

April 23, 1960

**Notes on Conversation held between Sardar Swaran
Singh and Marshal Chen Yi on 23rd April, 1960, at
Agra**

Citation:

"Notes on Conversation held between Sardar Swaran Singh and Marshal Chen Yi on 23rd April, 1960, at Agra", April 23, 1960, Wilson Center Digital Archive, Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, P.N. Haksar Papers (I-II Installment), Subject File #26, 131-150.
<https://wilson-center-digital-archive.dvincitest.com/document/121123>

Summary:

Swaran Singh and Chen Yi discuss the dispute over the boundaries of the Sino-Indian border.

Original Language:

English

Contents:

Original Scan

NMML
P.N. Haksar Papers

CI-II Installment)

Subject File #26

TOP SECRET

Notes on conversation held between
Sardar Swaran Singh and Marshal Chen Yi on
23rd April, 1960, at Agra.

Sardar Swaran Singh: During the course of our talks in Delhi, we discussed the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border. I do not want to go into the details but would like to say one or two things before other subjects are taken up.

I have already indicated the Indian reaction to words like 'Imperialism' and 'Imperialist'. One thing is noticeable about the Simla Conference that the Central Government of China was not happy about the line suggested by MacMahon between inner and outer Tibet as it considered some part was wrongly shown as not being in China and, it, therefore, did not accept the arrangements agreed upon by the three plenipotentiaries of China, India and Tibet. It was never suggested by the Chinese Government that the line drawn in the map showing the border between Tibet and India was in any way prejudicial and the dispute was only about the line between Tibet and other provinces of China. The other thing which I would like to mention briefly is that this line (the MacMahon Line) did not transfer any territory one way or the other but only took notice of the existing realities, alignments of watersheds etc. on the basis of which international boundaries are fixed. I may also point out that when such principles were applied to the Sino-Burmese border, they yielded the same ^{results} ~~relations~~ as the MacMahon Line. At the Simla Conference, the border between India and Tibet was based on the same principles

on which international boundaries are drawn.

Your Excellency was pleased to say that there were other principles which should be a guide for working a boundary line. Your Excellency must have gone through this aspect. What is the boundary line which works out on the basis of these principles? What are the differences which may arise from the boundary line made on the principles suggested by Your Excellency and the so-called MacMahon Line? If there is ~~any~~ not much difference between the two lines, what is the difficulty in accepting the line which was initialled by the Chinese plenipotentiary and which did not transfer any territory but accepted the existing realities and is in accordance with the international principles of watersheds, geographical features, etc., on which boundaries are based. Between our two countries which have so close and friendly relations, there can hardly be any area of dispute if we view this problem in this background.

Mr. Chang Han-Fu: I would like to say something before the Vice-Premier deals with your question. What Your Excellency actually means is to ask us to recognise the illegal so-called MacMahon Line. Your Excellency mentioned the drawing of the MacMahon Line in the Simla Conference. Firstly, this fact has to be made clear that there is no record of the Simla Conference which shows that the Sino-Indian border was discussed. What was actually discussed was the question of boundary between Inner and Outer Tibet. Your Excellency has mentioned a map initialled by the Chinese Plenipotentiary. On this map there is a red line which is the so-called MacMahon Line and another ^a blue line. Below the map it is explained in a note that the blue line

152

-3-

represents the demarcation between Inner and Outer Tibet and the red line shows the demarcation between Tibet and the rest of China. The note in the map does not say that any line represents demarcation between India and China. Indeed, this map was initialled by the Chinese plenipotentiary and the Indian and Tibetan representatives. In India it is said that only initialling was done by the British representative while the initialling made by the Chinese and Tibetan representatives was a formal signature by them. The British representative, MacMahon, the Chinese representative, Ivon Chen, and the Tibetan representative initialled the map with date and year under a remark:

"We hereby initial in the token of
acceptance etc. etc."

This clearly shows that all the three representatives only initialled the map and did not sign it. Besides, this map, there is another map having similar boundary line, in red and blue. The explanatory note below this map also is the same as the one which was initialled. It did not mention that the red line -- the so-called MacMahon Line -- was to be the Sino-Indian border. This latter map was attached to the Simla Convention and has the signature and the seal of MacMahon and the Tibetan representative. This clearly shows on the one hand that the map attached to the Convention was formally signed and sealed only by the British and the Tibetan representatives while the Chinese representative neither signed it, nor put his seal on it. The reason for this was that after the Chinese representative initialled the map, he received instructions from the Central Government not to

sign the same. Not only the map but also the Simla Conference agreement was not signed or ratified by the Chinese Government. Instead of ratifying the Conference agreement, the Minister of China in Great Britain, Mr. Liu, gave indications ^{of} the same to the British Government. The British representative and the representative of the Tibetan local authority did not draw this MacMahon line at Simla but in Delhi where secret notes were exchanged. This situation shows that the MacMahon Line is illegal and the Simla Convention was not ratified by the Central Government of China. For these reasons, all the Chinese Central Governments have refused to agree to the MacMahon Line. All these points mentioned by me had been made clear in the various letters and notes sent by us. After our ~~is~~ viewpoint has been made so clear, you still ask the Chinese Government to recognise the illegal so-called MacMahon Line.

More than ten years have passed when India became independent and China was liberated and this position does not correspond to the existing situation and to the development of friendly relations between our two countries. It is true that we want seriously a settlement of Sino-Indian border in the eastern sector in a friendly manner. Under such circumstances, if you still want us to recognise the MacMahon Line, it cannot help in the settlement of the question. The very fact that Premier Chou En-lai and the Vice-Premier, Chen Yi have come here shows that we want to settle the matter in a friendly manner based on the Five Principles of co-existence, mutual accommodation and friendliness. It can be clearly seen from the

-5-

talks between Premier Chou and Premier Nehru and the Vice-Premier Chen Yi and Sardar Swaran Singh that we sincerely want a settlement. As we have moved forward, we hope that India would also come forward. To still hold on to the illegal MacMahon Line and want us to recognise it, creates difficulties. We are anxious to reach a settlement based on historical conditions and existing realities by mutual consultations and on a reasonable basis. Vice-Premier Chen Yi, in our talks yesterday, had very clearly said about our attitude to this question of the Sino-Indian border. We hope that in our talks today the two sides would get closer to one another.

Marshal Chen Yi: Since we came to Delhi, we have discussed the boundary question many times and today is the fifth day. Both of us have already talked three times and we have also taken part in talks with Mr. Menon, Mr. Desai, Mr. Pant and Mr. R.K. Nehru. The question is: whether the two parties have found a common point, and we need to make efforts to find a common point. It would be bad if we cannot find a common point of agreement. Even if we cannot find a common point on the boundary question, it is essential that we should see that, at any rate, our friendly relations do not deteriorate and we can continue our talks after the two parties have made further consideration. After a lapse of time, we may find some settlement. As today is the fifth day, I would very much like that some way China and India should arrive at an agreement. We may compare the views of the two parties. It is impossible for ^{the} Chinese side to recognise the Simla Convention or the so-called illegal MacMahon Line. No

Central Government of China has ratified the Convention and it has no binding effect on the Chinese Government. This point is absolutely clear. The Indian side considers that the so-called MacMahon Line is effective and, therefore, the Indian Government by all means wants China to recognise it. It is said that if China does not recognise the MacMahon Line, it would mean that China is raising territorial claims against India. About this matter, there have been many reports in Indian papers which have shocked us and hurt our feelings. This is the main difficulty in reaching a settlement. On the other hand, the Chinese side has repeatedly said that they cannot accept the Simla Convention and the MacMahon Line and would not take it as the basis of a settlement of the border. But we Chinese also say that the two great nations of China and India must be friendly and in accordance with the spirit of friendship and accommodation, find a certain boundary. Liberated China and independent India must shake off the influences left over by imperialists and adopt a friendly attitude to settle the question. The question can be easily settled if we take into consideration historical conditions and actual state of control. Between China and Burma, there was a quick friendly agreement because both of us decided to do away with the bad influences left by history and moved freely from the MacMahon Line.

After five days of our talks, my personal view is that the Indian friends and the Government still do not have a very profound understanding

176

of the point that the Chinese Government absolutely does not recognise the Simla Convention and the MacMahon Line. This has made us very unhappy. On the other hand it appears that the Indian friends have not understood the positive and friendly attitude of the Chinese Government in settling the boundary question by shaking off the influences left over by the imperialists and create a new friendly border. We greatly regret this situation. Ambassador Nehru talked about the ^{security} security of the two countries: Indian security, dignity and self-respect. But we can say that to recognise the Simla Convention and the MacMahon Line hurts Chinese self-respect. We are two great nations having independent political rights and independent will of our two peoples. Why should we still be manipulated by the outdated so-called MacMahon Line? To force us to recognise it would not be honourable for us and it would also not be honourable for India. Why not the two great men of peace -- Premier Chou and Premier Nehru -- settle this question independently without following the illegal Simla Convention and the so-called MacMahon Line? If we look at the question from this aspect, a settlement can be made and I hope that you will tell other Indian friends about it, to preserve self-respect of both the parties. The question must be settled peacefully and on mutual friendly understanding and accommodation. MacMahon was only a coloniser and the Foreign Secretary of the British in India.

Yesterday when Premier Chou called on Mr. Desai, the latter had said that he could not accept that this question was left over by history --

137

it was not left by history but was created by the Chinese during the past three years. This stubborn attitude I do not understand, for it is a question left by history, and should be settled by the two countries on the basis of historical conditions and actual control. Mr. Desai appeared to refuse to talk. We felt great regret over this attitude. Yesterday Premier Chou was talking and I did not say anything about it. This attitude of Mr. Desai gave us an impression that there was an attempt to force us to accept something stipulated by MacMahon. We want a settlement based on consultations by which both sides will not lose anything and find a friendly border which would be eternal. We do not understand the attitude of Mr. Desai.

You have mentioned the Sino-Burmese border and it is possible that by actual survey the boundary between China and Burma would not be much different from the so-called MacMahon Line. You appreciated the Sino-Burmese agreement. I want to remind that the settlement was reached because we shook off the MacMahon Line and reached an agreement based on friendship. We hope the Indian friends will concede this point. We are proceeding in a spirit of friendship and do not want to hide anything. If the Chinese Government recognise the Simla Convention and the MacMahon Line, there would be an explosion in China and the Chinese people would not agree. Premier Chou has no right to do so. Premier Chou has only authority to settle a common line based on friendship and mutual consultations and not to recognise the Simla Convention and the MacMahon Line.

I would like to say something again about

the Sino-Burmese agreement. I am happy that you listened patiently to our explanation about the same. Of course, the Sino-Burmese question is not the same as the Sino-Indian boundary question. But the common point is that the two parties -- China-India and China-Burma -- can settle quickly questions left by history in a friendly attitude. Strictly speaking, the China-Burma boundary question is more complicated than China-India boundary. The Sino-Burmese boundary question involves not only the MacMahon Line of several hundred ^{miles} ~~kilos~~, but also the question of the 1941 line signed by the British and the KMT Government. There is then the Nam Wang Triangular area leased by the British from China. Again the area of Tienmo (?), Kholung (?) and Khamfang(?) was forcibly occupied by the British. There is also a silver mine below the 1941 line which by treaty China had ^{rights} ~~writes~~ to exploit. Some parts of the boundary were demarcated while others were in dispute and, therefore, the question was very complicated. There was also the question of the border people and the tribes which were the same on both sides. Moreover, in the southern section there were ~~fertile~~ ^{fertile} lands where coffee and rubber ~~grow~~ ^{grew} which were in dispute. The Sino-Burmese line was more complicated than the Sino-Indian boundary line. The interests of the two peoples are more involved and only a part of the boundary consists of high mountains and unpopulated land. The Sino-Burmese boundary line is longer than the Sino-Indian line. We have a common boundary line of about 2,000 ^{miles} ~~kilos~~ with India and in this sector we have a common border also with Nepal, Sikkim, Bhutan and Pakistan -- I ^{do} ~~did~~ not have any

179

implications in saying so. The most important fact is that we can settle the problem by mutual understanding and accommodation. A quick settlement could be made with Burma because Burma agreed not to base its claim on the MacMahon Line but to draw a boundary in accordance with Historical conditions, natural terrain and actual control. Burma knew that China could not accept the MacMahon Line and understood that the position of China was reasonable and the line was illegal. The Chinese Government also made the Burmese Government understand that the solution would be based on actual control and survey etc. The Burmese Government knew that the Chinese Government did not want anything south of the line. South of the traditional line there are some small Tibetan temples and mountains growing Chinese herbs. After delimitation, the Chinese will give up their rights to those places. I hope the Indian friends would consider this example and also the attitude of the Chinese Government to the Sino-Burmese boundary line drawn in 1941. If the Chinese Government did not follow a policy of settling questions with brotherly South-East Asian nations in a friendly manner, it was possible for us not to recognise the 1941 line. This boundary line was drawn by British colonialism at a time when China was in dire straits fighting for its existence against Japan. Our attitude was not to draw this line again and we said that as the treaty was formally signed by the Chiang Kai-shek Government, we would accept it. Though the Chinese Government was unhappy about the 1941 line in the interests of the Sino-Burmese friendship and for implementing international obligations we accepted it. This friendly attitude of our Government was responded by the Burmese

140

-11-

in two ways: (i) the Burmese were satisfied that China had accepted the 1941 line, and Premier U. Nu in his talks with Premier Chou said that this line was immoral as the British had taken advantage of difficulties of China during the war against Japan and (ii) the Burmese Government further recognised that though the boundary on this line was delimited, local adjustments could be made. Both the parties recognised the 1941 line but agreed to local adjustments. We also immediately responded to this attitude of the Burmese Government and gave up our rights to Namk Wang triangular area and the Burmese in return willingly gave up in exchange the area of Thang Hung and Thang Ho tribes. After the Sino-Burmese agreement and the friendship treaty were completed, Gen. Ne Win, the then Burmese Premier, told Premier Chou about the Chinese rights to a silver mine south of the 1941 line. Premier Chou immediately replied to him that "We give up that". He did not even ask ^{for} my opinion though I was present.

S.S: Both of you knew each other's mind.

CY: By coming to Delhi with a large delegation we have not thought of asking India to give up any territory for our selfish interest. Otherwise, we would not have come. We have come here for the sake of friendship, and I see that it is not possible to settle this question if we depend on archives and quote a letter here and there.

AS for the Sino-Nepalase agreement, some small areas -- 9 or 10 -- may be in dispute. Some of these areas which are under Chinese administration are claimed by Nepal and others under Nepalese administration, claimed by China. We agreed

to settle the matter in a spirit of mutual accommodation and friendship based on actual control, historical conditions and joint surveys.

We have been here for five days and have been given a grand reception and warm welcome by all the leaders. We thank you for this. The Indian Government have taken good measures for the security of Premier Chou in a responsible manner and this is an indication of your friendly attitude. If we do not see this friendly attitude of yours, it would not be right for us. We shall show the same friendly attitude and warm welcome when our Indian friends or Your Excellency come to China.

SS: The Indian leaders who have already visited China were given a warm welcome and if they go there again, they would receive the same welcome. It is a pleasure for us to welcome guests from any part of the world, especially from friendly China.

CY: The most important question is that our Indian friends have failed to understand that we cannot accept the Simla Convention and the MacMahon Line but want a friendly settlement on historical facts and actual control. The insistence on our recognising the Simla Convention and the MacMahon Line makes the position very difficult. When we say to delimitate the boundary by joint surveys, actual control and historical conditions, it includes local adjustments. It does not mean that India would lose large parts of territory. Nor does India want China to lose large parts of its territory.

Supposing the so-called MacMahon Line is recognised, that would mean that we would recognise that the MacMahon had a right not only to delimitate the boundary between China and India but also the boundary between Inner and Outer Tibet. We have no such reactionary ^{words} ~~settlement~~ as Inner and Outer Tibet. We have only provincial boundaries

142

between Szechwan, Tibet, Yunan, Chinghai and Singkiang. The Tibetan reactionary elements have an idea of "Greater Tibet" and I hope that our Indian friends would not be misled by the same. According to these Tibetan reactionaries, Greater Tibet would include parts of Sikang, Chinghai, Kangsu, Szechwan, Shensi and Yunan provinces -- in fact about one-fourth of the total Chinese area would be handed over to the Dalai Lama. Our non-recognition of Simla Convention and the MacMahon Line should not be misunderstood as our having any intention of making territorial claims over India. Both of us should shake off the colonial influence left after independence. After this bitter experience of a dispute for a year, we must bring about a friendly settlement by mutual consultation and accommodation. Why do Indian friends not consider it? How can our delegation come to India to ask India to lose something?

CHF: If we did so, the Indian people can blame us and the Chinese people would also blame us.

CY: To insist on recognising something to which we cannot agree is not a friendly attitude. We are two friendly countries like relations. We have a long history of friendship and cannot be separated and will always remain close to each other. We should shake off the imperialist legacy and by mutual understanding and accommodation find a new line. We have bright prospects. I hope we will not be blamed ~~if we find~~ for we have been frank in our talks.

SS: Frank talks are very good. Otherwise, how could we come closer to each other. Similarly, some of our leaders have also been frank in their talks and they should not be misunderstood.

CY: So, we should settle the eastern sector on mutual understanding, accommodation and joint surveys and shake

123

off the legacy of history. The Western sector of the boundary could also be settled in the same spirit. Prime Minister Nehru said that the Western Section of the boundary was vague and undilimited. An agreement in this sector is easier. Our Prime Ministers are discussing the same and may be that they have already arrived at an agreement and this talk may be unnecessary.

SS: It is necessary to give vent to pent-up feelings as we are friendly to each other.

CY: The situation now is such that we do not recognise the MacMahon Line and, therefore, an agreement cannot be reached. Only two days are left and we hope that we may reach some agreement to see that the border clashes do not occur again and both the parties maintain the status quo and talks are continued later. By coming with Premier Chou in Delhi we have at least relaxed the atmosphere and this is a great achievement. We hope that all of us have the same feeling.

SS: Meetings and consultations at various levels have great value.

CY: Yes.

SS: It is refreshing to have a frank discussion and to hear what you actually feel. Some of the members of our Government, ^{who} are not normally associated with diplomatic talks, discussions and meetings, have been taking part in these discussions during these five days. We wanted you to contact the various members of the Government. If things are talked over frankly, any scope for misunderstanding is avoided. You have rightly pointed out that on many occasions issues are highly political and go beyond pure routine documents, etc. Documents, agreements, papers, records, etc., have their own value but the political issues must be settled first, before detailed data could be examined. I must say that

127

-15-

I did not feel greatly surprised after listening to what Your Excellency has said during our talks. We must express freely and frankly our feelings. You should in the same way not feel surprised at the views expressed by us during the last few days. Specific issues, lengthy notes etc. cannot solve the question and, therefore, there is the need for personal talks and discussions. I would like to mention that the very fact that we talk frankly indicates our mutual desire to understand the viewpoint of each other and to ~~give~~ come to an understanding. History bears testimony to the fact that those who do not want to settle the question do not talk in a friendly and frank manner as the Chinese and Indian friends ^{have} ~~have~~ been doing.

CY: Yes.

SS: If there are difficulties, they are inherent in the situation and have not arisen from our present arguments, talks and discussions. The important thing is, as you have been good enough to say, that China is keen to have friendship with India. India is also keen to have friendship with China and has always been working for the same. We must settle the matter in this spirit. Unfortunately, the discussions of the boundary dispute and differences are under the shadow of incidents in the form of border clashes. After all, we must remember the basic fact of a long boundary between two friendly countries. It would be a sad state of affairs if we were nervous about each other all the time. To mark that boundary at each yard and to place a police constable or a soldier as a proof of actual Indian border would be impossible. Our two countries have more important things to do than to take this step to prove the boundaries. To place a soldier or a police man to show the extent of the boundary is not a satisfactory state of affairs. The basic thing is mutual respect for territory, e.g. if any ^{part} ~~proof~~ of

1449

Chinese territory is vacant, the Indian soldiers should not walk forward and occupy the same or if any Indian territory is vacant, the Chinese soldiers should not come forward and take the same. This kind of situation would be very wrong. I would be frank and say that a sort of such feeling has grown, particularly in the Ladakh area. There is a caravan route between Tibet and Singkiang through this area used by people without any elaborate system of control and checks. If that is shown as some sort of proof ^{for} as the claim of a part of our territory, it is not in the spirit of respect of each other's territory.

In speaking about actual jurisdiction and control, the important question is at what date -- six months, one year, five years or what? The situation has been changing fast. Because of a feeling of mutual friendship, it was not necessary to place any actual symbols of authority on the Sino-Indian border. It does not mean that the actual jurisdiction is ⁱⁿ anyway attenuated or sought to be not exercised. We have a genuine feeling and place implicit trust in Chinese friends that they will respect our territory, especially when we had raised the question and were not happy about the Chinese maps. It was a great shock to us that instead of discussing the maps, steps were taken to change the actual position.

CY: About the date or year of control, we take the historical conditions and actual present control as the basis. It will mean some adjustments. If ^a the date is to be ~~is~~ given, China would give a date which would be favourable to her and India would give a date which would be favourable to her and the present ~~situation~~ situation would not change. If after a joint survey, there is no agreement, further talks will have to be held.

CHF: What you say about the Western sector should also apply to the eastern sector.

MS

-17-

SS: After your visit and frank talks you must have been satisfied that we are keen to solve the problem and have friendly relations with China and unless you have this understanding, it would be difficult to solve the question.

CY: Yes, yes.

The following conversation took place during flight from Agra to Delhi between Sardar Swaran Singh and Marshal Chen Yi.

CY: China has made great industrial progress in steel, iron, etc. and we have also increased our food production. But we have made an agreement with Burma to import rice. As Indians are our ^{good} friends, I do not want to hide anything from you. We have not been able to solve the food problem in China. Every one cannot get rice and wheat to eat, and so many people have to eat sweet potatoes or other things. We have to export some of our grains in order to get machinery in exchange; by introducing commune system we have been able to organise our labour for the development of ~~our~~ agriculture and industry. The Japan-U.S. Treaty is directed against us and the USA has built bases around us. We are alive to the fact that the U.S.A. may attack and take possession of cities like Canton, Shanghai, Peking, Tiensin etc. but we shall fight hard and ultimately defeat them. We cannot hide these facts from our people and have told them about these. There are KMT troops in ~~our~~ Northern Burma and American planes take over from that area and drop radio sets, etc.

120

-18-

to incite the rebel elements in Tibet and other areas. The United States and Kisi^h and Chiang are united together against us. We believe in having negotiations with U.S. for having peaceful relations but U.S. may suddenly attack us and we have to be prepared for this. It is clear to us that our most important enemy is the United States which may attack us any time. In this situation, it is most important for us to improve our relations ^{with} the South-East Asian nations, e.g. Nepal, Burma, India, etc. It is most important for us to have most friendly relations with India. We are anxious that even if there is no solution the situation should not go worse and the status quo be maintained. We may stop patrolling the border and have only police and civil administration and separate the Armed Forces by a belt. We do not want to offend India. Our relations with the United States and Japan in the east are tense. It would be stupid if we created a tense situation with India in the west also. The U.S.A. has its bases, atomic missiles and atomic weapons around us. Our dispute with India is very small. We know that India cannot occupy ^{Chenghai} Shanghai, Sikang etc. and that if we cross the Himalayas, the United States would attack us from the east and we cannot defend ourselves. We do not want to worsen the situation and must come to a settlement by mutual understanding and accommodation. It is not that we want India to fight along with us against the United States. The Indian policy of non-alignment is good for the world. You cannot follow the same policy as ours and we cannot follow the same policy as yours. Japan committed aggression against China after 40 years and still does not recognise China and is helping Chiang to invade China and deprive us of our

147

-19-

place in the U.N. We want to relax our tension in relations with the United States and Japan but have to resist their aggression. If there is no war for 20 years, that would be good for us but if they attack us we cannot kneel down to them. Some people in India say that they should have understanding with the West. The policy of Prime Minister Nehru of non-alignment is correct. Your attitude towards China is very different from that of the United States and Japan. We are in a serious situation and need your friendship. We cannot fraternize with the other side in the east and oppose India for in that case China would no longer be a socialist country. We want to be friendly with India and were shocked when there was trouble on the border. The situation in the east being so tense, we cannot afford to have trouble in the west also.

SS: Your Excellency should rest assured that as far as India is concerned, we have most friendly feelings and deep regards for China. It is because of this friendly feeling and deep regards that we felt so much hurt over the unfortunate incidents on the boundary. Leaving aside the long history of no conflict, during recent years we have always sympathised and maintained friendly relations with China. We do not boast about our friendship with you as it was in accordance with our overall policy of non-alignment and friendship with all. We have always adopted a correct attitude in our policy towards Formosa, Ind-China, Laos, Viet Nam, SEATO, etc. The very idea that China may have any feeling of danger from India is irritating. I have heard with interest the admirable analysis of the situation in South-East Asia with reference to China as given by Your Excellency. No argument is required to show as to in which direction India's sympathy lie. My appeal to you is not to ~~win~~ ^{view} Indian friendship only in the light of your difficulties

-20-

in the east. We want your friendship as you are a great country and we want friendly relations irrespective of the fact whether you have difficulties elsewhere or not. India has been following a policy of non-alignment and friendship with all and even to imagine that we shall create an inconvenient situation for you in the west because of your difficulties in the east, would be unjust. We had very close friendship with you and so felt shocked and the foundations of friendship were shaken because of recent incidents. This basis of friendship is of greater importance than specific differences. The real basic task before you is to restore the damage done on that front. I have been very frank in telling you what I feel about it.

CY: We have been having friendly and frank talks. I do not say that China wants the friendship of India because China has difficulties in the east. I also do not mean that difficulties had been created by India because we have had troubles in the east.

SS: We have no such idea.

CY: We are two great nations and we have a strong friendship with each other. Even if both of us are in difficulties, we should be friends. I am speaking from my heart. Our situation is serious and we have great difficulties and are prepared for coastal areas to be occupied by the United States. We do not want to hide our difficulties from you as we are friends.

SS: As the leader of the people, a Minister in the Government and a leader of the Army, you can assure your people that India would never embarrass China in her difficulties. Whatever our differences, we would all along try to solve them by peaceful discussions. I say this with the same responsibility as you have spoken.

149

CY: If two ordinary countries are negotiating, they do not expose their difficulties to each other. As we are brothers, I am telling you about our difficulties.

SS: We were shocked by the pressure brought against us by the troop movements, clashes, etc. If there were differences, they could be discussed. I am speaking frankly about these things.

CY: It would be best if we could reach some overall settlement but if that is not possible some interim arrangement should be made.

SS: We also want a settlement to be reached.

1570