

The Khrushchev-Mao Conversations

31 July-3 August 1958 and 2 October 1959

By Vladislav M. Zubok

The last summits between the Soviet leader Nikita S. Khrushchev and the Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) Mao Zedong played a significant role in political and psychological preparations of the Sino-Soviet split. This was already obvious from the secondary sources, including Khrushchev's memoirs. More recently documentation from the CCP archives, published selectively in Beijing, added significantly to the picture.¹ Further documents from Soviet archives shed new light on the period when the Sino-Soviet friendship capsized and began to sink.² But transcripts of the summit talks were still not available. Russian historian Dmitri Volkogonov was the first to study these documents and cite from them in the mid-1990s.³ It took the efforts of dedicated individuals and four years of time before these remarkable documents became part of the public domain as the Volkogonov Collection at the Library of Congress opened its microfilm reels of materials from the Russian Presidential Archive in January 2000.

This brief introduction cannot provide a comprehensive analysis of Sino-Soviet summits, but it attempts to place them into historical context. Several observations should be made in this regard for future, more substantial research. Disputed issues were at the center of the two Sino-Soviet summits. Also equally important was the broader context that Norwegian historian Odd Arne Westad called "history, memory, and the languages of alliance-making."⁴ The ideological nature, discourse and rituals of the Sino-Soviet alliance-making defined the nature, discourse and rituals of the alliance-breaking. Finally, the clash of personalities added to the drama. Mao Zedong's pride and revolutionary ambitions contributed as much to the trouble in Sino-Soviet relations as Khrushchev's impulsive anti-Stalinism and defiant earthy character.

Issues and personalities at the 1958 summit

The Sino-Soviet summit of July-August 1958 was an unforeseen and secret affair. Nikita Khrushchev came to Beijing as a trouble-shooter, on the instructions of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU Central Committee) Presidium, in response to a sharp reaction by Mao Zedong to two Soviet proposals. First, to build a short-wave radar station in China in order to help Soviet submarine and surface fleets operate against the US Navy in the Pacific. Second, to create a joint Sino-Soviet submarine flotilla, operating under the Soviet command. According to Chinese sources, the second proposal was in response to the Chinese request sent by Zhou Enlai to Moscow on 28 June, to provide technology and documen

tation for construction of Chinese nuclear submarines with SLBMs. On 21 July, Soviet ambassador Pavel Yudin laid out the Soviet "joint fleet" proposal to Mao. The next day Mao called him back and in the presence of the CCP leadership lashed out at the Soviets, accusing them of chauvinism and plans to dominate China.⁵ The record of conversations between Khrushchev and Mao informs us about the final act in this dispute. Several important documentary links are, however, still missing, among them the exchange between the Soviet and Chinese military. Two additional memoranda of conversations exist, presumably on 1 and 2 August 1958, which were not found in the Volkogonov collection.

The major issue at the summit was Mao Zedong's profound dissatisfaction with the old model of the alliance according to which the USSR posed as "senior brother" and the People's Republic of China (PRC) had to be satisfied with the role of the "junior brother." Economic costs of Soviet industrial aid to China are cited as a reason for dissatisfaction. Indeed, Soviet data show that in 1958-1960 the PRC had to pay back 2.3 billion rubles on Soviet loans.⁶ Nevertheless, in general economic terms, the Sino-Soviet alliance by that time worked exceptionally well for China. After Stalin's death, Nikita Khrushchev made a strong emphasis on the ideological, romantic foundations of the Sino-Soviet alliance, and on "fraternal, selfless" forms of assistance. Genuine euphoria about "friendship deeper than the sea and higher than the mountains" spread in the USSR from the top leadership down to common citizens: there were far-reaching expectations of integration between the two communist giants in all fields. Even the pragmatic Vyacheslav Molotov, ousted by his rival Khrushchev, at that time shared this euphoric mood and submitted to the Central Committee a plan for further Sino-Soviet integration all the way into a giant "socialist confederation."

The Chinese leadership seemed to reciprocate these expectations. For instance, in February-March 1958 Zhu De urged Yudin to think about "tight coordination" of economic development of the Northeastern China and Soviet Far East, as well as about a common "ruble zone" and "an international bank of socialist countries."⁷ In 1957, the Kremlin, prodded by the Chinese leadership, decided to help China become a nuclear power, i.e. to transfer nuclear know-how, help constructing facilities of the nuclear-industrial complex and, ultimately, to get a prototype device of the 1951 Soviet atomic bomb. On 18 June 1958, shortly before the dispute and Khrushchev's secret trip, a group of Soviet nuclear experts came to China to tell their colleagues "how to make nuclear weapons."⁸ Against this context, the proposals on the construction of joint fleet and the

eagerness to pay for the joint radar station in China came indeed, as Khrushchev insisted at the 1958 summit, from the heart and had no strings attached. For the Soviets, from all indications, Mao's attack came as a bolt from the blue.

In retrospect, it is obvious that political and personal, not economic reasons, motivated Mao Zedong's behavior. In the view of a Soviet diplomat who worked in Beijing from 1951 until 1966 and was a keen observer of China, "the Chinese felt too tight in our embrace. They wanted to break out of our arms and go their own way."⁹ About that time, Mao was getting ready to mobilize hundreds of millions of people for the Great Leap Forward. By its meaning and tone, this grandiose campaign was designed to resume the revolutionary process in China and the world, to surpass Stalin's "collectivization" and "industrialization" of the 1930's. The Chinese continued to take advantage of the large-scale assistance from the USSR and other "socialist countries." At the same time, however, they sought to demonstrate that they were no longer "pupils," but actually the leaders of the communist movement, since, by contrast to the Soviet "friends" who "marked time and made no headway," they moved "straight from socialism to communism."¹⁰

Readers of the transcripts will immediately see why American scholar William Taubman concluded that "the Sino-Soviet dispute was personal as well as political."¹¹ The huge contrast between the personalities of Mao and Khrushchev leaps into the eyes. In terms of experience and historical role, Mao was Chinese Lenin and a Chinese Stalin combined, both the leader of victorious revolution and a founding father of the post-revolutionary Chinese state. He was the driving engine behind the challenge to Soviet authority in the communist camp. It is well known that Stalin's calculating and mistrustful attitudes towards the PRC had upset and offended Mao. It is less understood that the amicable embrace by the Soviets under Khrushchev repelled Mao no less. As Mao explained, he had long wanted to challenge Soviet seniority, and only waited for an auspicious moment. From the record of the 1958 summit Mao comes out looking almost the same as in his stormy meeting with Yudin on 22 July: offended, irritable and peevish, as well as haughty and lecturing. As Khrushchev tried to explain the Soviet position, Mao constantly interrupted him with teasing and provocative remarks.

By contrast to Mao, Khrushchev led his country and its bureaucratic classes on the road towards "normalization," not revolution. Mao, like Stalin, had the right to say, "l'état est moi" [the state is myself], and sought to symbolize the dignity of power. Khrushchev, who sought to overcome the excesses of Stalinism, was the caricature of a communist potentate. He was an extrovert, big-bellied, nearly farcical figure. He never minced words. Mao, on the contrary, posed as a sphinx-like, philosophizing emperor. Khrushchev's thinking was earthy, Mao's was cosmic.¹² Taubman pointed out several personal

characteristics of Khrushchev that explained his "allergic reaction" to Mao. Among them was his "shaky sense of self-esteem," "vaulting ambition and an extraordinary low level of culture," "impulsiveness and hyper-sensitivity to slight," and his racist sense of superiority over the "Oriental" Chinese.¹³

The contrast of personalities continued on the lower level of participants: between the pedantic head of the CPSU International Department, Boris Ponomarev, and the pithy, politically gifted Deng Xiaoping. According to Chinese sources, Deng, the CCP general secretary, played a particularly active role at the meeting. He "flew at the Soviet leader like a terrier. He accused the Russians of 'Great Nation' and 'Great Party' chauvinism.'" ¹⁴ There is not a word by Deng in the Soviet transcripts. Perhaps, Chinese version of the talks would one day help clarify this discrepancy. In any case, Deng was a witness to Mao's harangue at Yudin, and at the summit presented what Yudin had said on 21 June, since Yudin himself fell sick and could not be present—an awkward imbalance for Khrushchev. The Soviet leader would have gained a lot from the presence of Anastas Mikoyan, the most skillful Soviet trouble-shooter. Mao, however, singled him out for criticism as the one who "flaunted his seniority" at the 8th CCP Congress in September 1956. Perhaps Mao intentionally wanted to cut down Mikoyan who, after all, had worked side-by-side with Lenin and thus could upstage the new international revolutionary hierarchy which the Chinese revolutionaries planned to lead.

Mao's personal ambitions were closely related to his groping for ways to consolidate his fluid regime and revolutionary legitimacy into a solid form where communist ideology was combined with Chinese aspirations of national greatness. The documents highlight in particular Mao's pride that came to be inextricably linked to his determination to restore China's greatness. Soviet assistance reminded him daily of China's backwardness and dependence, and therefore nourished his elemental anti-Sovietism.¹⁵ At the 1958 summit with Khrushchev, a theme of wounded pride was a major underlying issue. While Mao was disgusted with Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin's crimes, he relished in the opportunity to evoke Stalin's ghost at every opportunity, in order to demonstrate that Soviet policy toward China had the original sin of "Great Russian chauvinism."

This jarred Khrushchev's ears. The Soviet leader, who in the previous years had invested so much into building Sino-Soviet friendship, could not understand why, instead of gratitude and respect, he evoked Mao's condescension from.¹⁶ In his memoirs, Khrushchev admits that the proposals to build the joint fleet and radar station were a mistake. The Soviets, he said, "got too excited at that moment [in 1958] and exaggerated the international interests of communist parties and socialist countries. We believed that both our Navy and the Chinese Navy, as well as all the military means of the socialist countries serve one goal: to be prepared for retaliation if imperialism imposes a

war on us." Khrushchev continues: "One again, we touched on sensitive chords of a state whose territory had long been dominated by foreign conquerors. After this [summit] I began to understand much better what motivated Mao in this conversation... I understand that a lot of tact is required in this kind of issues. *Now I came to understand this consideration especially well.* [Italics added - V.Z.]"¹⁷

In reality, this understanding must have dawned upon Khrushchev much later. Had he been just a bit more literate in the history and mentality of the "Middle Kingdom," he would have armed himself with better strategy—to the extent the erratic Soviet leader was ever capable of strategizing. But the only source from which Khrushchev could cull explanations for Chinese motivations was his own Stalinist experience and his current context of fighting against "Stalinists" among his colleagues. And something told him that Mao was trying "to play Stalin" on him, which was absolutely intolerable, both for political and personal reasons.

The first conversation appears to end in a full agreement between the two leaders. "Dark clouds have passed away," Mao commented. But the summit did not resolve the crisis of the alliance, and brought into the open the mistrust between the two communist leaders. In his memoirs, Khrushchev downplays this, recalling that "the conversations were in a rather calm, friendly tone."¹⁸ Yet, the transcript of the first conversation suggests the opposite. Particularly important was the exchange on Soviet advisers in China. It provides a new important insight into Khrushchev's decision in the summer of 1960 to recall all Soviet advisers from the PRC, and indicates that it was not so spontaneous as it looked. Other sources show that it marked the beginning of steep decline in Soviet efforts to assist China in creating its nuclear arsenal.¹⁹

From Khrushchev's memoirs we know that in the conversations that followed the leaders disagreed on the issues of war and peace in the nuclear age, and the meaning of the Soviet nuclear arsenal and missile technology for future joint policy of the Sino-Soviet alliance. The minutes of the concluding talks on 3 August, recently declassified and published below, hide the echoes of these disagreements behind the mutual assurances of unity.

The Road to the 1959 Summit

Khrushchev's mistrust of Mao grew during the Taiwan crisis, provoked by Beijing on 23 August 1958. As many Soviet sources indicate, Mao did probably not discuss his intentions regarding Taiwan and the off-shore islands of Quemoi and Matsu with Khrushchev during the 1958 summit. When the People's Liberation Army of China began shelling the islands, however, the Soviet leadership was convinced that the Chinese wanted to seize them to remove the threat to their coastline. Moscow was prepared

to help its ally in this endeavor. As the Eisenhower Administration, particularly Secretary of State John F. Dulles, made threatening declarations that implied the use of nuclear weapons, Khrushchev sent a letter to Eisenhower on 7 September declaring that the Soviet Union would abide by the Sino-Soviet treaty of 1950 and would regard nuclear attack on its ally as an attack on itself²⁰.

These threats concealed the embarrassing lack of unity and coordination between the Chinese and Soviet leadership during the crisis. When it broke out, the Soviets tried desperately to learn about Chinese plans. On 6 September, Soviet foreign minister Andrei Gromyko flew to Beijing, officially to coordinate Soviet and Chinese positions at the forthcoming UN General Assembly. But the reconnaissance attempts confused the Soviets rather than clarified the situation for them. On one hand, Zhou Enlai told Soviet envoys that there would be no war over the islands. On the other hand, the war hysteria in China was intensifying. At one point Zhou Enlai told Gromyko that the Soviet Union should stay out of the war in case the Americans used tactical nuclear weapons against the

PLA. Khrushchev was uncertain about the real Chinese objective: to test his ally's loyalty or to drag him into a confrontation with the US without even informing him. After deliberating for almost twenty days, the Soviet leadership sent a special message to the CC CCP on 27 September, "thanking" the Chinese for their noble attitude, but affirming its intention to consider the war against China "a war with the entire Socialist camp."²¹

Once again, Khrushchev leadership failed to recognize the significance of the crisis in the light of Chinese domestic politics and Mao's urge to make China stand tall and fearless. As Soviet diplomat Fedor Mochulsky recalled, "it became clear to me, then just a young China specialist, that the [off-shore] islands were not the issue. The issue was domestic, not foreign policy." The war scare helped Mao Zedong and the Chinese communist authorities to mobilize the people for the "Big Leap Forward." The Chinese peasants toiled in the fields, while their rifles were stacked nearby. The war preparations also helped explain to people why they had to eat less and work harder. Unfortunately, Mochulsky's observations did not reach the Kremlin: the euphoric expectations among many Soviet officials fed the bureaucratic mood that impeded critical and objective observation.²²

Mochulsky also recalled an episode in September 1958, when Soviet diplomats consulted with their American colleagues in search of a negotiated resolution on the disputed offshore islands. At one point they decided to inform the Chinese leadership that, if the PLA stopped shelling the islands, the US would attempt to persuade the Taiwanese regime to withdraw their troops from them. Mao Zedong's reaction came as a surprise: "We do not need any [your mediating] mission with Americans! This is our business!"²³ On the contrary, the Chinese leadership intended to maintain the tension over the islands indefinitely, using it as "a means of educating all the peoples of

the world, first of all the Chinese people."²⁴

In the fall of 1958, Khrushchev was still sympathetic to Chinese brinkmanship, despite his ally's bizarre methods. He was also in a risk-taking mood with regard to West Berlin, and must have believed that only a "shock therapy" with threats of the use of force could bring the West to the negotiating table on the German question. He did not believe that the United States would start a nuclear war—either over the Chinese offshore islands or West Berlin. Mikoyan recalled in his memoirs that it was the second time (the first was in November 1956, over the Soviet invasion of Hungary), when he sharply from disagreed with Khrushchev and thought about resigning the leadership.²⁵ In November 1958, Khrushchev unleashed the "Berlin crisis" which to many in the world seemed to be synchronized with the Taiwan Crisis.

One year later the situation changed dramatically. By autumn 1959, Khrushchev seemed to be winning his risky game: first, British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan traveled to the Soviet Union indicating his willingness to negotiate; second, US President Dwight D. Eisenhower invited the Soviet leader to visit the United States (the last such invitation had come to Stalin from Truman in March 1946). Khrushchev's trip to the United States in September vastly expanded his international recognition. From the UN podium, the Soviet leader presented a plan of general and complete disarmament. At the meeting a Camp David Eisenhower vaguely hinted to Khrushchev that the situation around West Berlin was "abnormal." This was enough for the Soviet leader, who celebrated the triumph of his personal diplomacy. His foreign policy adviser Oleg Troyanovsky recalls: "Khrushchev returned from the US in a good mood, confident that he [had] achieved substantial political results. As an emotional and impulsive person, he began to view his trip over the ocean as the beginning of a new era in US-Soviet relations. In particular, he grew to believe that the Western powers would make concessions on the German problem."²⁶

Khrushchev's optimism had another dimension to it: in the summer of 1959, the CPSU adopted the new party program of "construction of communism" to be achieved in twenty years. It was as risky a commitment as his promise "to catch up and surpass the United States." As some observers believed, it was Khrushchev's response to Mao's Big Leap in the race for the reputation of the most ambitious communist.²⁷ Such was the mood and baggage of achievements (real or imaginary) that Khrushchev brought with him on his trip to China on 1-4 October. This time his summit with the Chinese leaders took place openly, during the national celebration of the 10th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China. He came not only as a leader of the communist superpower who could talk on equal footing with the US president, but also as a successful architect of peace and détente with the West.

By contrast, the leaders of the CCP, particularly Mao Zedong, had grave problems on their hands. Despite

tremendous achievements and sacrifice, the Great Leap Forward fizzled out and led to the tremendous ecological disaster and, ultimately, to a three-year-long famine in the Chinese countryside. The number of famine casualties reached astronomical number—up to 20 and perhaps 30 million people. At the Wuhan conference of the CC CCP in December 1958, Minister of Defense Peng Dehuai criticized Mao's policies, and in August 1959 the CCP Plenum began to back off from the disastrous policies. In Tibet, the Great Leap Forward, in combination with the attempts to eradicate Lamaism, led to a rebellion in March 1959. Though the Chinese authorities suppressed it (with full Soviet support), the Dalai Lama fled to India, creating an international uproar and triggering a Sino-Indian propaganda war. As before, the Chinese leadership sought to use external tensions as a means to defuse the domestic crisis. On 25 August 1959, during initial skirmishes, the Chinese military killed several Indian border-guards who were positioned along the McMahon Line (established in 1914 between Great Britain and the Tibet authorities). Unlike India, China never recognized this line as the Sino-Indian border.²⁸

The Sino-Indian conflict came at the worst possible time for Khrushchev who was about to leave for the United States on his "mission of peace" and with a message of disarmament. This time Khrushchev decided to distance himself from the PRC, and TASS released an official announcement calling on both sides to reach a negotiated settlement. On 13 September, the Chinese responded with an unpublished communiqué to the CC CPSU through party channels, criticizing its policy of "time-serving and concessions [*politika prisposoblenchestva i ustupok*] with regard to Nehru and the Indian government."²⁹ Soon Khrushchev would get these reproaches thrown into his face in person.

The thaw in US-Soviet relations and its implications for the Sino-Soviet alliance were the first irritants at the two leaders' talks in early October. Khrushchev's itinerary—he came to Beijing almost straight from Washington via Moscow—added insult to injury. As a witness recalls, "Khrushchev enraged the Chinese, when he went to America first, instead of China; This produced strong antipathy on their part. And when Khrushchev arrived, they could not conceal it."³⁰ Khrushchev noticed the cool reception, the absence of cheering crowds on his way, and probably decided to challenge the hosts for their lack of politeness and hospitality. As the transcripts of the talks reveal, this time the Soviet leader did not spare Chinese sensibility: he continuously referred to his recent talks with President Eisenhower at Camp David; suggested to release the remaining American prisoners in China, and criticized, in a quite undiplomatic manner, Chinese policies that had led to the Taiwan crisis.

The summit, however, survived the discussion of these issues and collapsed only over the sharp disagreements over the Sino-Indian war. Mao was enraged by Moscow's position of the middleman between the

neutral India and the PRC. This war revealed a real discrepancy between Soviet foreign policy and Chinese interests. The official Soviet record provides necessary correction to Khrushchev's memoirs:³¹ what the Soviet leader remembered was "rude" and "awkward" manners of Chen Yi. The record shows that these epithets fitted Khrushchev more than anyone else in the talks, especially providing possible refinement of his expressions by Russian interpreters who wrote the transcripts. Volkogonov, commenting on the October summit of 1959, wrote: "Khrushchev in Beijing did not show flexibility, tact, wisdom, and his 'revolutionary diplomacy' collided with its counterpart."³²

Indeed, the Russian transcripts show Khrushchev as much more confident of himself in comparison with the 1958 summit, and prepared to attack the Chinese as Mao had assaulted the Soviets more than a year earlier. Wearing the mantle of a world statesman, Khrushchev preferred this time to disapprove of Mao's brinkmanship as illogical, unnecessary and contradicting Soviet policy of "détente." From Mao's angle, Khrushchev practiced a double standard, since he himself was doing approximately the same thing with different means with regard to West Berlin.

Even during the first conversation in July 1958, Khrushchev's patience had begun to wear thin under the barrage of Mao's pricking, unnerving comments. In October 1959 he was considerably more short-tempered. Contrary to his claims in the memoirs, he had learned nothing about the Chinese motivations, and was not even prepared to listen. At one point Chinese Foreign Minister Chen Yi hinted to him openly that the Chinese belligerence towards India was dictated by the desire to take revenge for the century of humiliation at the hands of European great powers. He tactfully omitted Russia. But this useful hint was ignored by Khrushchev. He was incensed by Chen Yi's repeated use of the word "time-servers" in connection with the Soviet leaders. There might have been a problem of language and translation involved: for Khrushchev this word was synonymous with "opportunist," a deadly ideological label for a good communist. It is not clear what the word exactly meant in Chinese context.

Khrushchev rushed to give a rebuff: "What a pretty situation we have: on one hand, you use the formula [the communist camp] 'led by the Soviet Union,' on the other hand, you do not let me say a word. What kind of equality can we talk about?" Later Khrushchev and Suslov repeated this argument in Moscow, expecting to get support from his colleagues.

The October 1959 summit presents a different Mao in comparison with 1958; the Chinese leader was less forceful and somewhat mellow. Perhaps the disastrous consequences of his Great Leap Forward forced Mao to take a lower profile, and provided more room for his politburo colleagues at the meeting. At the same time he was clearly in command and must have enjoyed when his colleagues, one after another, attacked the Soviet leader. At some point, when the altercation between Khrushchev and Chen Yi degenerated into a brawl, Mao must have realized that

things had gone too far. He intervened with reassuring calm tone to bring the stormy meeting to a civilized conclusion.

Consequences of the Summits: Soviet Side

Whether Mao expected an open Sino-Soviet split soon or not, he obviously did not want to be blamed for it. After Khrushchev's departure, in a conversation with Soviet chargé S.F. Antonov, the Chinese leader struck a very conciliatory tone. He pointed out that the Sino-Soviet differences constituted only "half a finger" out of ten. He even approved Khrushchev's plan of general and complete disarmament (it was not even mentioned at the summit in Beijing), and remarked that Khrushchev "spoke very firmly and correctly on the issue of Taiwan" during his talks with Eisenhower. He promised to refrain from war over Taiwan and "to wait for 10-20, and even 30 and 40 years" for China's control over the island. One could imagine, Mao continued, that the Taiwan crisis was "a tricky and mysterious affair." In reality, it was just "one link in the chain of difficulties that we created for the Americans. Another chain was the issue of Berlin put forth by the Soviet Union." All these issues "assisted in achieving some goals that you set in Europe." As to the Sino-Indian conflict, Mao said: "We would never go beyond the Himalayas. This is a dispute over insignificant patches of territory."³³ This was not the last time the Chinese leader turned to sweet talk in his conversations with Soviet representatives. But he was hardly sincere.

Khrushchev did not do so well protecting his flanks after the disastrous communist summit. Offense was the best defense for him. Even on his way to Moscow he began to complain that Mao was "an old galosh;" later he indiscreetly used this expression publicly. Khrushchev also authorized Mikhail Suslov, who accompanied him to Beijing, to prepare a report that for the first time contained an open criticism of the CCP leadership, and Mao Zedong in particular. The report cited "mistakes and shortcomings in the field of domestic and foreign policy of the Communist Party of China" and explained them largely "by the atmosphere of the cult of personality of cde. Mao Zedong." The report blamed Mao for coming "to believe in his own infallibility. This is reminiscent of the atmosphere that existed in our country during the last years of life of I.V. Stalin."³⁴ This, incidentally, reveals that the Soviet leader continued to rationalize Chinese challenge against the backdrop of his political experience. From that moment on, Mao became "another Stalin" to Khrushchev—the enemy of his course of de-Stalinization, the advocate of obsolete and disastrous policies.

Khrushchev's incautious steps caused negative reaction among Soviet officials and general public. The flywheel of Soviet euphoria regarding China could not be stopped so abruptly. As some recalled the spirit of the time, "it seemed that the friendship sanctified by the same

ideological choice would be unbreakable. It seemed much more solid than the ties that emerge between countries on the ground of sober pragmatic interests.³⁵ The truth that Mao had decided to shake off the fraternal embrace was completely irrational and unthinkable for the Soviet people, even the most intelligent of them. Therefore, after Khrushchev's trip to Beijing, public opinion was concerned that the Soviet leader, already well known for his capacity to be rude and unpredictable, might have damaged the Sino-Soviet friendship. Troyanovsky recalls that "back in Moscow, one could not help feeling in some circles of the society a new concern with the aggravation of the relations with China. I recall that about that time I received several calls from the people whose opinion I valued very much. They asked me to do whatever is possible to prevent a split with [China]."³⁶

Other radical initiatives by the Soviet leader, who was still euphoric about the prospects for improving Soviet-American relations, did even more to antagonize him to a growing segment of Soviet officials and broader public. Even the rapid reduction of Soviet armed forces which was designed to turn swords into plowshares and to liberate resources for improvement of civilians' living standards, created for Khrushchev hosts of new enemies. Former Soviet diplomat Oleg Grinevsky believes that by the spring of 1960 a "new opposition" to Khrushchev emerged in the leadership and among the officials. Its mood was that it would be better to do everything to mend the alliance with the communist China, rather than to risk everything by aiming at an elusive friendship with Americans.³⁷

The first casualty of the acrimonious summit in Beijing was another summit in May 1960 in Paris. It is said sometimes that Khrushchev just used the U-2 episode to wriggle out of the summit when he realized that the West was not ready for negotiations on the German Question. The available record reveals Khrushchev as, above all, willing to project image of toughness to the party elites. On 4 May, he told the CC Plenum that he planned an anti-American speech at the forthcoming session of the Supreme Soviet about the US spy plane. He warned that "perhaps we would not have a meeting on 16 May, this outcome is also possible." He explained that he and other members of the CC Presidium believed that the collapse of the summit "not only would not be a failure for us, but it would work to our advantage, since the situation is such that [hopes] for resolution of any questions at the meeting are weak." He added: "It would be difficult for Eisenhower to come [to Paris] after this."³⁸

The October 1959 meeting in Beijing contributed to Khrushchev's mood in this case. Troyanovsky claims in his memoirs that Khrushchev was forced to confront Eisenhower after the U.S. President admitted the guilt for sending the spy plane into the USSR. "There is no doubt," he writes, "that had he not reacted with enough toughness, the hawks in Moscow and Beijing would have used this incident—and not without justice—as a testimony that

the person who stands at the helm of the Soviet Union is ready to bear any insult from Washington."³⁹ Back in Beijing, Khrushchev had said: "We shot [down] several American planes and always said that they crashed by themselves. This you cannot brand as time-serving." Now Khrushchev decided to prove to the Chinese and anybody concerned that he was not a coward and opportunist.

Another casualty of the 1958-59 summits were the chances for a peace settlement in Laos, and perhaps in the Indochina in general. At the end of the October 1959 meeting Mao suggested to discuss the Laotian situation, but an angry Khrushchev was not interested. During the 1950s the PRC and the USSR had jointly kept the more belligerent among Vietnamese communists from expanding "revolutionary struggle" in the region. As the transcript reveals, they continued to understand that Stalin's mistake in Korea in 1950, that brought American military might there, should not be repeated in Indochina. For historians of the Vietnam War it may be of interest that both Khrushchev and Mao were pessimistic as to the ability of the communist forces in Vietnam to withstand US intervention. The Sino-Soviet duel, however, precluded any effective cooperation on this issue, and ultimately the Vietnamese were able to have their way.⁴⁰

Suslov's report on the 1959 summit failed to arouse much discussion. As long as Khrushchev remained in power, the rest of the Soviet leadership did not have the nerve to discuss openly the reasons for the Sino-Soviet dispute that quickly turned into the split. But Khrushchev's colleagues had their opinion on what happened, and they expressed it in October 1964, when they sent Nikita Sergeevich into forced retirement. At that time, of course, the relations between the communist powers were already poisoned by years of mutual ideological and political hostility. CC Secretary Alexander Shelepin, speaking at the Presidium, said Khrushchev's policy vis-à-vis China was correct, but he had to be "more flexible in pursuing the line." "There is much that you have to be blamed for," he rebuked Khrushchev.⁴¹ A more detailed opinion was in the undelivered Presidium report (prepared by Dmitry Polyanski, the Presidium member, in case Khrushchev would not surrender and prefer to fight at the CC Plenum). The report stated that "the main reason of the danger of the split is the subversive activity of the Chinese leadership that slid back to the position of great power nationalism and neo-Trotskyism. But there are some points for which Khrushchev has to be blamed. He is crude, haughty, and does not contain himself in conversations with the leaders of fraternal parties. He uses offensive expressions. He called Mao Zedong publicly 'an old galosh,' [the Chinese leader] learned about it and, of course, became enraged."⁴²

These phrases, however, might not have been completely sincere either. Shelepin and Polyanski, among others (including Alexei Kosygin), still misunderstood the Chinese reasons and dynamics; they tended to believe that, without the factor of Khrushchev and after correction

of Soviet foreign policy, the Sino-Soviet rift could be mended. In January 1965, this group severely criticized Yuri Andropov, then the head of the CC International Department (for socialist countries) and Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko for defending the course of "détente" and disregarding measures to improve relations and strengthen unity with our "natural" allies and our "class brothers" (meaning the Chinese).⁴³ These sentiments finally died off only by the end of the 1960's. There are still no archival documents available illustrating the painful reconsideration on the Soviet side. One may suggest that ultimately the Chinese challenge became, in the Kremlin's eyes, primarily a geopolitical challenge. The most perceptive among Soviet leaders began to see what Khrushchev had failed to see in 1958-59: how naïve and romantic the Soviets were in trying to hold in its fraternal embrace a giant country with unique history and culture. As Gromyko told to an assistant in 1978, when the question of German unity was discussed: "A united socialist China is enough for us."⁴⁴ According to this new Soviet convictions the Sino-Soviet alliance was doomed because of the geopolitical weight of China and political ambitions of Beijing. Khrushchev's impulsiveness, abysmal lack of culture and other personal qualities only played a secondary role.

The documents published below reveal that it is impossible to extricate great acts of history from their actors. In the situation, when personal sympathies and antipathies were as important and real as state interests, the two summits in Beijing became the important and necessary preludes to the split and fragmentation of the Sino-Soviet alliance and to the end of the world communist movement as it existed since 1917.

DOCUMENT No. 1

First Conversation of

N.S. Khrushchev with Mao Zedong

Hall of Huaizhentan [Beijing],

31 July 1958

Present at the meeting: Cdes. B.N. Ponomarev, Deng Xiaoping.

N.S. Khrushchev passes on greetings and best wishes from the members of the Presidium of the C[entral] C[ommittee of the] CPSU.

Mao Zedong thanks him. He says that cooperation between the leaders of the two parties facilitates decision-making on world problems.

N.S. Khrushchev agrees.

Mao Zedong: Without making forecasts for a longer time, one can say that our cooperation is assured for 10,000 years.

N.S. Khrushchev: In such a case we could meet again

in 9,999 years in order to agree on cooperation for the next 10,000 years.

Mao Zedong: We have, however, certain differences of opinion. Such differences on specific questions were, are, and will be the case. If we compare this with 10 fingers, then our cooperation will [account for] 9 fingers, and the differences for one.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yes, we can have a difference in understanding.

Mao Zedong: These issues can be easily solved, and cooperation between us will last forever; therefore we can sign an agreement for 10,000 years. He suggests to move to the discussion on the question of interest.

N.S. Khrushchev: We received information from Yudin⁴⁵ on his conversations with you.⁴⁶ Judging by it, there was a lot there that was exaggerated [*nakrucheno*]. Therefore, I would like to talk to you, so that everything would become clear.

Mao Zedong: Good.

N.S. Khrushchev: I will not dwell on the issues where, according to the messages on the conversation with your ambassador, we have common views. These are issues relating to the international situation, the assessment of the events in the Middle East [*na Blizhnem I Srednem Vostoke*],⁴⁷ the Yugoslav question. We also support your declaration where you say that we cannot have issues that might generate different viewpoints. We take great joy in the successes of your Party and the PRC. I believe you take joy in ours.

Mao Zedong: Yes.

N.S. Khrushchev: I would like to touch on the issue that hit us squarely on the head [*ogoroshil*]. It is on the building of the Navy [*voenno-morskogo flota*]. You said that you spent a night without sleep. I also had a sleepless night when I received this information.

Mao Zedong: I was shocked, therefore I could not sleep.

N.S. Khrushchev: Never, did any of us, and above all as far as I am concerned, for it was primarily I who talked to Yudin, and only then he received the instructions from the CC Presidium, have had such an understanding of this issue that you and your comrades developed. We had not even an inkling of the idea about a joint fleet. You know my point of view. When Stalin was alive, I was against joint companies. I was against his senile foolishness [*starcheskoj gluposti*] regarding the concession on the factory for canned pineapples. I am emphasizing this, it was his senile stupidity, since Stalin was not so stupid as to not understand this. But it was the beginning of his sclerosis.

Mao Zedong: I also cited these examples and kept saying that Khrushchev liquidated this heritage.

N.S. Khrushchev: I was one of the members of the Politburo who said it straight to Stalin that we should not send such a telegram on the concession to Mao Zedong, because it would be wrong as a matter of principle. There were also other members of the Politburo, with whom I

have parted ways now, who did not support this proposal by Stalin either. After Stalin's death we immediately raised the issue of liquidating the joint companies [*smeshannie obschestva*], and today we do not have them anywhere.

Mao Zedong: There were also two half-colonies_Xinjiang [Sinkiang] and Manchuria.

N.S. Khrushchev: The abnormal situation there has been liquidated.

Mao Zedong: According to the agreement, there was even a ban on the residence of citizens of third countries there.⁴ You also eliminated these half-colonies.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yes, since it contradicted basic communist principles.

Mao Zedong: I am in absolute agreement.

N.S. Khrushchev: Even in Finland, a capitalist country, we liquidated our military base.

Mao Zedong: And it was you personally who liquidated the base in Port Arthur.

N.S. Khrushchev: It could not be otherwise. This was even more correct with regard to a socialist country. Even in capitalist countries this causes nothing but harm. We liquidated joint ownership in Austria; we sold it to the Austrian government. This bore its fruits. Otherwise there would have been a constant source of conflict with the Austrian government. We had good, warm meetings when we received a delegation from Austria. Earlier we would not have been able to hold such meetings. The fact that we have good relations with a neutral capitalist country is advantageous for all socialist countries.

Our course is crystal-clear. We render assistance to former colonies; there is not a single clause in our treaties that would cloud our relations or contain encroachments on the independence of the country which we assist. In this lies the strength of the socialist camp. When we render assistance to former colonies and do not impose political conditions, we win over the hearts of the peoples of these countries. Such assistance is provided to Syria, Egypt, India, Afghanistan, and other countries. Recently we agreed to sign a treaty with Argentina. This will strongly affect the minds of people in Latin America and particularly in Argentina. We agreed to provide equipment for the oil industry in the amount of \$100 million. This is directed against the United States, so that South Americans would not feel completely dependent on the US and would realize that there is a way out.

Mao Zedong: This is right.

N.S. Khrushchev: How could you think that we would treat you in such a way as was described in the conversations with cde. Yudin? (Joking.) Now I am launching an attack.

Mao Zedong: What is a joint fleet? Please, clarify.

N.S. Khrushchev: It displeases me to speak about it, since the ambassador is absent.⁴⁷ I sent him the instruction, talked with him separately and then at the Presidium. When I talked with him, I feared that he might misunderstand me. I asked: "The issue is clear for you." He said: "Clear." But as I can see, he did not tell you the essential thing from what I

said to him.

Mao Zedong: Is that so? [*Vot kak?*]

N.S. Khrushchev: As I can see, these issues are as far from him as the moon is from the earth. This is a special issue, in which he is not involved.

The issue about the construction of the fleet is so complicated that we have not passed a final judgment on it. We have been dealing with it since Stalin's death. We sent Admiral [Nikolai] Kuznetsov into retirement, freed him from military service, because, in case we had accepted his

10-year program of naval construction, then we would have ended up with neither a Navy nor money. That is why, when we received the letter from com. Zhou Enlai with the request of consultation and assistance in the construction of a navy, it was difficult for us to give an answer.

Mao Zedong inquires about the cost of this program.

N.S. Khrushchev gives an answer.

We were asked to build cruisers, aircraft carriers, and other big-size vessels. One cruiser is very expensive, but [there is the] construction of ports and the places of anchorage for the fleet. It's many times more expensive. We discussed this program and rejected it. But, most importantly, we subjected to criticism the very doctrine of the Navy in the light of the changed situation with regard to military technology.

In 1956 we convened a conference of seamen at Sevastopol, where [Klementi] Voroshilov, [Anastas] Mikoyan, [Georgy] Malenkov, [Gen. Georgy] Zhukov and I were present. The seamen reported on how they planned to use the Navy in war. After such a report they should have been driven out with a broom, not only from the Navy, but also from the [Soviet] Armed Forces.

You may remember, when we were returning from you in [October] 1954, we took a detour via Port Arthur to Vladivostok, and then to Komsomolsk [on Amur]. Then we made a brief trip on a cruiser, during which we held a small exercise. Admiral Kuznetsov was with us. During the exercise our submarines and torpedo boats attacked the cruiser. Not a single torpedo from the boats hit the cruiser. From the submarines only one hit the target. We felt that if the Navy was in such combat readiness, then our country could not rely on its naval forces. This was the beginning of our critical attitude. After that we instructed Kuznetsov to make a report and prepare proposals. At the CC Presidium his proposals were not accepted. He grew indignant and became insolent, declaring: "When would the CC take a correct position with regard to the Navy[?]" Then we built a correct relationship_sacked Kuznetsov from the Navy.

Under Stalin we built many cruisers. During my stay in London I even offered [British Prime Minister Anthony] Eden to buy a cruiser. Today people scratch their heads how to use the Navy in war. Can you recall any large-scale sea battles during the Second World War? None. The Navy was either inactive or perished. The US and Japan were the strongest naval powers. Japan inflicted a serious defeat on the American Navy by its air force. The Americans then

also routed the Japanese Navy with the help of the air force.

The question is where one should invest money.

When we received your letter, we began to think to send the military [to China], but they have no unanimous viewpoint on naval construction. We already discussed this question three times and one last time decided to give them a month deadline for presenting their proposals. What kind of navy does one need under modern

conditions? We stopped the construction of cruisers, [and] tossed the artillery turrets that were already finished into the smelting furnaces. And they had the value of gold. We have several cruisers under construction in docks [*na stapeliakh*]. Within our General Staff, people are divided into two camps: some say to toss them away, others say we should finish them and then should stop building. Upon my return I will have to decide on this. The military advisers split into two groups. I did not have a firm opinion on this: to end the construction investments are lost, to finish more expenses are needed. One does not need them for war. Before I left for vacation, [Defense Minister Marshal Rodion] Malinovsky asked me to look into this question. At the Military Council for Defense I spoke against finishing the cruisers, but did not do so decisively. Malinovsky cajoled me, I decided to support him. We held a session of the CC Presidium, and many distinguished marshals and generals spoke there categorically against [terminating construction]. We then decided to postpone the question until Malinovsky returned from vacation and to discuss it once again. I think that at this time we will decide to throw them in the furnace [*vagranka*].

What kind of consultation under such circumstances could our military have given you? Therefore we said to ourselves that we must get together with the responsible Chinese comrades to discuss and resolve this issue. We could not rely on the military alone since they lack themselves any precise point of view. We wanted to discuss jointly with you which direction we should take in the construction of the Navy. For instance, I cannot say today which point of view on this question the head of the Naval Headquarters has [*shtaba voenno-morskikh sil*]. If we send him [to the PRC], one cannot say which opinion he would express his own or ours. Therefore we wanted to discuss this with comrades Zhou Enlai and Peng Dehuai, with military and civilian officials. We did not want to impose our point of view and we are not going to; you might have disagreed with us on which kind of navy we should build. We are still in the exploratory phase.

Who today needs cruisers with their limited firepower, when rocketry exists? I told Eden in London that their cruisers are just floating steel coffins.

The question of naval construction is very complicated. Military officers ask, why then do the Americans keep building their Navy? I believe that the Americans, from their point of view, are doing the correct thing because the United States are located in America, and they are going to wage war in Europe or Asia. They need the

Navy for transportation and support [*prikritiia*]. Otherwise they should renounce their policy and declare the Monroe Doctrine.

Mao Zedong turns to Deng Xiaoping and asks him for the records of conversations with Yudin. Deng Xiaoping passes to Mao Zedong the records of conversation.

N.S. Khrushchev: Such is now the situation with regard to this business. Therefore I talked with Yudin in such a way, instructed him to tell you about this situation.

I asked him if everything was clear. He responded

affirmatively. But he never dealt with the Navy, therefore he could only render the crux of the matter imprecisely. The CC CPSU never intended and does not intend to build a joint Navy.

Mao Zedong (irritated): I could not hear you. You were in Moscow. Only one Russian spoke with me Yudin. Therefore I am asking you: on what grounds you can speak of "launching an attack" against me?

N.S. Khrushchev: I did not claim it. [*Ia ne v pretenzii*].

Mao Zedong (with irritation): So who should be attacked Mao Zedong or Yudin?

N.S. Khrushchev: Am I bothering you with my long explanation?

Mao Zedong: Not at all. You have said the main thing.

N.S. Khrushchev: For reasons that I mentioned we wanted your comrades to come for joint discussions of the issue of what kind of navy is needed, about its technical and combat use. Indeed, I spoke to Yudin in such a way—that cde, Mao Zedong had welcomed coordination of our efforts in case of war. You spoke about it in 1954 during our visit and during your stay in Moscow in 1957. Until now, unfortunately, we have not acted on this. Therefore I told Yudin to clarify the situation. It is obvious for us that one should build a submarine fleet and torpedo boats armed not with sea-to-sea missiles, but instead with sea-to-air [*vozdhusnimi*] missiles, because the main task of the submarine fleet would be not the struggle against the surface fleet of the enemy, but instead the destruction of its ports and industrial centers. So I talked with Yudin along these lines. It would be good to discard the fleet located in the Black and Baltic Seas. We do not need it there, and if something should be built in those areas, then it should be mid-size submarines. In this case, where can we build them? In the area of Murmansk, but reaching America from there is not easy. In England and Iceland they take measures to intercept us. Vladivostok is better, but there as well we are squeezed by Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands—they defend us, but also allow the enemy's submarines to monitor the exit of our submarines. I told [Yudin] that China has a vast coastline and access to open seas, from where it would be easy to conduct the submarine war with America. Therefore it would be good to discuss with China how to use these possibilities. More specifically perhaps, on one of the rivers (Yellow River or another) we need to have a plant producing submarines in rather big numbers. We believed it would be necessary to talk about this, but we

did not think to build a joint plant or a joint fleet. We do not need anything like this.

Mao Zedong: Yudin spoke not once about the creation of a joint fleet and said that the Black and the Baltic Seas do not have outlets, that to operate the Navy from Murmansk is not easy, that the road from Vladivostok is blocked by Japan, etc. He also pointed out that the Chinese coastline is very extended. According to Yudin, the USSR produces atomic submarines. His entire speech boiled down to the creation of a joint fleet.

N.S. Khrushchev: We build our Navy and can use it. This is a formidable weapon. It is true that it will be difficult to use it, but so will it be for the enemy. War in general is a difficult business.

Mao Zedong: I asked Yudin, who would have ownership of the fleet, the Chinese, the USSR, or both countries jointly[?] I also emphasized that under current conditions the Chinese need the fleet as Chinese property, and that any other ownership is out of question. In case of war we will deliver everything to the Soviet Union. Yet, Yudin insisted that the fleet should be a joint one. For the third time Yudin was received by cde. Liu Shaoqi and other comrades. At this conversation Yudin repeated what he said previously. Our comrades spoke against the joint fleet. He changed the formula and instead of a "joint fleet" started talking about "joint construction." Our comrades criticized this statement as well, and said that we understood this to mean joint ownership of the fleet. Then Yudin began to speak about "joint efforts" to create the fleet.

N.S. Khrushchev: This is also my fault. I should not have instructed Yudin, who does not command the issue, to inform you. But we did not want to write a letter on this question. We wanted to inform you orally.

Mao Zedong: We understood it as follows: if we want to obtain [Soviet] assistance, then we must build a joint fleet aimed primarily against the US. We understood that Khrushchev wanted to resolve the question about a joint creation of the Navy together with Chinese comrades, having in mind also to draw in Vietnam.

N.S. Khrushchev: I said that, when the war begins, we would have to use the coast widely, including Vietnam.

Mao Zedong: I already said that, in case of war, the Soviet Union will use any part of China, [and] Russian sailors will be able to act in any port of China.

N.S. Khrushchev: I would not speak about "Russian sailors." Joint efforts are needed if war breaks out. Perhaps Chinese sailors would act, perhaps joint efforts would be necessary. But we did not raise the question about any territory or our base there.

Mao Zedong: For instance, if there were 100 men-of-war in the fleet, which part would be owned by you and by us?

N.S. Khrushchev: The fleet cannot be owned by two countries. The fleet needs to be commanded. When two are in command it is impossible to fight a war.

Mao Zedong: That is correct.

N.S. Khrushchev: You may disagree with us. We consider this, and we may say [now] that we are against it. If you had suggested this to us, we would have been against it as well.

Mao Zedong: If this is so, then all the black clouds are blown away.

N.S. Khrushchev: There were no clouds in the first place.

Mao Zedong: However, we spent a night without sleep. It turns out, that I missed my sleep in vain.

N.S. Khrushchev: How could Comrade Mao Zedong imagine that we might enforce this, going completely against party principles?

Mao Zedong: I even told my comrades that I could not understand this proposal from the principled point of view, and perhaps this was a misunderstanding. You eliminated the wrong that had been perpetrated by Stalin. I personally and some other comrades had doubts that perhaps this proposal might be one of the Naval Headquarters of the USSR. Your advisor (a sailor) advised us four times to send a cable asking for assistance in building the fleet. He assured us that this request would get a positive decision.

N.S. Khrushchev: Such advisers must be thrown out.

Mao Zedong: Advisers did not speak about a joint fleet.

N.S. Khrushchev: Anyway, they had no right. Their business is to give advice when they are asked for it.

Mao Zedong: The advisers suggested to ask the USSR for assistance. After this Zhou Enlai sent this request, having in mind the fleet with missile launchers.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yudin was not instructed to make this proposal. He was instructed only to pass an offer to discuss jointly the issue of constructing the submarine fleet. How could we have instructed Yudin to carry out negotiations on the construction of the submarine fleet? We know Yudin and trust him in party matters, but he is a poor fit for negotiations on atomic submarine fleet.

Mao Zedong: He said that we should send

representatives for the negotiations about the joint creation of a navy. I asked him to inform that we cannot conduct such negotiations.

N.S. Khrushchev: He tried to give the correct account in essence [*po suschestvu*], but must have misperceived our instruction, misinterpreted it, and let it happen that we find ourselves in a mistaken relationship.

Mao Zedong: But Yudin said precisely this. And Antonov was present there. Whose pride is pricked now?

N.S. Khrushchev: As I can see your pride was very much pricked.

Mao Zedong: That is why I lost sleep.

N.S. Khrushchev: Our pride is touched as well. How could you have misperceived our policy?

Mao Zedong: Your representative made such an account. And I told him that I would disagree with such a proposal, would not accept, and declared: "You wage the war on sea and in the air, and we will stay as partisans [*guerillas*] on land [*mi budem na sushe partizanit*]."

Deng Xiaoping: The issue stemmed from the analysis of the maritime coast of China and the Soviet Union. Yudin said that China has a good coast, and the Soviet Union's coast is bad, thus one needs a joint fleet. Then Mao Zedong said_ is this a cooperative?

Mao Zedong: A cooperative consists of two parts.

N.S. Khrushchev: Everything is absolutely clear. I expressed my opinion. I believed that Chinese friends held us in better esteem. Therefore I believed it was necessary to get united [*ob'ediniatsia*]. We did not encroach on the sovereignty of China. We had one approach in the Party. I believe that you adhere to the same principle.

Mao Zedong: In this case I cease to worry. [*ia spokoen*]

Another scenario would have been [to build] a joint fleet. If the fleet were not a joint one, then there would be no assistance.

N.S. Khrushchev: Did Yudin say that?

Mao Zedong: No, he did not. I am telling you the essence of his words.

N.S. Khrushchev: But this is your inference!

Mao Zedong: And the third scenario means that we withdraw our request, because the second scenario does not suit us. Even if in the next ten thousand years we do not have atomic submarine fleet, we will not agree to build a joint fleet. We can live without it [*oboidemsia*].

N.S. Khrushchev: You did not write about the atomic submarine fleet in your letter.

Mao Zedong: Yes, we did not write about it. We posed the question about the equipment of the fleet with atomic weapons. Yudin spoke about the atomic submarine fleet.

N.S. Khrushchev: That is why I am saying: which kind of fleet to build, we have to discuss. Who will give you advice, [commander of the Soviet Navy Admiral Sergei] Gorshkov? I am not sure he gives you good advice. When he gives you advice, you may consider that it is we who are advising you. Then you sort it out and may say—they gave the wrong advice.

Mao Zedong: For us there is no question of building a large-size fleet. We only spoke about torpedo boats and submarines with rocket launchers. This is laid out in our letter.

There is a second issue_ on the construction of a radar station in China.

N.S. Khrushchev: I would like to finish the business on the navy, and then [talk] about the station. I consider that this part of the instruction Yudin misrepresented. Perhaps he did not formulate it carefully and gave occasion to misinterpret him.

Mao Zedong: But there were 7 to 8 persons present. I said then that it was not a cooperative. Everyone just gasped with surprise when they heard this proposal. Because of that I lost my sleep for a night.

N.S. Khrushchev: And I_ the next night. I agree to take upon myself part of the blame. I am the originator [*pervostochnik*]. I explained to Yudin, he misperceived me

and misrepresented it. Yudin is an honest man and he treats China and you personally with a great deal of respect. We trust Yudin and believe he could not deliberately distort it. He is an honest member of the CC and does everything to strengthen the friendship between our countries. All this is a result of a misunderstanding flowing from his misperception of the instruction. I want to say that I had premonitions myself, and I repeated 2-3 times if all was clear, because I gave him instructions on a matter in which he was not involved at all. And I have a problem with you [*ia k vam v pretenzii*]. If you see that the matter goes beyond the boundaries of communist attitudes, then you should have had a good sleep, told yourself it was a misunderstanding, and tried to clarify this once again. (Jokingly.) You see, I am pressing you hard [*ina vas nasedaiu*].

Mao Zedong: I said that perhaps it was a misunderstanding, and I hope this is a misunderstanding.

N.S. Khrushchev: You should have gone to bed.

Mao Zedong: Several times the conversation was exclusively about the joint fleet, therefore I then launched a counterattack. Now you are counterattacking me. But wait, I will still attack you back.

N.S. Khrushchev: There is a law in physics: action produces equal counteraction.

Mao Zedong (crossly): I had my reasons. I said then that we could give you the entire Chinese coast, but we disagree with a joint fleet.

N.S. Khrushchev: We have plenty of coastline of our own, God help us to cope with it.

Mao Zedong: There is a forth scenario_ to give you the whole coast. There is a fifth one_ I am accustomed to fight guerilla wars [*ia privik partizanit*].

N.S. Khrushchev: Times are different now.

Mao Zedong: But we had no hope, having in mind that if we had given up on the coastline, we would have had only the hinterland [*susha*].

N.S. Khrushchev (jokingly): Well, let's trade our seacoasts, but better still let each of us stay with ours, we are accustomed to them.

Mao Zedong: I agree to give you the whole coast all the way to Vietnam.

N.S. Khrushchev: Then we should invite Ho Chi Minh. Otherwise he may learn about it, and would say that here Khrushchev and Mao Zedong plotted against him.

Mao Zedong: According to the fifth scenario, we would have given you Port Arthur, but we would still have had several ports.

N.S. Khrushchev: Now, do you really consider us as red imperialists?

Mao Zedong: It is not a matter of red or white

imperialists. There was a man by the name of Stalin, who took Port Arthur and turned Xinjiang and Manchuria into semi-colonies, and he also created four joint companies. These were all his good deeds.

N.S. Khrushchev: You are familiar with my viewpoint. On the issue of Port Arthur, however, I think that Stalin

made the correct decision at the time. Then Jiang Jieshi [Chiang Kai-shek] was still in China, and it was advantageous for you that the Soviet Army was in Port Arthur and Manchuria. This played a certain positive role. But this should have been brought to an end immediately after the victory of People's China. It seems to me that in 1954, when we raised the issue about withdrawal of troops from Port Arthur, you expressed doubts whether it would be advisable, for you considered the presence of Soviet troops as a factor containing aggressive US ambitions. We asked you to study this issue. You promised to think. You thought and then agreed with us.

Mao Zedong: Yes.

N.S. Khrushchev: You then said that non-communists raised in your parliament the issue if this was in China's advantage. Did you speak about it?

Mao Zedong: Yes. But it was one side of the problem. Stalin not only committed mistakes here. He also created two half-colonies.

N.S. Khrushchev: You defended Stalin. And you criticized me for criticizing Stalin. And now—vice versa.

Mao Zedong: You criticized [him] for different matters.

N.S. Khrushchev: At the [20th] Party Congress [in February 1956] I spoke about this as well.

Mao Zedong: I always said, now, and then in Moscow, that the criticism of Stalin's mistakes is justified. We only disagree with the lack of strict limits to criticism. We believe that out of Stalin's 10 fingers, 3 were rotten ones.

N.S. Khrushchev: I think more were rotten.

Mao Zedong: Wrong. The essential in his life_his accomplishments.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yes. If we speak of Stalin's accomplishments_we are also part of them.

Mao Zedong: This is fair.

N.S. Khrushchev: Stalin was and remains Stalin. And we criticized the scum and scab that accumulated, in particular when he became old. But when Tito criticized him, it's another thing. 20 years from now school-kids will search the dictionaries [to see] who Tito was, but everyone will know Stalin's name. And the dictionary will say that Tito was the splitter of the socialist camp who sought to undermine it, and it will say that Stalin was a fighter who fought the enemies of the working class, but committed grave errors.

Mao Zedong: Stalin's main errors regarding China were not on the issue of the semi-colonies.

N.S. Khrushchev: I know. He incorrectly assessed the CCP's revolutionary capabilities of the CCP, wrote courteous letters to Jiang Jieshi, supported Wang Ming.

Mao Zedong: Even more important is something else. His first major error was one as a result of which the Chinese Communist Party was left with one-tenth of the territory that it had. His second error was that, when China was ripe for revolution, he advised us not to rise in revolution and said that if we started a war with Jiang Jieshi that might threaten the entire nation with destruction.

N.S. Khrushchev: Wrong. A nation cannot be

destroyed.

Mao Zedong: But that is how Stalin's cable read. Therefore I believe that the relationship between the Parties was incorrect. After the victory of our Revolution, Stalin had doubts about its character. He believed that China was another Yugoslavia.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yes, he considered it possible.

Mao Zedong: When I came to Moscow [in December 1949], he did not want to conclude a treaty of friendship with us and did not want to annul the old treaty with the Guomintang [Kuomintang]. I recall that [Soviet interpreter Nikolai] Fedorenko and [Stalin's emissary to the PRC Ivan] Kovalev passed me his [Stalin's] advice to take a trip around the country, to look around. But I told them that I have only three tasks: eat, sleep and shit. I did not come to Moscow only to congratulate Stalin on his birthday. Therefore I said that if you do not want to conclude a treaty of friendship, so be it. I will fulfill my three tasks. Last year, when I was in Moscow, in a conversation where [Soviet Premier Minister Nikolai] Bulganin was also present, we heard that Stalin had bugged us back then.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yes, I said it at that time. He had bugged us as well, he even bugged himself. Once, when I was on vacation with him, he admitted that he mistrusted himself. I am good-for-nothing, he said, I mistrust myself.

Mao Zedong: What kind of a fleet to build_this question does not exist for us. We will not build a fleet along the plans of Admiral Kuznetsov.

N.S. Khrushchev: We have not decided on the fleet ourselves.

Mao Zedong: We would only like to obtain assistance in the construction of the submarine fleet, torpedo boats and small-size surface ships.

N.S. Khrushchev: I agree. We should have a powerful submarine fleet armed with missiles, and torpedo boats armed not with torpedoes, but with missiles.

Mao Zedong: This was what we asked for in our letter.

N.S. Khrushchev: We believe one needs destroyers armed with missiles. We believe one should build a merchant fleet with the view of using it for military goals. We are building several rocket-carriers. We believe that we also should have guard-ships armed with rockets,

minesweepers. And most important_the missile-carrying air force. I think that you need this in the first instance. You have further shooting range from the air. In the first instance we will need maritime defense. Artillery in Port Arthur makes no sense. Its capacity is severely limited. One needs coastal rocket launchers and rocket-carriers, or a mobile coastal defense. This is the direction we are taking in the fleet construction.

Mao Zedong: This is the right direction.

N.S. Khrushchev: I would suggest that rocket-carriers are needed in the first place. A submarine fleet is more expensive. With the help of rocket-carriers we can keep the enemy at a very respectable distance from our shores.

Mao Zedong: Absolutely correct. We already spoke about it in Moscow [in November 1957].

N.S. Khrushchev: Aircraft have more potential. We are ready to give China what we have. TU-16s have lost their significance as bombers, but they are still good as rocket-carriers for sea approaches [*na morskikh podstupakh*]. In general, the bombing aviation is in crisis.

The military is confused. And for fighters there is a substitute_rockets.

Mao Zedong inquires about missile armaments of the USSR, America, England, its combat specifications and types.

N.S. Khrushchev gives answers to the questions by Mao Zedong.

Mao Zedong says it would be good to avoid war.

N.S. Khrushchev: That is why we keep the enemy in fear by our missiles. We wrote to the Turks that with 3 to 4 missiles there would be no more Turkey. 10 missiles suffice to wipe out England. In England they debate: some say that 9 missiles are needed to destroy England, others say, no, 7 to 8. But nobody doubts that, in case of nuclear war England will be destroyed. They only debate how many missiles one needs for this. When we wrote letters to Eden and [French Prime Minister] Guy Mollet during the Suez events [in November 1956], they immediately stopped the aggression. Now, that we have the transcontinental missile, we hold America by the throat as well. They thought America was beyond reach. But this is not true. Therefore, we must use these means to avoid war. Now we should save Iraq.

Mao Zedong: In my opinion, the US and England gave up on attacking Iraq.

N.S. Khrushchev: I think this is 75% true.

Mao Zedong: About 90%.

N.S. Khrushchev: This is the Chinese way. Here are our "disagreements."

Mao Zedong: They are afraid of a big war.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yes, they are very afraid. Particularly in Turkey, Iran, Pakistan. The revolution in Iraq stirs up these people [in these countries], and they may repeat the events in Iraq.

Mao Zedong: We will talk about the international situation tomorrow. I consider that on the maritime matters the question is resolved.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yes, without a fight and defeat for either side.

Mao Zedong: There will be no joint fleet?

N.S. Khrushchev: Yes, and we never posed this question.

Mao Zedong: But three Soviet comrades still spoke about a joint fleet.

N.S. Khrushchev: Here are four Soviet comrades. And we are saying that there will be no joint fleet.

Mao Zedong: Let's not return to this question.

N.S. Khrushchev: This question does not exist. This was a misunderstanding.

Mao Zedong: Agree. Let's write it down_withdraw the question.

N.S. Khrushchev: I agree. Let's write it down: there

was no such issue; there is no such issue; and there will not be any. This was the result of misunderstanding.

misinterpretation of this issue by Yudin. I consider that the matter is exhausted.

Mao Zedong: Now I am calm.

N.S. Khrushchev: I am calm, too. Let us have sound sleep.

Now I would like to talk about the radar station. There was no CC decision on this question. Our military comrades say that one should have a radar station, so that, when needed, one could command Soviet submarines in the Pacific. I think these considerations are correct. I thought that on this issue we could get in contact with Chinese comrades in order to build such a station. It would be better that Chinese comrades agreed that we participate in the construction of this station via credit or in some other way. The station is necessary. We need it, and you will need it, too, when you will have a submarine fleet. The issue is exploitation [*ekspluatatsiia*]. I think that two cannot be masters at this station. Therefore we could agree on the basis of equality, so that you could via this station maintain communications with your submarine fleet. There is no question about ownership. It should be Chinese. I would like to reach an agreement on its exploitation on equal terms. You might exploit our stations in Vladivostok, in the Kuriles, the northern coasts. If there is no objection from your side, I think that our military should consider this matter. If the PRC disagrees, we will not insist.

Mao Zedong: This station may be built. It will be the property of China, built with investments of the Chinese government, and we could exploit it jointly.

N.S. Khrushchev: Not jointly, but only partially. For us it will be needed only in case of war and for training in peacetime.

Mao Zedong: Then we must change the formula in Malinovsky's letter.

N.S. Khrushchev: I did not see the letter. We did not discuss it in the CC.

Mao Zedong: Another cooperative venture [*kooperativ*]. The Chinese share is 30% and Soviet share_70%. We gave answer to Malinovsky in the same spirit you heard.

N.S. Khrushchev: I am not familiar with the correspondence on this issue. Perhaps this occurred as a result of the contacts between our military, and the contact went awry.

Mao Zedong: The second letter from Malinovsky, in July, contained a draft treaty on this issue. If in the first letter the Chinese share was 30%, in the second one the whole belonged to the Soviet Union.

N.S. Khrushchev: I suspect good intentions on the part of our military. We need this station. This is an expensive project. So they just wanted to help. But they ignored the political and legal aspects of the issue.

Mao Zedong: We sent our answer on behalf of Peng Dehuai, in which we said that we would build it, and the USSR may exploit it.

N.S. Khrushchev: The military told me that they thought they reached complete agreement with the Chinese comrades.

Mao Zedong: Here, you can see, the entire correspondence.

N.S. Khrushchev: I have not seen it. If it had gone through the CC then perhaps it would have not allowed such foolishness and would have offered to build it at our expense, but in the CC, we did not discuss it. But if you do not wish us to pay for it, then so be it.

Mao Zedong: But we represent socialist countries. We will build the station ourselves, and it should be exploited jointly. Do you agree?

N.S. Khrushchev: We do not need the station now. It costs many millions. Do not repudiate the money. Don't let friendship interfere with work. Under conditions of socialism we should carry the burden together. We may give credits for the construction. Part of it you can pay back, and part of it not, since you also need the station.

Mao Zedong: It is possible to build the station without any credit.

N.S. Khrushchev: It would be wrong. You do not need it now.

Mao Zedong: We will need it.

N.S. Khrushchev: But above all we need it.

Deng Xiaoping: We have already answered that we will build it ourselves and will exploit it jointly.

N.S. Khrushchev: Perhaps because of this our military told me that the Chinese agreed, but they ignored the Chinese nuance. They are wondering_what's the problem[?] Full agreement seemed to have been reached.

Mao Zedong: We agree to build at our expense, but exploit it jointly.

N.S. Khrushchev: I would suggest that credit is needed, assistance from our side.

Mao Zedong: If you insist on assistance, then we will not build the station at all.

N.S. Khrushchev: Now the issue about [Anastas] Mikoyan. We were surprised by your declaration, for all are convinced that you have the best possible relations with cde. Mikoyan. We do not think he could be suspected of disloyalty towards China, of some kind of attitudes that stand in the way of our friendship. He never mentioned it himself and we never saw anything like this. His speech at your [Party] Congress [in September 1956] was discussed at the CC Presidium and raised no objections. He was advised to show the speech to you, to introduce your remarks and proposals as an obligatory matter. In 1954, when I spoke here, I also sent you my report and asked for your remarks.

Mao Zedong: We welcomed your speech, for it reflects [the spirit of] equality. The speech of cde. Mikoyan was not so bad either, but the ratio of good and inappropriate was 9 to 1. This concerns the tone of the speech that was somewhat didactic [*pouchitelnim*]. Some delegates of the Congress expressed dissatisfaction, but we were too shy to tell cde. Mikoyan about it. When we say that the Chinese

Revolution is the extension of the October Revolution—this is the unquestionable truth. But there are many things that the Chinese themselves should speak about. There was something in Mikoyan's speech resembling the relationship between father and son.

N.S. Khrushchev: I did not re-read recently these speeches, but I recall that I told him that a great deal of attention was devoted to international affairs. Perhaps he should not have done it, but Mikoyan provided some kind of explanation, and I agreed with him. If some unnecessary points crept into it, he was not the only guilty one. Then all of us overlooked them.

Now the issue of the displeasure about his stay in Xibaipo [in February 1949].

Mao Zedong: All that he did there was good, but his behavior was a bit haughty. He was like an inspector.

N.S. Khrushchev: I am surprised.

Mao Zedong: I am surprised as well. But to some degree it looked like lecturing of father to son.

N.S. Khrushchev: It is hard for me to explain this. You should have told him. Mikoyan knows how to listen, how to pay attention and draw conclusions.

Mao Zedong: Yes, he is a good comrade. We are asking him to come back to us.

N.S. Khrushchev: He is now on vacation.

Mao Zedong: We would welcome a trip by him to China at any time. We thought it necessary to state what we found inappropriate in his speech.

N.S. Khrushchev: His stay in China then [in 1949] was caused by Stalin's order. Stalin demanded from him reports every day, instructed him to sniff out everything, whether there were spies around you. Stalin was motivated by good intentions, but in his way, in Stalin's way. Then Stalin insisted on arresting two Americans, and you arrested them. After Stalin's death Mikoyan said that they were not guilty. We wrote you about it and you released them. You should keep in mind that, at that time, Mikoyan did not do what he wanted, but what Stalin wanted. For instance, [US journalist Anna Louise] Strong was evicted from Moscow, then she was rehabilitated. I believe Stalin did it to prevent her from going to China since he took her for a spy. Now Strong is going to visit China and the USSR. We have no objections, although she wrote stupid things about Stalin and your newspaper published them.

Mao Zedong: I did not read it, but people talk about it.

N.S. Khrushchev: I read and hear that this was the newspaper of the Chinese capitalists.

Mao Zedong: Yes, this newspaper was in the hands of the rightists.

N.S. Khrushchev: The article was directed against the USSR. We even thought to write to you about this, but then decided it was not worth it, if it was a capitalist newspaper.

Mao Zedong: The newspaper belonged to the rightists, now it is in our hands.

N.S. Khrushchev: We have no problems with this, but Strong was mistaken.

Mao Zedong: The direction of the newspaper was erroneous, and now the situation is rectified.

N.S. Khrushchev: This is your business. We also considered the direction of the newspaper to be erroneous. I think the business with Mikoyan is resolved.

Mao Zedong: He is a good comrade. But the ratio in him spawned our remarks. We would like him to come.

N.S. Khrushchev: Among us in the Presidium there is no differences of opinion about our relations, [about relations] between our Parties. We all take joy in your successes as if they were ours. We think that you treat us similarly. We nurture no doubts about this. Now on the specialists. I believe they are like a pimple on a healthy body.

Mao Zedong: I disagree with such a formula.

N.S. Khrushchev: We send thousands of specialists to you. Who can guarantee that all of them give 100% correct advice?

Mao Zedong: It is more than 90% correct.

N.S. Khrushchev: The specialists whom we send know the particulars of their field, but they do not deal with political matters. We cannot even demand that they know the particulars of our relations. If somebody knows about them, then he does not know his trade. So we wrote to you with a request to recall all the specialists. Then you could send your people to us for study.

Mao Zedong: One should take advantage of both ways.

N.S. Khrushchev: But then we have unequal conditions. We do not have your people and you are guaranteed that they do not commit follies.

Mao Zedong: We are not asking you for these guarantees.

N.S. Khrushchev: But you are placing us in an unequal position. We send specialists, they commit follies, and I have to make excuses.

Mao Zedong: You need not bring excuses. We must settle the matter.

N.S. Khrushchev: As if we have no other things to do.

Mao Zedong: We are talking here of several people. They are all communists.

N.S. Khrushchev: Not all of them. Some are not communists, and some we are expelling from the Party. But even this is not a guarantee against follies.

Mao Zedong: The same can be said about China.

N.S. Khrushchev: We do not take a license only for follies for the Russians. This is an international quality, it can strike all the nations. But the conditions are unfair for us. You can bring complaints about the follies of our specialists, and we do not have your specialists. Therefore, it turns out that only we commit follies.

Mao Zedong: History is to blame for this.

N.S. Khrushchev: And we have to answer for it?

Mao Zedong: You made a revolution first.

N.S. Khrushchev: And should we be blamed for this?

Mao Zedong: That is why you have to send specialists. You will still have to send them to London and

other places.

N.S. Khrushchev: Then we will do this jointly and will share responsibility and follies between ourselves.

Mao Zedong: Our criticism concerns only the Soviets from the military field and from the state security, not from the economic field.

N.S. Khrushchev: All among us make mistakes, and among yourselves_nobody. Nobody is guaranteed.

Mao Zedong: These are small mistakes. There is no harm that they give sometimes inappropriate recommendations or suggest unsuitable options for construction.

N.S. Khrushchev: Why do you need advisers on state security? As if you cannot secure things yourselves? You see, this is a political matter.

Mao Zedong: Even as far as military advisers are concerned, we are talking only and exclusively about specific persons, and primarily this concerns the fact that the advisers were replaced often without clearing it with us. Only very few share blame for this.

N.S. Khrushchev: We do not know who works with you and who replaces whom. We cannot bear

responsibility for this, we cannot control this.

Mao Zedong: This not your fault. Perhaps the state security apparatus and the military staff should be blamed.

N.S. Khrushchev: But why do you need military advisers? You won such a war, acquired such an

experience. Of what use are they to you? Our advisers have been brought up under different conditions.

Mao Zedong: We need specialists in technology.

N.S. Khrushchev: Come to the USSR and study.

Mao Zedong: We are using this form as well and are sending people to you, but it would also be useful to have some specialists come here.

I am talking about individual cases, not about the recall of all of them.

N.S. Khrushchev: We would suggest to discuss this issue together. We were very alarmed by your observation about our workers. We would not like it to cause you to worry.

Mao Zedong: I agree with your opinion. On specific measures in this direction we can talk. We probably should allow most advisers to stay. Some of them we do not need. We will provide you with a list.

N.S. Khrushchev: We would like to get a list of all, so that there are no misunderstandings, since today one can do stupid things, tomorrow it will be another.

Mao Zedong: We are asking [you] to leave them, and you would like to take the advisers.

N.S. Khrushchev: We will do nothing without you.

Mao Zedong: The difference between our workers and your workers is only in citizenship.

N.S. Khrushchev: [I] agree that [it] is a temporary difference. The main thing is [to preserve] communist ties.

Mao Zedong: Yes. There are contradictions even inside nations. For instance, our working people from the north are not much welcomed in the south of China.

N.S. Khrushchev: I heard that you mentioned in the conversation with Yudin one of our specialists who suggested a caisson-free way of building bridges and who did not find support in our country. I would tell you who did not support him. [Lazar] Kaganovich. What kind of specialist is he? I asked him, why they did not support you? He says this method has not been used anywhere. But the new is precisely new because it has never been used before.

I have spoken out [and said] everything I wanted. Even a good housewife that keeps things tidy has from time to time to remove fine dust with a damp cloth. And we, too, have to meet from time to time, so that not too much dust accumulates.

Mao Zedong: Absolutely correct.

N.S. Khrushchev: Therefore, when you proposed a meeting, we thought it would be necessary. At first we answered that I cannot come, because we thought there would be a meeting in New York. But when we received the answer from the Westerners it became clear that they were dragging their feet. So we came here immediately. This is the best meeting useful and pleasant.

Mao Zedong: [It is] very good that we had this conversation. We should not set issues aside. I am proposing to meet and talk without any agenda, if anything comes up or even if there is nothing [urgent]. We always can find something to talk about. There are issues relating to the international situation, what we can undertake in this direction, the situation in some countries; you could inform us about some countries, [and] we could tell you from our side about others. But the issue of a "cooperative" came up suddenly and is an absolutely temporary phenomenon, but because of it I lost my sleep, quarreled with Yudin, did not let you sleep. But at least we struck a balance.

As to Mikoyan, he is a good comrade. All that he has done in China is well done. We will express to him our discontent on some issues, and if he takes it well—good, if he does not—that is also his business. But I had to draw the line in this matter. As to the advisers, we do not have and will not have any problems here. I told both Yudin and all your comrades that the advisers have been doing enormous and useful work and they do it well. We often give instructions along party and administrative channels to local authorities how they should deal with Soviet advisers. We emphasize the need to keep solidarity with them, we point out that they were sent to assist us. 99.9% and perhaps even more of them who stayed here for the last 7 to 8 years are good people and only some individuals do not take up their duties such as they should have done. For instance, from the group of [Soviet military advise] Petrushevskii. But this was his fault, not the fault of his people.

N.S. Khrushchev: But can't you see that I do not even know him[?]

Mao Zedong: Me, too, I have never seen Petrushevskii. Now there is a good leader of this group—Trufanov.

N.S. Khrushchev: I have known him since the defense of Stalingrad. He is not a bad general.

Mao Zedong: We appreciate having him. We do not need any advisers on state security.

N.S. Khrushchev: You may send yours. This is an internal political affair.

Mao Zedong: There was one man sent to the Main Political Administration [of the PLA of China]—we did not even invite him.

B.N. Ponomarev: You should have mentioned it to the ambassador, and he would have been immediately recalled.

Mao Zedong: I would like to draw a sharp line. The overwhelming majority consists of good workers. Our criticism only concerns some of them.

N.S. Khrushchev: Who should be responsible for those who are beyond this sharp line? Khrushchev, not Mao Zedong. There are no fair conditions. You are in a more favorable position.

Mao Zedong: Do you really want to recall them all?

N.S. Khrushchev: No. We are suggesting to discuss it. We believe that the cadres are not only our capital, but the common possession of communist parties. We must use them, in order to overthrow capitalism.

Mao Zedong: We are not posing the question about advisers. Perhaps we posed incorrectly the question about the shortcomings in the work of advisers?

N.S. Khrushchev: On the contrary, [it is] good that you said this, otherwise it would not have been [handled] comradely. There was this issue, and you kept silence.

Mao Zedong: This issue existed for a long time, but we, for instance during the events in Hungary,⁵⁰ consciously avoided to put it forward. We did not put it forward at the time when Soviet military advisers had to be recalled from Poland either. The criticism concerns a negligible number of people and, specifically, the method of their assignment [*komandirovaniia*].

N.S. Khrushchev: You acted wisely. I leave it to you to decide. Yesterday you needed advisers, today you do not. Indeed, you do not want Russians to walk around with Chinese in diapers. It has never been this way. You went through such a road of struggle.

Mao Zedong: I am talking about a negligible number of people. One adviser from the military academy, for instance, gave instructions to [Chinese] professors to base [their] studies only on the use of the experience of the Great Patriotic War.

N.S. Khrushchev: He is like a sausage—holds what he is stuffed with.

Mao Zedong: Perhaps we should change all the advisers into specialists?

N.S. Khrushchev: That's right. Leaving them with the right to advise. Let them work.

Mao Zedong: Yes, let them work, but in a slightly different way. Could you stay tomorrow?

N.S. Khrushchev: And you want to send us back expeditiously?

Mao Zedong: No, you may stay as long as you

want.

Regarding the time of our next meeting there could be a contradiction between us. You work during the day, and I sleep during the day. One could meet in the afternoon after 4.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yes, this is a contradiction, but not a conflict.

Mao Zedong: Should we publish a communiqué about our meeting[?] Perhaps we should scare the imperialists just a bit?

N.S. Khrushchev: Not a bad idea. Let them guess what Khrushchev and Mao Zedong talked about in Beijing. From our side one could assign the work on the communiqué to comrades [Vassily] Kuznetsov, Ponomarev, Fedorenko.

Mao Zedong: From our side there will be comrades Wan Xia Sang and Hu Xao Mu. We can frighten the imperialists, and they should be frightened.

N.S. Khrushchev: That's right. Perhaps that is why Stalin did not want to reach a treaty with you, because he thought an attack on China was possible and did not want to get involved into this. We would have helped a little, but without full-scale involvement. But he did not tell anybody about this. We, for instance, had no treaty with Albania. During the discussion of the issue of the Warsaw Pact, Molotov suggested to exclude Albania. I asked Molotov why Albania should not be included. He said—would we fight for it? But if we do not defend [a country], they would capture it without fight.

Mao Zedong: Yes, this is a staunch, hard-boiled nation. They should be assisted.

N.S. Khrushchev: Molotov then objected also to covering the GDR. I believe we should discuss the issue about the reinforcement of Albania. It needs a fleet. On what basis we could do it—cooperation or some other, we will discuss it with [Albanian leader] Enver Xoxha. This is a complicated issue. Maybe some kind of cooperation will be necessary. Please do not blame us for it.

Mao Zedong: Yes, cooperation is needed with Albania, the GDR, Poland, Hungary, but hardly with Czechoslovakia. Do you have troops there?

N.S. Khrushchev: No. Only in Poland and Hungary. When I was in Hungary I offered [Janós] Kádár to withdraw the troops. He disagreed and only consented to the reduction of one division. They deployed our troops along the Austrian border, but the Austrians do not threaten us. I believe that the situation in Hungary is very good. Kádár is a good man.

Mao Zedong: In case of war we should definitely cooperate. Look how many military bases, how many nails are studded around us; in Japan, on Taiwan, in South Korea, [South] Vietnam, Malaya, etc.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yes. And how many in Europe? Bases are all around.

[It is] good that we developed [the Soviet] economy, and our scientists helped us build missiles.

Mao Zedong: We all live because of your missiles.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yes, to a certain extent this is so,

one can say without false modesty. This deters the enemies.

I believe that the situation in the GDR is good.

Mao Zedong: I am of the same opinion. Cde. Dung Bi U characterized the situation there in a similar way.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yes, we met with him in Bulgaria and in the GDR.

This was the end of the meeting.

The conversation was recorded by N. Fedorenko and A. Filev.

[Source: Archive of the President of the Russian Federation, fond 52, opis 1, delo 498, ll. 44-477, copy in Dmitry Volkogonov Collection, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC; translation from Russian for CWIHP by Vladislav M. Zubok, (National Security Archive).]

DOCUMENT No. 2

Fourth Conversation of

N.S. Khrushchev with Mao Zedong

Hall of Qinjendiang, 3 August 1958

Present at the meeting: cdes. Khrushchev, Malinovsky, Kuznetsov, Ponomarev, Antonov

Cdes: Mao Zedong, Liu Shaoqi, Zhou Enlai, Zhu De, Chen Yun, Lin Biao, Deng Xiaoping, Peng Dehuai, Peng Zhen, Chen Yi, Wang Jiaxian [?], Huang Kecheng Sheng, Yang Shang, Hu Qiuomu.

[Mao Zedong:] I would like to clarify two small, but important issues.

First—on the ban of testing of atomic weapons. You stopped testing unilaterally, but in the West they continue to test. Do you think it is necessary to resume testing?

N.S. Khrushchev: They liberated us from our pledge by not ceasing their tests. We conducted our tests. Now we continue to work on atomic and hydrogen bombs. When necessary, we will resume testing, of course, if by that time there is no general agreement on the cessation of testing.

Mao Zedong: It is clear to me.

You said that a transcontinental missile flies through space. Doesn't it burn up when it re-enters the atmosphere?

N.S. Khrushchev: No, this issue is resolved.

Mao Zedong: How do you assess the fact that the US located its military bases around the Soviet Union?

N.S. Khrushchev: This is unfavorable for us. The

military bases are drawn up close to our borders. But their main bases are located far from us, in America. It is difficult for bombers to reach them. But now, with the availability of missile weapons, the correlation of forces has been equalized. We are currently going through difficulties in testing long-range missiles. For this our territory is insufficient.

Mao Zedong: Could you launch them in the direction of the North Pole?

N.S. Khrushchev: But this is exactly the short

distance, and in case of war we will fire across the Pole. That is why the Americans offer inspections of the Arctic Zone, so they could detect our missile bases and secure themselves.

Mao Zedong: I read the reply by Eisenhower to your proposal on prevention of surprise attack. It seems to be a decent answer, he seems to be ready to convene a

conference of experts on this issue. They are obviously afraid of a surprise attack.

N.S. Khrushchev: I have not seen this letter yet.

Mao Zedong: I would like to agree with you regarding the departure of the delegation. Perhaps we should change the farewell ceremony, to convene the public at the airport, line up the guard of honor, invite the diplomatic corps.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yesterday we seemed to have agreed to arrange the same kind of departure as the arrival. Let our agreement be firm. Thus we will give fewer pretexts for idle gossip [*krivotolki*]. Otherwise they will write in the West that the arrival was secret, because they did not expect the talks to be successful, that perhaps there were some contradictions between China and the Soviet Union, that then they met, reached agreement and decided to stage a pompous farewell ceremony. Let them better try to solve the riddle, let the very fact of the meeting have an effect.

Mao Zedong: I thought it necessary that your arrival would be in secret so that the imperialists could not use your absence for delivering a surprise attack.

N.S. Khrushchev: I do not think they would have dared to do this; the correlation of forces is not in their favor. Now they had to swallow another bitter pill—to recognize Iraq. But even if they had been prepared for war at 50 percent readiness, they would not have started it even then.

Mao Zedong: Yes, England, of course, would not have started it.

N.S. Khrushchev: Both France and Germany would not have dared it. They know that we can reduce them to dust. The British during the Second World War suffered from German "V-1" and "V-2," but now these would be toys in comparison with [our] missiles. Everyone knows it.

Mao Zedong: But they have bases everywhere. In Turkey alone more than 100 bases.

N.S. Khrushchev: No, there are fewer bases in Turkey, and even they all are now in our cross-hairs [*u nas podpritselom*]. They intend to build bases in Greece, but there it is even easier: one can push the boulder from the

mountain in Bulgaria—so much for the bases. Even America itself is now under threat of attack.

We should be grateful to our scientists for the creation of the transcontinental missile.⁵¹

Mao Zedong: And German scientists, too?

N.S. Khrushchev. No, they participated only in the very beginning. We could not entrust such an important matter to the Germans. Now they all returned to Germany and told their stories about what they had worked on. The Americans believed their stories and decided that we had no transcontinental rockets. When we announced that we tested it, they could not believe. But then we launched sputniks.⁵² Now Americans already say that Russians themselves built the transcontinental rocket. The

newspapers wrote that there are Germans working in America as well, but America did not launch the first sputnik.

Mao Zedong: I still think that your trip abroad for the summit of heads of the states is dangerous. I would advise you to declare that you nominate a deputy in your absence. We all are concerned when you leave the country.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yes, there is a certain risk there, particularly if the summit takes place in New York: there are many embittered Hungarians there, and other enemies. Conditions are better in Geneva. I recall an interesting story during the Geneva conference in [July] 1955.

According to the American Constitution, the President's bodyguards should run ahead of him during his movement in the streets. But the Constitution was developed when people still moved in horse-drawn carriages. Therefore, when Eisenhower came to Geneva and sat in a car, and his bodyguards ran ahead, this made everyone who met him laugh. Then everyone guessed how Khrushchev and Bulganin would behave. And we came to Geneva, sat into an open car and drove across the city. This surprised everyone, because they believed we would be afraid and would move around only in the armor-plated car. True, then we drove in the armor-plated car [*bronirovannaya mashina*], because, as the Swiss police informed us, there was some kind of a terrorist group, which plotted an attack.

Americans also wrote that Khrushchev would not dare to show himself to people in Hungary. But it is well known what happened during our trip in Hungary. We had to lay a wreath to the monument near the American embassy. I then suggested to Kádár to go to the monument through the crowd, so that Americans could see how people would "tear Khrushchev to pieces." After this they stopped writing that Hungarians were against the Soviet Union.

Mao Zedong: Stalin refused to go even to Geneva, but I had a different kind of danger in mind.

N.S. Khrushchev: It was a senile defect of mind.

We now do not consider possible the outbreak of war. From time to time we instruct our military to prepare, according to their data, an outline of the situation. Recently they reported that there were no grounds to believe in an

imminent threat of war.

Mao Zedong: Do you think [US Secretary of State John Foster] Dulles will remain in his position?

N.S. Khrushchev: No, he will probably go, although it is better for us if he stays. It is easier to deal with a fool than with a bright person.

Mao Zedong: In your opinion, will [Democratic presidential candidate Adlai] Stevenson become president?

N.S. Khrushchev: He is a more positive personality.

Mao Zedong: Most probably, if the Republican Party stays in power, then [Vice President Richard] Nixon will become President.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yes, most probably so. He would be worse than Eisenhower. Eisenhower entered the national [political] arena as a national hero, as a result of the war. As a politician he is not among the best; he lacks political experience. And even as a military officer, he does not shine brightly. At the end of the war the Germans almost defeated him in the Ardennes. Then [Winston] Churchill asked Stalin to come to the assistance of the Western allies.

Mao Zedong: You should not have assisted them then. Maybe as a result there would not have been a West Berlin, and perhaps not even a Western Germany.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yes, perhaps today we would have been guests of [French Communist Party leader Maurice] Thorez. But at that moment the situation was different. The Germans surrendered to the Americans without fighting, and offered strong resistance against us. The situation could have turned out in such a way that we would not have captured Berlin. Stalin then reached understanding with Eisenhower and he gave us an opportunity to capture Berlin. During the battle of Vienna, the Germans also ran away from us towards Eisenhower, but he did not accept them as prisoners. So, as you can see, Eisenhower was not devoid of a certain decency. But now he does everything that American monopolists recommend to him.

Mao Zedong says that everything is ready for signing of the communiqué.

N.S. Khrushchev: Good. Let's sign it.

This was the end of the meeting.

The conversation was recorded by N. Fedorenko, A. Filev.

[Source: Archive of the President of the Russian Federation, f. 52, opis 1, delo 498, ll. 151-156, copy in Volkogonov Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.; translated from Russian for CWIHP by Vladislav M. Zubok, (National Security Archive).]

DOCUMENT No. 3

Memorandum of Conversation of

N.S. Khrushchev with Mao Zedong,

Beijing,

2 October 1959

Present at the conversation: Cdes. M.A. Suslov and A.A. Gromyko.

Cdes: Deputy Chairmen of the CC CCP Liu Shaoqi, Zhao Enlai and Lin Biao; Members of the Politburo Peng Zhen and Chen Yi; Member of the Secretariat Wan Xia Sang.

Today, together with cde. M.A. Suslov and A.A. Gromyko, I paid a visit to Mao Zedong at his request in his residency.

Mao Zedong: We acquainted ourselves with the content of the message from Eisenhower to you, Cde. Khrushchev, which at your instruction was passed to us this morning.

N.S. Khrushchev: Good. Besides, we would like to acquaint you with the excerpt concerning China from my conversation in the US with President D. Eisenhower on 27 September 1959, and after that let us exchange opinions on the issue regarding my trip to the US and on the issues of relations with America. Most advisable would be if the above mentioned excerpt from my conversation with Eisenhower would be translated here orally by the interpreter.

The interpreters Yang Ming Fu and Li Yue Zhen translate orally the aforementioned excerpt from my conversation with Eisenhower.

The Chinese paid greatest attention to the issue of detention of 5 Americans in China, as well as the remark by Eisenhower about the reason for which the USSR did not take the same position on the Taiwan question as on the German question.

N.S. Khrushchev (after the translation ended): It is clear why Eisenhower was in a hurry to send his message to China.

Mao Zedong: As far as I understand it, the meaning of Eisenhower's observations can be summarized as follows: that moderate and restrained policy should be conducted.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yes.

Mao Zedong: Eisenhower also says that 45 countries allegedly recognize Taiwan and there are smaller number of [countries that recognize] us, and [that] war is unnecessary. There are positive points in Eisenhower's dispatch, in particular his observation that one should not let war break out. We also do not want war.

N.S. Khrushchev: You understood this correctly. I would like to emphasize that there is a thought in Eisenhower's message which implies not removing forever, only postponing the resolution of the Taiwan issue. The main idea of the Eisenhower message is that there should

be no war. We do not want war over Taiwan.

Mao Zedong: Taiwan is an internal PRC issue. We say that we will definitely liberate Taiwan. But the roads to liberation may be different—peaceful and military. Zhou Enlai declared at the Bandung conference in 1955 that China is ready to conduct negotiations with the US. In effect, since then there have been talks between Americans and us, first in Geneva, then in Warsaw. At first, the representatives at these talks met once a week, then once every two weeks, and recently once a month. Both sides do not want to derail the talks. For a while the Americans attempted to derail the talks. We declared that it was bad and set the terms for its resumption. The Americans declared that they were also in favor of continuing the talks, but they could not accept the "ultimatum" schedule. We disagreed. Then, after our shelling of the off-shore Chinese islands Quemoy and Matsu, the talks resumed. We Chinese always put forth the following idea at the talks: Americans, please, leave Taiwan, and after that there will not be any problems between us. We would then begin resolving the remaining issues with Jiang Jieshi [Chiang Kai-shek] on the basis of negotiations. Jiang Jieshi does not want the Americans to leave. The US, in turn, is afraid that Jiang Jieshi may establish ties with the PRC. There were military actions in this region but they did not constitute war. In our opinion, let Taiwan and other islands stay in the hands of the Jiang Jieshi-ists [Chiang Kai-shekists] for ten, twenty and even thirty years. We would tolerate it.

N.S. Khrushchev: I would like to say that at the first lunch meeting at the Soviet embassy in the USA, Eisenhower said that they, the Americans, had been negotiating with the PRC for a number of years and there were no results, and that the Chinese did not even agree to liberate five Americans that were in confinement in the PRC, and this complicated the situation and seriously irritated the American people. Moreover, Eisenhower told me, let all the Chinese that live in the US leave, if they like, we will not hold them back. Eisenhower also told me that there was no use for me to go to China.

Mao Zedong: China cannot be equaled with Germany, not only because the population of Taiwan is considerably smaller than the population on the Chinese mainland, but also because China was not a defeated country at the end of World War II, but among the victorious powers. Germany was divided into two states as a result of the Potsdam Agreement. In Korea, the 38th parallel was also established per agreement between Kim Il Sung and us, on one side, and Americans on the other. Vietnam was divided into North and South in accordance with the Geneva agreements. As for Taiwan is concerned, there was no decision on it at any international conference. The

appearance of Americans on Taiwan arouses discontent not only in socialist countries, but also in England, in the US itself and other countries.

N.S. Khrushchev: Eisenhower understands this. But the problem is that he must first recognize the Chinese

Revolution, and then the Chinese government. And recognize the Revolution is what he does not want.

Mao Zedong: Yes, this is true. The US understand[s] this, but they want to conduct talks in their direction. The US government hinted that the PRC should make a declaration on the non-use of violence in the Taiwan question. The Americans want to receive guarantees on the non-use of arms, but as for them, they intend to do there whatever they want.

N.S. Khrushchev: I did not even know that the PRC holds five Americans in captivity. Is this true? In the conversation with Eisenhower I only said that, as a matter of friendly advice, I could touch on this question in Beijing.

Zhou Enlai: On 1 August 1956, the Americans and we reached an agreement in Geneva according to which Americans who had long lived in the PRC (immigrants), could be returned to the US. However, we stipulated that if these people committed any crime, they could be arrested. Chinese law also stipulates that if a prisoner behaves well in prison, his sentence might be reduced. The second category of people on which agreement was reached to allow them the right of exit from the PRC were prisoners of war. A US plane shot down over China in the area of Andung, not in Korea. 18 US military personnel who were on this plane were taken prisoners. Subsequently we set them all free. You recall that the question of American prisoners of war was discussed by the United Nations, and that in 1955 UN General Secretary Dag Hammarskjold came to the PRC on this business. Following Hammarskjold, [French Prime Minister] Mendes-France also came [to discuss] the same question. Via the British, the Americans informed us that they would like to hold talks with the PRC. We agreed to it and the talks began. We took the initiative and released 13 American prisoners of war. Therefore at the conference in Geneva the Americans had no axe to grind with us. After this there were two more Americans, Fekto and Downey, who were in our prisons; they are the agents of the US Central Intelligence Agency and were caught red-handed. Their plane was shot down when they tried without landing to raise their spies onboard with a special rig. A Chinese court sentenced them to lengthy prison sentences: one to life in prison, the other to 20 years in prison. When Hammarskjold came to the PRC, he said that negotiations about the fate of these Americans was not part of his mission. The remaining three are people who lived permanently in China and were arrested for conducting espionage activities. We had overall something like 90 Americans. Most of them we released and now there are only five persons in prison in the PRC. All of them are spies, and, according to the Chinese law, they are subject to imprisonment. We believe that we, Chinese, let too many Americans go.

N.S. Khrushchev: This is the first time I am hearing about this. But if you want to hear my opinion, we, if we were you, would have acted differently. The Americans who are imprisoned in the PRC should, if you do not take the course on confrontation, either be expelled or traded for

counterparts. Lenin did it at his time and was correct. If one, so to say, would "tease geese," then, of course, the Americans should be kept in detention. At some point we exchanged [Mattias] Rakosi for one of the Hungarian spies we detained. In a word, in our opinion, the Americans that you hold in prison should better be set free.

Mao Zedong (with obvious displeasure and testily): Of course, one can set them free or not, and we will not release Americans now, but we will do it at a more appropriate time. After all, the Americans sent a large number of our volunteers [who fought in] Korea to Taiwan, and a great deal of the fighters from the PDRK [People's Democratic Republic of Korea] army they sent to South Korea.

N.S. Khrushchev: Good. This is your internal affair. We do not interfere. But your attitude and the fact that you probably took offense at us complicates the exchange of opinions. I would like to emphasize that I am not a representative of the US and not a mediator on behalf of the Americans. I am a representative of my own Soviet socialist state, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. If I touched on this issue, I did it only because I wanted to sort it out and to lay before you our point of view, since this issue stirs up the international situation.

Mao Zedong: That means it complicates life for the Americans.

N.S. Khrushchev: This issue also complicates our life. We have more substantial grounds to present our claims to the US. After all, they detain a big number of the so-called displaced persons [*peremeschennikh lits*]. The weakness of our position stems from the fact that many of these people do not want to return to the USSR. Of course, we did not discuss with the Americans the issue of setting free the Americans who are imprisoned in the PRC. I only promised Eisenhower to raise this question in the form of a friendly advice during my stay in the PRC. And the Americans raised this question only indirectly.

Mao Zedong: The issue of Taiwan is clear, not only will we not touch Taiwan, but also the off-shore islands, for 10, 20 and perhaps 30 years.

N.S. Khrushchev: Taiwan is an inalienable part, a province, of China, and on this principled question we have no disagreements. As for the five Americans, we would resolve it differently. You are saying that you will live without Taiwan for 10, 20, and even 30 years. But here the main issue is about tactics. The Taiwan question creates difficulties not only for the Americans, but also for us. Between us, in a confidential way, we say that we will not fight over Taiwan, but for outside consumption, so to say, we state on the contrary, that in case of an aggravation of the situation because of Taiwan the USSR will defend the PRC. In its turn, the US declare that they will defend Taiwan. Therefore, a kind of pre-war situation emerges.

Mao Zedong: So what should we do then? Should we act as the US says, that is declare the non-use of force in the area of Taiwan and move towards turning this issue into an international issue?

Zhou Enlai: As far as the Taiwan question is concerned, we should draw a clear line between its two aspects: relations between the People's Republic of China and Taiwan are an internal issue, and relations between China and America regarding the Taiwan issue this is the international aspect of this problem.

N.S. Khrushchev: This is clear, and this is how we spoke with Eisenhower, as you could see from the excerpt of the record of my conversation with the President. To be sure, every question has many sides to it. The main issue—what should be put in the beginning [*kakoe polozhit nachalo*]. A while ago Lenin created the Far Eastern Republic in the Far East of the Soviet Union, and Lenin recognized its [sovereignty]. Keep in mind that this republic was established on the territory of the Soviet Union. It was unbelievable, but Lenin temporarily put up with this. Later, as it ought to be, the Far Eastern Republic merged with the Soviet Union.

We do not have proposals regarding the Taiwan Question, but we would think you ought to look for ways to relax the situation. We, being your allies, knew about the measures you undertook on the Taiwan Question, and today I am hearing for the first time about some of the tenets of your position in this area. Should it be appropriate for us as allies to exchange opinions on all these questions that might involve not only you, but also your friends into events? We could search for ways to promote the relaxation of international tensions without causing damage to the prestige and sovereign rights of the PRC.

Mao Zedong: Our General Staff informed you about our intentions in the Taiwan Question through your chief military adviser whom we asked to relay everything to the USSR Ministry of Defense. I would like to clarify right away that we did not intend to undertake any large-scale military actions in the area of Taiwan, and only wanted to create complications for the United States considering that they got bogged down in Lebanon. And we believe that our campaign was successful.

N.S. Khrushchev: We hold a different opinion on this question.

Mao Zedong: Although we fire at the off-shore islands, we will not make attempts to liberate them. We also think that the United States will not go to war because of the off-shore islands and Taiwan.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yes, Americans will not go to war because of Taiwan and the off-shore islands. We are familiar with the content of the instructions that were given to [John Foster] Dulles when he went to a meeting with Jiang Jieshi.⁵³ If you are interested to see this document, we can show it to you. As for the firing at the off-shore islands, if you shoot, then you ought to capture these islands, and if you do not consider necessary capturing these islands, then there is no use in firing. I do not understand this policy of yours. Frankly speaking, I thought you would take the islands and was upset when I learned that you did not take them. Of course, this is your

business, but I am speaking about it as an ally.

Mao Zedong: We informed you about our intentions regarding Taiwan a month ahead, before we began shelling the off-shore islands.

N.S. Khrushchev: He reported to us not about your policy on this issue, but about some separate measures. We expressed our position, and now it is your business, whether to agree with us or not. We do not quite understand your policy in international issues. The issues of international policy we must coordinate. You perhaps should think if it is necessary to exchange opinions through the channels of foreign ministries on major political issues where we have no agreement.

Mao Zedong: As I already said, we informed you about our intentions through your General Staff. However, I would like to know what is your opinion on what we ought to do.

N.S. Khrushchev: We stand for relaxation of tensions. We only wanted the people to understand that we stand for peace. It is not worth shelling the islands in order to tease cats.

Mao Zedong: This is our policy. Our relations with Jiang Jieshi and with the Americans—are two different things. With the United States we will seek to resolve issues by peaceful means. If the United States does not leave Taiwan, then we will negotiate with them until they go from there. The relationship with Jiang Jieshi is our internal question and we might resolve it not only by peaceful, but also other methods. As far as the creation of the Far Eastern republic is concerned, and also the fact that at some point Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia were separated from the Soviet Union, you should keep in mind that in these cases there was no foreign intervention.

N.S. Khrushchev: The issue of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, Poland, Georgia, Armenia - this is an issue of a completely different nature. This is an issue of national self-determination. As for the Far Eastern republic, it was part of Russia.

Mao Zedong: The Taiwan Question is very complex.

N.S. Khrushchev: We have a common understanding of the question of Taiwan. At the present time there is only [a difference on] the question of tactics. You always refuse to work out a policy on this question that we could understand. You might think that we interfere into your internal affairs, but we only express our considerations. In this regard I would remark that we do not know what kind of policy you will have on this issue tomorrow.

Mao Zedong: We do not want war with the United States.

N.S. Khrushchev: One should not pose the issue this way. Neither you nor I want war—this is well known. The problem is that not only does the world public opinion not know what you might undertake tomorrow, but also even we, your allies, do not know it.

Mao Zedong: There could be two ways here. The first of them—to do what the Americans demand, i.e. to provide a guarantee on the non-use of force regarding Taiwan. The

Americans long ago posed the question and told us about it via Eden as early as March 1955. The second way is to draw a clear line between our relations with the United States and the relations with the Jiang-Jieshi-ists. As to the relations with Jiang Jieshi, here any means should be used, since the relations with Jiang Jieshi are our internal matter.

After a one-hour break the exchange of opinions resumed.

Mao Zedong: What should we do?

Zhou Enlai: We should continue.

Mao Zedong: To do what the Americans propose is not too good for us. And the Americans do not want to reciprocate, to do what we want.

N.S. Khrushchev: You are leaving us in an awkward position. You frame the question as if we support the position of Americans, while we stand on our Soviet communist position.

Mao Zedong: Perhaps we should postpone this question indefinitely. Everyone sees that we are not close to the United States and that the United States, not us, send[s] its fleet to our coast.

N.S. Khrushchev: One should keep in mind that we also are not without sin. It was we who drew the Americans to South Korea. We should undertake such steps that would allow the Americans to respond with their steps in the direction of a relaxation of the situation. We should seek ways of relaxing of the situation, to seek ways to ameliorate the situation. You know that when the events in Hungary took place, our hand did not waver to deliver a decisive crack-down on the counterrevolution. Comrade Liu Shaoqi was then with us and we together resolved this question. If it becomes necessary again, then we will carry out one more time our internationalist communist duty, and you should have no doubts about it. We would think that one should work out a whole system, a staircase of measures, and in such a way that people would understand us. After Stalin's death we achieved a lot. I could tell about a number of points on which I disagreed [with Stalin]. What did Stalin leave for us? There were [anti-aircraft] artillery around Moscow that was ready to open fire any moment. We expected an attack at any minute. We succeeded in liquidating such a situation and we are proud of this. Keep in mind that we achieved [the present-day] situation without giving up on any principled positions. We raised this issue also because we do not understand your position, do not understand in particular your conflict with India. We had a dispute with Persia on border issues for 150 years. 3-4 years ago we resolved this issue by transferring to Persia some part of our territory. We consider this issue as follows: five kilometers more land we have or five kilometers less—this is not important. I take Lenin's example, and he gave to Turkey Kars, Ardahan and Ararat. And until today area a part of the population in the Caucasus are displeased by these measures by Lenin. But I believe that his actions were correct. I am telling about all this to show you that for us this territorial issue was not

insurmountable. You have had good relations with India for many years. Suddenly, here is a bloody incident, as result of which [Prime Minister of India Jawaharlal] Nehru found himself in a very difficult position. We may say that Nehru is a bourgeois statesman. But we know about it. If Nehru leaves, who would be better than him? The Dalai Lama fled from Tibet, he is a bourgeois figure. This issue is also not clear for us. When the events in Hungary took place, then Nehru was against us, and we did not take offense at him, because we did not expect anything from him as a bourgeois statesman. But although he was against it, this did not prevent us from preserving good relations with him. If you let me, I will tell you what a guest should not say—the events in Tibet are your fault. You ruled in Tibet, you should have had your intelligence [agencies] there and should have known about the plans and intentions of the Dalai Lama.

Mao Zedong: Nehru also says that the events in Tibet occurred on our fault. Besides, in the Soviet Union they published a TASS declaration on the issue of conflict with India.

N.S. Khrushchev: Do you really want us to approve of your conflict with India? It would be stupid on our part. The TASS declaration was necessary. You still seem to be able to see some difference between Nehru and me. If we had not issued the TASS declaration, there could have been an impression that there was a united front of socialist countries against Nehru. The TASS declaration turned this issue into one between you and India.

Mao Zedong: Our mistake was that we did not disarm the Dalai Lama right away. But at that time we had no contact with the popular masses of Tibet.

N.S. Khrushchev: You have no contact even now with the population of Tibet.

Mao Zedong: We have a different understanding of this issue.

N.S. Khrushchev: Of course, that is why we raised this issue. One could also say the following: both you and we have Koreans who fled from Kim Il Sung. But this does not give us ground to spoil relations with Kim Il Sung, and we remain good friends. As to the escape of the Dalai Lama from Tibet, if we had been in your place, we would not have let him escape. It would be better if he was in a coffin. And now he is in India, and perhaps will go to the USA. Is this to the advantage of the socialist countries?

Mao Zedong: This is impossible; we could not arrest him then. We could not bar him from leaving, since the border with India is very extended, and he could cross it at any point.

N.S. Khrushchev: It's not a matter of arrest; I am just saying that you were wrong to let him go. If you allow him an opportunity to flee to India, then what has Nehru to do with it? We believe that the events in Tibet are the fault of the Communist Party of China, not Nehru's fault.

Mao Zedong: No, this is Nehru's fault.

N.S. Khrushchev: Then the events in Hungary are not our fault, but the fault of the United States of America, if I

understand you correctly. Please, look here, we had an army in Hungary, we supported that fool Rakosi—and this is our mistake, not the mistake of the United States.

Mao Zedong: How can you compare Rakosi to the Dalai Lama?

N.S. Khrushchev: If you like, you can to a certain degree.

Mao Zedong: The Hindus acted in Tibet as if it belonged to them.

N.S. Khrushchev: We know. As you know, Nepal wanted to have a Soviet ambassador, but we did not send there for a long time. You did the same. This is because Nehru did not want that Soviet and Chinese ambassadors were there. This should not come as a surprise—nothing else can be expected from Nehru. But this should not be a grounds for us for breaking off the relations.

Mao Zedong: We also support Nehru, but in the question of Tibet we should crush him.

N.S. Khrushchev: Why did you have to kill people on the border with India?

Mao Zedong: They attacked us first, crossed the border and continued firing for 12 hours.

Zhou Enlai: What data do you trust more—Indian or ours?

N.S. Khrushchev: Although the Hindus attacked first, nobody was killed among the Chinese, and only among the Hindus.

Zhou Enlai: But what we are supposed to do if they attack us first. We cannot fire in the air. The Hindus even crossed the McMahon line. Besides, in the nearest future [Indian] Vice President [Savrepalli] Radhakrishnan comes to China. This is to say that we are undertaking measures to resolve the issue peacefully, by negotiations. In my letter of 9 September to Nehru we provided detailed explanations of all that had occurred between India and us.

N.S. Khrushchev: Comrade Zhou Enlai. You have been Minister of Foreign Affairs of the PRC for many years and know better than me how one can resolve disputed issues without [spilling] blood. In this particular case I do not touch at all the issue of the border, for if the Chinese and the Hindus do not know where the borderline goes between them, it is not for me, a Russian, to meddle. I am only against the methods that have been used.

Zhou Enlai: We did not know until recently about the border incident, and local authorities undertook all the measures there, without authorization from the center. Besides, we are talking here about three disputed regions between China and India. The Hindus were the first to cross the McMahon line and were the first to open fire. No government of China ever recognized the McMahon line. If, for instance, the Finns attacked the borders of the USSR, wouldn't you retaliate?

M.A. Suslov: We do not have claims against the Finnish government.

N.S. Khrushchev: That the center knew nothing about the incident is news to me. I would tell you, what I was against. On 22 June 1941 Germans began their assault

against the Soviet Union. Stalin forbade opening fire in response, and the instruction to open fire was sent only after some time. As Stalin explained, it might have been a provocation. Of course, it was Stalin's mistake. He simply got cold feet [*on strusil*]. But this case is absolutely different.

Zhu De: Hindus crossed the McMahon line that tears away 90 thousand square kilometers from China.

Chen Yi: After the revolt in Tibet there were several anti-Chinese, anti-communist campaigns in India. There were demonstrations against our Embassy in Dehli and the consulate in Calcutta; their participants reviled the leaders of the PRC and shouted anti-Chinese slogans. We did nothing like that, and the Indian Ambassador in the PRC had not the slightest pretext to claim [that we] were unfriendly.

N.S. Khrushchev: Our Soviet representatives abroad had much more fallen on them than yours. Since the establishment of our state not a few of Soviet ambassadors were killed abroad. And in the Soviet Union only a German ambassador was killed in 1918. True, at some point the windows in the embassies of the United States and Federal Republic of Germany were broken, but we organized it ourselves.

Chen Yi: Speaking of the effectiveness of efforts to pull Nehru to our side, our method will be more efficient, and yours is time-serving [*opportunist-prisposoblenchestvo*].

N.S. Khrushchev: Chen Yi is Minister of Foreign Affairs and he can weigh his words. He did not say it at random. We have existed for 42 years, and for 30 years we existed alone [as a socialist country] and adjusted to nothing, but carried out our principled communist policy.

Chen Yi (in great agitation and hastily): The Chinese people evoked pity for a long time and during many decades lived under oppression of British, American, French and other imperialists. The Soviet comrades should understand this. We are now undertaking certain measures to resolve the conflict with India peacefully, and just one fact testifies to this, that perhaps Vice President of India Radhakrishnan will come to us in mid-October. We also have a certain element of time-serving. You should understand our policy correctly. Our line is firmer and more correct.

N.S. Khrushchev: Look at this lefty. Watch it, comrade Chen Yi, if you turn left, you may end up going to the right. The oak is also firm, but it breaks. I believe that we should leave this issue aside, for we have a different understanding of it.

Zhou Enlai: Comrade Khrushchev, even the Hindus themselves do not know what and how it occurred on the Indo-Chinese border.

Lin Biao: During the war between the Soviet Union and Fascist Germany, the Soviet Army routed the fascists and entered Berlin. This does not mean that the Soviet Union began the war.

N.S. Khrushchev: It is not for me, a lieutenant-general,

to teach you, comrade Marshal.

M.A. Suslov: Comrade Lin Biao, you are trying to compare incomparable things. During the Patriotic War millions of people were killed, and here is a trivial incident.

Zhou Enlai: The Hindus did not withdraw their troops from where they had penetrated. We seek peaceful resolution of the conflict and suggested and do suggest to resolve it piece by piece.

N.S. Khrushchev: We agree with all that you are doing. It is what you have done before that we disagree with.

Zhou Enlai: The Hindus conducted large-scale anti-Chinese propaganda for 40 years until this provocation. They were the first to cross the border; they were the first to open fire. Could one still consider under these circumstances that we actually unleashed this incident?

N.S. Khrushchev: We are communists, and they are like Noah's Ark. You, comrade Zhou Enlai, understand it as well as I do.

M.A. Suslov: Noah's Ark in a sense that they have a pair of every creature.

Peng Zhen (in hasty agitation): Nasser has been abusing without reason the Soviet Union that delivers to him unconditional assistance. Here we should keep in mind the reactionary aspects of the national bourgeoisie. If you, Soviet comrades, can lash out at the national bourgeoisie, why we cannot do the same?

N.S. Khrushchev: Nobody says you cannot lash out—but shooting is not the same as criticism.

Peng Zhen: The McMahon line is a dirty line that was not recognized by any government in China.

N.S. Khrushchev: There are three of us here, and nine of you, and you keep repeating the same line. I think this is to no use. I only wanted to express our position. It is your business—to accept it or not.

Mao Zedong: The border conflict with India - this is only a marginal border issue, not a clash between the two governments. Nehru himself is not aware what happened there. As we found out, their patrols crossed the McMahon line. We learned about this much later, after the incident took place. All this was known neither to Nehru, nor even to our military district in Tibet. When Nehru learned that their patrols had crossed the MacMahon line, he issued the instruction for them to withdraw. We also carried out the work towards peaceful resolution of the issue.

N.S. Khrushchev: If this had been done immediately after the skirmish, the conflict would not have taken place. Besides, you failed to inform us for a rather long time about the border incident.

Liu Shaoqi: On 6 September I informed you through comrade [Soviet charge d'affaires in Beijing Sergei F.] Antonov about the situation on the border. Earlier we could not inform you, since we still had not figured it out ourselves.

Zhou Enlai: The TASS announcement was published before you received my letter to Nehru. It was passed to comrade Antonov on the afternoon of 9 September.

M.A. Suslov: It was probably done simultaneously, considering that the time difference between Moscow and Beijing is 5 hours.

A.A. Gromyko: The ambassador of India in the USSR told me that the Chinese letter not only fails to make things calmer, but also actually throws everything back.

M.A. Suslov: At the present moment the temperature has fallen and we can let this issue alone.

Mao Zedong (peevishly). The temperature has fallen thanks to your announcement?

M.A. Suslov: Not only, but also thanks to the decision of your parliament.

Liu Shaoqi: On 6 September I passed a message to you via comrade Antonov that within a week [we] would deliver retaliation to the Hindus.

M.A. Suslov: The decision of your parliament was considerably softer than your Note.

Peng Zhen: The delegates of the All-Chinese

Assembly of People's Deputies asked me how one should understand the TASS announcement, was it that the senior brother, without finding out what was right and who was wrong, gave a beating to the PRC and India.

Wang Ixia-Sang: But the first who began to fire were the Hindus, not us.

N.S. Khrushchev: Yes, they began to shoot and they themselves fell dead. Our duty is to share with you our considerations on the incident, for nobody besides us would tell you about it.

Zhou Enlai: There could be disputes and unresolved issues between the CCP and the CPSU, but for the outside consumption we always underline unity with the Soviet Union.

Lin Biao: The Hindus began to shoot first and they fired for 12 hours, until they spent all their ammunition. There could be a different approach to this issue, one might admit, but the facts are facts: 1) the Hindus were the first to cross the border; 2) the Hindus were the first to open fire; 3) the Hindus sustained fire during 12 hours. In this situation there might be two approaches to the issue: 1) the Hindus crossed the border and we have to beat retreat; 2) the Hindus cross the border and we offer a rebuff.

Mao Zedong: The rebuff was delivered on the decision of local military organs.

Lin Biao: There was no command from the top.

Mao Zedong: We could not keep the Dalai Lama, for the border with India is very extended and he could cross it at any point.

M.A. Suslov: You should have known in advance about his intentions and plots.

Mao Zedong: We wanted to delay the transformation of Tibet by four years.

N.S. Khrushchev: And that was your mistake.

Mao Zedong: The decision to delay the transformations was taken earlier, after the Dalai Lama visited India [in early 1959]. We could not launch an offensive without a pretext. And this time we had a good

excuse and we struck. This is, probably, what you cannot grasp. You will see for yourselves later that the McMahon line with India will be maintained, and the border conflict with India will end.

N.S. Khrushchev: This is good. But the issue is not about the line. We know nothing about this line and we do not even want to know.

Mao Zedong: The border issue with India will be decided through negotiations.

N.S. Khrushchev: We welcome this intention.

Zhou Enlai: On 22 January you suggested to Nehru to conduct talks on the border issues. Then he disagreed with this. Today he agrees.

Mao Zedong: You attached to us two labels—the conflict with India was our fault, and that the escape of the Dalai Lama was also our error. We, in turn, attached to you one label—time-servers. Please accept it.

N.S. Khrushchev: We do not accept it. We take a principled communist line.

Mao Zedong: The TASS announcement made all imperialists happy.

M.A. Suslov: Precisely on the contrary. This announcement and our recent measures promoted the relaxation of the situation. The imperialists would have been happy, had the relations between India and China been spoiled. We have the information that Americans approached Nehru and offered him their services regarding the conflict between India and China. Our steps cooled the hot expectations of the reactionaries.

Lin Biao: The whole issue is about who was first to shoot, not who was killed.

Zhou Enlai: It follows from your reasoning that, if burglars break into your house and you beat them up, then you are guilty.

N.S. Khrushchev: Why may you criticize us, and the senior brother may not censure you. At one meeting with cde. Yudin you, comrade Mao Zedong, very sharply criticized the CPSU, and we accepted this criticism. Moreover, you left the session at the 8th Congress of the CCP during the speech of comrade [Anastas] Mikoyan. This was a demonstrative gesture, and Mikoyan could have left also.

In fact, I can also pack my suitcases and leave, but I am not doing it. When the events in Hungary took place, comrade Zhou Enlai came to us and lectured us. He blamed us both for Bessarabia and for the Baltic countries. We received this lesson. It turns out that you may censure us, and we may not. There are even some members of the CC CPSU Presidium back home who say the following: there is a formula "the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union," but in reality one lacks even respect for observations of the CPSU. Aren't you talking to us too haughtily?

Mao Zedong: We expressed our observations to you in a confidential manner. And you this time expressed them in the same order. This is good. This will serve the right cause. But when you took a public stand (I have in mind the TASS announcement) this was not good.

A.A. Gromyko: The TASS announcement did nothing to push India away from the People's Republic of China (reads an excerpt).

Peng Zhen: We also must speak out. The Hindus were really the first ones to cross the border, to start shooting, they continued shooting for 12 hours. Comrade Mao Zedong has just said that nobody knew precisely what actually occurred on the Sino-Indian border.

N.S. Khrushchev: You do not tolerate objections, you believe you are orthodox, and this is where our haughtiness reveals itself. Chen Yi attached to us a label, and it is a political label. What ground does he have to do this?

Chen Yi: The TASS announcement was in support of India, in support of the bourgeoisie.

N.S. Khrushchev: You want to subjugate us to yourselves, but nothing will come out of it, we are also a party and we have our own way, and we are not time-servers towards anybody.

Mao Zedong: And what is then our way?

N.S. Khrushchev: We always believed and believe that you and we take one road and we regard you as our best friends.

Mao Zedong: I cannot understand what constitutes our mistake? Kerensky and Trotsky also escaped from you.

N.S. Khrushchev: The Dalai Lama escaped, and you are not guilty? Well, there were also similar mistakes and facts on our side. True, when we allowed Kerensky to escape from the USSR, it was our mistake, but one should keep in mind that this happened literally in the first days of the revolution. Lenin freed on parole generals Krasnov and Kaledin. As for Trotsky, it was Stalin who expelled him. Nehru may go over to the USA. He is among our fellow-travelers who go with us when it is to their advantage. When we delivered assistance to Nasser, we knew that he might turn against us. We gave him credits for construction of the high-altitude Aswan dam. This is tactics. Had we not given him this credit, Nasser would have ended up in America's embrace.

Mao Zedong: You only see our "threatening gestures," and fail to see the other side—our struggle to pull Nehru over to our side.

N.S. Khrushchev: We are not confident that Nasser will hold out with us for long. There is only a very fine thread connecting us and it can break off at any moment.

Chen Yi: I am outraged by your declaration that "the aggravation of relationship with India was our fault."

N.S. Khrushchev: I am also outraged by your declaration that we are time-servers. We should support Nehru, to help him stay in power.

Mao Zedong: The events in Tibet and the border conflict—these are temporary developments. Better that we end here the discussion of these issues. Could we assess the relationship between us as follows, that on the whole we are united, and some differences do not stand in the way of our friendship?

N.S. Khrushchev: We took and do take this view.

Mao Zedong: I would like to introduce a clarification—I never attended the session at the 8th Congress when comrade Mikoyan spoke. I would like to speak to Mikoyan personally.

N.S. Khrushchev: You skipped that session precisely because Mikoyan spoke there. Zhou Enlai once delivered to us a fair lecture. He is a good lecturer, but I disagree with the content of his lecture.

Liu Shaoqi: We never told anybody about our disagreements, not to even any fraternal party.

N.S. Khrushchev: This is good, this is correct. You gave us the first lesson, we heard you, and you must now listen to us. Take back your political accusations; otherwise we spoil relations between our parties. We are your friends and speak the truth. We never acted as time-servers with regard to anybody, even our friends.

Chen Yi: But you also lay two political accusations at our door, by saying that both the aggravations of relations with India and the escape of Dalai Lama were our fault. I believe that you are still acting as time-servers.

N.S. Khrushchev: These are completely different matters. I drew your attention only to specific oversights and never hurled at you principled political accusations, and you put forth precisely a political accusation. If you consider us time-servers, comrade Chen Yi, then do not offer me your hand. I will not accept it.

Chen Yi: Neither will I. I must tell you I am not afraid of your fury.

N.S. Khrushchev: You should not spit from the height of your Marshal title. You do not have enough spit. We cannot be intimidated. What a pretty situation we have: on one side, you use the formula "headed by the Soviet Union," on the other hand, you do not let me say a word. What kind of equality we can talk about? That is why we raised the question at the 21st Congress of the CPSU about the repeal of the formula "the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union." We do not want any Party to stand at the head. All communist parties are equal and independent. Otherwise one is in a false situation.

Mao Zedong (in a conciliatory manner): Chen Yi speaks about particulars, and you should not generalize.

Wang Jiaxiang: The whole matter is about wrong translation. Chen Yi did not speak of time-serving as some kind of doctrine.

N.S. Khrushchev: We shot down not only one American plane and always said that they crash by themselves. This you cannot brand as time-serving.

M.A. Suslov: Now you are moving toward negotiations between you and India. This is good.

A.A. Gromyko: Is there a need that the PRC makes a declaration that would promote a relaxation in the situation? I am making a reservation that I am saying this without a preliminary exchange of opinions with cde. Khrushchev.

Zhou Enlai: There is no need to make such a declaration. We informed the Hindus that Vice President Radhakrishnan might come to us at his convenience in the

period from 15 October until 1 December.

N.S. Khrushchev: I would also like to express an idea that has materialized just now with regard to the question of the visit of the Vice President. Would there be no bewilderment, if it were the Vice President, and not the President and Prime Minister [i.e., Nehru], to come to the PRC?

Zhou Enlai: The Hindus themselves offered the candidacy of Radhakrishnan. The President and Prime Minister of India sent us best wishes on the 10th anniversary of the PRC. In reply to the address we will remind them again about the invitation of Radhakrishnan to come to the PRC.

Mao Zedong: "Pravda" published only an abridged version of Zhou Enlai's letter to Nehru, and the TASS announcement was published in full. Perhaps we now stop discussing this issue and shift to Laos?

N.S. Khrushchev: Good, let us do this, but I have not a slightest interest in this matter, for this is a very insignificant matter, and there is much noise around it. Today Ho Chi Minh came to see us and had a conversation with us about Laos. I sent him to you, for you should be more concerned with this. During the events in Hungary and Poland etc. Liu Shaoqi and Zhou Enlai came to us. Cde. Liu Shaoqi and I held different, sometimes diametrically opposed positions. During several days we could not work out a common opinion. Our positions shifted, but then we reached agreement and resolved the matter well.

Mao Zedong: We are against an escalation of fire in Laos.

N.S. Khrushchev: We are also against it.

Liu Shaoqi: The Minister of Defense of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam has a plan to expand the struggle in Laos. Ho Chi Minh is against this plan, against an expansion of military activities. We support his stand.

N.S. Khrushchev: We should not expand military actions in Laos, for in this case the Americans will come. Then they will stand on the border with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and will certainly undertake provocations against the DRV. Therefore, they will be located in the immediate vicinity of the DRV, while we are removed quite substantially from the DRV. If the situation gets complicated there, the Americans could very quickly crush the DRV and we would not have time to undertake anything. In our opinion, we should advise the Vietnamese comrades not to expand military actions in Laos.

Mao Zedong: Here we are in a complete agreement with you. We are in general against not only expansion of military actions in Laos, but also for preservation of the status quo in the area of Taiwan. I would like to repeat that in August 1958, when we began shelling the off-shore islands Jimmen [Quemoy] and Matsu, we did not intend at all to undertake any kind of large-scale military actions there.

Present at the conversation were Provisional Chargé d'Affaires of the USSR in the PRC, S.F. Antonov, Attaché

of the Far Eastern Division of the Foreign Ministry of the USSR, R.Sh. Kudashev, and from the Chinese side—interpreters Yan Min Fu and Li Yue Zhen. The conversation was recorder by S.F. Antonov and R.Sh. Kudashev.

Signature: S. Antonov, 3 October 1959

R. Kudashev, 3 October 1959

[Source: Archive of the President of the Russian Federation, f. 52, op. 1, d. 499, ll. 1-33, copy in Volkogonov Collection, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.; translation from Russian for CWHIP by Vladislav M. Zubok, National Security Archive.]

.....

Vladislav M. Zubok is a senior fellow at the National Security Archive.

¹ Mao Zedong *waijiao wenxuan* [Selected diplomatic documents of Mao Zedong] (Beijing: The Central Press of Historical Documents, 1993); Nan Nianlong et al., *Dangdai zhongguo waijiao* [Contemporary Chinese Diplomacy] (Beijing: Chinese Social Science Press, 1989); Shi Zhongquan, *Zhou Enlai de zhuyue fengxian* [Remarkable Achievements and Contributions of Zhou Enlai] (Beijing: CCP Central Academy Press, 1993); Zhang Shu Guang and Chen Jian, "The Emerging Disputes Between Beijing and Moscow: Ten Newly Available Chinese Documents, 1956-1958," *CWHIP Bulletin* 6-7 (Winter 1995/96), pp. 148-163.

² Mark Kramer, "The USSR Foreign Ministry's Appraisal of Sino-Soviet Relations on the Eve of the Split, September 1959, 6-7 (Winter 1995/96), pp. 170-185; Odd Arne Westad, "Mao on Sino-Soviet Relations: Conversations with the Soviet Ambassador," *CWHIP Bulletin* 6-7 (Winter 1995/96), pp. 157, 164-169; "A New Cult of Personality": Suslov's Secret Report on Mao, Khrushchev, and Sino-Soviet Tensions, December 1959 *CWHIP Bulletin* 8-9 (Winter 1996/1997), pp. 244-248; Chen Jian, "A Crucial Step towards the Breakdown of the Sino-Soviet Alliance: The Withdrawal of Soviet Experts from China in July 1960," *CWHIP Bulletin* 8-9 (Winter 1996/1997), pp. 246, 249-250; M.Y. Prozumenschikov, "The Sino-Indian Conflict, the Cuban Missile Crisis and the Sino-Soviet Split, October 1962: New Evidence from the Russian Archives," *CWHIP Bulletin* 8-9 (Winter 1996/1997), pp. 251 - 257, 258-261; Vladislav Zubok, "Look What Chaos in the Beautiful Socialist Camp!": Deng Xiaoping and the Sino-Soviet Split, 1956-1963," *CWHIP Bulletin* 10 (March 1998), pp. 152-162; "Deng Xiaoping's Talks with the Soviet Ambassador and Leadership, 1957-1963," *CWHIP Bulletin* 10 (March 1998), pp. 165-173.

³ Dmitri Volkogonov, *Sem Vozhdei: Galereia liderov SSSR. Kniga 1* [Seven Leaders. The Gallery of the Leaders of the USSR. Volume 1] (Moscow: Novosti, 1995), pp. 412-

415.

⁴ Odd Arne Westad, "History, Memory, and the Languages of Alliance-Making" in: Odd Arne Westad, Chen Jian, Stein Toenneson, Nguyen Vu Tung and James G. Hershberg (eds.), *77 Conversations Between Chinese and Foreign Leaders on the Wars in Indochina, 1964-1977*, Working Paper no. 22 of the Cold War International History Project (Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars May 1998).

⁵ See details in: Zhang Shu Guang and Chen Jian, "The Emerging Disputes," pp. 155-159, 163.

⁶ Jonathan D. Spence asserts that "the Soviets were making China pay dearly for aid in industrial development, and one reason China needed an even greater agricultural surplus was to meet the terms for repayment of Soviet loans," *The Search for Modern China* (New York: Norton, 1990), p. 575 The Note of Yu.V. Andropov to the CC CPSU, 17 May 1958, Russian State Archive of Contemporary History [Rossiiskii Gosudarstrenni Arkhiv Noveishei Istorii] f.5 op. 49, d. 128, l. 60

⁷ "From the Diary of Yudin. Record of conversation with comrade Dzu De on 22 February 1958 and on 24 March 1958", RGANI, f. 5, op. 49, d. 128, ll. 40, 44-45.

⁸ E.A. Negin, Yu.N. Smirnov, "Did the USSR share its atomic secrets with China?" *Science and Society. History of the Soviet Atomic Project (40's - 50's):* Proceedings of the International Symposium at Dubna, 14-18 May 1996, pp. 306-308.

⁹ Interview with Feodor V. Mochulsky, Moscow, 9 July 1992.

¹⁰ Interview with Feodor V. Mochulsky, Moscow, 9 July 1992.

¹¹ William Taubman, "Khrushchev Vs. Mao: A Preliminary Sketch of the Role of Personality in the Sino-Soviet Split," *CWHIP Bulletin* 8-9 (Winter 1996-97), p. 248.

¹² See more in Vladislav Zubok and Constantin Pleshakov, *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), pp. 213-220.

¹³ William Taubman, "Khrushchev Vs. Mao," pp. 246, 247.

¹⁴ Harrison E. Salisbury, *The New Emperors: China in the Era of Mao Zedong and Deng Xiaoping* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1992), p. 156; Vladislav Zubok, "'Look What Chaos in the Beautiful Socialist Camp!'," p. 156.

¹⁵ In some ways this anti-Sovietism was as "natural" (or irrational, depending on the perspective) as the anti-Americanism of the French after the Second World War. As a historian comments on the latter, "the French, intellectuals especially, resented the very fact that they had been liberated by the Americans, resented their humiliated postwar status and more particularly the need to go cap in hand to Washington for assistance with French reconstructions." Tony Judt, *Past Imperfect: French Intellectuals, 1944-1956* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1992), p. 195.

¹⁶ William Taubman, "Khrushchev Vs. Mao," p. 247

¹⁷ N.S. Khrushchev. *Vremia. Lyudi. Vlast*

(*Vospominaniia v 4-kh knigakh*) [Time, People, Power. Memoirs in four volumes] (Moscow: Moscow News, 1999), vol. 3, pp. 75-76.

¹⁸ N.S. Khrushchev. *Vremia. Lyudi. Vlast* (*Vospominaniia v 4-kh knigakh*) [Time, People, Power. Memoirs in four volumes] (Moscow: Moscow News, 1999), vol. 3, p. 74.

¹⁹ Negin, Smirnov, Op. cit., pp. 312-313.

²⁰ Editor's Note: For Khrushchev's letter to Eisenhower, see Department of State, ed. *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1958-1960: China* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1996), pp. 145-153.

²¹ Vladislav M. Zubok, Constantin Pleshakov, *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War. From Stalin to Khrushchev* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1996), p. 225; "Record of Conversation with Chairman of the State Council of the PRC Zhou Enlai on 5 September 1958, RGANI, f. 5, op. 49, d. 133, ll. 1-8; "Record of Conversation of the Chairman of the State Committee for External Economic Ties in Beijing Com. S.Ia. Fomin with Deputy Secretary of the State Council of the PRC Com. Yan Fanji, 10 September 1958, RGANI, f. 5, op. 49, d. 128; "Khrushchev's Nuclear Promise to Beijing During the 1958 Crisis," Introduction by Vladislav M. Zubok: *CWHIP Bulletin* 6-7 (Winter 1995/96), pp. 219, 226-227.

²² Interview with F.V. Mochulski, 9 July 1992.

²³ Interview with F.V. Mochulski, 9 July 1992.

²⁴ "Record of Conversation of Com. Mao on 2 October at the Meeting with the Six Delegations of Socialist Countries", RGANI, f. 5, op. 49, d. 128, l. 234-235, cited in Zubok, Pleshakov, Op. cit., p. 226.

²⁵ Anastas Mikoyan, *Tak bilo; razmishleniia o minuvshem* [As It Was: Reflections on the Past] (Moscow: Vagrius, 1999), p. 598.

²⁶ Oleg Troyanovsky, *Cherez godi I rasstoiania* [Over Years and Distances] (Moscow: Vagrius, 1997), p. 219.

²⁷ Oleg Grinevsky, *Tisacha I odin den Nikiti Sergeevicha Khrushcheva* [One thousand and one day of Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev] (Moscow: Vagrius, 1998), pp. 99-100.

²⁸ M.Y. Prozumenschikov, "The Sino-Indian Conflict, the Cuban Missile Crisis and the Sino-Soviet Split, October 1962: New Evidence from the Russian Archives," *CWHIP Bulletin* 8-9 (Winter 1996/1997), p. 251.

²⁹ The text of the letter is cited by M.Y. Prozumenschikov, "The Sino-Indian Conflict," p. 251, but the words cited in our text came from the report of Mikhail Suslov at the CC CPSU Plenum, 18 December 1959, RGANI, f. 2, op. 1, d. 415, l. 30.

³⁰ Interview with F.V.Mochulsky, 9 July 1992.

³¹ N.S. Khrushchev, *Vospominania: Vremia, Liudi, Vlast*, vol. 3, pp. 84-85.

³² Volkogonov, *Sem vozhdiei*, vol. 1, p. 415.

³³ From the diary of S.F. Antonov, "Record of conversation with Mao Zedong on 14 October 1959," RGANI, f. 5, op. 49, d. 233, ll. 86-95.

³⁴ RGANI, f. 2, op. 1, d. 415, ll. 43-44, translated and

published in "A New Cult of Personality": Suslov's Secret Report on Mao, Khrushchev, and Sino-Soviet Tensions, December 1959, *CWHIP Bulletin* 8-9 (Winter 1996/1997), p. 248

³⁵ Negin, Smirnov, Op. cit., p. 304.

³⁶ Troyanovsky, Op. cit., p. 222.

³⁷ Grinevsky, Op. cit., pp. 125-129, 131, 149-150, 162-163.

³⁸ Unedited Version of the Stenographic Report on the Session of the CC Plenum, 4 May 1960, Afternoon session, RGANI, f. 2, op. 1, d. 451, pp. 20-21.

³⁹ Troyanovsky, Op. cit., p. 225.

⁴⁰ See Ilya V. Gaiduk, *The Soviet Union and the Vietnam War* (Chicago: Ivan Dee, 1996), pp. 4-5.

⁴¹ Records of Vladimir Malin at the CC Presidium, 13-14 October 1964, *Istochnik* 2, (1998), p. 128.

⁴² Report of the CC CPSU Presidium at the October CC CPSU Plenum (draft), by D. Polyansky, *Istochnik* , 2 (1998), p. 114.

⁴³ Georgi Arbatov, *The System: An Insider's Life in Soviet Politics* (New York: Times Books, 1992), p. 115.

⁴⁴ Valentin Falin, *Politische Erinnerungen* (München: Droemer Knauer, 1993), p. 239, and the Russian-language version *Bez skidki na obstoiatelstva: politicheskie vospominaniia* [Making no allowance for circumstances: political reminiscences] (Moscow: Respublika-

Sovremennik, 1999), p. 302.

⁴⁵ Pavel Yudin was Soviet ambassador to the PRC in 1950-1958.

⁴⁶ For Chinese records of these conversations see Chen Jian and Shuguang Zhang, eds., *Chinese Communist Foreign Policy and the Cold War in Asia : New*

Documentary Evidence, 1944-1950 ; with a preface by Warren I. Cohen (Chicago : Imprint Publications, 1996).

⁴⁷ Reference to the Lebanon Crisis of 1958. One day after the violent overthrow of the pro-Western government of Nuri al Said in Iraq on 14 July, US President Eisenhower sent US marines to Beirut in support of the Government of President Camille Chamoun's regime.

⁴⁸ This was stipulated in secret agreements attached to the Sino-Soviet Treaty for Friendship and Cooperation signed in Moscow on 14 February 1950.

⁴⁹ Yudin fell ill on 30 July.

⁵⁰ Editor's Note: Reference to the 1956 Soviet military suppression of the Hungarian Revolution.

⁵¹ Editor's Note: Inter-continental ballistic missile, or ICBM, first tested by the USSR in 1957.

⁵² Editor's Note: Artificial satellites, first launched by the USSR in October 1957.

⁵³ 22 October 1958, REAT MC-16 (Taiwan), FRUS 1958-1960 China, p.421.