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I am sending you a report from the meeting of the International Department delegations of seven parties on the China issue, including the following attachments:

1) A protocol note

2) Theses – the China problem after the IX CCP Congress (including our remarks regarding the text)

Wiktor Kinecki  
Warsaw, March 19, 1970

Note

On March 10-12 of this year, a confidential meeting took place of the representatives of the CC International Departments: BCP, CPCz, MPRP, SED, PUWP, HWSP, and CPSU devoted to a further discussion on the China issue. The first such meeting took place in December 1967 in Moscow and the second in 1969 in Berlin. The department heads of the CC (MPRP, SED, PUWP, and HWSP) and deputy heads (BCP, CPCz) represented the participating delegations in the Warsaw meeting. The CC CPSU was headed by the CC member, an academic Rumiantsev, ad the First Deputy Head of the CC International Department Oleg Rakhmanin. On the last day of the deliberations, the conference participants met with the CC PUWP Politburo Member, CC Secretary – Comrade Zenon Kliszko.

The daily agenda consisted of the following topics:

1. The exchange of views regarding the situation in China after the Ninth CCP Congress and Beijing's activity on the international arena.

2. The exchange of information by the individual departments on selected topics regarding the social and economic processes taking place in the PRC.

3. The coordination of efforts of fraternal parties and fraternal countries in the area of propaganda, and study and research, against the diversion carried out by Mao Zedong's group.

The discussion took place on the basis of the theses presented by the CPSU International Department delegation (the adopted final text is attached), which, in accordance with the meeting's procedures, consist of the informational material for the leaderships of fraternal parties. The “Protocol Note” (text in attachment), which was unanimously adopted, emphasizes in point 2 that “the Central Committees of fraternal parties make decisions as they fit as to the use of this jointly prepared material.”

***

The discussion on the topic of the theses was limited to the pronouncements of the delegation heads, which contained a unanimous adoption of the material for “a good base for discussion.” Besides, some of the delegations brought up their remarks regarding the text, which were later taken into account by the editorial commission composed of the representatives of all of the delegations.

One should underscore the [participants’] particular support for the theses presented by the delegations of the CC International Departments of the MPRP, CPCz, and BCP. The Hungarian delegation's statement, among other things, justified the need to further examine the possibilities of the development of inter-state relations with the PRC, especially in the area of science and
technology, as well as culture. The comrades from the GDR questioned equating Maoism with “Bonapartism,” which was included in the Soviet draft and also developed during the Soviet preliminary statement which called for the analysis of Bonapartism contained in Marx’s theory.

Our delegation proposed to expand and fill in gaps pertaining to the issue of the opposition in China to Mao’s group’s policy, pro-Maoist groupings abroad, and the PRC’s attitude toward the German issue, especially taking into consideration the diversionary aspect of Chinese attacked pertaining to the talks with the FRG.

There were no other elements that would bring any fundamental innovations to the theses and therefore further discussion regarding the formulation of the presented document was moved to the editorial commission.

As far as point 2, the delegations presented information regarding selected topics on the social and economic issues in the PRC. Comrade Rumiantsev’s statement broached this topic. In the pronouncement, which he defined as “unofficial,” he justified the correctness of the following statement that “the PRC is not a socialist country” from the point of view of social and economic transformations which were carried out due to the “cultural revolution.” Comrade Rahmanin devoted his pronouncement to the results of the Sino-Soviet talks. This pronouncement did not depart from the content in the information which we had recently received in the written form from the CC PUWP. Besides, the Soviet delegation submitted one more piece of information about the current state of the Sino-Japanese relations.

The delegation of the CC SED International Department presented a paper on the situation of Chinese youth and the talks and contacts between the U.S. and the PRC. The written material about some aspects of the development of the internal situation in China was presented by the delegation of the CC MPRP’s International Department.

As far as point 2, we presented material on the personnel situation within the CCP leadership after the Ninth CCP Congress, as well as the statement discussing the social and political situation in Shanghai. The delegations of the CC international departments of the BCP, HWSP, and MPRP presented separate information regarding point 2.

In the discussion on point 3 of the agenda, it was emphasized that a series of concrete decisions, included in the “protocol note” of the Berlin statement, were not implemented. It was decided that a series of these propositions are still current and the international departments should make all efforts to carry them out. The Soviet delegation, among other things, declared that it would organized a sinology and political symposium in the autumn this year in Moscow. The representatives of the CC CPCz International Department accentuated the need to carry out consultations between the departments of international affairs and foreign trade. The Mongolian comrades presented their postulates regarding more thorough research on the Maoist influence in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The Hungarian delegation proposed a joint action regarding the coordination of conducting research on contemporary China.

The delegation of the CC PUWP International Department pointed out the need to exchange internal party materials designated for the training and propaganda use. Our conclusion was met with approval by all of the participating delegations.

The Editorial Commission

The commission carried out a detailed analysis of the text of the theses and adopted a series of revisions, especially when it came to the editorial and stylistic nature. They also took into account the formulations supplementing the individual parts of the text. The Hungarian and German comrades were particularly active during the work of the commission. Our delegation also came out with a series of addenda. Although the Soviet comrades continued to emphasize the unofficial nature of the presented material, they tried, however, not to allow for any major changes or cuts in
The commission adopted corrections regarding the following topics:

- the role and the social base of the pro-Maoist groupings in the world, as well as the situation of the opposition in China (propositions of the CC PUWP International Department);

- China's attitude toward the German question (propositions of the International Departments of the CC SED and the CC PUWP);

- The comparison of “the counterrevolutionary events in Hungary and Czechoslovakia” with “the Maoist coup” (propositions of the CC HWSP and the CC PUWP);

- The comparison of Maoism and “Bonapartism” (propositions of the CC SED International Department);

Besides, a series of revisions, mostly of editorial nature, were adopted, as well as the verifications of some of the PRC's economic estimates, the CCP's personnel issues, and so on. On our suggestion, they removed a rather scant comment about the so-called “the Communist Party of Poland,” as we did not think that our broader explanations as not desirable and not possible within the structure of the presented material. Due to the same reasons, a mention of the “Hungarian Marxist-Leninists” was removed at the suggestion of Hungarian comrades.

***

Having exhausted the agenda during our deliberations, the representatives of the International Departments, on the initiative of the Soviet comrades, conducted consultations on the assessment of the politics and the social and economic situation in Albania, as well as the preparations for the Congress of Nations (this information will be presented separately). It was initially decided that the next meeting of the representatives of the International Departments of fraternal parties will take place in Sofia either at the end of 1970 or in the beginning of 1971.

The CC PUWP International Department

Our [PUWP] remarks regarding the [joint] text of adopted theses

- this material shows for the first time the possibility of defining the PRC as a “non-socialist” country due to “internal” transformations which resulted due to the “cultural revolution.” In our opinion, the argumentation of the Soviet comrades in this respect was not sufficient. The thesis about “the non-socialist nature of the PRC’s economy,” was directly broached in the statement of Comrade Rumiantsev, who reserved the right to state that his statement was not official and only included his “personal opinion.”

- Comparing the counterrevolution in Hungary and the events in Czechoslovakia with the “Maoist coup,” also as results from our knowledge, did not seem to correspond with the opinions of the majority of other comrades during our unofficial talks. The change of this formulation did not take place, most of all, due to a clear support of this thesis by the Czechoslovak comrades and a silent approval by the Hungarian comrades (even though that Hungarian comrades in the conversations with us questioned the correctness of this part of the text).

- One major difficulty, which the Soviet comrades did not negate, was to find a proper definition of the PRC’s current social and political system. The definition of the type of “barrack communism,” “petty bourgeois reactionary socialism,” were not sufficiently justified in a theoretical sense by the authors of this thesis.

- Besides, the material includes a series of simplifications and propaganda-style formulations,
which as useful as they can be in publishing the text (Soviet comrades are planning to publish it in the “Komunist”), they still do not give this study the nature of a fully academic analysis.

In our opinion, the approved text, despite the abovementioned remarks, constitutes, in comparison with the theses from the previous meetings, as a whole, constitutes, a reliable and more deeply substantial study.

The International Department
CC PUWP