing reached the conclusion that normalization of relations with PRC was a mutually beneficial and correct course. Another conclusion was that it was not realistic to think, at that point, that anyone in the world could apply policy from the position of strength towards China or isolate it internationally. The correct policy of the socialist countries was to normalize and develop mutual relations, increase contacts, attract China to joint action to build peace, socialism and security. Of course the officially announced Chinese policy at that time was still not in favor of joint, but only parallel actions in areas of similar or close positions.

In trying to rebuild bilateral party ties, the Embassy suggested that during the visit of Zhivkov in China it should be stated in an appropriate form by both sides that “the bilateral party ties should be revitalized,” without bringing up the questions how they had been broken, what were the differences and which of them still existed, who was exactly responsible and why this was the right time to reestablish them. It also suggested that some preliminary talks should be held between the international departments of both parties,

In 1986 there were also many cultural exchanges between the two countries. A cultural agreement and a plan for a five-year cultural cooperation were drafted and a five-year agreement in the area of high education was signed.

There was also an agreement on scientific cooperation signed between the academies of sciences of both countries.

In 1987 the Sino-Bulgarian relations were entering a new stage. Bilateral visits on the highest level took place. Relations between the parties were normalized. The links between the Parliaments, ministries of foreign affairs, labor unions, women's organizations continued their development. This means that by that time, probably all contacts except in the military and security areas had already been reestablished, but even in these two areas in 1987 the Chinese side was exploring the possibilities to establish contacts.

Of the 20 official visits in 1987, the most important was that by Zhivkov (3–10 May), who held meetings with Deng Xiaoping, Zhao Ziyang, Li Xian-nian, and Peng Zhen. An agreement on economic and scientific-technological cooperation until 2000, a consular convention, and a cultural agreement were signed. Zhao Ziyang visited Bulgaria in June, holding talks with Zhivkov and signing various bilateral agreements. In New York a 5<sup>th</sup> meeting between the ministers of foreign affairs took place in October.

In its annual report for 1987, the Embassy in Beijing underlined that in view of the internal political process in China especially the results of the 8<sup>th</sup> Congress of CPC held in October the same year, which paved the socialist way of development for China with the Marxist theory at its core, a “conclusion can be made that the objective factors are encouraging for the further deepening of cooperation between PRC and USSR and the Eastern European countries.” The Embassy concluded that “the positive evolution in the foreign policy of the Chinese leadership creates serious background for further cooperation with PRC in the world arena and for the resolution of some international questions.”

This is basically how the process of normalization of the relations between PRC and the Eastern European states took place in the 1980s. We together with most of the hosts and guests present today were following this process with great interest and satisfaction. Thank you for your attention.

*Westad:* Thank you very much, Ambassador Donchev. Zhang Baijia and I are aware that these two final sessions will necessarily spill over onto each other a bit in some of the topics, because they are dealing with parallel time periods. Our intention for the discussion is to focus this forum on the issues of the reforms and the mutual impact of reforms. The next forum will primarily be on the political and diplomatic normalization. But we are all aware that this will necessarily affect each other. With regard to the introductions we see no problems in having the introductions touching

on both topics. But for the discussion afterwards we would very much like to organize it so that we first deal with issues of reforms and restructuring broadly speaking, and then we will deal with political and diplomatic issues in next session. Ambassador Bai, please.

*Bai Shoumian:* I wish to thank the two moderators for giving me this opportunity to discuss the Chinese–Eastern European relations during the reforms. As the topic suggests, the reforms in China and those in Eastern European countries affected each other. The reforms should be discussed more. Therefore, I made some adjustment to my presentation to meet the requirement. Ambassador Donchev just discussed the Chinese–Bulgarian relations in detail. There are some other details. From the end of the 1970s to 1989, reforms were an important issue in both China and Eastern Europe. The issue involved not only these countries’ domestic politics but also a series of issues in these countries’ international relations. Some historical issues were also affected. In my presentation I will talk about my own understanding to these events.

China’s reforms began at the third plenum of the eleventh party congress in 1978, which decided to shift the work focus at home to economic construction. As we all know, the so-called reforms in both China and in Eastern Europe were to seek further development of national economy through changing the existing economic and political systems. In this sense, the reforms in Eastern European countries started as early as the 1940s. After World War II the Eastern European states were established by the Soviet Union and their economic and political systems were copies of the Soviet models. This socialist system in Eastern Europe initially made some contributions to these countries’ economic recovery and development.

But, very soon, because of different national conditions, some shortcomings of the system were exposed. Some countries began to seek modification of the Soviet model and to find a path of development more suitable to their national conditions. It can be recalled that in 1945, [Klement] Gottwald, leader of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, pointed out that the Soviet path to socialism was not the only path, and that there should also be other paths. Czechoslovakia wanted to construct socialism in its own way and, according to its conditions at the time, adopted a set of policies to lead the country to peace and democracy. But, because of the reform demands in Czechoslovakia, its leaders were persecuted and labeled as Titoists and nationalists, and even spies and secret agents. At the time some 70,000 party members were persecuted and the party’s secretary-general, [Rudolf]

Slánský, was executed. In 1948 Yugoslavia split with the Soviet Union also because it refused to copy the Soviet model.

Gomułka was persecuted in Poland also because he wanted Poland to have its own way to socialism. The Hungarian incident of 1956, in many aspects, took place also for ridding Hungary of the Soviet model. The discussion in this morning covered the events in Czechoslovakia in 1968. The Prague Spring launched by Dubček was a reform movement that had clear goals and rich content and contained creative solutions of the problems in domestic development. Unfortunately, this movement was brutally suppressed by the Soviet Union with direct military intervention. In the 1970s and 1980s, the Eastern European countries shared a belief that only through reforms of different kinds and degrees could they solve their economic and political crises caused by the Soviet model and control. Therefore, to certain extent, the postwar history of former socialist Eastern European countries, until the drastic changes in Eastern Europe [in 1989], was one of repeated search for reforms and repeated frustrations and defeats. The question of Eastern European reforms was directly connected to the drastic change of Eastern Europe. The Eastern European reform experiences suffered from the former Soviet Union's interference and restrictions. This is the first question.

Secondly, before the 1980s, that is, prior to the third plenum, China basically repudiated Eastern European countries' reforms, including the Czechoslovak incident, classifying them as revisionism and capitalism. We were opposed to the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, but we did not evaluate the significance of the Prague Spring as a reform movement. Actually, as a reform effort, the movement was very valuable.

Thirdly, after 1978, China began to reform and opened up. We paid close attention to reforms in Eastern European countries and began to inspect the experiences and lessons of these countries' reforms. First we had exchanges with and learned from Yugoslavia. Hungary was the next country whose experiences were important to us. We sent many inspection delegations to these countries. Our reforms were indeed implemented by considering some Eastern European countries' experiences and lessons. But, except for Yugoslavia, Eastern European countries' reforms were limited by the Soviet Union and remained under the Soviet shadow. They were restrained by the Soviet frame. Reforms in Eastern Europe had to maintain the same pace with the Soviet Union and be in concert with the interests of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance [Comecon]. Exactly for these reasons, Eastern

European reforms evolved under very unfavorable and difficult conditions and could not be free from restrictions. Their reforms developed differently.

In our view, Poland and Hungary were bolder and their reforms were more effective. East Germany and Czechoslovakia were confused and occasionally even resisted reforms. Bulgaria did not say much but did a lot, trying its best to avoid Soviet interference. When Zhivkov visited China, Deng Xiaoping said to him that “I knew you were also reforming, quietly.” In this period we and Eastern European countries exchanged many experiences and lessons from reforms. In June 1987, Zhao Ziyang visited Eastern Europe, and exchanges about reforms occupied a significant portion of his agenda. He made the point that reforms were the trend and direction of our time, and that every country should discard the old models, seek a development path suitable to the national conditions, and find a way out in reforms. All Eastern European countries supported and agreed with this view.

Fourthly, China’s reforms began in 1978 and this was later than those in Eastern Europe. But China had clear goals, and the determination, scale, and results of China’s reforms far surpassed Eastern Europe. Therefore China’s reforms had significant impact on Eastern European countries and caused tremendous interest there. In the 1980s many high-level and top leaders of Eastern Europe took the initiative to visit China. One of the major purposes of their visits was to learn about China’s reform and opening policies.

In July 1987 Zhivkov visited China. As he clearly stated in his memoir, aside from promoting the development of the two states’ general relationship, he had in his mind two specific goals for his visit in China. One was to turn over the old page of the bilateral relationship and have a new beginning; another was to observe first-hand China’s policies and experiences in reforms. He then could reexamine his own reform ideas and his views about the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. The visit verified some of his ideas. After returning to Bulgaria, he put forward his reform ideas at the party plenum in July 1987. This development was directly related to his visit in China and Zhao Ziyang’s June visit in Bulgaria, when the two sides exchanged opinions on reforms.

After 1978 and in the 1980s and 1990s, in a positive sense, China and Eastern Europe had mutual needs, learned from each other, and influenced each other. In this period China’s reforms did not cause any conflict of interest with the Eastern European countries. In the meantime, the reforms in the Eastern European countries began to cause contradictions and crises in

their economic, political, and organizational (i.e., the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance) relations with the Soviet Union.

At this time the Eastern European countries' misgivings about the Soviet Union became obvious and even intensified. These were especially directed toward the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, in which the Soviet Union advanced its own self-interest at others' expenses. The Eastern European countries complained a lot. For instance, without consulting the Eastern European countries, the Soviet Union decided to change the method of payments within the organization by using US dollars. This caused tremendous difficulties for Eastern European countries. The Soviet Union was also very sensitive to the exchanges about reforms between China and the Eastern European countries and even tried to apply pressure to limit such activities. As described in Zhivkov's memoir, after he visited China, Soviet leaders intentionally avoided him and did some tricks.

The last question. Prior to the drastic change in Eastern Europe, these countries had a widely shared concern about the reforms in the Soviet Union and about Gorbachev's policies. The rise of reforms in the Soviet Union caused an anxiety in Eastern Europe. Then, until 1989, these Eastern European countries successively saw drastic changes. The reforms after these changes are a different topic and I am not going to discuss it here.

*Westad:* Thank you very much, Ambassador Bai. We had two very useful introductions to this topic dealing with the Eastern European side. I thought it was particularly interesting to hear about the Bulgarian experience. I recall some of the discussions, of which we have records from Bulgarian archives, on the consultations that took place in 1950s between Bulgaria and China on development issues. The general conclusion was that the two countries had much to learn from each other. It is interesting to see how that was being played back in a much later era. Also very interesting and useful is Ambassador Bai's discussion of exactly how the relationship developed and who was in charge of the development of that relationship on the Chinese side. Now we will go to the discussion. As I said, before we start we would like to keep this part of the discussion on the mutual influence of reform and restructuring in Eastern Europe and in China. Then we will move to center on the political and diplomatic issues in the next session. Who would like to go first?

*Shen Zhihua:* The discussion of reforms in Eastern Europe reminds me of the Solidarity movement in Poland, which at the time had a very strong influence in China. But at that time I was undertaking my own reforms, "sailing

into the sea” and doing business. Therefore I have not done much research of the subject. My question is quite simple. How did our embassy in Poland and other Eastern European countries report the movement back to China? Since this movement continued for a while, was there any change of views on this issue [within the Chinese government]? During the process China was also carrying out reforms. Maybe Ambassador Liu can talk about this.

*Zhang Baijia:* Ambassador Liu, would you like to discuss this?

*Liu Yanshun:* I think that this may be discussed later in connection with the normalization of relations.

*Zhang Baijia:* Alright. Any other questions?

*Niu Jun:* I have some small questions for the two respected ambassadors. The first is for Ambassador Bai. You just mentioned that in the 1980s China began to learn from Eastern European reform experiences, first from Yugoslavia and then from Hungary. Exactly when did this begin, who made the decision, and why Yugoslavia was the focus at the beginning? Secondly, you talked about China’s evaluation of the Prague Spring in Czechoslovakia in 1968. I think that no evaluation was made in public. But was there or was there not an internal evaluation—not of the Soviet invasion but of the Prague Spring itself?

I am sorry I don’t know how to pronounce the Bulgarian ambassador’s name. You discussed very clearly the development of the Chinese–Bulgarian relations. My question is whether or not, from the Bulgarian perspective, the improvement of the Chinese–Bulgarian relationship was connected to China’s reform and opening. How did Bulgaria evaluate China’s internal conditions, not its foreign policies but its domestic situation? These are my questions.

*Zhang Baijia:* Ambassador Bai, please.

*Bai Shoumian:* The choice of Yugoslavia was decided by a historical condition. As we have already discussed, when our disagreement with the Soviet Union became public, we used Yugoslavia as a main target to repudiate the Soviet Union. This happened in the 1960s. Then, along with some international developments and readjustments of our own policies, our disagreement with the Soviet Union became public and intensified. We wanted to treat the Eastern European countries differently in order to concentrate strength in opposing Soviet revisionism. After the Czechoslovak incident, our relations with Romania and Yugoslavia changed and improved significantly.

When we began reforms, our view of Yugoslavia changed completely. After learning about the achievements of Yugoslavia’s market economy, we

realized that much could be learned there. Therefore, our relations with Yugoslavia developed rapidly not only on the basis of opposing Soviet social imperialism but also because of our needs in reforms. In addition, at the time, we had a good relationship with Romania but our relations with the other Eastern European countries could not provide much for reforms. There were many opportunities for exchanges and improvement in our relations with Yugoslavia. The center also strengthened its working relationship with Yugoslavia. Comrade Hu Yaobang visited Yugoslavia and significantly facilitated the improvement of the Chinese–Yugoslav relations. In political, economic, and even security aspects, we fully developed the relationship with Yugoslavia.

The second question is about the evaluation of the Prague Spring in Czechoslovakia. To my knowledge, not much was said. Even if any evaluation were made, it was inconvenient to endorse the reforms of the Prague Spring. Internally, the value and significance of the movement was discussed. But the issue did not affect our stand on the Soviet action in Czechoslovakia. Our stand was decided by the fact that the Soviets conducted military aggression in Czechoslovakia. This was not discussed much even internally.

*Zhang Baijia:* How was this discussed internally?

*Bai Shoumian:* I only knew the situation in the foreign ministry. The responsible branch was the Soviet–European Department. Those comrades in charge of Czechoslovakia treated the issue as a whole and believed that the Prague Spring had positive contents. We knew what was going on there. But no policy was formed. The situation was reported to the superiors. But endorse it? Such a condition did not exist at the time.

*Zhang Baijia:* Thank you.

*[There is no recording for the next 18 entries, and the text is based on the shorthand Chinese minutes]*

*Liu Qibao:* I have some comment on the inspections. The *People's Daily* also sent some people to participate in these inspections. Yugoslavia was the only independent Eastern European state. Our relations with Hungary were good and it did have a new system. So we went to these countries. As for the Prague Spring, according to a colleague of mine, they contacted us before the event and sought our support. But that was the time of the Cultural Revolution, the people at home had no time for this. In addition, the view at the time was that the Soviet Union was a big revisionism and Czechoslovakia was a small revisionism. Although the big revisionism should not

revise the small revisionism, this did not mean that we endorsed the Prague Spring. Certainly it was rejected.

I also want to add a point to this morning's discussion, about East Germany after the Nixon visit in the 1970s. Beginning with January 1972, East Germany hoped very much to improve relations with us. What was said in their newspapers differed from what they were doing. In 1976, my superior assigned me to maintain an unofficial contact with an East German official. We often met in the embassy and discussed all kinds of issues. At the time many Eastern European countries participated in [joint] seminars on China.<sup>8</sup> The purpose of these seminars was to coordinate their China policies. At these seminars, East Germany. . . [sic] The two of us also exchanged opinions about this.

In the early 1970s, East German leaders considered coming to Beijing when they visited Korea. Our side agreed, but then I was notified by my contact. . . [sic] Today the ambassador discussed how the environments of the Eastern European countries decided their policies. These policies did not reflect what those countries wanted. Those countries had different circumstances. In its circumstances East Germany could only have such a policy. When we established diplomatic relationship with West Germany in 1976, the development had a strong impact on East Germany. They wanted to develop relations with us but the Soviet Union did not allow them to do so. Therefore, they could only contact us through a third channel. Under the circumstance, our leaders were very considerate and our diplomacy was forthcoming. We made many special arrangements, including political and economic benefits.

As for the other Eastern European countries, in the mid- and late 1970s, we constantly conducted inspections. I was then the chief counselor at the embassy and I participated in a delegation headed by a policy study director of the State Planning Commission. The inspection continued for a half month. East Germany received us very warmly and provided detailed information. But, in our internal discussion, we held the view that among the Eastern European countries, only Yugoslavia and Hungary were undertaking genuine reforms and that the other countries' steps were too small. We wanted to make big strides. Tens of people, including some economic specialists, participated in the discussions at the embassy. Our delegation was huge

8 See records of these "Interkit" seminars on the PHP website, [http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/conferences/PreviousEvents/2004\\_beijing\\_docs.htm](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/conferences/PreviousEvents/2004_beijing_docs.htm).

and stayed there for a half month. In general, it was the East Germans who offered experiences. Their presentations were excellent, very concrete and detailed. But our leadership at home did not appreciate them, believing that they were still based on the Soviet model. In comparison with our economic system of the time, theirs already made significant changes and used market operations. Theirs was better than ours.

*Yu Sui:* This is a response to Professor Niu Jun's question. At the time we wrote an article about the Czechoslovakia incident. We considered how to evaluate the event in public. As I remember, we saw a positive and a negative aspect. Our article would support the positive aspect. In other words, as the Soviet Union used troops and other means to control Eastern European countries, the developments in Prague, Czechoslovakia, meant resistance to such control. At the time we did not recognize that the event was a rejection to the Soviet model. Our view at the time did not reach the depth of our studies done in later years. I myself wrote such a view later.

Actually, after World War II, the level of economic and democratic development of some Eastern European countries was higher than that of the Soviet Union. The Soviet model was imposed on them and constrained their development. Later, their resistance to the Soviet model was an attempt to restore their original economic and political achievements. But at the time we did not see this and only talked about the event from the angle of resisting control. In the positive sense, we supported their resistance to control.

But we also had a negative perspective. As comrade Liu Qibao just mentioned, the contradiction was seen as one between an old and new revisionism, meaning that [Czechoslovakia] was also undertaking revisionism. Therefore we would not take a stand or get involved in such a contradiction. Hence we supported resistance to control but did not talk about the Prague Spring. We did not have a profound understanding of its positive significance as we would have later.

*Donchev:* I know that Zhao Ziyang had a strong personal interest in Yugoslavia. He studied the reforms in Yugoslavia and carried out some industrial and agricultural reform experiments in Sichuan. He also paid attention to the reforms in Bulgaria. Before the Soviet Union began reforms, the Chinese leadership paid close attention to the Bulgarian views on reforms. During his visit to China, Zhivkov praised very much China's reform ideas. Some of his speeches at the Bulgarian party school were compiled into a book and, after translation, the book was published in China. Therefore at the time China and Bulgaria had mutual interests in each other's reforms and ideas.

Bulgaria sent many delegations to China to learn reform experiences, the special economic zones and contract system in agriculture, for instance. China also sent delegations to Bulgaria. All this happened before the reforms in the Soviet Union. Gorbachev [Zhivkov?] was not so lucky. He faced pressure from the Soviet Union, which did not want to go the Bulgarian reforms farther than its own. He was able to make some changes in the economic field but was unable to take big steps in the ideological field. This was one of the principal reasons for Zhivkov's downfall. He wanted to carry out genuine reforms, including political reforms, in Bulgaria. This was very difficult to do because then we still relied on the Soviet Union. I also want to say that Zhivkov was very interested in the way in which China implemented reforms.

*Westad:* Thank you very much.

*[Hershberg]:* A follow-up question to Ambassador Donchev. In the 1980s China's reforms in agriculture, special economic zones, and other areas achieved great success, but in the meantime the reforms in Eastern Europe became stagnant. Did China's achievements in the 1980s set a model for the state elites of the Eastern European countries? For instance, what was the influence of the [Chinese] communist government's view on market economy? Did the demonstration effect of the Chinese reforms help undermine faith in the Soviet Union and the socialist economy?

*[Luthi]:* We are discussing the mutual influence of reforms. I have a question for the Chinese ambassadors. In the mid-1980s, there were at least three Eastern European countries that refused to carry out reforms. These were Albania, Romania, and to certain degree East Germany. If China realized this, what political risks, in China's view, these countries were facing? How did China view this issue, for in the late 1970s China discovered that its political power could be maintained only through economic reforms?

*Westad:* Eastern European ambassadors, please answer these questions first.

*Juhász:* There were different reforms. On the road of reform two countries went the greatest distance. One was China and the other was Hungary. The Soviet Union constantly opposed reforms. No matter where you were, the Soviet Union would oppose you if you wanted to reform. They did not feel comfortable with China's reforms after 1979 and repudiated China for going capitalist. But this was done not only toward China but also toward other countries. This was obvious. Because of this special situation, our two countries began to cooperate [in reforms]. This was opposed by the Soviet

Union. But the process was not interrupted and continued. This was very important.

In 1979 a delegation of Chinese economists came, and in 1982 the delegation of the State Commission for Restructuring the Economic System under Zhao Ziyang came to Hungary. In 1983, the father of Hungarian reforms, [Rezső] Nyers visited China. There were many developments in later years, but I just want to mention that in 1987 Kádár came to visit China. This was a process. After 1985 the situation changed. Gorbachev came to power and as a result the Soviet attitude also changed. In my opinion, this subject of reform in the Chinese–Hungarian relations is a very important one..

*Westad:* Mr. Rowiński, please.

*Rowiński:* I have to say that the views presented by Ambassador Liu Qibao and Professor Yu Sui are new to me. How to understand the connection between the anti-revisionist struggle and reforms in Eastern Europe was the largest obstacle to our country's and party's reformers' understanding of China. This changed in the early 1980s. Here I am probably making a heretical point by saying that without reforms in China, the events in Eastern Europe would have been delayed for several years. Why?

As Ambassador Juhász said, in those years our reforms were constrained by certain limits. There was a line beyond which we could not go. Under the circumstance, not to say political reforms, even economic reforms were hard to implement. China did not have such a problem and you could carry out reforms at will. Nobody could tell you that this or that should not be done. Once you started reforms, the consequences immediately affected us. Without China's reforms, the reforms and changes in the Soviet Union would not have taken place. This is a fact. It was a tremendous help to us, without which we would not have been able to undertake such difficult reforms.

*[Passages in italics are from Mr. Rowiński's prepared written presentation.]*

*Starting from 1970, China took steps to check the regression caused by a drastic reduction of trade and economic cooperation with Central and East European countries, characteristic of the 1960s. These decisions were underpinned by political considerations and they also suited China's particular economic interests: access to markets for large quantities of textile and clothing articles and food and produce, lower and stable prices, room for long-term planning of capital investment orders, reconstruction of industrial factories built with Central and East European countries assistance. They also benefited the partners.*

*During the 1970s, trade picked up, as compared with the previous decade. Its level was closely linked to the political preferences. Throughout the decade, China's first partner was Romania, where the 1979 trade level almost equaled China's combined exchanges with Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and the GDR, and was twice as high as trade with the USSR. The exchanges with Yugoslavia rose from the 1970 level of \$1.9 million, to reach \$98.7 million. Compared to the 1959 level, the figures for trade with Czechoslovakia equaled 26.4% in 1969 and 130.3% in 1979; with the GDR, 30.5% and 170.1%, respectively; with Hungary, 23.1% and 174.1%; with Poland, 35.6% and 296.9%; with Romania, 113.2% and 1867.1%; and with Yugoslavia 1.7% and 815.7%. For the USSR, the respective percentages were 2.6% and 23.5%. China's trade with the whole Comecon area in 1970 accounted for 14% of the 1958 level, while in 1978 it was 71.1%. The Comecon's contribution to total Chinese trade ran at 16.6% in 1971 and 9% in 1979. While back in 1958, all socialist countries made up 73% of China's exchanges, the figure in 1969 was 20%, and in 1979, 12.9%.*

*Technical cooperation, suspended by China in 1967-68, was resumed over the 1971-1974 period with Hungary, Poland, the GDR, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia (in a limited degree). In relations with Yugoslavia it was established for the first time, in relations with Albania it was broken off in 1978, and in relations with the USSR it was not resumed. In the years 1972-73, China signed an agreement with Romania, Yugoslavia, and Albania opening a transcontinental southern air route linking Beijing, Belgrade, Bucharest, and Tirana. Shipping cooperation was being developed with Poland, Romania, and Bulgaria, and it was initiated with Yugoslavia. After several years' break, China returned to international trade fairs at Poznań, Leipzig, Zagreb, Budapest, Plovdiv and Brno—even if its presence there was irregular.*

*Westad:* Thank you very much. Any other Eastern European ambassadors?

*Budura:* Romania's policy was influenced by China in one aspect, namely, in not criticizing harshly other countries' domestic affairs. In this period that policy was very important. Romania did not criticize China's policy of reforms and opening, and China did not criticize Romania's relatively conservative attitude. This conservatism was limited to the question of reforms. When China began reforms, Romania remained conservative in domestic policies. But this did not affect the two countries' relations very much. This is the first point I want to make.

In 1967, the Romanian Communist Party held a meeting to deal with the question of reforms. At the time an important decision was adopted, which was to reform political and economic policies. This was a very important event. Because of this event, Romania sympathized with the developments in Czechoslovakia. The two countries maintained unity on the basis of not interfering with each other's sovereignty. We were sympathetic toward the reforms in Czechoslovakia. But, after the Prague Spring, Ceaușescu learned a lesson. Czechoslovakia's internal weakness had been the lack of political unity among its main leaders. This view led Ceaușescu to strengthen his power and influence at home. Consequently, he rejected the consensus on democratic reforms reached at the 1967 conference. This happened in the 1970s.

Then, in the early 1980s, Gorbachev's policy of opening and reforms deeply impressed Romanian leaders and people. At the time we believed that the Soviet Union could not be reformed by Gorbachev's policies. Ceaușescu firmly believed that he must oppose this kind of reform policies. I also want to mention that in 1978, after the CCP's third plenum of the eleventh congress, the vice president of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences led a delegation to Romania. I was among the people who welcomed the delegation. He praised the achievements of our economic reforms. But, in the early 1980s, because of the influence of Gorbachev, Ceaușescu believed that he should adopt a conservative domestic policy.

*Westad:* Thank you very much. You just mentioned some details and we may discuss them in a moment.

*Zhu Ankang:* I would like to add some information to what Ambassador Juhász just said. Why did we choose Yugoslavia as the first model for our reforms? Ambassador Bai already talked about the historical conditions, that is, the interstate relations. Yugoslavia and Hungary acted faster than others, and it would be easier to cooperate with them. Actually, our cooperation with Hungary began even earlier than that with Yugoslavia. But it was often limited by the Soviet Union. If we developed it too fast, the Soviet Union might become suspicious. This was one of the reasons. But later, through inspections we discovered that the Yugoslav system was different from ours. It was a federal and self-management system. It had private agriculture. These features were unsuitable to our national conditions. Therefore later we shifted attention to other Eastern European countries.

We inspected every Eastern European country and in the end we came to believe that the Hungarian model was more suitable to us. Hungary also

had a planned economy. At the time this was a very difficult question for us. The question was how to deal with commodities and market relations under a planned economic system. Hungary had solved the question relatively successfully and effectively. In 1987 Zhao Ziyong led a delegation and visited several countries. He paid close attention to this question and examined it in every Eastern European country. At the time I was in Hungary, the last country he visited. He felt that Hungary had a better approach and its conditions were closer to ours. Therefore the direction of our reforms should better use Hungary as the model. Of course it was not the only model.

I remember that Wen Jiabao accompanied Zhao in his visit in Hungary. At the conclusion of the visit, he told me specifically that Premier Zhao Ziyang attached great importance to the Hungarian experiences and hoped that the embassy could provide more information about Hungary's reforms. This was the situation at the time. Therefore, as Ambassador Juhász said, in this respect our cooperation was long and involved many activities. It can be said that initially China's reforms followed the Hungarian model. Later, of course, our reforms took big strides and surpassed Hungary in many aspects. In its later stage, the reform in Hungary could no longer make progress, and a different situation emerged.

*Westad:* Thank you very much.

*Yu Sui:* I want to make three points about the mutual influences between the Chinese and Eastern European reforms. First, the reforms in both China and Hungary were targeted at the Soviet model of planned economy. Of course there were also political reforms that went beyond planned economies. I am talking about the beginning. The reforms, though happening under different national conditions, inevitably had common grounds and these would lead to mutual study and support. This superseded ideology and improved interstate relations. This was the reason for a connection between reforms and interstate relations as mentioned by one of the ambassadors a moment ago.

Secondly, the Soviet Union was opposed to the Hungarian reforms and also to the Chinese reforms. It was of course more difficult for it to oppose China's reforms. The Soviet Union's leadership believed that these reforms constituted a revolution against it and a challenge to its authority. In the Soviets' words, this was rejection of socialism. Such pressure from the Soviet Union affected the Eastern European countries and to certain degree also China. The pressure had the effect of weakening and restraining the degree of mutual influence between China and Eastern Europe.

Thirdly, in the mid-1980s, a new generation of Soviet leaders had to take the road of reform for three reasons. The first reason was that in the age of science and technology, the Soviet Union was increasingly falling behind capitalist countries and the challenge became increasingly greater. The second reason was that the successful reforms in China and in some Eastern European countries taught the Soviet Union something. The third reason was that the new generation of leaders also began to recognize the shortcomings of the Soviet model. Influenced by these factors the Soviet Union embarked on a road of reform but failed. I will not discuss here the reasons for the failure.

*Westad:* Thank you very much. Our time is a bit tight because we want to take a longer break. Next we will ask our Eastern European friends to talk more because now we have more archival materials from the Eastern European side. I wish to know more about the situation in Eastern Europe and ask you to discuss it briefly. Then we will take a break. I know that Mr. Schröter wants to make some comments. Would you please wait till the next session? Excellent. Thank you very much. We ask our two presenters to make concluding remarks.

*Donchev:* I do not have more to say. The discussion is excellent and I learned a lot.

*Bai Shoumian:* This is a very important subject in the Chinese–Eastern European relations in the 1970 and 1980s and is also a very significant ongoing topic at present. Reforms in both China and in Eastern European countries are far from over. I believe that this issue will further evolve and additional and deeper perspectives will emerge.

*Westad:* Christian, would you talk about the situation on the Eastern European side?

*Ostermann:* I will talk about the archival declassification in Eastern Europe. In cooperation with Professor Mastny, in the past decade the Cold War International History Project (CWIHP) has been involved in the declassification of many Eastern European documents. This has been achieved through the CWIHP's collaboration with scholars in the countries involved. As mentioned during the discussion, we have obtained some documents, and if you wish, we can provide photocopies of these documents to you.<sup>9</sup> The past decade has seen a remarkable improvement of access to archives in Eastern Europe, access to new sources, in part in response to the pressure from civil

9 See the CWIHP website, [www.cwihp.si.edu](http://www.cwihp.si.edu).

society, in part because the governments realized that for their nations and their people to come to terms with the past, they need to open up files, open up archives. Centrally, there are four types of archives that we have been concerned with: party archives, government archives and particularly foreign ministry archives, military archives, and intelligence records.

The party archives by far contain the most interesting records which include the politburo records and, in terms of international history, the records of the central committees' departments for international relations. In most Eastern European countries these records are entirely open for the Cold War period from 1945 to 1989. Let me just give you a few samples of what they include. They include memoranda of conversations between Eastern European leaders and foreign counterparts, for example, Todor Zhivkov's conversations, including his conversations with Chinese leaders, which will be published in the next issue of the *Cold War International History Project Bulletin*, which I hope will be out next month.<sup>10</sup> They include many conversations, for example that between Eastern German leaders and Kim Il Sung, which will also be available in the next *Bulletin*.

The party files also often contain important government files, for example, foreign ministry or embassy cables. Many of the significant ones are accessible through the party files. They include, for example, Eastern German cable traffic during the martial law crisis in Poland in 1980 and 1981. They include a full set of the Hungarian embassy reports from Pyongyang in the 1950s and the 1960s, which give us wonderful insights into North Korea. They include of course transcripts of politburo discussions, especially in the late years of 1970s and 80s. Some of the discussions of the politburo were taped and have been transcribed, such as in the case of Hungary. The party records also include policy papers and analyses, for example, Eastern German policy analyses of the Reagan administration's new policies, including information memoranda supplied by the Soviets. Often we have the original Soviet documents in Russian language in these files. That is the case, for example, for some of the documents related to the 1969 border clashes. They also have been published in the *Cold War International History Project Bulletin* a few years ago and are available to you.<sup>11</sup> The party records are by far the most important and the most accessible.

10 For the electronic version, see <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/CWIHP/BULLETINS/b8-9toc.htm>.

11 Christian Ostermann, "East German Documents on the Sino-Soviet Border Conflict, 1969," <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/CWIHP/BULLETINS/b6-7a13.htm>.

Access to government records is quite good in Eastern Europe. Many of the governments decided to follow roughly the Western European or American standards by declassifying or making accessible documents over 25 or 30 years old. But in many cases this policy is handled flexibly and you can get access to files for the 1970s or 80s as well. This includes of course foreign ministry files, cables, drafts of cables, memoranda of conversations, notes of internal foreign ministry committee discussions and so forth.

Third, the military files. Here the situation is admittedly less even. A good number of records have been declassified and become available. But many of the key documents, key subjects are still missing, including some of the war plans of the Warsaw Pact. The PHP has done a service to us all, obtaining some of them, including the 1964 war plan found by a Czech researcher in the Czech archives.<sup>12</sup> Thanks to the PHP, we also have fairly full sets of transcripts and documents relating to key consultative meetings of the Warsaw Pact,<sup>13</sup> attendees of [some of] these meetings having been foreign ministers. These are accessible to various degrees in Eastern European archives.

Fourth, intelligence files. Here, too, the situation is uneven. The most open archives in this respect are the archives of the former Eastern German intelligence agency, the Stasi. Much of the foreign intelligence files were destroyed in 1989 and 1990. Yet a certain amount of material survived. Mr. Schaefer has done quite a bit of research in these files and has unearthed, for example, East German intelligence files on NATO planning and discussions.<sup>14</sup> I talked to Military Attaché Schröter, who has been unable to find some of his reports he mentioned here, that he had sent home. But these may be in the intelligence files. A particular problem has been the files relating to unofficial informants that have been in East Germany as well as in other Eastern European countries. It is a painful history, but one that has worked in the end to the advantage of all countries working their way through these experiences.

12 See the collection "Taking Lyon on the Ninth Day? The 1964 Warsaw Pact Plan for Nuclear War in Europe and Related Documents," with introduction by Petr Lužák, on the PHP website, [http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/collections/coll\\_1.htm](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/collections/coll_1.htm).

13 See the collection "Records of the Warsaw Pact Committees" on the PHP website, [http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/collections/coll\\_3\\_overview.htm](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/collections/coll_3_overview.htm).

14 See the collection "Stasi Intelligence on NATO" on the PHP website, [http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/collections/coll\\_17.htm](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/collections/coll_17.htm).

Let me just in summary say that there is an unprecedented degree of access in Eastern European countries to documents on the Cold War in Asia, on Chinese policy, going well beyond access to the Soviet archives. In a way this has fueled the research and writing of the Cold War history in favor of the Eastern European perspective. The history of Russian or Chinese policies has been written in part from Eastern European documents, almost only. Only the further release of Chinese and Russian documents can improve the situation, which is unsatisfactory and one that we all would like to see redressed. Let me point out that the Cold War [International History] Project, in partnership with GWU [George Washington University], organized the conference, which Vojtech mentioned at the beginning, last October on Eastern European archival materials on the Cold War in Asia.<sup>15</sup> Many of the materials are related to the subjects we discussed in this conference. We will publish them as a special issue of the bulletin. Please touch base with me, and I will be happy to make sure that you can get a copy of these files.

*Westad*: Thank you very much. That is very helpful. You are ready for a break, more than ready for a break in my case.

*Juhász*: Either now or some time later, can we obtain some short information about the declassification on the Chinese side?

*Westad*: Yes, I think that is a fair question. We don't have time to go into that in this session. But perhaps in next session we can set a little bit time to deal with that as well. Thank you all very much. Thank you, the presenters Ambassador Bai and Ambassador Donchev. It has been a very useful session. We will all have a break, in my case with plentiful supply of coffee. Thank you very much.

\* \* \*End of Session Six \* \* \*

15 For the program of the conference, see <http://www.gwu.edu/~ieresgwu/Workshop.html>.

## Session Seven: The Road to Normalization in Chinese–Eastern European Relations, 1976–1989

(4:00–5:45, March, 25)

*Zhang Baijia*: Now let's begin our last session. Because the bilateral dialogs among us have become increasing lively, our multilateral conference has been weakened somewhat. Before we begin the next session, we'll ask Professor Mastny to give a talk.

*Mastny*: I would like to just complement very briefly what Christian Ostermann said about Eastern European archives and share with you some of the experience that PHP has had after we have started the research dealing with history of the Warsaw Pact. I think what will be particularly important to know for the Chinese scholars is that one can use these Eastern European materials extensively to substitute for documents that are in Moscow but are not accessible there. The archives of the defense ministry in Moscow are practically inaccessible. But given the nature of the Warsaw Pact, evidence of much of what was going on within the Warsaw Pact can be found in Eastern Europe, with the notable exception of the war plans, the operational planning, which was done in the Soviet general staff. But again, to some extent we can substitute by using records of military exercises that are available in Eastern European archives.

Many of the documents are on the PHP website.<sup>16</sup> They are from different Eastern European archives, in particular, records of the political consultative committee where Chinese issues were discussed extensively, especially in the 1960s and 1970s, meetings of the committee of the defense ministers, which are also on the website, and meetings of the committee of the foreign ministers.<sup>17</sup> What is important in addition, which is not yet on the website, are meetings of the committee of deputy ministers of foreign affairs, which

16 See, in particular, the collection, "European Cities Targeted for Nuclear Destruction: Hungarian Documents on the Soviet Bloc War Plans, 1956–71," [http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/collections/coll\\_4.htm](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/collections/coll_4.htm).

17 See the collection "Records of the Warsaw Pact Committees," [http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/collections/coll\\_3\\_overview.htm](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/collections/coll_3_overview.htm).

were meetings where policy preparation was taking place. So, in many ways these are, from the historical point of view, more useful even than the meetings of the foreign ministers. This is to complement what Christian Ostermann was saying.

I would invite you to periodically look at the website because we are constantly adding documents from the archives. They are published in facsimile, not always in translation but in the original. We are adding translations as we are able to get money for translations. What is on the website can substitute for research in the archives, at least for the most important documents.

*Hershberg:* Could I just add to that? In addition to being able to use Eastern European archives to gain material on the Chinese–Soviet split, it is very possible to use the archives of many former Soviet republics, for instance the Baltic republics, Ukraine, and even some of the Russian regional archives. To take one example, we have obtained from the archives in Khabarovsk the record of the September 1969 meeting between Kosygin and Zhou Enlai. This is just to add to the point that Christian made, which is that all these materials reflect the Soviet point of view in the Soviet–Chinese relations, and this is why we need also the Chinese archives.

*Westad:* Just one sentence to follow up on that. I do not want to leave anyone here with an impression that the Russian archives are inaccessible. There is a great deal of work that can be done in the Russian archives at this moment on the Sino–Soviet relations all the way up to the 1970s. Someone who is here and has recent experience working in those archives is Sergey Radchenko. He is sitting over there. If anyone of you wants to know more about what kind of materials are available in Russia, particularly in the foreign ministry archives and those in the party archives on China. These are some of the most significant materials. They have gone through a true scale of declassification and there are some very important materials available there. I would recommend that you have a chat with Sergey.

*Zhang Bijia:* Now we begin the presentation and discussion of the seventh subject, the normalization of the Chinese–Eastern European relations. This subject is actually connected with the last one. We have one and a half hour for this session. Ambassador Liu Yanshun will make the first presentation.

*Liu Yanshun:* The topic of my talk is the normalization of Chinese–Eastern European relations. First I will briefly review the process of normalization, then I will discuss some special features of Eastern Europe and China's poli-

cies, thirdly I will talk about the preconditions for the normalization, and finally I will draw some conclusions from the normalization process.

Many colleagues and friends before me already made very good presentations about the Chinese–Eastern European relations. They presented many vivid examples. I will just review these relations briefly. After World War II, eight socialist countries appeared in Eastern Europe. China’s relations with these countries changed along with the changes of the larger international climate, especially the changes in the Sino–Soviet relationship. There were ups and downs in the relations and they went from warm to cold and then from cold to warm again.

Beginning with the mid-1950s, in terms of interstate relations, four situations existed. The first was the Chinese–Albanian relationship which, according to Ambassador Fan’s vivid presentation, went through four seasons. I will not say more about this. The second was the Chinese–Yugoslav relationship which changed from bad to good and the two countries changed from enemies to friends. There is no need for me to say more because Ambassador Chen already discussed this issue in detail. The third was the Chinese–Romanian relationship that did not go through a so-called normalization because the relationship was always good. In the late 1950s, although this relationship was affected by the deterioration of the Sino–Soviet relations, this was very brief and the relationship returned to the normal track very soon. Therefore, the issue of normalization did not exist in the Chinese–Romanian relationship. The fourth situation was the relations between China and Poland, GDR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Bulgaria. These five countries had some commonalities. China’s relations with them went through the process of normalization. Thus, there were three kinds of normalization: Albania, from good to bad, then to normalization; Yugoslavia, from bad to good and normalization; the five Eastern European countries’ normalization.

The Eastern European countries had some basic features and China had some basic policies. Briefly, the Eastern European countries, excluding Albania, Yugoslavia, and Romania, relied on the Soviet Union politically and militarily. They were members of the “big family,” or allies and partners of the Soviet Union, and were under Soviet control. In the cold war between China and the Soviet Union, they stood on the Soviet side, disagreed with China’s views and policies, and publicly opposed and attacked China. Yet, these countries did not form a monolith with the Soviet Union and had their own state and national interests. Their relations with the Soviet Union were unequal. To a certain degree, aside from reasons of their own, they joined

the Soviet Union in opposing China under pressure. Hence, their relations with China always had two sides. Their attitudes toward China followed the Soviets', but they also differed from the Soviets. This is my simple view of the common features of these Eastern European countries.

From the mid-1950s, we adopted a series of correct policies toward the Eastern European countries. First, interstate relations must be based on the five principles of peaceful coexistence. We know that these principles were first raised by the two premiers of China and India. Initially these were understood as principles for states of different systems. But, after the Polish and Hungarian incidents in 1956, China considered the positive and negative experiences from the relations among socialist countries and decided that these principles should also be applied to countries of similar systems, including the interstate relations among socialist countries.

This position was first expressed in the Chinese government's statement of November 1, 1956, in response to the Soviet proclamation of October 1, 1956. This was the first time that these principles were included in a formal document and were used to guide the relations among socialist countries. This was a pioneering step taken by China. From then on, no matter how bitter the ideological disputes were between China and the Eastern European countries, China always upheld these principles in interstate relations and pursued peaceful coexistence with the Eastern European countries. China believed that ideological differences should not affect interstate relations. This topic has been discussed by many colleagues here.

China fully understood the environments of the Eastern European countries and adopted a differentiated approach in working with them. In discussing international disputes, Chairman Mao once said two things, which were quoted in newspapers. One was, *chailang dangdao, an wen holi* ("when the wolf is rampant, why pick on the fox?"). The other was, *qin zei xian qin wang* ("to catch brigands, first catch their king"). What did he mean? He meant that China should ignore the anti-Chinese words and articles of the Eastern European countries and focus its struggle on the Soviet Union.

China did not believe that there were any fundamental conflict of interest between it and Eastern European countries. The Eastern European countries were under Soviet pressure and had no choice but openly opposing China. This was an objective fact. It decided that there was much room for maneuvering between China and the Eastern European countries. In different historical moments and over different issues both sides indicated desire for preserving, improving, and developing bilateral relations.

Here is an example. In 1964, the Sino–Soviet polemics heated up. The Chinese side issued its ninth commentary and Khrushchev was about to fall from power. At this moment the Polish government offered help to the Chinese government in rescuing nine comrades in Brazil who had been arrested by the new Brazilian regime after a coup. The Polish government took the action on its own initiative. At the time I was in Warsaw. At night I accompanied the leader of our embassy and knocked on the door of the Polish foreign ministry. The Polish foreign ministry obtained intelligence information in Brazil and called us for an urgent meeting. It was middle of the night, around 11 o'clock or midnight.

The two sides' relationship could be seen from this episode. The Polish side took the initiative to offer assistance in rescuing our comrades. This was a moment when the Sino–Soviet disputes were most intense and Khrushchev was most desperate before he lost power. Both the Chinese and the Polish sides hoped to maintain and protect their relationship. For this episode, we on the Chinese side highly praised Poland. After our comrades had been rescued, foreign minister and Vice Premier Chen Yi wrote a letter to the Polish foreign minister to express gratitude.

Now let me turn to the preconditions for normalization between China and the Eastern European countries. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the Chinese–Eastern European relations entered a new stage. Conditions for normalization became mature. Many factors facilitated such a development. This was a result of the changed situation in the world, readjustments in Chinese and Soviet foreign policies, changed Sino–Soviet relations, and changed relations between the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries. At this time the economies in Eastern European countries were caught in different degrees in stagnation or low-speed growth. In some countries, such as Poland, long economic and political crises broke out. In the 1980s, the economic distance between Eastern Europe and the West was enlarged and their rigid systems and stagnant economies clearly exposed many problems. These conditions forced Eastern European countries to seek new solutions. Thus a new wave of reforms happened in Eastern Europe.

This was not the first time, but the third time, when Eastern Europe tried to get rid of the Soviet model. In my view, in postwar Eastern Europe two views always existed and engaged in a struggle. One view or theory was that socialism in Eastern Europe should be constructed according to the Soviet model. Another view was that the Eastern European countries must consider their own national conditions and find a way of development suit-

able to themselves by combining the general truth of Marxism with Eastern European conditions. One theory was that of transplantation, and the other was that of combination. In 1947 and 1948, the idea was raised in Poland and Czechoslovakia that they should find their own way of constructing socialism. In the 1970s the new reforms were also intended to find a way for Eastern Europe, suitable to its conditions. In the 1980s the same effort was made again.

In the 1980s, it was generally accepted among the Eastern European countries that socialist construction must not copy the Soviet model, and that every country must conduct new and bold exploration according to its own national conditions. "New and bold exploration" were the words of an Eastern European leader. In international relations, aside from bloc interests, each country had to consider its national interests as well. Such a change in Eastern Europe happened to coincide with China's reforms. They supported each other and learned from each other. The idea in Eastern Europe about the stages of socialist development and models of socialist constructions agreed with or was similar to China's. This reduced the ideological disagreements between the two sides and also provided a theoretical and cognitive basis for a new type of socialist state relationship between the two sides. Thus the changes in Eastern European countries affected interstate relations.

Then the Soviet Union also changed. Clearly, after Gorbachev rose to power, the Soviet Union loosened its control of the Eastern European countries. At its 27<sup>th</sup> congress, the Soviet Communist Party recognized that socialism could be constructed in different ways in different countries. Gorbachev said that the relations with the Eastern European countries should be handled with a new attitude. The so-called new attitude meant that in international affairs the Soviet Union still wanted to macro-manage the Eastern European countries and stress conformity and common action, but it was prepared to tolerate some different domestic policies in Eastern European countries and to allow pluralism to exist. Such a change in the Soviet Union reflected Eastern European countries' demands for reforms and was beneficial to their search for paths toward their national growth. This pushed reforms in the Eastern European countries as well.

The Soviet Union also changed its attitude toward China. In March 1982, Brezhnev made a speech in Tashkent, sending out the first signal for improving relations with China. Afterwards talks began between special envoys of the two sides for the purpose of removing obstacles to their normal relations. The economic and scientific and technological cooperation

between the two sides began to develop. In March 1985, Gorbachev rose to power and he speeded up improvement in the relations between the two countries. In 1986, Gorbachev expressed in public his willingness to establish a good neighbor relationship with China. The Soviet factor used to be the basic constraint on Eastern European countries' relations with China. Now the constraint was removed by Soviet action and willingness to improve relations with China.

Also relevant was China's foreign policy readjustment. On October 6, 1976, the Gang of Four was destroyed in China. After two years of hesitation, the CCP held the third plenum of the eleventh congress in December 1978, which refocused the party's work on economic construction and laid the ideological basis for China's search for a unique socialist road and for China's foreign policy readjustment. Deng Xiaoping later said that in 1978, while deciding a domestic orientation for economic construction, the party also adopted a new policy for developing relations with the Eastern European countries. In the summer of 1982, Deng Xiaoping proposed that an important step should be made to send signals to the Soviet Union and rapid improvement of the Sino-Soviet relations should be achieved.

In the meantime, China speeded up readjustment of policies toward the five Eastern European countries. The readjustment involved the following principles. First, it was recognized that the Eastern European countries were socialist countries. In the past, the disputes interrupted inter-party relations and China stopped recognizing the Eastern European countries as socialist countries. This was a very big problem. The key was for China to recognize the Eastern European countries as socialist countries. The means to do so was first sending a telegram to Hungary, congratulating it on its national day. In this telegram of 1983, China congratulated Hungary on its achievements in socialist construction. This friendly wording admitted that Hungary was constructing socialism, and, naturally, this was tantamount to recognition that the other Eastern European countries were also constructing socialism.

Secondly, we viewed the Eastern European countries as victims of hegemony. In the past, we identified the Eastern European countries with the Soviet Union. Although we knew that they were victimized [by the Soviet Union], the open recognition of them as victims was made only after reforms and opening. Thirdly, the Eastern European countries were classified as developing countries. And, lastly, the Eastern European countries were identified as part of the force for peace.

When these perceptions were adopted, China established an orientation of “three respects” toward Eastern European countries. First was the respect for their domestic and foreign policies based on their own national conditions. Second was the respect for their special relations with the Soviet Union that were formed in history. And third was the respect for their ideas and means in developing relations with China. These were important guiding principles in China’s readjustment of relations with the Eastern European countries. China stressed the commonalities between itself and the Eastern European countries. These included, in their relations, traditional friendship, absence of fundamental interest conflict, central interest in domestic construction, effort in promoting world peace, and hope for developing mutual relations.

This policy readjustment was reflected in some official documents. In June 1983, the report by the premier to the National People’s Congress indicated that the Chinese people harbored friendly feelings toward the Eastern European peoples, that we cared about their achievements and experiences in socialist construction, that in recent years the economic, cultural, and athletic exchanges between China and the Eastern European countries had increased, and that the two sides’ relations could be further improved through common efforts.

Next, I will talk about the normalization of state relations. Normalization of the Chinese–Eastern European relationships differed from that of the Sino–Soviet relationship, for there was no fundamental conflict of interest between China and the Eastern European countries. Therefore, in these bilateral relations there were no basic obstacles to remove. Normalization of the Sino–Soviet relationship went through long and difficult negotiations whereas normalization between China and the Eastern European countries warmed up gradually and succeeded when conditions were ripe.

Ambassadors Juhász and Donchev already discussed in detail how their countries’ relations with China were improved step by step. The normalization was marked by two visits. In September 1986, [Wojciech] Jaruzelski visited China, and in October [Erich] Honecker also came. Their visits completed the restoration of inter-party relations between China and the Eastern European countries and also a full-scale normalization of interstate relations. When reviewing history, we are doing so not just for the sake of history. We want to use the experiences from the past for the future. We want to learn historical lessons from the past in order to develop a better relationship between China and the Eastern European countries.

In this regard, I have four propositions. The first is that the five principles for peaceful coexistence are the best way to deal with interstate relations. After the normalization of the Chinese–Eastern European relations, two types of relations emerged among socialist countries. One was the family relationship between the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries, and another was the new type of interstate relationship between China and the Eastern European countries based on the five principles. This kind of new relationship will not be affected by ideologies and social systems, is very vigorous, and therefore can stand the test of time.

The second is that states must respect each other. The third is that states should seek commonalities and reserve differences. When Jaruzelski visited China, he said that he liked common language and that the principle of seeking commonalities and reserving differences was correct. Currently in our cooperative relations both sides are willing to strengthen the common grounds between us, those things that can connect us. We should forget those secondary and unimportant matters and just remember those important, beneficial, and beautiful matters. The fourth is that the interstate and inter-party relations should not be mixed together.

If I may, I want to mention a concrete example to show how China correctly implemented this principle. In December 1970, when the Polish incident took place, the *People's Daily* published an article, “The Revolutionary Storm of the Polish People.” The Polish side reacted to it very strongly and protested to us internally. This reflected the [ideological] disputes on the surface. In reality, we strictly followed the policy of not interfering with Poland’s internal affairs and rigorously separating ideological differences from interstate relations.

At the time I was in the embassy in Poland. I remember a directive from China that set a principle of “seven not-to-do” for our comrades in Poland. At the time there were three Chinese ships at the Polish ports. As we all know, Chinese sailors also participated actively in the Cultural Revolution. But during the Polish incident, the “seven not-to-do” regulation was issued to them: not to leave the ships, not to hold demonstrations, not to post posters, not to use radio transmitters on the ships, not to lend out guns on the ships, not to allow foreigners to board the ships, and not to accept Polish refugees. These strict regulations indicated that we did not interfere in Poland’s internal affairs. In terms of the disputes, our December article took a stand, but in terms of action, we set strict limits. Such a clear distinction facilitated the

development of interstate relations. This is a wise policy. If such a distinction does not exist, interstate relations will be damaged.

*Zhang Baijia:* Ambassador Liu discussed in great detail China's policy changes and normalization of relations. In this session we only have one presenter. Now questions may be asked.

*Hershberg:* I enjoyed Ambassador Liu's presentation very much, although I would also like to hear his response to the question posed in the last session about the Chinese embassy's perception of the Solidarity crisis in Poland in 1980–81. My own question for this session is about an impediment problem to normalizing Chinese–Eastern European relations from the mid-70s to the late 80s, even though the ambassador has emphasized that it was easier to normalize the relations between them than between China and the Soviet Union.

During this period, China and the Eastern European countries were on the opposite sides of several very intense rivalries in Third World. To take three examples, in Angola, Cambodia, and Afghanistan during this period, the Chinese and Eastern Europeans supported opposite sides, quite actively. I just give one example from an East German document from 1982, which Christian Ostermann will publish in the Cold War Project bulletin soon. It is actually a copy of a document given to East Germans by the Soviets about the role of China in supporting the mujaheddin in Afghanistan against the government in Kabul. It blames the Chinese policy on great power hegemonic ambitions of Mao and also says that China wanted to recapture Wakhan Corridor from Afghanistan. So I am wondering how both the Eastern Europeans and the Chinese perceived their rivalries in the Third World during this period and whether there were serious problems in their relations?

*Chen Jian:* In connection with Hershberg's last question, I have two questions, one for Eastern European ambassadors and another for Chinese ambassadors. In the 1970s and especially in the 1980s, China's relations with Eastern European countries began to improve. According to Ambassador Liu's presentation, there were no serious obstacles in the process. But there is a big theoretical question. At the time China upheld the three-world theory and classified the Eastern European countries as part of the second world along with the capitalist countries of Western Europe. How would our Eastern European ambassadors see this question? The improvement of the Sino–Soviet relationship already involved a theoretical question and the Eastern European countries were the next in the line. This is my question for the Eastern European ambassadors.

My next question for the Chinese ambassadors is also related to this. In my view, after the 1970s, to a significant degree the situation of reforms and opening and the diplomatic channel were pioneered by Chairman Mao. Without the step toward relaxation of the Sino–American relationship, Deng Xiaoping’s policy of reforms and opening would have faced with many diplomatic problems and difficulties, especially in dealing with relations with the Eastern European countries. This is my feeling about the diplomacy in the 1970s and the 1980s.

The first world was very important because it involved a strategic issue. The Third World was our focus. At the time, in the three-world theory the second world did not have the strategic importance as the first world nor the theoretical significance of the Third World. Relatively speaking, the second world was not very important. Furthermore, in the second world the capitalist countries were given greater importance than the socialist countries. From your perspectives, as China’s ambassadors and diplomats in Eastern Europe, how should this issue be dealt with? Did you feel at the time that China’s relations with these Eastern European countries were not decided by the importance of these countries themselves but were conditioned by the bigger frame?

*Radchenko:* I have a question to Eastern European ambassadors. I am wondering how the Tiananmen event of 1989 was perceived in Eastern Europe, by Eastern European leaders, and in particular by those who were stationed in Beijing at the time. How did you report the events to Eastern Europe and did you receive any instructions?

*Zhang Baijia:* We have already got many questions. Ambassador Fan, please.

*Fan Chengzuo:* Your question is clearer. I would like to comment on a few issues. In the past my work involved the second world, as Professor Chen Jian asked. We did not treat the Eastern European countries uniformly but treated them case by case. Eastern Europe as a region was not viewed as part of the second world. The friendly Yugoslavia and Romania, and even the unfriendly Albania, belonged to the Third World. The first world was hostile toward us and the Third World was friendly to us. Neither hostile nor friendly was the large area of Europe. The second world also included Canada and Australia. Therefore the Eastern European countries were not treated uniformly.

As for normalization, the central issue of this afternoon’s discussion, we need to ask the meaning of “normal.” Now most of these countries have

normal relations with us, and some still have abnormal relations with us because of certain special reasons. In my view, a relation is not normal if it involves sudden rises and sudden falls. As for our relations with the Eastern European countries, if in the past we had always followed the principles described by several colleagues and, especially, had not interfered with each other, sought commonalities and reserved differences, and not used ideology as the criterion, then the relations would always have been normal. For we indeed did not have fundamental conflicts of interest with them. But then why did abnormal relations happen? In the Chinese–Albanian relationship, it was abnormal when this was excessively warm. Later it turned cold and became almost hostile. Of course this was not normal either.

The excessively warm period, I feel deeply, could hardly endure. Sometimes our Albanian friends had too big an appetite for Chinese assistance. For instance, once they asked for 500 tanks, 200 airplanes, and also missiles. Premier Zhou asked them, “What is the use for wanting so many?” Balluku said: “We will put the tanks along the Adriatic Sea to build a wall of steel to prevent the enemy’s landing.” This was inconceivable. If the enemy really wanted to land there, could you stop him with 500 tanks? Premier Zhou firmly told him, “I tell you this as your friend. First, we do not have so many weapons to give you. Secondly, the idea of resisting the enemy outside the gate of the state cannot work. What would you do next after you have spent all these weapons?” Thirdly, Premier Zhou patiently tried to convince Balluku that we did not believe that the Soviet Union or the United States, or the Warsaw Pact or NATO, would want to launch a large-scale invasion of your country.

The Albanian side told us that they got intelligence information. Our colleagues here may recall whether or not such intelligence existed. Premier Zhou did not believe it. In the winter of 1972 Balluku came and said that they had reliable information about the Warsaw Pact’s and NATO’s intentions to occupy Albania ahead of the other. Therefore they needed such large amount of military assistance. Premier Zhou said: “Why did our PLA not have such information?” He asked the marshals and a general present, and all of them shook their heads. Premier Zhou said: “Could it be true that our military is useless?” This phenomenon was abnormal.

The same situation existed in economic assistance. A lot was wasted. But it could not be said, and they wanted a lot, the more the better. Premier Zhou said: “How can you digest so much if we give you everything you ask for?” Later, it proved that many of these weapons were stored in caves.

After water leaked into these caves, heavy weapons became rusted and could not be moved out. Many factories provided by China were also idle. We in China understand this very well. Comrades and gentlemen, what a difficult situation we now have in reforming the old industrial base in the Northeast! No wonder that many industries in Albania later became paralyzed. Nowadays their economic development cannot rely on what that they got in those years.

What relations are normal? Later Albanians interfered with China too much. In November 1964, they told us that Premier Zhou or other Chinese leaders must not go to Moscow. But, as I remember, they said one thing pretty well, that is, after Khrushchev's fall from power, Brezhnev followed Khrushchevism without Khrushchev. In this matter Albania made an accurate prediction. In 1965 and 1969, Zhou Enlai met with Kosygin, but Albania said that this should not be done. Later when Kissinger and Nixon came, the matter was for Albanians no longer one of general suitability, but of opportunism. Hoxha wrote a letter to Mao Zedong and the CCP Central Committee that made Chairman Mao very mad: "Albania called me a revisionist!"

When Balluku came to visit, Mao refused to see him. Zhou Enlai talked to him twice and Ye Jianying talked to him three times. But Balluku was also pitiful. He was only carrying a policy of his superiors. I can tell you this because I was then the interpreter and knew how difficult his situation was. In the meeting he read from a prepared text. I knew that Balluku was quite eloquent and logical. It could be easily recognized that the text was provided to him by his superiors. It included many foreign words mixing together with Albanian, and it was very difficult to read. Obviously its language belonged to the top leader. I did not know French, and therefore I realized this once I listened to the text. After the reading, Zhou Enlai immediately rejected the text. Balluku could not say a word and only nodded his head. I am sorry to say that when Balluku returned to Albania, he was finished. Allegedly, Balluku surrendered to the pressure of Zhou Enlai's revisionism. Later he was executed. The whole military delegation, Balluku the defense minister, the army chief of staff, the chief of the army political department, and some generals, were all arrested, and some were executed.

Albania declared that the revisionist line of the Balluku anti-party clique was connected to a remote place. The remote place was of course not Poland, or East Germany, or even the Soviet Union, none of which could be reached. The remote connection could only apply to China. This was a tragedy. The relationship was abnormal whether it was too warm or too cold. A too warm

or too cold relationship would not be beneficial to oneself and could be harmful to others. This was a very painful self-inflicted wound of Albania's. This is how I understand normalization.

Now our two countries have normal relations and do not interfere with each other. You may develop in whatever way you want. We now have an equal trade relationship with Albania. There are certain special arrangements, but we do not give them whatever they want as in the past. We have also changed since those years. In those years the Soviet Union forced us to repay the debts, withdrew experts, and made us miserable. In the Korean War, they provided weapons but then asked us to pay with money. We do not force Albania to repay debts. Therefore, now we can be together here and have good conversation with Mr. Kapllani. We are good friends and our relationship is normal.

*Zhang Baijia:* Ambassador Fan, thank you very much.

*Rowiński:* I have a question and a suggestion. The suggestion is that our Chinese friends and hosts may consider how to interpret the three-world theory and how to use this special concept. This is a very interesting question. I think that Ambassador Liu Yanshun's presentation can serve as the starting point for analyzing the relations between us. It articulated the idea. However, I cannot agree on one issue. Before I left Warsaw for Beijing, I carefully read all the Chinese articles on the Polish incident of 1970. If you read the December article again, its language and its interpretation of the event, did it differ, really, from the earlier analysis of Czechoslovakia's internal situation? Therefore, what you just said about non-interference in internal affairs may not be entirely accurate.

*Liu Qibao:* We know that the three-world theory was raised by Mao Zedong in his conversation with Kissinger in 1974 [1973?]. This was a theoretical summary of China's international and diplomatic strategy at the time. Since then the international conditions have changed and China's diplomacy has made readjustment. Therefore this theory should be understood within the context of China's historical experiences in those years, which was different from today's international conditions. From the eleventh plenum to the sixteenth party congress, China adopted a foreign policy that no longer used the concept in diplomatic documents. Of course, we are not going to discuss the current foreign policy here. There will be other opportunities to discuss it in detail. We should understand however why China today follows such a very correct foreign policy. We need to discuss and analyze China's

international environment and foreign policies between the eleventh plenum and the sixteenth congress.

*Zhang Baijia:* Li Danhui, please.

*Li Danhui:* I have a question for Chinese ambassadors, especially Ambassador Liu Qibao. After China established diplomatic relationship with West Germany, an incident happened. China mentioned the question of Germany's national unification. Since the mid-1960s East Germany advocated the coexistence of two Germanys and did not talk about national unification. At the time a Chinese article mentioned East Germany and caused the latter to protest against the article's reference to "East Germany", not to the GDR. My question is, did the Chinese behavior reflect China's policy readjustment toward the United States, a new gesture, or was it an oversight? I hope that our ambassadors can comment on this. Another question: against the larger background of the Chinese–American alliance against the Soviet Union, did China subordinate its principle of differentiating between inter-party and interstate relations in Eastern Europe to its grand strategy?

*Zhang Baijia:* Can Ambassador Liu answer this question?

*Liu Qibao:* We understood the people's demand for national unification. Since Germany's division by the four-power occupation after World War II, we always supported its national unification. For a long time both Germanys supported national unification. But later, in serving the Soviet strategic interests, the GDR changed its policy and abandoned its demand for unification. We believed that this was not correct. The unification approach should not have been abandoned. Yet this did not mean that we supported West Germany and opposed East Germany. We only said that in general we supported the German people's plan for unification. We always supported the two Germanys to solve this issue without external inference.

In 1972, there were many questions during the Chinese–West German negotiations about establishing diplomatic relations. We all know that both German states were established in 1949. At the time we had diplomatic relations with the GDR, but West Germany could not possibly establish diplomatic relations with us. Yet [Konrad] Adenauer, the very courageous West German statesman in the 1950s, did not and would not establish diplomatic relationship with Taiwan either. Therefore, the Taiwan question did not exist when we established diplomatic relations with West Germany. Our communiqué for establishing diplomatic relations had only one sentence and did not mention Taiwan. Neither did we mention support of the German people's desire

for unification. Why? The reason was that such wording would have meant that we supported West Germany. The GDR was very sensitive to the issue and now it knew that the communiqué did not have such content.

We all know that in the Cold War Germany was a central issue, and there was the Berlin question. Over the Berlin question four contradictory conceptions and stands existed among the United States, the Soviet Union, East Germany, and West Germany. When we established relations with West Germany, they asked us to clarify our attitude in this matter. We did so by including a sentence in exchanged notes, but not in the communiqué. So this was an internal understanding. This sentence did no harm to the GDR's interests. The sentence, "*Die Volksrepublik China wird in konkreten Fragen entsprechend der bereits entstandenen tatsächlichen Lage in Berlin (West) handeln,*"<sup>18</sup> had a very vague meaning. We dealt with the Berlin question according to its actual situation and did not become involved in the two sides' relationship. This indicated that we did not need to sacrifice the interests of East Germany to serve those of West Germany. In our dealing with relations with the two Germans, neither of them had any reason to complain.

In the 1980s our relations with West Germany developed rapidly. East Germany was also very anxious to develop relations with us. In the early 1980s, the speaker of the East German parliament wanted to visit China. At the time I was chargé d'affaires at the embassy. He called me and asked for a private meeting. I rushed to his office and I was quite nervous lest our work caused some problems. But he told me that he wanted to visit China. I asked him whether or not this was a decision made by the party central committee. He said that this was an assignment given to him by Honecker and it had been discussed in the politburo. I was very surprised because among the five Eastern European countries such high-level visit was rare at the time. He asked me whether or not there was any difficulty on our part. I said no because I knew our policy readjustment toward the Eastern European countries. Soon he visited China and his task was to pave the way for Honecker's visit. Honecker's visit soon followed. Mrs. [Margot] Honecker, then minister of education, also came to China. In a word, our policy toward each country followed very strict principles and the policy was decided by our top leaders.

18 "With regard to specific questions, the People's Republic of China will act in accordance with the actual situation already in existence in West Berlin." Communiqué by West German Foreign Office ministerial director Berndt von Staden and Xinhua Bonn bureau chief Wang Shu, 29 September 1972. Thanks to Bernd Schaefer for the reference.

*Westad:* Thank you very much, Ambassador Liu. Just one brief comment, before I turn to Schröter, with regard to the historical issues involved. I think that one thing we need to do is to make sure we look at the different periods in terms of their own characteristics. A number of people have already commented on this. I think this is particularly important with regard to China's diplomacy and foreign policy. On the German question, of course, since we know the American version of their discussions with the Chinese on Germany, it is particularly important to catch up with the historical detail.

One issue that we have discussed very much in 1974 and 1975 is China's opposition to the Western German policy of trying to get closer to the East in terms of German *Ostpolitik* and the CSCE [Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe] agreement. The Chinese at that point saw it, as they explained to the Americans, as an attempt by the Soviet Union to lower Western Europe's defenses and to put pressure on the Western European side. So let's try to look at this in terms of the historical period in which all this developed. I think that is particularly important for this session.

*Schröter:* I only want to add some remarks to what my friend and colleague said about the developing relationship between China and West Germany. It was the same time that the GDR wanted to establish a relationship with West Germany in the name of *Ostpolitik*. That means that there was no contradiction between China's interests and our interests at that time. Even when the West German embassy came here, to Beijing, during the first month all West German mail came to our embassy. Regularly, every day we sent mail to them because the Chinese only knew one German embassy, and that was the East German embassy.

As I said at that time I was dealing with military affairs. When the first West German military attaché came to China, it was a very complicated problem because he had no experience. How to diminish this problem in the military way? The French, British, Canadian military attachés had asked me how to arrange this and that. I always said I would bet you know. Why should I have to help this young attaché who was a member of the NATO? But he spoke German. Therefore I had no problem. From the very beginning, he came to our embassy. At first he was very nervous, so I walked with him around our embassy, showed him everything, and then we came to the visitors' room. My wife came and offered him some cake and coffee, and then we introduced each other. I asked him what questions he had for me about China. Up to now I still have a good relationship with him. That means that there was no problem between China and West Germany.

Another question is about the East German leadership's change of thinking about China. At the end of the 1970s and the beginning the 1980s, of course there was interference from the Soviet side, but Honecker himself sent a request to us for publications on China. He said that we should write about how China viewed its own policies. In the 1960s and 1970s there were books on China reflecting the Soviet view. But later the publication and translation of this kind of books stopped. Some books were already in the process of being printed but were taken out. In the late 1970s and 1980s there were many public lectures on China at the military academy, institutes, and enterprises. The rooms were always full of people. These were not organized and the participation was voluntary. That means that interest in China was extensive.

*Westad:* Thank you very much. We have a couple of questions that are still left hanging from the participants, which I want to return to briefly before we have the concluding remarks for this session. Particularly interesting is the one from James Hershberg about the relationships in the Third World. I was in Berlin in December. I was reading the East German reports coming back from [Third World] countries, particularly Africa. We are aware that by the mid-1970s the relationship between East Germany and China was anything but friendly. In some countries, such as Angola, as James Hershberg alluded to, there was a war with China, and East Germany was the main part of the Soviet–Cuban square, literally fighting each other.

I also want to call for a response from the Eastern European diplomats to Radchenko's question about the 1989 reporting. Perhaps we could do the Third World first, if anyone would like to respond to that. But the Eastern European perception, like the Soviet perception, clearly was that at least by the mid-1970s, the United States and China were in a virtual alliance with each other in combating the Soviet Union's influence in the Third World and the Eastern European support of that influence. I don't know who would like to respond to that? Yes, but very briefly.

*Schröter:* Forgive me, I forgot one problem. This problem is unification. Unification was not the policy of our country and nor that of West Germany. When Brezhnev died, Honecker and Chancellor [Helmut] Kohl met in Moscow to talk to each other about this question. Both sides decided not to bring up this problem of reunification at the present time. That was the official policy in both states. It was seen as a problem of the past. Reunification of Germany came from the crowd, not from the top. There was no regular action on reunification by the governments, but the crowd demanded it. That

is different. That means at this time there was no actual problem between the two German states. .

*Westad*: Thank you very much. OK, anyone would like to respond to the question raised on the relations in the Third World? Anyone outside of the field of expertise here? Maybe someone from the Chinese side?

*Liu Qibao*: Under the circumstances of the Sino–Soviet split, China’s relations with Third World countries followed the pattern of their relations vis-à-vis the Soviet Union. If you were closer to China, then we would treat you well, but if you were closer to the Soviet Union, then we would not treat you well. The Soviet Union followed the same approach. The Sino–Soviet split also affected the Third World. But sometimes there were different opinions within a country, such as Angola. Some people supported a good relationship with China and others supported the Soviet Union. Internal contradictions happened in this way. Such a situation did exist. But in general, at the time China actively supported the Third World. Certain countries were influenced by the Soviet Union and had better relations with the Soviet Union than with us. But this differed from the situation of the Eastern European countries; it was very different. For both China and the Soviet Union, the Third World countries occupied an international position very different from that of the Eastern European countries.

*Westad*: Thank you very much.

*Yu Sui*: I will briefly comment on the issue of the division of the three worlds. The division was a strategic conception, a variant of Mao Zedong’s earlier theory of the intermediate zone that took shape under particular historical conditions. The First World included the American and Soviet hegemonic powers, the Third World was the vast area of developing countries, and the Second World the European countries that were relatively developed. I will not discuss whether or not such a division was reasonable. But the classification of the Eastern European countries as part of the second world should clarify their historical positions. They were objects to be won over and they could be used indirectly. Such an idea was clear.

As for the attitude toward the Third World and Mao Zedong’s strategic thinking, the Chinese often like to use simple expressions and jingles, and it was called *yi tiao xian, yi da pian* (a line of alliance, and a large group of supporters). The line was used to deal with the Soviet Union. In the words of Mao Zedong, to deal with the polar bear, we use a line running from China to Europe and to the United States. The large group included the vast

majority of the developing countries, a basic force that we could unite with and rely on. But there were various and very complicated conditions among the developing countries. At the time the Soviet global strategy contained the important idea that the developing countries were natural allies of the Soviet Union. The idea was to introduce the Soviet model into developing countries. Therefore the conception of a “large group” meant competing with the Soviet Union for influence in the Third World. There is no need to evade this.

*Westad:* We are running very short of time. So just very quick comments, please. Then we will move to conclusion.

*Budura:* I would like to recall the fact about the theory on the three worlds that we are discussing. The three-worlds theory was made public in 1974. But we have to remember that such a theory existed before. It was explained by Mao Zhedong in a discussion with a foreigner, who I think was an American journalist. At the time, the three worlds were different. There were socialist countries, capitalist countries, and new emerging forces that were the countries just trying to be independent and so on. I suppose this was an expression in the Chinese way of forming or building up their strategic prerequisites. I remember that Sun Zi said you must know who were your friends, who were your foes, and who were those people who could be together with you against the enemy.

*Zhang Baijia:* As for the three-worlds theory, I may offer some background information. After reforms and opening, the party branches in charge of foreign policies discussed the question of whether or not the theory should be used any longer. There were different opinions. If you have paid attention, you may have noticed that since the twelfth party congress, all party documents and central leaders’ speeches have stopped using the three-worlds theory, though the conception of three worlds is still in use. We should end now. Ambassador Liu Yanshun will make a very brief concluding comment and then we will end this session.

*Liu Yanshun:* Mr. Shen Zhihua raised a question about Solidarity in 1981 and 1982. I’d like to respond briefly. Solidarity was an internal problem of Poland. The economic difficulties in Poland caused workers’ strikes. The labor movement was against inflation. This was a domestic issue. Yet in the Solidarity movement another voice emerged that opposed the Soviet control and exploitation of Poland. This reflected the Polish people’s view of Soviet–Polish relations. The Chinese side always believed that this was Poland’s internal affair. In public, China’s attitude was that we trusted the

Polish people's ability to solve the problem themselves. China was opposed to external interference. This was China's basic attitude toward the Solidarity affair in 1980.

In 1981, the affair developed further. Jaruzelski appeared and martial law was imposed. China immediately expressed its consistent support for Poland solving its own problems and sternly opposed external interference. China believed that the Polish question could be solved peacefully on the basis of the Polish state's and people's interests. China did not just offer its moral support to the Polish people in solving their problems. Whenever possible, China also offered material assistance. After the Solidarity movement began, the market of Poland fell short of goods, especially pork. China offered Poland a loan to buy pork at very favorable conditions. There would be no interest during ten years, and Poland would repay the loan after ten years. In total China offered 80,000 tons of pork. This was a huge burden for China's own market, for, at the time, China's economic development was not yet up to today's standard.

I have no other comments to make. But I wish to emphasize that as long as we base interstate relations on the five principles of peaceful coexistence, the interstate relations in the world will keep improving. I believe in this and in the vitality of these principles. This has been proved by the Chinese–Eastern European relations since the drastic change in the Eastern European countries in 1989.

*Zhang Baijia:* Thank you, Ambassador Liu. Now our session in this afternoon came to the end. In the evening there will be an event at the Romanian Embassy. We need to go now because we have to arrive there before 6:30.

\* \* \* End of Session Seven \* \* \*



## Roundtable Discussion

(8:30–10:30, March 26)

*Westad:* A moment ago I was talking to Mr. Zhang Baijia, and we agreed that today's discussion would be very remarkable. Today we will be able to listen to the ambassadors on the two sides to talk about their personal experiences in history, and this will be very educational to us. This is the last day of our symposium, and probably we are all tired a little after our heated debate. Some problematic things occurred here that remind me of a story which I was once told by a Brazilian diplomat, a friend of mine, who was talking about a young Brazilian diplomat who had been sent to Iceland as the chargé d'affaires. Of course, he was trained to learn Icelandic before he left. When he did come to Iceland, he had a good conversation with the Icelandic foreign minister. He then reported back that at first he talked about how much Iceland and Brazil had in common, and the closeness of the relationship between the two countries. The young diplomat explained that there were no problems in relations between Iceland and Brazil. And then the young diplomat described how beautiful he thought Iceland was. He said that it was very warm. Then his senior colleague said, "That is very good, what happened then?" The young diplomat said, "Well, then, I broke the diplomatic relations." The senior diplomat said, "How on the earth did that happen?" The young man said, "I ran out of things to say in Icelandic."

So that thing can happen when we run out of steam, and when we cover things a bit too often. So that is what we are trying to avoid doing today. Instead of going over the ground we have covered in previous sessions, in this roundtable session, we will try, at least initially, to concentrate on questions and issues that have not been raised. Then we will see how much time we need to discuss these issues. Again the priority will go to the former ambassadors and diplomats who are here and also to a few other people who have not been able to speak much, including Mr. Yu who is sitting over there, whom we want to call on for some comments.

Let us make sure to stick to issues that have not been discussed before or things that have not been clarified. If there are questions that have been asked, here I include the scholars, which they feel have not been answered, please feel free, the historians, to repeat those questions briefly so that you

can see if it is possible to get an answer. We also have a number of issues that we have not touched upon. I will try to return to these during this session, and Baijia will also chip in on this. We'll try to deal with those as we move along. I want to open up first for the participants' questions and issues that you feel have not been covered so far. Again let me remind you this is not the place for politeness. I am not encouraging you to break up diplomatic relations, but I am certainly trying to encourage you to be as frank and direct as possible. OK, who would like to start? Let's turn first to Mr. Yu.

*Yu Sui:* If this morning's free discussion is conducted according to the principles of market economy, I am prepared to make a presentation at the two moderators' command. This symposium has been widely praised for its solid preparation, rich content, effective pace, live discussion, and frank atmosphere. We will leave this meeting with unforgettable impressions. In the following I will present some thoughts and views.

First, from the 1960s to the 1980s, the Soviet Union cast a long shadow on the Chinese–Eastern European relations. The Eastern European countries' conditions and the degree of their closeness to the Soviet Union decided their different attitudes toward China. China's policies toward the Eastern European countries were also connected to a line hinged on the Soviet factor. Therefore, I feel that further study of the Chinese–Eastern European relations will necessitate further study of the Sino–Soviet relationship and Soviet–Eastern European relations.

Secondly, against the background of the Sino–Soviet relations, China's relations with the Eastern European countries experienced a period of deterioration. This distorted the development of real socialism and was a tragedy. The Eastern European countries were victims of the Soviet theory of limited sovereignty, but they also had to play a certain supplementary role in the Soviet anti-Chinese policy. Although China had a policy of differentiating the Eastern European countries from the Soviet Union, some of the Chinese practices still harmed the Chinese–Eastern European relations.

Thirdly, ideological polemics led to deterioration or even rupture of interstate relations. The consequences both weakened our states and tarnished the image of socialism in the world, saddening our friends and gladdening our enemies. This can be termed a criminal behavior that destroyed the bright prospects of socialism.

Fourthly, military conflicts between socialist countries are completely incompatible with the nature of socialism. They were inconceivable to the founders of scientific socialism and incomprehensible to the mass of ordinary

people. Relations among socialist states should follow higher principles than the five principles of peaceful coexistence, but they should at the minimum be models in following these principles.

Fifthly, by nature, the contradictions between China and the Eastern European countries were internal contradictions within the people. Any treatment of these as contradictions between enemies, no matter with what justifications, must be viewed as a mistake.

Sixthly, historically it is perhaps inevitable for China and the Eastern European countries to choose successively the Soviet model or to be forced to accept the model. Similarly, this inevitably led to these countries' confrontations with the Soviet Union. This was a very important reason for some of these countries, under Western instigation, interference, and even intervention, to have deviated from the wholesome path during their reforms.

Seventhly, what were the features of the era from the 1960s to the 1980s? People desired peace, development was the trend, and reforms were the necessary path, competition was a universal means, opportunities and challenges coexisted. I believe that we should observe and study the changes in China and in the Eastern European countries and their relations against this large background of the time.

Eighthly, on the purpose of reforms, we must keep in mind the fundamental idea that poverty is not socialism but prosperity is not necessarily socialism either; socialism ought to be more than just capitalism. Although tyranny is not socialism, democracy is not necessarily socialism either; but in socialism there ought to be more equality than in capitalism.

Ninthly, state interests and principles produce independence and autonomy. The deepening of interdependence does not necessarily require organization of blocs and alliances. Plurality decides that every state has the right to choose its own path of development according to its national conditions.

Tenthly, the basis of normal interstate relations is the five principles of peaceful coexistence. The core of these principles is equal sovereignty. These principles should be able to facilitate wholesome interaction between states.

According to my own research, after the Cold War, wholesome interstate interaction, especially among great powers, has unfolded with an inner rule. This rule has three links, the beginning, process, and result. The beginning is protection of one's own country's interests while respecting other countries' interests. Both are indispensable. Then, the process includes both competi-

tion and cooperation, both friction and compromises. We must be good at cooperation and compromise. Now there are many commentaries on the Chinese–American relations. Are we partners in cooperation or adversaries in competition? After the younger Bush came to power, he now said that China and Russia were adversaries in competition and then said that we were partners. I believe that these are two sides of the same coin. Finally, the result must be winning for both and winning for all, not just bringing about unilateral benefits. I think that this rule should apply to the current and long-term relations between China and the Eastern European countries.

In the end, I have a sincere request to the Eastern European ambassadors. I hope that in today's free discussion, you may use some vivid examples to illustrate how, even under the Soviet pressure, you created conditions for developing friendship with China and the Chinese people, and how you publicly or secretly contributed to the friendship. Thank you.

*Westad:* Thank you very much, Professor Yu. You raised the issue of the Chinese view of the 1989 democratic revolutions in Eastern Europe and how this was perceived from the Chinese side. The political issues in 1989, the historical conflicts in different Eastern European countries are well known. I would be extremely interested in hearing more from the Chinese side about how those events were viewed in Beijing. These are things that we have not really had a chance to touch upon before. Because there is a reality here which I think we must recognize: On the one hand China was very eager to see Eastern Europe break free from Soviet hegemony; on the other hand, China could not be that eager to see many of these countries or all of them going away from the socialist system. I would like to have some comments from the Chinese side on that later on.

Also, to the Eastern European side, I think that what Professor Yu stressed is very important. We discussed the Chinese example at great length yesterday. Now I recalled that discussion was fascinating. How China has inspired, particularly in economic terms, some of the reform tendencies in Eastern Europe. But we are also interested in hearing, during the 1985–1989 period, how in the Eastern European capitals people understood the events in China, the direction that China was taking. James Hershberg has a question.

*Hershberg:* Thank you, Arne. I also want to thank Professor Yu for his comments and especially endorse the idea that we need, possibly as the next step in this project, to consider a similar conference on the Sino-Soviet relationship during this period. I think from the discussion it is clear that

many of the central issues we have discussed cannot be understood without the Russians at the table and without their sources and perspectives. I just want to make a couple of comments in that respect. I think, this meeting has shown the value of gaining the insights, experiences, and memories of the former participants in the events from both sides. If we had another such conference, it would also be extremely valuable, because it shows that there are things that we cannot simply learn from the documents. However I think this conference shows that we need the documents at the table in order to inform the discussion.

Just take one example from Professor Yu. He made a very interesting comment in stressing the importance of five principles in relations between countries. As we all know, these were developed between Premier Zhou Enlai and Prime Minister [Jawaharlal] Nehru in 1965. Unfortunately we still cannot read the discussions between them to understand how they developed these five principles. It would be extremely interesting to do so. One thing I would like to, for some participants, to address in this discussion, maybe later in this morning, is what are the central questions and mysteries still remaining that might be explored if we have another conference dealing explicitly with the Sino-Soviet relationship.

Just to add to Arne's specific, concrete questions for this discussion: one question that was raised yesterday but was not really responded to, is that in the 1980s the Eastern Europeans and the Chinese were on the opposite sides of the hot war in Afghanistan which was viewed primarily through the lens of the Cold War. Today of course we can look back on that as an early confrontation in the post-Cold War world, with Islamic fundamentalism and Islamic militancy. So I am curious if the participants have any memories of their perceptions of the war in Afghanistan on opposite sides, in retrospect, even the perspective of the post-9/11 world.

*Westad:* That is a good question, Jim. Could I turn to one of our colleagues on the Chinese side for the question about Chinese perceptions of 1989 in Eastern Europe, first? Then perhaps we could try to deal with Jim's question after that, if that is possible. If anyone on Chinese side would like to just give a brief view on how Beijing saw the 1989 events in Eastern Europe. I am not asking you to give an extensive one. Ambassador Bai.

*Bai Shoumian:* At first I want to express my admiration of and support to some of Professor Yu's remarks about our symposium. Our moderator asked how we in China viewed the drastic change in Eastern Europe and how we dealt with the event. When the change took place, I was at the Soviet Union

and Eastern European Division of the foreign ministry. We dealt with the event on a daily basis. The event had many aspects. Its scale, speed, and nature went beyond ordinary people's vision and even went beyond our expectations, even though we had been working in the field of Eastern European affairs for a long time. We were profoundly stirred by the rapid development of events. Here I can only talk about my personal view of this matter.

The radical change in Eastern Europe had historical origins and inevitability. Yesterday I talked about the history of Eastern European reforms and illustrated this issue from the historical angle. The change took place because in the long historical process of Eastern European development, many necessary reforms were strangled by the Soviet Union. The cumulative consequence was inevitably a huge and drastic change. Western countries had a hand in this change, and the changes in the Soviet Union were also in the background. But the fundamental reason was these countries' own desire to find a road of development suitable to their national conditions. When the historical conditions and international environment became ripe, the desire became a reality. This is the first point.

The second point is that no matter how the Eastern European countries changed and what they became, these were those countries' internal affairs. We respect the peoples' choice of their own social systems.

Thirdly, our relations with these countries were based on China's independent and peaceful foreign policy. This policy was established at the third plenum, and it was an adjusted foreign policy after reforms and opening. The policy guided the readjustment of China's relations with the Eastern European countries before their change, and, after their change, the policy continued to maintain our political, economic, and cultural relations with the Eastern European countries on the basis of the five principles. The policy is still in effect today. This was our policy and principle at the time. We believed that this was a correct policy.

Fourthly, in China there are different opinions about the drastic change of Eastern Europe. Some regard it as restoration of capitalism, some attribute it to subversion by Western imperialism, and some contend that it happened because of the Eastern European countries' own needs. No matter what was the case, China respected these countries' choice and did not interfere. But we did not believe that the change of Eastern Europe, as viewed by some people in the West, indicated the failure or bankruptcy of the socialist system. In our view, the event only proved the bankruptcy of the rigid and ineffective economic and political system of the Soviet Union. The collapse

of socialism in Eastern Europe should not lead to the conclusion that the socialist system failed and communism perished. This may not be the case. Instead, in both the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe an unsuccessful model went bankrupt. In holding such a view, we observed the changes in Eastern Europe calmly and dealt with the situation steadily. In our own words, this was to *tao guang yang hui* (“hide one’s capacities and bide one’s time”). This is how I view our basic attitude and stand toward the drastic change in Eastern Europe.

*Westad*: Thank you very much, Ambassador Bai. You made a very good beginning, which can lead to a better discussion, especially, of the Chinese view of the drastic changes in Eastern Europe in 1989. It can be seen that China was very cautious in expressing an attitude toward these events. These were historically inevitable because the issue of sovereignty in these countries became increasingly significant. In a moment I will turn to Chinese ambassadors for comments.

[*Luthi*]: I am glad that Ambassador Bai mentioned the reform demands in Eastern European countries. These eventually led to the drastic change in Eastern Europe. Yesterday I asked a question about whether the reforms started in China in 1978 stimulated the reforms in Eastern Europe in the 1980s, and whether the Chinese leadership hoped to see similar reforms to happen in the Eastern European countries.

*Westad*: Who would like to comment on this? Perhaps if it is to do with this, Vojtech, you want to comment?

*Mastny*: With regard the developments in the 1980s, I would like to call your attention to the documents which are already on the website. Unfortunately these are those that couldn’t be translated in time. But the translations will be forthcoming. These documents are directly relevant to what has been discussed. There are other documents in the Czech archives concerning the visit by Zhao Ziyang in Czechoslovakia in June 1987 and his conversations with the president and prime minister of Czechoslovakia. Particularly interesting in terms of timing, there is a record of the visit by Czechoslovak foreign minister [Jaromír] Johanes to China, including his conversation with Premier Li Peng and President Jiang Zemin on November 8, 1989, just a few days before the Czechoslovak government collapsed.<sup>19</sup>

19 “Document Reader for the International Conference on Reviewing the Relations between China and East European Countries: From the 1960s to the 1980s, 24–26 March 2004, Beijing/China,” [http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/conferences/PreviousEvents/2004\\_beijing\\_docs.htm](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/php/conferences/PreviousEvents/2004_beijing_docs.htm).

I think that all these documents will be very interesting for the understanding of the expectations that China had concerning the government in Czechoslovakia. The overall thrust of the Zhao Ziyang conversations in 1987 was upbeat. His Czechoslovak hosts and he agreed that things were well on their way toward reform in Czechoslovakia, and they concluded very much on the same viewpoint. More remarkably, the similar spirit prevailed in the conversation in 1989 between Johanes and his Chinese hosts, which is a good indication of how rapidly the developments were proceeding, and how they took the leaders by surprise.

Considering that, I would like to emphasize here, as Ambassador Bai Shoumian mentioned, the ability of the Chinese government to adjust to the developments in Eastern Europe, adopt in time the right attitude toward the new governments that just emerged, and continue the good relations despite the radical change of governments on the spot. In fact, not only good relations but, I think, better relations than had been the case with the governments before the upheavals. So I would like to urge you to look at these documents in a week or two, once the translations are available.

*Westad:* Thank you, Vojtech. Anyone else on the Chinese side who would like to add to Ambassador Bai's really fascinating recollections of his insight into the 1989 events and how he saw it from being in the foreign ministry and working at the Eastern European desk here in Beijing. Anyone else among the Chinese friends who would like to add something? Yes, please.

*Yu Hongjun:* Ambassador Bai already made an excellent explanation of the question. I just have very few things to add. When the 1989 event took place, China's basic stand was to observe calmly, report objectively, and not make any subjective comments and speculation that might mislead the public. At the time the situation in Eastern Europe was very confusing and the prospect was unclear. Under the circumstances, China continued normal interstate relations and the exchanges in different aspects proceeded as usual. The Chinese government repeatedly stressed that we respected these countries' own choice. In reality, China also acted in this manner.

On the other hand, our own was a socialist country after all and we had a comradely kind of feeling toward the Eastern European countries. When the governments of these countries were on the verge of losing power, the Chinese people had a keenly felt pain. This feeling was real. Many people were worried about the fate and future of Eastern European communists and Eastern European socialism. In the theorists' circles, many experts and scholars said clearly that the change in Eastern Europe and the disintegration

of the Soviet Union marked a major setback of the world's socialist movement, unprecedented low ebb of the international communist movement, or even a major setback for human history.

But, as Ambassador Bai pointed out, our comrades within the party and among the theorists had different opinions about the causes of these events. Some people believed that these events reflected an objective process in both the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and could not be reversed by any people's will. So we had to respect and accept this fact. But some other people believed that these happened because opportunists existed in these parties and because of the long-term strategy of peaceful evolution pursued by international imperialism. These two opinions continue to exist today. Whatever the experts' and scholars' opinions are, our party and our country consistently respected the people's choice of social systems in Eastern Europe and in Russia. We continue to develop normal interstate relations with them on a new and realistic basis.

At that time our relations with Romania were very good. Before the 1989 event happened in Romania, the CCP sent a high-level party leader to participate in Romania's party congress. This was widely reported abroad. Some people spread a rumor that this happened after China's June 4<sup>th</sup> [Tiananmen] incident and that China sent a message to Romania. There is absolutely no basis for this. At the time I was with the Central Liaison Department. I knew that our leader in Romania did not say a word about what happened in China. Neither did he offer any advice to the Romanians in respect to what might happen in their country in the future. Absolutely not. We were very serious, very calm, and very responsible in dealing with any contingencies in Eastern Europe.

Another example: In 1991, on the very day when the August 19 incident [attempted coup against Gorbachev] took place, a CCP delegation arrived in Moscow. The head of the delegation was Li Zemin, first secretary of the CCP committee of Zhejiang province. According to some people, this was carefully arranged. But actually they were there purely by accident. According to the two parties' plan for exchanging visits, the delegation was to depart for Moscow on August 19 by prior arrangement. But before it left the Beijing airport, we received information about the incident in Moscow. The Soviet ambassador came to the airport very late to see the delegation off. He looked glum and said that a big thing happened in his country. Then we had to make a choice about the delegation's trip. In the end it was decided that since the Soviet side did not ask us to postpone the visit, they should

go. But when the delegation came to the streets of Moscow, they found out that the Soviet Communist Party was already paralyzed. There was no way to arrange the visit according to the original plan. In the afternoon, they only found two people from the international department of the Soviet party's central committee. These promised to find the first secretary of the Moscow municipality. But he did not come at the agreed time and had disappeared. Later we heard that he had been arrested. Thus the delegation was unable to do anything in Moscow and neither did they contact the tottering Soviet party's central committee. They then returned home ahead of the schedule. These examples can prove that the Chinese party was very objective and calm in dealing with the events in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Our party was mature and responsible, and our attitude and stand can stand the test of history.

*Westad:* Thank you again. That was another fascinating intervention. Again, as I'm recalling, since I was here, of course this is an internal impression from talking to my Chinese friends rather than what was reported in the newspapers, the shock of many Chinese felt about the execution of Ceaușescu in Romania. Yes, if there was one thing in China that really hit home at that moment, it was the way in which the Romanian top leader and his wife were toppled. Ambassador Liu, do you want to address this issue in 1989? Could you please just wait a tiny little second? I want to take a couple of more questions about 1989, and then I will return to you. Bernd, then Jim, and then I will return to Ambassador Liu.

*Schaefer:* I don't have a question, but I just want to add something to Vojtech's remarks. We have very extensive documentation on the bilateral relationship between East Germany and China in the book that came out in Germany in 1995, published in Berlin.<sup>20</sup> It contains sources from East German archives about the bilateral relationship. So for all the 1980s we have very good records on the relationship between China and Eastern Germany, and in particular on the years between 1987 and 1989. We can say that the closest relationship ever between the People's Republic of China and East Germany existed between June 4, 1989, and November 1989 when the Eastern German regime finally came down. So these documents are very

20 Werner Meißner and Anja Feege, eds., *Die DDR und China, 1949 bis 1990: Politik-Wirtschaft-Kultur: Eine Quellensammlung* (Berlin: Akademie, 1995).

important to read, and whoever interested in reading these documents, I would be happy to help find them.

*Westad:* That would be very good. I think we want to return to the issue of documents a little bit later on. I know that Shen Zhihua wants to talk about Chinese documentation. Perhaps Yu Hongqun would have something to add to that as well. We will do that at the end of this session. Jim, a quick question.

*Hershberg:* Yes, we are on the issue of the collapse of the Soviet empire. First of all, following on Bernd's comment, it would be interesting to hear from East Europeans, since Arne was in Beijing in June 1989 and I was in Moscow and in Budapest, to what extent did the crackdown of June 4 in China embolden and strengthen the hardliners in Eastern Europe who were trying to resist the reform movement or arguing for a hard response against it.

Since the last Chinese speaker raised the August 19 event in 1991, can someone who was in a position of authority, such as Ambassador Bai, clarify how the Chinese government dealt with the hardliners in Moscow between August 19 and August 21, 1991? Did they have any official conversations or communications with the emergency committee in Moscow at the time when it briefly appeared as if the communist government had restored authority and overthrown Gorbachev?

*Westad:* These are very useful questions. I don't want to spend too much time on 1989, because there are some other issues we want to deal with in this session as well. Could I please ask Ambassador Liu to be quite brief? And also others who want to address this now before we return to next topic. Ambassador Liu.

*Liu Yanshun:* Ambassador Bai and the comrade from the Central Liaison Department explained very well China's policies and practices in dealing with the changes in Eastern Europe in 1989. What I wish to add is how we in the foreign ministry handled the problems when they emerged. For instance, the new leaders in Eastern Europe were not communists but belonged to other parties. Should we deal with them? Our attitude was to treat all parties the same and to maintain normal state relations.

Another example: in the past China signed many agreements and contracts with the Eastern European countries. Should they be carried out? Our policy was to continue to carry out these agreements. But if the other side had difficulties and wanted to terminate the agreements, we would respect their opinion.

In Beijing we had to deal with their embassies. After the changes, how should we address their diplomats? This was a simple issue, one of protocol, but it could turn into a political problem. In the past we addressed each other as comrades. But what now? Comrade or Mr.? Our practice was to see what the other side's wish was. If the other side extended his hand and said, "Hello, comrade Liu," then I would respond by saying, "Hello, comrade so and so." But if the other side used Mr., I would do the same. This was a concrete detail in our respect to the other side. In my presentation I mentioned the principle of three respects. One of these was to respect the practices and attitudes of the Eastern European countries in developing relations with China. In reality we have continued this policy. We have insisted in using the five principles as the basis of establishing and developing normal interstate relations.

In the end I have a question in connection to the question raised by Professor Yu. Because our discussion is reviewing the Chinese–Eastern European relations from the 1960s to the 1980s, I support very much the last question raised by Professor Yu. As one working for many years in Eastern Europe, I hope to know what considerations the Eastern European countries had in the process of improving relations with China. What concrete policies and guiding ideas were adopted in dealing with what concrete issues? I very much hope to hear our Eastern European friends talking about these matters.

*Westad:* That was a very good question. I want to turn to the Eastern European side now on 1989 before we move to another topic, if anyone from the Eastern European side would like to answer Ambassador Liu's question with the precise reference to 1989. I don't think he was talking about broad developments and relations but about how this was handled with regard to China during the changes of 1989. And also the question that has been raised several times, one about the effect of the June 1989 crackdown in China had within Eastern Europe. How was this perceived? Who would like to go and comment on this?

*Rowiński:* Yes. The Polish situation was special because the elections in Poland were on the same day as the incident of June 4, 1989 in China. So you know this event and all what happened in Tiananmen Square strongly influenced the climate in the Polish–Chinese relations, especially in 1989. You know this is such a shadow, of course a climate, a special one we thought. But, frankly speaking, what had happened in China, the eruption, was hard to believe in Poland. It was so hard, and so concrete. Chinese ambassador

and representatives first tried to establish contact with the leaders of the Solidarity Movement, just like our two Chinese colleagues said.

Frankly speaking, we were a little bit afraid of three countries. Romania was another question, but [Miloš] Jakeš in Czechoslovakia, Zhivkov in Bulgaria, and Honecker in the GDR [would be affected]. What will be China's reaction? We thought that maybe this would lead to some kind of repetition of 1956 as in the Gomulka case. This was a real test to see how far we could trust in China's position and how true it was. The issue of East Germany involved conflicts between Honecker and Gorbachev. There was a very strong anti-Gorbachev feeling in Eastern Germany. I remembered this myself. So this was a very important test. In addition, we know that Jakeš tried to ask the Chinese for help. There was a similar action in Bulgaria.

I think that China's reaction was absolutely different from that toward Poland and Hungary in 1956. There may have been a connection between China's reaction to Czechoslovakia in 1968 and all that happened in 1989, a long road of understanding what happened in the world. As Professor Yu explained, there was an issue of how to understand inter-state relations. But the key problem was a theoretical one about what was the meaning of socialism.

*Westad:* Thank you very much, Jan. That was very useful. I wanted to move off this topic, but it is becoming so fascinating, so I think we will have to stay with this topic a little bit longer. Please forgive me, those of you who want to raise other topics. A brief comment on Romania that you touched upon before. On that side, I think, the worry, particularly in the Soviet Union, on Gorbachev's side, was about Chinese involvement in order to rescue the Ceaușescu regime. The worry was very real.

Actually this is something that I talked about to Gorbachev himself. I spoke to him about the Romanian events. He said one of the three major concerns they had was about China's involvement. We all know, of course, that did not happen. But on the side of the Soviets, I am sure probably on the Eastern European side as well, this was a big concern because of the close relationship between Ceaușescu and China early on. Ambassador Li.

*Li Fenglin:* My comments are very simple. In 1989 I was in Bulgaria. That was still the Zhivkov period. Therefore when changes took place in Bulgaria and Romania, I was in Eastern Europe. Several of our Chinese colleagues just discussed the issue very clearly and frankly. In my view, China's reaction to the events in Eastern Europe should be considered at two levels. The first is an emotional level. We, including the ordinary Chinese

people, had a socialist feeling and were sympathetic to the countries' loss of socialism. Such feeling still exists today. This is positive and normal. In the meantime, why did communists in these countries lose power and what were the root reasons? These theoretical issues are still being studied today. Perhaps just as Deng Xiaoping said, we are not clear about what socialism is and how to construct socialism. Questions at this level are being studied.

The second level is one of policies and diplomacy: how did Chinese diplomacy deal with these events? As Ambassador Bai said, in our practice the most basic task was to discard ideological principles in diplomacy and use interstate principles to handle China's relations with these countries, even after their changes. We did not interfere in others' internal affairs and respected the people's own choice in these countries. The five principles were such principles. Ambassador Donchev here was a colleague of mine in Bulgaria. For instance, we may recall that when Foreign Minister Qian Qichen visited Bulgaria, he had a special meeting with the leader of the opposition party. This is to say that we respected these countries reality. As a result, our relations developed relatively steadily.

*Liu Qibao:* We respect the people's choice in every country. After the Soviet Union disintegrated, we established diplomatic relations with the newly independent countries in a short time. This is another proof.

*Westad:* Thank you. That is another interesting question to raise. I am afraid this question is mostly outside the confines of this particular conference. I want to turn briefly to Ambassador Donchev since Bulgaria has been mentioned many times here. Again if you, from your personal point of view at that time, could describe the impact of this event and how to deal with China, that will be very useful. We all know that you have served for most of your career in a socialist government, but suddenly it was no longer there. How did this affect the position in Bulgaria and its China relations?

*Donchev:* I returned from China in September 1989 and became chief of the Asian Department of the foreign ministry. We were preparing for the visit of Petar Mladenov, then the foreign minister, to China. This visit took place in the beginning of November. At that time a letter from Mladenov to Todor Zhivkov that criticized the policy of Bulgaria and the role of Zhivkov was very popular in Bulgaria. Everybody knew about this letter and it was being discussed. I should say the development of events in Bulgaria was different from those in Poland and Czechoslovakia.

On November 10, the party held a national plenum, but before that Mladenov came to China. I went with him. He came on November 5, five days before the November 10 events. We had meetings with Zhao Ziyang [sic], Li Peng, and Qian Qichen. I remember, I have these records at home, that during a meeting Li Peng told us that they were already planning a session of the CCP Central Committee, and that it would deal with economic affairs. Then Mladenov said that we were also planning a plenary session in Bulgaria, and it would also deal with the budgetary planning for the next year. Suddenly, Li Peng asked him, “Will you soon have your [Egon] Krenz in Bulgaria?” This was a very interesting question. I wrote all these down. We returned on the 8<sup>th</sup> because on the 9<sup>th</sup> there was a politburo meeting in Bulgaria. Mladenov asked me to write down the records of these meetings with the three Chinese leaders. Of course I did not put down reference to Krenz. But then Mladenov returned to me saying that he [Li Peng] said that. I have these records brought from home to here.

I can say that during the meetings with the Chinese leaders nothing was mentioned about what happened in Bulgaria and how we should do, and so on. There were many rumors about our meetings in China and our stopover in Moscow, and about how Mladenov took instructions from Gorbachev. It was encouraged of course by Gorbachev and by Moscow. But we did not stop over in Moscow because we used the Lufthansa flight from Beijing to Frankfurt, and then to Bulgaria. I mean that the Bulgarian–Chinese relations were not affected in any way by the events in Bulgaria because they started in a way different from those in other Eastern European countries. It was an internal party event. In the plenary session Zhivkov was removed from power and Mladenov became the secretary general of the party. Lukanov became prime minister. These were people from the younger generation who wanted reforms in Bulgaria. They did not start a movement like Solidarity and so on.

*Westad:* Thank you very much. That is a fascinating story linking Bulgaria and China in a way that we have not been aware of before. Thank you very much. I shall turn next to Mr. Kapllani. Mr. Kapllani, is this on 1989 or the perception of the June crackdown in China? Use the microphone, be very brief, please.

*Kapllani:* Yes, I have a very brief comment about what was said here previously with regard to what led to the reforms in Eastern European countries. It was said here that the adoption of the Soviet model in Eastern Europe actually, objectively or inevitably, led to reforms. I cannot say anything

against this view, but I think it is a little bit oversimplified. And also the view that the Eastern European upheavals were result of the fact that the reforms had not started earlier.

I think we should not lose sight of two moments or developments in Europe at large. One was the Helsinki process. In the 1970s Europe witnessed the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe that is known as the Helsinki process, which specially addressed human rights basket. This process, I believe, had profound impact on the developments in Eastern Europe, especially with regard to democratization, not just economic reforms. Because we have been laying too much stress on economic reforms we have forgotten political reforms and other aspects.

Another moment I would like to point out is the competition between socialism and capitalism which involved and was embodied in the competition between the Soviet Union and the United States, especially after the advent to power of President Regan, the Star Wars. We witnessed that this was the last straw that broke the camel's back, so to speak. The Russian giant became the lame giant with a wooden leg, which was the economy, and a steel leg, which was the army. And then Gorbachev came to power. It was a sign that Russia needed change. Gorbachev's advent to power affected the developments in Eastern Europe as everybody admitted yesterday.

*Westad:* Thank you very much, Mr. Kapllani. I will turn to Ambassador Zhu next. Ambassador Juhász, is this to this point, to 1989? OK, both of them. Then I will switch to the next topic that has been proposed to me. By the way it is again going back to the border clashes of 1969, and it is a question from the Chinese side. Ambassador Zhu first.

*Zhu Ankang:* Ambassadors Bai and Li explained very well the events of 1989. In October 1989 I was in Hungary and witnessed the events there. At the time we sensed that something would happen in Eastern Europe. In November 1989 I was assigned to the foreign ministry and worked in the areas of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. When we discussed our attitude toward the changes in Eastern Europe, as pointed out by the two ambassadors, we had these considerations.

First, these changes did not take place by accident. Secondly, no matter whatever changes took place, these were internal affairs of these countries. Therefore, according to our consistent principle of not interfering in other countries' internal affairs, we proposed the policy of respecting the people's own choice in these countries because these were changes of internal causes. Another consideration was not to take a stand according to ideology. This

was a lesson learned from the deterioration of the Chinese–Eastern European relations after the Sino–Soviet split. Now, when we considered our next policy toward the Eastern European countries, ideology was no longer a factor. No matter whether these countries continued socialism or became capitalist, we still wanted to maintain and develop relations with them. We used these two principles in processing our relations with these countries.

Soon, the Romanian incident happened. When I heard the news, I rushed from my home to the foreign ministry to be on duty in my office. From Ceaușescu's capture to his execution, I was in the foreign ministry. A question was raised here as to whether we discussed this matter or consulted with the Romanians about this. To my knowledge, we did not do these things. We just paid close attention to the development of events. Ceaușescu had been very friendly toward China. We certainly did not feel good about his fate. But, we believed that we should maintain the consistency of policy and treat the Romanian incident in the same way as we treated events in the other Eastern European countries. Therefore we maintained the established policy. It should be mentioned that there were disagreements in China. Some people criticized the foreign ministry, saying that when people got killed, you were still respecting the people's choice, and what choice was made there. But we considered these issues in terms of general state relations and principles, not in terms of personal feelings.

Later, when changes happened in other countries, we continued to insist on these two principles. Even after the disintegration of the Soviet Union, we applied the same principles to the newly dependent states. Consequently, despite such drastic changes in these countries, our relations with them were not damaged and did not suffer from major setbacks. These relations continued to develop smoothly and served as good basis for later growth.

*Westad:* Thank you very much. That is another extremely useful intervention. Ambassador Juhász, for a brief last comment on this.

*Juhász:* First I quite agree with Mr. Kapllani's views. It was a very important process that led to the collapse of the entire system. Now, 1989. You know that the changes in Hungary were a result of roundtable talks, not result of violence or any killing of people or something like that. The political climate in Hungary at that time was quite free. I would say that within the limits of the legal system, democracy was a living force in Hungary.

The Tiananmen Square incident had a great impact on the Hungarian society and even on the party members. There were strong demands coming from the bottom demanding issuance of documents that would express the

opinion of the Hungarian leadership. And it was done. (*Westad*: Sorry, it was done at the time?) Yes, some days after June 4. This influenced, to the some extent, the bilateral relations, the Hungarian approach to China. Then, even in the first four years, especially after we had our elections in [March and] April, if I am not mistaken, and the new government was formed in May, the event influenced strongly the bilateral relations and the Hungarian government's approach to China.

At the same time the new government felt and we in the foreign ministry felt that China kept the sober mind. That was a very important fact for the future. It was very important that we could protect the bilateral relations because within some newly emerged opposition parties, there were also demands to make a shift from the People's Republic to Taiwan. We in the Foreign Ministry made efforts to protect the bilateral relations with the People's Republic and the one-China principle. I should say that the foreign minister of Hungary [Géza Jeszenszky] accepted our opinion almost completely. I was then working at the Asia-Pacific Department, first as a deputy, and then as the director general. And I accompanied him to China when he visited China. It was a very important event in the history of our bilateral relations because he was impressed by what he saw in China, and impressed by the friendly atmosphere that was created around him here in China.

*Westad*: Thank you very much. I am afraid it will be very difficult for us to go on with this now. I will have a two- or three-sentence intervention from Ambassador Rowiński and the same from Ambassador Budura. Then we really have to move on.

*Rowiński*: The human factor was important. The Chinese ambassador in Poland at the time spoke very good Polish. He graduated from a Polish university. We joked that he was half Polish. This was very helpful in solving the difficulties at the time.

*Budura*: As far as the events in China in June 1989 are concerned, we as usual observed the rule. Our statement about the situation in China at that time was just a reproduction of the Xinhua News Agency's reports, no more than that. But of course, the events were commented on in different bureaus and places and among the population. And a lot of people recalled the images of the Cultural Revolution in China. By noticing the fact that many of the slogans, of the demands by the youth were acceptable and noble, our people thought that the way to deal with these problems and to promote these ideals was not by demonstrating or by going out in the streets. Because no one can deny the fact that during the Cultural Revolution, the so-called

*dazibao* (big-character posters) and some other meetings were expressions of democracy, but what kind of expression was that.

I remembered that by the time I was appointed here as ambassador. I had a very good relationship with the American ambassador and we talked a lot about this situation. He tried to convince his own people in Washington that those events took place against the background of reforms and the opening policy. And after that reforms and the opening policy continued. So the stand taken by the Chinese government did not prevent the continuation of those processes. On the contrary, they were undertaken under control, and so the processes led to positive final results. This is my belief that in spite of the fact that there was a tragedy, particular for the young people, who participated in that demonstration, the solution was, from the historical point of view, a positive one.

I would add something more. I remember the image of Gorbachev talking with the Chinese students on the Great Wall. I have to say that he was just selling the perestroika, the transparency, and inviting the Chinese students to repeat his practices in the Soviet Union. The result of such a policy, we know, went nowhere.

Now the second point, may I? In 1989 the first ambassador who was received by the Romanian chairman of the Salvation Front Council was Ambassador Wang Jinqing. He repeated the two main policies of China toward Romania: that China was observing and respecting the choice of the Romanian people, and that China was ready to continue developing good relations with Romania. Even then the ambassador and then the chairman, because at the time I became his counselor, told me that they decided to appoint me ambassador here in China just to ensure the continuation of the traditional relations between Romania and China. There was no sign of any kind that China would try to influence or disagree with the choice made by the Romanians at that time.

*Westad:* Now we don't have much time left. Thank you very much, Ambassador Budura. Maybe the perception in Bucharest of the events in China in June 1989 goes some way toward explaining what happened in December 1989 in Bucharest. But again we could spend a whole conference discussing just 1989.

I think this has been fascinating and enlightening. I apologize for spending too much time on it, but it is just an aspect of Sino-Eastern European relations that we have to explore in full. Now I want to switch to two other questions which have been raised by participants. They want to know more

about these. And, then, at the end, we will go over to Shen Zhihua and perhaps also Yu Hongjun with regard to comments on Chinese documentation before we do the break. So we have to be brief on these two historic topics.

The first one is going back to the border clashes in 1969. Several of the Chinese participants have asked me to raise the question again to Eastern European participants: how close to war were the two sides in 1969? We heard quite a bit early on about the overall perceptions. I think many of my Chinese colleagues would like to know more about the idea that existed in Eastern Europe about whether this was a manageable conflict, or whether it easily could have gotten out of control. I am sure this is linked to documentation that we have been receiving recently from the Chinese side about how worried the Chinese leadership was. Particularly in later summer of 1969, whether the Chinese leadership believed that a Soviet attack was imminent. The central leadership evacuated from Beijing at that point because of this potential danger from Soviet Union. So here it was taken very seriously indeed. The question for the Eastern European side is not just in terms of clashes and tensions but actually an all-out war. Is there any evidence, further evidence that you can shed light on about how close that might have been in 1969? Ambassador Juhász.

*Juhász:* In my view, but this is a view also shared by others, this was a very serious event. At the same time, it was limited to one region, it was a regional military conflict. It was unlikely for the Soviet Union to plan for launching a war because China could not be occupied so easily. It would have been a big mistake had they intended to do so. But they did not. On the Chinese side, the Chinese thinking was defensive, not offensive. What was the people's war? It was about how to defend one's own territory. Therefore, we did not believe that a large-scale war was likely.

*Westad:* Thank you very much. Yes, Mr. Schröter, I can see your microphone is on. Do you want to speak to this?

*Schröter:* No, no.

*Westad:* Anyone from the Eastern European side wants to add something on? Sergei Radchenko, what are you thinking?

*Radchenko:* This is a related question. The event of 1969 was very interesting with regard to the Sino–Soviet relations if viewed from the Soviet perspective. At the time the Soviets were concerned about reasserting their claim to the Far East, even to rename a lot of villages along the Ussuri River, to change their Chinese names into Russian names.

The interesting question I want to pose actually to the Albanian participant, or maybe to Ambassador Fan. This is related generally to the issue of Mao's claims to the Russian Far East. What is particularly in my mind is the October 1964 meeting between Mao Zedong and Balluku. At that meeting Mao Zedong told Balluku that what he had told the Japanese delegation in June regarding the claims that the Soviet Far East was Chinese territory was actually firing empty cannons? I would just like to collect comments about this from the Chinese side, especially those who are familiar with the Albanian situation or Chinese–Albanian relations.

*Westad:* OK, good. Now, we are running a little bit short of time. Anyone else on the 1969 border clashes from the Eastern European side? If that is not the case, perhaps we can now deal with Sergey's question. Anyone likes to respond to that, on the claims made by Chairman Mao? Ambassador Li? Let me just mention the last issue that we want to deal with. It is a question from the Chinese side about the possibility of improvement of China's relations with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in 1965, or in later 1964 after Khrushchev's fall. So I may have to turn to you again, Ambassador Li, for that. Please.

*Li Fenlin:* We should not discuss this issue here. We will not be able to finish the discussion. This is a concrete issue. Professor Li Danhui and others are very clear about this history. It would be very time-consuming if we started talking about this.

*Yu Hongjun:* After Khrushchev fell from power, it became possible for China to improve its relations with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. 1964 was the fifteenth anniversary of the PRC. At the time the Sino–Soviet relations were very bad. It was mentioned yesterday that China differentiated the Eastern European countries from the Soviet Union. Therefore China informed the Eastern European countries that they were welcome to send delegations of different levels to participate in the celebration of the PRC's fifteenth anniversary. In 1964 China hoped to use this opportunity to maintain or develop friendly relations with the Eastern European countries. So their party delegations at any level would be welcome.

The result was very disappointing. Among the Eastern European delegations, only one country sent a deputy prime minister. Some sent a trade union leader, some a newspaper editor, and some the head of an unofficial friendship association. Obviously China was not reciprocated properly. Nevertheless, the Chinese side still received these with the party protocol. Zhu De, Deng Xiaoping and other high-level party leaders met

with these guests. I would like to know why at the time the Eastern European countries gave such low-key responses to China's warm invitation.

After the Sino-Indian border conflict in 1962, how did the Eastern European countries view the conflict? In the winter, Soviet Union leaders attacked China at the Bulgarian party congress, and then they did the same at the party conferences in Hungary, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia. Immediately the Eastern European parties joined the Soviet Union in attacking China. Was there some kind of coordination?

*Westad:* Thank you. I will have very brief comments from Ambassador Juhász and Professor Rowiński first, and then Ambassador Budura. Then we will have to move on to the next topic.

*Juhász:* The name of the Hungarian delegation to the PRC's fifteenth anniversary was Delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic. We did not send any trade union or other organization's leader. The delegation was headed by a member of the politburo. You just said that these Eastern European parties in their party congresses acted as one in attacking China. I do agree that this was the case. We need to examine what tone was taken and what was said by each individual party. They were different and should be differentiated. There was no coordination. Our friends here seem to think that after Khrushchev fell from the power, the atmosphere immediately became relaxed and this would facilitate bilateral relations. This was not the case in Hungary. In 1964, Kádár returned to Budapest from a visit to Poland. The transition of power from Khrushchev to Brezhnev happened when he was in Poland. He issued a statement to support Khrushchev as soon as he returned to Hungary. Therefore, Brezhnev did not trust him from day one. To Hungary, this was not a good environment.

*Rowiński:* As you know, we sent a United Front delegation to China. Why? Probably in July 1964, in talking to a delegation of the Japanese Social Democratic Party, Chairman Mao discussed the issue of international boundaries and for the first time mentioned the western border of Poland. We asked the Chinese foreign ministry whether China changed its stand on the borders. We asked Wang Bingnan about this. His answer was that Chairman Mao said what he said. It seemed that your basic stand on our western borders changed. This was a very important question to us. We waited for three months and did not get any answer from the Chinese side.

Then our leaders sent a telegram to China to congratulate it on its fifteenth anniversary. This time you answered. Chairman Mao, Liu Shaoqi, Zhou Enlai, and Zhu De answered together and stressed that China's stand

on Poland's western borders had not changed. We however had waited for three months. When the delegation was dispatched, the answer had not arrived yet. As for the Indian question, Ambassador Juhász already clarified the matter. We thought that the situation at the time was harmful to the policy of the socialist camp, to our relations with Asian countries, and to the role of India. This view was not imposed on us by the Soviets.

*Westad:* Ambassador Budura.

*Budura:* I already said that in 1964, in September or even before, the Chinese government informed us that they intended to organize a kind of bigger festivities and to invite delegations from some socialist countries. We were told that we would be among those invited. Then, after some weeks, we received another piece of information that the Chinese government and party were ready to invite representatives of all socialist countries. So, from Romania the delegation was headed by the prime minister and included the deputy prime minister and the secretary for international relations.

*Westad:* Thank you very much. We are running out of time for this session. (*Yu Hongjun:* I want to add something about Romania. . .) Sorry, we cannot do that. We will have opportunities to return to some of these issues, Baijia and I have agreed, if we have time in the summing up session. If there are more specific questions coming in, we could spend some time doing that after Baijia and I make some brief introductions starting up with our impressions of the conversations we have been having. Now I want to turn to Shen Zhihua with regard to the question about access to Chinese documents and Chinese materials. Perhaps after that Mr. Yu could also chip in. We only have about seven or eight minutes left for this session. We have to be brief. Shen Zhihua.

*Shen Zhihua:* I will describe briefly archival declassification in China. The foreign ministry archives were opened this year, though the documents made available only reached the year 1955 and they, some 10,000 pieces, account for only 30% of the archives for these years. Nevertheless this is a very important step. Before this, as we all know, scholars could only see those declassified documents that had been selected, edited, and even altered by relevant government branches. Although these have been many, they can easily cause problems.

An example is the telegram of October 2, 1950. The compilers of the documents did not realize that the telegram had not been sent out. After drafting the telegram, Mao Zedong shelved it. When the document was published in 1987, it caused a big misunderstanding in the circle of his-

torical studies. This question was not solved until 1996 when the Russian archives were declassified.<sup>21</sup> Before this year, whenever we participated in scholarly conferences, foreign colleagues would always ask Chinese scholars whether or they brought with them any new archival materials. I was never able to answer this question. But today I can. I brought with me archives from the Chinese Foreign Ministry. Why? Because it is open and we can make photocopies and bring them here. I have visited the archives four or five times. Although the declassification is still limited, there are still some rather important materials that we did not know before. These have not been seen even in the Russian archives.

Here I have some examples. On June 9, 1949, Mao Zedong sent a telegram to Stalin before Liu Shaoqi's trip to Moscow. This telegram was very long because Mao asked Stalin to send 600 experts to China. The list of these 600 names was very long. He requested that before August, 258 of these experts come to China first. I did not know this material before and only knew that Lin Biao sent a telegram to Stalin. I do not know whether Arne has seen it in the German archives. This is therefore a new piece of information. In addition, according to some memoirs, the Soviet experts in China were to be paid the same salaries as Chinese experts. There was not a document to prove this. Now we know that, when Mao visited Moscow in 1950, the Soviets changed their attitude. Their demand was that besides receiving the same salaries as Chinese experts, the Soviet experts should be given by the Chinese side an additional compensation of 3,000 to 4,000 rubles each month. This condition differed from the one agreed upon during Liu Shaoqi's visit. Now I found this document signed by the two parties. The two parties' central committees reached an agreement that clearly stipulated that after paying the salaries and providing accommodation and meals to the Soviet experts, the Chinese side would not provide additional compensation to the Soviet side.

There is also information about many other events. Before the [July 1954] Geneva conference, the Soviet Union informed China of the situation at the [January-February 1954] Berlin conference. Gromyko advised the Chinese foreign ministry about how to participate in international conferences, including how to speak, how to dress, how to behave at photo sessions, and so on. Another very interesting information is that China's renminbi were

21 For the texts of the two documents, see *Cold War International History Project Bulletin* 6-7 (1995-96): 106-107, 114-16.

first printed by the Soviet Union. There was an agreement on this. Of course these newly opened archival materials, despite what has been said about the archives and in the news media, will not solve all historical puzzles. Actually we need to make greater effort and work harder. Nevertheless, this is the first step in the opening of China's archives.

*Westad:* Thank you very much, Shen Zhihua. That is very useful. I had a chance to do some work in the foreign ministry archives myself. We can return to this topic in the next session. My impression is that declassification, however welcome it is, is also extremely uneven. There are some very important topics that are not very well covered. And I am surprised to hear the figure, 30%, that I was told by a friend from the foreign ministry. Because if the five documents on Indonesia that we have been told about amount to 30% of the Chinese relationship with Indonesia between 1950 and 1955, then China's relationship with that very important country must really have been much more minimal than anyone would have expected. We will have a chance to return to this later on in terms of concrete questions.

I would like to thank you again for what has been, at least for me, a fascinating session. I apologize to those of you who had put questions to me beforehand that we didn't have time to address. I think all of us have learned a lot from this session anyhow. Thank you very much. We now have 15 minutes for tea break.

\* \* \* End of Round Table \* \* \*



## Closing Session

(10:45–11:45, March 26)

*Zhang Baijia:* Please be seated. We have the last item on our agenda. At first I want to make two announcements. We just distributed a directory among the participants. All the participants' e-mail addresses are listed. Now we found some errors, so please check your own e-mail address and see if there are any mistakes. We need to collect the corrected list and print it again. Another thing is that some in the audience have pointed out that our vitae for the ambassadors had errors. In a moment our people will check with each of the ambassadors about your careers involving China, especially your tenures in China or in Eastern Europe. Accurate time is extremely important to researchers.

We will use this last segment to make some conclusive remarks about the symposium itself. At first our two moderators will make brief remarks and then the participants may freely express their thoughts and suggestions. In the end, we will invite Professor Mastny and Director Li Zhongjie to make closing speeches.

*Westad:* Thank you, Baijia. As I have already said before, this has been an extremely useful conference. Not only has it been the first of this kind in China—we have been able to bring together veterans from Eastern Europe and from the Chinese diplomatic service to discuss their bilateral issues during the period of great change, conflict, and slow movement toward cooperation. But it also has been, at least for me, I think I speak for most participants who think so, certainly those from outside of China, it has been filled with new revelations, things we didn't know about, particularly in terms of insight that you have given us on some of the decision-making that took place. This is where I want to start my remarks with regard to the conference overall. We have started on that. We have got some steps further, but we still have some way to go.

There are a number of breaking points in Chinese–Eastern European relations during the time period that we are looking at here, basically from the early 1960s to 1989. For all these breaking points, such as 1962, 1964, 1968, 1969, 1976 to 1978, and then the period from 1985 to 1989, we still do not have much insight into some of the key decision-making processes and

positions that were taken, particular on the Chinese side. The reason for that is quite obvious. It is the lack of documents dealing with the top leadership's decisions. One of the things that we have to work on in the future, as I see it, is to bring together the documentary record that is now available in Eastern Europe and is slowly and incompletely becoming available from the side of the Soviet Union, and wait for the results of the policy of openness with regard to historical evidence that has now started in China.

It was fascinating for me to be in China during the last meeting of the National People's Congress and to see how issues, such as transparency and openness in terms of the government and party decisions, were addressed by the premier and others who spoke at that session of the congress. It is my hope that this will also encompass a new openness with regard to historical documents and historical issues. Of course, we are aware that the work on this will have to be done by our Chinese friends and our Chinese colleagues. It is not a job for foreigners to deal with the opening up of China's historical records. But I do hope that the ambassadors who have been here, who have witnessed this extremely open and frank and useful discussion that we have been having, will use their own influence and their own advice, particularly within the foreign ministry, to speed up the release of Chinese documents, not only for the early period of the existence of the People's Republic of China, but also for later periods. And then we will get a complete understanding of the development of Chinese diplomacy. That is my first conclusion.

The second one is with regard to the Eastern European sides. There has been a long period when research into Eastern European–Chinese relations has not had a high priority in Eastern Europe. Many of the resources that have gone into studying relationships between Eastern Europe and China after the changes in 1989 have been very limited. The reason for this, obviously, is that Eastern Europe has been reorienting itself toward cooperation with Western Europe and, to some extent, the United States. But I would hope, based on the discussions such as we have had here, especially for the younger generation of scholars and teachers, that they can cooperate with some of the veterans who have been present here and others to develop the study of the East European–Chinese relations further. I stress again the importance of the conference that took place in Budapest a few months ago, which was the first time that East European scholars met to compare evidence and to compare notes on the East European relationship with China. And it was a really a breakthrough conference, for which the organizers, many of whom are here, should be congratulated. Our conference here in

Beijing has been an almost perfect follow-up to that. This is a process that we hope can continue.

My third point is with regard to the development of the oral testimony, the reminiscences of the veterans who take part in these proceedings and hopefully also others. It cannot be stressed strongly enough how important it is, as Shen Zhihua emphasized as well, that the documentary record should be accompanied by historical evidence taken directly from the participants. One area we should try to develop further with regard to oral cooperation would be exactly with regard to that, both in terms of diplomats, and hopefully also the decision makers. We know that Niu Jun and some of his colleagues at *Beida* have been preparing the oral history program for the Chinese side. I think it is very important that such programs also cooperate with other institutions abroad that are conducting oral history. Through that cooperation the program can help complete the record.

There is a problem now in China, which I think we will try to overcome. This is with regard to, on the one hand, the diplomatic personnel and on the other hand the actual interviewing of former decision makers. I think the next breakthrough on this would have to be taking the next step up, and actually trying to deal extensively, while they are still alive, with the recollections of the former policy makers. And I would very much welcome the initiative that has been discussed here, as James Hershberg mentioned, the possibility of trying to incorporate some of the decision makers, after they have been completely briefed by our Chinese friends about what has been happening here in the last few days, into some form of oral history exercise. It is extremely important because, without that record, much of the context of history will be lost. The time to begin it is now when we still have the opportunity of doing it.

My final comment goes to the veterans, participants on both sides. I have been deeply impressed by the willingness, on the part of our friends, foreign and Chinese, to deal with highly sensitive and problematic issues. This conference to me is a testimony of how far you can get if you are willing to encounter those kinds of issues, not just frankly and openly but also with good humor. Everyone here has had friendly, I dare not say comradely, certainly friendly relations to each other, even when discussing the difficult, problematic issues. I think the participants should be congratulated for that.

OK, I'll try to sum up the conference with regard to the work we have done and point the way forward. I could have gone through a number of

issues that we have not dealt with and we'll all have to deal with. There are limits to how much we can do within a three-day conference. My final appeal would be for those scholars who are here and those are many, who feel that Baijia and I have not been able to call on them for questions as often as they would have liked to. I apologize again for that. But now that you know the people who are involved on both sides, on the Chinese side and on the foreign side, you can continue your relationship with them and try to get their advice and testimony when you are preparing your historical work, and incorporate them directly into your work. This conference is just the beginning, and I think it is a very, very good one.

*Zhang Baijia:* Now I will make a brief summary of the symposium as one of its organizers. I have been engaged in the study of the PRC's foreign relations for many years. In my research I have sensed a major flaw. That is, the study is not balanced. We have been paying more attention to great power relations than to other aspects. A rather weak aspect of the study had been China's relations with Eastern European countries. Of course, the situation also exists in the study of China's relations with Western European countries. I hope that we can change this situation. This is also the reason why we chose this subject as a starting point. In my view, along with the progress of time and especially in the twenty-first century, we need to have more balanced international relations. In the future, both great powers and small states should play important roles in international relations.

My second point is that mutual understanding is very important in diplomatic work. In the past bilateral relations only involved diplomatic processes. Rarely did the participants in the processes have opportunities to communicate and to review these processes. I think that this has cost us many opportunities for learning and accumulating experiences. Therefore, a conference should enable the participants to recall their historical experiences and involve historical researchers in dialogues with these participants and clarify many issues. To diplomatic work, mutual understanding belongs to the soft cultural background. Without such soft yet deep understanding, understanding the significance of the other side's policies would become impossible and correct policy-making on one's own side would be unlikely. Therefore, in my opinion, such historical reviews are not only useful to historians but are also extremely important to current interstate relations.

In the eyes of historians, traditional research, especially research in diplomatic history, relies mainly on archives. This differentiates the study of diplomatic history from other historical studies. In other fields of historical

research such complete sets of archival documents as in diplomatic history may not exist. But we have found out more and more that although archives are important, we also need to learn from historical participants' thoughts and feelings. Archives cannot reflect the entire historical process, especially the participants' direct experiences. Therefore, in current historical research, oral history becomes increasingly important.

In this symposium we have hoped to combine the two elements. For this symposium our foreign friends prepared numerous East European archival materials. We will use them carefully after this conference. Although the opening of Chinese archives has already begun, we are not yet able to combine the Chinese archives with this symposium. In any event, we are trying to combine the two elements. I want to thank especially the historical participants, the ambassadors, at this symposium. I am very grateful to you for making very careful preparations for this conference. Both the Chinese and the foreign ambassadors have made a lot of preparation, including consultations with their colleagues. As organizers of this symposium, we are very grateful.

This time we have had a dialogue between scholars and diplomats. Perhaps because of their different trades, the two sides have different habits. The scholars have preferred directness and wanted to get to the point and details right away. The diplomats were more principled and more tactful in their presentations. In any event this is a very good beginning. After this meeting, this format can be continued at a proper time. We may either choose a different topic or continue this one, and hold another conference. At least we may use e-mail to contact each other more frequently. When possible, we will certainly have more mutual visits. Now we invite all the participants of this symposium to talk about your thoughts and suggestions.

*Chen Jian:* I am very glad to be part of this conference and very grateful to the organizers and the ambassadors. The Chinese and Eastern European ambassadors taught a class to historians here. I have some suggestions and thoughts. The first suggestion is for the ambassadors. I think that the ambassadors should write memoirs. For yourselves you should put on record a very important part of your life. For your children you should let them know how you spent a main portion of your energy. And for history you should write how historical events happened. The memoirs need not necessarily be for publication, but for preserving the record. This undertaking can also enrich your life after retirement.

The second thing I want to talk about is history. I remember that on the first day Ambassador Li Fenglin raised four questions. One of them was about the role of individuals. This existed in the special field of the Chinese–Eastern European relations, in the development of Chinese foreign policies and relevant domestic changes, and in the whole process of the Cold War and twentieth-century history. Two issues are clear. One involves three very important individuals, though we did not discuss them specifically here. They are Mao Zedong, Zhou Enlai, and Deng Xiaoping. From the 1960s and the 1980s, China was a revolutionary state outside the world system. Or, in various ways, it was a state that first challenged other systems and then gradually entered the world system. In the process the roles of these three individuals cannot be ignored. Why did China not become reconciled with the Soviet Union in 1964 and 1965? To a great extent this was because of Mao. But then, through the Sino–American rapprochement, in his unique way, Mao built a bridge for China to reenter the world. It was because of Zhou Enlai that China could demonstrate rationality while it was a revolutionary state. And it was Deng Xiaoping who led China to reenter the world and to play a responsible role. as becoming to its status of a world great power. All these are important points.

Lastly, I wish to talk about a very important issue discussed in this symposium. It is the fate of socialism in the twentieth century. One thing is certain from my point of view as a scholar. In the twentieth century socialism rose and transformed itself in the end. This fate and process shows a historical phenomenon of great historical import. In the end socialism met different destinies in different countries. Its legacies should not be evaluated just by the system's own success or failure because today, even in contemporary capitalism, the influence of socialism has been incorporated into every aspect of life. From such a perspective, we may get a broader view in understanding many questions. We may develop a fuller view in understanding the Chinese experience and its impact on the world in the twentieth-century history.

*Hershberg:* I also want to endorse the comments of our chairmen, both Arne Westad and Zhang Baijia, about the usefulness of this event, the desirability of obtaining more Chinese documentary materials to inform and anchor future discussions and to consider the possibilities for continuing this process. I mentioned earlier the idea of a conference bringing together the veterans of the Sino-Soviet confrontation. Another possibility would be to explore the memories of the veterans, documents, and scholars on the

triangular relationship, because Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski, for example, are still alive and active. Maybe it would be very expensive to bring them to Beijing. There are many senior officials dealing with US–Chinese relations who could inform such discussions.

I also want to agree very strongly with what has been said about the importance of oral history in supplementing the usefulness of documents in a comprehensive way. I just want to provide one piece of information that maybe helpful not only to Niu Jun and his partners but also to the party history research group. In the United States, most, if not all, presidential administrations, when they conclude, have a systematic, even routine, program of interviewing senior officials. If you go to the internet web sites, for example, of the Lyndon Johnson Library and the John F. Kennedy Library, they contain lists of hundreds of interviews, many of them are available online. And most of them were conducted within a year of the end of the administration, so the memories were fresh, before they were influenced by later events.

It would be extremely helpful for the party research institute, if it does not already exist, to consider a program of routine interviews of senior decision makers. Even if they are kept secret for some time, at least they would exist for some point in the future. Maybe my new son will live long enough to read them in his old age. I think this conversation, as has been pointed out, provides two thirds of the elements of the critical oral history, the former participants and the scholars. Perhaps next time we can add the final third, the relevant documentation, to inform the discussion.

And finally, I am sure that I am expressing the view of many here, thanks the translators. Unlike Chen Jian and several others, I and several others have depended on the excellent translation to be able to follow the discussion. It is indeed a great privilege and honor to be here. I really want to express my thanks to them.

*Juhász:* First I wish to thank our hosts for their very kind hospitality. They prepared very good conditions for this symposium. This symposium has been quite successful. I have three thoughts to offer. First, we have a shared past. The study of the past should also be a common effort, otherwise the study may lead to biased conclusions. Secondly, therefore, I propose to continue this dialogue between us. Thirdly, I agree completely with Mr. Chen Jian's suggestion. Participants in historical events should write memoirs. But I also suggest that to avoid subjective judgments, the memoirs should be written with the support of archival material. Thank you.

*Budura:* I am very happy to have participated in this international symposium. I firmly believe that this symposium not only contributed to clarification of certain historical issues but also contributed significantly to the mutual understanding and trust between the countries that we represent. I wish to use this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to the organizers, including organizations and individuals, of this conference. Thank you.

*Zhang Baijia:* Thank you. Shen Zhihua, please.

*Shen Zhihua:* The speakers before me have expressed many thanks. I will not repeat them because I will have to bother many diplomats and ambassadors present. A moment ago I already contacted many of you. I have two suggestions regarding the next step. One is directly connected with this symposium. This time our main subject has been the Chinese–Eastern European relations between the 1960s and 1980s. Yet in the second half of the twentieth century, China, the Soviet Union and all the Eastern European countries were faced with two questions. One was domestic reform and another was the Cold War in the international scene. It was still a time of confrontation between two blocs. Therefore we as researchers should consider these two leads.

We should pay more attention to the events of the 1950s. I mean the incidents in Poland and Hungary. These can be viewed as a starting point of the reforms in China and in the Eastern European, even though these reforms failed and were suppressed. Afterwards the Eastern European countries had a situation, and in China, to a very large extent, the CCP changed its policy because of the Polish–Hungarian incidents. I do not need to get into details because we have all studied these issues. But now it appears that there are many unanswered questions. I understand that much of the relevant Hungarian and Russian archival material has been declassified. But there are still many loopholes.

Today in private I asked people some questions. I have seen material indicating that on the evening of November 1, 1956, Kádár left the headquarters of the Hungarian Communist Party and proceeded to the Soviet military barracks and then to Moscow. But in the process he met with the Chinese ambassador once. We do not know what they talked about. Then, did China play a role in Kádár's sudden change of mind? This is a big question. In addition, during the Polish incident, Khrushchev decided to stop military advance toward Warsaw on October 19. What was the reason? Was there a China factor here? Right now we still cannot find clear and accurate answers to these questions. We will need the recollections by individuals involved

in these events and study them together with archival materials. Therefore, next time we should probably have an earlier time frame and consider the Polish–Hungarian incidents.

My second suggestion is to hold a similar symposium on the Sino–Soviet relations. All of the issues discussed here were directly connected to the changes in the Sino–Soviet relationship. China’s development, at least from the 1950s to the 1960s, could not be separated from that of the Soviet Union. There are many questions that remain unclear to us. Now all the important research institutions on Cold War history are represented here. Vojtech, Christian, National Security Archives, and Chen Jian, who is the director of the Center for Cold War Studies at the Eastern Chinese Normal University. [*Chen Jian*: Who said I’m a director?] [jokingly] I appointed you. There is also a center at Peking University. We are all here. Perhaps we should consider what to do next. Thank you.

*Li Xiangqian*: Professor Chen Jian has just talked about this symposium from the angle of the historical destiny of socialism and that of the macro development of the twentieth century. I do not have a grand perception like his, and therefore I would like to discuss this symposium from the angle of our Party History Research Center. Although we are named the Party History Research Center of the CCP Central Committee, we also hope to enrich ourselves through opening up and extensive exchanges with foreign scholars. This should be apparent after our two-day discussions. Although our gate is guarded by the PLA [People’s Liberation Army], there is neither an iron curtain nor a bamboo curtain as was the case in the Cold War period.

In my opening speech I said that our center accomplished many firsts. I hope, as just has been said by Professor Westad, that more scholars from different countries will continue to cooperate with our respected veteran ambassadors. We will open our arms to welcome you and cooperate with you as closely as possible, so we can enrich our academic research together. I am not up to Chen Jian’s level because he is the director of the Cold War center. I just hope that our colleagues pay more attention to us. Thank you.

*Nu Jun*: I feel very honored by having been invited to participate in this symposium, and have been very fortunate to meet with so many senior Eastern European diplomats. I have indeed learned a lot about those historical events. I am always trying to imagine how in those years Chinese and Eastern European diplomats conducted themselves and dealt with each other. Perhaps there was a cultural atmosphere that we can never learn from historical narratives. It can only be seen and felt directly. The dialogue here

has greatly exceeded my imagination in terms of its success. I think actually we all share the same thought. Again I realize that the study of Chinese diplomatic history needs more exchanges. We cannot only rely on Chinese archives. The Chinese archives are limited. If we only rely on them, many problems would occur, especially in understanding the other side.

Briefly, I have two points to make. First, we as scholars must strengthen our dialogue with diplomats. Only in this way can we understand what diplomacy is. It is not archival diplomacy but contacts between real people. Secondly, I am with the School of International Relations, Peking University, and have been directing nearly for three years the oral history project on the PRC's foreign relations. We have collected a great number of materials. There are audio recordings and transcripts of these recordings. Some of these may be published with the approval of the interviewees. Shen Zhihua and Li Danhui have participated in this work and many faculty members and students have also been involved. Our School has so far provided adequate financial support, though sometimes our interviews have encountered understandable difficulties. At this point I still do not have a concrete idea. But I hope that a way or channel can be found for us to establish close collaboration with oral history projects abroad. Then we may together assess the value of our materials.

Lastly, I am very grateful to the Party History Research Center for arranging such an excellent conference and for providing so much for us to learn. The last point, I hope that the proceedings of this symposium can be shared with us and will not enter the archives. Thank you.

*Zhang Baijia:* Let me answer Niu Jun's question now. The proceedings of this symposium have been recorded both on tapes and in shorthand. The foreign side will be responsible for producing an English text and the Chinese side will produce a Chinese text. We are considering ways of how to provide the texts to the participants. I do not believe that there is anything to be kept secret. Our symposium itself is transparent and open. Now we invite the ambassador to make some remarks.

*Fan Chengzuo:* When I received the notification of the conference, I could not believe it. I asked: what was the sponsoring unit? This happened last year when I was visiting my relatives in the United States. I was told to participate in this conference when I returned. Ambassador Liu, who is sitting opposite me, and other colleagues recommended me. When I learned that the Party History Research Center was the sponsoring unit, I said that this did not seem like an undertaking for them. At the time I did not under-

stand, but now I understand the reason. What is an opening? This is a full opening, if a unit like the Party History Research Center can sponsor such an activity. This is very good. This is my first thought.

My second thought is that, according to a Chinese saying, everything can be done if preparations are made. I am deeply impressed by the accomplishment of the Party History Research Center, which had never sponsored such activities before. I would like to use three phrases to describe it: first, undiverted attention—I do not know whether this is easy to translate—second, full-scale effort, and third, complete devotion. This is the case from the top to the bottom, and from the director to the chef. I said to a colleague, what if we try to find some fault in what they are doing? But, sorry, we cannot find any. This conference is perfect because of careful preparations. I am very moved and grateful.

Thirdly, there is a Chinese saying: “Three cobblers with their wits combined surpass Zhuge Liang, the mastermind.” Three ordinary people may achieve extraordinary wisdom. Zhuge Liang was one of the wisest and smartest figures in Chinese history. On the battlefield he could lead an army of millions to victory, and under the emperor he could administer the state to achieve great order. We are not three cobblers but many ambassadors and scholars. The combination of our wits is extraordinary. My presentation is a mere sluggish brook, but our brooks have converged into a long river.

Lastly, I never expected that at my age, about 75, I would feel pressure again. Fortunately my blood pressure is normal. What pressure? It is a pressure brought about by this conference, such as Professor Chen Jian’s suggestion that we write memoirs. This will disturb my plan after retirement and my life now. Let me tell you, I retired but I have not rested. I am working almost every day. I set a standard for myself, which contains eight Chinese characters and can be said in four foreign words. They are listen, write, talk, and travel. I have cooperated with the Beijing University and given lectures there. I have given many talks both south and north of the Yangtze River. I have talked about the international situation. I have devoted much of my energy to writing poems, two thousands of them, and published a selection in a volume. What should I do now? Do I have to obey Chen Jian? It seems that I need to be more focused in my mind just like an interpreter figuring out a sentence in his head. The journal editor here also asked me to write. I thought, all right, I had to change my focus. Therefore I feel some pressure. In a word, I benefited from this symposium. I have talked a little but listened

a lot. In the past few days I ate many good meals but did not waste time, and I learned a lot of new things. Thank you.

*Zhang Baijia:* Thank you, Ambassador Fan.

*Westad:* Maybe, since we have the adviser for the Albanian president here, it could be a possibility to invite Ambassador Fan to Albania, or he could conduct research in the Albanian archives and write his memories at the same time. He could combine his interests and travel.

*Kapllani:* You took the words from my mouth.

*Byrne:* I will be very brief. I am a humble observer at this event but I am representing the National Security Archive, which has organized a number of similar events in countries as diverse as Cuba, Vietnam, Russia and elsewhere. And I must say that the experience we have had, we have done this with a few colleagues in this room, is that it is a difficult concept often at first for those governments and countries to reconcile themselves to, as Ambassador Fan has implied. But once they get used to the idea, once they see that in a proper academic environment there are not only no threats to any particular interests, national or otherwise, but also extremely important benefits to be had, both from personal and national points of view, they realize that this is a very worthwhile activity to be a part of.

Perhaps the most important thing from our point of view is that these events add a perspective to scholarship that was previously unavailable in most instances. So I would hope that this is a message you and your colleagues could pass on to your other colleagues, that this type of activities has very important benefits for China. I would like to thank the organizers for their many kindnesses to all of us from outside of China, and especially to me personally and my family. I also welcome this event as a very important step in the process of bringing China's voice more clearly to the attention of the international scholarly community. Thank you very much.

*Zhang Baijia:* Thank you. Now, Professor Mastny.

*Mastny:* I think it is very difficult for me to say something significant after so many good reasons have been cited here why the conference have been such a success. I certainly endorse all those reasons that have been mentioned and perhaps just add a few more. It has been a matter of great satisfaction also for me personally and for the project that I am heading. As I might have hinted at the beginning, I had encountered some difficulties with a few of my colleagues in the Parallel History Project, particularly in Europe, when I first proposed to hold this sort of seminar. Why in China, what is really in it for us, how can it possibly succeed? So when I get back to

them I think I will have a very strong argument to counter these skeptical views.

I would like to use this opportunity to make you aware of the particular suitability of the Parallel History Project for pursuing our contacts, for following up this meeting by means of E-mail and in other ways. I would like to see not only those conferences that James Hershberg mentioned here as a possibility in the future, but I would also like to see more of you, Chinese scholars as well as Eastern European diplomats, participating in various events that our project, our colleagues from the Cold War Project, and other co-sponsors will organize, participating as both individuals and institutions.

I have been particularly impressed here—and I'm repeating what has been said before—by the spirit of easy communication. I think this has to be emphasized again because it is not something to be taken for granted. After all, the people here come from different countries, different cultures, and different organizations, and most of us had never met before. I think that it is mainly thanks our Chinese colleagues that this communication has been made so easy. Perhaps we have been lucky here to be dealing with diplomats. I have been struck by the observation that Chen Jian made here, if I understood the translation correctly. He attributed to Deng Xiaoping two qualities that changed Chinese foreign policy for the better—rationality and courage. I think I could trace those qualities among our Chinese colleagues in our discussions here, and I see them as one of the major reasons why communication has been so easy.

Let me conclude by saying, or confessing why so many of us like to come to China. It is an enormous country, it has enormous problems, enormous energy, enormous accomplishments, and consequently a great future. The Party History Institute is not one of the obvious places where one would look for this kind of spirit, but I am particularly encouraged to find such spirit at this institute as well. And for that, too, we have to be grateful to our hosts and organizers. I join the rest of us in expressing my sincere thanks to you for making this seminar such a success. Thank you.

*Zhang Baijia:* Mr. Li Zhongjie of the Party History Research Center has listened to our discussion from the beginning to the end. Now he has the last word.

*Li Zhongjie:* Ladies and Gentlemen, you just made very substantive and warm speeches. I will say a few words as the host. After a long time of preparations and especially through the tense yet orderly work in the

past three days, our international symposium is coming to an end. Judging from the remarks before mine, we indeed feel that the conference has been very successful. It succeeded first in its format. Through the efforts of all sides concerned, the symposium brought together veteran Eastern European and Chinese diplomats and many established scholars. This unique format laid a very good foundation for the conference. Yesterday, at the Romanian Embassy I said that this was a rare opportunity for so many older and younger ambassadors to get together. This opportunity provided us with an excellent forum of discussion.

The conference succeeded secondly in its content. The symposium has had a very rich content. Through a common effort, we examined the historical process of the Chinese–Eastern European relations, explored certain the causes and consequences of events, and clarified the principles, orientations, and practices of the countries concerned. The dialogue enabled the different sides to achieve a better understanding of each other’s stands and practices in those years. From this perspective, we are responsible to history, and we have achieved progress and success in the study of history. Thirdly, as many participants have pointed out, at the beginning of the conference many of us did not know each other or had not seen each other for a long time. But this opportunity brought us together. Now strangers became friends, and old acquaintances became even better friends. During the conference, in different ways we strengthened communication and enhanced friendship. This is also a success.

We feel very good about this symposium. Of course, we cannot clarify all the complicated historical issues of several decades or even produce a chronology for these decades in just two or three days. It is very difficult and needs more persistent efforts. But this conference has made a very good beginning in doing a significant job of laying the foundations of and creating excellent conditions for research in the future. The participants have different professions and interests, and they wanted to learn about different things. It would be difficult to satisfy every individual’s interest. But the purpose of this conference is not to satisfy any people’s or any group of people’s interest, but to bring scholars and veteran diplomats together to have this dialogue. In this sense, the symposium has enriched and completed a historical process. We must recognize this contribution.

The second thing I want say is to express our gratitude. The success and satisfactory result of the conference have to be attributed to the efforts of the ladies, gentlemen, and also organizations that participated in the dis-

cussions here and supported the conference in the back stage. Therefore, at first we want to thank the Eastern European diplomats. You endured many difficulties. You had to make very long journeys. Some of you are either of an advanced age or have health problems. But you overcame these difficulties and came here. We are very glad and also very grateful. Then we want to thank our Chinese ambassadors. Although you have retired from responsible positions, you are actually still undertaking very important and arduous work. Some of you had to cancel some very important conferences in order to participate in our symposium. You made careful preparations in advance and that is why your presentations were excellent, profound, and very educational. We thank you for this.

To prepare for such a conference, the organizers and our friends in Zurich, Washington, DC, and other places have made enormous efforts to communicate with and invite so many people to come here to participate in the discussions. We should thank them. Of course the branches of the Chinese government concerned provided strong support and helped us overcome many difficulties. Foreign participants had to be invited through a procedure. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Central Liaison Department, and the Foreign Affairs Office helped facilitate the process. We also want to thank many of our staff, such as the stenographers, interpreters, and personnel in charge of housing, meals, and transportation, who worked very hard and provided perfect service for this conference. Therefore, the success of the symposium is the result of a common effort of many people.

Aside from expressing our gratitude to people and organizations that contributed to this conference, I should especially mention the ambassadors. In listening to the discussions in the past few days, we were profoundly impressed with the laborious work by both the Eastern European and the Chinese ambassadors that in the past helped and currently still help maintain and develop the friendly relations between China and the Eastern European countries. From the many vivid examples presented here we can clearly see their work. So, our special thanks to the ambassadors for their contribution to the development of the friendship between China and the Eastern European countries.

Thirdly I wish to talk about the significance of the symposium. This dialogue has enriched our understanding of history and our narratives and interpretations of history. We often say: let history inform the future. History exists objectively and cannot be altered. We have to respect history. Yet our historical study is for enhancing our development today and in the future.

From the history we have discussed here, we may draw many lessons and experiences. In the past two days we have already derived some lessons and experiences worth considering, evaluating, and learning. Such insights will benefit the development of the relations among states and among peoples in the future. As an academic undertaking, such a multilateral international symposium is especially useful to advance scholarly research. Both Chinese and foreign scholars have their own advantages and disadvantages. We may advance our study of many issues if we learn from each other. We Chinese scholars are especially willing to learn from scholars abroad. In this is another significance of this conference.

Fourthly, what inspirations have we got from the discussions here? There are many. I often wonder what kind of history is the history of the human society. This can be defined in different ways. But I would suggest that the history of humanity is one of continuous progress and development of civilization. The human civilization has continuously progressed from the primitive stage to the intermediate stage, and then from the advanced to an even more advanced stage. In the process all nations of the world, big or small, have contributed to the civilization of humanity. It should be recognized that socialist countries have made contributions, and other countries, even capitalist countries, have also made contributions. China has made contributions and the Eastern European countries have also made contributions.

At the same time, we have found out that the relations between countries of different civilizations constitute a very complex question. Sometimes because of various historical reasons, misunderstanding, disagreements, and unpleasant events between them may happen. But, after experiencing many difficulties and hardships, we should become wiser. We know that our civilization may be very good, but it also has defects and needs improvement. The civilizations of other nations should perhaps also seek further advancement. Therefore we should together explore the rules in the development of human civilization. We should use our work and research to facilitate the dialogue and mutual learning between different civilizations and to enhance the development of human civilization. In this sense, although our symposium is only a small effort, maybe just a drop of water in the sea, we should be able to achieve the expected results if we work toward the common goal. The relations among our countries and among their scholars should be able to improve continuously. There should be many inspirations from this symposium, but I feel especially strongly about this.

Fifth, I have hope in the future. This conference has concluded, but it has been just a step in a long journey. We still have a very long way to travel in the future. I hope that after this conference, our diplomats, scholars, the Party History Research Center, and research institutions in the United States, Europe, and the Eastern European countries will strengthen their communication and collaborate in studying subjects of common interests, so that we can strengthen our ties and enhance our understanding of societies and history. In this regard, our Center is in favor of opening. China's grand strategy in the past two decades has been that of reforms and opening pioneered by comrade Xiaoping. China is open, the Chinese Communist Party is similarly open, and our Center is also open. If we have done some work in this regard in the past, we have not done enough. If we have not done enough, we will need to make greater efforts. Therefore we welcome support from our friends. We would be very willing to participate in more international scholarly exchanges. Of course, after this symposium we also hope that the exchanges between the scholars and the diplomats will continue.

Lastly, we have all good wishes for the participants of the symposium. After the end of the conference, we wish you a good time in Beijing, and a smooth and safe trip for those who will visit other places in China. When you return to your own countries, we wish you more success in your work, and, also, our best wishes for your families. These are my remarks. Perhaps I used some of your lunch time. My last word, therefore, should be my deep apologies. Thank you.

*Zhang Baijia:* Before we leave here, please allow me to introduce the people who are in charge of the logistics of the symposium and have done a lot to ensure its success. Mr. Xiao Zhixian is in charge of the sound systems of the conference. Mr. Feng Guosheng is the director of the Technical Department here. Mr. Feng Zihui is responsible for our restaurant and has prepared those delicious meals for us. Ms. Liu Liping is the guesthouse manager. Xu Wongtang and Chen He assisted with the conference affairs. Lastly we ask our two interpreters to come out of their closed door, Mr. Sun Ning and Ms. Zhang Lei. We have two stenographers who have processed the entire proceedings of the conference. Now the symposium officially concludes. Please enjoy your lunch now.

\* \* \* End of the Closing Session \* \* \*



## Lieferbare Bände aus der gleichen Publikationsreihe:

- Nr. 2 Kurt R. Spillmann: *Beyond Soldiers and Arms: The Swiss Model of Comprehensive Security Policy* (1987)
- Nr. 4 Beat Näf; Kurt R. Spillmann: *Die ETH-Arbeitstagung zur schweizerischen Sicherheitspolitik vom 29. Juni 1987 – Bericht und Auswertung* (1987)
- Nr. 5 Beat Näf; Kurt R. Spillmann: *Die ETH-Arbeitstagung zur schweizerischen Sicherheitspolitik vom 7. Dezember 1987 – Bericht und Auswertung* (1988)
- Nr. 6 Jacques Freymond: *La menace et son évolution dans les domaines militaires et civils dans l'optique de la recherche scientifique et universitaire* (1988)
- Nr. 7 Christian Kind: *Extended Deterrence – Amerikas Nukleargarantie für Europa* (1989)
- Nr. 8 Franz Martin Aebi: *Der Weg zum Weiterleben – Morphologische Studie zu einer zeitgemässen Planung einer Strategie der staatlichen und gesellschaftlichen Selbstbehauptung* (1989)
- Nr. 9 Madeleine Hösli; Kurt R. Spillmann: *Demographie und Sicherheitspolitik: Nationale Aspekte – Bericht und Auswertung der ETH-Arbeitstagung vom 5. Dezember 1988* (1989)
- Nr. 10 Richard D. Challener: *John Foster Dulles: The Certainty/Uncertainty Principle* (1989)
- Nr. 12 Kurt R. Spillmann und Kati Spillmann: *Feindbilder: Entstehung, Funktion und Möglichkeiten ihres Abbaus* (1989)
- Nr. 13 Madeleine Hösli; Kurt R. Spillmann: *Demographie und Sicherheitspolitik: Rückwirkungen internationaler Entwicklungen auf die Schweiz – Bericht und Auswertung der ETH-Arbeitstagung vom 8. Juni 1989* (1989)
- Nr. 14 Fred Tanner: *Die Schweiz und Rüstungskontrolle: Grenzen und Möglichkeiten eines Kleinstaates* (1990)
- Nr. 15 Jacques Hürlimann; Kurt R. Spillmann: *Der Bericht 90 zur schweizerischen Sicherheitspolitik im Urteil ausländischer Expertinnen und Experten – Bericht und Auswertung der ETH-Arbeitstagung vom 6. Dez. 1990* (1991)
- Nr. 16 Urs Roemer: *Die Strategie der «Flexible Response» und die Formulierung der amerikanischen Vietnampolitik unter Präsident Kennedy* (1991)
- Nr. 17 Michael Fajnor: *Die europäische Integration und ihre sicherheitspolitischen Folgen für die Schweiz* (1991)
- Nr. 18 Christof Buri; Karl W. Haltiner; Kurt R. Spillmann: *Sicherheit 1991 – Ergebnisse einer Repräsentativbefragung* (1991)
- Nr. 19 Andreas Wenger: *Kontinuität und Wandel in der amerikanischen Nuklearstrategie – Präsident Eisenhowers Strategie der massiven Vergeltung und die nuklearstrategische Neuevaluation der Administration Kennedy* (1991)
- Nr. 22 Kurt R. Spillmann (Hg.): *Europäische Integration und Schweizerische Sicherheitspolitik – Bericht und Auswertung der ETH-Arbeitstagung vom 25./26. Oktober 1991* (1992)

- Nr. 24 Sabina Ann Fischer: Namibia Becomes Independent – The U.S. contribution to regional peace (1992)
- Nr. 25 Dominique Wisler: La violence politique en Suisse et les mouvements sociaux: 1969–1990 (1992)
- Nr. 26 Mauro Mantovani: Stand und Perspektiven der Sicherheitspolitik in Europa (1992)
- Nr. 27 Kurt R. Spillmann (Hg.): Zeitgeschichtliche Hintergründe aktueller Konflikte II – Vorlesung für Hörer aller Abteilungen – Sommersemester 1992 (1992)
- Nr. 28 Kurt R. Spillmann; Mauro Mantovani (Hg.): Die sicherheitspolitische Integration in Europa als Herausforderung für die Schweiz – Bericht und Auswertung der ETH-Arbeitstagung vom 26. Oktober 1992 (1993)
- Nr. 30 Ilja Kremer: Die Sowjetunion und Russland nach 1985: Von der Oktoberrevolution zur Oktoberkrise (1993)
- Nr. 32 Karl W. Haltiner; Kurt R. Spillmann: Öffnung oder Isolation der Schweiz? Aussen- und sicherheitspolitische Meinungsbildung im Trend (1994)
- Nr. 34 Michael Fajnor: Multilaterale Anstrengungen zur Kontrolle konventioneller Rüstungstransfers und die Schweiz (1994)
- Nr. 35 Kurt R. Spillmann (Hg.): Zeitgeschichtliche Hintergründe aktueller Konflikte IV – Vorlesung für Hörer aller Abteilungen – Sommersemester 1994 (1994)
- Nr. 36 Andreas Wenger; Jeronim Perovic: Das schweizerische Engagement im ehemaligen Jugoslawien (1995)
- Nr. 37 Kurt R. Spillmann (Hg.): Zeitgeschichtliche Hintergründe aktueller Konflikte V – Vorlesung für Hörer aller Abteilungen – Sommersemester 1995 (1995)
- Nr. 38 Karl W. Haltiner; Luca Bertossa; Kurt R. Spillmann: Internationale Kooperationsbereitschaft und Neutralität: Aussen- und sicherheitspolitische Meinungsbildung im Trend (1996)
- Nr. 39 Ulrich Gerster; Regine Helbling: Krieg und Frieden in der bildenden Kunst (1996)  
Ulrich Gerster; Regine Helbling: Krieg und Frieden in der bildenden Kunst (1996) (Bildteil)
- Nr. 40 Christoph Breitenmoser: Sicherheit für Europa: Die KSZE-Politik der Schweiz bis zur Unterzeichnung der Helsinki-Schlussakte zwischen Skepsis und aktivem Engagement (1996)
- Nr. 41 Laurent F. Carrel; Otto Pick; Stefan Sarvas; Andreas Schaer; Stanislav Stach: Demokratische und zivile Kontrolle von Sicherheitspolitik und Streitkräften (1997)
- Nr. 42 Karl W. Haltiner; Luca Bertossa; Kurt R. Spillmann: Sicherheit 97 (1997)
- Nr. 43 Andreas Wenger; Jeronim Perovic: Russland und die Osterweiterung der Nato: Herausforderung für die russische Aussen- und Sicherheitspolitik (1997)
- Nr. 44 Kurt R. Spillmann (Hg.): Zeitgeschichtliche Hintergründe aktueller Konflikte VI – Vorlesung für Hörer aller Abteilungen – Sommersemester 1997 (1997)
- Nr. 45 Kurt R. Spillmann; Hans Künzi (Hg.): Karl Schmid als strategischer Denker: Beurteilungen aus historischer Perspektive. Bericht und Auswertung der Tagung vom 1. Juli 1997 (1997)

- Nr. 46 Derek Müller: Die Aussen- und Sicherheitspolitik der Ukraine seit 1990/91: Herausforderungen, Leistungen und Perspektiven (1998)
- Nr. 47 Andreas Wenger; Jeronim Perovic: Russland zwischen Zerfall und Grossmachtsanspruch: Herausforderungen der Regionalisierung (1998)
- Nr. 48 Andreas Wenger; Christoph Breitenmoser; Patrick Lehmann: Die Nato-Partnerschaft für den Frieden im Wandel: Entwicklung und Zukunft eines kooperativen Sicherheitsinstrumentes (1998)
- Nr. 49 Christof Münger: Ich bin ein West-Berliner: Der Wandel der amerikanischen Berlinpolitik während der Präsidentschaft John F. Kennedys (1999)
- Nr. 50 Christian Nünlist: Kennedys rechte Hand: McGeorge Bundys Einfluss als Nationaler Sicherheitsberater auf die amerikanische Aussenpolitik 1961–63 (1999)
- Nr. 51 David C. Atwood; Shahram Chubin; Pál Dunay; Jozef Goldblat; Martin Schütz; Heiner Staub: Arms Control and Disarmament: Revised version of papers Presented at the 3rd International Security Forum Zurich, 19–21 October 1998 (1999)
- Nr. 52 Andreas Wenger: Herausforderung Sicherheitspolitik: Europas Suche nach Stabilität (1999)
- Nr. 53 Kurt R. Spillmann; Andreas Wenger; Stephan Libiszewski; Patrik Schedler: Informationsgesellschaft und schweizerische Sicherheitspolitik (1999)
- Nr. 54 Kurt R. Spillmann; Andreas Wenger (Hg.): Zeitgeschichtliche Hintergründe aktueller Konflikte VII – Vortragsreihe an der ETH-Zürich – Sommersemester 1999 (1999)
- Nr. 55 Daniel Möckli: Neutralität, Solidarität, Sonderfall: Die Konzeptionierung der schweizerischen Aussenpolitik der Nachkriegszeit, 1943–1947 (2000)
- Nr. 56 Andreas Wenger; Jeremi Suri: The Nuclear Revolution, Social Dissent, and the Evolution of Détente: Patterns of Interaction, 1957–74 (2000)
- Nr. 57 Jon A. Fanzun; Patrick Lehmann: Die Schweiz und die Welt: Aussen- und sicherheitspolitische Beiträge der Schweiz zu Frieden, Sicherheit und Stabilität, 1945–2000 (2000)
- Nr. 58 Vojtech Mastny: Learning from the Enemy: NATO as a Model for the Warsaw Pact (2001)
- Nr. 59 Daniel Maurer: Europäische Sicherheit: Konfliktmanagement am Beispiel «Ex-Jugoslawien» (2001)
- Nr. 60 Kurt R. Spillmann; Andreas Wenger (Hg.): Zeitgeschichtliche Hintergründe aktueller Konflikte VIII – Vortragsreihe an der ETH-Zürich – Sommersemester 2001 (2001)
- Nr. 61 Fred Tanner (ed.) with the assistance of Joanna Schemm: The European Union as a Security Actor in the Mediterranean. ESDP, Soft Power and Peacemaking in Euro-Mediterranean Relations (2001)
- Nr. 62 Judith Niederberger: «Making the Difference between Mutual Destruction and Survival». Amerikanische Rüstungskontrollpolitik unter Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1953–1960 (2001)

- Nr. 63 Daniel Trachsler: Neutral zwischen Ost und West? Infragestellung und Konsolidierung der schweizerischen Neutralitätspolitik durch den Beginn des Kalten Krieges, 1947–1952 (2002)
- Nr. 64 Myriam Dunn: Information Age Conflicts. A Study of the Information Revolution and a Changing Operating Environment (2002). Unveränderter Nachdruck (2004)
- Nr. 65 Kurt R. Spillmann; Andreas Wenger (Hg.): Zeitgeschichtliche Hintergründe aktueller Konflikte IX – Vortragsreihe an der ETH-Zürich – Sommersemester 2002 (2002)
- Nr. 66 Kurt R. Spillmann: Von Krieg und Frieden – Of War and Peace. Abschiedsvorlesung – Farewell Adress, ETH Zürich, 3. Juli 2002 (2002)
- Nr. 67 Doron Zimmermann: The Transformation of Terrorism. The «New Terrorism,» Impact Scalability and the Dynamic of Reciprocal Threat Perception (2003)
- Nr. 68 Tina Kempin: Ready for Peace? The Implementation of the Good Friday Agreement in Northern Ireland 1998–2002 (2003)
- Nr. 69 Marco Zanoli: Zwischen Klassenkampf, Pazifismus und Geistiger Landesverteidigung. Die Sozialdemokratische Partei der Schweiz und die Wehrfrage 1920–1939 (2003)
- Nr. 70 Doron Zimmermann: Tangled Skein or Gordian Knot? Iran and Syria as State Supporters of Political Violence Movements in Lebanon and in the Palestinian Territories (2004)
- Nr. 71 Alexandre Lambert: OSZE-Verhaltenskodex zu Politisch-Militärischen Aspekten der Sicherheit. Zur Rolle der Streitkräfte in Demokratischen Gesellschaften (2004)

Eine Gesamtübersicht über alle bisher erschienenen «Zürcher Beiträge zur Sicherheitspolitik und Konfliktforschung» ist einsehbar im Internet unter [www.css.ethz.ch](http://www.css.ethz.ch).

Die Beiträge können bei der Forschungsstelle für Sicherheitspolitik, ETH Zentrum SEI, CH-8092 Zürich, Tel. 01/632 40 25, Fax: 01/632 19 41, bezogen werden. Es ist auch möglich, die Bestellung online auszuführen unter <http://www.css.ethz.ch/publications/>

Online version provided by the  
International Relations and Security Network

A public service run by the  
Center for Security Studies at the ETH Zurich  
© 1996-2004

