

November 20, 1960

**Record of Conversation between Polish Delegation
(Gomułka et al.) and Chinese Communist Politburo
Member Liu Shaoqi, Moscow**

Citation:

"Record of Conversation between Polish Delegation (Gomułka et al.) and Chinese Communist Politburo Member Liu Shaoqi, Moscow", November 20, 1960, Wilson Center Digital Archive, Sygnatura XI A15, KC PZPR, AAN, Warsaw. Obtained by Douglas Selvage and translated by Malgorzata Gnoinska.

<https://wilson-center-digital-archive.dvincitest.com/document/117782>

Summary:

Liu Shaoqi, Peng Zhen, and Gomułka discuss problems within the communist bloc since 1956.

Credits:

This document was made possible with support from MacArthur Foundation

Original Language:

Polish

Contents:

Translation - English

Protocol from conversation of the PUWP delegation with the CPC delegation

On 11.20.1960

As well as on 11.29.1960

The conversation
Of the Polish delegation
With the delegation of the PRC

□After a preliminary pronouncement of Comrade Gomułka, Cde. Liu Shaoqi presented the position of the Communist Party of China [while] stating, among other things, [the following]:

□The Communist Party of China is pleased with the good relations which exist currently between Poland and the Soviet Union; it is pleased that past misunderstandings have been eliminated. The Communist Party of China, and he personally, have been aiming at eliminating these misunderstandings ever since 1956 when the difficulties between Poland and the Soviet Union were brought to light. He came to Moscow with this purpose, under the leadership of the delegation of the CP of China, and he conducted many conversations which pertained to Poland and not to Hungary. The Hungarian matter was brought up later. Zhou Enlai was also in Moscow regarding the matters of Poland and he conducted many talks with the Soviet comrades. Subsequently, Cde. Zhou Enlai came to Poland where he conducted the talks with the Polish comrades, including also Cde. Gomułka. He has detailed protocols of these conversations, both from Moscow and from Warsaw; he has everything at hand. He knows well what Cde. Zhou Enlai was saying in Warsaw and what he was told by the Polish comrades.

□There was an official communiqué about Zhou Enlai's visit in Warsaw. In 1956, in the conversations with the Soviet comrades, they criticized the position of the CPSU in which the tendencies of the great empire chauvinism were manifested.

□As a result of the conversations, which they conducted with the Soviet comrades, a Declaration about the relations between socialist countries appeared on 10.31.1956. After this Declaration had already appeared, Cde. Zhou Enlai was still criticizing the CPSU for the chauvinism towards Poland. They proposed to the Soviet comrades to insert in the Declaration from 10.31.1956 the 5 principles adopted in Bandung. The Soviet comrades did not agree, however, and they crossed out the principle of peaceful coexistence.

Cde. Gomułka: Something more than peaceful coexistence exists between the socialist countries, given that brotherly relations exist [between the socialist countries], and that is surely why the Soviet comrades did not agree to insert this principle in the Declaration.

Cde. Liu Shaoqi: However, the Soviet Union sent its troops to Poland and to Hungary. He [Liu Shaoqi] has in mind the first action of the Soviet troops in Hungary.

Cde. Gomułka: But, we had the Soviet troops in Poland and we did not demand at all

their withdrawal; on the contrary, we thought that their presence in Poland was necessary.

Cde. Liu Shaoqi: The present good Polish-Soviet relations are a fruit [result] of their [Chinese] position which they [Chinese] assumed in 1956 towards the Soviet comrades. They definitely do not want any new type of difficulties to arise between Poland and the Soviet Union. Today, the difficulties of the similar type, which took place between Poland and the Soviet Union in 1956, arose between the Soviet Union and China, as well as Albania. You should currently help us in eliminating these difficulties as we helped you in 1956. What the CPSU wrote about the Polish-Soviet relations on 11.5.1960 does not correspond with the truth. I have all the protocols at hand. We do not want to exploit them as not to create any new difficulties between Poland and the Soviet Union. The Polish delegation should aim at decreasing our (Chinese) divergences with the CPSU and not to increase these divergences. However, the pronouncement of Cde. Gomułka at the Conference amplified these divergences and we do not agree with this pronouncement. Also, during the sittings of the Editorial Commission Polish comrades, who took part in working on the draft of the Statement, carried out bad work and [thus] widened the divergences between the CPSU and CCP. They, together with Czechoslovakia, came out with propositions of including in the Statement the XX and XXI CPSU Congress as a program for all the parties. We cannot agree to this and we cannot sign [it]. They [Chinese] will not sign such a document if this is not thrown out of the Statement.

They will also not accept a formulation regarding the factional and group activity. This formulation should be crossed out of the Statement. You say that this does not pertain to the Chinese party, while at the same time Cde. [French communist party leader Maurice] Thorez, [Spanish communist party leader Dolores] Ibarruri and [Czechoslovak communist leader Antonin] Novotny said this clearly [that is did concern the Chinese Party]; this many articles directed against the Communist Party of China also attest to this. Your statement is therefore false. We have come out against this formulation in the draft of the Statement many times in the Editorial Commission. The formulation about nationalist communism is also directed against the Communist Party of China. [US Secretary of State John Foster] Dulles was the first one to use this term. He also had Yugoslavia in mind. Yugoslavia does not accept this [formulation] directed at it. Neither Marx nor Engels, nor Lenin, ever used this formulation, and now it is used against the Communist Party of China. These three fundamental concepts must be taken out of the Statement. If any of the formulations (about the XX Congress, the factionalism [frakcyjność], and about nationalist communism) are kept, [then] CP [of] China will definitely not sign the Statement. We cannot sign the document in which the CP [of] China is being accused either openly or through allusions. They received permission from Beijing for this. They still have a series of reservations as to the draft of the Statement. The draft was agreed upon 90% at the [session of] Editorial Commission. If these contentious matters are taken out, then we will sign the Statement. There is no basis for imposing on other parties the resolutions of the congress of one party.

How can all the parties subordinate themselves to one party? The XX and XXI Congresses have their good sides, but they also have their bad sides, especially the XXI Congress is directed, in some points, against the Communist Party of China. How will it be in the future? Will we always be including the subsequent Congresses of the CPSU [i.e.] XXII, XXIII, [etc.] in the documents from the conferences? The CPSU can make whatever resolutions it wants, without consulting with any other parties, it can condemn our party, your party or any other [party] during its congresses and there is nothing any one can do about it. That is why the formulation about the XX and XXI Congresses should be removed from the Statement. We therefore think that the propositions of the Polish comrades regarding the matter of the XX Congress do not further the unity of the international communist movements; on the contrary, they deepen the existing divergences. This is what I wanted to tell you today.

We have already told the comrades from Brazil, since they were the authors of this motion, about our position with regard to including the passage about the factionalism.

□

You are talking about Albania today; [you say] that their [Albanians'] policy is wrong, but they are in the same position today that, and maybe even in a more difficult one than, you (Poland) were in 1956. But, a small Albania cannot offend the Soviet Union; it is the other way around. We deem this abnormal that you are not in solidarity with Albania, but [instead] you are on the side of the USSR [and] you attack Albania; and this is wrong. What would happen if the Communist Party of China backed the Soviet Union against Poland in 1956? You wouldn't have the same situation as today.

We think that [Enver] Hoxha's pronouncement was right and necessary. That is why we should now defend Albania, and not back the Soviet Union. It is not in accordance with Marxism-Leninism and with the proletarian internationalism to attack Albania.

We cannot adopt a principle [that] the minority subordinates itself to the majority within the international communist movement.

No matter what the pressure from the majority of the parties, we cannot agree to that; and we have the right to sign a document with which we agree and not to sign a document with which we do not agree.

When it comes to the activity of the Albanian comrades within the UN, then we are not familiar with this matter. We can tell them about your allegations and to check what the actual situation was.

As far as the Polish proposition [trans. note-a reference to the Rapacki Plan], about not increasing the number of countries possessing nuclear weapons, we think that this proposition concerns our country and we do not agree with it.

I will make clear, together with the Albanian comrades, whether Cde. [Mehmet] Shehu in his report from the UN was really talking about someone making a proposition about the full disarmament of the Balkans.

We also do not understand the position of the Polish comrades, [which they] assumed at the UN, regarding not creating any new [military] bases. Does it mean that we want to legalize the already existing bases? Recently, nations, e.g. Japan and other countries, are fighting for removing all the existing bases, aren't they?

Cde. Gomułka accused us in his pronouncement, but he did not mention a word about the CPSU's letter from 11.5.60; and you must have surely read this letter, as well as others have read it when it was sent out to all 81 parties. No one, except for Deng Xiaoping, mentioned about the letter at the Conference. You were saying in your pronouncement that the CP [of] China adheres to its old positions. We do not understand why everyone was silent when there was a talk about factionalism, and factionalism is on your end, because everyone was silent.

We became familiar with your position and we have now presented our position to you.

Cde. Gomułka: As far as the matters from 1956, I am saying once more that we do not want to return to them. We don't know what you were talking about with the CPSU at the time and it does not interest us anymore today. The issue has been resolved.

Cde. Liu Shaoqi: Good that it has been resolved. We were talking about this because it is not the first time today that the Soviet Union is assuming a wrong position towards other parties.

Peng Zhen: And today, China and Albania are in a situation in which you were in 1956.

Cde. Gomułka: I don't agree with this. These are different things. This is a fundamental difference. The Soviet Union, while not knowing exactly the situation and the intentions of the CC PUWP before the VIII Plenum, could fear that there could be a counterrevolution in Poland. At that time, the reaction [reactionary forces] was lifting its head and it developed a wide anti-Soviet propaganda. The Soviet comrades could fear even though these fears were groundless.

Liu Shaoqi: The Soviet comrades meddled in your party and organizational matters. We have materials [to prove it].

Peng Zhen: Cde. Novotny said in Bucharest that we were worse than Yugoslavia, that we were Trotskyites, and now we are told that we are nationalist communists.

A longer argument arose regarding the origin of the Bucharest Conference and what its subject [really] was. The Chinese comrades continued to go back to the statement that the Bucharest Conference was an unexpected attack on the CP [of China]. They blamed us for carrying out a factional meeting in Bucharest, and that at one of the sittings we allegedly assumed a position that if the Communist Party of China did not sign the communiqué then it would [still] be fine, and that it would not matter. Peng Zhen stated, to the emphatic protest of Cde. Gomułka [who claimed that] this was false information, that they know very well what we were saying at the factional meetings; he referenced Cde. [Hysni] Kapo from whom he received the information. He also made allegations that neither Chinese nor Vietnamese and Korean comrades were invited to the meeting, which attests to their [Soviet?] factionalism.

Cde. Gomułka states that nothing like this took place. Again, feverish allegations are taking place [thus] making it impossible to have a calm discussion.

Liu Shaoqi: Why did the CPSU sent out its letter directly to the parties before the present Conference?

Peng Zhen: But, still some progress has been made with regard to the Bucharest Conference. A note from the CPSU was handed out over there half a day before the Conference, and now [it is handed out] two and a half days [ahead of time]. We were given an ultimatum in Bucharest, but even an enemy is given 48 hours, which they [Soviets] did not want to give us in order to coordinate the content of the communiqué with our CC. Presently, we have again been unexpectedly attacked, and Cde. Gomułka did not disapprove of this attack, but [instead] he accused the CP [of] China in his pronouncement.

Cde. Gomułka: And, do you think that we do not have the right to present our position as much as you can? We made statements regarding the matter of fundamental differences which emerged in the pronouncement of Cde. Deng Xiaoping towards the position taken by our party and by the majority of other parties. We did not stick any labels on you, but we talked about the matters pertaining to the entire communist movement and about the fact that your position does not correspond with the Declaration from 1957.

Peng Zhen: You did stick many labels on us, but you did it skillfully.

Cde. Gomułka: We also have the right to assume our own attitude. We did not talk about old matters [and] we do not talk about Bucharest, because, if we did, we would have to talk about the Session of the General Council of the WFTU [trans. note- World Federation of Trade Unions, or ŚFZZ (Światowa Federacja Związków Zawodowych)] in Beijing and a series of other matters. All this belongs to the past. Now, we want to come to an understanding with you regarding the Statement.

Liu Shaoqi: The Poles deepened the divergences by bringing up the XX and XXI Congress. If this is not removed, then we will not sign the Statement.

Cde. Gomułka: The formulation pertaining to the XX Congress was inserted in the Declaration from 1957. The Polish delegation also added the XXI Congress of the CPSU to its motion regarding the Statement. We think that currently the most important matter is to eliminate the difference, which has emerged, and to achieve unity in our movement.

We do not know where the Chinese Comrades see the attacks on the CP [of] China in the resolutions of the XXI Congress [of the] CPSU. If the XXI Congress [of the] CPSU is to be an obstacle and is to make it impossible for the CP [of] China to sign the Statement, then we are prepared to consider our correction and possibly to limit ourselves only to [the inclusion of] the XX Congress [of the] CPSU, since this Congress is the most significant one to the international communist movement. We are prepared to replace our correction with the repetition of the formulation from the 1957 Declaration where there is talk only about the XX Congress. We would like to know if this change would make it possible for you to sign the Statement.

Li Shaoqi: No, we will not sign. There is a talk [mention] in the 1957 Declaration about the fact that the XX Congress [of the] CPSU creatively developed Marxism-Leninism, and Congresses of other parties manifested their loyalty to the principles of the proletarian internationalism. The CP [of] China did not agree with this formulation at the time either; it demanded that this reference to the XX Congress be crossed out from the Declaration. We gave up our demand due to the insistence from the Soviet comrades.

Cde. Gomułka: But, the Chinese comrades agreed to the inclusion of the formulation on the XX Congress in the Declaration and they signed this Declaration, didn't they? Why don't they now want to agree to the inclusion of the same formulation?

Liu Shaoqi: Yes, we yielded, but this was our mistake. Our concession did not make the Soviet comrades more restrained [moderate], but the other way around - they continued to display their attitude towards other parties as an attitude of father to son. That is why we now want to fix this mistake and [do] not [want] to insert the formulation about the XX and XXI Congress in the Statement [of the] CPSU, as proposed by the Polish comrades.

Cde. Gomułka: We are currently talking only about the XX Congress.

Li Shaoqi: We will not agree - it cannot be written into [the Statement].

.....: The resolutions of one party cannot be written into the Statement as a program by which all parties are to be bound. Every party can individually position itself towards the congresses of other parties according to its own regard.

Cde. Cyrankiewicz: The Chinese comrades are proposing to insert into the Statement the formulation [which says] that the Soviet Union was "at the head," but at the same time they do not express their agreement to insert the reference about the XX

Congress [of the] CPSU. How can one reconcile this position of theirs?

The Chinese comrades did not answer this question, but, yet again, repeated their statement that the resolutions of one party cannot bind [oblige] other parties and that is why one cannot write about the XX Congress [of the] CPSU in the Statement.

Cde. Gomułka: We became familiar with your position on the matter of the XX Congress. Now, we would like to explain to one another the formulations about the factional and group activity in the international communist movement. You think that this formulation is directed against the CP [of] China and that this does not allow you to sign the Statement. The Polish delegation is looking for another formulation than the one which is included in the draft of the Statement. The point here is to find such a formulation, from which it would be clear, that it is not directed against any party [and] that it does not accuse [any party] for their factional and group activity in the past. Our point here is to prevent the international communist movement from the factional and group activity in the future. We will exclude from the definition of factionalism all what pertains to the internal matters of every party. Our point here is to have the definition of factionalism to refer only to international matters, to the strategy and tactics of the countries of the socialist camp, and to the entire international movement in the fight against imperialism. We think that there should be unity of action in these matters. If differences of opinions emerge, then the minority is obliged to subordinate itself to the majority. There must be one and united line of action in the external policy of each socialist country. There can be no two lines [of policy] since this would weaken our fight with imperialism. There should also be one line in the fight with imperialism within the international communist movement. That is why we are looking for such a formulation which would not give any pretexts for the Chinese comrades to believe that the formulation about factionalism is directed against the CP [of] China. Will the Chinese comrades agree to the inclusion of such a formulation in the Statement regarding factionalism?

Liu Shaoqi: No. We will not agree to it in this case either. One cannot define what fraction [division] within the international communist movement is. Every party is independent. All decisions concerning all parties should be made unanimously on the principle of consultation. The fraction [division] means a defined program of action, but currently no one is coming out with any program rather than the one which was agreed upon in the draft of the Statement. That is why we see it unnecessary to introduce this formulation of the fraction [division].

Cde. Gomułka: Unfortunately, we see, by the example of Albania, that one country is already breaking out from the collective decisions undertaken by all socialist countries. It is also a fact that the CP [of] China accuses the CPSU and other parties that they have deviated from the Moscow Declaration. We would like to stop talking about the past, do not make mutual allegations, and instead secure for the future the unanimous position of all the communist parties as far as fundamental issues [are concerned]. It may happen that this or another party can take a different position in the future than is taken by other parties on these fundamental issues. We think that in such a case a minority should subordinate itself to the majority. Today, Albania came out with a different position [than other socialist countries]. Albania is a small country, but its separate position also has a fundamental significance for the unity of the socialist camp in the fight with imperialism. What would happen, however, if Poland came out with a separate position on the fundamental matters? It is unthinkable to us. Even then, if we did not agree with the position of the majority, we would think it necessary to subordinate ourselves to the position of the majority. That is why we adhere to the formulation of the factionalism and group activity to be included in the Statement and we deem this matter very important.

Peng Zhen: We will never agree to what took place in Bucharest. All decisions should be undertaken unanimously. If there is no unanimity of all the parties, then the matter cannot have a place in the joint document. In Bucharest, I proposed to choose

a Commission which would establish who deviated from the Moscow Declaration - the CPSU or us. You did not agree to this. You imposed your position on us. Such a Commission could be called at the present Conference. Let it examine all the materials and decide who deviated from the Moscow Declaration. Is it right, and in accordance with the Moscow Declaration, that some parties say and write that a world without weapons, without armies and without wars can exist in face of imperialism? Can one consider a person, who says such things, a communist?

Cde. Gomułka: No one is using such formulations. We are only saying that a real possibility exists of avoiding a world war. We have a question for Cde. Peng Zhen: If we were to call such a Commission, and in case if it [the Commission] stated, by way of the majority, that the CP [of] China deviated from some principles of the Moscow Declaration, would, then, the Chinese comrades agree to accept its decisions?

Peng Zhen: I was talking about a Commission whose task would be to examine differences which exist in the positions of individual parties towards the Moscow Declaration. The material worked out by such a Commission should be sent out to all communist parties in order for these parties to take a position, based on the [examined] materials, as to who deviated from the Moscow Declaration. We can adopt only these decisions which have been made unanimously.

Cde. Gomułka: Why do we then need a commission when, in this case, you are talking about the matter of unanimity? Such a material, sent out to other parties, would be a factor which would deepen the divergences [and] this would only facilitate organizing the division [fraction]. We should eliminate the divergences at the present conference, and in a case when there is still difference of opinions in the matter, which I was already talking about, the minority should subordinate itself to the majority.

Liu Shaoqi: We came to this Conference with the intention of creating the best atmosphere possible and of strengthening the unity. We brought with us a statement written in this spirit. My pronouncement at the airport also attests to this. However, the letter of the CPSU ignited the divergences anew. Cde. Mao gave instructions for the report to be maintained in a friendly, moderate, and kindhearted tone. I came [precisely] with this. Cde. Mao Zedong and all present members of the leadership of the CP [of] China in Beijing participated in the celebrations on the occasion of the 43rd anniversary of the October Revolution. We came with the desire of achieving unity. I could not sleep for three, four nights after [having received] this letter from the CPSU. I became convinced that the Soviet comrades took the course of igniting the divergences. Again, we were met with an unexpected attack. Many parties were organized at the Conference to attack us.

Cde. Gomułka: What purpose would the Soviet Union have in attacking you? The speech of Cde. Khrushchev attests to the best will of the CPSU in striving for unity. There were no accusations directed at the CP [of] China in this pronouncement.

Cde. Liu Shaoqi: There is a duality within the CPSU. First, they handed out their letter, with the attacks on the CP [of] China, to the delegations, and later at the Conference, they read the report. The main thing in the position of the CPSU is not the report, but the letter. The statement, which I had already prepared, turned out to be no longer necessary.

Cde. Gomułka: So did ours. After the statement of Deng Xiaoping, who did not assume an attitude towards the statement of Cde. Khrushchev at all, and [who] brought up a series of many accusations against the CPSU, we [also] had to write a new statement.

Cde. Liu Shaoqi: The letter of the CPSU is the reason why we had to take such a position in the pronouncement of Cde. Deng Xiaoping. And you are accusing us, not the CPSU? Your position is unjust.

Cde. Gomułka: Your line is wrong. We distinguish the divergences existing between the CP [of] China and the CPSU into two groups: the first group encompasses the intra-nation divergences, and this matter only concerns the CPSU and the CP [of] China. I did not bring up these matters in my pronouncement. I did not talk, for example, about the matter of radiolocation, about the withdrawals of the specialists and about other matters, which comprise the subject of the dispute between the Soviet Union and China. We think that these matters could be settled and they could be settled only between the two parties: between the CPSU and the CP [of] China. We will be very pleased when these disputes are resolved as soon as possible. The second group encompasses the matters of a fundamental significance for the entire international workers' movement and it concerns the disputes not only between the CPSU and the CP [of] China, but [also pertains to] other parties. I presented the position of the Polish delegation precisely regarding these matters in my speech at the Conference.

.....: In your speech you expressed a position which was neither in accordance with the Moscow Declaration nor with the draft of the Statement. Despite the fact that the Moscow Declaration [discusses] the matter of peace and war, you are only talking about one possibility, namely, that all parties should have a [policy] line for peace. The Declaration, however, is talking about two possibilities: about the possibility of war and peace.

Cde. Gomułka: Evidently you did not read the entire statement of mine. If you become well familiar with it, you will realize that your allegation is wrong.

Cde. Liu Shaoqi: Nevertheless, a consensus exists as far as most matters which are discussed in the Statement, doesn't it? The remaining divergences could be removed by not inserting in the statement those matters of disagreement. But, why did the CPSU sent out the letter directly to the parties before the Conference began?

Cde. Gomułka: You therefore think that it would be better if this letter were sent out after the Conference? In our opinion, it would be worse.

Liu Shaoqi: They could have sent it after the Conference, they could have sent it before the Conference, and soon enough so we could also take a position. The CPSU, however, sent out the letter directly before the Conference and it did it on purpose.

□□□Cde. Peng Zhen: The same [thing] was [done] in Bucharest. You unexpectedly attacked the CP [of] China, you conferred separately, without China, without Korea, and without Vietnam. Wasn't this a faction? You were saying at the factional meetings that if the CP [of] China sings the communiqué, that's good; if it doesn't sign it - that's good, too. (He is repeating all his previous accusations). □□

Cde. Gomułka: Comrade Peng Zhen, I thought that you were a more responsible comrade, and I stress one more time that all this information is false. You are talking nonsense [glupstwa]. You believe in the nonsense that Kapo told you. You continue to deviate from the subject which the Polish delegation came to discuss with you.

Cde. Peng Zhen: I am not accusing Cde. Gomułka of organizing the factional meetings. Someone else did.

Cde. Gomułka: There were no factional meetings. It's an understandable thing that, in light of a different position which the CP [of] China took in Bucharest, the individual parties had the right to discuss this topic amongst themselves. We did not come here

in order to discuss the Bucharest Conference with you. We want to eliminate, by way of mutual consultation, the current divergences related to the Statement which should be signed by all parties.

Cde. Liu Shaoqi: He again returns to the issue of the XX Congress and he states: We were against the introduction of the formula about the XX Congress into the Declaration already after 1957. We yielded since we made a compromise with the CPSU. We currently think that we made a mistake. We will not sign the statement if the formula about the XX Congress is included in it. All resolutions must be made unanimously at conferences. If there is no unanimity [then] the matter should be consulted further between the parties. Every party would then have the right to maintain its position.

Cde. Gomułka: There should be one line as far as the matters of the fight with imperialism [are concerned]. This is the base of the basis of our movement. There can be no two lines [of policy]. The minority should subordinate itself to the majority. This is our fundamental position.

Liu Shaoqi: [There should be] unity, but by way of consultation.

Cde. Gomułka: And what if you cannot achieve unity through consultation? This is what happened with Albania at the UN. It [Albania] took a separate position from the other countries of the socialist camp.

Cde. Liu Shaoqi: Albania is right.

Cde. Gomułka: Then, in light of this, are we all to subordinate ourselves to one Albania?

Cde. Liu Shaoqi: We have to support it [Albania].

Cde. Peng Zhen: Albania is fighting with imperialism [and] it is building socialism; Albania cannot be compared to Yugoslavia [since] it does not receive [economic] assistance from the imperialists. What is currently happening at the conference regarding Albania proves that this is an organized attack on Albania. In 1957, during the Moscow Conference, you came out against the formula "with the Soviet Union as the head;" we, however, did not want to introduce the XX Congress of the CPSU into the Declaration. You compromised and we compromised. Three fundamental issues distinguish us at the Conference regarding the Statement: the XX Congress, the issue of factionalism, and the formulation regarding nationalist communism. Dulles was the first one to talk about the nationalist communism, and Suslov was the second [to talk about it]. This is directed against the CP [of] China; the course of the Conference is proof to that. We are happy that one talks openly at the conference today about what we [all] thought about deep in our souls at the [meeting of] the Editorial Commission. One cannot cover fire with paper.

Cde. Liu Shaoqi: He is deducing that all the parties knew less about the XX Congress of the CPSU than the republican parties and district organizations of the CPSU. They did not have any influence on the resolutions of the XX Congress. How can one presently include the formulation about the XX Congress in the Statement by which all the parties are to be bound?

Cde. Gomułka: We desired to meet with the Chinese comrades in order to find a way towards resolving the differences regarding the Statement. We are representing our own position here. We did not consult with any other party [regarding] the propositions which we put forward to you. I only mentioned to Cde. Khrushchev that

the Polish delegation approached the Chinese delegation with the proposition of a meeting. I did not mention anything about any propositions which we put forth to you. It results from the exchange of views [today] that the CP [of] China does not agree to signing the Statement if we include the formulation on the XX Congress as well as the fraction. The Polish Delegation cannot agree to take out these chapters. When it comes to the formulation on nationalist communism, the Polish delegation does not hold a final position on this issue. We do not see this formulation as a fundamental issue. It is, however, exclusively our own opinion. From what we have heard from the Chinese comrades, it seems that the situation is very bad; the things have gone farther than we thought. I do not want to think what will happen next. We thought that the words used in Cde. Deng Xiaoping's speech, that is, "that the CP [of] China will never allow for the split [to happen]," expressed the fundamental position of the CP [of] China. It turned out that it is not so. We hope that the Chinese comrades will once again consider their position.

Cde. Liu Shaoqi: The Statement talks about the XX Congress of the CPSU in the context of the peaceful coexistence. We do not question it even though we have reservations as to the sequence of Bandung and the XX Congress. However, we cannot express our consent regarding the motion of the Polish and Czech comrades on the issue of the XX Congress.

As to the fraction, we think that placing the factional issue in the international movement is fundamentally wrong. How can there be a factional work [robota] within the international movement?

Now, about the issue of the split. According to us, those who demand to include these points [in the Statement] are in favor of the split. It is done with the purpose in order for a later campaign against the CP [of] China to sanction the resolutions of the Conference. If we do sign, they will attack us; if we do not sign, they will attack us as well. It is better not to sign; we will not bind our hands. If such a resolution is signed on the issue of factionalism, [then] the fight with Albania will also be validated [legalized]. This would be harmful to the unity. If you continue to pressure [us], then [it means] that you will be against the unity in the international movement and against the unity of the CP [of] China between the CPSU. Even though we do not sign the Statement, we will still be for the unity, we will be fighting with imperialism, we will be building socialism, and we will be supporting the national-liberation movement.

Cde. Peng Zhen: The corrections, which you are proposing, also signify sticking a knife in our chest.

Cde. Gomułka: Do you really think that we want to stick a knife in your chest?

Cde. Peng Zhen: We do not think that the PUWP is sticking a knife [in our chest], but [instead it is sticking] these three problems.

Cde. Gomułka: Since we are abiding by including these matters in the Statement it would seem then that your allegation regarding sticking a knife pertains to our party.

In connection with what the Chinese comrades were saying today about Albania, we would like to emphasize that Albania is a member of the Warsaw Pact and it must conduct the same policy as is conducted by all the countries [that is] the signatories to the Pact. The point here is military matters. There can be no two lines [of policy] here. The minority must subordinate itself to the majority.

We thank the Chinese comrades for the conversation. We came with the intention of

achieving an understanding and leading towards signing the Statement by all the parties. We have explained our positions to each other. We hope that your position is not yet a final one.

Cde. Liu Shaoqi: He also thanked for the conversation and announced that the Chinese delegation will repay a visit to the Polish delegation in a few days.