

**April 18, 1964**  
**Transcript of Conversation between Zhou Enlai and  
Kenzo Matsumura**

**Citation:**

"Transcript of Conversation between Zhou Enlai and Kenzo Matsumura", April 18, 1964, Wilson Center Digital Archive, Zhou Enlai Waijiao wenxuan [Selected Diplomatic Papers of Zhou Enlai] (Beijing: Zhongyang wenxian, 1990), pp. 403-411. Translated by Simon Schuchat. <https://wilson-center.drivingcreative.com/document/260520>

**Summary:**

Zhou Enlai speaks with the spokesman for Japan's conservative party, Kenzo Matsumura. The two sides reached an agreement on the mutual establishment of non-governmental resident offices and the exchange of resident journalists. Zhou also discusses China's stance on the Taiwan issue. Both sides agree to work together toward normalization of Sino-Japanese relations.

**Credits:**

This document was made possible with support from Chun & Jane Chiu Family Foundation

**Original Language:**

Chinese

**Contents:**

Original Scan  
Translation - English

## 友好当先 抵抗在后\*

(一九六四年四月十八日)

**周恩来总理**(以下简称周): 听说双方对具体问题已经谈得差不多了。我想主要从大的方面跟各位谈一谈向前看的问题。

**松村谦三**(以下简称松村): 我们从到达北京的时候起,直到今天,同中国朋友进行了坦率而友好的谈判。一些具体问题大部分已经谈妥,这是一件值得高兴的事情。这些天来,我是游玩闲逛了。但是,代表团的各位朋友和孙平化<sup>[303]</sup>先生、王晓云<sup>[304]</sup>先生进行了象外交一样的谈判,经过激烈的辩论之后,达成了协议。所以,我想这些协议应该是稳妥可靠的了。

**周:** 问题总是多辩论几次好,不但外交上的事情如此,其他事情也是如此。辩论在政治上是不可避免的。

**松村:** 冈崎嘉平太<sup>[305]</sup>先生继高碕达之助<sup>[268]</sup>先生

---

\* 这是同日本自由民主党顾问,国会议员松村谦三等日本客人的谈话节录。这次松村一行来访,双方达成互设民间常驻机构和互派常驻记者的协议。

之后负责高碕办事处的工作，希望今后得到您的关照。

**周：**我们希望冈崎先生继续同我们合作。我记得前年冈崎先生曾同高碕先生一同来过，去年又来过，冈崎先生已经有两次同我们合作的经验了。事务问题总是要复杂一些，麻烦一些。原则商定了，到具体化就复杂了。廖承志<sup>[306]</sup>同高碕达之助商定的原则要付诸实践，问题就会多起来。

我想就松村先生和永井道雄教授对谈中的一些问题谈一谈我的看法，也就是如何向前看的问题。我看了《世界杂志》四月号刊载的这篇对谈的中译文，引起了我想谈的问题。的确，这些问题存在于中日两国关系之中。

我想，不论是促进两国关系也好，维护远东和平、促进亚非团结和世界和平也好，首先要从两国本身的利益来看，然后再从世界角度来看。

中国解放后十五年来，采取了独立自主的立场，所执行的国内外政策既符合中国人民的利益，也符合世界人民的利益。在座的朋友中，有的多次来过中国。你们能不能找出具体例子说明中国的内外政策是听人指挥、受人控制、依赖别国的，是卫星国而不是独立国的政策呢？如果有，我愿领教领教。

**冈崎嘉平太：**没有。

**松村：**我根本没那样想过。中国解放后执行了完全独立的政策，这一点我很了解，甚至可以说中国坚持独立

过分了。

**周：**如果不是坚决贯彻独立自主的立场，就会成为卫星国，仰帝国主义的鼻息，就会成为从属国家。因此，在坚持独立自主上不能放松。松村先生所说的“独立过分”是不是说要把自己孤立起来，不跟人合作的意思？

**松村：**是这个意思。我是想，日本采取了错误的政策，发动了战争，结果战败了，日本垮了台，亚洲各国获得独立。我希望这些受压迫的国家获得独立，成为非常繁荣的国家。我认为独立、繁荣和世界和平联系起来才有意义。

**周：**对松村先生谈的意见，我稍有不同的看法。松村先生说日本垮了台，我认为日本并没有垮台，是日本军国主义垮了台，而日本人民根据自己的意志，独立发展起来了。

**松村：**我也是这样想。灭亡的是日本军国主义。军国主义使日本国民蒙受了巨大的灾难和牺牲，一时连吃的东西也没有。军国主义垮台后经过二十年的努力，我们才搞到今天这样的地步。

**周：**战争的祸害是军国主义造成的。日本人民和中国人民都遭受了痛苦。但是军国主义的罪恶也教育了人民，使他们起来反对军国主义、反对侵略战争，反对把它强加在人民头上。

刚才松村先生说的中国会不会独立过分的问题，我

的看法是，独立并不排斥合作。在现代，每个国家都不能闭关自守、孤立起来。真正的独立并不排斥国际合作，即同真正的友好国家合作。前年，松村、石桥<sup>(260)</sup>先生来访时我也谈到了我们的独立自主的政策。我们的政策是这样的：凡是对我们友好的国家，我们就以更友好的态度对待他们；如果敌视我们，我们就以同样的态度进行抵抗。也就是说，我们在推进友好方面是积极主动地以友好的态度求得同人家的友好相处的；如果谁敌视我们，我们将进行抵抗，但是敌视不为人先，这是我们的原则。这些原则用两句话来说，就是友好当先，抵抗在后。对各国人民来说，我们这些政策是丝毫不成为问题的。因为绝大多数人要和我们友好，只有极少数人敌视我们。当然，反动派要在人民当中制造敌视气氛，有少数人会受到影响。不管是什么肤色、什么种族、什么信仰的人，总是应该友好相处。即使对过去同我们敌对过、作过战的日本，在战后，我们也主动伸出友好的手，日本人民接受了，友好关系就发展了起来。这是好事，证明我们可以友好相处。我们对美国人民也是这样，我们一向表示愿意同美国人民友好。我想，绝大多数美国人也愿意同中国友好，不过由于形势如此，现在美国人民不容易表达他们的愿望。

目前，摆脱帝国主义统治、独立起来的国家一天天多起来。亚非国家在全世界国家中要占一半，现在非洲还

有些国家尚未独立，如果独立了，亚非国家将超过一半。九年以前参加第一次亚非会议〔103〕的国家只有二十多国，今年光是参加在雅加达召开的第二次亚非会议筹备会议〔307〕的国家就有二十二国，估计明年第二次亚非会议正式举行，参加的国家就不会是二十几国，而是更多。这些国家基本上是要求友好合作的。当然，这并不是说这些国家的社会制度相同，彼此没有争端。争端是会有有的，但总的说来可以求同存异。为了民族独立、建设自己的国家、反对侵略战争、维护世界和平，这些国家总要进行友好合作。不仅亚非国家如此，就是拉丁美洲、北美洲、欧洲、澳洲国家也是如此。这些国家中，有的是社会主义国家，有的是追随美帝国主义的，有的是资本主义发达国家。社会主义国家当然愿意世界和平，就是后两种国家也总是要维护世界和平的。只有少数帝国主义国家要用战争来威胁人民，敌视世界人民，企图维持原来的统治，或者重新控制世界。不过，现时的特点是这些占少数的国家掌握着强大的武力，用核武器来吓唬人，要控制全世界。从表面看，好象它们很强大，我们应该透过现象看本质。绝大多数国家是要和平友好、反对压迫和侵略战争的。

中国反对少数人用战争、核武器来讹诈世界人民、欺负人，表示了独立和反抗的精神。中国为了世界绝大多数人的利益反对帝国主义的侵略和战争政策。在这个问

题上,松村先生不要担心中国独立气概太盛,同美国闹翻了,会在亚洲引起世界大战。中国就是有这种反对帝国主义侵略战争的气概。我们受了一百多年的压迫,深深懂得不仅要使自己摆脱帝国主义的压迫,而且也要使世界人民,包括日本人民摆脱帝国主义的压迫。我们要为此而奋斗。这就要坚决抵抗最顽固的帝国主义,即表面上强大实际上是极虚弱的战争势力,说穿了就是美国。对它我们就是要顶下去。不要看美国手里有核武器,似乎很了不起。世界人民要和平,反对侵略战争,大多数的国家要和平友好,反对核战争,美国人民也不愿意打仗。如果美国敢于发动战争,那么失败的将是美国。

如果亚非国家团结起来,美国怎么敢在亚非地区发动世界大战?松村先生刚才也说过日本人民蒙受了第二次世界大战的巨大祸害,我不相信受过祸害的日本人民会替美国去打第三次世界大战。也许少数人愿意打,但是绝大多数人是不会为美国去火中取栗的。美国人民愿意不愿意打?这一点美国政府很清楚,美国人民是不愿意打仗的。

蒋介石要拖美国下水,妄图进攻大陆。实际上美国不赞成进攻大陆。美国警告蒋介石不要闯祸,如果蒋介石闯祸,美国不愿意参战。最近,腊斯克<sup>(256)</sup>跑到台湾去了,也没有谈出什么结果。蒋介石要美国提供船只和军火,美国知道这是要把美国拖下水,美国不干。美国有另

外的打算，它要蒋介石把精锐部队派到南越去干涉越南内政，参加镇压南越人民的战争。美国不愿派自己的人到南越去送死，因为每死一个人，家属就要闹，说不值得去送死。蒋介石知道美国的打算，他也不干。因为蒋介石的精锐部队在南越损失了，美国就可以在台湾换人。蒋介石懂得，一旦他的主力部队没有了，他就会变成李承晚<sup>[8]</sup>和吴庭艳<sup>[308]</sup>式的人物。象这样，美国连南越都搞不到手，它还想在亚洲发动世界大战？

最近，东南亚条约组织<sup>[71]</sup>国家在马尼拉开了会，这个会开得毫无结果，可是还要发表联合公报。这是什么样的联合公报？这是最不联合的联合公报。公报本身就写明美国和法国有不同的意见。会上意见纷纭，可是腊斯克还自我解嘲地说意见不一致也可以行动。在这一点上，应该称赞日本记者的眼光，他们说东南亚条约组织的作用在一天天减弱。在马尼拉会上，菲律宾的代表嚷得很凶，不赞成法国承认新中国。可是菲律宾派到雅加达参加第二次亚非会议筹备会议的代表却是另外一种态度。他们的团长与陈毅外长拥抱，庆贺亚非会议筹备会议的成功。这说明什么？说明美国所依靠的东南亚条约组织也靠不住。在这种情况下，美国怎敢在亚洲发动世界大战？中国懂得，也看清楚了这种情况。美国并不可怕，这话并不是我们在事后才说的，二十年前毛主席就说美帝国主义是纸老虎，并不那么可怕。



朋友们也许会担心，中国会不会因为独立精神太盛，在亚洲闯起乱子？我看日本朋友是最了解中国的。十多年来，日本朋友们来得最多。几十年来，大约有三四千日本妇女，入了中国籍，她们已成为我们的和平家庭的成员。她们很了解中国需要一个和平环境来建设自己的国家，愿意和世界上一切爱好和平的国家和平相处。中日关系的现实就证明了这一点。日本政府承认蒋介石代表中国，不承认我们代表中国。如果从形式看问题，你们的政府是敌视我们的，但是，我们还是邀请了你们。我们相处已有六七年了。我们把你们当做朋友看待，没有当敌人看待。我们要透过表面看实质。日本人民愿意同中国友好相处。日本执政的党和政府中的多数人也愿意恢复两国邦交，不过因为形势的关系还不能实现，目前还保留着承认台湾为代表中国的政府的状态。你们代表着日本执政党和政府中的多数。岸信介〔216〕被池田〔217〕政府代替，不是表现了这种趋势吗？松村先生对我的这一点评价如何看？

**松村：**在这一点上，情况大体如此。只有一点，需请您谅解。因为我们是自由阵营中的一员，同贵国情况不一样，把问题提交到国会上去讨论，要费很大周折。但是我相信您所说的那种局面终究会出现，我们正在努力促其实现。

**周：**正是因为日本的政治制度是资本主义制度，所

以我们才不看表面现象而看实质。如果只看形式，看表面，台湾的大使馆就在东京，我们的代表团为什么还进去？因为台湾的大使馆在东京，这是一种临时现象，终有一天，东京的蒋介石大使馆会被中华人民共和国的大使馆所代替。这也是大多数日本人的愿望。上一次我也谈过，我们赞成用积累的方式改进中日关系，为建立中日邦交而努力。

## FRIENDSHIP FIRST, RESISTANCE COMES LATER\*[1]

(APRIL 18, 1964)

Premier Zhou Enlai (hereafter shortened to Zhou): I hear that both sides have pretty much finished with discussing specific issues. I'd like to talk with you about issues going forward from a broader perspective.

Matsumura Kenzo (hereafter shortened to Matsumura): From the time we arrived in Beijing up to the present, we've engaged in frank and friendly discussions with our Chinese friends. We've already largely settled some specific issues, which is certainly something we are happy about. These past few days I've been enjoying myself sightseeing. However, other friends in our delegation have been engaged in diplomatic-like negotiations with Mr. Sun Pinghua and Mr. Wang Xiaoyun\*[2]\*, and after vehement debate, they have reached an agreement. Therefore, I think these agreements ought to be solid and reliable.

Zhou: It's good to debate issues thoroughly, not only for diplomatic matters, but for other business as well. Political debates are inevitable.

Matsumura: Mr. Okazaki Kaheita took over responsibility from Mr. Takasaki Tatsunosuke\*[3]\*\* for the work of the Takasaki office, and I hope you will look after him in the future.

Zhou: We hope that Mr. Okazaki will continue to cooperate with us. I recall how Mr. Okazaki accompanied Mr. Takasaki on his visit two years ago, and also visited last year, so Mr. Okazaki already has had the experience of working with us twice. The issue of a [representative] office will for sure be a little complicated and troublesome. The principle is settled but actualizing it is complicated. The principles which Liao Chengzhi and Takasaki Tatsunosuke agreed to need to be put into practice. Many problems can come up.

I want to talk about some of the issues that came up in Mr. Matsumura and Professor Nagai Michio's\*[4] conversation, that is, how to move forward. I saw in the April issue of "World Affairs" a Chinese translation of their dialogue, which relates to the issues I want to discuss. For sure, these are some existing problems in Sino-Japanese bilateral relations.

I believe that, whether we talk about advancing bilateral relations, preserving peace in the Far East, advancing Afro-Asian unity and world peace, first of all we have to consider the two countries own interests, and only then can we look at it from a global perspective.

In the fifteen years since China's liberation, we have adopted a position of independence and self-reliance, and implemented foreign and domestic policies that are not only suited to the interests of the Chinese people, but which are also suited to the interests of the people of the world. Among the friends present here, some who have visited China many times. Can you find any specific examples in China's foreign or domestic policies which indicates that we're ordered around by, controlled by or dependent on someone else, behaving like someone's satellite instead of an independent country? If so, I'd like to learn about them.

Okazaki: None.

Matsumura: I have never thought that way. Ever since liberation China has adopted completely independent policies, a point which I am well aware of, one could even say that China has been overly insistent on being independent.

Zhou: If we had not held firmly to an independent and self-reliant position, then we would have turned into a satellite country, a subordinate at the beck and call of imperialism. Therefore, we cannot weaken our resolve to be independent and self-reliant. By being “too independent,” does Mr. Matsumura mean to say that we want to isolate ourselves and refuse to cooperate with others?

Matsumura: Exactly what I meant. What I’m thinking is, Japan adopted the wrong policies, started a war, the result being Japan’s defeat and subsequent collapse, bringing about independence for all the Asian countries. I hope that these oppressed countries will achieve independence, and become flourishing, prosperous countries. I believe that independence, prosperity and world peace are meaningful only when linked together.

Zhou: I have a somewhat different view from what Mr. Matsumura said. Mr. Matsumura mentioned that Japan collapsed, but I don’t think that Japan has collapsed, it was Japanese militarism that collapsed, but that the Japanese people can now achieve independence and development according to their own will.

Matsumura: That’s what I think too. It was Japanese militarism that was destroyed. Militarism caused the Japanese people much suffering and sacrifice, to the extent that at one point there was nothing to eat. Our hard work in the twenty years since the collapse of militarism has enabled us to reach the point where we are today.

Zhou: The scourge of war was created by militarism. The Japanese people and the Chinese people both endured hardship from it. But the crimes of militarism also taught the people to rise up against militarism, oppose aggressive war, and oppose having it imposed on the people.

As for the question that Mr. Matsumura just raised, whether China could be too independent, my view is, independence does not exclude cooperation. At present, no country can be fully isolated. True independence does not exclude international cooperation, that is, cooperation with truly friendly countries. The year before last, when Messrs. Matsumura and Ishibashi\*[\[5\]](#) visited, I also spoke about our policy of independence and self-reliance. Our policy is like this: with any country that is friendly towards us, we will reciprocate with even more friendliness; with anyone hostile towards us, we will push back with the same attitude and oppose them. That is to say, in advancing friendship, we take the initiative to proactively get along well with others in a friendly manner; if [others] are hostile to us, we will push back, but we won’t initiate hostility – that is our principle. We have two sentences to describe this principle, that is: friendship comes first, resistance comes later. For the people of every country, this policy of ours doesn’t cause any problems. That’s because the vast majority of people want to be friendly towards us, it is only a very small handful who are hostile towards us. Of course, the reactionaries will try to create a hostile atmosphere against us, and a minority of people will be influenced by that. Regardless of color skin, race, or religious beliefs, people ought to be friendly towards each other. Even with Japan, which was hostile and engaged in war with us, after the war we took the initiative to offer the hand of friendship, which the Japanese people accepted, and [we] developed friendly relations. This is a good thing, which proves that we can treat each other in a friendly manner. We are the same way towards the American people, we have always expressed our desire for friendship with the American people. I think that the vast majority of the American people also wish for friendship with China, although under the circumstances, at present it isn’t easy for the American people to express their wish.

Currently, every day there are more countries that have thrown off domination by imperialism and become independent. Half of the countries in the world are Afro-Asian countries, and there are some African countries that have yet to become independent, if they are independent, then the Afro-Asian countries will exceed

one-half. Nine years ago, only a little over twenty countries participated in the First Afro-Asian Meeting, but this year, there are already twenty-two countries participating in this year's preparatory meeting in Jakarta for the Second Afro-Asian Meeting, and it's estimated that when next year's Second Afro-Asian Meeting formally takes place, there won't only be around twenty countries participating, but many more. These countries fundamentally want friendly cooperation. Of course, this isn't to say that these countries all have the same social systems, or that there are no conflicts. There may be conflict, but overall we say it's possible to seek common ground despite differences. For national independence, to build up their own countries, to oppose wars of aggression and maintain world peace, these countries must always carry out friendly cooperation. This doesn't just apply to Afro-Asian countries, but to the countries of Latin America, North America, Europe, and Australia as well. Among these countries, some are socialist, some follow American imperialism, some are developed capitalist countries. Socialist countries of course wish for world peace, but even these latter countries also want to preserve world peace. It's only a few imperialist countries that want to use war to threaten people, are hostile to the people in the world, attempt to maintain their existing rule, or regain control of the world. Nevertheless, the current key point is that these few countries have powerful militaries, they use nuclear weapons to frighten people and they want to control the world. On the surface, they seem very powerful, but we should look past the surface to see their real nature. The overwhelming majority of countries want peace and friendship and oppose oppression and wars of aggression.

China stands against these few countries using war and nuclear weapons to blackmail and bully the people of the world and has shown the spirit of independence and resistance. China opposes the aggressive war policies of imperialism on behalf of the interests of the vast majority of the world's people. On this question, Mr. Matsumura doesn't need to worry that China's independent spirit will be too strong and that it will make fall out with the U.S. and bring on a world war in Asia. China has always had the spirit to oppose imperialism's aggressive war. We suffered over a hundred years of oppression, and profoundly understand not only our own need to throw off imperialist oppression, but the need of the people of the whole world, including the people of Japan, to throw off imperialist oppression. We will endeavor towards that end. This calls for resolutely resisting the most stubborn imperialists, the forces of war which may appear to be strong but are in fact extremely weak. That is to say, the United States. We must push them back. We shouldn't think that their nuclear weapons are so extraordinary. The people of the world want peace, oppose wars of aggression, the great majority of countries want peace and friendship, oppose nuclear war, and even the American people don't want war. If the U.S. dares to start a war, then it will be the U.S. that will fail.

If the Afro-Asian countries unite, how would the U.S. dare to start a world war in the Afro-Asian region? Mr. Matsumura just mentioned how the Japanese people suffered greatly in the Second World War, and I don't believe that the Japanese people who have suffered that way would fight for the U.S. if it started a third world war. Maybe a few people would want to fight, but the vast majority will not pull America's chestnuts out of the fire. Do the American people want to wage war? On this the U.S. government knows very well: the American people don't want to go to war.

Chiang Kai-shek [Jiang Jieshi] wants to drag the U.S. into the water in a futile attempt to retake the mainland. Practically speaking, the U.S. is not in favor of an attack on the mainland. The U.S. has warned Chiang Kai-shek not to make trouble; if Chiang Kai-shek makes trouble, the U.S. will not be willing to join the war. Recently, Rusk went to Taiwan but nothing came of his talks. Chiang Kai-shek wants the U.S. to provide him with ships and weapons, but the U.S. knows that this would be to drag the U.S. into the water, so the U.S. won't do it. The U.S. has a different calculation, it wants Chiang Kai-shek to send his elite troops to Vietnam to interfere in Vietnam's internal affairs, joining the war to suppress the South Vietnamese people. The U.S. doesn't want to send its own people to die in Vietnam, since every time someone dies

the dead person's family will be upset and say that it wasn't worth sending them to die. Chiang Kai-shek knows what the U.S. has in mind, so he won't do it, either. This is because once his elite troops suffer losses in Vietnam, the U.S. can replace him on Taiwan. Chiang Kai-shek understands that once his main troops are gone, he would end up like Syngman Rhee or Ngo Dinh Diem. Given this situation, where the U.S. can't even successfully take South Vietnam, so how can it start a world war in Asia?

Recently, the SEATO countries held a meeting in Manila, a meeting in which nothing whatsoever was achieved, though they still issued a joint communique. What sort of joint communique? It was the least joint of joint communiqués. In the communique it actually stated that France and the U.S. had different views. There were myriad different views at the meeting, yet Rusk made a fool of himself saying that despite the differing views they could still take action. On this point, I have to admire the perspicacity of the Japanese journalists, who said that the usefulness of SEATO is diminishing day by day. At the Manila meeting, the Philippine delegation was the loudest in its disapproval of France recognizing New China. However, the delegation that the Philippines sent to the Jakarta preparatory meeting for the Second Afro-Asian meeting had a different attitude. Their delegation head embraced [PRC Foreign Minister] Chen Yi, celebrating the success of the Afro-Asian meeting preparatory meeting. What does this tell us? It tells us that the SEATO that the U.S. relies on is unreliable. Under such circumstances, how can the U.S. dare to start a world war in Asia? China understands and sees this situation clearly. The U.S. is definitely not frightening, this is not something we said after the fact, twenty years ago Chairman Mao had already said that the U.S. was a paper tiger, nothing to be frightened of.

Our friends here may be worried that, because China's independent spirit is so strong, it might cause unrest in Asia? I think that our Japanese friends understand the U.S. best. For the past ten years most of the visitors we've had were Japanese friends. Over several decades, around three or four thousand Japanese women have taken Chinese citizenship, they have already become members of our peaceful family. They understand very well that China needs a peaceful environment in order to build up its own country and wants to live in peace with all the peace-loving countries in the world. The reality of Sino-Japanese relations proves this point. The Japanese government recognizes Chiang Kai-shek as representing China, doesn't recognize us as representing China. If you look at this issue from a formal perspective, your government is hostile towards us, nevertheless, we have still invited you. We have already been together for six or seven years. We see you as friends, we don't see you as enemies. We need to see past the surface to the reality. The Japanese people want to be friends with China. The ruling party in Japan and the majority of people in the Japanese government hope to restore bilateral relations, although it isn't yet possible to realize formal relations, since for the present you still maintain the posture of recognizing Taiwan as the government representing China. You represent the majority in Japan's governing party and government. Doesn't the replacement of Kishi Nobusuke by the Ikeda government represent this trend? What does Mr. Matsumura think of my evaluation of the situation?

Matsumura: I'd say that the situation is basically as you have described. On just one point, I hope you will forgive me. Because we are members of the "free world" camp, our situation is different from that of your honorable country; to present an issue for discussion to the Diet involves a lot of trouble. Nevertheless, I believe that the situation to which you referred will eventually occur, and we are working hard to realize it.

Zhou: Exactly because Japan's political system is a capitalist system, we therefore don't look at the surface but rather look at the reality. If we only look at the form, at the surface, Taiwan has an Embassy in Tokyo, so why are we still unable send our representatives? Because the Taiwan Embassy in Tokyo is a temporary phenomenon, and eventually, one day, Chiang Kai-shek's Embassy in Tokyo will be replaced by an Embassy of the People's Republic of China. This is the wish of the majority of

Japanese people. As I said the last time we spoke, we support using cumulative steps to improve Sino-Japanese relations and work hard to establish Sino-Japanese diplomatic relations.

\* This is an excerpt from a transcript of a discussion with a delegation of Japanese guests led by Liberal Democratic Party advisor and Diet member Matsumura Kenzo. During this visit by the Matsumura delegation, the two sides reached an agreement for an exchange of non-governmental resident offices and resident journalists.

\*\* Sun Pinghua (1917-1997) and Wang Xiaoyun (1920-1983), CCP Japan experts; Sun was first head of PRC liaison office in Tokyo, Wang also served as Ambassador to Japan.

\*\*\* Okazaki Kaheita (1897-1989), Japanese businessman. Takasaki Tatsunosuke (1885-1964), businessman and politician; worked in Manchukuo, served as MITI Minister in Kishi cabinet, negotiated first Japan-PRC trade agreement.

\* Nagai Michio (1923-2000), Japanese sociologist and University administrator.

\* Ishibashi Tanzan (1884-1973), Japanese journalist and politician, Prime Minister 1956-57.