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Note given by the Counsellor of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, 17 July 1954

According to a report received from the Tibet Region of China, over thirty Indian troops armed with rifles crossed the Niti Pass on 29 June 1954, and intruded into Wu-Je of the Ali Area of the Tibet Region of China. (Wu-Je is about one day's journey from the Niti Pass). The above happening is not in conformity with the principles of non-aggression and friendly co-existence between China and India, and the spirit of the Joint Communique issued recently by the Prime Ministers of China and India. It is hoped that the Government of India would promptly investigate the matter, and order the immediate withdrawal of the Indian troops in question from the above-mentioned territory of the Tibet Region of China. We shall appreciate it if you will let us know at the earliest opportunity the results of steps which you are to take in the above matter.
Regarding the intrusion into Wu-Je in the Ali Area of the Tibet Region of China by the Indian troops the question of which I raised with you on 17 of July, I am to inform you that further investigations reveal that they were a unit of 33 persons attached to the local garrison in U.P., India. The unit was under the command of an officer called Nathauje (according to Chinese pronunciation) who was a deputy commander of the troops stationing at Kanman (Chinese pronunciation). Together with the officer, there was a local official named Sopit Singh (Chinese pronunciation) of Chinal tribe in U.P., who was also a district magistrate of Walzan japur (Chinese pronunciation) district. Besides, there were a doctor, radio-operators and soldiers. They were putting up in 17 tents.

The above situation, as I spoke to you last time, is not in conformity with the principles of non-aggression and friendly co-existence between China and India and the spirit of the joint communique issued recently by the Prime Ministers of China and India. It is hoped that the Government of India will adopt necessary measures as to order the immediate withdrawal of the Indian troops in question from the territory of the Tibet Region of China. It will also be much appreciated if you would let us know the results of the steps you may take in this matter.
Note given to the Chinese Counsellor in India, 27 August 1954

We have made thorough enquiries regarding the allegation made by the Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy on 17th July and repeated again on 13th August about a report that a unit of 33 Indians attached to the local garrison in U.P. (India) had intruded into the Tibet region of China. As previously mentioned to the Chinese Counsellor, our further investigations have confirmed that the allegation is entirely incorrect. A party of our Border Security Force is encamped in the Hoti Plain which is south-east of Niti Pass and is in Indian territory. None of our troops or personnel have crossed north of the Niti Pass, as verbally mentioned by the Chinese Counsellor.

2. On the other hand, we have received reports that some of the Tibetan officials tried to cross into our territory in Hoti Plain and it is requested that such entry without proper documents is not in conformity with the Agreement signed between India and China regarding Trade and intercourse between India and the Tibet region of China, nor in conformity with the principles of non-aggression and friendly co-existence between China and India and the spirit of the joint communiqué issued recently by the Prime Ministers of India and China. It is hoped that the Government of China will instruct the local authorities in Tibet not to cross into Indian territory as we have instructed our authorities not to cross into Tibetan territory.
We have regretfully to refer again to the report which we conveyed to the Chinese Embassy last year (27 August 1954) that Tibetan officials attempted to enter in our territory in the Hoti Plain. We have now received a report that a party of Chinese are camping at Hoti with 5 tents and 20 horses and that they have entered our territory without proper documents.

2. We had mentioned earlier and would like to repeat once again that such entry without proper documents is not in conformity with the Agreement signed between India and China on the subject of trade and border relations between India and the Tibet region of China. We would request that instructions be issued immediately to these personnel to withdraw across the border over the Tunjun La and to refrain from entering Indian territory unless they are in possession of proper documents. We would like to emphasise that such violation of our territory is not in conformity with the principles of non-aggression and friendly co-existence between China and India nor in the spirit of the joint communique issued last year by the Prime Ministers of India and China. We ourselves have issued a strict injunction to all our personnel not to cross into the territory of the Tibet region of China and would be grateful if the Chinese authorities will issue similar instructions to their own personnel and to the local authorities in Tibet not to enter Indian territory.
Note given by the Chinese Counsellor in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 11 July 1955

1. On 29 June 1954, a batch of more than 30 Indian soldiers crossed into Wu-Je of the Tibet Region of China. Only after our repeated representations to the Ministry did the Indian troops withdraw from the place on 19 September 1954.

2. According to recent reports from authorities concerned in the Tibet Region of China, another batch of more than 30 Indian soldiers crossed into Wu-Je of the Tibet Region of China on 25 June 1955 and engaged in constructing fortifications at places very close to our garrison forces stationing there. On the basis of the Five Principles, we would request the Indian Government to order the prompt withdrawal of the said troops from the Chinese territory so as to avoid any possible accident.

3. As regards the representation made by Mr. S. K. Roy on 28 June 1955 in connection with the alleged crossing of the border of Chinese personnel and their camping at the Hoti Plain, it may be recalled that last year when we made the request that the Indian troops be withdrawn from Wu-Je, you also mentioned that our officials in the Tibet Region had attempted to cross into Hoti. In this regard we wish to point out that the Chinese Government has times and again instructed the personnel of the frontier garrison not to move a single step beyond the Chinese border. Our investigations have confirmed that in the course of the last year and the current one there never has been any case of Chinese personnel crossing the border in the vicinity of the Niti Pass.
Informal Note given to the Chinese Counsellor in India, 18 July 1955

With reference to the informal note handed over by the Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy, New Delhi, on 11 July 1955, to Shri T. N. Kaul, it is pointed out that the statement in para. 1 regarding the withdrawal of Indian troops said to be at Wu-Je does not correctly indicate the position. The troops mentioned were not in the Tibet region of China but at Bara Hoti, on the Hoti Plain in India which is south of the Tunjun La. The movement of the troops had no connection with the Chinese representations. They withdrew in September 1954, because the outpost maintained at Bara Hoti is only a seasonal post.

2. We would also like to emphasise that the same remarks apply to the Indian troops now said to be at Wu-Je. We are not aware of the exact location of Wu-Je, though the Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy mentioned that it was 12 kilometres north of the Tunjun La, but we are quite confident that our troops have not, under any circumstances, crossed the border into the Tibet region of China. The only party of Indian troops in the area is the party camping in the Hoti Plain. We understand that a party of Chinese troops are camping close by in Indian territory, about whose presence a representation was made by Mr. S. K. Roy to the Chinese Counsellor on 28 June 1955. Since the Chinese troops are within Indian territory, we would again request the Chinese Government, in furtherance of the five principles, to order their prompt withdrawal from Indian territory so as to avoid any possible further misunderstanding.
Note given to the Chinese Counsellor in India, 18 August 1955

With reference to the informal note handed over to the Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi on the 18th July 1955, by Shri T. N. Kaul, we regret to point out that we have received a report that the Sarji, a Tibetan official, with the Chinese troops at Bara Hoti on the Hoti Plain in India has realised grazing tax from Indian herdsmen grazing goats in the area. This is a new development which we would request the Chinese authorities to stop forthwith.
Note given by the Counsellor of China to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi on 26 September 1955

The informal note handed over to me by Mr. S. K. Roy, Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs on 18 August 1955 has been duly transmitted to our Government.

2. Our repeated investigations made in Wu-Je area of the Tibet Region have proved that no Chinese personnel has ever crossed the border. On the contrary, it was the Indian troops that intruded into Wu-Je which has always belonged to Dabatsing of the Tibet Region within the Chinese boundary.

3. According to reports from quarters concerned, the Indian troops are still stationing at Wu-Je, and are incessantly carrying out reconnaissance activities on the Chinese Garrison. Hence the situation is rather serious.

4. In order to avoid any possible accident, it is hoped that the Government of India would continue to investigate into this case of border-crossing and take effective measures to prevent its further development.

5. Since no Chinese personnel has crossed the border, there could not have been such situation as stated in your informal note of 18 August 1955.

23 September 1955.
The position as set out in the informal note handed over to Shri T. N. Kaul by Mr. Kang, Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy on the 26th September 1955, shows that there is clearly a misunderstanding of the position. We are quite definite that our personnel have at no time intruded into the Wu-Je area of the Tibet region of China but have throughout remained at Bara Hoti which is 2 miles south of the Tunjun La.

2. We regret to say that Chinese troops came south of the Tunjun La and were camping at Bara Hoti alongside our troops. We would like to repeat that we are most anxious to avoid any possible incident and we, therefore, suggest that strict instructions should be issued that no personnel from the Tibet region of China should cross into India without due permission from us.

3. We would also like to repeat our earlier assertion that we have issued strict instructions to all our personnel that they are not to cross the border into the Tibet region of China without due permission from the authorities. We are quite sure that our personnel have not entered the Wu-Je area of the Tibet region of China because they have never crossed the Tunjun La, the border pass, and Wu-Je was stated by Mr. Kang to be 12 kilometres north of this Pass.
Note given to the Chinese Counsellor in India, 5 November 1955

On 15th September as our detachment from Hoti Plain in India was approaching Damzan, which is 10 miles south of the Niti Pass and in Indian territory, they were stopped by 20 Chinese soldiers who were trespassing on Indian territory. These soldiers sent a message to our detachment that it could not go via Damzan unless it got permission from the Chinese authorities at Gartok. Our detachment insisted on going via Damzan and told them that they were passing through Indian territory. They made it clear that if the Chinese party used force to stop our detachment from going through Indian territory they would be responsible for the consequences. The situation was such as might have led to a serious clash between Indian and Chinese soldiers but for the great restraint exercised by our detachment. The Chinese soldiers did not try to stop our detachment but wanted to remain on the Indian territory at Damzan without due and proper permission from us.

We must point out that Damzan is clearly within Indian territory. It is situated at longitude 79°51'—latitude 30°49' and is 10 miles south of the Niti Pass which has been recognised by the Sino-Indian Agreement of 29th April 1954 as the border pass between the two countries in this region. The unauthorised presence of Chinese soldiers at Damzan in Indian territory therefore amounts to trespass and their action in trying to stop our detachment from going through Damzan is a violation of the Five Principles.

We have already asked that strict instructions should be issued to the Chinese authorities in the Tibet region of China that their personnel and the local authorities in Tibet should not enter Indian territory without first obtaining permission from the authorities concerned in India. We would earnestly repeat this request and point out that such action is not in conformity with principles of non-aggression and friendly co-existence accepted by India and China and that incidents such as these may well have grave consequences. We would also request that action should be taken against the offenders.
We have learnt with surprise and regret from the Commander of our Border Security Force at Nilang that 12 Chinese soldiers including one officer equipped with tommy and sten guns and telescopes were seen half a mile east of Nilang at 12-30 hours on 28th April. Nilang and the area right up to Tsang Chokla pass is clearly within Indian territory and has always been in our possession. We have, therefore, instructed the Officer Commanding our Border Security Forces in Nilang to inform the Chinese Officer to leave Indian territory immediately.

2. We assume that the movement of the Chinese troops into our territory is due to ignorance and would request that the Chinese troops and their officer should be instructed to withdraw immediately beyond Tsang Chokla pass and warned not to violate Indian territory in future. If, however, it is under instructions from higher authorities we wish to lodge a protest against this clear violation of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 29th April 1954 and the Five Principles which were signed jointly by Premier Chou En-lai and Prime Minister Nehru the same year. We wish to point out that failure of immediate withdrawal of the Chinese troops beyond Tsang Chokla may lead to serious incidents which would mar the friendly relations between India and China. This we wish to avoid and hope that the Chinese Government shares our wish and will issue immediate instructions for the withdrawal of their troops beyond Tsang Chokla into Chinese territory.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Chinese Charge d'Affaires in India, 7 June 1956

A number of informal notes have been exchanged between the Ministry of External Affairs and the Chinese Embassy on the subject of Bara Hoti and Wu-Je of the Tibet region of China. We have throughout maintained that Chinese personnel have crossed the Tunjun La from the Tibet region of China and entered the territory of the Indian Union, whereas the Chinese Embassy have maintained that our personnel have entered the Wu-Je area of the Tibet region of China.

2. A copy of the last note handed over to Mr. Kang, Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy on 5th November 1955 is attached. From this it will be seen that the main point has been the position of the areas in question with relation to the Tunjun La, our contention being that Bara Hoti is two miles south of the Tunjun La whereas Chinese Embassy have held that Wu-Je is 12 kilometres north of this Pass.

3. The present position is that our personnel are now encamped at Bara Hoti south of the Tunjun La, and we have received a report that a party of 20 or 30 Chinese troops are preparing to cross the Tunjun La from the Tibet region of China into India. We have instructed our personnel not to permit this party to cross over and camp at Bara Hoti and we would be grateful if the Chinese Embassy could have instructions issued immediately that the party should not cross the Tunjun La into Indian territory.

4. As we have already stated on several occasions our personnel have strict instructions not to enter the Tibet region of China without permission from the authorities concerned. They have assured us that they have never crossed the Tunjun La. Now that they are encamped on the Indian side of the Tunjun La we trust that the position will be clarified and no attempt will be made by Chinese personnel to cross over this Pass from the Tibet region of China into India. Any unfortunate incident in this connection would do nothing but harm to the friendly and cordial relations prevailing between our two countries.
Concerning the question of Wu-Je, representations were made on September 26, 1955 by Mr. Kang Mao-Cho, Counsellor of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in the Republic of India, to Mr. T. N. Kaul, Joint Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs of India, and on November 5 of the same year, India's views on the same question were set forth by Mr. S. K. Roy, Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs of India to Mr. Fu Hao, Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy in India.

Now that the Wu-Je area has already become passable, if the Governments of China and India should again send their respective troops into that area as they did in 1955, a situation similar to that of 1955 will inevitably recur, in which the troops of the two countries confront each other. The Chinese Government cannot but be concerned about this, and it is presumed that the Indian Government shares the same feeling.

The Chinese Government has made a study of data concerning this part of the Tibet Region of China adjacent to India and it has been proved that the Wu-Je area has always been under the jurisdiction of Daba Dzong of the Tibet Region of China. This area is within Chinese territory.

In his talk on November 5, 1955 with Mr. Fu Hao, Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy in India, Mr. S. K. Roy, Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs of India referred to Tunjun La as the border pass. However, according to historical records of this part of the Tibet Region of China adjacent to Indian territory, Tunjun La is proven to be within Chinese territory. There is no historical record showing Tunjun La to be a border pass between China and India.

The Ministry of External Affairs of India more than once expressed to the Chinese Embassy in India the desire to know the opinion of the Chinese Government regarding the joint investigation into the question of Wu-Je. The Chinese Government is of the opinion that, with a view to settling the question of Wu-Je, a joint investigation by representatives of the Chinese and Indian Governments will be useful. The Chinese Government is willing to continue consultations with the Indian Government with regard to the method in such a joint investigation.

The Chinese Government wishes further to suggest that, pending the settlement of the Wu-Je question by the two Governments through normal diplomatic channels, both Governments should refrain from sending troops into the Wu-Je area so as to avoid a situation in which the troops of the two countries confront each
other, and to maintain the normal state of affairs along the Sino-Indian border.

China and India are the first countries to initiate the five principles of peaceful co-existence. We should abide by these principles and ideals which we ourselves have initiated. The Chinese Government considers that, so long as the two Governments keep to a friendly and fair attitude, the question of Wu-Je will undoubtedly be settled satisfactorily through the clarification of historical facts by means of investigation and study.
Note given by the Foreign Office of China to the Counsellor of India, 26 July 1956

On June 8, 1956, Mr. Chen Chia-kang, then Assistant Foreign Minister of China, handed over to Mr. Bahadur Singh, Counsellor of the Indian Embassy in China, a memorandum in which it was stated that the Chinese Government was willing to undertake a joint investigation with the Indian Government to settle the question of Wu-Je (Hoti) and that the Chinese Government further suggested that pending the settlement of the Wu-je question by the two Governments through normal diplomatic channels, both Governments should refrain from sending troops into the Wu-je area.

On June 13, 1956, Mr. R. K. Nehru, Indian Ambassador to China, indicated to Mr. Chi Peng-fei, Vice-Foreign Minister of China, that the Indian Government had agreed to a joint investigation by China and India into the Wu-je question. The Chinese Government is pleased with this, and will continue to consult with the Indian Government on the concrete matters relating to the joint investigation.

However, in connection with the Chinese Government's suggestion that, pending the settlement of the Wu-je question by the two Governments through normal diplomatic channels, both Governments should refrain from sending troops into the Wu-je area, no reply has yet been received from the Indian Government. With a view to facilitating the settlement of the Wu-je question through friendly consultation between the Chinese and the Indian Governments, this year the Chinese Government has not sent its frontier garrisons into the Wu-je area. In the meantime, however, the Chinese Government has received a report that Indian troops have crossed the border and entered the Wu-je area as they did last year. This is disquieting. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will take necessary measures to effect the speedy withdrawal of Indian troops from the Wu-je area so as to create a favourable atmosphere and condition for a smooth settlement of the Wu-je question between China and India.

In his talk with Mr. Chi Peng-fei, Chinese Vice-Foreign Minister, Mr. R. K. Nehru, Indian Ambassador to China, also raised the question of the terms of the joint investigation of the Wu-je question. Ambassador R. K. Nehru was of the opinion that the joint investigation should be based on the contents of an informal talk in 1955 between Mr. Kang Mao-chao, former Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy in India, and Mr. T. N. Kaul, Joint Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs of India. Ambassador R. K. Nehru said that, as he understood it, both Mr. Kang and Mr. Kaul had agreed in their talk that Tunjun La was the border pass between China and India, and that therefore the aim of the joint investigation should be limited to finding out on the spot whether Wu-je or Bara Hoti was the
north or to the south of Tunjun La. Ambassador Nehru further added that if it was to the north of Tunjun La, it was in Chinese territory, and if it was to the south of Tunjun La, it was in Indian territory.

In the memorandum handed over on June 8, 1956 by Mr. Chen Chia-kang, then Assistant Foreign Minister of China, to Mr. Bahadur Singh, Counsellor of the Indian Embassy in China, it has been clearly pointed out that according to historical records of this part of the Tibet Region of China adjacent to Indian territory, Tunjun La is proven to be within Chinese territory and there is no historical record showing Tunjun La to be a border pass between China and India. Hence any disputation about Wu-je being in Chinese territory cannot be based on the ground that Wu-je is to the south of Tunjun La.

When Counsellor Kang Mao-chao in the above-mentioned informal talk with Mr. Kaul, Joint Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs of India, in 1955 referred to Wu-je as situated 12 kilometres to the northeast of Tunjan La, he was in fact not so clear about the geographical position of Wu-je in relation to Tunjun La. His above remark thus gave rise to some misunderstanding, but even then it cannot change the actual geographical position of Wu-je, i.e. it is within Chinese territory.

The Chinese Government maintains that Wu-je is within Chinese territory. Nevertheless, in the spirit of friendly cooperation, the Chinese Government is still willing to make joint efforts with the Indian Government to iron out the difference of views of the two Governments regarding the jurisdiction over Wu-je. The Chinese Government is convinced that, provided both sides refrain from sending troops into the Wu-je area and undertake a joint investigation on the basis of historical records in a matter-of-fact way, it should not be difficult to settle the Wu-je question satisfactorily.
Note Verbale given to the Chinese Charge d'Affaires in India, 8 September 1956

The Government of India have received a report that on the 1st September 1956, a party of about 10 Chinese Army personnel entered and took up positions about 2 furlongs from Hupsong Khad on the Indian side of Shipki La Pass. The party withdrew after the Officer-in-Charge of the Indian Border Police pointed out to the Captain in command of the Chinese Military Personnel that the Indian territory extends up to the Shipki La Pass.

2. The crossing of the Shipki La Pass by the Chinese Army Personnel without visaed Passports violates the Sino-Indian Agreement of April 29, 1954, in which the Shipki La Pass has been recognised as the border between India and the Tibet Region of China at that place. The Government of India presume that the Chinese Army Personnel crossed into Indian territory by mistake and not deliberately.

3. The Government of India would, however, request the Chinese Government to issue strict instructions to their authorities concerned that no unauthorised persons should cross into Indian territory in this manner in future, as otherwise there is danger of breach of peace. They would also request that action be taken against the offenders in the present case and the Government of India be informed of the action taken.
Aide memoire given to the Chinese Charge d'Affaires in India, 24 September 1956

Since the handing over of the last informal Note to Charge d'Affaires Fu Hao on the 8th September, the Government of India have received two reports of serious situations that recently developed between the Chinese and Indian border patrols in the region of Shipki La Pass on the Indo-Tibetan border.

2. The first of these occurred on the 10th September, when a party of Indian border police on its way to the Shipki La Pass sighted a party of Chinese Military personnel on the Indian side of the frontier. The Chinese party was commanded by a Captain and consisted of at least ten persons. The Indian patrol signalled the Chinese party to withdraw, but the latter did not do so. Thereupon, on the Indian patrol trying to advance, the Chinese personnel threw stones at it and threatened to use their grenades.

3. Towards the evening, the Indian party approached and held conversations with the Chinese. During this conversation, the Chinese Commander intimated that he had “received instructions from the Tibetan Government that the border extended up to Hupsang Khad and that Indian personnel should accordingly not advance beyond Hupsang Khad”. The Indian Patrol Commander pointed out that the border was in fact situated at the Shipki La Pass and suggested that the Chinese should accordingly withdraw.

4. However, it does not appear that the Chinese troops withdrew, as the following morning (11th September) they were again soon on the ridge above the roadway on the Indian side of the Pass. The position remained the same on the 12th September.

5. The Chinese Government will no doubt agree that in throwing stones and threatening to use hand grenades, the Chinese patrol offered such provocation as could easily have resulted in serious and regrettable incidents. However, a development even more likely to cause an ugly situation was soon to follow.

6. On the 20th September at about 4.45 a.m., a party of 27 Indian Border Security Force came face to face with a party of 20 Chinese troops and officers two miles on the Indian side of the Shipki La Pass. The Indian Commanding Officer asked the Chinese Officer to withdraw his troops. The Chinese Officer replied that he had received no further communication from his Government. He added that meanwhile his instructions were clear, namely, to patrol right up to Hupsang Khad, and in carrying these out he was prepared to face the consequences. He concluded that if the Indian party went beyond Hupsang Khad he “would oppose it with arms”.

7. The Government of India are pained and surprised at this conduct of the Chinese Commanding Officer. It is not difficult to visualise that the natural and direct result of such attitudes, if continued in, may be one of clash of arms.
8. In view of the fact that Shipki La is clearly the border and is acknowledged as such in the Sino-Indian Agreement of 29th April 1954, the Government of India consider any crossing of this border pass by armed personnel as aggression which they will resist. Government of India have ordered their Border Security Force not to take any action for the present in repulsing this aggression and to await instructions which they hope the Central People’s Government will issue immediately. Government of India have however directed their Border Security Force on no account to retire from their position or to permit Chinese personnel to go beyond where they are even if this involves a clash.

Government of India attach great importance to this matter and request immediate action by the Chinese Government. Otherwise there might be an unfortunate clash on our border which will have undesirable results.
Note given to the Chinese Charge d’Affaires in India, 3 October 1956

A number of conversations have been held in both New Delhi and Peking during the last 12 months in connection with the ownership of the territory of Barahoti and Wu-Je.

2. The last such conversation was at Peking on the 26th July 1956, when the WAICHIAOPU handed over an informal note to the Indian Embassy Counsellor, Mr. Bahadur Singh.

3. Previous to this, there seemed to have been agreement between the Governments of India and China in regard to the location of the Indo-Tibetan border in this area at the Tunjun-La Pass. On the basis of this location the factual point requiring ascertainment was merely whether the territory of Barahoti/Wu-Je was situated to the north of this Pass (and was therefore Chinese) or to the south of it (and was therefore Indian).

4. From the last conversation and informal note, however, the Government of India has observed with surprise the appearance of what seems to be a change in the Chinese view of the position of this Pass in relation to the border, on the ground that the understanding and statements by its Counsellor, Mr. Kang, at New Delhi, on the geographical position of Wu-Je in relation to Tunjun-La, was not correct.

5. While the Government of India are confident that having regard to the friendly relations of the two countries, the difference that has consequently arisen can be resolved in a peaceful and friendly manner, they feel that it would be helpful to make the actual situation clear so that there may be an agreed basis for settlement.

6. This is as follows:

(a) The district of Garhwal, in which Barahoti is situated, is, and has always been, a part of India;

(b) The historical evidence to support this goes back for many centuries;

(c) By possession and usage also Barahoti is, and has always been, part of India and Tunjun-La is, and has always been, the Border Pass;

(d) The precise latitude/longitude of this Pass is $30^\circ-53^\prime$ latitude north, $79^\circ-59^\prime$ longitude east.

This may assist identification of the Pass, and avoid danger of confusion with any other Pass.

1A copy was given to the Foreign Office of China on 5 October 1956.
7. The Government of India feel that proper understanding of the actual situation is a basic preliminary to any joint investigation. It is for this reason that the Government of India have again considered it necessary to elucidate the position, for it is only on the basis of a solid foundation such as this, that any joint Sino-Indian inspection survey party can be expected to arrive at correct conclusions as to the ownership of adjoining territory.

8. In view, however, of the mutual desire of the Governments of India and China to settle this problem peacefully and avoid any kind of clash, the Government of India agree that it would assist towards the expedition of a friendly settlement if both Governments refrain from sending troops into this area. As desired by the Government of China, the Government of India will accordingly issue the necessary orders, on the understanding that the Government of China will do likewise.
Note Verbale handed by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Counsellor in India, 2 July 1958

The Government of India have received information that troops of the Government of the People's Republic of China crossed into Indian territory and visited the Khurnak Fort (longitude 79°-00 E and latitude 33°-47' N) which lies within the Indian frontiers of the Ladakh region of Kashmir and occupied it.

It will be recalled that a conference of the representatives of the Kashmir State of India and the Tibet Region of China was held in 1924 regarding the boundary in this area. Unfortunately, the conference came to no agreed conclusions. It may, however, be mentioned that even during these discussions, the jurisdiction of India over the Khurnak Fort was never disputed. Discussions took place in regard to the international boundary which was further north of the Fort. No claim has ever been affirmed that the Fort formed part of the Tibet Region of China.

The Government of India are concerned at the report of the violation of the Indian frontier. They would not like to believe that unilateral action has been taken by the Government of the People's Republic of China with whom their relations are of the friendliest, to enforce alleged territorial claims in the region.

For the information of the Chinese Government, it may be mentioned that the Government of India propose to send a reconnaissance party to the area with clear instructions that the party will remain within the Indian side of the frontier.
Note handed by the Chinese Counsellor in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 2 August 1958

Since 8th July 1958, more than twenty Indian personnel entered into Wu-Je of the Tibet Region of China, bringing with them wireless communication apparatus, arms, etc. They said they were sent there by the Government of India to keep watch over the place. It is obvious that they are officials sent by the Indian Government. It is attempted to change the existing situation of Wu-Je and to create new dispute that, at a time when negotiations on the question of the ownership of Wu-Je are being held between China and India, the Indian side should have taken such an action. The Chinese Government cannot but lodge a protest and demands that the above-mentioned Indian personnel withdraw immediately from China's territory Wu-Je.
Note handed to the Chinese Counsellor in India by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 8 August 1958

With reference to the informal note handed over personally by Mr. Fu Hao, Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi to Shri B. K. Acharya, Director of the Eastern Division of the Ministry of External Affairs on the 2nd August 1958, the Government of India would like to state that it is a fact that a team of civilian revenue officials consisting of 21 persons sent by the Government of Uttar Pradesh have been camping in Barahoti in Indian territory since 8th July 1958 in connection with normal revenue settlement operations.

2. In this connection, the Government of India would recall that during the recent series of talks between the two Governments at Delhi on Barahoti, the Foreign Secretary on behalf of the Government of India suggested to His Excellency the Chinese Ambassador at the very first meeting held on the 19th April 1958, that during the pendency of negotiations the civil authorities on either side should not try to exercise control or possession over the Barahoti area. He pointed out that any such attempt to exercise control by civil authorities would only lead to counter-attempts to exercise similar control by the other side and that this is a situation, which, in the interest of friendship between India and China and also in the interest of satisfactory progress of the negotiations, should be avoided.

3. Subsequently, Mr. Fu Hao informed Shri B. K. Acharya that in the view of the Government of the People's Republic of China, it is unnecessary to consider such an interim agreement. Shri Acharya then informed Mr. Fu Hao that as the Indian proposal was not acceptable to the Chinese side, the Government of India will have no option but to continue to send their own civil authorities to the area.

4. It has already been explained to Mr. Fu Hao that both sides have claimed jurisdiction over Barahoti and both sides in the past have been sending officials to Barahoti. While the Government of India were and are of the view that during the pendency of the negotiations neither side should send civil officials to the area, they cannot agree to only one side sending their civil officials to Barahoti. In the present case, the Government of the People's Republic of China did not accept the proposal of the Government of India in this regard and actually sent their civil officials to the area on the 29th June. The Government of India, therefore, had no option but to instruct the Government of Uttar Pradesh to send their civil officials also to the area.

5. As, in the view of the Government of India, Barahoti is within Indian territory, it was not obligatory on the Government of India to inform the Government of the People's Republic of China regarding the movement of their civil officials in their own territory.
view of the friendly relations existing between the two Governments, however, the Government of India have kept the Government of the People's Republic of China informed about the visit of civilian officials to Barahoti during this summer. The Government of India, therefore, are of the view that the Government of the People's Republic of China can have no legitimate cause for protest against the action taken, particularly in view of the fact that the sending of Indian officials to any part of Indian territory is an internal domestic matter.

6. As regards Mr. Fu Hao's allegation that civilian officials have carried arms with them, the information of Government of India is that the Indian team of revenue officials is not carrying with it any arms like rifles and revolvers normally carried by members of the armed forces. Whether any weapons like shotguns have been carried for purposes of protection against wild animals is being enquired into. Government of India would be glad to receive information from the Embassy of the People's Republic of China as to whether the Chinese officials at Barahoti are carrying any arms with them or not.

7. The facts stated above furnish no support for the suggestion in the Chinese note that the Government of India are "attempting to change the existing situation of Wu-Je and to create a new dispute". The Government of India, therefore, emphatically repudiate the suggestion.
The attention of the Government of India has recently been drawn to the fact that a motor road has been constructed by the Government of the People's Republic of China across the eastern part of the Ladakh region of the Jammu and Kashmir State, which is part of India. This road seems to form part of the Chinese road known as Yehcheng-Gartok road or Sinkiang-Tibet highway, the completion of which was announced in September, 1957. The road enters Indian territory just east of Sarigh Jilgnang, runs north-west to Amtogar and striking the western bank of the Amtogar lake runs north-west through Yangpa, Khitai Dawan and Haji Langar which are all in indisputable Indian territory. Near the Amtogar lake several branch tracks have also been made motorable.

2. The India-China boundary in the Ladakh sector as in others is traditionally well-known and follows well marked geographical features. The territory which the road traverses has been part of the Ladakh region of India for centuries and the "old established frontiers" have been accepted by the Chinese in a Treaty of 1842 as the international boundary. In an official communication, a Chinese member of the Boundary Commission of 1847-49 accepted the boundary as "sufficiently and distinctly fixed so that it will be best to adhere to this ancient arrangement and it will prove far more convenient to abstain from any additional measures for fixing them". Accordingly, Indian survey parties have visited the region since the nineteenth century. Travellers to the area have referred to it as part of Ladakh, and Atlases like the Johnston's Atlas of India, edition 1894, and maps published by the Survey of India show it unmistakably as part of Ladakh.

3. In view of the position indicated in para. 2 above, it is a matter of surprise and regret that the Chinese Government should have constructed a road through indisputably Indian territory without first obtaining the permission of the Government of India and without even informing the Government of India.

4. The Government of India would like to point out that Chinese personnel, including officials and workers engaged in constructing and maintaining the road, as well as Chinese travellers traversing this road have been contravening Article V of the Agreement between the People's Republic of China and India on Trade and Intercourse with Tibet concluded in 1954. According to this Article "for travelling across the border, the High Contracting Parties agree that diplomatic personnel, officials and nationals of the two countries shall hold passports issued by their own respective countries and visaed by the Other Party" except as provided in the subsequent paragraphs of the Article relating to traders, pilgrims and muleteers. No applications for visas from Chinese personnel working on the
road or from Chinese travellers traversing this road have ever been received by the Government of India.

5. As the Chinese Government are aware, the Government of India are anxious to settle these petty frontier disputes so that the friendly relations between the two countries may not suffer. The Government of India would therefore be glad for an early reply from the Tibetan Government.

6. In this connection the Government of India would also like to draw the attention of the Chinese Government to another fact. An Indian party consisting of three Military Officers and four soldiers together with one Guide, one porter, six pony-owners and thirtyfour ponies, were out on a normal patrol in this area near Shinglung in Indian territory. This patrol had been given strict instructions not to cross the border into Chinese territory. Since the end of August, however, no news of their whereabouts has been received in spite of search by air. Since there are now Chinese personnel in this part of Indian territory the Government of India would be grateful for any information that the Chinese Government may have about the party and for any assistance that they may find it possible to give to the party to return to their headquarters.
Memorandum given by the Foreign Office of China to the Counsellor of India, 3 November 1958

According to the report of the Chinese local authorities in Sinkiang, Frontier Guards of the Chinese liberation army stationed in the south western part of Sinkiang discovered in succession on September 8 and 12, 1958 two groups of Indian armed personnel at Tahungliutan and Kezrekirekan on the Sinkiang-Tibet road on Chinese territory. These personnel had clearly intruded into Chinese territory to conduct unlawful surveying activities within Chinese borders. They were therefore detained by the Chinese Frontier Guards. The two groups of personnel consisted of 3 Indian officers and 4 soldiers and 8 employees. They carried with them 3 sten guns, one rifle, one pistol and radio sets, instruments for surveying and photographing and horses.

In addition since September this year Chinese Frontier Guards have more than once discovered Indian aircraft penetrating deep into the air space over south western part of Sinkiang of China to carry on reconnaissance and even circled low over Chinese garrisons.

The above-mentioned unlawful intrusions of Indian armed personnel and aircraft into Chinese territory and territorial air to conduct reconnoitring and surveying activities are inconsistent with Sino-Indian friendly relations and the five principles of peaceful co-existence initiated jointly by the two countries. The Chinese Government expresses deep regret at these happenings. The Chinese Government requests the Government of India to guarantee that no similar incidents will occur in the future.

As for the detained Indian armed personnel the Chinese Government in the spirit of Sino-Indian friendship has already ordered the military authorities concerned to deport them from Chinese territory through the Karakoram Pass on 22nd October.

Peking;
1 November, 1958.
Government of India have seen the note of the Chinese Government of November 1. As the Chinese Government are aware the Government of India had spoken to the Chinese Ambassador at New Delhi as early as the 18th October about the area which is referred to in the Chinese note. It was specifically mentioned to the Ambassador that an Indian party of 15 including 3 Military Officers were out on a normal patrol in this area but had been missing since the end of August. It is now clear that the Chinese Government also claim this area as their territory. The question whether the particular area is in Indian or Chinese territory is a matter in dispute which has to be dealt with separately. The Government of India propose to do so and reply later in detail to the Chinese note of November 1. Meantime the Government of India express their surprise and regret that although the Indian patrol party had been arrested for nearly 5 weeks no information was given to the Government of India and even then it was mentioned to the Counsellor of the Embassy only casually that the arrested persons had been sent across to India on the 22nd October. The Government of India had expected that in view of the friendly relations between the two countries intimation would have been given to them immediately after the apprehension of the patrol party and that arrangements would have been made in mutual consultation about the handing over of the party. The action of the Chinese Government in sending the party across the frontier without previous notice exposed the party to grave risks of life particularly in this season and it was only providential that the party could be rescued.
During the recent talks at Delhi on Barahoti between Chinese and Indian Delegations, it was proposed by the Indian side that the civil authorities of either country should not attempt to exercise jurisdiction over the Barahoti area until the dispute is finally settled. As this suggestion was not acceptable to the Chinese side, the Director of the Eastern Division informed the Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy at Delhi that if the Chinese Government sent their civil officials to Barahoti this year, the Indian side would also have to do likewise. The Chinese officials entered Barahoti on the 29th June 1958. The Government of India, therefore, had no option but to instruct the Uttar Pradesh Government to send their civil officials also to the area. These Indian officials reached Barahoti on the 8th July.

2. On the 2nd August, the Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy handed over to the Director of the Eastern Division an official note protesting against the presence of the Indian Revenue Party at Barahoti and alleging that they were carrying arms. On the 8th August, the Director of the Eastern Division handed over to Counsellor Fu Hao an informal note in reply to the Chinese protest. In this note it was stated that the Indian Revenue Party was not carrying with it any arms like rifles or revolvers normally carried by the members of the Armed Forces. The Director, however, undertook to enquire whether any shot guns for purposes of hunting and protection against wild animals had been taken. The results of the enquiry were intimated to Counsellor Yeh Cheng-Chang on the 18th August and he was informed that only three shot guns had been carried for protection against wild animals, but even these guns had since been withdrawn.

3. The Indian Revenue Party left Barahoti on the 9th September. The Government of India have received information that immediately after the departure of the Indian Party, a Chinese Party carrying with them arms and ammunition entered the Barahoti area and camped there. They have been further informed that on the 26th September this Chinese Party was reinforced by another 25 fully armed military personnel.

4. The Government of India would, therefore, draw the attention of the Government of the People's Republic of China to the subsisting agreement on the question of sending troops or armed personnel into the Barahoti area. As early as August, 1955, Shri S. K. Roy of the Ministry of External Affairs had proposed to Counsellor Kang that the Barahoti area should be "neutralised" and that neither side should send officials or Army detachments to the area pending the conclusion of the joint efforts of the two Governments to find a solution of the Barahoti question. No reply to this proposal was received from
the Chinese Government in 1955. In June 1956, the Assistant Foreign Minister of China handed over to the Indian Counsellor in Peking a memorandum suggesting, *inter alia*, that "both sides might refrain from sending troops into the Wu-Je area". In their *aides memoires* handed over to the Chinese Government both at Delhi and in Peking in October 1956, the Government of India agreed that both Governments should refrain from sending troops into the area. In February 1957, the Chinese Government confirmed that they would not send troops to the Hoti area "this year". Accordingly, the Government of India also instructed that their forces should not be sent to Barahoti during the year. No forces were, therefore, sent by either side during 1957.

5. At the beginning of the Delhi talks on Barahoti between Chinese and Indian delegations, on the 19th April, the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India proposed that "as last year neither side will send their forces to this particular area in asserting its right or supposed right while the matter is in dispute". On the Chinese side, the Ambassador accepted the proposal and said "I agree with the suggestion which Mr. Dutt has just made, *viz.*, before the Wu-Je question is solved, both sides will not send troops there".

6. Subsequently, on the 8th August, Counsellor Fu Hao informed the Director of the Eastern Division that the Chinese interpretation of the agreement not to send any troops was that no person actually carrying arms should be sent to the area by either side. He also assured the Director that the Chinese Government had been faithful to their agreement and did not propose to send such armed personnel to Barahoti.

7. In view of this agreement between the two Governments not to send any armed personnel into the Barahoti area, the Government of India are surprised to receive the reports referred to in para. 3 of this note about the entry of armed Chinese personnel into the Barahoti area. The Director of the Eastern Division in the Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India, therefore, spoke to Mr. Yeh Cheng-Chang, Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi, on the matter on the 23rd October. He also mentioned that the Government of India had received information to the effect that the Chinese party had taken to Barahoti considerable building materials like lime, beam, timber etc. which seemed to indicate that the Chinese intended to construct permanent or semi-permanent structures in Barahoti. The Director pointed out that if the information was correct, then the action of the Chinese Government would amount to bringing about a change in the existing situation during the pendency of talks between the two Governments and mentioned that such unilateral action by either party was undesirable and contrary to the frank and friendly spirit of the talks.

8. Counsellor Yeh promised to have enquiries made and to let the Director know as soon as he obtained definite information on the subject. As no reply has yet been received from the Chinese Embassy, the present unofficial note is being handed over with the request that early confirmation on the points raised may be obtained from the Chinese Government by the Embassy and communicated to the Government of India.
9. There is also another information which has recently been received by the Government of India. There are two places called Lapthal (latitude 30°-44' N: longitude 80°-8'E) and Sangcha Malla (latitude 30°-47' N: longitude 80°-11'E) which are both on the Indian side of the Balcha Dhura Pass (latitude 30°-40' N: longitude 80°-12'E) which is considered as traditional boundary between India and China. These places have never before been claimed either by the Government of China or by the local authorities in the Tibet region of China. The Government of India have been maintaining Indian check-posts at these two places for several years. Due to climatic conditions these check-posts retire further south at the end of the summer months. The Government of India have been informed that when the check-posts retired as usual in October this year, Chinese personnel entered into Indian territory and established out-posts at both the places.

10. The Government of India trust that the information that they have received is incorrect and would request the Chinese Embassy to confirm the position immediately. In case the information is found to be correct, the Government of India would request the Government of the People's Republic of China to withdraw all personnel from Lapthal and Sangcha Malla. They would also request the Government of China to withdraw all armed personnel from the Barahoti area forthwith in pursuance of the subsisting agreement between the two Governments.
Informal note given by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy in India, 17 January 1959

Information has been received by the Government of India that a detachment of Chinese troops, consisting of one officer and approximately 50 men, crossed into Lohit Frontier Division of the North-East Frontier Agency of India on the 27th/28th September, 1958. The party camped inside the Indian border at a point approximately 28°-15'N: 97°-15'E and later left towards Tazung Dam which lies in Burma. It may also be mentioned that previously a smaller party had come into Dichu Valley in the same area in October 1957. This party started from Dolong and came as far down as Walong in the Lohit river basin.

2. The area visited by these parties clearly lies within the Indian border. The Indian frontier with the Tibet region is well recognised and clearly demarcated and it is possible that the Chinese parties which were engaged on survey work crossed into Indian territory by mistake.

3. In view of friendly relations existing between China and India and in accordance with the Five Principles agreed to between them for regulation of their mutual relations, the Government of India would request the Government of the People's Republic of China to issue suitable instructions to ensure that such transgressions into Indian territory do not recur in future.

New Delhi;
January 16, 1959.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China present their compliments to the Embassy of India in China and have the honour to state the following regarding the Indian troops’ intrusion and occupation of Migyitun, Samgar Sanpo and other places in the Tibetan region of China and their collusion with the Tibetan rebel bandits.

According to well-founded report received by the Chinese Government, the Migyitun area in the south eastern part of the Tibetan region of China was intruded, shelled (and) occupied by over 200 Indian troops. These Indian troops, equipped with radio stations and weapons of various types, were building military work around Migyitun. What is particularly serious, they even went to the length of entering into collusion with the Tibetan rebel bandits to carry out illegal activities.

At the same time the Chinese Government received the report that the area of Samgar Sanpo north east of Migyitun, and nearby Molo and Gyala, which are likewise part of the territory of the Tibetan region of China, were also intruded and occupied by Indian troops. The Indian troops who intruded into and occupied this area numbered several hundreds and they also entered into collusion with the local Tibetan rebel bandits to carry out illegal activities.

The Chinese Government must point out solemnly that the above-mentioned Migyitun, Samgar Sanpo and other places are indisputably territories always belonging to China. And the brazen intrusion and occupation of Chinese territory by batches of Indian troops numbering hundreds and their unscrupulous collusion with the traitorous Tibetan rebel bandits entrenched in those places in carrying out illegal activities hostile to the People’s Republic of China, constitute grave encroachments on China’s sovereignty and flagrant interference in China’s internal affairs and are completely against the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence jointly initiated by China and India and Sino-Indian friendly and good neighbourly relations. The Chinese Government solemnly express to the Indian Government the hope that the Indian Government may order immediate withdrawal from the above-mentioned places of all Indian armed forces intruding into and occupying Chinese territories so as to prevent further complications and aggravation of the situation. In view of Sino-Indian friendly relations, it is the belief of the Chinese Government that the Indian Government will appreciate the grave situation created by the above said illegal actions taken by the Indian troops and will adopt at once effective corresponding measures.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs would appreciate very much if the Embassy should speedily communicate the above to the Indian Government and give an early reply.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note of the Government of India, 26 June 1959

The Embassy of India present their compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to state that they communicated to the Government of India the text of the Ministry's note of the 23rd June 1959 immediately on receipt. They are now instructed by the Government of India to transmit the following reply.

2. The Government of India received with surprise the allegations in the Ministry's note that Indian troops had violated territory in the Tibet region of China near Migyitun and shelled and occupied this place. The Government of India made immediate enquiries into these allegations and are satisfied that there is no truth in them. These allegations must have been based on wrong information received by the Government of the People's Republic of China.

3. The Government of India have scrupulously observed the traditional border between India and the Tibet region of China along the entire Indo Chinese frontier. This traditional international frontier coincides with the so-called MacMahon Line. According to this line Migyitun is within Chinese territory in Tibet and so are Samgu Sampo, Molo and Gyala. The Government of India emphatically repudiate any suggestion that their forces violated the international frontier and occupied these places which are admittedly part of Chinese territory. The Government of India regret that the Government of the People's Republic of China should have believed the allegations that their forces could in any way be in collusion with Tibetan rebels. The Chinese Government are aware of the circumstances in which a large number of people from Tibet have sought refuge in Indian territory. The Government of India while giving refuge to these people in accordance with accepted international usage, made it clear to them that they could not use Indian territory for hostile action against China. The refugees were disarmed as soon as they entered Indian territory and those who wished to stay in India were moved south away from the frontier. The Government of India have scrupulously enforced these measures and there could be no question of their encouraging, far less acting in collusion with the refugees in violating Chinese territory. The Government of India have no information about any rebel activities in this area, and if there are any, they are in no way responsible for them.

4. The nearest outpost which the Government of India have in this area is at Long Ju. This is south of Migyitun and within the Indian side of the traditional international border. There is another outpost at Tamadem which is some miles south of Samga Sampo. Tamadem is locally recognised as the limit of the Indian territory. Both these outposts were established peacefully and there was no question of shelling or using force in establishing these outposts. The Government of India have respected and will always respect the
traditional international frontier between India and the Tibet region of China, which, as stated above, coincides with the so-called Mac-Mahon Line. The Government of India agree that if by error the forces of one side are in occupation of any territory on the other side of the frontier, the error should be rectified by the party concerned.

5. The Government of India place great value on the maintenance of friendly and good neighbourly relations with China and stand firmly by the Five Principles of co-existence or Panch Sheel. They can only believe that the note of the Chinese Government must be based on wrong information received by them. The Government of India have already asked the officers in charge of their outposts in this area to place themselves in friendly contact with the Chinese officers on the other side and will be grateful if similar instructions are issued by the Chinese Government to the officers on their side of the frontier.

6. The Embassy of India renews to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Informal Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Chinese Counsellor in India, 24 July 1959

In accordance with our usual practice, survey operations will be carried out in the North-East frontier regions during the months of November 1959 to February 1960. Such survey involves both aerial as well as ground operations. Strict precautions will be observed so that pilots confine themselves to the Indian borders. Since the aircraft have to fly at a very high altitude, should by an error of judgment the boundary be transgressed, the Chinese Government may kindly raise no objection.

2. The Chinese authorities were good enough to inform the Government of India before conducting the survey of the Sino-Burmese and Indian borders in the winter of 1958 and the Government of India wish to do likewise.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Counsellor of China in India, 30 July 1959

The Government of India have just received a report indicating the presence of a Chinese armed detachment in Indian territory in the region of Western Pangong Lake in the Ladakh area of the Jammu and Kashmir State.

On the 28th July at about 10-45 A.M. (IST) an Indian Police party engaged on reconnaissance within Indian territory came across a Chinese armed detachment of nearly 25 persons at a point approximately 33·39 N and 78·46 E. The Officer commanding of the Indian party along with five constables approached the Chinese party with a view to explain that the Chinese detachment had transgressed into Indian territory and that it should withdraw immediately beyond the international frontier. The Indian patrol party of six persons had still not reported to its headquarters by the evening of 29th July, 1959, and there is reason to believe that the Indian party has been taken into custody by the Chinese detachment. It is also reported that the Chinese detachment has established a camp at Spanggur 33·34 N and 78·48 E.

The places mentioned lie well within the Indian frontier as notified in official maps. In fact, on an earlier occasion, when information had been received of a Chinese patrol having visited Khurnak Fort, latitude 33·47 N longitude 79 E the Ministry had drawn attention of the Chinese Embassy to the violation of the Indian frontier in a note presented on the 2nd July 1958. In the same note, advance intimation of the intention of the Government of India to send a reconnaissance party to the Khurnak Fort had been conveyed to the Chinese Government.

The Government of India take a serious view of the violation of the Indian frontier and the establishment of a camp by the Chinese armed detachment on Indian territory. They also take serious exception to the Chinese action in arresting an Indian police party engaged on duties within the Indian frontier particularly after advance intimation had been given of their intention to send such a reconnaissance party. The Government of India lodge a strong protest against the violation of the Indian border and the arrest of the Indian party engaged in bonafide duties within Indian territory. The authorities of the Chinese People's Republic are requested to order immediate steps for the release of the six Indian police personnel so apprehended and the complete vacation of the Indian territory by the Chinese armed detachment. They are also requested to take necessary action to prevent repetition of similar incidents in future.
Note given by the Foreign Office of China to the Counsellor of India,
6 August 1959

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to acknowledge receipt of the late Note handed over on 30th July 1959 to Counsellor Yeh Cheng-Chang of the Chinese Embassy in India by Mr. K. L. Mehta of the Ministry of External Affairs of India and states in reply as follows:

According to reports received by the Chinese Government at 1300 hours Peking time on 28th July 1959, 6 Indian armed personnel were suddenly discovered to have intruded into Chinese territory without any permission from the Chinese authorities by Chinese frontier guard patrolling on Chinese soil west of Digra and south of Pangong Tso in the western part of the Tibetan region of China. In view of friendly relations between China and India the Chinese frontier guards thereupon advised in a friendly manner the above mentioned intruding Indian armed personnel to withdraw at once from Chinese territory. But the said Indian armed personnel did not heed to the above mentioned warning of the Chinese frontier guards and persisted in armed violation of the Chinese frontier. Under these circumstances the Chinese frontier guards in order to safeguard their territory against infiltration could not but deal with these as a case of unlawful intrusion and have the Indian personnel detained and disarmed.

The Chinese Government wishes to point out solemnly that the area intruded by the above mentioned Indian armed personnel is undoubtedly Chinese territory. The Chinese frontier guards stationed and patrolling in that area have not overstepped the Sino-Indian boundary line there. In its Note however the Government of India described the above mentioned area and Spanggur and Khurnak Fort to its east both within the Chinese borders as Indian territory and asserted that Chinese armed forces had violated the Indian frontier. The Chinese Government cannot but be greatly surprised and express its regret at these assertions which are inconsistent with the facts and of course it cannot accept the protest lodged by the Government of India.

The Chinese Government must point out that the unlawful intrusion of the above mentioned Indian armed personnel into Chinese territory is in serious contravention of Sino-Indian friendship and the five principles of peaceful co-existence. Regarding this the Chinese Government cannot but lodge a protest with the Government of India and demand that it immediately takes effective measures to prevent recurrence of similar incidents.

Out of friendly considerations the Chinese Government has instructed its frontier guards to deport the above mentioned Indian
armed personnel who had unlawfully intruded into Chinese territory together with their weapons and other equipments at the original spot in the immediate future.

The Ministry of External Affairs of People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given to the Foreign Office of China by the Ambassador of India, 11 August 1959

On 7th August armed Chinese patrol strength approximately 200 committed violation of our border at Khinzemane longitude 91°46' E latitude 27°46' N. When encountered by our own patrol who requested the Chinese patrol to withdraw to their territory, our patrol was pushed back to the bridge at Drokung Samba longitude 91°47' E latitude 27°46' N. These places are admittedly within Indian territory and we have been in continuous possession of it. Traditionally as well as according to Treaty Map the boundary runs along Tntagla Ridge north of Mankha Chuthangmu valley and this position has been accepted in the past.

2. Our security forces have instructions to resist trespassers and to use minimum force necessary for this purpose if warning given by them remains unheeded. Request that if any Chinese troops are still within Indian territory, they should be immediately withdrawn as otherwise this may lead to avoidable clash.
Note given by the Embassy of India to the Foreign Office of China, 13 August 1959

The Embassy of India presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China and with reference to their note presented on the 6th August, has the honour to state as follows:

2. The Government of India are surprised by the statement in the note that the area where the Indian personnel were apprehended is part of Chinese territory. This claim is unfounded. In fact the traditional international frontier in this sector follows well defined geographical features and has been clearly depicted and openly notified in Government of India maps. For convenience of reference the boundary is described below in detail:

"Between Lanak La (34° 24' N and 79° 34' E) and Chang La (32° 2' N and 79° 22' E) in the Ladakh region of the State of Jammu and Kashmir the international boundary follows the eastern and southern watershed of the Chang Chemmo and southern watershed of Chumesang and thence the southern bank of Chumesang and the eastern bank of Changlung Lungpa. Skirting the western extremity of the eastern half of Pangong Tso (called Yaerhmu in Chinese maps) the boundary thence follows the Ang watershed and cutting across Spanggur Tso, follows the northeastern and northern watershed of the Indus".

3. When the Chinese armed personnel intruded in this area in the region of the Khurnak Fort the Government of India lodged a protest with the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi in a note presented on 2nd July 1958. The Government of India's reconnaissance parties carry strict instructions not to cross over into Chinese territory. In this case the party apprehended was about 10 miles within Indian territory.

4. The Government of India express their satisfaction at the instructions issued for the release of the Indian party. They however reiterate their protest at the arrest of the party within Indian territory. Further, they are informed that the Chinese authorities have established a camp at Spanggur which also lies well within the Indian territory. The Government of India would ask for the immediate withdrawal of this party from Indian territory and urge that steps be taken against similar violation of the international border in future. Such incidents may result in an armed clash which would be contrary to the friendly relations subsisting between the two countries and the tradition of amity which has prevailed all along this frontier.

5. The Embassy of India avails itself of this opportunity to express to the Foreign Office of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Foreign Office of China to the Counsellor of India, 27 August 1959

According to an urgent report received by the Chinese Government from frontier guards in Tibet, around 0600 hours on 25th August 1959, a group of Indian armed troops intruded into Chinese territory south of Migyiton and suddenly opened fire on Chinese frontier guards stationed at Migyiton discharging dozens of rounds of machine-gun and rifle shots. After the Chinese frontier guards fired back in self-defence the above armed troops withdrew from that area.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Government of India against the above mentioned grave provocation by the Indian troops in openly violating Chinese territory and directing unwarranted armed attack on Chinese troops. In the interest of preserving peace and tranquility in the border areas of the two countries the Chinese Government strongly demands that the Government of India immediately adopts effective measures to prevent any renewal of violation of Chinese territory and armed provocation by Indian troops otherwise the Indian side must be held responsible for all the serious consequences arising therefrom.
Note given to the Foreign Office of China by the Indian Ambassador, 28 August 1959

The Government of India have recently brought to the notice of the Chinese Government a number of instances in which Chinese troops have violated the international frontier and trespassed into Indian territory. On the 11th August the Chinese Government were informed of a violation of the border at Khinzemane and on 13th August detailed information was provided about Chinese intrusion in the Spanggur region. No replies have been received so far to these notes.

2. Another serious instance of violation of the Indian border and unlawful trespass into Indian territory by Chinese forces has just been brought to the notice of the Government of India. On the 25th August a strong Chinese detachment crossed into Indian territory south of Migyitun on the NEFA border and fired without notice on an Indian forward picket. They arrested the entire picket which was twelve strong but eight Indian personnel somehow managed to escape. Thereafter the Chinese detachment outflanked the Indian outpost at Longju and opened fire on it from a distance of about 800 yards. Their object clearly was to overpower our outpost which was well within our territory about two miles south of the international border. There could be no doubt about the international frontier in this area and this is a case of deliberate aggression on Indian territory. The Government of India take very serious notice of this latest incident which, as we have said above, is one of a number in recent weeks.

3. The Government of India strongly protest against these repeated violations of Indian territory by Chinese armed forces. Until now Government have observed discreet reticence about these incidents although there is a good deal of concern among the Indian public and in Parliament about the security arrangements on India's northern frontier. The Government of India would urge once more that the Chinese authorities should issue immediate instructions to all their frontier forces not to violate Indian territory. The Government of India have issued instructions to their frontier posts to maintain their territorial integrity and use force on the trespassers if necessary. It occurs to them that all this show of force is entirely uncalled for. If the Chinese Government have any dispute about any point on the international frontier, it should be possible to resolve the dispute by negotiations between two friendly governments rather than by the unilateral application of force by one side against the other. The Government of India strongly urge the Chinese Government to adopt this peaceful approach. It is possible that the Central Government of China is not aware of the illegal activities of their forces in the region of the international frontier. The Government of India suggest that they should issue immediate instructions to all concerned against the use of force in assertion of supposed claims.
4. The Government of India are now informed that on the 26th August Chinese forces encircled the post at Longju and opened heavy fire on it. Our personnel had therefore to abandon the post. We have no exact information as to their whereabouts. This is a very serious matter which is bound to rouse popular feelings in India. The Government of India reiterate once more their emphatic protest against the enforcement of claims by the unilateral application of force. The question of Chinese claim to Indian frontier areas as indicated in official Chinese maps was dealt with in detail by the Prime Minister in his letter of the 22nd March 1959 to the Chinese Prime Minister. The Prime Minister agreed “that the position as it was before the recent disputes arose should be respected by both sides and neither side should try to take unilateral action in exercise of what it conceives to be its right. Further, if any possession has been secured recently, the position should be rectified”. The Prime Minister has not yet received any reply to this letter. The Government of India reiterate the suggestion and urge that the Chinese troops withdraw immediately from the area at Longju which they have forcibly occupied.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Counsellor of China in India, 21 August 1958

The attention of the Government of India has been drawn to a map of China published on pages 20-21 of the "China Pictorial" magazine (No. 95—July 1958) in which the borders of China have been indicated by a thick brown line. Though this map is on a small scale, there are clear inaccuracies in it insofar as China's border with India is concerned. The border as depicted in the map includes as Chinese territory (i) four of the five Divisions of India's North East Frontier Agency; (ii) some areas in the north of the State of Uttar Pradesh; and (iii) large areas in eastern Ladakh which form part of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. It appears that the entire Tashi-gang area of Eastern Bhutan and a considerable slice of territory in north-west Bhutan have also been included as Chinese territory.

2. In the past, similar inaccurate maps have been published in China. The matter was referred to His Excellency Premier Chou En-lai by His Excellency the Prime Minister of India when the latter visited China in October 1954. His Excellency Chou En-lai had at that time replied that current Chinese maps were based on old maps and that the Government of the People's Republic of China had had no time to correct them. The Government of India recognised the force of this statement. Since, however, the present Government of the People's Republic of China has now been in office for so many years and new maps are being repeatedly printed and published in China, the Government of India would suggest that necessary corrections in the Chinese maps should not be delayed further. In this particular case, the map has been published in a magazine, which is printed in an official press and is distributed by an official agency.

3. The Government of India are, therefore, drawing the attention of the Government of the People's Republic of China again to this matter. They trust that the necessary corrections will be made soon. The northern boundary of India is clearly shown in the Political Map of India—3rd edition, 1956 (scale—one inch to seventy miles), which is freely available on sale. The Government of India will be happy to supply a copy of this map to the Government of the People's Republic of China.
Reference the memorandum of the Indian Government, dated August 21, 1958, on the rough sketch map showing "the development of railways and trunk roads in China during the First Five-Year Plan period" published in the "China Pictorial" (July issue, 1954), the Chinese Government wishes to make the following statement:

2. In the maps currently published in China, the boundary line between China and its neighbouring countries, including India, is drawn on the basis of maps published in China before the liberation. This was made clear to His Excellency Prime Minister Nehru by Prime Minister Chou En-lai, when the former visited China in October 1954. Premier Chou En-lai explained then to His Excellency Prime Minister Nehru that the reason why the boundary in Chinese maps is drawn according to old maps is that the Chinese Government has not yet undertaken a survey of China's boundary, nor consulted with the countries concerned, and that it will not make changes in the boundary on its own. The Chinese Government notes with satisfaction that the Indian Government recognises the force of Premier Chou En-lai's statement on this matter.

3. The Chinese Government believes that with the elapse of time, and after consultations with the various neighbouring countries and a survey of the border regions, a new way of drawing the boundary of China will be decided on in accordance with the results of the consultations and the survey.
Letter from the Prime Minister of India to the Prime Minister of China, 14 December 1958

NEW DELHI,
December 14, 1958.

HIS EXCELLENCY,
Mr. CHOU EN-LAI,
Prime Minister of the People's Republic of China,
Peking.

MY DEAR PRIME MINISTER,

I am writing to you after a long time. We have watched with great interest and admiration the progress made by the People's Government of China in recent years. In particular, we have been deeply interested in the remarkable advance in the yield of rice per hectare as well as in the total yield, as also in the great increase in production of pig iron and steel.

2. As we are faced with somewhat similar problems in our country in regard to rice production and steel manufacture, we would naturally like to benefit by the example of what China has done. For this purpose we decided to send two delegations to China, one consisting of farmers and agricultural specialists and the other of experts in iron and steel. Your Government was good enough to agree to this. It was pointed out however that the next season for rice sowing and cultivation would be in March-April next. We hope to send our farmers and agricultural experts then, if it suits the convenience of your Government. But we shall be sending our iron and steel experts to China fairly soon. I hope that they will learn much from the methods being now employed in China and we could then profit by their experience.

3. My purpose in troubling you with this letter, however, relates to another matter. This is in regard to the border between India and China. You will remember that when the Sino-Indian Agreement in regard to the Tibet region of China was concluded, various outstanding problems, including some relating to our border trade, were considered. A number of mountain passes were mentioned which should be used for purposes of travel between the two countries. No border questions were raised at that time and we were under the impression that there were no border disputes between our respective countries. In fact we thought that the Sino-Indian Agreement, which was happily concluded in 1954, had settled all outstanding problems between our two countries.

4. Somewhat later, my attention was drawn to some maps published in China. The maps I saw were not very accurate maps, but nevertheless the frontier as roughly drawn in these maps did not correspond with the actual frontier. In fact it ran right across the territory of India in several places. I was surprised to see this, as I
had not been aware at any time previously that there was any frontier dispute between our two countries. No mention of this had been made in the course of the Sino-Indian talks which resulted in the Agreement of 1954.

5. Subsequently, in October 1954, I had the privilege of visiting your great country and the happiness to meet you and other leaders of the Chinese People's Republic. We had long talks and it was a pleasure to me to find that we had a great deal in common in our approach and that there was no dispute or problem affecting our relations. In the course of our talks I briefly mentioned to you that I had seen some maps recently published in China which gave a wrong borderline between the two countries. I presumed that this was by some error and told you at the time that so far as India was concerned we were not much worried about the matter because our boundaries were quite clear and were not a matter of argument. You were good enough to reply to me that these maps were really reproductions of old pre-liberation maps and that you had had no time to revise them. In view of the many and heavy pre-occupations of your Government, I could understand that this revision had not taken place till then. I expressed the hope that the borderline would be corrected before long.

6. Towards the end of 1956, you did us the honour of paying a visit to India and we had the pleasure of having you in our midst for many days. Part of this time you spent in visiting various parts of India. I had occasion to be with you both in Delhi and during some of your visits, notably to our great river valley project at Bhakra-Nangal. We had long talks and discussed many international issues which were then agitating people's minds and I was happy to know what your views were about them. In the course of these talks you referred to the Sino-Burmese border. You told me about the talks you had with U Nu at Peking and your desire to settle this problem with the Burmese Government. I had received the same information from U Nu who had told me of your wish to settle this problem to the satisfaction of both countries. It was in this connection that you mentioned to me the Sino-Indian border, and more especially the so-called MacMahon Line. This MacMahon Line covered a part of the Sino-Burmese border and a large part of the Chinese border with India. I remember your telling me that you did not approve of this border being called the MacMahon Line and I replied that I did not like that name either. But for facility of reference we referred to it as such.

7. You told me then that you had accepted this MacMahon Line border with Burma and, whatever might have happened long ago, in view of the friendly relations which existed between China and India, you proposed to recognise this border with India also. You added that you would like to consult the authorities of the Tibetan region of China and you proposed to do so.

8. Immediately after our talk, I had written a minute so that we might have a record of this talk for our personal and confidential use. I am giving below a quotation from this minute:

"Premier Chou referred to the MacMahon Line and again said that he had never heard of this before though of course the
then Chinese Government had dealt with this matter and not accepted that line. He had gone into this matter in connection with the border dispute with Burma. Although he thought that this line, established by British Imperialists, was not fair, nevertheless, because it was an accomplished fact and because of the friendly relations which existed between China and the countries concerned, namely, India and Burma, the Chinese Government were of the opinion that they should give recognition to this MacMahon Line. They had, however, not consulted the Tibetan authorities about it yet. They proposed to do so."

9. I remember discussing this matter with you at some considerable length. You were good enough to make this point quite clear. I then mentioned that there were no disputes between us about our frontier, but there were certain very minor border problems which were pending settlement. We decided that these petty issues should be settled amicably by representatives of the two Governments meeting together on the basis of established practice and custom as well as water sheds. There was long delay in this meeting taking place, but ultimately a representative of the Chinese Government came to Delhi and discussed one of these petty issues for some time. Unfortunately no settlement about this matter was arrived at then and it was decided to continue the talks later. I was sorry that these talks had not resulted in a satisfactory agreement so far. The issue is a minor one and I wanted to remove by friendly settlement all matters that affected our two Governments and countries. I had thought then of writing to you on this subject, but I decided not to trouble you over such a petty matter.

10. A few months ago, our attention was drawn again to a map of China published in the magazine "China Pictorial", which indicated the border with India. This map was also not very clearly defined. But even the rough borderline appeared to us to be wrongly placed. This borderline went right across Indian territory. A large part of our North-East Frontier Agency as well as some other parts which are and have long been well recognised as parts of India and been administered by India in the same way as other parts of our country, were shown to be part of Chinese territory. A considerable region of our neighbour country, Bhutan, in the north-east was also shown as being on the Chinese side. A part of the North-East Frontier Agency which was clearly on the Indian side of what has been known as the MacMahon Line, was shown in this map as part of Chinese territory.

11. The magazine containing this map was widely distributed and questions were asked in our Parliament about this. I gave answers to the effect that these maps were merely reproductions of old ones and did not represent the actual facts of the situation.

12. We drew your Government's attention to this map some time ago this year. In a memorandum in reply to us, it has been stated by your Government that in the maps currently published in China, the boundary line between China and neighbouring countries including India, is drawn on the basis of maps published before the liberation. It has further been stated that the Chinese Government
has not yet undertaken a survey of the Chinese boundary nor consulted with the countries concerned, and that it will not make changes in the boundary on its own.

13. I was puzzled by this reply because I thought that there was no major boundary dispute between China and India. There never has been such a dispute so far as we are concerned and in my talks with you in 1954 and subsequently, I had stated this. I could understand four years ago that the Chinese Government, being busy with major matters of national reconstruction, could not find time to revise old maps. But you will appreciate that nine years after the Chinese People’s Republic came into power, the continued issue of these incorrect maps is embarrassing to us as to others. There can be no question of these large parts of India being anything but India and there is no dispute about them. I do not know what kind of surveys can affect these well-known and fixed boundaries. I am sure that you will appreciate our difficulties in this matter.

14. I am venturing to write to you on this subject as I feel that any possibility of grave misunderstanding between our countries should be removed as soon as possible. I am anxious, as I am sure you are, that the firm basis of our friendship should not only be maintained but should be strengthened.

May I send you my warm regards and every good wish for the New Year.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) JAWAHARLAL NEHRU
Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

I have received your letter dated December 14, 1958, forwarded by Mr. Ambassador Parthasarathi.

Thank you for the credit you gave the achievements of our country in economic construction. It is true that, through the joint efforts of the entire Chinese people, our country made in industrial and agricultural production in 1958 an advance which we describe as a "great leap forward". However, as we started from a very poor economic foundation, our present level of development in production is still very low. It will take us a number of years more of hard work in order to bring about a relatively big change in the economic picture of our country.

Our government heartily welcomes the sending by the Indian Government of two delegations to study our agriculture and iron and steel industry respectively. And as I understand, another delegation has already arrived in China to study our water conservancy and irrigation work. We welcome them to our country and will be glad to provide them with every possible convenience. We also hope to learn from them Indian experience in the respective fields. The exchange of such specialized delegations and the interflow of experience will undoubtedly be helpful to the economic construction of our countries. We too have always taken a great interest in the progress of India's second five-year plan, and wish it success.

We note with pleasure that, in the past year, friendly cooperation between China and India has undergone further development. I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the Chinese Government, to express thanks to the Indian Government for its efforts at the 13th session of the United Nations General Assembly for restoring to China its rightful place in the United Nations. We are also grateful to the Indian Government for its support to our country on the question of Taiwan and the coastal islands.

In your letter you have taken much space to discuss the question of Sino-Indian boundary and thus enabled us to understand better the Indian Government's stand on the question. I would also like now to set forth the views and stand of the Chinese Government.

First of all, I wish to point out that the Sino-Indian boundary has never been formally delimited. Historically no treaty or agreement on the Sino-Indian boundary has ever been concluded between
the Chinese central government and the Indian Government. So far as the actual situation is concerned, there are certain differences between the two sides over the border question. In the past few years, questions as to which side certain areas on the Sino-Indian border belong were on more than one occasion taken up between the Chinese and the Indian sides through diplomatic channels. The latest case concerns an area in the southern part of China's Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region, which has always been under Chinese jurisdiction. Patrol duties have continually been carried out in that area by the border guards of the Chinese Government. And the Sinkiang-Tibet highway built by our country in 1956 runs through that area. Yet recently the Indian Government claimed that that area was Indian territory. All this shows that border disputes do exist between China and India.

It was true that the border question was not raised in 1954 when negotiations were being held between the Chinese and Indian sides for the Agreement on Trade and Intercourse between the Tibet Region of China and India. This was because conditions were not yet ripe for its settlement and the Chinese side, on its part, had had no time to study the question. The Chinese Government has always held that the existence of the border question absolutely should not affect the development of Sino-Indian friendly relations. We believe that, following proper preparations, this question which has been carried over from the past can certainly be settled reasonably on the basis of the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence through friendly talks. To this end, the Chinese Government has now proceeded to take certain steps in making preparations.

An important question concerning the Sino-Indian boundary is the question of the so-called MacMahon Line. I discussed this with Your Excellency as well as with Prime Minister U Nu. I would now like to explain again the Chinese Government's attitude. As you are aware, the "MacMahon Line" was a product of the British policy of aggression against the Tibet Region of China and aroused the great indignation of the Chinese people. Juridically, too, it cannot be considered legal. I have told you that it has never been recognized by the Chinese central government. Although related documents were signed by a representative of the local authorities of the Tibet Region of China, the Tibet local authorities were in fact dissatisfied with this unilaterally drawn line. And I have also told you formally about their dissatisfaction. On the other hand, one cannot, of course, fail to take cognizance of the great and encouraging changes: India and Burma, which are concerned in this line, have attained independence successively and become states friendly with China. In view of the various complex factors mentioned above, the Chinese Government, on the one hand finds it necessary to take a more or less realistic attitude towards the MacMahon Line and, on the other hand, cannot but act with prudence and needs time to deal with this matter. All this I have mentioned to you on more than one occasion. However, we believe that, on account of the friendly relations between China and India, a friendly settlement can eventually be found for this section of the boundary line.

Precisely because the boundary between the two countries is not yet formally delimited and some differences exist, it is unavoidable
that there should be discrepancies between the boundary lines drawn on the respective maps of the two sides. On the maps currently published in our country, the Chinese boundaries are drawn in the way consistently followed in Chinese maps for the past several decades, if not longer. We do not hold that every portion of this boundary line is drawn on sufficient grounds. But it would be inappropriate for us to make changes without having made surveys and without having consulted the countries concerned. Furthermore, there would be difficulties in making such changes, because they would give rise to confusion among our people and bring censure on our government. As a matter of fact, our people have also expressed surprise at the way the Sino-Indian boundary, particularly its western section, is drawn on maps published in India. They have asked our government to take up this matter with the Indian Government. Yet we have not done so, but have explained to them the actual situation of the Sino-Indian boundary. With the settlement of the boundary question—which, as our government has repeatedly pointed out, requires surveys and mutual consultations—the problem of drawing the boundary on the maps will also be solved.

In recent years, there occurred between China and India some minor border incidents which are probably difficult to avoid pending the formal delimitation of the boundary. In order to avoid such incidents so far as possible before the boundary is formally delimited, our government would like to propose to the Indian Government that, as a provisional measure, the two sides temporarily maintain the status quo, that is to say, each side keep for the time being to the border areas at present under its jurisdiction and not go beyond them. For the differences between the two sides, naturally, a solution may be sought through consultations like those held on the Wu-Je (Hoti) question. As to the negotiations regarding Wu-Je, we also regret very much that no agreement has yet been reached, as we formerly thought a solution would not be difficult to achieve through negotiations and on-the-spot investigations. We still believe that this small question can be settled satisfactorily through the continued efforts of our two sides. The Chinese Government hopes that the above proposal about temporary maintenance of the present state of the boundary between the two sides will be approved of by the Indian Government.

I need not reiterate how highly the Chinese Government and people value Sino-Indian friendship. We will never allow any difference between our two countries to affect this friendship, and we believe that India shares the same views. I hope that this letter will help you get a better understanding of our government’s stand on the Sino-Indian boundary question.

With sincere regards,

(Sd.) CHOU EN-LAI,
Premier of the State Council of the People’s Republic of China.
NEW DELHI,
22nd March, 1959.

DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER,

Many thanks for your letter of the 23rd January which I have read with the care and attention which it deserves.

2. I am grateful to you for the facilities which your Government accorded to our small delegation which visited China to study your water conservancy methods and programme. Two more delegations—one to study methods for improving agricultural yield and the other to study your iron and steel programme—will shortly be reaching China. I have no doubt that they will benefit from this opportunity of studying the remarkable progress which your country has achieved in these fields.

3. We were glad to receive Mr. Chang Han Fu in India and I do hope that his brief visit was enjoyable and enabled him to see something of our own efforts to develop our national resources. I entirely agree with you that such exchange of visits on both sides can be of great help in resolving the somewhat similar problems which face our respective countries in their endeavour to quicken the rate of our economic progress.

4. On receipt of your letter I have again examined the basis of the determination of the frontier between India and the Tibet Region of China. It is true that this frontier has not been demarcated on the ground in all the sectors but I am somewhat surprised to know that this frontier was not accepted at any time by the Government of China. The traditional frontier, as you may be aware, follows the geographical principle of watershed on the crest of the High Himalayan Range, but apart from this, in most parts, it has the sanction of specific international agreements between the then Governments of India and the Central Government of China. It may perhaps be useful if I draw your attention to some of these agreements:

(i) Sikkim.—The boundary of Sikkim, a protectorate of India, with the Tibet Region of China was defined in the Anglo-Chinese Convention 1890 and jointly demarcated on the ground in 1895.

this boundary was sufficiently and distinctly fixed. The area now claimed by China has always been depicted as part of India on official maps, has been surveyed by Indian officials and even a Chinese map of 1893 shows it as Indian territory.

(iii) The MacMahon Line.—As you are aware, the so-called MacMahon Line runs eastwards from the eastern borders of Bhutan and defines the boundary of China on the one hand and India and Burma on the other. Contrary to what has been reported to you, this line was, in fact, drawn at a Tripartite Conference held at Simla in 1913-1914 between the Plenipotentiaries of the Governments of China, Tibet and India. At the time of acceptance of the delineation of this frontier, Lünchen Shatra, the Tibetan Plenipotentiary, in letters exchanged, stated explicitly that he had received orders from Lhasa to agree to the boundary as marked on the map appended to the Convention. The line was drawn after full discussion and was confirmed subsequently by a formal exchange of letters; and there is nothing to indicate that the Tibetan authorities were in any way dissatisfied with the agreed boundary. Morever, although the Chinese Plenipotentiary at the Conference objected to the boundaries between Inner and Outer Tibet and between Tibet and China, there is no mention of any Chinese reservation in respect of the India-Tibet frontier either during the discussions or at the time of their initialling the Convention. This line has the incidental advantage of running along the crest of the High Himalayan Range which forms the natural dividing line between the Tibetan plateau in the north and the sub-montane region in the south. In our previous discussions and particularly during your visit to India in January 1957, we were gratified to note that you were prepared to accept this line as representing the frontier between China and India in this region and I hope that we shall reach an understanding on this basis.

5. Thus, in these three different sectors covering much the larger part of our boundary with China, there is sufficient authority based on geography, tradition as well as treaties for the boundary as shown in our published maps. The remaining sector from the tri-junction of the Nepal, India and Tibet boundary up to Ladakh is also traditional and follows well-defined geographical features. Here, too, the boundary runs along well-defined watersheds between the river systems in the south and the west on the one hand and north and east on the other. This delineation is confirmed by old revenue records and maps and by the exercise of Indian administrative authority up to the boundary line for decades.

6. As regards Barahoti (which you call Wu-Je), I agree with you that its rightful ownership should be settled by negotiation. During the talks held last year, we provided extensive documentary proofs that this area has been under Indian jurisdiction and lies well within our frontiers. An on-the-spot investigation could hardly throw any
useful light until proofs to the contrary could be adduced. Neverthe-
less, we were agreeable to both sides agreeing not to send their civil
and military officials to the area. Unfortunately, your delegation did
not agree to our suggestion. I learn that a material change in the
situation has since been effected by the despatch of Chinese civil and
military detachments, equipped with arms, to camp in the area, after
our own civil party had withdrawn at the beginning of last winter. If
the reports that we have received about an armed Chinese party
camping and erecting permanent structures in Hoti during winter are
correct, it would seem that unilateral action, not in accordance with
custom, was being taken in assertion of your claim to the disputed
area.

7. I do hope that a study of the foregoing paragraphs will con-
vince you that not only is the delineation of our frontier, as published
in our maps, based on natural and geographical features but that it
also coincides with tradition and over a large part is confirmed by
international agreements. I need hardly add that independent India
would be the last country to make any encroachments beyond its
well-established frontiers. It was in the confidence that the general
question of our common frontier was settled to the satisfaction of
both sides that I declared publicly and in Parliament on several
occasions that there is no room for doubt about our frontiers as shown
in the published maps. We thought that our position was clearly
understood and accepted by your Government. However, as unfor-
tunately there is some difference of views between our two Govern-
ments in regard to the delineation of the frontier at some places, I
agree that the position as it was before the recent disputes arose
should be respected by both sides and that neither side should try to
take unilateral action in exercise of what it conceives to be its right.
Further, if any possession has been secured recently, the position
should be rectified.

8. You will appreciate that the continuing publication of Chinese
maps showing considerable parts of Indian and Bhutanese territory as
if they were in China is not in accordance with long established
usage as well as treaties, and is a matter of great concern to us. As
I said in my previous letter, we greatly value our friendship with
China. Our two countries evolved the principles of Panch Sheel
which has now found widespread acceptance among the other coun-
tries in the world. It would be most unfortunate if these frontier
questions should now affect the friendly relations existing between
our countries. I hope therefore that an early understanding in this
matter will be reached.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) JAWAHARLAL NEHRU.
Note Verbale handed by the Ministry of External Affairs to the First Secretary of the Chinese Embassy in India on 17 December 1958.

The Government of India have received a number of reports of flights of foreign aircraft over Indian territory during October and November 1958. The details of these flights are given in the attached statement. As the planes in question were flying at a great height, it was not possible to establish their definite identity, but the direction of the flights clearly indicated that they were Chinese aircraft coming from the Tibet region of China.

2. In view of the friendly relations between India and China and the mutual dedication to the principles of Panch Sheel, the Government of India cannot but believe that such violations of the air space over India must be accidental.

3. The Government of India, however, earnestly hope that the Government of the People's Republic of China will take early steps to ensure that such violations do not recur in future.

**Statement of unauthorised flight of Chinese Aircraft over Indian Territories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time of flight</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Direction of flight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29-10-58</td>
<td>10-30 a.m. to</td>
<td>Spiti Valley (Punjab)</td>
<td>Came from Western Tibet side and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-45 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Himachal Pradesh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>returned towards Gartok (W. Tibet).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-10-58</td>
<td>11-30 a.m.</td>
<td>Chini (Himachal Pradesh).</td>
<td>North and North East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-10-58</td>
<td>12-00 noon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-10-58</td>
<td>09-00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-11-58</td>
<td>09-30 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New Delhi,*

*16 December 1958.*
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Note of the Chinese Government given to the Counsellor of India, 12 January 1959.

The Government of the People's Republic of China has received the note verbale handed over by the Ministry of External Affairs of India to the Chinese Embassy in India on December 16, 1958. The Indian Government stated in the note verbale that flights of foreign aircraft over Indian territory occurred during October and November 1958, that it did not know the nationality of those aircraft but that it was of the opinion that they were Chinese aircraft coming from the Tibet Region of China judging from the direction of the flights.

Investigations have been carried out by the Chinese Government on the basis of the data regarding time and place provided by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs in the annex to its note verbale, and it has been established that no flights of Chinese aircraft over Indian territory ever occurred at the specified times and places. As a matter of fact, no flight of Chinese aircraft took place over the western border area of the Tibet Region of China at the said times. The Chinese Government is devoted unswervingly to the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence and has on this basis made untiring efforts for the promotion of friendly relations between China and India. The Indian Government may rest assured that the Chinese Government definitely would not permit its aircraft to fly into the air space of its friendly neighbours without the consent of the government concerned.

At the same time, the Chinese Government would like to inform the Indian Government of the following facts: During 1958, particularly during October and November 1958, the Chinese Government repeatedly received reports to the effect that foreign aircraft intruding into Chinese air space were observed at Gargunsa, Gartok, Gyanima and other places in the western part of the Tibet Region of China. Some of these aircraft flew from the direction of India while others flew towards India. Foreign aircraft intruding into Chinese air space were also discovered in other parts of the Tibet Region of China, in the area of Yatung, Phari and Gyantse and in the vicinity of Chayul. The Chinese border troops were not able to identify the nationality of these planes; however, considering the direction of their flights and the fact that the places where they appeared are close to India, the Chinese Government, in the spirit of friendship and cooperation between China and India, would like to draw the attention of the Indian Government to the above-mentioned circumstances. If these are Indian planes, it is hoped that the Indian Government would take necessary measures to prevent recurrence of such incidents. If these are not Indian planes, it is also hoped that these incidents would arouse the common vigilance of the Indian Government as well as the Chinese Government.
Note given by the Foreign Office of China to the Counsellor of India, 10 July 1958.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of the Republic of India in China and has the honour to state as follows regarding the exigency of the stepped up subversive and disruptive activities against China's Tibetan region carried out by the U.S. and the Chiang Kai-Shek clique in collusion with fugitive reactionaries from Tibet using India's Kalimpong as a base.

Since the peaceful liberation of the Tibetan region of China, reactionaries who have fled from Tibet to the Kalimpong area have been carrying on subversive and disruptive activities against China's Tibetan region under the instigation and direction of the U.S. and the Chiang Kai-Shek clique and in collusion with local reactionaries in Kalimpong. On visit in India at the end of 1956 Premier Chou En-Lai called the attention of the Government of India and His Excellency the Prime Minister Nehru to this question. His Excellency the Prime Minister Nehru indicated at the time that if the Chinese Government could produce evidence in this regard, the Government of India would take action. Later, on 12th January 1958 Premier Chou En-Lai referred again to this question in an interview with Ambassador R. K. Nehru. On 22nd January 1958 the Ministry of Foreign Affairs delivered to the Indian Embassy in China samples of a reactionary propaganda leaflet sent to Tibet from Kalimpong, which it had collected.

According to reliable material available to the Chinese Government the American Chiang Kai-Shek clique and local special agents and Tibetan reactionaries operating in Kalimpong have recently stepped up their conspiratorial and disruptive activities against the Tibet region of China. Using Kalimpong as a base they are actively inciting and organising a handful of reactionaries hidden in Tibet for an armed revolt there in order to attain the traitorous aim of separating the Tibet region from the People's Republic of China. The Chinese Government would like hereby to convey to the Government of India certain information concerning the activities of the above said special agents and reactionaries in Kalimpong as follows:

(1) Chief among Tibetan reactionary elements who have fled China are Gyalodenju, Shakapa, Losangjanzan, Thubten Nobo, Alohrze and Lukaniona. In collusion with American-Chiang Kai-Shek clique and local special agents in Kalimpong they frequently hold meetings in Kalimpong and other Indian cities to plan disruptive activities against Tibet. Gyalodenju has been to the U.S. in 1951. At the instance of the U.S. Thubten Nobo made a special trip from the U.S. to India in the winter of 1956 to take part in the conspiratorial moves of the other Tibetan reactionaries.
(2) Under the manipulation of Gyalodenju and others, various reactionary organisations have been set up in Kalimpong under such names as "Tibetan Freedom League", "Kalimpong Tibetan Welfare Conference" and "Buddhist Association". These organisations are used for collecting intelligence from Tibet carrying out reactionary propaganda against Tibet and expanding the reactionary forces, etc.

(3) There is openly published in Kalimpong the "Tibetan Mirror" a reactionary newspaper hostile to the Chinese Government and people. The Tibetan reactionaries and the organisations under their control also printed various reactionary leaflets and other propaganda material and smuggled them into Tibet. Such newspapers and propaganda material spread vicious rumours and slanders against the Chinese Government, the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese People's Liberation Army and fabricated all sorts of lies, moreover attempted to sow discord between the Han and the Tibetan nationalities of China, between the Chinese Central Government and the Tibetan local authorities as well as between Dalai Lama and Pan-chan Lama. Some of the propaganda material even openly called on the Tibetan people to rise up against the Chinese Government and advocated the separation of Tibet from China. Gyalodenju, Shakapa Losangjanzan and others wrote to the Lamas of the three big monasteries in Tibet to entice them to participate in their subversive activities.

(4) Taking advantage of the fact Kalimpong is situated near Tibet and that few formalities are required for travel across the India-China's Tibet region border, the Tibetan reactionaries and Americans, Chiang Kai-Shek clique and local special agents in Kalimpong have continuously dispatched agents and saboteurs to Tibet to contact the hidden reactionaries there. They smuggle weapons and ammunition into Tibet in preparation for armed revolt.

(5) The Chiang Kai-Shek clique has special agents and organisations in Kalimpong. Among the leading agents is one called Yeh Cheng-Yung. They also use Kalimpong as a base to collect intelligence from Tibet, smuggle arms and despatch agents into Tibet and incite riots in Tibet. They maintain a close contact with the Tibetan reactionaries in Kalimpong and provide Gyalodenju with important maps of Tibet for military use.

The conspiratorial and disruptive activities against the People's Republic of China carried out by the above-said Americans, Chiang Kai-Shek clique and local special agents and Tibetan reactionaries in Kalimpong cannot but enrage the Chinese Government and people and put them on the alert. The Chinese Government regards the criminal activities of the above-said reactionaries and special agents as a direct threat to China's territorial integrity and sovereignty and yet another malicious scheme of United States imperialists to create tension in Asia and Africa. It cannot be overlooked that in using
Indian territory adjacent to China to perpetrate disruptive activities against the People's Republic of China, the American and Chiang Kai-Shek clique special agents have also the hideous object of damaging China-India friendship. In order to shatter the underhand schemes of United States imperialists, defend China's territorial integrity and sovereignty and safeguard China-India friendship, the Chinese Government hereby requests the Government of India to repress the subversive and disruptive activities against China's Tibetan region carried out in Kalimpong by American and Chiang Kai-Shek clique special agents, Tibetan reactionaries and local special agents. China and India are co-initiators of the five principles of peaceful co-existence, to uphold and propagate which the Government of India has made unremitting efforts. The Chinese Government is confident that the Government of India, pursuing a consistent policy of defending peace and opposing aggression, will accept its request and take effective measures.
Note sent by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Embassy of China in India, 2 August 1958.

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and, with reference to the Note handed over on July 10, 1958, by His Excellency Lo Kwe Po, Vice-Minister of the People's Republic of China, to Shri K. M. Kannampilly, Charge d'Affaires of the Embassy of India at Peking, has the honour to state as follows:

2. As the Government of the People's Republic of China are aware, the Government of India attach the highest importance to friendly relations between India and China. This friendship is traditional and was emphatically reaffirmed in the agreement which was entered upon by the two Governments in 1954. This agreement enunciated the famous five principles which the Government of India faithfully follow in their relationships with China as with all other countries. The Government of India recognise that the Tibetan region is part of the People's Republic of China.

3. The Government of India were therefore greatly surprised by the note which the Government of the People's Republic of China handed over to the Indian Charge d'Affaires at Peking on July 10. They regret to say that the statements contained in this note must have been based on a complete misunderstanding of facts. The Government of India have no evidence that the US Government and the Kuomintang regime are using Kalimpong as a base for disruptive activities against China's Tibetan region. The Government of India will never permit any portion of its territory to be used as a base of activities against any foreign Government, not to speak of the friendly Government of the People's Republic of China.

4. As the Government of the People's Republic of China must be aware, from time immemorial, there has been inter-communication between India and the Tibet region of China through passes on the northern frontier of India. In fact, for centuries the only feasible outlet for that region was through India. Movement of people between India and Tibet was free and easy. Most of the people living in the Tibet region of China (hereafter referred to as Tibetans) who enter India come here either as traders or pilgrims. This fact was recognized in the 1954 agreement between India and the People's Republic of China. Many Tibetans have been settled in north east India for years. The Government of India have made it clear to all Tibetans that they will be permitted to stay in India only if they carry on their vocations peacefully.

5. The Government of the People's Republic of China have mentioned six persons by name in their note as among those who are carrying on anti-Chinese activities on Indian territory. Some of these persons have already been warned that if their activities,
political or other, are such as to have adverse effect on the relations between India and China, the Government of India will take the severest action against them. The Government of India have no definite evidence that these persons have been indulging in unfriendly activities. Even so, the Government of India propose to warn them again.

6. In their note, the Government of the People's Republic of China state that various reactionary organisations have been set up in Kalimpong under different names. Enquiries made by the Government of India reveal that no organisations or associations with the names mentioned in the note are functioning in Kalimpong. So far as the Government of India are aware there are two associations in Kalimpong of people who formerly lived in the Tibet Region of China namely, the Tibetan Association and the Indian Tibetan Association. The first named association has been in existence for about 25 years, the second was formed in September 1954. The aims and objects of both these associations are religious, cultural and social, such as promoting study of Buddhism or rendering medical aid to Tibetans, arranging their funeral rites etc. The Government of India are not aware that these two associations have been indulging in any undesirable activities such as those mentioned in the Chinese Government's note.

7. The Government of the People's Republic of China refer to a newspaper named the 'Tibetan Mirror'. There is no daily or weekly newspaper of that name published in Kalimpong. A monthly periodical called the 'Tibetan Mirror' is published there. The editor of this newspaper is not a Chinese but an Indian national. The Government of India have noted with displeasure that some of the articles published in this periodical are objectionable and calculated to affect the friendly relations between India and China. The law in India is, however, such that it is not easy to take executive or legal action against newspapers and periodicals of this character. There are other newspapers in India which severely criticise other friendly Governments. In fact, strong criticisms are voiced by some newspapers against the Government of India themselves. However, the Government of India are most anxious that an unimportant magazine like the 'Tibetan Mirror' should not adversely affect the relations between our two friendly countries and are directing their local officers to administer a severe warning to this periodical. If it continues to create mischief, the Government of India will take whatever other action is feasible.

8. The Government of the People's Republic of China have stated in their note that taking advantage of the liberal travel regulations across the border of India and the Tibet region of China near Kalimpong, weapons and ammunition have been smuggled into Tibet by Tibetan reactionaries, the Americans and followers of the Kuomintang regime. Both the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of India have got Customs Posts and Check Posts on this border. Officers of the Posts under the Government of India have got strict instructions to be particularly vigilant regarding the possible smuggling of articles like arms and ammunition which are contraband according to Indian law. No case of
such smuggling of arms and ammunition has been detected by these Indian Check Posts in the locality.

9. The Government of the People's Republic of China have, in their note, referred to the photostat copy of a leaflet in Tibetan language handed over by them to the Indian Embassy at Peking. Though this leaflet was handed over on the 22nd January, 1958, the date of its publication given at the bottom is 17 December, 1956. This was the time when all manner of people from Tibet came to India in connection with Buddha Jayanti celebrations and the visit of His Holiness the Dalai Lama. At about this time the Prime Minister of India discussed the entire situation in the Tibet region of China and other relevant matters with His Excellency Premier Chou En-Lai. The Government of India did not, therefore, attach any great importance to the circulation of this particular leaflet in December, 1956. It is mentioned at the bottom of this leaflet that it was issued by the "Tibetan Welfare Association". It has already been stated earlier in this note that, according to Government of India's information, no association with this name is functioning in Kalimpong.

10. The Government of the People's Republic of China have stated that there are special agents of the Kuomintang regime in Kalimpong. Their note, however, mentions only one name, namely, Yeh Cheng-Yung. The Government of India have not been able to trace any such individual in Kalimpong and a preliminary examination of their records shows that no visa to enter India has been issued to any individual of that name. Even so, the Government of India are pursuing their enquiries and will communicate the results later to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China at New Delhi.

11. The Government of India reiterate their friendship for the people and the Government of the People's Republic of China. They have no doubt that the Chinese Government's note is based on misinformation and express the hope that, in the light of the facts now mentioned, the Government of the People's Republic of China will feel assured that India does not and will not permit any activities on its territory directed against the People's Republic of China and that the Government of India are determined to take action under the law of the country against those who indulge in any such illegal activities.

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India takes this opportunity of renewing to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Statement made by the Chinese Ambassador to the Foreign Secretary, 3 August 1958

Tibetan reactionary elements have recently set up in Kalimpong an organisation named "Committee for giving support to resistance against violence". The organisation is now engaged in a signature movement. At the end of July nearly all the Tibetan aristocrats in Kalimpong, rebels from Schedchuan and Sikang provinces, the Lamas and nearly all the members of the Tibetan Association and the Indian Tibetan Association put their signatures on a petition. Some of the signatories were compelled to give their signatures.

On the 29th July, fifteen aristocrats and rebels from Tibet held a meeting. The following are the names of some of the persons who were present:

1. Khan Chung Sagapa.
3. Sokhang Khen Chung.
5. Chiang Pa Tsin Liang.

They passed a resolution at that meeting a favour of sending an appeal to various countries in the world. The meeting decided to send out the appeal on the 18th June according to the Tibetan Calendar, which corresponds to 3rd August, i.e., today. It is stated that after the appeal has been sent, a demonstration will be organised. The main contents of the appeal are a request to the various countries to give assistance and support to the independence of Tibet. In the appeals there would be slanders against China and against the People's Liberation Army.
Statement by the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of China to the Indian Ambassador, 22 March 1959

We have received a report from our Foreign Affairs Bureau in Lhasa that they were going to meet the Indian Consul General in Lhasa and convey to him following three points:—

1. The local Government in Tibet under instigation and support of the imperialists and foreign reactionary elements have torn up the agreement on the peaceful liberation of Tibet and begun armed revolt by attacking Government offices of the Central Government and the functionaries thereof and the Central Government troops. The Central Government of our country never permit such high treason of the local Government of Tibet and we are certain to put down this revolt. This is entirely an internal affair of China and we shall never permit interference from outside. Tibet is an integral part of China's territory and any intrigue aimed at splitting Tibet away from China is doomed to total failure.

2. We are willing to give protection to the functionaries of the Indian Consulate General at Lhasa and we hope that they will move into and live in the houses which we shall assign to them.

3. It is hoped that the Consul General of India in Lhasa will inform all Indian nationals in various parts of Tibet to abide by the Chinese laws and, as far as possible, to stay indoors where the revolt is taking place so that no accident may occur. Wherever we have our troops stationed we shall do our best to give protection to Indian nationals. It will be better for Indian nationals to move away from those centres where there are no Central Government troops.
Statement made by Foreign Secretary to the Chinese Ambassador,
26 April 1959

On the 3rd April the Foreign Secretary informed His Excellency the Ambassador that the Dalai Lama with a small party had entered Indian territory on the 31st March. The Dalai Lama had earlier sent a message to the Government of India asking for political asylum in India. The Government of India had, in accordance with international usage, allowed the Dalai Lama and his party to cross into Indian territory and stay in India. The Dalai Lama has since moved with his entourage to Mussoorie where necessary arrangements have been made by the Government of India for his residence.

2. During the last few days a considerable number of other Tibetans have also crossed into Indian territory and sought refuge here. The Government of India have issued strict instructions to disarm such of these persons as are armed.

3. When news was first received of Dalai Lama's entry into India, the Government of India considered it necessary to send a senior officer of the Ministry of External Affairs to the NEFA to meet him and take charge of all arrangements connected with his travel. This officer had the advantage of knowing the Dalai Lama personally, having served as Indian Consul General in Lhasa some years ago. Certain security precautions had to be taken. It was also essential to prevent the Dalai Lama from being troubled by a large number of press correspondents and other elements until after he had some rest and overcome the effects of the physical and mental strain which he had recently undergone. The Dalai Lama reached Mussoorie on April 21.

4. The Government of India have now seen recent reports of speeches delivered in the current session of the National People's Congress in Peking. They have read these reports with regret as they contain unbecoming and unjustified attacks on the Government of India and their officials and certain allegations which are patently untrue. Thus, it is stated that the Dalai Lama continues to be under duress and that the statements made by him are imposed on him by foreigners. Reference has also been made to so-called "Indian reactionaries" who are supposed to be "working in the footsteps of the British imperialists and have been harbouring expansionist ambitions towards Tibet". The Government of India are distressed to see these reports and to notice that a furious and unworthy campaign has been started in the press and the radio in Peking, the effect of which can only be to do incalculable damage to the friendly relations between India and China. The Government of India would like to state categorically that the statements
made by the Dalai Lama are entirely his own and no official of theirs was in any way responsible for them. The Dalai Lama was allowed to enter India at his own request; he is acting entirely on his own and is free to return to his country any time he wishes to do so. If the Chinese Government want to satisfy themselves on this point, they are welcome to send their Ambassador in India or any other emissary to meet the Dalai Lama and necessary facilities will be given to the emissary to discuss with him and ascertain his wishes.

5. The Prime Minister met the Dalai Lama at Mussoorie on the 24 April and had a long talk with him. No member of the Dalai Lama's party was present at this interview. The Dalai Lama assured the Prime Minister that he left Lhasa of his own free will. It appeared to the Prime Minister that the Dalai Lama is still suffering from the after-effects of the great physical and mental strain which he had undergone and has not yet had time to think of his future course of action.

6. It is well-known that India has had long standing religious and cultural contacts with the people of Tibet and the people of India are interested in developments there. India has had and has no desire to interfere in internal happenings in Tibet. Because of old contacts, recent tragic events in Tibet have affected the people of India considerably, but it has been made clear by the Prime Minister that there is no question of any interference in the internal affairs of Tibet. As the Government of the People's Republic of China are no doubt aware, there is by law and Constitution complete freedom of expression of opinion in Parliament and the press and elsewhere in India. Opinions are often expressed in severe criticism of the Government of India's policies, as well as other opinions with which the Government are not in agreement.

7. The Prime Minister has declared in Parliament that the Dalai Lama will be accorded respectful treatment in India, but he is not expected to carry on any political activities from this country. The Government of India consider it most unfortunate that the fact of their having given asylum to the Dalai Lama, in exercise of their sovereignty and in accordance with well-known international usage, should have led responsible persons in China to make serious allegations which are unbecoming and entirely void of substance.
The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of the Republic of India, and hereby lodges the following serious protest with the Ministry regarding the occurrence in Bombay of Indians insulting the head of state of the People's Republic of China:

At about 4:40 on the afternoon of the 20th April, 1959, in Bombay there were about 80 Indians claiming themselves to be members of the Socialist Party, came to the Consulate General of the People's Republic of China at Bombay, demonstrated and shouted slogans in front of the Consulate-General and some of them made speeches. They branded China's putting down of the rebellion in her own territory, the Tibet Region, as imperialist action and made all sorts of slanders. What is more serious is that they pasted up a portrait of Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the People's Republic of China, on the wall of the Chinese Consulate-General and carried out wanton insult by throwing tomatoes and rotten eggs at it. While these ruffians were insulting the portrait, the Indian policemen stood by without interfering with them, and pulled off the encircling spectators for the correspondents to take photographs of it. After the ruffians had left, the police officer once again allowed people to take photographs of the portrait and then tore it down and took it away.

Such an act of pasting up the portrait of the Chairman of the People's Republic of China on the wall of the Chinese Consulate-General and throwing tomatoes and rotten eggs at it is a huge insult to the head of state of the People's Republic of China and the respected and beloved leader of the Chinese people. And while the ruffians were insulting the portrait, the policemen of the Bombay local authorities not only did not interfere but pulled off the encircling spectators for correspondents to take photographs of it. After the ruffians had left, the police officer once again allowed people to take photographs of the portrait and then tore it down and took it away. It is evidently an act of connivance. For this the Chinese Government cannot but express its indignation and hereby lodges a serious protest. The Chinese Government requests that the Government of India speedily deals with the matter of insult to the head of state of the People's Republic of China and makes a speedy reply. Such a matter of huge insult to the head of state of the People's Republic of China is what the masses of the six hundred and fifty million Chinese people absolutely cannot tolerate, and it must be reasonably settled, otherwise the Chinese people cannot come to a stop with regard to the matter. In case the reply from the Indian Government is not satisfactory, the Embassy is instructed to make it clear that the Chinese Government will again raise this matter to the Indian Government, and the Chinese side will never come to a stop if without a satisfactory settlement of the matter, that is to say, never stop even for one hundred years.
Note of the Government of India, 30 April 1959

The Embassy of India, Peking, present their compliments to the Foreign Office of the Government of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the note No. M/129/59 presented to the Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India on April 27 by the Chinese Embassy, New Delhi, have the honour to state that investigations have been made into the facts relating to the incident referred to in the note. These facts, which are not wholly as stated in the note of the Embassy, are given below.

2. On the 20th April 1959, a demonstration was organised by the Socialist Party, Bombay Branch. About 75 persons went in procession from the headquarters of the party to the premises of the Chinese Consulate in Bombay. The processionists carried some placards and shouted slogans. A detachment of the Bombay Police accompanied the procession to prevent violence or any untoward incident. As the procession was otherwise peaceful, the police could not prohibit it altogether. Near the gate of the Consulate building, one of the processionists took out a bunch of memoranda and started distributing them. He also gave a number of these memoranda to some others in the procession for pasting them on the wall and the gate of the Consulate building. The police intervened to prevent this, but suddenly they noticed another person in the procession affixing something on the compound wall. They ran to intervene, but before they succeeded in reaching the particular spot, they found that a small picture of Chairman Mao Tse-tung had already been affixed and a few tomatoes and two eggs had been hurled at the picture. The police officers present stood in front of the picture to save it from further desecration and ordered one of their men to remove it. The picture was on the wall only for a minute or two and was removed by the police. A number of press photographers accompanied the procession and were taking photographs and it is possible that one of them managed to get a snapshot of the particular picture.

3. As a result of the full investigation made by them, the Government of India are satisfied that the police did not connive at the deplorable behaviour of some of the demonstrators. On the contrary, they intervened immediately the particular incident came to their notice and sought to stop further mischief. It is not a fact that the police cleared the way for photographers to take photographs of the picture of Chairman Mao Tse-tung. As the Chinese Government are probably aware, the Chinese Consulate is situated at one of the busiest traffic corners in Bombay. In fact, since the demonstrators were obstructing the traffic, the police endeavoured to clear the way and many of the demonstrators were pushed to the opposite side of the road.

4. The Chinese Government are, no doubt, aware that under the law in India processions cannot be banned so long as they are peaceful. Indeed in Indian cities processions and demonstrations are not unusual. Not unoften they are held even near the Parliament House and the
processionists indulge in all manner of slogans against high person-
age in India. Incidents have occurred in the past when portraits of Mahatma Gandhi and the Prime Minister were taken out by irresponsible persons and treated in an insulting manner. Under the law and Constitution of India a great deal of latitude is allowed to the people so long as they do not indulge in actual violence.

5. The Government of India would like to point out that the particular procession in Bombay referred to in the Chinese Embassy's note was organised by a party called the Socialist Party which broke away some years ago from the major Socialist Party in India, namely the Praja Socialist Party. This splinter party consists of a small group of irresponsible persons who have no importance in the country and do not in any way reflect the standard of conduct followed by the major political parties in India. In fact it is the definite programme of this party to indulge in highly objectionable behaviour towards Government.

6. Whatever the circumstances and facts, the Government of India deeply regret that discourtesy was shown to a picture of Chairman Mao Tse-tung, the respected head of a State with which India has ties of friendship. The incident is undoubtedly deplorable, but as stated above, it is the act of a few persons and there was no question of connivance of the police or Government.

7. The Prime Minister has already expressed the deep regret of Government at this incident in his statement in the Lok Sabha on the 27th April.

8. The Government of India would like to add that while they can understand and appreciate the resentment of the Chinese Government at such an incident, they regret the language used in the Chinese Embassy's memorandum.
Statement made by the Chinese Ambassador to the Foreign Secretary, 16 May 1959

Since March 10, 1959 when the former Tibet Local Government and the Tibetan upper class reactionary clique unleashed armed rebellion, there have appeared deplorable abnormalities in the relations between China and India. This situation was caused by the Indian side, yet in his conversation on April 26, 1959 Mr. Dutt, Foreign Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs of India, shifted responsibility onto the Chinese side. This is what the Chinese Government absolutely cannot accept.

The Tibet Region is an inalienable part of China's territory. The quelling of the rebellion in the Tibet Region by the Chinese Government and following that, the conducting by it of democratic reforms which the Tibetan people have longed for, are entirely China's internal affairs, in which no foreign country has any right to interfere under whatever pretext or in whatever form. In Tibet, just as in other national minority areas in China, regional national autonomy shall be implemented as stipulated in the Constitution of the People's Republic of China. In this matter which is purely China's internal affairs, the Chinese Government has no obligation to give assurances to any foreign country, nor can it tolerate others under the pretext of a so-called different interpretation of autonomy, to obstruct the Chinese Government's exercise of its state sovereignty in the Tibet Region to make Tibet semi-independent or even to turn it into a sphere of influence of a foreign country or buffer zone.

The above-said is self-evident and undeniable. Nevertheless, there appeared in India, before and after the outbreak of the rebellion in Tibet, large quantities of words and deeds slandering China and interfering in China's internal affairs. Responsible persons of many Indian political parties, including the National Congress, and not a few Indian publications openly called Tibet a "country", slandered the Chinese Government's putting down the rebellion in Tibet as "practising banditry and imperialism", demanded that the Tibet question be submitted to the United Nations and even proposed the holding of a tripartite conference of India, China and Tibet to settle the Tibet question which can only be handled by the Chinese Government. Most of the political parties in India went so far as to form organisations in support of the Tibetan rebels. Groups of ruffians were allowed to make provocations and disturbances in front of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General in India, and there even occurred the grave incident of insulting the head of state of China. These words and deeds were in the nature of serious interference in China's internal affairs and sabotage of Sino-Indian friendship, and this cannot be altered by recourse to any pretext, whether "freedom of speech" or any other "freedoms", even less can the "feeling of kinship derived from long-established religious and cultural contacts with the Tibetan people" be a pretext for these words and deeds.
It is obvious that the Chinese people likewise have a “feeling of kinship derived from long-established religious and cultural contacts” towards the Indian people, but China has never used this as a pretext to interfere in India’s internal affairs, and will never do so.

The Indian Government has recognised the Tibet region as a part of China’s territory and has repeatedly declared that it has no desire to interfere in China’s internal affairs. This was worthy of welcome. Nevertheless, responsible members of the Indian Government, though they could not possibly be better acquainted with the situation in Tibet than the Chinese Government openly expressed doubts about documents published by China officially, refused to accept the Chinese Government’s account of the facts, and asserted that the basis of the rebellion in Tibet “must have been a strong feeling of nationalism” and that the upper strata reactionaries in Tibet were not solely responsible for the rebellion. They even charged that “agreement between Tibet and China on the autonomous status of Tibet and the assurances given to India had not been kept” by the Chinese Government, and described the Chinese Government’s putting down the rebellion in Tibet as “armed intervention” and as “oppressing and suppressing” the Tibetan people. The Indian Government announced that it had granted political asylum to the Dalai Lama in accordance with international practice and stated that the Dalai Lama was “not expected” to engage in any political activities in India. This would not have caused any dispute. But on April 18 and 22, two statements advocating “independence of Tibet” and directing wanton attacks on the Chinese Government were issued respectively in Tezpur and Mussoorie in the name of the Dalai Lama. What was particularly surprising, the so-called “statement of the Dalai Lama” of April 18 was not only distributed by an official of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs but also carried on official bulletins of Indian Embassies abroad. Such a line of action on the part of the Indian Government could hardly be considered conformable to well-known international practice. The Indian Government insisted that the Dalai Lama was entirely responsible for the two traitorous statements issued in his name. In that case, did not the impressive welcome extended to the Dalai Lama by the Indian Government and the talks Prime Minister Nehru himself held with him mean giving a welcome to a Chinese rebel and holding a meeting with him? All these statements and actions of the Indian Government, no matter what the subjective intentions might be, undoubtedly played an objective role of encouraging the Tibetan rebels.

The facts themselves have completely overthrown the allegation that there is no Indian interference in China’s internal affairs. The Chinese Government and people, having regard for the overall Sino-Indian friendship, for quite a long time exercised utmost forbearance in the hope that the words and deeds occurring in India interfering in China’s internal affairs and detrimental to Sino-Indian friendship would end. To the contrary, however, the words and deeds against China and interfering in China’s internal affairs coming from the Indian side went from bad to worse and developed to an intolerable extent. Only then did the Chinese people give the reply that was due, in order to safeguard their state sovereignty and oppose outside
interference, and also to uphold the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and Sino-Indian friendship. The Chinese people's reply is in the nature of reasoning and is well grounded on fact. All those who have the opportunity of reading a full report of the opinions of the Chinese people will arrive at this conclusion. It is unjustifiable that the Indian Government should have tried in various ways to defend the words and deeds of the Indian side interfering in China's internal affairs and impairing Sino-Indian friendship, while making charges against the proper reply of the Chinese people.

The Dalai Lama was abducted to India by the Tibetan rebels. A most strong proof of this is the three letters he wrote to General Tan Kuan-san, Acting Representative of the Central People's Government in Tibet, before he was abducted out of Lhasa. The so-called "statement of the Dalai Lama", which is full of loopholes, instead of being capable of making one believe that the Dalai Lama is now able to act on his own volition, precisely serves to show that he is still being surrounded and under control. The Chinese Government is greatly concerned about the situation of the Dalai Lama. It is, however, futile for the Chinese Government to send someone to see the Dalai Lama before he has freed himself from encirclement and control. It would be even more inappropriate for the Chinese Government to send someone to see the Dalai Lama, if, as alleged by the Indian Government, he was entirely responsible for the two statements betraying his motherland.

In its relations with India, China has consistently adhered to the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and worked for the development of friendly co-operation between the two countries. China has always held that every thing must be done to safeguard the friendly relations between the two great Asian countries, China and India, from being impaired. In spite of the fact that the Indian side brought about this unpleasant argument between the two countries, and the Indian Government has failed to give a satisfactory reply on the Bombay incident of insulting the Head of State of China, the Chinese side is willing to stop its rebuff as soon as the Indian side stops its words and deeds against China and interfering in China's internal affairs. Prime Minister Nehru has now expressed the wish to end this argument and called on Indian newspapers to exercise restraint and wisdom, this is worthy of welcome. It is the hope of the Chinese Government that the dark clouds overcasting Sino-Indian relations for a time will speedily disperse and that, through the current trial, Sino-Indian friendship, which is of long standing and based on the Five Principles, will develop even better.

On the whole, India is a friend of China, this has been so in the past thousand and more years, and we believe will certainly continue to be so in one thousand, ten thousand years to come. The enemy of the Chinese people lies in the East—the U.S. imperialists have many military bases in Taiwan, in South Korea, Japan and in the Philippines which are all directed against China. China's main attention and policy of struggle are directed to the east, to the west Pacific region, to the vicious and aggressive U.S. imperialism, and not to India or any other country in the south-east Asia and south Asia. Although the Philippines, Thailand and Pakistan have joined the
SEATO which is designed to oppose China, we have not treated those three countries as our principal enemy; our principal enemy is U.S. imperialism. India has not taken part in the Southeast Asia Treaty; it is not an opponent, but a friend to our country. China will not be so foolish as to antagonize the United States in the east and again to antagonize India in the West. The putting down of the rebellion and the carrying out of democratic reforms in Tibet will not in the least endanger India. You can wait and see. As the Chinese proverb goes "the strength of a horse is borne out by the distance travelled, and the heart of a person is seen with the lapse of time". You will ultimately see whether relations between the Tibet region of China and India are friendly or hostile by watching three, five, ten, twenty, a hundred......years. We cannot have two centres of attention, nor can we take friend for foe. This is our state policy. The quarrel between our two countries in the past few years, particularly in the last three months, is but an interlude in the course of thousands upon thousands of years of friendships between the two countries and does not warrant a big fuss on the part of the broad masses and the Government authorities of our countries. The principles, positions and distinctions between right and wrong as set forth in the foregoing paragraphs have to be set forth; otherwise the current difference between our countries cannot be resolved. But so far as the extent of the implication of those words is concerned, it is only temporary and local; that is to say, they refer only to a temporary difference between our two countries and concern solely the region of Tibet. Our Indian friends! What is your mind? Will you be agreeing to our thinking regarding the view that China can only concentrate its main attention eastward of China, but not south-westward of China, nor is it necessary for it to do so. Chairman Mao Tse-tung, the leader of our country, talked on many occasions with Mr. R. K. Nehru, former Indian Ambassador to China, who could well understand and appreciate it. We do not know whether the former Indian Ambassador conveyed this to the Indian authorities. Friends! It seems to us that you too cannot have two fronts. Is it not so? If it is, here lies the meeting point of our two sides. Will you please think it over? Allow me to take this opportunity to extend my best regards to Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, the leader of India.
Statement of the Foreign Secretary to the Chinese Ambassador, 23 May 1959

The statement made by the Chinese Ambassador to the Foreign Secretary has been considered. The Foreign Secretary has been directed to make the following reply to the Chinese Ambassador:

(1) The Government of India have learned of this statement with regret and surprise. It is not only not in consonance with certain facts, but is also wholly out of keeping with diplomatic usage and the courtesies due to friendly countries. It is a matter of particular surprise and disappointment to them that a Government and people noted for their high culture and politeness should have committed this serious lapse and should have addressed the Government of India in a language which is discourteous and unbecoming even if it were addressed to a hostile country. Since it is addressed to a country which is referred to as friendly, this can only be considered as an act of forgetfulness.

(2) We have no desire to enter into a lengthy argument about facts or opinions, much less about the discourteous language used in the statement made on behalf of the Chinese Government. It has been the consistent practice of the Government of India to treat other countries with courtesy and friendliness, even though any country might express opinions opposed to theirs. With China they have endeavoured to maintain and develop friendly relations, and they propose to continue to do so in spite of the discourtesy shown to them by the Chinese Government. This is in consonance with India's past culture and background and Mahatma Gandhi's teachings.

(3) In so far as facts are concerned, the Prime Minister made a statement in the Lok Sabha on April 27, 1959, as well as on some subsequent occasions. Those statements give a correct narration of facts, and the Government of India stand by them. They can only regret that the People's Government of China is unable to accept these facts.

(4) The Government of India realise that the system of Government in China is different from that prevailing in India. It is the right of the Chinese people to have a Government of their choice, and no one else has a right to interfere; it is also the right of the Indian people to have a Government of their choice, and no one else has a right to interfere. In India, unlike China, the law recognises many parties, and gives protection to the expression of differing opinions. That is a right guaranteed by our Constitution and, contrary to the practice prevailing
in China, the Government of India is often criticised and opposed by some sections of the Indian people. It is evident that this freedom of expression, free press and civil liberties in India are not fully appreciated by the Government of China, and hence misunderstandings arise. So far as the Parliament of India is concerned, it is a sovereign body, and each one of its 750 members has perfect freedom to express his or her opinion under the protection of the law, whether anyone likes it or not. The People's Government of China should understand that this is a sovereign Parliament of a sovereign country and it does not submit to any dictation from any outside authority.

(5) From the statement made on behalf of the People's Government of China, it appears that, according to them, the Panchsheel or the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence may or may not be applied according to convenience or circumstances. This is an approach with which the Government of India are not in agreement. They have proclaimed and adhered to these Principles as matters of basic policy and not of opportunism. They will continue to hold to these principles and endeavour to apply them according to their own thinking.

(6) The Government of India do not consider or treat any other country as an enemy country, howsoever much it may differ from it. It is their constant endeavour to develop friendly relations with all countries and try to remove tensions, bitterness and ill-will, while adhering to the policy they consider right. In particular, they have endeavoured to cultivate the friendship of the Chinese people and Government in spite of differences of opinion. They have avoided interference with China's internal affairs. They will continue this policy, but this must not be understood to mean that the Government of India will discard or vary any of their own policies under any pressure from outside.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Counsellor in India, 24 July 1959

The attention of the Government of India has been drawn to recent articles being circulated in the Tibet region of China, which contain false statements and are, therefore, likely to create grave misunderstanding between India and China.

2. The ‘Lhasa Daily’ in Tibetan language, on 23rd June, published an article entitled “Gyantse in the history of imperialist design in Tibet”. The article gives details of the invasion of Gyantse by British troops in 1904, and proceeds to state as follows:—

“The place immediately near to the British Imperial Cemetery is the cantonment of Indian Army stationed at Gyantse. The 1954 Agreement between India and China on trade and intercourse specified the withdrawal of the Indian troops from Gyantse. The people of Gyantse could clearly see that the legacy of British imperialism in Tibet was inherited by the Indian expansionist element. During the course of their stay at Gyantse, the Indian Army forcibly took foodgrains and fodder from the people of Gyantse. The people were forced to do corvee work for them, they had to provide supply transport, firewood, servants, etc., in return for nothing to the Indian army. The Indian troops were fond of riding military horses, and they rode rough shod the green fields of the people and thus destroying the autumn harvest. Officers and men of the Indian troops visited the traitor Phala and held parties and games of Majong. These evil deeds of the Indian army are very much resented by the people of Gyantse. And though the fire of their anger was burning in the stomach, there was no opportunity for the smoke to come out of the mouth”.

3. Similarly an article about Chumbi valley appeared on the 15th June which inter alia stated as follows:—

“According to Tsewang, formerly when they suffered from any ailment, they had not only to send a servant and a horse to fetch the doctor, but the fee charged by the doctor was exorbitantly high. The poor man was helpless to provide such luxury and so when a poor man fell ill, the inevitable was death.”

4. The extracts quoted above are factually and historically incorrect. They are obviously intended to damage the friendly relations between the people of India and the nationals of the People’s Republic of China. The Government of India emphatically protest against such articles being published in areas where the press is officially controlled and would request that steps be taken to stop such deliberately hostile propaganda against India.
Under Article 1(2) of the 1954 Agreement between India and China pertaining to the Tibet Region, the Government of the People's Republic of China agreed *inter alia* to the establishment of an Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse. Further, according to the letters exchanged in pursuance of this Agreement, the Government of India were permitted to retain the buildings and the right to lease land within the bounds of the existing Agencies.

2. Unfortunately, the entire Trade Agency buildings in Gyantse belonging to the Government of India were washed away with the loss of several lives including that of the Trade Agent in the unprecedented floods of July 1954. Ever since, the Government of India has been endeavouring to reconstruct the Trade Agency buildings for the proper functioning of our trade agency at Gyantse. But a variety of difficulties have been experienced locally and thus the commencement of the reconstruction of the Agency prevented.

3. The local authorities in the Tibet Region had informed us that no construction could be undertaken without their prior approval and scrutiny of plans. Though no such restriction except in terms of municipal bye-laws is placed in India, the prescription of prior scrutiny was accepted and plans of the new Trade Agency buildings were submitted to the Sub-Office of the Foreign Bureau in Gyantse in August 1958.

4. As stated above, the letters exchanged recognize the right of the Government of India to continue to lease and retain the buildings on the existing premises. Notwithstanding this fact, only towards the end of 1957 the Consul-General in Lhasa was informed that the existing lease which was valid up to 1971 could not be accepted by the Chinese authorities since it was concluded with the previous regime. Although our legal advice confirmed the continuing validity of the lease held by the Government of India, in deference to the wishes of the local authorities we agreed to execute a new lease deed with the owner of the land.

5. The Government of India engineer who visited Gyantse in connection with the plans for the new construction found that the floods in the adjacent river had already scoured a substantial part of the lease land. In the absence of any plans by the local authorities to control the channel of the river and prevent recurrence of damage through floods, the Government of India accepted the recommendation of the engineer and decided to construct protective embankments to ensure the future safety of the leased property. This decision was conveyed to the Foreign Bureau of Lhasa as well as to the Chinese Government through the Indian Embassy in Peking, and permission was sought for the leasing of some additional
land considered necessary and the authorisation of the construction of the protective works.

6. In July 1958, the Indian Embassy in Peking were informed by the Government of China that there would be no objection, in principle, to the construction of the proposed protective embankments and that construction might be taken in hand without the detailed finalisation and the execution of the new lease-deed. However, when the Indian Consul-General in Lhasa broached the subject with the Chinese Foreign Bureau with a view to initiating preliminary construction work, he was verbally informed that it would not be possible to agree to the protective works lest they should endanger the safety of the bridge and do damage to the portion of the Gyantse village which lay further down-stream.

7. In view of this reservation, an Indian engineer was again instructed to proceed to Gyantse to explain on the spot that the proposed protective works were in no way likely either to endanger the bridge or to damage the property in the village. Although detailed explanations were furnished to the two representatives and an engineer of the Chinese Foreign Bureau in Gyantse, no agreement was forthcoming.

8. After a lapse of another two months, the Chinese Foreign Bureau informed the Consul-General in Lhasa that they could not agree to the plan of the protective works and sought modification of the plan if immediate construction was to be taken in hand. Notwithstanding the fact that the plan which had been earlier explained was not only economical but, according to our engineers, in no way likely to damage other properties, the Government of India instructed their engineers to prepare revised plans. This second set of plans has now been finalised. They envisage only a protective wall along the leased land, do away with the necessity of spurs and additional land and are not calculated to deflect the course of the river in any way. The blue prints of the revised plan have now been transmitted for presentation through the Consul-General in Lhasa.

9. Ever since the destruction of the Indian property in Gyantse the officers and staff of the Trade Agency have been living in the most unsatisfactory and unhygienic conditions. There are inadequate office and residential buildings inevitably causing great hardship to the staff of the Agency. In the climatic conditions of Gyantse, which lies at a height of 14,000 feet, inadequate housing facilities inevitably cause great hardship to our staff.

10. The Government of India are most anxious that the construction of the new Trade Agency building and the protective works should commence in May 1959 and urge that the Government of the People's Republic of China should give the necessary instructions to authorise the immediate construction of the buildings and the protective works. Further, to facilitate construction, it is also urged that the local authorities may be instructed to give help in procuring timber, stones and bricks and in making available the necessary transport for construction work. If a further technical discussion of the blue prints of the protective works is considered essential,
the Government of India are prepared to depute an engineer to meet his duly authorised counterpart from the Chinese side at the beginning of April either in Gyantse or in Lhasa to enable a final decision being taken on the spot.

11. Commensurate with the friendly relations existing between India and China, it is imperative that the representatives of the two countries should be given the necessary housing facilities for their functioning and the full discharge of their duties to promote understanding, trade and cultural contact between their two peoples. As far as the Government of India are aware, no serious difficulties have arisen in finding satisfactory housing and office accommodation for the Chinese diplomatic, consular and trade missions in India. The Government of India trust that such difficulties as are listed above in the case of the Gyantse Trade Agency will be removed and particularly the necessary construction of protective embankments and the commencement of building of the Agency during the coming working season authorised.
Aide Memoire given to the Embassy of China in India, 23 March 1959

The Indian Trade Agency building at Gyantse in the Tibet region of China was washed away during the unprecedented floods of 1954. The question of reconstruction of the Trade Agency and the necessary river embankment to protect the property from similar floods has been taken up from time to time with the officials of the People's Republic of China. A full statement of the case with a request for necessary authorisation for the construction of the protective works and help in the construction is being presented to the Embassy separately.

Pending the construction of the new premises, it is necessary to give some immediate relief for improvement of office accommodation and housing facilities of the Trade Agent and his staff. At present the Agency has been accommodated in a small rented building insufficient in space and unsuitable for healthy habitation. From time to time attempts have been made locally by the Indian Trade Agent to hire additional accommodation and the matter has been brought to the attention of the sub-office of the Foreign Bureau in Gyantse. So far there is no appreciable improvement and in the meanwhile the Trade Agent and his staff are experiencing great difficulty particularly in the hard climatic conditions of Gyantse.

While construction of the new Agency will inevitably take some time, the Government of India strongly urge the Government of the People's Republic of China to instruct their local authority to help the Trade Agent immediately in hiring additional accommodation to meet the reasonable requirements of the Trade Agency. The Government of India are informed that with the co-operation of the local authorities it should be possible to get on lease suitable premises locally.
Letter from the Consul-General of India in Lhasa to the Foreign Bureau in Tibet, 13 May 1959

On the 27th April 1958, I discussed with you the question of Ladakhi Lamas and Muslims of Jammu and Kashmir origin. You stated then that there were some Lamas from Ladakh but no one was in possession of any visaed documents. You enquired about the manner and the dates of arrival of certain other Indian Muslim nationals from Kashmir. I have looked into the position which appears to be as follows:

Ladakhi Lamas and Muslims of Jammu and Kashmir origin have traditionally come to Tibet without any restriction or formality. Most of these people had been residing in the Tibet region of China for some time before the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 was concluded.

The former local Government of Tibet always treated the Muslims of Kashmir origin as foreigners and as distinct from their own nationals. These Kashmiri Muslims never declared themselves as Tibetan or deliberately renounced their Indian nationality. In fact these Kashmiris selected their own headman who is called Khachi Ponpo, literally meaning Kashmiri Officer. The former local Government had no hand in the selection of this officer; nor was the Khachi Ponpo treated as an official of the Tibetan Government or paid any remuneration by them. Khachi Ponpo, with the help of a few representatives of the community, settled the disputes between the Kashmiri Muslims. The Tibetan Government was only brought into the picture in case of a dispute between a Kashmiri Muslim and a Tibetan but any fine imposed on the Kashmiri Muslim used to be returned to the Khachi Ponpo. The position of the Kashmiri Muslims was similar to that of Nepalis trading in Tibet. In both categories the menfolk paid no taxes to the former local Government nor did they enjoy the right to own immovable property in Tibet. These people came and resided in Tibet only for the purpose of pursuing their trade and commerce.

Similarly a large number of the Kashmiri Lamas had come to Tibet prior to this agreement and were visiting monasteries to pursue their theological studies. The Lamas who came to Tibet after the conclusion of the 1954 Agreement were here on legitimate pilgrimage and permits should have been issued by the authorities of the Tibet region of China. Pilgrims from India, under the Agreement, are not required to hold any Government of India travel document.

The Agreement of 1954 does not specify any procedure in respect of the nationals of one country who had been residing in the other country prior to the Agreement. Thus it was for the Government of such country to prescribe the procedure to regularise the stay in their country of the nationals of the other country. To the knowledge of the Government of India, no notification or declaration was made by
the local authorities in the Tibet region of China requiring the persons of Indian origin residing in the Tibet region to obtain registration or traders certificates if they were not actually travelling across the border.

In fact, however, some of these people had registered themselves with the Indian Consulate-General long before the recent disturbances. It may be stated that in accordance with the laws and practice of India it is not obligatory for Indian nationals staying in foreign countries to register themselves with Indian Missions or Consulates in those countries. They are expected to fall in line with the practice prescribed for foreigners and would of course obtain an Indian nationality certificate if it was required by the local regulations. The position therefore is that these Lamas and Muslims have their origin in Jammu and Kashmir State in India, and, notwithstanding their long residence in Tibet or even marriage with Tibetans, they do not cease to be Indian nationals. Since no law or regulation has been announced and enforced previously by the local authorities of Tibet region of China, we do not agree with the contention that absence of travel documents deprives them of their Indian nationality. Some of these persons, it is now understood, applied recently as Indian nationals and the seizure of their application forms would amount to interfering in their legitimate claims to be treated distinctly as Indians.

In view of the facts explained above, the Government of India urge that Ladakhi and Kashmiri Muslims and other Indians living in Lhasa and Shigatse should be treated as Indian nationals and their registration recorded accordingly.

It may be mentioned here that the Government of India do not regard the Chinese in India as Indian nationals merely on the ground of their long residence in India unless they have formally obtained naturalisation certificates according to the Indian laws after renouncing their former nationality.
Informal Note given by the Government of India to the Chinese Counsellor in India, 8 July 1959

Apart from the Embassy, the Chinese Government have Consulates General in Bombay and Calcutta and, by virtue of the 1954 Agreement, a Trade Agency in Kalimpong. All these Chinese Posts in India enjoy full facilities for hiring of suitable accommodation for the offices and their residential staff. Chinese officers and members of the staff have freedom of movement without even intimation to the Government of India. They are allowed, after registration, to keep personal arms with them. They enjoy freedom of meeting whom they wish, freedom to distribute official bulletins, move in official transport and function without restrictions in India. Further full facilities are allowed for couriers to carry official mail from and to Chinese Mission and Posts in India.

2. Similarly Chinese nationals, other than officials, are permitted freedom of movement, facilities to take up employment, own property, ply their transport and indulge in trade between India and Tibet region as well as maintain shops and undertake petty commerce in India.

3. In contrast to these facilities for the Chinese officials and their nationals, Indian Posts in the Tibet region and Indian nationals have faced, particularly in recent months, innumerable difficulties and disabilities in the pursuit of their official normal functions. The following are only some examples of such difficulties reported to the Government of India.

(a) Difficulties of accommodation for our Consulate General and Trade Agencies.

(i) Gyantse.—The question of reconstruction of the Trade Agency was mentioned by the Prime Minister in Parliament and by the Foreign Secretary to the Ambassador. The construction work is now starting but full helpful co-operation is not forthcoming from the local officials. Apparently the labourers working on the site are being harassed. In the last week of June and first week of July there was firing practice over our site. No permission for the hiring of private trucks or import of our own trucks or provision of transport from the local authorities has yet been forthcoming.

(ii) Gartok.—The lease deed has been agreed to but the actual construction deferred pending arrival of our Trade Agent. The Trade Agent's arrival has been delayed because he is being diverted at Chinese request through Lipuleh Pass. Initial construction must start immediately and we, therefore, wish the engineering personnel to enter the Tibet region and commence construction before the loss of this season.

(iii) Lhasa.—The Consulate General in Lhasa is also short of accommodation and has been wanting additional office and residential accommodation.
(b) **Restrictions on movements.**

By order of Military Control Commission freedom of movement is not being permitted to our Trade Agents even in the vicinity where the Trade Agencies are located. For example the I. T. A. Yatung was not permitted to go to Rinchengang, only six miles from Yatung, where he wished to meet the Indian Trade Agent, Gyantse, and his wife, who were returning to their post from Gangtok. Similarly a junior official of the Trade Agency, who desired to return to Gangtok on short leave, was not permitted to do so.

(c) **Repair and maintenance work.**

The lease of the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung requires that "Only with the Lessor's advance consent being reported to local organ of the People's Republic of China, the Lessee may carry out construction or reconstruction on the said lands in addition to the already existing buildings." This provision is being interpreted to place difficulties and create delays even in carrying out simple repairs, and white-washing of the buildings where there is no proposal to vary the plinth area of existing buildings. It is not understood what purpose is served by placing such restrictions and unnecessarily making the carrying out of simple repairs to our property so difficult.

(d) **Registration of arms.**

Originally there was no licensing system for possession of arms in Tibet. Officials and traders kept some personal arms for sport or self-protection purposes. Recently orders were issued for the presentation and registration of arms and we instructed our officials and nationals to fall in line with this order. It was, however, noticed that when the sporting rifle and two revolvers of our Consul General in Lhasa were taken in for registration at Yatung, not only were the arms not returned but no receipts were given that they were held in official custody. Similarly when the Indian nationals presented their arms for registration, no receipts were given to their owners.

4. Indian traders and nationals have similarly been suffering considerable difficulties.—Some irresponsible elements have indulged in propaganda that Indian traders purported to exploit the Tibetans. In fact these trading arrangements under the express authority of the 1954 Agreement, preserve the traditional pattern and are to the mutual advantage of Indian and Chinese people.

Indian traders and pilgrims have recently been checked when proceeding or returning from their legitimate business or pilgrimage. In one case in Yatung a trader's shop was locked and the owner denied access to his possessions. Two other shop-keepers were threatened in Phari but no redress was given by local authorities. An Indian pilgrim to Kailash was harassed because he carried some medicines for himself. Two cobblers from Shingatse have been held up in Yatung for the last 3 weeks and prevented from returning to India. It is also reported that traders are not being permitted to travel between Yatung and Gyantse which are recognised marts under the Agreement.
5. Indian nationals in the Tibet region of China.—The Government of India have already drawn attention in Delhi and through the Consulate General Lhasa to obtain protection for Indian nationals residing in the Tibet region of China. We specially bring to the notice of the Chinese authorities the case of Indians of Ladakhi origin who were trading or residing in Lhasa prior to 1954 Agreement was concluded. It is requested that impediments in their registering with the Consulate General or leaving the Tibet region if they so wish should not be placed.

We have also repeatedly drawn attention through the Consulate General to the case of the family of Shri Shahabir Dival which has been under arrest since 5th of April, 1959. No reason for their arrest has been given and despite request no steps taken to set them free. Similarly, Tromo Geshe Rimpoche of Donkar Monastery, an Indian protected person, is understood to be still held by the Chinese authorities.

Government of India are anxious that the provisions of the 1954 Agreement should be strictly and mutually respected and therefore draw the attention of the Embassy to these difficulties which have been placed at the local level in the Tibet region of China. Just as full facilities and adequate help and protection are afforded to the Chinese officials and Chinese nationals in India, it is hoped that legitimate help and courtesy and support from the authorities will be given to Indian officials and Indian nationals who are serving, working in or visiting the Tibet region of China.
Your letter of 13th May 1959 duly received. In your letter you have referred to Kachis who for generations, have lived in Lhasa, Shigatse and other places and have long become Chinese nationals, as Indian nationals; and you described the well-known facts that they had, at all times, been subjected to the jurisdiction of the local Government of Tibet of our country as: the former local Government of Tibet of China always treated the Muslims of Kashmir as foreigners. These assertions are opposed to the historical facts and I cannot agree with them.

As everybody knows, among the inhabitants in Tibet of our country, there are a number of people of Islamic faith. Besides the Huis from such provinces as Yunan and Szechuan, these are some whom we call Kachis. Although their forefathers were from Kashmir, yet as early as the 17th century, during the time of the 5th Dalai Lama, their forefathers had already chosen the Chinese nationality and had thus become a component part of the Tibetan people of China. In a report submitted to the former local Government by their headman during the time of the 13th Dalai Lama there is such a passage which serves as a powerful evidence: “at the time of the 5th Dalai Lama, we, the subjects, had chosen him to be our own King, and, in return, he the King, also loved us as his own subjects. And it was such a great gracious kindness he bestowed on us, by allotting to us land for maintenance”. Thereafter, from generation to generation, they had, at all times, been under the administration of the local Government. The final decision on the selection of headmen they elect and their appointments had to be obtained from the local Government. With the exception of some minor disputes, which were allowed to be settled by themselves under the guidance of their headmen, as was the case with the Huis also, all their civil and criminal cases, irrespective of a dispute between Kachis and Tibetans or between Kachis themselves, had to be referred to former local Government for judgments. And it was by no means like what Mr. Chhibber had alleged, that “the Tibetan Government was only brought into the picture, in case of a dispute between a Kashmiri Muslim and a Tibetan” to say nothing about that “the position of the Kashmiri Muslim was similar to that of Nepalese trading in Tibet” as asserted by Mr. Chhibber. In addition they are entitled to the right of purchase of immovable property, and they also had the obligations of doing Corvee for the former local Government and of serving the military service, etc. All these facts fully prove that they are Tibetan people of China.

After the peaceful liberation of Tibet, there has been no change in their being Tibetan people of China. All those who went to India for trade or to Mecca for pilgrimage and who account for more than 80 per cent. of their total households, had, in accordance with the
unified stipulations of our country, approached our Bureau for traders certificates to India or for passports to Mecca. And all their passports were issued with transit visas or entry visas by the successive Consuls-General of India in Lhasa (Indian Consul-General, Lhasa, Mr. Chhibber). This is a fact which demonstrates that the Indian Government have long recognised them as the nationals of the People's Republic of China. Can there be any room left for doubts?

However one could not help feel surprised that Mr. Chhibber should have raised with us the problem that they are Indian nationals, at a time when our troops had put down the rebellion unleashed by the former local Government and the reactionaries of the upper strata in Tibet. As mentioned above, there has never been any question with regard to them as Chinese nationals. To my knowledge, only after the talks between Mr. Chhibber and the "headman" of these Kachis, in April of this year, did such things happen, that that "headman" taking advantage of a prayer meeting announced to all the Kachis that they all must fill revised "applications" for registration as citizens of India, which were distributed by the Consulate-General of India. I am of the view that this occurrence is not fortuitous. This is unfriendly act of instigating the Chinese people to break with China by means of external forces. Therefore we consider it to be highly improper and an act of interference in the internal affairs of our country, that Mr. Chhibber, without obtaining any consent from our Bureau whatsoever, went so far as to utilise the former official of the former local Government (the so-called "Kachi Ponpo") to carry out the activities, among our people, instigating them to break off with their mother-land, after we openly ordered the dissolution of the former local Government and after the dismissal of all its former officials. We regret this and hope that these activities are stopped forthwith.
Informal Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, India, to the Chinese Counsellor in India, 24 July 1959

Some time ago the Embassy was requested to ensure that appropriate arrangements are made for the Government of India's couriers proceeding from Gangtok to the various Posts in Central Tibet. Recent reports indicate that no assurance regarding the safety of the transmission of Government bags has been forthcoming. It is understood that the local authorities have been pressing the postal couriers such as in Kangma and Samada near Gyantse to obtain prior permits for their travel in connection with the carriage of Indian bags. The requisite applications have been submitted some time ago but no permits have been issued. Pending assurance of the safety of the official bags and the mail courier, the bag service has been suspended. Unless the mail service is resumed, it is not unlikely that the Trade Agency will not be able to meet even its day to day requirements. Immediate instructions are solicited to guarantee the safety of these Dakwalas and the official bags from Yatung to Gyantse and Gyantse to Lhasa in both directions to permit resumption of the normal mail service, as provided under the 1954 Agreement.

In the conversation on the 3rd June, a special request was made for facilities for Shri Bhupendra Singh who was proceeding to Lhasa to be given privileges as a diplomatic courier. Shri Bhupendra Singh carries a diplomatic passport and a laissez-passer. Even though prior intimation was given and official Chinese visa has been granted, Shri Bhupendra Singh has been held up in Yatung for the last several weeks because no official transport has been provided for his onward journey to Lhasa. As in the case of the normal dak service, it is of the utmost importance that Shri Bhupendra Singh should reach Lhasa within the next few days. Immediate instructions are solicited so that necessary transport and security arrangements can be made from Yatung to Lhasa.
1. Article 1 of the Agreement between India and China on Trade and Intercourse between Tibet Region of China and India provides for the establishment of Indian Trade Agencies at Yatung, Gyantse and Gartok and Chinese Trade Agencies at New Delhi, Calcutta and Kalimpong. In terms of this article and the letters exchanged between the two Governments the Trade Agencies of both Parties are guaranteed the same status and the same treatment. They are also guaranteed privileges and immunities for couriers, mail bags and communications in code.

2. The Government of India have to state with regret that during the past few months our Trade Posts at Yatung and Gyantse are being subjected to a variety of difficulties with the result that they cannot function in the way envisaged in the Sino-Indian Agreement. This has also affected the life and normal trade activities of Indian nationals at these posts. Some of these difficulties have already been brought to the attention of the Chinese authorities. In March the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India presented two notes to the Chinese Ambassador in New Delhi seeking the assistance and co-operation of the Chinese authorities in the reconstruction of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse and, until the new premises are ready, in obtaining additional accommodation for the housing of the Trade Agency officials. Other difficulties experienced by the Trade Agencies have also been informally brought to the attention of the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi and the Chinese Foreign Bureau in Tibet.

3. The Government of India would like to draw attention in particular to the following difficulties which have been brought to their notice:

   (i) Gyantse.—The lease of the temporary accommodation occupied by the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse expired in April and it has not been possible to renew it since the owner is apparently held in custody. We are now informed that pressure is being brought to bear on the owner against the renewal of the lease. A short while ago one member of the staff who had temporarily moved to the Agency site was forcibly made to vacate his accommodation. Thus, far from assisting the Agency in obtaining suitable rented accommodation as earlier requested by the Government of India, difficulties are being placed in the way of the Agency staff continuing to occupy the accommodation which they already have.

   (ii) The Trade Agency is also experiencing difficulties in the use of the official car. Recently the local driver who had been in the service of the Agency for a long time was questioned by the authorities. In order to be on the safe
side, the driver, who had already passed the prescribed driving test in Lhasa, applied for a second test. Apparently, pending consideration of his second application, the official car of the Trade Agency was stopped on the 12th July and the driver was taken into custody. Despite the efforts of the Trade Agent, even the official car was not immediately released.

(iii) Difficulties are also being experienced in the carriage of official mails between Yatung and Lhasa. A diplomatic courier was sent with special advance notice to the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi, but he has been held up in Yatung since June 30 for want of travel facilities. The requests of the Trade Agent in Gyantse for the issue of necessary permits to the normal dakwalas particularly in places like Kangma and Sanda near Gyantse have not been considered. In the absence of any assurance of the safety of our official mails, communications with the posts has been suspended. The mail for the Consulate-General in Lhasa has been held up for weeks in Gyantse. The extent of the hardship caused as a result may be judged from the fact that even tinned milk intended for the small child of the Consul-General in Lhasa was not forwarded despite a special request from the Trade Agency, Gyantse. Obviously our posts cannot function under such difficulties.

(iv) It appears that for inexplicable reasons delays are caused in transmission of telegrams from Gyantse through the Chinese Commercial Telegraph Office there.

(v) Reconstruction of Trade Agency, Gyantse.—The Agreement specifically provides for the Indian Trade Agencies continuing to hold on lease the lands within the Agency compound walls at Yatung and Gyantse. Notwithstanding this, it was after nearly two years that Chinese authorities had agreed in principle to permit the reconstruction of the Trade Agency. Despite the assurances of Chinese co-operation, all manner of difficulties have been created about commencement of the preliminary work. For several days, target practice and rifle shooting took place over the site of the Trade Agency apparently with a view to frighten the labour engaged on the construction. More recently the local authorities have ordered labourers under threat of arrest to stop working on the site. Similarly, owners of horse carts have been instructed not to lift bricks to the Trade Agency site and dealers supplying Arca (mortar) have been prohibited from making deliveries to the Agency. Despite previous promise no transport has been provided locally to help in the construction work. Meanwhile, apart from one jeep, no permit for the import of necessary transport from India for the construction work has been forthcoming.

(vi) Protective works at Gyantse.—Chinese authorities both in Lhasa and Gyantse had agreed in principle to the construction of protective works on the Agency site on our assurance that these would not damage the bridge and the
highway further down the stream. Despite this assurance, the authorities summarily started to demolish a spur along the Indian property and ordered the complete stoppage of essential protective works which are intended to prevent further damage to the land of the Trade Agency.

4. The attention of the Chinese Government has already been drawn through the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi to the severe restrictions which have been placed on the movement of Indian officials as well as the Indian traders engaged in *bona fide* trade. The Indian Trade Agent for Western Tibet who was provided by the Chinese authorities with a visa for the Niti Pass, was required at the last minute to divert his route through Lepuleh pass. This caused him needless expense and inconvenience and prevented him from reaching his post in time.

5. A large number of Indian nationals including Muslims and some Lamas from Jammu and Kashmir State have been residing in Lhasa and the Shigatse area from before the conclusion of the 1954 Agreement. These persons were not required to carry any Indian passports in the past and do not therefore possess any. No adverse inference should be drawn against them on this ground. They are however anxious to retain their Indian nationality. According to the information of the Government of India, they are not being permitted by the Chinese authorities to contact the Consul-General of India at Lhasa and pressure is being brought to bear on them to declare themselves as Chinese nationals.

6. The Government of India have also noticed with concern the persistent propaganda in official organs in the Tibet region describing Indians as imperialists, who have inherited the British traditions and continue to exploit the Tibetans. Such propaganda is deliberately intended to create hostile feelings against India and Indian Posts in Tibet and are bound to come in the way of their normal functioning.

7. The Government of India take a serious view of the facts mentioned in the previous paragraphs. They are deeply concerned at the generally unhelpful and unfriendly attitude of the local authorities towards Indian officials and Indian nationals in the Tibet region of China. It is obvious that the Trade Agencies cannot discharge their normal functions unless customary privileges and immunities for themselves and for their couriers, mailbags and communications are fully guaranteed. They must also have suitable accommodation locally so that they can function with dignity and self-respect. So far as the Government of India are concerned, they have given in the past and continue to give the fullest facilities and privileges to the Chinese Trade Agencies in India in accordance with Article I of the 1954 Agreement. Unfortunately, repeated representations for reciprocal facilities to the Indian Trade Agencies in the Tibet region of China have produced no results. The Government of India have, therefore, begun to entertain serious doubts as to whether the Chinese Government really wish the Indian Trade Agencies in the Tibet region to continue to function. Not only are the facilities laid down in the 1954 Agreement not provided for them.
but even the normal courtesies given to foreign representatives and missions are being denied. From this it would appear that the Chinese Government do not wish these Trade Agencies to continue to function. For their functioning depends on full facilities and courtesies being provided to them by the Chinese authorities. The Government of India would like to have a clear and early answer conveying the wishes of the Chinese Government in regard to this, as the continued functioning of the Trade Agencies in China and India on a reciprocal basis will depend on that answer.
Note given to the Foreign Office of China, 19 August 1959

The Government of Bhutan have requested the Government of India who are responsible for the external relations of Bhutan to bring the following to the notice of the Chinese authorities with a request for immediate action.

2. There are eight villages within the Tibet region of China, over which Bhutan has been exercising administrative jurisdiction for more than 300 years. They are Khangri, Tarchen, Tsekhor, Diraphu, Dzung Tuphu, Jangche, Chakip and Kocha around Mount Kailash. Tarchen 80° 20' E and 30° 55' N is the administrative centre of these enclaves. They were not subject to Tibetan law nor did they pay any Tibetan taxes.

3. Recently the local Chinese authorities have seized all arms, ammunition and ponies belonging to the Bhutan officers who were in charge of these enclaves at village Tarchen. No reasons have been given for this seizure. The Government of Bhutan consider this action on the part of the local Chinese authorities as a violation of the traditional Bhutanese right and authority. The Government of India would urge that immediate instruction should be issued by the Government of the People's Republic of China for the return of the articles and the animals and for ensuring respect in the future by the local authorities for Bhutan's jurisdiction over these villages.
Note given to the Foreign Office of China, 20 August 1959

The system of Bhutan couriers crossing through Tibetan territory has been prevalent traditionally for a long time. No regulations were prescribed requiring permission or possession of any special kind of papers. Chinese authorities should notify if they wish to adopt a new procedure but meanwhile the traditional privilege of Bhutan's official couriers being permitted to use this route should be allowed to continue.

The Government of India who are responsible for the external relations of Bhutan protest against the arrest and ill-treatment of Bhutan's couriers and against restrictions being placed without notice on Bhutan nationals. In particular we protest against Bhutan couriers being prevented from approaching the Indian Trade Agency.
AGREEMENT

Between

THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA AND THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA ON TRADE AND INTERCOURSE

Between

TIBET REGION OF CHINA AND INDIA


Being desirous of promoting trade and cultural intercourse between Tibet Region of China and India and of facilitating pilgrimage and travel by the peoples of China and India.

Have resolved to enter into the present Agreement based on the following principles:

(1) mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty,
(2) mutual non-aggression,
(3) mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs,
(4) equality and mutual benefit, and
(5) peaceful co-existence.

And for this purpose have appointed as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The Government of the Republic of India, H.E. Nedyam Raghavan, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of India accredited to the People's Republic of China; the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, H.E. Chang Han-fu, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Central People's Government, who, having examined each other's credentials and finding them in good and due form, have agreed upon the following:—

Article I

The High Contracting Parties mutually agree to establish Trade Agencies:

(1) The Government of India agrees that the Government of China may establish Trade Agencies at New Delhi, Calcutta and Kalimpong.
(2) The Government of China agrees that the Government of India may establish Trade Agencies at Yatung, Gyantse and Gartok.
The Trade Agencies of both Parties shall be accorded the same status and same treatment. The Trade Agents of both Parties shall enjoy freedom from arrest while exercising their functions, and shall enjoy in respect of themselves, their wives and children who are dependent on them for livelihood freedom from search.

The Trade Agencies of both Parties shall enjoy the privileges and immunities for couriers, mail-bags and communications in code.

**Article II**

The High Contracting Parties agree that traders of both countries known to be customarily and specifically engaged in trade between Tibet Region of China and India may trade at the following places:

1. The Government of China agrees to specify (1) Yatung, (2) Gyzantse and (3) Phari as markets for trade. The Government of India agrees that trade may be carried on in India, including places like (1) Kalimpong, (2) Siliguri and (3) Calcutta, according to customary practice.

2. The Government of China agrees to specify (1) Gartok, (2) Pulanchung (Taklaokot), (3) Gyanima-Kharga, (4) Gyanima-Chakra, (5) Rampura, (6) Dongbra, (7) Puling-Sumdo, (8) Nabra, (9) Shantse and (10) Tashigong as markets for trade; the Government of India agrees that in future, when in accordance with the development and need of trade between the Ari District of Tibet Region of China and India, it has become necessary to specify markets for trade in the corresponding district in India adjacent to the Ari District of Tibet Region of China, it will be prepared to consider on the basis of equality and reciprocity to do so.

**Article III**

The High Contracting Parties agree that pilgrimage by religious believers of the two countries shall be carried on in accordance with the following provisions:

1. Pilgrims from India of Lamaist, Hindu and Buddhist faiths may visit Kang Rimpoch (Kailas) and Mavam Tso (Manasarovar) in Tibet Region of China in accordance with custom.

2. Pilgrims from Tibet Region of China of Lamaist and Buddhist faiths may visit Banaras, Sarnath, Gaya and Sanchi in India in accordance with custom.

3. Pilgrims customarily visiting Lhasa may continue to do so in accordance with custom.

**Article IV**

Traders and pilgrims of both countries may travel by the following passes and route:


Also, the customary route leading to Tashigong along the valley of the Shangatsangpu (Indus) River may continue to be traversed in accordance with custom.
For travelling across the border, the High Contracting Parties agree that diplomatic personnel, officials and nationals of the two countries shall hold passports issued by their own respective countries and visaed by the other Party except as provided in Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 of this Article.

(1) Traders of both countries known to be customarily and specifically engaged in trade between Tibet Region of China and India, their wives and children who are dependent on them for livelihood and their attendants will be allowed entry for purposes of trade into India or Tibet Region of China, as the case may be, in accordance with custom on the production of certificates duly issued by the local government of their own country or by its duly authorised agents and examined by the border checkpoints of the other Party.

(2) Inhabitants of the border districts of the two countries who cross the border to carry on petty trade or to visit friends and relatives may proceed to the border districts of the other Party as they have customarily done heretofore and need not be restricted to the passes and route specified in Article IV above and shall not be required to hold passports, visas or permits.

(3) Porters and mule-team drivers of the two countries who cross the border to perform necessary transportation services need not hold passports issued by their own country, but shall only hold certificates good for a definite period of time (three months, half a year or one year) duly issued by the local government of their own country or by its duly authorised agents and produce them for registration at the border checkpoints of the other Party.

(4) Pilgrims of both countries need not carry documents of certification but shall register at the border checkpoints of the other Party and receive a permit for pilgrimage.

(5) Notwithstanding the provisions of the foregoing paragraphs of this Article, either Government may refuse entry to any particular person.

(6) Persons who enter the territory of the other Party in accordance with the foregoing paragraphs of this Article may stay within its territory only after complying with the procedures specified by the other Party.

Article VI

The present Agreement shall come into effect upon ratification by both Governments and shall remain in force for eight (8) years. Extension of the present Agreement may be negotiated by the two Parties if either Party requests for it six (6) months prior to the expiry of the Agreement and the request is agreed to by the other Party.
Done in duplicate in Peking on the twentyninth day of April, 1954, in the Hindi, Chinese and English languages, all texts being equally valid.

(Sd.) NEDYAM RAGHAVAN, Plenipotentiary of the Government of the Republic of India.

NOTES EXCHANGED

NOTE

Peking, April 29, 1954

YOUR EXCELLENCY MR. VICE-ForeIGN MINISTER,

In the course of our discussions regarding the Agreement on Trade and Intercourse Between Tibet Region of China and India, which has been happily concluded today, the Delegation of the Government of the Republic of India and the Delegation of the Government of the People's Republic of China agreed that certain matters be regulated by an exchange of notes. In pursuance of this understanding, it is hereby agreed between the two Governments as follows:

(1) The Government of India will be pleased to withdraw completely within six (6) months from date of exchange of the present notes the military escorts now stationed at Yatung and Gyantse in Tibet Region of China. The Government of China will render facilities and assistance in such withdrawal.

(2) The Government of India will be pleased to hand over to the Government of China at a reasonable price the postal, telegraph and public telephone services together with their equipment operated by the Government of India in Tibet Region of China. The concrete measures in this regard will be decided upon through further negotiations between the Indian Embassy in China and the Foreign Ministry of China, which shall start immediately after the exchange of the present notes.

(3) The Government of India will be pleased to hand over to the Government of China at a reasonable price the twelve (12) rest houses of the Government of India in Tibet Region of China. The concrete measures in this regard will be decided upon through further negotiations between the Indian Embassy in China and the Foreign Ministry of China, which shall start immediately after the exchange of the present notes. The Government of China agrees that they shall continue as rest houses.

(4) The Government of China agrees that all buildings within the compound walls of the Trade Agencies of the Government of India at Yatung and Gyantse in Tibet Region of China may be retained by the Government of India. The Government of India may continue to lease the land within its Agency compound walls from the Chinese side. And the Government of India agrees that the Trade Agencies of the Government of China at Kalimpong and Calcutta may lease lands from the Indian side for the use of the Agencies and construct buildings thereon. The Government of
China will render every possible assistance for housing the Indian Trade Agency at Gartok. The Government of India will also render every possible assistance for housing the Chinese Trade Agency at New Delhi.

(5) The Government of India will be pleased to return to the Government of China all lands used or occupied by the Government of India other than the lands within its Trade Agency compound walls at Yatung.

If there are godowns and buildings of the Government of India on the above-mentioned lands used or occupied and to be returned by the Government of India and if Indian traders have stores, godowns or buildings on the above-mentioned lands so that there is a need to continue leasing lands, the Government of China agrees to sign contracts with the Government of India or Indian traders, as the case may be, for leasing to them those parts of the land occupied by the said godowns, buildings or stores and pertaining thereto.

(6) The Trade Agents of both Parties may, in accordance with the laws and regulations of the local governments, have access to their nationals involved in civil or criminal cases.

(7) The Trade Agents and traders of both countries may hire employees in the locality.

(8) The hospitals of the Indian Trade Agencies at Gyantse and Yatung will continue to serve personnel of the Indian Trade Agencies.

(9) Each Government shall protect the person and property of the traders and pilgrims of the other country.

(10) The Government of China agrees, so far as possible, to construct rest houses for the use of pilgrims along the route from Pulanchung (Taklakot) to Kang Rimpoche (Kailas) and Mavam Tso (Manasarovar); and the Government of India agrees to place all possible facilities in India at the disposal of pilgrims.

(11) Traders and pilgrims of both countries shall have the facility of hiring means of transportation at normal and reasonable rates.

(12) The three Trade Agencies of each Party may function throughout the year.

(13) Traders of each country may rent buildings and godowns in accordance with local regulations in places under the jurisdiction of the other Party.

(14) Traders of both countries may carry on normal trade in accordance with local regulations at places as provided in Article II of the Agreement.

(15) Disputes between traders of both countries over debts and claims shall be handled in accordance with local laws and regulations.

On behalf of the Government of the Republic of India I hereby agree that the present Note along with Your Excellency's reply shall
become an agreement between our two Governments which shall come into force upon the exchange of the present Notes.

I avail myself of this opportunity to express to Your Excellency Mr. Vice-Foreign Minister, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Sd.) N. RAGHAVAN,
Ambassador Extraordinary
and Plenipotentiary of the
Republic of India.

His Excellency Mr. Chang Han-fu,
Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs,
Central People’s Government,
People’s Republic of China.
NOTE

Peking, April 29, 1954

YOUR EXCELLENCY MR. AMBASSADOR,

I have the honour to receive your note dated April 29, 1954, which reads:

‘* * * * * * * *
* * * * * * * *
* * * * * * * *
* * * * * * * *’

On behalf of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, I hereby agree to Your Excellency's note, and your note along with the present note in reply shall become an agreement between our two Governments, which shall come into force upon the exchange of the present notes.

I avail myself of this opportunity to express to Your Excellency, Mr. Ambassador, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Sd.) CHANG HAN-FU,
Vice-Minister,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
People's Republic of China.

H. E. NEDYAM RAGHAVAN,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
Republic of India.
NOTES REGARDING RATIFICATION

Peking, August 17, 1954

EXCELLENCY,

I have the honour to state that:

WHEREAS an agreement between the Government of the Republic of India and the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China on trade and intercourse between Tibet region of China and India was signed at Peking on the 29th day of April, 1954, by the respective plenipotentiaries of the two Governments, namely,

For the Government of the Republic of India.
His Excellency Nedyam Raghavan, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of India,
For the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.
His Excellency Chang Han-fu,
Which Agreement is reproduced, word for word, in the Annexure hereto,

AND WHEREAS the Government of the Republic of India has ratified this Agreement on the 3rd June, 1954.

I request you to convey information of the said ratification to the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to you, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

NEDYAM RAGHAVAN,
Ambassador of the Republic of India.

His Excellency Mr. Chou En-lai,
Minister for Foreign Affairs,
Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China,
Peking.
No. M/680/54

August 17, 1954

EXCELLENCY,

I have the honour to inform you that the Agreement between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India on Trade and Intercourse between Tibet Region of China and India, which was signed at Peking on the 29th of April, 1954, by Chang Han-fu, Vice-Minister, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, for the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, and Nedyam Raghavan, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Republic of India to the People's Republic of China, for the Government of the Republic of India, was subsequently ratified on the 3rd of June, 1954, by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

I hereby request you to convey information of the said ratification to the Government of India.

The Agreement is reproduced, word for word, in the annexure hereto.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to you, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Sd.) YUAN CHUNG-HSIEN,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the People's Republic of China.

His Excellency Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru,
Minister for External Affairs,
Government of the Republic of India,
New Delhi.
Trade Agreement between the Republic of India and the People's Republic of China, 14 October 1954

The Government of the Republic of India and the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, animated by the common desire to develop trade between the two countries and to strengthen further the friendship that already exists between the Governments and the peoples of India and China have, on the basis of equality and mutual benefit, reached agreements as follows:—

Article I

The two contracting parties being desirous of adopting all appropriate measures for the expansion of trade between the two countries agree to give the fullest consideration to all suggestions for the promotion of such trade.

Article II

The two contracting parties agree that all commercial transactions between the two countries shall be carried out in accordance with the Import, Export and Foreign Exchange Regulations in force from time to time in their respective countries.

Article III

The two contracting parties agree to accord, subject to the laws and regulations of the two countries for the time being in force, facilities for the import and export of the commodities mentioned in the attached Schedules "A" and "B".

Article IV

The present Agreement will not preclude the two contracting parties from facilitating trade in commodities not mentioned in the attached Schedules "A" and "B".

Article V

The Trade between the Republic of India and the Tibet Region of the People's Republic of China will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Agreement between the Republic of India and the People's Republic of China on Trade and Intercourse between India and the Tibet Region of China signed in Peking on the 29th April 1954.

Article VI

The Government of the Republic of India agree that on request by the Government of the People's Republic of China, they will subject to the regulations in force, accord reasonable facilities for the entry into the Port of Calcutta and subsequent movement to the Tibet
Region of the People's Republic of China, of such commercial goods as cannot be obtained in India. These facilities will be accorded only to goods of Chinese origin.

**Article VII**

All commercial and non-commercial payments between the Republic of India and the People's Republic of China may be effected in Indian rupees or in pounds sterling as may be mutually convenient. For the purpose of facilitating such payments, the People's Bank of China will open one or more account(s) with one or more commercial bank(s) in India authorised to deal in Foreign Exchange to be called account(s) “A”. In addition, the People's Bank of China will, if necessary, open another account with the Reserve Bank of India to be called account “B”. All payments between the two countries will be made through account(s) “A”. Account “B” will be used only for replenishing the balance(s) in Account(s) “A” whenever necessary. Payments to be made by residents of India to residents of the People's Republic of China will be effected by crediting the amounts of such payments to the above-mentioned account(s) “A”. Payments to be made to residents of India by residents of the People's Republic of China will be effected by debiting the said account(s) “A”. The account(s) “A” will be replenished as and when necessary by one of the following methods, namely:—

(i) by transfer of funds from another account “A” of the People's Bank of China with another commercial bank, or from account “B” with the Reserve Bank of India;

(ii) by sale of sterling to the bank concerned. Account “B” will be replenished by either sale of sterling to the Reserve Bank of India or by transfer of funds from account(s) “A”.

2. Article VII of this Agreement covers the following payments:—

(i) Payments for the commodities imported or exported under the present Agreement;

(ii) Payments connected with commercial transactions and covering insurance, freight (in case of shipments of goods by the ships of either country) port charges, storage and forwarding expenses and bunkering;

(iii) Payments for distribution of films, for incomes and expenses of cultural performances and other exhibitions;

(iv) Payments of expenses on account of tours of delegations of commercial, cultural, social or official nature;

(v) Payments for the maintenance of the Embassy, Consulates and Trade Agencies of the Republic of India in China and for the maintenance of the Embassy, Consulates and Trade Agencies of the People's Republic of China in India;

(vi) Other non-commercial payments on which agreement is reached between the Reserve Bank of India and the People's Bank of China.

3. Any balances on the credit side of the account(s) “A” or Account “B” maintained by the People's Bank of China will be
convertible on demand into sterling at any time at the usual Banks’ selling rate for sterling as fixed from time to time by the Indian Exchange Banks’ Association. The above mentioned balances will be convertible into sterling even after the expiry of this Agreement.

4. Payments for Border Trade between the Republic of India and of the People's Republic of China, however, will be settled according to the customary practice.

*Article VIII*

The two contracting parties agree to consult with each other on questions that may arise in the course of the implementation of the present Agreement.

*Article IX*

This Agreement will come into force from the date of its signature and will remain valid for a period of two years.

This Agreement can be extended or renewed by negotiation between the two contracting parties to be commenced three months prior to its expiry.

Done in duplicate in New Delhi on the fourteenth Day of October 1954, in the Hindi, Chinese and English languages, all texts being equally authentic.

(Sd.) KUNG YUAN, (Sd.) H. V. R. IENGAR,
China.
SCHEDULE A

Goods available for Export from China to India

1. Cereals—
   (1) Rice.
   (2) Cereals other than rice.
   (3) Green Beans.
   (4) Soyabeans—green and black.


3. Minerals—
   (1) Antimony, Crude and Regulus.
   (2) Gypsum.
   (3) Graphite.
   (4) Fluorspar.
   (5) Sulphur.
   (6) Realgar (Munsell).
   (7) Orpiment.
   (8) Borax.
   (9) Naphthalene Refined.
   (10) Clay.
   (11) Arsenolite (Arsenic Oxide).

4. Silk and Silk piecegoods—
   (1) White and Yellow Raw Silk, Steam Filature.
   (2) Spun Silk.
   (3) Tussah Silk (Wild Silk).
   (4) Douppion Silk.
   (5) Silk piecegoods.
   (6) Fuji Silk piecegoods.
   (7) Tussah Silk piecegoods.
5. Animal Products—

(1) Wool.
(2) Skins and Hides.
(3) Duck Feathers, Goose Feathers.
(4) Woollen Yarn.
(5) White Wax.
(6) Honey.

6. Paper and Stationery—

(1) Newsprint.
(2) Mechanical Pulp free printing paper.
(3) Packing paper.
(4) Stencil paper.
(5) Blotting paper.
(6) Fountain pen.
(7) Pencil.
(8) Ink.
(9) Printing Ink.
(10) Numbering Machine.

7. Chemicals—

(1) Dinitrochloro-Benzene.
(2) Sodium Phosphate.
(3) Carbolic Acid (Phenol).
(4) Potassium Carbonate.
(5) Mono-chloro-benzene.
(6) 666 Insecticide.
(7) Bleaching Powder.

8. Oils—

(1) Tung Oil (Wood Oil).
(2) Cinnamon Oil.
(3) Peppermint Oil.

9. Miscellaneous—

(1) Camphor.
(2) Cassia Lignea.
(3) Musk.
(4) Nutgall.
(5) Aniseed star (star anise).
(6) Menthol Crystal.
(7) Appricot Kernel.
(8) Galangal.
(9) Resin.
(10) Vegetable Medicinal substances.
(11) Hair net.
(12) Fluorescent tubes.
(13) Paint.
(14) Bicycles.
(15) Sports goods.
(16) Porcelain.
(17) Glass and glassware.
(18) Printed matter and books.
(19) Canned goods.
(20) Torch lights.
(21) Vacuum flash.
(22) Buttons.
(23) Lacquer ware.
(24) Fire crackers.
(25) Hosiery needles.
(26) Stitching needles.
(27) Fish and sea products.
(28) Dried fruits.
(29) Vegetables and vegetable products.
(30) Garlic.
(31) Vermicelli.
(32) Chinese films (exposed).
SCHEDULE B

PART I

Goods available for Export from India to China, including Tibet

Food Products and Tobacco—

(1) Grams, Rice and Pulses.

(2) Spices including chillies and pepper.

(3) Tobacco unmanufactured.

Raw materials and articles mainly unmanufactured

Ores and Concentrates—

(1) Chrome Ore.

(2) Kyanite Ore.

(3) Manganese Ore.

(4) Tin and Zinc Concentrates.

Oils, Vegetable—

Groundnut Oil.

Oils, Essential—

(1) Lemon grass oil.

(2) Sandalwood oil.

Textile fibres—

(1) Cotton raw.

(2) Wool raw.

Wood and Timber—

Sandal wood.

Hides and skins—

Raw goat skins and sheep skins of heavier variety and hides and skins tanned.

Miscellaneous—

(1) Myrobalan and Myrobalan extracts.

(2) Paraffin wax.

(3) Art Shellac.

Articles mainly manufactured

Chemicals, Chemical Products and drugs and medicines—

(1) Chemicals (Bichromates), Calcium Chloride, Chromic acid, Glycerine, Magnesium Chloride, Magnesium Sulphate, Naphthalene, Potassium Bromide, Potassium Nitrate, Sodium Bromide, Sodium Sulphide, Sodium Sulphite.
(2) Drugs, medicines and medicinal herbs.
(3) Processed dyes.
(4) Shark Liver Oil.

Instruments, apparatus and appliances—

(1) Clinical Thermometers.
(2) Electric lamps.
(3) Electric insulating materials.
(4) Electro-medical apparatus.
(5) Mathematical instruments.
(6) Surgical instruments.
(7) X-Ray equipment.
(8) Telephone.
(9) Electric Fans.

Machinery—

(1) Ball and Roller bearings.
(2) Generators.
(3) Motors.
(4) Textile Machinery including Spindles, ring frames, carding engines, looms and finishing machinery.
(5) Boilers.


Metal Manufactures—

(1) Aluminium, brass and copper wares.
(2) Iron and Steel manufactures excluding containers.
(3) Non-ferrous metal products.

Textiles—

(1) Cotton piecegoods and cotton manufactures.
(2) Cotton twist and yarn.
(3) Flax manufactures.
(4) Sisal ropes and twine.
(5) Jute manufactures.

Vehicles—

(1) Bicycles.
(2) Motor Cars.
Miscellaneous—
(1) Indian films exposed.
(2) Light engineering goods: centrifugal pumps, G.I. buckets, hurricane lanterns, sewing machines.
(3) Plastic manufactures.
(4) Shellac.
(5) Mica.
(6) Asbestos cement sheets.
(7) Cement.
(8) Hume pipes.
(9) Builders’ hardware.
(10) Tyres and tubes.
(11) Belting for machinery.
(12) Paper.
(13) Bituminous composition.
(14) Agricultural implements.
(15) Disinfectants.

PART II

Goods available for Export from India to the Tibet Region of China

Food Products and Tobacco—
(1) Confectionery.
(2) Hydrogenated Oil.
(3) Tinned fruits and vegetables.
(4) Cigarettes.

Raw materials and articles mainly unmanufactured

Oils, Vegetable—
(1) Castor Oil.
(2) Kardiseed Oil.
(3) Linseed Oil.
(4) Mustard Oil.
(5) Nigerseed Oil.
(6) Rapeseed Oil.

Textiles—
Apparel.

Miscellaneous—
Gums other than gum arabic.

Articles mainly manufactured

Instruments, apparatus and appliances—
(1) Accumulators.
(2) Electric wires and cables.
(3) Scientific instruments.
(4) Transmission line equipment.
(5) Wireless instruments.

Machinery—
Control and transmission gear.

Metal manufactures—
(1) Bolts and nuts.
(2) Enamelware.
(3) Wood screws.

Stationery including paper—
Paper and Stationery.

Vehicles—
(1) Trucks.
(2) Carriages and carts.
(3) Wheels and shafts for carts.

Miscellaneous—
(1) Candles.
(2) Clocks.
(3) Coral manufactured.
(4) Matches.
(5) Soaps and washing powders.
(6) Toilet requisites.
(7) Lard.
(8) Pork.
(9) Sugar.
(10) Rain coats.
(11) Rubber shoes.
(12) Reinforcement steel bars.
(13) Galvanized iron wire.
(14) Barbed wire.
(15) Steel plates and sheets.
(16) Road Rollers.
(17) Gasoline, Kerosene, Diesel and Engine Oils.
(18) Galvanized iron sheets, plain and corrugated.
(19) Leather and leather goods.
(20) Safety razor blades.
(21) Biscuits.
(22) Rubber manufactures other than tyres and tubes.
(23) Sheet glass and glassware.
(24) Sports goods.
LETTERS
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

New Delhi, 14th October, 1954.

Dear Mr. Kung,

In the course of the discussions that have led to the conclusion of the Trade Agreement between the Government of the Republic of India and the Government of the People's Republic of China, it was agreed that the intentions of the two Governments regarding Article VI and the procedure for its implementation should be placed on record by an exchange of letters.

2. On the basis of equality and mutual benefit, both Governments desire to maintain and develop the existing customary trade between India and the Tibet Region of the People's Republic of China.

3. The Government of the Republic of India appreciate that the Tibet Region of the People's Republic of China may need certain commercial goods that cannot be obtained in India and are, therefore, willing to give reasonable facilities for the clearance of such goods through Calcutta for movement to the Tibet Region of the People's Republic of China, provided the goods are of Chinese origin.

4. It is agreed that the following broad lines of procedure may be adopted for the clearance and movement of the goods mentioned in the preceding paragraphs:

(i) With a view to facilitating clearance and transport, the Government of the People's Republic of China will give advance intimation to the Government of India of such goods to be transported to the Tibet Region of the People's Republic of China, in order to ascertain with reference to the availability of such goods in India, whether clearance and movement facilities can be accorded. Matters pertaining to the transportation of such goods will be discussed and settled between the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi and the Government of India.

(ii) The goods agreed to be cleared shall, on import, be entered at the Custom House in the Port of Calcutta.

(iii) Subject to the Indian Customs Regulations, and on a deposit being made as required by the Customs Authorities, the goods will be cleared under Customs seal for onward despatch to the Tibet Region of the People's Republic of China by the agreed routes.

(iv) The goods will be produced with the Customs seals intact before the Land Customs Officer at the point of final exit.
and cleared for export to the Tibet Region of the People's Republic of China.

(v) The Land Customs Officer will, if the goods are received with seals intact, clear the goods and grant a certificate to that effect.

(vi) On presentation of such certificate to the Customs Authorities at the Port of Calcutta, the deposit shall be returned with such deductions for incidental charges as may be mutually agreed upon.

5. This letter and your confirmation will be treated by both Governments as forming part of the Agreement.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) H. V. R. IENGAR.

His Excellency Mr. Kung Yuan,
Vice-Minister for Foreign Trade and Leader of the Chinese Trade Delegation,
New Delhi.
New Delhi, 14th October 1954.

SHRI IENGAR,

I have today received with thanks your letter dated the 14th October 1954, which reads as follows:

"..............."

I agree to the contents stated in your aforesaid letter on behalf of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. Your letter and this confirmation will be treated as forming part of the Agreement.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) KUNG YUAN.

Shri H. V. R. Iengar,
Secretary to the Government of India,
Ministry of Commerce and Industry,
New Delhi.
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

New Delhi, 14th October, 1954.

DEAR MR. KUNG,

During the course of the negotiations which have led to the conclusion of the present Trade Agreement between India and China, both the Delegations recognised that the problems concerning inspection, surveys, shipping, insurance and travel by businessmen should be considered and solved in a practical manner so that the objectives of the Agreement are better achieved and trade relations between the two countries further strengthened. These problems relate to questions of detail rather than of principle and the two Delegations have accordingly agreed to defer the discussion on these matters to a later date. It is hoped that in these subsequent discussions our two Governments will be able to arrive at constructive solutions that will help to encourage and stimulate the smooth flow of trade between our two countries.

2. In the meanwhile, the trade between the two countries will continue to be conducted on such basis as may be agreed upon between the importers and exporters concerned.

3. This letter and your confirmation will be treated by both Governments as forming part of the Agreement.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) H. V. R. IENGAR.

His Excellency Mr. Kung Yuan,
Vice-Minister for Foreign Trade and
Leader of the Chinese Trade Delegation,
New Delhi.
New Delhi, 14th October 1954.

'SHRI IENGAR,

I have today received with thanks your letter dated the 14th October 1954, which reads as follows: —

" ...................

I agree to the contents stated in your aforesaid letter on behalf of the Central People’s Government of the People’s Republic of China. Your letter and this confirmation will be treated as forming part of the Agreement.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) KUNG YUAN.

'Shri H. V. R. Iengar,
'Secretary to the Government of India,
'Ministry of Commerce and Industry,
'New Delhi.
Letters exchanged at New Delhi on 25 May 1957, extending the Trade Agreement between India and the People’s Republic of China for a further period ending 31 December 1958.

EMBASSY OF THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA IN INDIA,
NEW DELHI.

May 25, 1957.

Dear Mr. Ranganathan,

I have the honour to refer to the recent discussions regarding promotion of trade between the People’s Republic of China and India when it was agreed that the trade relations between our two countries will continue to be regulated by the terms and conditions embodied in the Trade Agreement concluded on the 14th October 1954 for a further period ending 31st December 1958, subject to the substitution of Article VII of the old Agreement by the following Article:

“All commercial and non-commercial payments between the People’s Republic of China and the Republic of India may be effected in Indian rupees. For the purpose of facilitating such payments, the People’s Bank of China and/or other commercial banks in China will open one or more account(s) with one or more commercial bank(s) in India authorised to deal in foreign exchange. In addition, the People’s Bank of China will open another account with the Reserve Bank of India. All payments between the two countries will be made through the account(s) maintained with the commercial bank(s). Payments to be made by residents of India to residents of the People’s Republic of China will be effected by crediting the amounts of such payments to the above mentioned account(s) with the commercial bank(s) in India. Payments to be made to residents of India by residents of the People’s Republic of China will be effected by debiting the said account(s) with the commercial bank(s) in India. The account(s) with the commercial bank(s) in India will be replenished as and when necessary by one of the following methods, namely:—

(i) by transfer of funds from another account(s) of the People’s Bank of China or the commercial bank(s) in China with another commercial bank(s) in India, or

(ii) by transfer of funds from the account of the People’s Bank of China with the Reserve Bank of India, or

(iii) by sale of sterling to the bank concerned.

The account of the People’s Bank of China with the Reserve Bank of India will be replenished either by sale of sterling to the Reserve Bank of India or by transfer of funds from the account(s) of the People’s Bank of China or the commercial bank(s) in China with the commercial bank(s) in India.
2. Article VII of this Agreement covers the following payments:—

(i) Payments for the commodities imported or exported under the present Agreement;

(ii) Payments connected with commercial transaction and covering insurance, freight (in case of shipments of goods by the ships of either country), port charges, storage and forwarding expenses and bunkering;

(iii) Payments for distribution of films, for incomes and expenses of cultural performances and other exhibitions;

(iv) Payments of expenses on account of tours of delegations of commercial, cultural, social or official nature;

(v) Payments for the maintenance of the Embassy, Consulates and Trade Agencies of the People's Republic of China in India and for the maintenance of the Embassy, Consulates and Trade Agencies of the Republic of India in China;

(vi) Other non-commercial payments on which agreement is reached between the Reserve Bank of India and the People's Bank of China.

3. Any balance in the Rupee account maintained by the People's Bank of China with the Reserve Bank of India will be convertible on demand into sterling at the usual Banks selling rate for sterling as fixed from time to time by the Indian Exchange Banks' Association. The above-mentioned balance will also be convertible into sterling after the expiry of this Agreement.

4. Payments for Border Trade between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India, however, will be settled according to the customary practice.

The new Article VII will come into force with effect from the 1st July 1957.

I shall be glad if you will please confirm that the above correctly sets out the understanding reached between us.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) PAN TZU-LI,

Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the People's Republic of China to India.

Shri S. Ranganathan, I.C.S.,
Secretary to the Government of India,
Ministry of Commerce and Industry,
New Delhi.
New Delhi, 25th May, 1957.

Dear Mr. Pan Tzu-Li,

I write to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated May 25, 1957, which reads as follows:

"""

I confirm that the foregoing correctly sets out the understanding reached between us.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) S. RANGANATHAN,
Secretary to the Government of India

H.E. Mr. Pan Tzu-Li,
Ambassador Extraordinary and
Plenipotentiary of the People’s
Republic of China in India,
New Delhi
DEAR MR. TU,

In the course of discussions which we had recently regarding further development of trade between the People's Republic of China and India, it was agreed that the Government of the People's Republic of China will encourage the State Trading Corporations of China to establish and strengthen contacts to the extent practicable with the State Trading Corporation of India in those commodities which are handled by the State Trading Corporation of India.

I shall be grateful if you would kindly confirm that the foregoing correctly sets out the understanding reached between us.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) K. B. LALL,
Joint Secretary to the Government of India.

Mr. Tu Yu-Yun,
Counsellor for Commercial Affairs,
Embassy of the People's Republic of China,
New Delhi.
DEAR MR. LALL,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of today's date which reads as follows:—

"..............."

I confirm that the foregoing correctly sets out the understanding reached between us.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) TU YU-YUN,
Counsellor for Commercial Affairs,
Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India.

Shri K. B. Lall,
Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, New Delhi.
Letters extending the Indo-Chinese Trade Agreement up to 31 December 1959

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

New Delhi, 25th May, 1959.

Jyaistha 4, 1881 (S)

Dear Mr. Tu,

With reference to Article IX of the Trade Agreement between the Republic of India and the People’s Republic of China concluded on the 14th October, 1954 and the recent discussions regarding the promotion of trade between the two countries, I have the honour to say that the two contracting parties have agreed that the present Trade Agreement as modified by the letters exchanged on the 25th May, 1957, shall remain valid up to the 31st December, 1959.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) K. B. LALL,
Additional Secretary to the Government of India.

Mr. Tu Yu-Yun,
Counsellor for Commercial Affairs,
Embassy of the People’s Republic of China,
New Delhi.
DEAR MR. LALL,

With reference to Article IX of the Trade Agreement between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India concluded on the 14th October, 1954 and the recent discussions regarding the promotion of trade between the two countries, I have the honour to say that the two contracting parties have agreed that the present Trade Agreement as modified by the letters exchanged on the 25th May, 1957, shall remain valid up to the 31st December, 1959.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) TU YU-YUN,
Counsellor for Commercial Affairs.

Mr. K. B. Lall, I.C.S.
Additional Secretary to the Government of India,
Ministry of Commerce and Industry,
New Delhi.
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Note given to the Ambassador of India by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 1 September 1959

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply to the Embassy's Note of August 11 as follows:

According to reports received by the Chinese Government, at 07:00 hours on August 7, seven Indian armed personnel were suddenly discovered to have intruded into Chinese territory at Shatze by Chinese frontier guards patrolling there on Chinese soil. At 10:30 hours on the same day, more than 10 Indian armed personnel again intruded into the above-mentioned place. In order to safeguard their territory against violation, the Chinese frontier guards promptly advised them to withdraw from Chinese territory. The Indian armed personnel thereupon left the above place. But starting from August 9, Indian armed personnel again unlawfully intruded many times into Shatze and Khinzemane, both within Chinese territory. On August 14, when Chinese frontier guards patrolled to Khinzemane, they repeatedly warned the Indian armed personnel who had unlawfully intruded there to withdraw from Chinese territory. These Indian armed personnel, however, did not heed the solemn warnings of the Chinese frontier guards; they not only failed to withdraw from Chinese territory promptly, but even camped there and deployed forces to control the surrounding important positions to prevent the Chinese frontier guards from entering, in an attempt to seize by force the above-said Chinese territory.

In addition, the Chinese Government has learnt that on June 28, 1959, more than 10 Indian armed personnel unlawfully intruded into Chinese territory at the Kechilang pasture-ground, west of Shatze, and peremptorily set up so-called Sino-Indian boundary marks at Latze Pass which is within Chinese territory.

The Chinese Government wishes to point out solemnly that the above-mentioned places are undoubtedly parts of Chinese territory. The stationing and patrolling by Chinese frontier guards on their own soil by no means involve so-called violation of the Indian border. The Chinese Government expresses great surprise and regret at the allegations made in the Indian Government's Note that the above-mentioned places belong to India, that the boundary runs along Thangia Ridge north of Namkha Chuthangmu Valley, and that Chinese troops in this area violated the Indian border. The Chinese Government absolutely cannot agree to these allegations which are totally inconsistent with the facts.

The Chinese Government must also point out that the unlawful intrusion into Chinese territory by the above-mentioned Indian armed personnel, their arbitrary setting up of boundary marks within Chinese territory, and especially their brazen camping and stationing on Chinese territory in defiance of the repeated warnings served by the Chinese frontier guards, in an attempt to seize Chinese territory indefinitely, constitute serious encroachments upon China's sovereignty and territorial integrity, violations of the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence and direct threat to the peace of this area. Regarding this, the Chinese Government hereby lodges a
serious protest with the Indian Government and, in view of the grave nature of the situation, demands that the Indian Government immediately order the above-mentioned Indian armed personnel who have intruded to withdraw from Chinese territory, and adopt effective measures to seriously ensure against the occurrence of similar incidents in the future.

The Chinese Government, out of considerations for the friendly relationship between the two countries, has been trying its best to avoid any armed clashes. However, it cannot but point out with regret that, after the above-mentioned intrusion of Chinese territory by Indian armed personnel, the Indian Government, in its Note dated August 11, arbitrarily described the place within Chinese territory which has been intruded into by the Indian armed personnel as belonging to India, and declared in a threatening and provocative tone that the Indian security forces had instructions not to scruple using force to prevent Chinese troops from entering this place. The Chinese Government must point out that this decision of the Indian Government has already created an extremely dangerous situation in this area. Should the Indian Government fail to change this decision at once, to have the Indian armed forces promptly withdraw from Chinese territory which they have seized unlawfully, responsibility for all the serious consequences arising therefrom will necessarily rest with the Indian Government.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given to the Ambassador of India by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 1 September 1959

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of the Republic of India in China and has the honour to state, on instructions, once again the following regarding Indian armed forces' unlawful violation of Chinese territory at Longju in the Migyitun area and Tamaden and their armed provocation against Chinese troops in the Migyitun area:

1. According to verified investigation conducted by the Chinese Government, it is confirmed without any doubt that the armed clash between Chinese and Indian troops which occurred on August 25, 1959 in the southern part of Migyitun in the Tibet Region of China was solely caused by Indian troops' unlawful intrusion into the Migyitun area and their unwarranted provocative attack on Chinese troops. The facts pointed out in the Note of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs handed over to the Embassy on August 27 were true and established. The Indian troops must bear full responsibility for this serious border incident. The actual fact was as follows: Around 06:00 hours on August 25, when Chinese troops were patrolling in the southern part of Migyitun, a group of Indian troops which had intruded into that area suddenly opened fire on the Chinese troops without giving any warning, discharging dozens of rounds of machine-gun and rifle shots. Only after the Chinese troops under compulsion fired back in self defence, did the Indian troops withdraw from the area of clash. The Chinese troops then neither arrested any Indian soldiers, nor out-flanked any out-post of the Indian troops at Longju. But in the morning of the next day, that is, August 26, the Indian troops at the Longju out-post went further in carrying out new provocations, once again launching a violent attack on the Chinese troops in Migyitun, discharging as many as several hundreds of rounds of rifle, sten-gun and light and heavy machine-gun shots. On the same day, Indian aircraft many times violated China's air space over this area. At the time the Chinese troops merely held their own posts; they did not strike back against the Indian troops' provocation, not to speak of so-called encircling Indian troops' outpost at Longju. The Indian troops stationing at Longju withdrew subsequently on their own accord. Thus it can be seen that the Chinese troops acted entirely in self defence and to preserve China's territorial integrity, and throughout the incidents demonstrated the greatest toleration and self-restraint. Nevertheless, in its Note handed over to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on August 27 by the Indian Embassy in China, the Indian Government groundlessly accused Chinese troops of violating Indian border, opening fire first on the Indian troops, out-flanking and encircling the Indian post at Longju and even arresting twelve Indian soldiers, etc., etc. These in no way correspond to the facts. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the allegation made in the Embassy's Note that the Chinese troops carried out deliberate aggression on India as well as the Indian Government's unwarranted protest, and once again lodges its serious protest with the Indian
Government against the violation of the above-mentioned Chinese territory and repeated armed provocations by the Indian troops.

2. Although the Chinese troops did not cross for a single step into Longju during the incidents on August 25 and 26, it must, however, be pointed out that Longju is indisputably part of Chinese territory, and that the invasion and occupation of that place and the setting up of outposts there by the Indian troops constitute a grave violation of China's territorial integrity. The Indian Government's claim that Longju be Indian territory as made in the Notes of the Indian Embassy in China of June 27 and August 27 is entirely groundless; the Chinese Government absolutely cannot agree to this claim.

Longju is part of the Migyitun area and has all along been under the jurisdiction of the Tibet Region of China. After the peaceful liberation of Tibet, the Chinese People's Liberation Army for long stationed units there, and Chinese authorities took various administrative measures locally, including the issuance of agricultural loans. It was only not long ago that the place was unlawfully invaded and occupied by Indian troops taking advantage of an interval resulting from the shift of Chinese troops.

As the Indian Government is aware, the Chinese Government has pointed out that no section of the Sino-Indian boundary has ever been formally delimited; the boundary between the two countries is yet to be settled through surveys and discussions between the two sides. The Chinese Government has also repeatedly pointed out that the so-called traditional boundary between India and the eastern part of the Tibet Region of China as referred to by the Indian Government, i.e., the so-called McMahon Line, was set forth in the past by the British imperialists unilaterally and has never been accepted by the Chinese Government; it of course cannot be regarded as legal. Nevertheless, even by documents and maps related to this so-called traditional boundary as set forth by the British, Longju is unquestionably within Chinese territory. It can thus be seen that the Indian Government's claim that Longju belongs to India is devoid of any ground no matter viewed from what aspect.

In Premier Chou En-lai's letter to Prime Minister Nehru dated January 23, 1959, the Chinese Government, in order to avoid any border incidents so far as possible pending the formal delimitation of the boundary between the two countries, proposed to the Indian Government that, as a provisional measure, each side temporarily maintain the status quo of the border areas under its administration and not go beyond them. To this proposal Prime Minister Nehru expressed his agreement in his reply dated March 22, 1959. Yet the Indian Government claimed Longju to be Indian territory and occupied it by troops. This was an attempt to change the status quo of Longju by force. The Chinese Government cannot but lodge a strong protest against this.

Now that the Indian troops have withdrawn from Longju of their own accord, the Chinese Government emphatically urges the Indian Government to adopt measures at once to prevent Indian troops from committing any new violation against Longju. Otherwise the Indian side must bear full responsibility for all the serious
consequences arising therefrom. The Chinese Government must also point out that some remnant Tibetan rebel bandits are still using areas under Indian administration as bases to carry out harassment against Migyitun, Longju and other places. The Chinese Government asks the Indian Government to take effective measures also to put a stop to this.

3. In its Note dated June 27, 1959, the Indian Government also claimed Tamaden which is east of Migyitun to be Indian territory. After investigations, the Chinese Government is in possession of reliable materials which prove that that place likewise has long been Chinese territory, and even by the so-called traditional boundary, i.e., the so-called MacMahon Line as set forth in the past by the British, the place is located to the north of that Line. The Chinese Government asks the Indian Government to order the Indian troops now still occupying the place to withdraw immediately and completely.

It is clear from the above that the fact is not, as alleged in the Indian Government's Notes, that Chinese troops have repeatedly violated Indian territory or that the Chinese Government has been asserting its territorial claims by force; quite contrary, it is the Indian troops that have repeatedly violated Chinese territory and the Indian Government that has been asserting its illegitimate territorial claims by force. In its Notes, the Indian Government more than once said that it had instructed its frontier troops to use force against Chinese troops. This action not only constitutes a deliberate intimidation against China but has already led to serious consequences. The Chinese Government deems that the recent unwarranted provocations by Indian troops in Migyitun and Longju were by no means fortuitous, but were precisely the inevitable results of the Indian Government's above instructions.

The Chinese Government, in the spirit of the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence and Sino-Indian friendship, has always adhered to the attitude of seeking a settlement of the question of boundary between China and India through diplomatic channels. At the same time, the Chinese Government wishes to reiterate: No violation of Chinese territory will be tolerated. All areas that have been invaded and occupied must be evacuated. Any armed provocation will certainly meet with Chinese frontier guard's firm rebuff.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note dated 3 September 1959, given by the Counsellor of India to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China on 5 September 1959

The Embassy of India presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to communicate the following Note from the Government of India:

The Government of India have seen the note from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China dated 27th August, 1959 on the incident south of Migyitun. The statements in the Chinese Government's Note are not in accordance with facts. The Government of India have now received first hand accounts of the incident from members of the detachment at Longju who had to leave the outpost under Chinese fire. These reports confirm our previous information that the Chinese deliberately fired on our forward picket killing one person on the spot and seriously wounding another. Later the Chinese detachment opened fire on the main outpost at Longju at 03.00 on 26th August and over-ran the surrounding area. Our personnel had to fire back in self defence. The Government of India emphatically protest against this unprovoked firing on a static post within Indian territory. They are always ready to discuss border disputes with the Government of the People's Republic of China but such discussions can be fruitful only if both sides agree to maintain the status quo and one side does not use force in the assertion of its supposed claim. The Government of India are therefore unable to accept the Chinese Government's protest. They request that the territory occupied by the Chinese troops should be vacated immediately so that the Indian frontier outpost at Longju can be re-established. The Government of India will hold the Chinese responsible for the death of the Indian frontier guard. A further communication will follow as soon as the extent of Indian casualties has been ascertained.

The Embassy of India avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given to the Counsellor of India by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 7 September 1959

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state as follows on the Indian Government's dispatch of personnel into the Wu-je area:

According to reports received by the Government of the People's Republic of China from the local authorities, since June 1959 more than 20 Indian official personnel equipped with radio sets have entered China's Wu-je area and camped there, and carried out illegal examination and registration of Chinese travelling about in that area.

It must be pointed out that the above-mentioned actions of the Indian official personnel are obviously deliberate attempts to change the status quo of the Wu-je area and constitute an infringement on China's sovereignty and territorial integrity. The Chinese Government, therefore, cannot but lodge a protest with the Indian Government. The Chinese Government asks the Indian Government to immediately order those personnel to withdraw from the place and adopt effective measures to prevent the occurrence of similar incidents in the future.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Embassy of India presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to convey the following from the Government of India:

The Government of India have seen the two Notes which were received by the Indian Embassy in Peking from the Chinese Government, one relating to the India-China boundary in the neighbourhood of Khinzemane and the other relating to the boundary in the Migytin area. The Government of India would like to emphasize once more that the so-called McMahon Line definitely represents the boundary between India and the Tibet Region of China from the eastern border of Bhutan up to Burma and they stand firmly by it. The circumstances in which the McMahon Line was fixed as the boundary are given in detail in para. 4 of the Prime Minister's letter of the 22nd March 1959 to Premier Chou En-lai. This line is by and large in accordance with the geographical features in that area and also with long-established usage. The McMahon Line however departs from well-recognized geographical features at a few places. For example, the international boundary departs from the watershed near Tsari in order to include in Tibet the pilgrimage route of Tsari Nyingpa which is used every year by a large number of Tibetans. Similarly, the village of Migytin was included in Tibet in view of the fact that the Tibetans attached considerable importance to this village. The Government of India are prepared to discuss the exact alignment of the McMahon Line at places where it departs from the geographical features marking the international boundary. It would have been helpful if some indication had been given by the Chinese Government of where they think the exact boundary should be demarcated on the ground in the area of Migytin. In this context the Government of India cannot but express their regret once more that large areas of Indian territory should continue to be shown in official maps as part of China. It is most extraordinary that the Government of the People's Republic of China should not have found time during the last ten years to withdraw these faulty maps. The continued circulation of these maps is a standing threat to India's integrity and evidence of unfriendliness towards India. Obviously no discussion of the India-China border in any sector can proceed on the basis of maps which have no relation to reality. The position of the Government of India has been clarified in the Prime Minister's letter of the 22nd March 1959 to Premier Chou En-lai.

2. In regard to the specific dispute raised by the Chinese Government about Khinzemane, the Government of India would like to point out that the boundary line in the particular area follows the crest of the highest mountain range. Khinzemane is south of this range and is obviously part of Indian territory. Reference has been made in the Chinese Government's Note to the alleged Chinese territory of "Kechilang" west of "Shatze". The Government of India are unable to identify either of these places in their maps. There is however a pasture known as the Droksar pastures which is owned...
by the Indian village of Lumpo. The villages of Le and Timmod within Chinese territory on the other side of the Thangla ridge have been allowed to utilise these grazing pastures and for this privilege the Tibetan village of Le is paying rent in kind to the Indian village of Lumpo. In any case it is not uncommon for border villages on one side to use by mutual agreement pastures lying on the other side of the international boundary and the exercise of this privilege cannot be regarded as evidence in support of a territorial claim.

3. As regards the position at Longju as stated above the McMahon Line runs immediately south of the village of Migyitun which is in Chinese territory. The Government of India cannot accept the position that Longju is part of Migyitun. In fact it is entirely distinct from Migyitun. The Government of India are also surprised to learn that the Chinese authorities had exercised any administrative jurisdiction over Longju at any time in the past. Obviously the Chinese Government have received wrong reports on the point. It is not a fact that our detachment first fired on Chinese troops. Our definite instruction was that the Indian personnel should use force only in self-defence and we have no reason to think that they did not carry out this instruction. The instruction to the Indian patrol to resist trespassers could never be interpreted to mean that any person found on our territory was immediately to be fired at. Our personnel were to resist pressure brought to bear on them to vacate their position. The fate of all our personnel is not known even now but we are satisfied from the reports of those who have returned to base camp that the Chinese encircled and used overpowering force on the detachment at Longju and Indian personnel had to withdraw under this pressure.

The Government of India have investigated the complaint of intrusion of Indian planes into Chinese territory. The facts are that when the Indian post at Longju was surrounded and attacked by a superior Chinese force some planes were despatched to drop supplies to the post. Later, after the post had been overrun and contact with our personnel had been lost, planes were despatched to find the whereabouts of the personnel. We are satisfied that our planes kept entirely on our side of the international border.

4. The Government of India are examining once more the exact alignment of the boundary in the Tamaden area. They would like to assure the Chinese Government that if Tamaden is found not to be within Indian territory the Indian post will be withdrawn from there.

5. However, the Government of India are prepared to discuss with the Chinese Government the exact alignment of the so-called McMahon Line at Khinzemane, the Longju area and the Tamaden area. They request that the status quo should be maintained at all these places and that the Chinese personnel should not alter the present position by crossing the Thangla ridge and trying to occupy any territory south of the ridge. Similarly pending examination of the position at Tamaden force should not be used on the Indian post there. As far as Longju is concerned the Government of India would be prepared not to send their personnel back to the area provided that the Chinese would also withdraw their forces. This would mean that neither side would have their personnel at Longju.
6. The Government of India attach the highest importance to peaceful co-existence and the continuance of Sino-Indian friendship. They are convinced that if this principle had been acted upon the Chinese authorities would not have sought to send armed personnel into Indian territory. The Chinese Government have stated in their notes that no violation of Chinese territory will be tolerated. The Government of India have not the remotest wish to trespass into other people's territory. Equally they cannot possibly withdraw under intimidation from areas which are part of India and will have to prevent illegal intrusion by foreign forces into their territory. There is no truth at all in the allegation that rebel Tibetan elements are operating from Indian territory. In no circumstances will the Government of India allow any foreign elements to operate against a friendly Government from their soil. More than 13,000 Tibetans have crossed into Indian territory during the last five months. They were disarmed immediately they crossed the international boundary. Those who refused to part with their arms were pushed back from Indian territory.

7. Should the Chinese Government accept the proposal for a discussion of the exact delimitation of the border at the places mentioned above the Government of India would like to know what procedure they would wish to follow. The Government of India agree pending further discussions the position as stated above should not be altered by either side.

The Embassy of India takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Counsellor of India to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 13 September 1959

The Embassy of India presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to transmit the following reply from the Government of India in reply to the Note handed over to Mr. K. M. Kannampilly, Counsellor of the Indian Embassy, by the Deputy Director of the Asian Division of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, on 7th September 1959:

The Government of India have seen the Note presented by the Chinese Foreign Office to the Embassy of India in Peking on the 7th September 1959 regarding Barahoti which the Chinese Government call Wu-je. The Government of India have to say with regret that they are surprised by the contents of this Note. As the Government of India have consistently maintained, Barahoti, which lies south of the major watershed in the area, is part of Indian territory. Full discussions took place on the subject in the meetings held in Delhi in April-May 1958 between the Indian and the Chinese delegations. In the course of these discussions, the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India proposed that without prejudice to their respective claims both sides should refrain from sending armed personnel to the disputed area. The Foreign Secretary further suggested that pending settlement of the dispute neither country should exercise civil jurisdiction over this territory or send its civil personnel. The Chinese delegation was agreeable to the suggestion not to send armed parties to the disputed area, but they refused to agree to the proposal that neither side should endeavour to exercise civil jurisdiction over this area.

2. In the absence of agreement, the Government of India informed the Chinese delegation that India too would continue to send its civil administrative personnel to the territory. It would be unreasonable to expect that the Government should unilaterally refrain from sending their civil administrative personnel to an area which in their view is part of Indian territory. In the circumstances, the Government of India cannot accept the contention of the Chinese Government that this action of theirs constituted an infringement of Chinese sovereignty and territorial integrity. By the same reasoning the Government of India could bring the same charge against the Chinese Government who sent officials of the Tibetan region of China to Barahoti and sought to exercise civil jurisdiction over this area.

3. The Government of India would take this opportunity to invite the attention of the Government of the People's Republic of China to the Note which was presented by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy on the 10th December 1958 and to earlier conversations with the Chinese Embassy on the subject. It was mentioned to the Chinese Counsellor that according to information of the Government of India the Chinese Government had sent a large armed party to the area in September 1958, apparently in an effort to change the status quo of the area. No written
reply to the Indian Note was received but the Counsellor of the Indian Embassy in Peking was verbally informed that no armed personnel have been sent to Wu-je in September 1958. Although reports subsequently received by the Government of India confirmed their earlier information they agreed to the suggestion of the Chinese Government not to send any armed personnel to Barahoti during the 1959 season. Accordingly the Indian Revenue Party sent this year to Barahoti did not carry any arms even for self protection.

4. The Government of India was also informed that the Chinese Government despatched a party to Barahoti during the winter of 1958-59 after the Indian civil party had withdrawn. This was unusual and contrary to the traditional practice and the Government of India could regard this action only as an attempt to establish effective control over the area unilaterally. For their own part, the Government of India have scrupulously adhered to the interim agreement reached in the 1958 discussions at Delhi not to send any armed personnel to Barahoti.

5. It is unfortunate that the discussions which took place in Delhi in 1958 have not been resumed till now. The Government of India are of the view that the dispute relating to Barahoti (Wu-je) should be settled peacefully and in mutual discussions. They would once more suggest that pending a settlement of the dispute neither of the two Governments should send its civil administrative personnel to Barahoti or change the status quo in any other manner. If the Government of China are not agreeable to this suggestion the Government of India will continue as in previous years to send its civil personnel to exercise jurisdiction over an area which the Government of India have always considered as part of Indian territory. Such personnel however will not carry any arms. The Government of India will be glad if similar instructions are given to the Chinese personnel if any in the area.

The Embassy of India takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of the People's Republic of China, the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given to the Ambassador of India by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 22 October 1959

The Chinese Government has received an urgent report from its frontier guards in Sinkiang to the effect that in the afternoon of 20th October 1959 three men of the Indian armed forces carrying arms unlawfully intruded into Chinese territory south of the Kongka Pass. The Chinese frontier guards promptly advised them to leave Chinese territory immediately but were met with their refusal whereupon the Chinese frontier guards could not but disarm them and put them under detention. At noon on 21st October a large number of Indian troops again intruded into Chinese territory in the same area and carried out provocations with superior force against the Chinese frontier guards patrolling there at the time. In disregard of the advice of the Chinese frontier guards for them to withdraw from Chinese territory they twice unwarrantedly opened fire on the Chinese frontier guards and attempted to seize the Chinese frontier guards' horses by force. The Chinese frontier guards still tried their best to avoid a clash and did not fire back. The Indian troops however behaving even worse, subsequently opened heavy fire on the Chinese frontier guards and launched armed attack. Under these conditions the Chinese frontier guards were compelled to fire back in self-defence. It was only after this that the Indian troops left the place of the incident.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest against the above-mentioned serious provocation by a large number of Indian troops deliberately violating Chinese frontiers and launching unwarranted armed attack on the Chinese frontier guards and asks the Government of India to adopt measures at once to prevent the recurrence of violation of Chinese frontiers and provocation against Chinese frontier guards by Indian troops. The Chinese Government reserves the right to express itself further on this matter after receiving more detailed reports from the Chinese frontier guards.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Ambassador of China in India, 23 October 1959

The Government of India have seen the memorandum which the Chinese Government handed to the Indian Ambassador in Peking on the 22nd October. They are greatly surprised by the narration of events in this memorandum, which, according to their information, is not in accordance with the facts. The Government of India received information on the 21st October that an Indian police party had been subjected to sudden and aggressive firing by Chinese forces in the region of Kong Ka Pass about 16 miles from Tsogtsalu in Ladakh. As a result of this, the Indian police party suffered severe casualties. As this was a matter of very grave consequence and a repetition for the second time of a wholly unjustified attack by Chinese forces on Indian personnel, the Government of India waited for fuller details to be received by them before this was taken up with the Chinese Government. The reports thus far received by the Government of India entirely contradict the statements in the Chinese Government's memorandum. The facts are as follows:

2. On the 20th October, two members of an Indian Police Party went out on patrol duty in Indian territory in the neighbourhood of Kong Ka Pass in Ladakh. When they failed to return in the evening, a party was sent out in search of the missing persons. This search proved unavailing. On the following morning another party under the direction of a senior officer, went out to continue the search. It appears that this party was surprised by sudden fire from a Chinese armed force entrenched on a hill-top which used automatic weapons and hand grenades. Apparently, the Indian personnel fired back in self-defence, but were overwhelmed by the strategic situation and the superior strength and fire power of the Chinese troops. According to the latest report, as many as seventeen persons belonging to the Indian party, including the officer-in-charge, have lost their lives and some others have suffered severe injuries.

3. The Government of India strongly protest against this intrusion by Chinese troops into an area which is part of Indian territory. This area is about 40 to 50 miles west of the traditional Sino-Indian frontier which has been shown in official Indian maps. In connection with an earlier incident involving the arrest by the Chinese forces of another Indian party in the Chusul area in July this year, the Government of India described in detail the traditional frontier for the greater part of Ladakh in a note presented by the Embassy of India in Peking to the Chinese Foreign Office on the 13th August 1959. No answer has yet been received by the Government of India to this note. It was hoped that further confusion about the traditional frontier in the area would not arise. Instead, the Chinese authorities have entirely ignored this traditional frontier and our note on the subject and have come into Indian territory in considerable strength during the last few months. They have further fired at our police party and caused the death of a considerable number of persons belonging to this party.

4. The Government of India have had no troops in this area. Police parties have, however, discharged their normal functions of
patrol duty and previously they have patrolled this entire area without hindrance. It is clear that Chinese troops have in recent months moved into this part of Indian territory.

5. The Chinese memorandum admits the arrest of Indian personnel. The suggestion that two or three Indian policemen challenged the large Chinese forces is, on the face of it, not credible. The arrest of Indian personnel on Indian territory by Chinese authorities was highly objectionable and the subsequent unprovoked fire on the Indian search party can only be construed as a deliberate and unprovoked attack by Chinese forces.

6. On these facts, the Government of India do not accept the protest contained in the Chinese Government's memorandum of October 22. The Government of India reserve the right to claim adequate compensation from the Chinese Government when the precise extent of the losses is known. The Chinese authorities have no right to arrest or detain Indian personnel who should immediately be released. Further, the Government of India ask the Chinese authorities to withdraw their forces from this area and to prevent their illegal entry into Indian territory and interference with Indian personnel.
Note given to the Ambassador of India by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 25 October 1959

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the incident of Indian troops' intrusion into Chinese territory and armed provocation against Chinese troops at a place south of the Kongka Pass, has the honour to say that the Chinese Government has received the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs handed to Ambassador Pan Tzu-li on 23rd October and seen the communique issued by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs. The Chinese Government deems it necessary to state as follows:

The presentation of this incident in the Note and communique of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs is completely contrary to the facts. The Chinese Government absolutely cannot agree to the allegation of the Indian Government that Chinese troops intruded into Indian territory and attacked the Indian troops. The account of the outbreak and development of this extremely serious border clash given in the memorandum of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs handed to the Indian Ambassador to China on 22nd October is strictly based on facts. It clearly shows that this incident was a result of Indian troops' deliberate violation of Chinese frontiers and armed provocation against the Chinese frontier guards. The Indian side must be held fully responsible for this incident. The Chinese Government, therefore, categorically rejects the protest of the Indian Government and reiterates the serious protest and demand made in the memorandum of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs dated 22nd October.

The place where the Indian troops launched armed provocation is indisputably Chinese territory. The Kongka Pass near place of the incident is a border pass according to the Sino-Indian customary line between China's Sinkiang and Tibet regions on the one hand and Ladakh on the other. The places to the south, north and east of the Kongka Pass have always been Chinese territory, respective-ly under the jurisdiction of the Chinese local authorities in Tibet and Sinkiang. Since the liberation of Sinkiang and Tibet, frontier guards of the Chinese People's liberation army have all along sta- tioned and have been carrying out routine patrol in this area up to the Kongka Pass. The above-said customary line between China and Ladakh is clearly marked on maps published in China. In his letter to Prime Minister Nehru on 8th September 1959 Premier Chou En-lai further made a clear explanation about this section of the traditional boundary line. Even back at the time when Indian armed personnel, in September 1958 and July 1959, twice unlawfully intruded into Chinese territory to the east of the above-said customary boundary and were arrested by Chinese frontier guards, the Chinese Govern-ment already solemnly pointed out to the Indian Government that where those Indian armed personnel intruded was undoubtedly within Chinese territory. The Indian Government, however up to now still claims the area to the east of the Kongka Pass up to the
Lanak Pass to be Indian territory and, in total disregard of the fact, suggests that Indian troops have in the past been patrolling this entire area without hindrance. All this proves that it is the Indian Government that utterly pays no heed to the previous statements of the Chinese Government concerning this section of the boundary and ignores the Sino-Indian traditional customary boundary; but not the Chinese Government that pays no heed to the Notes of the Indian Government. The fact is thus perfectly clear. In the incident of October 20th and 21st, it was not Chinese frontier guards that violated Indian territory but precisely Indian troops that violated Chinese territory, thus breaching once again the long-existing status quo of the border between the two countries.

Although the Indian troops deliberately violated the Chinese frontiers, the Chinese frontier guards, with a view to maintaining the tranquillity of the border, consistently, took a reasonable attitude of trying their best to avoid a clash. With regard to the three Indian armed personnel who unlawfully crossed the customary boundary and intruded into Chinese territory on 20th October it was only because they persisted in ignoring advice and refusing to leave Chinese territory that the Chinese frontier guards could not but disarm them and put them under detention. Yet on 21st October, Indian troops, more than 70 in number, again intruded into Chinese territory. The Indian troops not only disregarded the advice given by the Chinese frontier guards for them to withdraw, but even encircled and came with superior forces upon the Chinese frontier guard patrol, tried to seize their horses and opened fire. Even under these circumstances, the Chinese frontier guards still exercised the utmost self-restraint and did not fire back. They only gesticulated for the Indian troops to stop firing and withdraw. But the Indian troops paid no heed at all, continued to press forward and then opened heavy fire and launched armed attack on the Chinese frontier guards. Only then were the Chinese frontier guards compelled to fire back in self-defence. It is clear from the above-mentioned facts that it was the Indian troops, and not the Chinese frontier guards, who gave rise to this serious clash. Responsibility for all the serious consequences arising therefrom must rest with the Indian troops and can in no way be placed on the Chinese frontier guards.

According to further reports received by the Chinese Government, the clash on 21st October lasted about two hours, resulting in casualties on both sides. The Chinese frontier guards, apart from capturing seven Indian soldiers during the clash, found on the spot the corpses of 9 Indian soldiers. The captured Indian soldiers are now still under detention, and the corpses have been properly buried.

After the occurrence of the above-said incident of violation of Chinese frontiers and armed provocation against Chinese frontier guards by Indian troops, the Chinese Government promptly handed a memorandum to the Indian Ambassador to China, hoping to secure a peaceful and reasonable settlement as soon as possible through diplomatic channels. However, before the Chinese Government received the reply from the Indian Government, the Indian Government had made public the incident in a one-sided version which distorts the facts and even issued an official communiqué on it. The
Chinese Government could not but feel extreme regret at this action which could only create an unfavourable atmosphere making it difficult for the two countries to solve the dispute cool-headedly; it consequently had to make public the truth of the matter to ensure a correct understanding of the facts.

In order to avoid the recurrence of similar grave incidents so as to maintain the tranquillity of the border, the Chinese Government once again asks the Indian Government to take immediate measures to prevent the violation of Chinese frontiers and provocation against Chinese frontier guards by Indian troops.

The Chinese frontier guards are under the strict standing orders to refrain from crossing for one step the Sino-Indian traditional customary boundary line, and to use peaceful means so far possible to advise those Indian military personnel who may have crossed into Chinese territory by mistake to withdraw immediately; but any violation of China's territory is absolutely impermissible and any armed provocation must be firmly rebuffed.

The Chinese Government is prepared to release and send out of China the ten Indian military personnel captured on October 20th and 21st. It is also prepared at any time to let the Indian side take back the bodies of the 9 Indian soldiers already found. The concrete method for this can be decided upon separately through consultations between the two sides.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the note which the Chinese Vice-Minister handed to the Indian Ambassador in Peking on October 25. The Government of India have also seen the statement issued by the Chinese Foreign Ministry at Peking on October 26. They have to state with regret that the account of the incidents given in the Chinese Government's note to the Indian Ambassador, and repeated in greater detail in the statement published by the Chinese Foreign Office, is completely at variance with facts and is a travesty of truth. The Government of India have enquired into this matter fully and have received a detailed account of the events of October 20 and 21 from the officer who was second-in-command of the Indian police party when it was attacked by Chinese forces and who later returned to the nearest Indian outpost. The account of the officer is appended to this note. The gallant officer who was in command of the party lost his life during the clash.

2. The Government of India not only reject the factual account given by the Chinese Government of this incident, but also repudiate certain assumptions underlying it. The suggestion made that the Indian police party armed with rifles only and in a disadvantageous position would attack a heavily armed Chinese force strongly entrenched on a hill top above them and equipped with mortar and hand-grenades, cannot be accepted by any reasonable person. All the circumstances concerning this incident as well as the detailed information that we possess contradict the version which has been supplied by the Chinese Government.

3. The attached note about the tragic incident in the Chang Chenmo Valley which gives a first-hand account by a responsible officer, clearly indicates that at no time on the 20th or 21st October did the Indian personnel take any aggressive attitude. While they were engaged on patrol duty, they were suddenly subjected to ruthless attack by Chinese forces with rifles, mortar and hand-grenades. One contingent of the attacking force was apparently entrenched on a hill top and the other was across the Chang Chenmo river on the right. Although the Indian party fired in self-defence, they had no chance against the superior strength of the Chinese force which was aided by its strategic situation and the superior arms that it possessed. The Chinese Government have not stated the exact casualties suffered by the attacking Chinese force, but have indicated that their casualties were much less than those of the Indian party. The Government of India entirely disagree with the extraordinary conclusion drawn by the Chinese Government from the heavy casualties suffered by the Indian personnel that the Indian party had taken the offensive. The obvious conclusion would be the opposite of this and would indicate that the Chinese forces were the attacking party as they were entrenched on a hill top and used mortars and hand-grenades.

4. The incident has to be viewed also in the context of other events preceding it, as well as of the correspondence that has taken
place between the Government of India and the Chinese Government. The Indian frontier, throughout its long extent, has been well known as a traditional frontier and has been shown with precision in official maps published by the Survey of India. There has been no doubt about this frontier. Repeatedly during the past few years, the Prime Minister of India has declared firmly and clearly what this frontier is. The Government of the People's Republic of China said nothing about this frontier for a number of years. When their attention was drawn to some vague Chinese maps appearing in magazines and showing large areas, without any precision, as part of the Chinese State, objection was taken to these by the Government of India. The answer given was that these maps were old maps produced by the previous regime in China and the present Government of China had been too busy with other activities to consider a revision of these maps. That answer itself indicated that the Chinese Government had no serious doubt about the correctness of the Indian maps, except perhaps for some minor disputes. As has been previously brought to the notice of the Chinese Government, the Premier of the People's Republic of China himself stated to the Prime Minister of India that the Chinese Government was prepared to accept the north eastern frontier of India which has been referred to as the McMahon Line. No question of the frontier of the Tibet region with Ladakh was ever raised during all these years, although the Chinese Government must have known very well, both from Indian maps and statements made on behalf of India as well as from the facts of the situation, where this frontier is. The Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 purported to deal with all outstanding issues between India and the Tibet region of China inherited from the British days. But neither during the long and detailed discussions preceding the Agreement nor in the Agreement itself was any mention made by the Chinese Government of their claim to such large areas of Indian territory. It was only in the letter addressed by Premier Chou En-lai to the Prime Minister of India dated 8th September 1959 that for the first time the Chinese Government laid claim to the territories vaguely included in their maps. This statement was at variance with the previous statements on the subject of the Chinese maps. It is to be observed that at no time up till now has any precise statement been made by the Chinese Government as to where, according to them, their frontier is. Even their own maps give completely different and varying frontiers.

5. So far as the Government of India are concerned, their position has been clear and precise from the beginning and, indeed, for a long period of years and there has been no doubt about it. That position was described in detail in paragraphs 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the Indian Prime Minister's letter of September 26 to Premier Chou En-lai. In this letter, the Prime Minister of India has given the historical background of the traditional Sino-Indian boundary and the basis of its delineation in different sectors in official Indian maps. Indeed, any person with a knowledge of history not only of recent events, but of the past hundreds of years and more, would appreciate that this traditional and historical frontier of India, has been associated with India's culture and tradition for the last two thousand years or so, and has been an intimate part of India's life and thought.

6. The Government of India, therefore, reject and repudiate the assumptions underlying the note of the Chinese Government in regard
to this long frontier. They reiterate that the area where the clash took place is not only a part of Indian territory but is well within it. They cannot accept the statement made by the Chinese Government that the entire area, including the places east, south and north of Kongka pass "has always been Chinese territory and under the respective jurisdiction of the local authorities of Sinkiang and Tibet region". This statement is contrary to history and facts. The maps published by the Survey of India since 1867-68 have been showing the boundary between Ladakh on the one hand, and Sinkiang and the Tibet region on the other, as in the present-day official maps published by the Survey of India. From the Karakoram Pass this boundary proceeds north-east via the Qara Tagh Pass and then follows the Kuen Lun range from a point 15 miles north of Haji Langar to Peak 21250 (Survey of India map) which lies east of Longitude 80 east. This line constitutes the watershed between the Indus system in India and the Khotan system in China. From point 21250 the boundary runs south down to Lanak La along the western watershed of streams flowing into lakes in the Chinese territory. The boundary further south from Lanak La to Chang La has been described in the note presented by the Indian Embassy in Peking to the Chinese Foreign Office on the 13th August 1959. As stated in that note, the international boundary follows the eastern and southern watershed of Chang Chenmo and the southern watershed of Chumesang and thence the southern bank of Chumesang and the eastern bank of Changlung Lungpa. Skirting the western extremity of the eastern half of Pangong Tso (which is called Yaerhmu in Chinese maps), the boundary then follows the Ang watershed and cutting across Spanggur Tso, follows the north-eastern and northern watershed of the Indus.

7. It will thus be seen that the international boundary has been shown for nearly a century in official Indian maps as it is today. In fact, detailed surveys of the area were undertaken from 1867-68, and the boundary as shown in our maps is not only in accordance with tradition and custom but is also based on the result of these surveys. The area on the Indian side of this boundary was surveyed by Hayward, Shaw and Cayley in 1868, Bower in 1891 and Aurel Stein in 1900. Drew, who was Governor of Ladakh under the Maharaja of Kashmir, officially inspected the area up to its northern border in 1871 and the maps appended to his book on 'Jammu and Kashmir Territories, 1875', as also the maps attached to the Gazetters of Jammu and Kashmir published from 1890 onwards and the Imperial Gazetter of India of 1908, show the boundary more or less similar to the frontier shown in official Indian maps today. It is the Chinese maps of the area which have shown different lines at different times. An official Chinese map of 1893 shows the Aksai Chin area as in India. The New Atlas of China published by Shun Pao, 1935, shows a great part of the Chang Chenmo region in India. In fact the place where the recent clash took place is in Indian territory according to this map. This map and the subsequent Chinese maps until 1951 showed the international boundary as running 30 to 60 miles east of and parallel to Shyok river. It is only in 1951 that a few Chinese maps took the boundary within 10 to 30 miles east of and parallel to the Shyok river. Most of the Chinese maps as late as 1954, and one as late as 1956, depict the boundary in the
Pangong lake as cutting the western extremity of the eastern half of Pangong Tso called Yaerhmu in Chinese maps. The few Chinese maps of 1951 referred to above show the line as cutting the western half of Pangong lake at its bend and thus include the Spanggur area and a part of Pangong area in Tibet.

8. It is true that the Government of India did not open any border outposts right along the traditional frontier. This was because the area was inhabited very sparsely, if at all, and they had no reason to anticipate any aggressive intention on the part of the Chinese Government. They were therefore content with sending regular police patrol parties to these areas in previous years. The Government of India cannot accept the statement in the press note issued by the Chinese Government on the 26th October that "the frontier guards of the Chinese People's Liberation Army have all along been stationed and patrolled this entire area." Indian survey and reconnaissance parties, which went from Leh to Lanak La in 1954 and 1956, did not come across any evidence of Chinese occupation. For the first time in 1957 signs of intrusion by outsiders were noticed at Shinglung and some places further north. Obviously, such intrusion must have occurred in these places for the first time in 1957. Other Indian reconnaissance parties went as far as Karakoram Pass without coming across any Chinese personnel. No Indian reconnaissance party was sent to the area in Aksai Chin where the Chinese authorities had built a new road. No adverse conclusion can however be drawn from the mere fact that the Chinese had constructed this road. This was done without the knowledge of the Government of India. As early as 1899, the then Government of India communicated to the authorities in Peking the international boundary in this area, which then was more or less as it is today. And as stated above, official Indian maps have shown the Aksai Chin area as part of India for nearly a century. This area is extremely difficult of access from inhabited areas in western and southern Ladakh, and the Government of India had no reason to suspect that the Government of China, with whom they had friendly relations, would trespass into the area and construct a road.

9. No answer has been received yet by the Government of India to the long and detailed letter of the Prime Minister of India to Premier Chou En-lai of September 26, 1959. Regardless of the facts stated in this letter, the forces of the Chinese Government have not only committed further aggression, but have attacked an Indian police party engaged in its normal patrol duty. This was the second armed attack on an Indian party, the previous one taking place at Longju, where Chinese forces crossed the Indian frontier forcibly. These facts, taken together with a continuance of aggressive attitudes in various parts of the frontier and the type of propaganda that is being conducted on behalf of the Chinese Government are reminiscent of the activities of the old imperialist powers against whom both India and China struggled in the past. It is a matter of deep regret that the Chinese Government, which has so often condemned imperialism, should act in a manner which is so contrary to their own assertions. It is a matter of even greater regret that the Five Principles as well as the Declaration of the Bandung Conference should thus be flouted by the Chinese Government.
10. The Government of India are surprised at the complaint in the Chinese Government's note about the publication of an official Indian communique on this incident. The Government of India would not have been justified in keeping the Indian people in the dark about such a serious incident. The Chinese Government must be aware not only of the strong feelings in India on the question of Indian frontiers, but also, and more especially, about this incident. As a matter of fact, the Government of India published their communique only after they found from the Chinese Government's note handed to the Indian Ambassador on October 25, that the account given in that note was at complete variance with the facts.

11. The Government of India do not propose to discuss in detail other matters referred to in the statement issued by the Chinese Foreign Office on the 26th October. They repudiate emphatically the allegation that the Indian forces have violated the status quo in several places on the Sino-Indian frontier or that they have occupied any place inside Chinese territory. The facts about the frontier have been given in detail in the Indian Prime Minister's letter of September 26. Paragraphs 12 to 16 of that letter deal with the traditional frontier in the north-east, which is sometimes referred to as the McMahon Line. It will be seen from these paragraphs that the Chinese claim to any territory south of this line is entirely baseless. Any trespass into this area by Chinese personnel would amount to deliberate violation of the territory of India.

12. The Government of India have always been willing to respect the traditional frontier between India and China and have indeed done so. They cannot, however, recognise any boundary in the Ladakh region or elsewhere, which includes in China areas on the Indian side of the traditional frontier. For a long period of years this frontier has been peaceful. Trouble and conflict have arisen there recently because the Chinese forces, having advanced up to the frontier in many places, committed aggression by crossing it at some places.

13. The Chinese Government have rightly stressed the importance of maintaining the status quo. An essential prerequisite to the maintenance of the status quo is that neither side should seek to extend its occupation in assertion of a supposed right in disregard of the traditional frontier, and that, in any event, there should be no resort to force except as a last resort in self-defence. The deplorable incident, which has resulted in such heavy casualties to the Indian personnel, would have been avoided if the Chinese force had paid regard to this basic fact.

14. It is recognised the world over that India stands for peace and is entirely opposed to the use of warlike methods for the settlement of international disputes. Even in their struggle for independence, the Indian people adhered to peaceful methods. In regard to the Government and people of China, India's attitude has always been friendly. This was not only in consonance with India's well known policy, but was due to the desire of the people and the Government of India that it was essential in the interests of India and China as well as of peace in Asia and the world, that these two great countries of Asia should have friendly relations, even
though they might differ in their internal structure of Government. To that end, the Government of India have laboured through these years. It is a matter, therefore, of great sorrow to them that their hopes have been belied, and a situation created which endangers the peaceful and friendly relations which have existed and which, they hoped, would continue to exist, between these two great countries.

15. It is a matter of special regret to the Government of India that at a time when the world appears at last to be moving towards a peaceful settlement of the grave problems which have afflicted it during the last twelve years and when the two great nations, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, are striving to their utmost ability to put an end to the cold war, there should be this relapse into violence and aggression on the frontiers of India. The countries of Asia have ardently advocated peace and have played not an insignificant part in the work for peace. At this critical moment in the history of the world, it would have been fitting for all the nations of Asia not only to stand for peace, but to further it by their own attitudes and activities.

16. In accordance with her firm policy, India will continue to endeavour to resolve all disputes by peaceful methods. But where aggression takes place, the people of India inevitably have to resist by all means available to them. The independence and integrity of India are what the Indian people laboured for during their long struggle for freedom, and they cannot permit any injury to or infringement of them. The Government of India, therefore, trust that the Chinese Government will remove their forces from Indian territory and seek to resolve minor frontier disputes by peaceful methods.

17. The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity of renewing to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Annexure to the Note of the Indian Government (Chang Chenmo Valley), 4 November 1959

ACCOUNT RECEIVED FROM THE SECOND-IN-COMMAND OF THE INDIAN POLICE PATROL PARTY

On the 19th October, the party reached Hot Springs and established a temporary camp there. Before proceeding further north the next morning (20th) the officer in charge, Karam Singh, sent two police constables and a porter on reconnaissance towards the east. Neither the constables nor the porter returned to the camp at the appointed time. A small patrol party was therefore sent out in the evening in search of the missing persons but it returned at 11 o’clock at night without being able to find any of the missing personnel.

On the 21st morning, the officer in charge decided to go out himself in search of the missing persons as it was possible that they had lost their way in these trackless hills. Accompanied by Tyagi, who was his second in command, some members of his staff and some police constables making a total of about 20, the officer in charge left the camp at about 10 o’clock in the morning on ponies. He left instruction for the rest of the party to follow behind on foot.

At six miles east of Hot Springs, at a place overlooked by a hill to the left, Karam Singh noticed some hoof-prints. So he halted and waited for the main party to come up. When the main party arrived, he and Tyagi decided that the main party under Tyagi should halt at that place whilst Karam Singh with a small party would follow the tracks to find if there were any intruders in the vicinity.

Karam Singh passed by this hill feature to the left without noticing anything unusual and went out of sight of the main party. A little later, Tyagi went forward to see how far Karam Singh’s party had gone, but he could not find them apparently because Karam Singh’s party had by then gone down the river bed. At this time, suddenly, fire was opened on Tyagi’s party by Chinese force which was entrenched on the hill feature. Karam Singh’s party was also simultaneously fired upon by another Chinese party entrenched on the other side of the river as well as by the party on the hill-top. The attackers fired with mortars and automatic weapons.

Subjected to this attack, members of both Karam Singh’s party and Tyagi’s party tried to take cover and fire back, but they were in a very disadvantageous position having no proper cover and, therefore, their firing was not effective. The Chinese on the hill-top effectively stopped Tyagi’s party from going to the aid of Karam Singh’s party which was being attacked from both sides.

After some time, the Chinese who were apparently in some strength on the other side of the Chang Chenmo river and some of whom were mounted on horses, advanced forward and overwhelmed Karam Singh’s party with automatic fire and mortar. They moved further forward to attack Tyagi’s party, which then had no other alternative but to retreat. Karam Singh’s party was, therefore decimated either by killing or by capture except for a few survivors who escaped along the river bed and over the high hills in the dark.
At night, Tyagi's party made an attempt to go forward to recover the dead and the injured, but the Chinese were still in position on the hill feature and maintained that position even on the 22nd. Tyagi then withdrew his entire force to Tsogstsalu.

17 persons including Karam Singh were missing after the clash. Out of these, five including the officer in charge and the Jamadar were seen by the survivors to have been killed by Chinese fire.
DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER,

I have carefully read Your Excellency's letter dated March 22, 1959. I find from your letter that there is a fundamental difference between the positions of our two Governments on the Sino-Indian boundary question. This has made me somewhat surprised and also made it necessary for me to take a longer period of time to consider how to reply to your letter.

The Sino-Indian boundary question is a complicated question left over by history. In tackling this question, one cannot but, first of all, take into account the historical background of British aggression on China when India was under British rule. From the early days, Britain harboured aggressive ambition towards China's Tibet region. It continuously instigated Tibet to separate from China, in an attempt to put under its control a nominally independent Tibet. When this design failed, it applied all sorts of pressures on China, intending to make Tibet a British sphere of influence while allowing China to maintain so-called suzerainty over Tibet. In the meantime, using India as its base, Britain conducted extensive territorial expansion into China's Tibet region, and even the Sinkiang region. All this constitutes the fundamental reason for the long-term disputes over and non-settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question.

China and India are both countries which were long subjected to imperialist aggression. This common experience should have naturally caused China and India to hold an identical view of the above-said historical background and to adopt an attitude of mutual sympathy, mutual understanding and fairness and reasonableness in dealing with the boundary question. The Chinese Government originally thought the Indian Government would take such an attitude. Unexpectedly, to the Chinese Government, however, the Indian Government demanded that the Chinese Government give formal recognition to the situation created by the application of the British policy of aggression against China's Tibet region as the foundation for the settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. What is more serious, the Indian Government has applied all sorts of pressures on the Chinese Government, not even scrupling the use of force to support this demand. At this the Chinese Government cannot but feel a deep regret.

The Chinese Government has consistently held that an over-all settlement of the boundary question should be sought by both sides, taking into account the historical background and existing actualities and adhering to the Five Principles, through friendly negotiations conducted in a well-prepared way step by step. Pending this, as a provisional measure, the two sides should maintain the long-existing status quo of the border, and not seek to change it by
unilateral action, even less by force. As to some of the disputes, provisional agreements concerning isolated places could be reached through negotiations to ensure the tranquillity of the border areas and uphold the friendship of the two countries. This is exactly the basic idea expressed in my January 23, 1959 letter to you. The Chinese Government still considers this to be the way that should be followed by our two countries in settling the boundary question. Judging from Your Excellency’s letter of March 22, 1959, it seems you are not completely against this principle.

I would like now to further explain the position of the Chinese Government in connection with the questions raised in Your Excellency’s letter and in conjunction with the recent situation along the Sino-Indian border.

1. In my letter to Your Excellency dated January 23, 1959, I pointed out that the Sino-Indian boundary has never been formally delimited. In your letter of March 22, 1959, Your Excellency expressed disagreement to this and tried energetically to prove that most parts of the Sino-Indian boundary had the sanction of specific international agreements between the past Government of India and the Central Government of China. In order to prove that the Sino-Indian boundary has never been formally delimited, I would like to furnish the following facts:

(i) Concerning the boundary separating China’s Sinkiang and Tibet regions from Ladakh.

In 1842, a peace treaty was indeed concluded between the local authorities of China’s Tibet and the Kashmir authorities. However, the then Chinese Central Government did not send anybody to participate in the conclusion of this treaty, nor did it ratify the treaty afterwards. Moreover, this treaty only mentioned in general terms that Ladakh and Tibet would each abide by its borders, and did not make any specific provisions or explanations regarding the location of this section of the boundary. It is clear that this treaty cannot be used to prove that this section of the boundary has been formally delimited by the two sides, even less can it be used as the foundation to ask the Chinese Government to accept the unilateral claim of the Indian Government regarding this section of the boundary. As to the Chinese Government official’s statement made in 1847 to the British representative that this section of the boundary was clear, it can only show that the then Chinese Government had its own clear view regarding this section of the boundary and cannot be taken as the proof that the boundary between the two sides had already been formally delimited. As a matter of fact, down to 1899, the British Government still proposed to formally delimit this section of the boundary with the Chinese Government, but the Chinese Government did not agree. Your Excellency also said on August 28 this year in India’s Lok Sabha: “This was the boundary of the old Kashmir State with Tibet and Chinese Turkestan. Nobody had marked it.” It can thus be seen that this section of the boundary has never been delimited. Between China and Ladakh, however, there does exist a customary line derived from historical traditions, and Chinese maps have always drawn the boundary between China and Ladakh in accordance with this line. The marking of this section of the boundary on the map of “Punjab, Western Himalaya and Adjoining Parts of Tibet” compiled by the
British John Walker by order of the Court of Directors of East India Company (which was attached to the British Major Alexander Cunningham's book "Ladakh" published in 1854) corresponded fairly close to the Chinese maps. Later British and Indian maps included large tracts of Chinese territory into Ladakh. This was without any legal grounds, nor in conformity with the actual situation of administration by each side all the time.

(ii) Concerning the section of the boundary between the Ari Area of China's Tibet and India.

It can be seen from your letter that you also agree that this section of the boundary has not been formally delimited by the two countries. Not only so, there have in fact been historical disputes between the two sides over the right to many places in this area. For example, the area of Sang and Tsunghsa, southwest of Tsaparang Dzong in Tibet, which had always belonged to China, was thirty to forty years back gradually invaded and occupied by the British. The local authorities of China's Tibet took up this matter several times with Britain, without any results. It has thus become an outstanding issue left over by history.

(iii) Concerning the Sino-Indian boundary east of Bhutan.

The Indian Government insists that this section of the boundary has long been clearly delimited, citing as its grounds that the so-called McMahon Line was jointly delineated by the representatives of the Chinese Government, the Tibet local authorities and the British Government at the 1913-1914 Simla Conference. As I have repeatedly made clear to Your Excellency the Simla Conference was an important step taken by Britains in its design to detach Tibet from China. At the Conference were discussed the so-called boundary between Outer and Inner Tibet and that between Tibet and the rest of China. Contrary to what was said in your letter, the so-called McMahon Line was never discussed at the Simla Conference, but was determined by the British representative and the representative of the Tibet local authorities behind the back of the representative of the Chinese Central Government through an exchange of secret notes at Delhi on March 24, 1914, that is, prior to the signing of the Simla treaty. This line was later marked on the map attached to the Simla treaty as part of the boundary between Tibet and the rest of China. The so-called McMahon Line was a product of the British policy of aggression against the Tibet Region of China and has never been recognised by any Chinese Central Government and is therefore decidedly illegal. As to the Simla treaty, it was not formally signed by the representative of the then Chinese Central Government, and this is explicitly noted in the treaty. For quite a long time after the exchange of secret notes between Britain and the Tibet local authorities, Britain dared not make public the related documents, nor change the traditional way of drawing this section of the boundary on maps. This illegal line aroused the great indignation of the Chinese people. The Tibet local authorities themselves later also expressed their dissatisfaction with this line, and, following the independence of India in 1947, cabled Your Excellency asking India to return all the territory of the Tibet region of China south of this illegal line. This piece of
territory corresponds in size to the Chekiang Province of China and is as big as ninety thousand square kilometres. Mr. Prime Minister, how could China agree to accept under coercion such an illegal line which would have it relinquish its rights and disgrace itself by selling out its territory—and such a large piece of territory as that? The delineation of the Sino-Indian boundary east of Bhutan in all traditional Chinese maps is a true reflection of the actual situation of the customary boundary before the appearance of the so-called McMahon Line. Both the map of "Tibet and Adjacent Countries" published by the Indian Survey in 1917 and the map attached to the 1929 edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica drew this section of the boundary in the same way as the Chinese maps. And it was only in the period around the peaceful liberation of China's Tibet region in 1951 that Indian troops advanced on a large scale into the area south of the so-called McMahon Line. Therefore, the assertion that this section of the boundary has long been clearly delimited is obviously untenable.

In Your Excellency's letter, you also referred to the boundary between China and Sikkim. Like the boundary between China and Bhutan, this question does not fall within the scope of our present discussion. I would like, however, to take this opportunity to make clear once again that China is willing to live together in friendship with Sikkim and Bhutan, without committing aggression against each other, and has always respected the proper relations between them and India.

It can be seen from the above that the way the Sino-Indian boundary has always been drawn in maps published in China is not without grounds and that at first British and Indian maps also drew the Sino-Indian boundary roughly in the same way as the Chinese maps. As a matter of fact, it was not Chinese maps, but British and Indian maps that later unilaterally altered the way the Sino-Indian boundary was drawn. Nevertheless, since China and India have not delimited their mutual boundary through friendly negotiations and joint surveys, China has not asked India to revise its maps. In 1954, I explained to Your Excellency for the same reason that it would be inappropriate for the Chinese Government to revise the old map right now. Some people in India, however, are raising a big uproar about the maps published in China, attempting to create a pressure of public opinion to force China to accept India's unilateral claims concerning the Sino-Indian boundary. Needless to say, this is neither wise nor worthy.

2. As stated above, the Chinese Government has all along adhered to a clear-cut policy on the Sino-Indian border question: on the one hand it affirms the fact that the entire Sino-Indian boundary has not been delimited, while on the other, it also faces reality, and taking specially into consideration the friendly relationship between China and India actively seeks for a settlement fair and reasonable to both sides, and never tries unilaterally to change the long-existing state of the border between the two countries pending the settlement of the boundary question.

Regarding the eastern section of the Sino-Indian boundary, as I have stated above, the Chinese Government absolutely does not recognise the so-called McMahon Line, but Chinese troops have
never crossed that line. This is for the sake of maintaining amity along the border to facilitate negotiations and settlement of the boundary question, and in no way implies that the Chinese Government has recognised that line. In view of the fact that my former explanation of this point to Your Excellency is obviously misunderstood in Your Excellency's latest two letters to me, I have deemed it necessary once again to make the above explanation clearly.

Regarding the western section of the Sino-Indian boundary, China has strictly abided by the traditional customary line and, with regard to Indian troops' repeated intrusions into or occupation of Chinese territory, the Chinese Government, acting always in a friendly manner, has dealt with each case in way befitting it. For example, regarding the invasion of Wu-je by Indian troops and administrative personnel, the Chinese Government has tried its best to seek a settlement of the question with the Indian Government through negotiations and to avoid a clash. Regarding the Indian troops who invaded the southwestern part of China's Sinkiang and the area of Lake Pankong in the Tibet Region of China, the Chinese frontier guards, after disarming them according to international practice, adopted an attitude of reasoning, asking them to leave Chinese territory and returning to them their arms. Regarding the Indian troops successive invasion and occupation of the areas of Shipki Pass, Parigas, Sang, Thungscha, Puling-sumbo, Chuva, Chuje; Sangcha and Lapthal, the Chinese Government, after discovering these happenings, invariably conducted thorough and detailed investigations rather than laying charges against the Indian Government immediately and temperamentally. These measures prove that the Chinese Government is exerting its greatest effort to uphold Sino-Indian friendship.

Despite the above-mentioned border incidents caused wholly by the trespassing of Indian troops, until the beginning of this year, the atmosphere along the Sino-Indian border had on the whole been fairly good. The fact that no armed clashes had ever occurred along the 2,000 or so kilometres of the Sino-Indian boundary, which is wholly undelimited, is in itself a powerful proof that, given a friendly and reasonable attitude on both sides, amity can be maintained in the border areas and tension rules out pending the delimitation of the boundary between the two countries.

3. Since the outbreak of the rebellion in Tibet, however, the border situation has become increasingly tense owing to reasons for which the Chinese side cannot be held responsible. Immediately after the fleeting of a large number of Tibetan rebels into India, Indian troops started pressing forward steadily across the eastern section of the Sino-Indian boundary. Changing unilaterally the long-existing state of the border between the two countries, they not only everstepped the so-called McMahon Line as indicated in the map attached to the secret notes exchanged between Britain and the Tibet local authorities, but also exceeded the boundary drawn in current Indian maps which is alleged to represent the so-called McMahon Line, but which in many places actually cuts even deeper into Chinese territory than the McMahon Line. Indian troops invaded and occupied Longju, intruded into Yashar, and are still in occupation of Shatze, Khinzemane and Tamaden—all of which are Chinese territory—shielding armed Tibetan rebel bandits in this area.
Indian aircraft have also time and again violated China's territorial air near the Sino-Indian border. What is specially regrettable is that, not long ago, the Indian troops unlawfully occupying Longju launched armed attacks on the Chinese frontier guards stationing at Migyitun, leaving no room for the Chinese frontier guards but fire back in self-defence. This was the first instance of armed clash along the Sino-Indian border. It can be seen from the above that the tense situation recently arising on the Sino-Indian border was all caused by trespassing and provocations by Indian troops, and that for this the Indian side should be held fully responsible. Nevertheless, the Indian Government has directed all sorts of groundless charges against the Chinese Government, clamouring that China has committed aggression against India and describing the Chinese frontier guards' act of self-defence in the Migyitun areas as armed provocation. Many political figures and propaganda organs in India have seized the occasion to make a great deal of anti-Chinese utterances, some even openly advocating provocative actions of an even larger scale such as bombarding Chinese territory. Thus a second anti-Chinese campaign has been launched in India in six months' time. The fact that India does not recognise the undelimited state of the Sino-Indian boundary and steps up bringing pressure to bear on China militarily, diplomatically and through public opinion cannot but make one suspect that it is the attempt of India to impose upon China its one-sided claims on the boundary question. It must be pointed out that this attempt will never succeed and such action cannot possibly yield any results other than impairing the friendship of the two countries, further complicating the boundary question and making it more difficult to settle.

4. The friendly relations between China and India are based on the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence. The Chinese Government has consistently held that all differences between our two countries must and certainly can be resolved through peaceful consultations and should not be allowed to affect the friendly relationship between the two countries. China looks upon its southwestern border as a border of peace and friendship. I can assure Your Excellency that it is merely for the purpose of preventing remnant armed Tibetan rebels from crossing the border back and forth to carry out harassing activities that the Chinese Government has in recent months dispatched guard units to be stationed in the south-eastern part of the Tibet Region of China. This is obviously in the interest of ensuring the tranquillity of the border and will in no way constitute a threat to India. Your Excellency is one of the initiators of the Five Principles and has made significant contributions to the consolidation and development of Sino-Indian friendship and constantly stressed the importance of this friendship. This has deeply impressed the Chinese Government and people. I have therefore given Your Excellency a systematic explanation of the whole picture of the Sino-Indian boundary. I hope that Your Excellency and the Indian Government will in accordance with the Chinese Government's request, immediately adopt measures to withdraw the trespassing Indian troops and administrative personnel and restore the long existing state of the boundary between the two countries. Through this, the temporary tension on the Sino-Indian border would be eased at once and the dark clouds hanging over the relations between our two countries would be speedily dispelled, setting at ease our friends who
are concerned for Sino-Indian friendly relations and dealing a blow
to those who are sowing discord in the Sino-Indian relations and
creating tension.

With cordial regards,

(Sd.) CHOU’ EN-LAI,
Premier of the State
Council of the People’s
Republic of China.
NEW DELHI, the 26th September, 1959.

DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER,

I have received your letter of September 8, 1959. I must say that I was greatly surprised and distressed to read it. You and I discussed the India-China border, and particularly the eastern sector, in 1954 in Peking and in 1956-57 in India. As you know, the boundary in the eastern sector is loosely referred to as the McMahon Line. I do not like this description, but for convenience I propose to refer to it as such. When I discussed this with you, I thought that we were confronted with the problem of reaching an agreement on where exactly the so-called McMahon Line in the eastern sector of the boundary lay. Even when I received your letter of January 23, 1959, I had no idea that the People’s Republic of China would lay claim to about 40,000 square miles of what in our view has been indisputably Indian territory for decades and in some sectors for over a century. In your latest letter you have sought to make out a claim to large tracts of Indian territory and have even suggested that the independent Government of India are seeking to reap a benefit from the British aggression against China. Our Parliament and our people deeply resent this allegation. The struggle of the Indian people against any form of imperialism both at home and abroad is known and recognised all over the world and we had thought that China also appreciated and recognised our struggle. It is true that the British occupied and ruled the Indian sub-continent against the wishes of the Indian people. The boundaries of India were however, settled for centuries by history, geography, custom and tradition. Nowhere indeed has India’s dislike of imperialist policies been more clearly shown than in her attitude towards Tibet. The Government of India voluntarily renounced all the extra-territorial rights enjoyed by Britain in Tibet before 1947 and recognised by Treaty that Tibet is a region of China. In the course of the long talks that we had during your last visit to India, you had told me that Tibet had been and was a part of China but that it was an autonomous region.

2. You have suggested in your letter that the Government of India have applied all sorts of pressure on the Chinese Government, including the use of force, to make the Chinese Government accept the Indian demand. This is the reverse of what the Government of India did. We did not release to the public the information which we had about the various border intrusions into our territory by Chinese personnel since 1954, the construction of a road across Indian territory in Ladakh, and the arrest of our personnel in the Aksai Chin area in 1958 and their detention. We did not give publicity to this in the hope that peaceful solutions of the disputes could be found by agreement by the two countries without public excitement on both sides. In fact our failure to do so has now resulted in sharp but legitimate criticism of the Government both in Parliament and
in the press in our country. Far from using force, we sought a peaceful settlement of the disputes. You must be aware of the prolonged negotiations between the Indian and Chinese representatives over Bara Hoti in 1958 and of the notes exchanged between our two Governments on the other disputes. I need hardly tell you that there is great resentment in India at the action of your troops in overpowering our outpost in Longju on our side of the McMahon Line, and although you have up till now not withdrawn your troops we have not sought to reoccupy the post.

3. You have referred to the maintenance of the long existing status quo on the border. The Government of India have always been in favour of it. It is the Chinese Government who have violated it repeatedly in recent years. I can refer, for example, to the construction of a 100-mile road across what has traditionally been Indian territory in the Aksai Chin area, the entry of Chinese survey parties in the Lohit Frontier Division in 1957, the establishment of a camp at Spanggur in 1959, the despatch of armed personnel to Bara Hoti in 1958 and stationing them there in winter against customary practice and last, but not least, the use of force in Longju.

4. It is true that the Sino-Indian boundary has not been formally delimited along its entire length. Indeed the terrain of the Sino-Indian border in many places makes such physical demarcation on the ground impossible. But the entire length of the border has been either defined by treaty or recognised by custom or by both and until now the Chinese Government have not protested against the exercise of jurisdiction by the Government of India upto the customary border. You have yourself acknowledged the fact that no armed clash ever occurred along our border until the beginning of this year. All Chinese Governments have respected the Indian border. The fact that previous Chinese Governments were weak is no answer. Not even a protest was registered in accordance with established state practice in this regard, as was done in the case of Burma between 1906 and 1937.

5. Concerning the boundary between Tibet and Ladakh, it is incorrect to say that the then Chinese Central Government did not send anybody to participate in the conclusion of the treaty between Tibet and Kashmir in 1842. The treaty was signed by the representatives of both the Dalai Lama and the Emperor of China. Kalon Sokon, one of the signatories, though by birth a Tibetan, had Chinese rank. Even the Tibetan version of the treaty makes it clear that China was a party to it. Thus, it asserts that “there will never be on any account in future till the world lasts, any deviation even by the hair's breadth and any breach in the alliance, friendship and unity between the King of the world Siri Khalsa Sahib and Siri Maharaj Sahib Raja-i-Rajagan Raja Sahib Bahadur, and the Khagan of China and the Lama Guru Sahib of Lhasa.”

6. It is true that the 1842 treaty referred merely to the “old established frontiers”. This was because these frontiers were well-known and did not require any formal delimitation. Even the treaty of 1684 between Ladakh and Tibet stated that “the boundaries fixed in the beginning, when Skyid-Ida-ngeema-gon gave a
kingdom to each of his three sons, shall still be maintained.” References in the Ladakhi chronicles of the 17th century indicate that the boundary was well-established. Cunningham, whom Your Excellency has referred to with approval, toured the area in 1846. He stated in 1854 that the eastern boundary of Ladakh “is well-defined by piles of stones, which were set up after the last expulsion of the Sokpo or Mongol hordes in A.D. 1687 when the Ladakhis received considerable assistance from Kashmir.” (Ladakh, 1854, page 261). Thus it is clear that for nearly two centuries the boundary between Ladakh and Tibet was well-known and recognized by both sides. There was a constant flow of trade between Ladakh and Tibet during these centuries as provided for by these treaties, and no boundary conflicts ever arose.

7. It has been stated in your letter that China never ratified the 1842 treaty. That China recognised the treaty is clear from the fact that the Chinese official in 1847 informed the British Government: “Respecting the frontiers I beg to remark that the borders of those territories have been sufficiently and distinctly fixed, so that it will be best to adhere to this ancient arrangement and it will prove far more convenient to abstain from any additional measures for fixing them.” There was no suggestion that the Chinese Government regarded the treaty as invalid. It is also clear from the statement quoted that not merely was the boundary known, but the boundary was distinctly and sufficiently fixed and there was no divergence of opinion as to where it lay.

8. Further evidence of Chinese acceptance of the 1842 treaty is provided by the fact that the other provisions of the treaty regarding exchange of goods and presents were in operation right up to 1946 without any hindrance from the Chinese Government.

9. It is incorrect to say that down to 1899 the British Government proposed formally to delimit this section of the boundary but that the Chinese Government did not agree. No proposals were made between 1847 and 1899 for any such formal delimitation. The proposal made in 1899 by the British Government referred not to the eastern frontier of Ladakh with Tibet but to the northern frontier of Ladakh and Kashmir with Sinkiang. It was stated in that context that the northern boundary ran along the Kuen Lun range to a point east of 80° east longitude, where it met the eastern boundary of Ladakh. This signified beyond doubt that the whole of Aksai Chin area lay in Indian territory. The Government of China did not object to this proposal.

10. So Ladakh, Tibet and China had all accepted that the frontier between Ladakh and Tibet was the customary boundary. You have stated that the boundary as shown in the Chinese maps follows, more or less, that shown in the map of “Punjab, Western Himalaya and adjoining parts of Tibet” compiled by Walker and attached to Cunningham’s book published in 1854. Walker’s Map states in the Compilation Index that the document used for this sector is the “Map of Ladakh and Nari Khorsum by Capt. H. Strachey.” Now, Strachey toured only a part of Ladakh in 1847-48. He knew little or nothing about Aksai Chin, having never visited the area, and drew the boundary where he thought the main water-parting, which was
the natural and old established frontier in this area, lay. Thereafter a number of exploration and survey parties were sent by the Government of India to this region. These parties ascertained the customary frontier on the basis of natural features and such local evidence as was available. Johnson visited the area in 1865 and Frederick Drew, an Englishman in the employ of the Maharaja of Kashmir as Governor of Ladakh, in 1866. Other survey parties in the nineteenth century were those of Hayward, Shaw and Cayley in 1868. Carey in 1885—87, Hamilton Bower in 1891, Littledale in 1895, Welby and Malcolm in 1896, Deasy and Pike in 1896, and Aurel Stein in 1900. Accurate maps of the whole Ladakh area thus became possible only from 1865, after the afore-mentioned surveys had ascertained the exact lie of the watershed; and it is significant that most of the maps since that date show the customary boundary in accordance with the line shown by us in our map rather than that claimed by China. The later Map of Turkestan of Walker himself published in 1867-68, Drew's map attached to this book Jammu & Kashmir Territories (1875), Johnston's Atlas (1882), and maps attached to the Gazetteers of Kashmir published from 1890 onwards all showed boundary lines more or less similar to our present frontier. Even official Chinese maps of the late nineteenth century showed a boundary approximating to our line. It is only in official Chinese maps of the twentieth century that the Chinese Government included large parts of our territory. On the other hand, The New Atlas and Commercial Gazette of China, published in Shanghai sometime after 1917 by the North China Daily News and Herald on the basis of authoritative surveys, shows a boundary in the north-west similar to our alignment and a boundary in the north-east which approximates to what later became known as the McMahon Line. I may add that the Chinese maps do not follow even Walker's Map of 1854 where it does not support the assertion made on behalf of China. Thus Walker shows the areas north of Demchok and north of Pangong in India but recent Chinese maps have not followed Walker's map in regard to these areas.

11. You have referred to the sector of the boundary between what is known as the Ari area of Tibet and India. We are told that Ari, which is an abbreviated form of Ngari Khorsum, is southwestern Tibet. This is the sector of the boundary between the Punjab, Himachal Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh in India and the Tibet region. You have stated that the boundary in this sector has never been formally delimited. In fact, there should be little doubt about the boundary in this sector. Article IV of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement specifies six passes in this area. There was discussion of these passes between the Chinese and Indian representatives before the Agreement was concluded. Your original draft contained the following: "The Chinese Government agrees to open the following passes." On behalf of India Mr. Kaul then said that these were Indian passes. After some discussion both sides agreed on the following text: "Traders and pilgrims of both countries may travel by the following passes". Your Vice-Foreign Minister remarked in that context. "This was the fifth concession on our part". This was recognition of the passes as border passes. In fact the Government of India have always been in control of the Indian ends of the passes.
12. I am particularly surprised by your statement that “the so-called McMahon Line was a product of the British policy of aggression against the Tibet Region of China”. You further state that the agreement in regard to the frontier between India and Tibet was concluded between the British representative and the representative of the Tibet local authorities and that it has never been recognized by any Chinese Central Government. From this you draw the conclusion that the agreement is illegal. The facts, however, are otherwise. The arrangements for the Simla Conference were made with the full knowledge and consent of the Government of China. The Foreign Minister of China wrote to the British representative on the 7th August 1913 that the Chinese plenipotentiary would proceed to India “to open negotiations for a treaty jointly” with the Tibetan and British plenipotentiaries. It is clear from the proceedings of the conference that not only did the Chinese representative fully participate in the conference but that the Tibetan representative took part in the discussions on an equal footing with the Chinese and the then British Indian representatives. Not only were the frontiers of India with Tibet discussed at the conference, but also the boundaries between Inner Tibet and China, and Inner Tibet and Outer Tibet. At no stage, either then or subsequently, did the Chinese Government object to the discussions on the boundary between India and Tibet at the conference. In the circumstances the agreement which resulted from the conference in regard to the McMahon Line boundary between India and Tibet must, in accordance with accepted international practice, be regarded as binding on both China and Tibet. In fact this was not the first occasion when Tibet concluded an agreement with other countries. In 1856 Tibet concluded an agreement on its own with Nepal. The Convention signed by Britain and Tibet in 1904 was negotiated by the British and Tibetan representatives with the assistance of the Chinese Amban in Tibet.

13. You have stated that for a long time after the exchange of so-called secret notes between Britain and Tibet Britain did not dare to make public the related documents. You have also contended that the McMahon Line “was later marked on the map attached to the Simla Treaty”. I am afraid I cannot agree either with your facts or your conclusion. The Chinese representative at the Simla Conference was fully aware of the McMahon Line boundary between India and Tibet. This particular line was discussed between the Tibetan and British Indian representatives, but when the draft convention emerging from the conference was presented on the 22nd April 1914 for signature by the British Indian, Tibetan and Chinese representatives it had attached to it a map showing the McMahon Line boundary as well as the boundaries between Inner Tibet and China, and Inner Tibet and Outer Tibet. Later, the Chinese Foreign Office in a memorandum, dated the 25th April 1914 listed a number of objections to the boundaries between Inner Tibet and Outer Tibet and Inner Tibet and China. It did not raise any objection to the boundary between Tibet and India as shown in the map attached to the tripartite Simla Convention. Thereafter, on the 27th April, the Chinese representative initialled both the convention and the map without any objection. Subsequently, in their memorandum, dated the 13th June 1914, the Chinese made
fresh proposals regarding the boundaries of Inner Tibet and Outer Tibet. It is significant that no mention was at all made in this memorandum of the boundary between Tibet and India. Almost five years later, on the 30th May 1919, the Government of China again suggested some modifications of the Simla Convention with a view to reaching a final settlement. These modifications related only to the boundaries between Inner Tibet and China and Inner Tibet and Outer Tibet. No reference at all was made to the boundary between Tibet and India (McMahon Line). Looking into the old papers, we find that the British Government withheld the publication of the Simla Convention for several years in the hope that there would be an agreement about the status and boundary of Inner Tibet. The Simla Convention was published in the 1929 edition of Aitchison’s Treaties and the McMahon Line was shown in the official maps from 1937 onwards. These maps were circulated widely but neither then nor subsequently was any objection raised by the Chinese authorities.

14. I entirely disagree with the inference drawn by you from the exchange of two communications between the Tibetan Bureau in Lhasa and the new Government of India in 1947. The facts are that our Mission in Lhasa forwarded to us a telegram, dated the 16th October 1947 from the Tibetan Bureau. The telegram asked for the return of alleged Tibetan territories on boundaries of India and Tibet “such as Sayul and Walong and in direction of Pemakoe, Lonag, Lopa, Mon, Bhutan, Sikkim, Darjeeling and others on this side of river Ganges and Lowo, Ladakh etc. upto boundary of Yarkhim.” It will be seen that the areas claimed by Tibet had not been defined. If they were to be taken literally, the Tibetan boundary would come down to the line of the river Ganges. The Government of India could not possibly have entertained such a fantastic claim. If they had the faintest idea that this telegram would be made the basis of a subsequent claim to large areas of Indian territory, they would of course have immediately and unequivocally rejected the claim. Not having had such an impression, they sent a reply to the following effect: “The Government of India would be glad to have an assurance that it is the intention of the Tibetan Government to continue relations on the existing basis until new agreements are reached on matters that either party may wish to take up. This is the procedure adopted by all other countries with which India has inherited treaty relations from His Majesty’s Government”. It would be unfair to deduce from this reply that India undertook to negotiate fresh agreements with Tibet on the frontier question. When the British relinquished power and India attained freedom on the 15th August 1947, the new Government of India inherited the treaty obligations of undivided India. They wished to assure all countries with which the British Government of undivided India had treaties and agreements that the new Government to India would abide by the obligations arising from them. All that the Government of India intended to do in the telegram mentioned in Your Excellency’s letter was to convey an assurance to that effect to the Tibetan authorities. There could be no question, so far as India was concerned, of reopening old treaties with Tibet with a view to entertaining, even for purposes of discussion, claims to large areas of Indian territory.
15. It is wrong to say that the frontier east of Bhutan as shown on Chinese maps is the traditional frontier. On the contrary, it is the McMahon Line which correctly represents the customary boundary in this area. The water-parting formed by the crest of the Himalayas is the natural frontier which was accepted for centuries as the boundary by the peoples on both sides. The tribes inhabiting the area south of the McMahon Line—the Monbas, Akas, Dafis, Miris, Abors, and Mishmis—are of the same ethnic stock as the other hill tribes of Assam and have no kinship with the Tibetans. The Tibetans themselves regard these tribes with contempt and group them all together as "Lopas". It is true that the boundary of two adjacent countries is not determined by the ethnic affiliations of the people living in these countries. Some sort of cultural intercourse between the peoples living on both sides of the frontier is also not uncommon. All the same it is significant that the tribes mentioned above have not been affected in the slightest degree by any Tibetan influence, cultural, political or other, and this can only be due to the fact that the Tibetan authorities have not exercised jurisdiction at any time in this area. On the other hand, Indian administration gradually moved up to these areas. Agreements were signed with the Akas in 1844 and 1888, the Abors in 1862-63 and 1866, and with the Monbas in 1844 and 1853, extending the authority of the Government of India over them. It was the British Government's policy generally to leave the tribes more or less to look after themselves and not seek to establish any detailed administration of these areas such as was to be found in the rest of British Indian territory. All the same British Political Officers visited these areas for settling disputes and such like purposes. Finally, the Sadiya Frontier Tract, approximately 10,000 square miles in area, was formed in 1912, and the Balipara Frontier Tract also comprising about 10,000 square miles, was formed in 1913, i.e., before the Simla Conference met. The Atlas of the Chinese Empire, published in London by the Chinese Inland Mission in 1906, shows as the frontier in this area an alignment which is almost identical with what was settled at Simla in 1914. The area was extensively surveyed in 1911-13. The Lohit area was surveyed by the Mishmi Mission in 1911-12, the Dibhang Valley was surveyed in 1912-13, and the Abor area in 1913. Captain Bailey carried out extensive surveys of the southern limits of Tibetan jurisdiction in the whole area in 1913-14. It was on the basis of all this detailed information that the boundary was settled between India and Tibet in 1914. It is clear, therefore, that the McMahon Line was not an arbitrary imposition on a weak Tibet by the Government of India. It formalized the natural, traditional, ethnic and administrative boundary in the area.

16. Your Excellency has referred to a map published by the Survey of India in 1917 and a map in the 1929 edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. The Survey of India map shows the line claimed by China but on the same sheet, in the index map, the McMahon Line is also shown. The reason for this is that the British Indian Government were reluctant to issue new maps of India showing only the McMahon Line in the hope that China would accept the Simla Convention as a whole. As for the map in the 1929 edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, it is true that in the
eastern sector it shows roughly the line now claimed by China. But the same map shows the whole of Aksai Chin as part of Ladakh. It would therefore be unfair to quote the authority of the Encyclopaedia Britannica in support of the Chinese claim in one sector of the boundary and to reject it in respect of the other. In fact, if maps published privately in other countries are to be cited as evidence, we can refer to a large number of such maps in our support. For example, the map of *Asie Meridionale* published by Andriveau-Coujon in Paris in 1876 and the map of *Asia Orientale* published by the same firm in 1881 show the whole tribal area as outside Tibet. The Atlas of the Chinese Empire published by the China Inland Mission in 1906 shows a boundary which approximates to the McMahon Line. The British War Office Map of the Chinese Empire published in October 1907 shows almost the entire tribal territory in India. The map in Sir Francis Younghusband's volume *India and Tibet* published in London in 1910 shows the Tribal area in India; and so does the map in Sir Charles Bell's book *Tibet Past and Present* (Oxford 1924).

17. It is not clear to us what exactly is the implication of your statement that the boundaries of Sikkim and Bhutan do not fall within the scope of the present discussion. In fact, Chinese maps show sizeable areas of Bhutan as part of Tibet. Under treaty relationships with Bhutan, the Government of India are the only competent authority to take up with other Governments matters concerning Bhutan's external relations, and in fact we have taken up with your Government a number of matters on behalf of the Bhutan Government. The rectification of errors in Chinese maps regarding the boundary of Bhutan with Tibet is therefore a matter which has to be discussed along with the boundary of India with the Tibet region of China in the same sector. As regards Sikkim, the Chinese Government recognised as far back as 1890 that the Government of India "has direct and exclusive control over the internal administration and foreign relations of that State". This Convention of 1890 also defined the boundary between Sikkim and Tibet; and the boundary was later, in 1895, demarcated. There is thus no dispute regarding the boundary of Sikkim with the Tibet region.

18. You have stated that the Sino-Indian boundary is about 2,000 kilometres in length, is wholly undelimited, and that it is not Chinese maps but British and Indian maps that have been unilaterally altering the Sino-Indian boundary. In fact, the Sino-Indian boundary (apart from the boundary of Sikkim and Bhutan with Tibet) extends over 3,520 kilometres. It is wrong to say that this long boundary is wholly undelimited. The frontier east of Bhutan has been explicitly delineated on the 1914 treaty map. The frontier of Himachal Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh has been clarified by implication by the mention of six passes in the 1954 Agreement. As for the charge that British and Indian maps have been unilaterally altering the boundary, the fact is that early British maps showed the boundary roughly where the British thought the water-parting was at the time. Later, as more topographical as well as local information about the water-parting was obtained, the boundary was shown with greater precision on the subsequent maps. The discrepancies between the earlier and later maps are also explained in part by the fact that
British cartographers as a rule showed in their maps the administrative boundaries irrespective of the actual alignment of the frontier. Therefore, as administration was gradually extended in the frontier areas, corresponding changes were made in the boundaries on the later maps. Thus the map of India published by the Survey of India in 1895 (1"=128 miles) showed the unadministered areas of northern Burma and north-eastern India up to what subsequently came to be known as the McMahon Line by a light orange colour wash as distinct from the deeper colours used for the rest of the Indian territory. The Memorandum on Native States in India published by the Government of India in 1909 has a map in Volume II showing this whole tribal area as part of India. The fact is that the present frontiers of India have always been the historic frontiers but administration in the British period was only gradually extended up to these frontiers. Shortly after India attained independence in 1947 the Government of India decided, as a matter of policy, to bring these frontier areas under more direct administrative control to enable them to share in the benefits of a welfare state subject to the protection of their distinct social and cultural patterns. It is not true to say that it was only after the recent Tibetan crisis and the entry into India of a large number of Tibetans that Indian troops started advancing steadily in the North-East Frontier Agency. In fact administrative personnel, civil and police, had been functioning in these areas right up to the McMahon frontier for several years before the recent disturbances broke out in Tibet. However, we did not have any military force anywhere in the border areas. There was only an armed constabulary in support of the civil personnel and even the frontier posts were manned by this constabulary. It was only when our outpost at Longju was overpowered by superior Chinese military force and our personnel elsewhere along the frontier were being intimidated by Chinese forces that we decided to place the responsibility for the protection of the frontier on our army.

19. It should be clear from what has been stated in previous paragraphs that it is the Chinese maps that have altered the boundary alignments through the years to include large areas of Indian territory in China. It should also be stated that Chinese maps published even after 1949 have not adhered to any definite frontier. Different maps show different alignments in the same sector.

20. I am sorry to have to say that it is the Chinese Government who have been trying unilaterally to change the long-existing state of the border. There is no other explanation for the presence of Chinese personnel in Bara Hoti and of Chinese troops in the Aksai Chin area, Khurnak Fort, Mandal, Spanggar, Khinzemane and Longju, and for Chinese intrusions in the Spiti area, Shipki pass, the Nilang-Jadhang area, Sangcha, Lapthal, and the Dichu Valley. Nor is it correct to say that Chinese troops have never crossed the McMahon Line. Both Khinzemane and Longju are south of this line.

21. The Government of India emphatically repudiate the allegation that in recent times they have “invaded and occupied” a number of places in the middle sector of the boundary. In fact it is the Chinese forces which have made persistent efforts in recent times
to come into and occupy indisputably Indian territory. Details of intrusions and attempted intrusions by Chinese forces have been given in the attached note. These intrusions have been particularly marked in the Spanggur area, where Chinese forces have been pushing forward in an aggressive manner during the last year or two in disregard of the traditional frontier. The Chinese have only recently established a new camp near the western extremity of the Spanggur lake at a point which even according to some official Chinese maps is in Indian territory. It is not for us to comment on the reports of large-scale movements of Chinese forces in the Tibetan frontier areas. We hope that these moves do not signify a new policy of actively probing into Indian territory along the whole length of the Sino-Indian frontier.

22. Reports have reached us that some Chinese officers in Tibet have repeatedly proclaimed that the Chinese authorities will before long take possession of Sikkim, Bhutan, Ladakh and our North-East Frontier Agency. I do not know what authority they had to make these remarks but I would like to draw Your Excellency's attention to them as these remarks have naturally added to the tension on the frontier.

23. Your Excellency has spoken of Indian parties having trespassed into Chinese territory. Nowhere have our personnel done so. Even if they had done so through an error of judgment at any point in the barren wastes of some far-flung frontier region, we would have expected that a friendly Government would promptly bring it to our notice for remedial action. Instead, last year when an Indian party was engaged on routine administrative patrol near Haji Langar in Ladakh, your forces arrested them and did not inform us of the arrest until we had enquired of you almost five weeks later. In the meantime our personnel were subjected to threats, harsh treatment and severe interrogation. Surely this is not the manner in which the personnel of a friendly Government should have been treated.

24. The charge that India has been shielding armed Tibetan rebels in the frontier areas in the north-east is wholly unfounded and we firmly reject it. On the contrary, our personnel disarmed the Tibetan rebels as soon as they crossed the frontier into Indian territory and insisted on their moving well away from the frontier areas. The few who showed disinclination to do so were told that they would not get asylum in India and made to leave our territory finally.

25. There is no truth in the allegation that Indian aircraft have repeatedly violated Chinese territorial air in this area. We have issued definite instruction to all our aircraft to avoid trespass into Chinese air space and we are assured that this instruction has been carefully observed. You will appreciate, however, that aircraft engaged in supply dropping missions to a frontier outpost may accidentally cross the international frontier or appear to do so even though it has not actually crossed the frontier. Our anxiety to respect the Chinese territorial air space would be clear from the fact that when in July last the officer in charge of our outpost at Longju fell seriously ill we informed your Government that we would be para-dropping a doctor. The object of our giving the information to
your Government was to ensure that you would not misunderstand it if by error of judgment our aircraft should cross into Chinese territory in flying over a frontier outpost. For the same reason we also gave you information in advance that survey operations would be carried out from the air on our side of the border during the months from November 1959 to February 1960. Incidentally, the information that we gave you about Longju would disprove any suggestion that we had surreptitiously started an outpost on Chinese territory. Had we done so, we would not have given its location to your Government.

26. I have looked into the allegation that the boundary drawn on Indian maps includes in many places even more territory than the McMahon Line, but have been unable to discover any basis for it. If you have in mind the Sino-Indian frontier shown in the Indian maps in the Migyitun area which differs slightly from the boundary shown in the Treaty map, the position can be easily explained. As settled between the British and the Chinese representatives at the time of the Simla Conference, the boundary was to follow the natural features, but a reservation was made that Migyitun (and a few other places) would be within Tibetan territory. This was done in order to leave within Tibet the two sacred lakes of Tsari Sarpa and Tso Karpo which were places of pilgrimage for Tibetans and the village of Migyitun from which the pilgrimage started. At the time of the Simla Convention, the exact topographical features in this area were not known. Later, after the topography of the area had been definitely ascertained, the actual boundary followed the geographical features except where a departure was necessary to leave Migyitun within Tibetan territory. The actual boundary as shown in the Indian maps, therefore, merely gave effect to the treaty map in the area based on definite topography. This was in accordance with established international practice.

27. I entirely disagree with your view that the tense situation that has arisen on the border has been caused by Indian trespassing and provocation. In fact, as the attached note will show, it is the Chinese who have trespassed into Indian territory across the traditional border at a number of places in recent years. You have mentioned that we in India have staged a second so-called anti-Chinese campaign. This, if I may say so, is the reverse of the actual position. Despite the regrettable happenings on the frontier of our two countries, we in India have conducted ourselves with great restraint and moderation. At a number of places your forces assumed a threatening attitude; at others they actually came into our territory. Such incidents concerning as they did the integrity of India, were very serious, but in our anxiety not to create feelings against your Government we deliberately avoided giving publicity to them. Questions in Parliament had, however, to be answered and the facts could not be withheld. When the facts thus became known, the reaction both in Parliament and among the public was one of dismay and great resentment. There was criticism of our Government both in Parliament and the press for our failure to give publicity to these developments at an earlier stage. Under the Indian Constitution Parliament is supreme. India has also a free press and the Government could not restrain public criticism. In the circumstances, to allege that the Government of India built up pressure on
China in any manner is a complete misreading of the facts of the situation. It is also based on complete misunderstanding of the constitutional procedures under which the Government, Parliament and the press function in India. Needless to say, such an allegation is entirely baseless.

28. I have stated before and wish to affirm once again that the Government of India attach great importance to the maintenance of friendly relations with China. They have hitherto sought to conduct their relations with China, as with other countries, in the spirit of Panch Sheel. This indeed had always been India's policy even before the five principles were enunciated. It is therefore all the more a matter of regret and surprise to us that China should now have put forth claims to large areas of Indian territory inhabited by hundreds of thousands of Indian nationals, which have been under the administrative jurisdiction of India for many years. No Government could possibly discuss the future of such large areas which are an integral part of their territory. We however recognise that the India-China frontier which extends over more than 3,500 kilometres has not been demarcated on the ground and disputes may therefore arise at some places along the traditional frontier as to whether these places lie on the Indian or the Tibetan side of this traditional frontier. We agree therefore that the border disputes which have already arisen should be amicably and peacefully settled. We also agree that until a settlement has been reached the status quo should be maintained. In the meantime both sides should respect the traditional frontier and neither party should seek to alter the status quo in any manner. Further, if any party has trespassed into the other's territory across the traditional frontier, it should immediately withdraw to its side of the frontier. So far as the Government of India are concerned, at no places at present have they any personnel, civil, police or military, on the Tibetan side of the traditional frontier. There was only one outpost, that at Tamaden, established some months ago, which, subsequent enquiries showed, was somewhat north of the McMahon Line. In keeping with our earlier promise we have already withdrawn it to a point south of the Line. There can therefore be no question of withdrawing any Indian personnel at any other place. We would now request that in the same spirit your Government should withdraw their personnel from a number of posts which you have opened in recent months at Spanggur, Mandal and one or two other places in eastern Ladakh. Similarly, your forces should also withdraw from Longju which they forcibly occupied on the 26th August and which they still continue to occupy. No discussions can be fruitful unless the posts on the Indian side of the traditional frontier now held by the Chinese forces are first evacuated by them and further threats and intimidations immediately cease.

29. Mr. Prime Minister, I regret that I have had to write to you at this length and in such detail. But I must frankly say that your letter of the 8th September has come as a great shock to us. India was one of the first countries to extend recognition to the People’s Republic of China and for the last ten years we have consistently sought to maintain and strengthen our friendship with your country. When our two countries signed the 1954 Agreement in regard to the Tibet region I hoped that the main problems which history had
bequeathed to us in the relations between India and China had been peacefully and finally settled. Five years later, you have now brought forward, with all insistence, a problem which dwarfs in importance all that we have discussed in recent years and, I thought, settled. I appreciate your statement that China looks upon her south-western border as a border of peace and friendship. This hope and this promise could be fulfilled only if China would not bring within the scope of what should essentially be a border dispute, claims to thousands of square miles of territory which have been and are integral part of the territory of India.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) JAWAHARLAL NEHRU.
Annexure to letter from the Prime Minister of India to the Prime Minister of China, 26 September 1959

A NOTE ON THE BORDER DISPUTES

A. Aksai Chin

As shown in the text of the letter, Aksai Chin is a part of Ladakh. The Chinese Government have now admitted that in 1956 they built a highway from Tibet to Sinkiang, running for about a hundred miles through this territory. In September 1957, it was announced that this road had been completed. The next year Indian personnel carrying out routine patrol duties were arrested near Haji Langar in north-east Aksai Chin, taken to Suget Karol and detained for five weeks. The leader of the Indian patrol was placed in solitary confinement, and all documents were seized. When the Government of India protested at the serious and continuous occupation of our territory which road-building implied, and enquired whether the Chinese authorities had any knowledge of the Indian patrol, they admitted that they had detained the Indian party. Later the party was released at the Karakoram pass.

B. The Pangong area

The customary boundary between Ladakh and Tibet in this region lies from Lanak La (34° 24' North and 79° 34' East) along the eastern and southern watershed of the Chang Chenmo and the southern watershed of the Chumesang, and then along the southern bank of the Chumesang and the eastern bank of the Changlung Lungpa. Skirting the western extremity of the eastern half of Pangong Tso, the boundary thereafter follows the Ang watershed and cutting across Spanggur Tso, follows the north-eastern and northern watershed of the Indus. In recent years Chinese armed personnel have crossed this border in several places, fanned out and occupied Indian territory illegally. In July 1958 the Government of India protested against the Chinese occupation of Khurnak Fort, about 1½ miles within the Indian frontier. This fort has from time immemorial been within Ladakh, and has never been the subject of dispute. Even at a conference on certain pasture grounds in this area, attended by the representatives of Tibet and Kashmir and a British Commissioner in 1924, the jurisdiction of India over this fort was not disputed. However, there has been no reply as yet to the note of the Government of India.

In July 1959 it was learnt that a Chinese armed detachment had entered Indian territory in the Spanggur area south of the Pangong Lake, and had established a camp at Spanggur. When an Indian police party on its way to Khurnak approached them, it was overpowered. The Government of India protested, but the Chinese Government in their reply asserted that this was Chinese territory. This statement is contradicted even by the boundary alignment in this sector shown on Chinese maps, for example, the Map of the Administrative Areas of the Chinese Republic (1948), in which the boundary cuts across the eastern extremity of the Spanggur Lake. Spanggur stands on the western edge of the lake. Though the Government of India would have been justified in dislodging this
Chinese camp, they have refrained from doing so in the hope that the Chinese would themselves withdraw.

C. Demchok

Demchok, or Parigas, is another area which India is supposed to have "invaded and occupied". This is part of the Hanle region in south-eastern Ladakh. Ladakhi chronicles of the 17th century and accounts of travellers of the 18th and 19th centuries all state that Demchok was a part of Ladakh. The Kailash range, which is the eastern watershed of the Indus, lies east of Demchok. Strachey, who visited this area in 1847, confirmed this position, and Walker, on the authority of Strachey, showed the boundary in this region as running east of Demchok village. The pasture grounds between Demchok and the Kailash range have been used by Indian villagers for a long time past. All revenue records of this country prove that taxes were collected in this area by the Jammu and Kashmir Government, and a checkpost has been maintained in this area for several decades.

D. The Spiti area

Premier Chou En-lai's letter alleges Indian "invasion" of Chauva and Chu-je, i.e., the Spiti area in the Punjab State. The Spiti valley is, however, traditional Indian territory. The frontier in this area is the major watershed between the Pare Chu and the Spiti systems. As far back as 1879 the "Map of Hundes or Ngari Khorsum and Monyol" issued by the Trigonometrical Survey of India showed the boundary along this watershed. In 1956 a Chinese survey party visited this area and sought to place boundary stones on Indian territory, and in 1957 a Chinese patrol party was noticed there. The Government of India drew the attention of the Chinese Government to these violations of Indian territory. The Chinese authorities neither denied the charge nor claimed this territory to be a part of Tibet. They did not appear even to have an exact knowledge of this terrain, for they asked India for details of latitude and longitude. A wall map of the People's Republic of China published in November 1953 (Ya Kuang Publishing Society) shows this area within India. To speak of Indian aggression in this area is, therefore, to say the least, astonishing.

E. Shipki pass

Shipki pass is the first of the six border passes mentioned in the 1954 agreement. This has always been the limit of Indian territory. All old maps indicated this as the border pass. The Government of India have constructed a road up to this point and have been maintaining it for many years; and in 1954 the words "Hindustan-Tibet" were engraved on a rock flanking the pass on the left. In the summer of 1956 a Chinese patrol was found on the Indian side of the pass and well within Indian territory. On being asked to withdraw the Chinese personnel threw stones and threatened to use hand grenades. The commander of the Chinese patrol contended that he had received instructions to patrol the area up to Hupsang Khud and if the Indian party went beyond Hupsang Khud he "would oppose it with arms". Hupsang Khud is four miles from Shipki pass on the Indian side. Indian protests to the Government of China against this incursion remain unanswered.
F. The Nilang-Jadhang area

Premier Chou En-lai states that there have been historical disputes regarding many places in the sector of the boundary between Ladakh and Nepal, and gives as an example the area of Sang and Tsungsha, south-west of Tsaparang Dzong in Tibet. In fact this is the only area in regard to which the Chinese authorities have raised a dispute. Sang is Jadhang village, Tsungsha is Nilang village and Tsaparang Dzong is the district headquarters in this part of Tibet. The Chinese Premier accuses India of having invaded and occupied Puling-Sumdo, that is Pulam Sumda, a village in the Nilang-Jadhang area.

It is not true that this area had always belonged to China and that the British occupied it only thirty to forty years ago. By the middle of the seventeenth century Nilang formed part of Bushahr state (now in Himachal Pradesh of India). A copper-plate inscription of 1667 A.D. records a treaty of mutual defence between Bushahr and Tehri and the cession to Tehri of Nilang. So clearly Nilang was then in India. Documents of the 18th century show that Tehri was administering the area. The inhabitants of this area are Garhwali by stock and not Tibetan.

In 1804 Nepalese troops are said to have destroyed Nilang village but in 1850 the Tehri Durbar re-established the village of Nilang and a hamlet named Jadhang, further north. In 1914 the Tibetans tried to set up a boundary pillar at Gum Gum Nala south of Nilang, and four years later the Tehri Durbar in its turn erected three boundary pillars at the border pass of Tsangchok La.

In 1926 a boundary commission consisting of Tibetan, Tehri and British representatives met at Nilang. Considerable evidence was produced by the Tehri Government in their own favour. It included ownership rights in land, proof of construction of roads and buildings and collection of land revenues for centuries. The only evidence the Tibetans could produce was that their agents had occasionally collected a tax levied on trade with Tibet. The territory continued under the administration of the Tehri Durbar and, after the merger of Tehri State in Uttar Pradesh (India) in 1948, under the administration of the Government of Uttar Pradesh. Since 1951 no taxes at all have been paid by these villagers to Tibetans, as they have discontinued the practice of visiting Tibet for trade.

The area of Nilang-Jadhang is situated south of the main watershed in this region, along which the six border passes mentioned in the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement are situated. In April 1956 it was found that some armed Chinese personnel had intruded into this area without securing the permission of the Indian authorities. A protest was lodged by the Government of India on 2nd May 1956, but till now there has been no reply to this protest from the Chinese Government.

G. Bara Hoti

Bara Hoti, which the Chinese call Wu-je and accuse the Government of India of having occupied, is a small area (about 1½ square miles) in the State of Uttar Pradesh (India). The area lies between the main watershed of the Sutlej and the Alaknanda, which is the
boundary in this sector, and the highest range of the Himalayas further south. Revenue records and other official documents of the 19th century establish that the watershed is the traditional frontier between India and Tibet in this region. It has been shown in Indian maps since 1850, when maps of this region based on surveys were first drawn. Even Chinese maps up to 1958 show the watershed as the frontier. Bara Hoti which is south of the watershed must, therefore, be regarded as within India. Till 1954 neither the Tibetans nor the Chinese seriously challenged this position, but since then Chinese personnel have persistently visited this area. There was a conference in Delhi to consider this question in April-May 1958. The Indian representatives proposed that pending a settlement of the dispute no armed personnel should be sent to the area. The Chinese Government agreed to this, but rejected the further proposal that neither side should send civilian personnel to the area. The Government of India, therefore, have continued to send civilian personnel to the area to exercise their long-established civil jurisdiction in this area. Bara Hoti has for centuries been under a patwari, and officials of Garhwal district have been touring it regularly. To describe the continuation of this administration as “aggression” is therefore, a distortion of facts. The accusation is more applicable to the Chinese Government, who sent not merely civilian officials but an armed party to the area in 1958 in contravention of the agreement at the Delhi conference. The Government of India have scrupulously adhered to the interim agreement not to send armed personnel and have not allowed even the revenue officials to carry arms for self-protection. Furthermore, the Chinese personnel stayed at Bara Hoti in 1958 for part of the winter also, contrary to normal practice.

India’s proposal at the conference that even civilian personnel should not be sent to the area shows the extent to which she was willing to go in the interest of a peaceful settlement. The only major argument that the Chinese side brought forward was that certain Tibetan agents called Sarjis came occasionally to this area to collect imposts. These men, however, were not regular officials of the Chinese Government but merely promoters of trade who came to declare Indo-Tibetan trade open and to inspect the cattle which was coming from or going to Tibet to see if it was diseased. They collected taxes only from Tibetans who had come down to trade and not from local villagers. And even against these visits of the Tibetan Sarjis, the Government of India had always been making repeated protests.

Indeed, it was revealed at the conference at Delhi in 1958 that the Chinese did not even know what area they meant by Wu-je. They therefore, pressed for a local enquiry as that would enable them to know what area they were claiming.

Two other places south-east of Bara Hoti also mentioned in Premier Chou En-lai’s letter as “invaded and occupied” by India are Sangcha or Sangcha Malla, and Lapthal. They are situated in Almora District in Uttar Pradesh, on the Indian side of the Balcha Dhura pass. This pass is located on the water-parting which is the traditional boundary in this area between India and Tibet. This is
confirmed by Edwin Atkinson in his volume *The Himalayan Districts of North-Western Provinces of India* (1886). Sancha Malla is two miles south of the border and Lapthal six miles south. No Chinese map has ever shown these places within Tibet, and they have never before been claimed by either Tibet or China. It was only in October 1958, when the Indian check-posts retired as usual because of the onset of winter, that Chinese personnel entered Indian territory and established outposts at these two places. A protest of the Government of India on 10th December 1958 has elicited no reply.

H. Yasher, Khinzemane and Shatze

Premier Chou En-lai alleges that Indian troops intruded into Yasher and are still in occupation of Shatze and Khinzemane. The Government of India are aware of no such place or area as Yasher. Judging from its location on the small-scale maps recently published in Chinese newspapers, it is presumably a small area north-east of height 15721 in the Simla Convention Map. Here the boundary runs due north and the territory that is marked as Yasher is inside India. Indian personnel, in this area have been given strict orders not to cross the boundary and they have scrupulously observed these orders. If the village Lung is being referred to as Yasher, then it can be categorically stated that Indian troops have never occupied it.

Khinzemane is south of the Thangla range which forms the international boundary in this area. In fact Chinese troops intruded into Khinzemane and tried to overawe Indian personnel there. Khinzemane and the Drokasar pastures near it in the North East Frontier Agency of India have for years belonged to the Indian village of Lumpo. The villages of Le and Timang in Tibet have been allowed to use these pastures on payment for pasture rights to the Indian village of Lumpo. There is no record of the Tibetan authorities ever having exercised jurisdiction in the region south of the Thangla range. As for Shatze, it is south of Khinzemane and well within Indian territory.

I. Longju and Migyitun

Premier Chou En-lai says that Indian troops have not only overstepped the McMahon Line as indicated in the map attached to the notes exchanged between Britain and Tibet, but have also advanced across the boundary drawn on current Indian maps, and these maps are alleged in many places to cut even deeper into Chinese territory than the McMahon Line. It is alleged that Indian troops “invaded and occupied” Longju and launched armed attacks on Chinese frontier guards stationed at Migyitun, leaving no option to the Chinese frontier guards but to fire back in self-defence.

It has been stated in the text of the letter that the representation of the McMahon Line on Indian maps strictly conforms to the line shown in the Simla Convention Map. Indian troops have not crossed the boundary as drawn on current Indian maps. The Indo-Tibetan boundary drawn at the Simla Conference departed from the watershed in the Subansiri area in order to leave in Tibet the sacred lakes of Tso Karpo and Tsari Tsarpa, the village of Migyitun to which Tibetans attach importance as the starting point of the
twelve-year pilgrimage, the route from Migyitun to the lakes, and another shorter pilgrimage route known as Tsari Nyingpa. The boundary alignment on current Indian maps carefully leaves these territories in Tibet. The international boundary here runs just south of the village of Migyitun. Longju which is entirely distinct from Migyitun lies 1½ miles further south of the border. It cannot be a part of Migyitun, which was a decaying village of twelve huts in 1913 and had further deteriorated to six huts and a monastic inn in 1935. The lands attached to Migyitun village were few and extended to a very short distance from the village.

Until Chinese troops recently trespassed into Longju no administrative control was ever exercised over this village by the Tibetan authorities. The detachment of Indian armed constabulary was instructed only to resist trespassers and to use force only in self-defence. It was the Chinese who first fired at the Indian forward picket and later overwhelmed by force the Indian outpost at Longju. This deliberate attack in superior numbers on an Indian outpost could have no justification at all. However, even though Longju is undoubtedly Indian territory, the Government of India are prepared to discuss with the Chinese Government the exact alignment of the McMahon Line in the Longju area. The Government of India have also offered not to send their personnel back to Longju provided that the Chinese Government also would withdraw their forces. The Chinese Government have not so far replied to this offer.
Note Verbale given to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 24 July 1959

The Officer-in-Charge of the Indian check-post at Longju near the international border in the Subansiri frontier division of NEFA is seriously ill. It is essential to send immediate medical relief to save his life. The location of the post is: GRID reference: MJ 7924 Longitude 93.32 East Latitude 23.37 North.

The Government of India propose to paradrop a doctor at the post. Depending on weather, the paradropping operation may take place on 24th afternoon or one of subsequent days. The aircraft has been instructed to take all care not to cross into the Chinese territory but the Chinese Government are being informed should there be any error of judgment. The Government of India would appreciate if immediate warning is issued to the neighbouring Chinese posts of this operation.
Note given to the Counsellor of India by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 7 September 1959

Recently, Indian aircraft have incessantly intruded into China's air space above the Tibet Region and the south-western part of Sinkiang, circling and carrying out reconnoitering activities within Chinese territory. The main facts are as follows:

1. From 10-45 to 11-00 hours on July 14, 1959, a double-engined Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space above Chekchar, in the eastern part of Tibet, and the area to its southwest.

2. At 10-00 hours on July 14, 1959, an Indian jet plane intruded into China's air space above the Amtogar area, in south-western part of Sinkiang.

3. From 12-36 to 12-44 hours on July 15, 1959, an Indian transport aircraft intruded into China’s air space above Tsona Dzong, in the eastern part of Tibet.

4. At 10-25 hours on July 22, 14-25 hours on July 29, and 10-50 hours on August 3, 1959, each time a double-engined Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space above Sunggu, Sama and other places in the Tsayu (Rima) area.

5. From 10-16 to 11-10 hours on August 22, 1959, a double-engined Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space above Migyitun, Checkchar, Raorang and other places, in the eastern part of Tibet.

6. From 11-20 to 11-30 hours, at 16-30 hours, and from 22-00 to 22-15 hours on August 26, 1959, each time a double-engined Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space above the Migyitun area.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against these serious incidents of Indian aircraft repeatedly violating China's territorial air and endangering peace in the border areas.
Note given by the Counsellor of India to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 14 September 1959

The Embassy of India presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to transmit the following from the Government of India:

The Government of India have seen the memorandum handed over to the Indian Embassy in Peking on September 7th, 1959 by the Deputy Director of the Asian Division on the alleged violation of Chinese territorial air by Indian planes. The Government of India have had enquiries made into the six instances mentioned in the memorandum. They are satisfied that in not a single case did any Indian plane trespass into Chinese territory. They have already repudiated more than once the allegations about the violation of Chinese air space by Indian planes which were engaged in a supply dropping mission to the encircled outpost at Longju.

The Embassy of India takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given to the Embassy of India by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 16 September 1959

From 14-00 to 14-30 hours on August 30, 1959, a double-engined Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space above the Migyitun area in the southeastern part of Tibet; and at 12-57 hours on September 2, 1959, a double-engined Indian aircraft again intruded into China's air space above the Lake Pangong area in the western part of Tibet. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China lodges a second serious protest with the Indian Government against these serious provocations of Indian aircraft repeatedly violating China's territorial air and endangering peace in the border areas.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of India in China to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 29 September 1959

Careful investigations have been made regarding the alleged violation of Chinese air space mentioned in the Note presented by the Chinese Foreign Office to the First Secretary of the Indian Embassy on the 16th September 1959.

No Indian aircraft either civil or military was within the neighbourhood of the Chinese frontier on the dates mentioned in the Chinese memorandum. It may, however, be mentioned that an aircraft of Aeroflot on its Delhi-Tashkent service may have been passing over the Lake Pangong area at about 08-00 IST on the 2nd September 1959.

There is no question of Indian aircraft endangering peace in the border areas. Indian aircraft engaged on their normal duties in Indian territory have strict instructions not to cross the international frontier, and the Government of India are satisfied that the allegations in the Chinese Government's Note are unfounded.
Note given to the Counsellor of India by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 7 September 1959

According to the report of the Naval Command of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, on August 9, 1959, the Indian *LST Magar* on its way to Hongkong, instead of taking the international route south-east of Hongkong and east of the Tankan Islands, unlawfully intruded into China's territorial sea from the direction south-west of the Wansan Islands outside the mouth of the Pearl River in Kwangtung, China, and sailed through the waterway west of the Chiapeng and Tankan islands of China. When the Chinese coast guard units discovered the Indian *LST Magar* intruding into China's territorial sea, they twice signalled at 06-11 hours of that day, warning the *LST* to leave Chinese territorial sea. The Indian *LST*, however, did not pay any attention and forcibly passed through. On account of the following circumstances, the Chinese Government cannot deem this incident of violating China's sovereignty over its territorial sea by the Indian *LST Magar* as fortuitous:

1. In July 1958, when the Indian cruiser *Mysore* was on its way for a friendly visit to Shanghai, China, it also unlawfully intruded into China's territorial sea on July 14, sailing through the waterway west of the Chiapeng and Tankan Islands. At the time, the Chinese coast guard units signalled four times, yet the cruiser did not pay any heed. The Chinese Government out of goodwill regarded that incident as one of the nature of incursion by mistake, and therefore did not raise the matter with the Indian Government. Now, however, the Indian *LST Magar* again intruded into China's territorial sea instead of taking the international route always followed by ships of other countries, paying no heed to the warnings served by the Chinese coast guard units. This can hardly be explained away again on the excuse of incursion by mistake.

2. In recent months, Indian troops have repeatedly intruded into the south-eastern part of the Tibet Region of China and occupied Chinese territory at Tamaden and Shatze, and even carried out armed provocations against the Chinese troops in the Migyitun area. At the same time, Indian aircraft also continually intruded into China's territorial air above this part of the Region. Thus, the Chinese Government cannot but consider the intrusion into China's territorial sea by the Indian *LST Magar* as a part of India's planned military provocations against China from the ground, air and sea.

In view of the above, the Chinese Government cannot but take a serious view of the incident of intrusion into China's territorial sea by the Indian *LST Magar*. The Chinese Government asks the Indian Government to take effective measures to ensure against similar incidents in the future.
The Embassy of India presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to transmit the following reply from the Government of India in reply to the memorandum handed over to Mr. M. K. Kannampilly, Counsellor of the Indian Embassy, Peking, on the 7th September 1959 by the Deputy Director of the Asian Division of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs:

The Government of India have seen the memorandum given to the Indian Embassy, Peking, by the Chinese Government on September 7th, 1959. They have investigated the complaint in the memorandum about the violation of Chinese territorial waters by the Indian Navy ship *Magar*. *I.N.S. Magar* was on its way to Japan to bring back some stores for the Government of India. It is not yet back home, but we have received a signal from *Magar* to say that the route which it took in approaching Hongkong passes west of Chipang and Tankan Islands. This route is an internationally recognised approach to the Hongkong port and is mentioned as such in the *China Sea pilot*, Volume I, page 454. There was no previous information that the Chinese Government had placed any restriction on the use of this channel. The Government of India have ascertained that on no occasion was the *I.N.S. Magar* challenged by the Chinese coast guard as alleged by the Chinese Government. On the 7th August, while the ship was passing 30 miles off the coast of Hainan island it sighted a ship showing no lights and challenged it. The latter answered back saying that it was a Chinese warship but did not disclose its name. *I.N.S. Magar* gave the international call sign and no further questions were asked. No other incident took place during the passage of the ship through the aforementioned channel or elsewhere. There was therefore no question of *I.N.S. Magar* forcibly passing through the channel. However the Government of India have issued instructions to *I.N.S. Magar* to avoid using this channel on the return voyage and to keep well clear of the Chinese territorial waters.

2. The Government of India are surprised to see the complaint about the alleged violation of Chinese territorial sea by *I.N.S. Mysore*. As the Chinese Government are aware, *Mysore* was on a goodwill mission to China and the Government of India are satisfied on enquiry that at no time did the ship receive any signal from the Chinese coast guard as stated in the memorandum of the Government of China. It is regrettable that the Chinese Government should have brought forward an allegation against *Mysore* which was on a goodwill visit to their country, more than a year after the conclusion of the visit. It is still more regrettable that the Chinese Government should have connected the use of the channel in good faith by *I.N.S. Magar* with a goodwill visit paid to China by *I.N.S. Mysore* thereby to build up a case of violation of Chinese sovereignty over its territorial waters by two successive Indian ships.

3. As the Government of India have stated in their previous notes, there is no truth in the Chinese allegation of intrusion into
Chinese territory by Indian troops on the North East Frontier Agency border or of armed provocations against the Chinese troops in the Migyitun area. Similarly, our planes were on a supply-dropping mission to the Indian outpost at Longju which was encircled by Chinese forces. The planes had strict instructions to keep within Indian territory and the Government of India are assured that the instructions were observed.

4. The Government of India deplore the attempt in the Chinese memorandum to connect the innocent passage of an Indian ship off the coast of Hongkong with the use of Indian air space by Indian planes hundreds of miles away. The suggestion is unworthy and the Government of India cannot accept it.

The Embassy of India takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of the People's Republic of China, the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given to the Counsellor of India by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 20 October 1959

According to the report of the Naval Command of the Chinese People's Liberation Army I.N.S. Magar which intruded into China's territorial sea on 9th August 1959 again made intrusion into China's territorial sea on 16th September on its way from Hongkong to Singapore. At 11-35 and 15-10 hours on 16th September the ship made unlawful intrusions 5.5 nautical miles deep into China's territorial sea east of the Chiapeng and Tankan Islands at the point 22.8 minutes 22 seconds N, 114.24 minutes 30 seconds E and 21.48 minutes 37 seconds N, 114.18 minutes 9 seconds E. The Chinese coast guard unit issued light and flag signals 15 times warning the ship to leave Chinese territorial sea yet it did not pay any attention or heed.

The Chinese Government must point out once again that the intrusions of Chinese territorial sea by I.N.S. Magar on 9th August 1959 and by I.N.S. Mysore on 14th July 1958 in disregard of the repeated warnings of the Chinese coast guard unit were wholly indisputable facts. Yet the Government of India in its reply note dated 13th September 1959 denied these facts and even cited the so-called China Sea Pilot published by the British Admiralty before the liberation of China as the basis for asserting that the waterway west of the Chiapeng and Tankan Islands is "an internationally recognised approach to the Hongkong Port". The Chinese Government cannot but express its surprise and regret at such an allegation which ignores the facts that China has already freed itself from the imperialist bondage and become a completely independent Sovereign State and although the Government of India indicated in its note that it had issued instructions to I.N.S. Magar to avoid using this channel on the return voyage and to keep well clear of the Chinese territorial sea the ship again intruded into Chinese territorial sea at another place on 16th September. This can only show that the Government of India have not taken any effective measures to stop its naval ships from unfriendly acts of repeated violation of China's sovereignty over its territorial sea. In view of this the Chinese Government cannot but make a protest and once again asks the Government of India to guarantee against similar incidents.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 29 October 1959

The Government of India have seen the Chinese Government's memorandum of the 20th October, 1959, regarding the visit of I.N.S. Magar to Hongkong on her return voyage from Japan. They can only express their surprise and regret that the Chinese Government should have chosen to send yet another protest against the passage of an Indian ship which, as the Chinese Government had been informed beforehand, was engaged on an innocent supply carrying mission.

The Chinese Government are aware that the Hongkong harbour lies within two miles of the Chinese main land. It is not possible for any ship to approach Hongkong without coming within 12 miles from the Chinese main land or one of the Chinese islands lying off the coast of South China. In view of the objection raised by the Chinese Government in their earlier memorandum of 7th September, 1959, the Government of India had issued strict instruction to I.N.S. Magar to approach and leave Hongkong harbour not through the south-western approach but the western approach channel, although this meant the ship's following a somewhat circuitous course.

It is correct that in the first position mentioned in the Chinese note the ship was within 6.8 miles from the nearest Chinese island of Tankan Shan in the Lima Chuntao group, but as already stated, no ship could leave Hongkong harbour without coming within the 12 miles limit imposed by China. Further, the Government of India are advised that at the second position, the ship was beyond the 12 miles limit from the island of Erh Chou in the same island group. The Government of India are informed by the officer commanding that the ship was never challenged by light and flag signals as stated in the Chinese Government's memorandum.

The Government of India would like to point out that although the China Sea Pilot has been compiled by the British Admiralty, it is generally recognised and internationally used as an aid to navigation for the use of mariners. In this case since the ship was visiting the British Port of Hongkong, this publication had to be relied on for a correct channel of exit from the port. The Government of India have no knowledge of any official Chinese publication for the guidance of ships sailing in the neighbourhood of Chinese territorial waters; and they cannot, therefore, understand the reference to "imperialist bondage" in this context.

Previous intimation had been given to the Chinese Government that the I.N.S. Magar was carrying a consignment of stores to India from Japan. In the geographical situation of Hongkong, it was impossible for any ship to call at that port without coming within the 12 miles from the nearest Chinese islands off the coast. The Government of India are, therefore, surprised that the Chinese Government should have regarded the innocent passage of the ship as an unfriendly act and, in the circumstances stated above, there should be no question of violation of the Chinese sovereignty over its territorial waters.
On the morning of August 26, 1959 an Indian policeman, without giving prior notice to the Chinese Embassy and obtaining its permission, went on a bicycle into the courtyard of the residence of the Chinese Ambassador Mr. Pan Tzu-li, which is situated at No. 28 Prithviraj Road, New Delhi, and found Mr. Shediling, an Indian gardener employed by the Embassy, for a talk. On the morning of August 27, an Indian policeman and an officer again made an intrusion into the backyard of the Ambassador’s residence, and on the afternoon of the same day, another Indian plain-clothed policeman once again intruded on a bicycle into the backyard of the residence, talked with Mr. Shediling and left together with him.

The Embassy deems it necessary to point out to the Ministry of External Affairs of India that, for whatever purpose the Indian policemen might think it necessary to enter the Ambassador’s residence, the three successive arbitrary intrusions into the residence by them constitute a serious encroachment upon the privileges of the Chinese diplomatic envoy. Regarding this, the Embassy lodges a protest with the Ministry of External Affairs, and demands that the Government of India immediately adopt effective measures to guarantee against recurrence of any similar incidents in the future.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 September 1959

The Government of India have investigated the facts mentioned in the Chinese Embassy’s note of the 7th September, 1959 regarding the visit of Indian Policemen into the compound of the residence of the Chinese Ambassador at 28, Prithviraj Road.

The Police authorities of the nearby Police Station at Tuglak Road had received a complaint relating to the disappearance of a lady named Shrimati Sakuntala. It was alleged that Siri Ram (not Mr. Shediling as referred to in the Chinese Embassy’s note), was in some way implicated in the matter. A police official visited the servant’s quarters on the 26th afternoon with a view to contact Siri Ram to investigate the complaint. Since, he was not available, another official proceeded to the servants’ quarters to contact him on the following day. As a result, Siri Ram went to the Police Station to make a statement in this connection. No further visit was made by any police official to the Ambassador’s residence. The Police official had only proceeded to the servants’ quarters in pursuance of a complaint completely unrelated to the functioning of the Embassy or the nature of duties assigned to Siri Ram at the Ambassador’s residence.

The Government of India regret that the Police Officer had visited the servants’ quarters without seeking the permission of the Ambassador. This was, however, done through an erroneous impression that since the servants’ quarters were inhabited only by Indian nationals and the complaint was unrelated to Embassy’s work, there would be no objection to the visit. The Police Officials concerned regretted their unintentional lapse. Fresh instructions have been issued that no Police Official will enter the premises of the Embassy or the Ambassador’s residence without the formal permission of the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Counsellor of China in India, 24 September 1959

The Government of India have already had occasion to point out to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China that they cannot permit a diplomatic mission accredited to the Government of India to publish or circulate any material critical of the Government of India's policies or Ministers of the Government in India. The only exception which is made as a matter of courtesy is in respect of official statements of the Government of the country which is represented by the Mission. This was made clear to the Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy at New Delhi on the 3rd June 1959 with reference to the article entitled "Revolution in Tibet and Nehru's philosophy", which had appeared in the Peking Review of the 6th May 1959, and reprinted subsequently in China Today.

2. The attention of the Government of India has now been drawn to issues No. 39 and 41 of China Today published by the Embassy of the People's Republic of China at New Delhi. In these bulletins, the Embassy have not only reproduced the texts of speeches made by Premier Chou En-lai and the Foreign Minister Marshal Chen Yi and the resolution passed by the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress but have also reprinted articles which appeared in the People's Daily on the 12th and 16th September and so-called factual data on the Sino-Indian boundary question.

3. While the Government of India raise no objection to the publication in India of official statements of the Chinese Government, even though they are critical of the Government of India, they cannot but express their surprise and regret that despite the previous warning, the Embassy should again have published articles critical of the Indian Prime Minister and the Government of India's policy. The Indian Embassy in Peking has scrupulously avoided reprinting any articles from Indian newspapers of speeches of Indian political leaders other than Government spokesmen, which are critical of the People's Republic of China and her policies, in the official bulletins issued by the Embassy's information services.

4. The Government of India ask once again that the Embassy should refrain from publishing in its bulletin any material of whatever kind critical of India's policies unless they are official statements by the Government of China.
Memorandum given to the Counsellor of India by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 23 October 1959

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China have received the verbal note handed over by Mr. Mehta, Deputy Secretary of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, to Counsellor Yeh Chen-Chang of the Chinese Embassy in India on 24th September, 1959 and have the honour to reply as follows:

The Chinese Government holds that the news bulletin issued by the Chinese Embassy in India has been consistently publicizing China’s foreign policy of peace and China’s achievements in various fields of construction, the purpose being to enhance the Government of India’s and people’s understanding of China and thereby promote the friendly relations between the two countries. The Chinese Government wishes to point out with satisfaction that throughout the years the news bulletin of the Chinese Embassy in India have played a very good role in this regard.

In accordance with the above-mentioned consistent policy followed in the issuance of the news bulletin, this publication of the Chinese Embassy in India carried some articles and material concerning the Tibet question and the Sino-Indian boundary question. The following articles and material: the article “The Revolution in Tibet and Nehru’s Philosophy” by the Editorial Department of Renmin Ribao 6th May 1959, the editorial “The truth about the Sino-Indian boundary question” of the Renmin Ribao 12th September, the editorial “Our Expectations” of the Renmin Ribao 16th September and the material on the Sino-Indian boundary question published by the Hsinhua News Agency 16th September referred to by the Government of India like other material concerning these two questions carried by the news bulletin of the Chinese Embassy correctly related the historical background and the current actual position of the two questions and were of help in enhancing the understanding of the truth of the situation and the stand and viewpoint of the Chinese Government and people on these questions by the Government of India and people. It was entirely proper and necessary for the bulletin to carry the above-mentioned articles and materials which were transmitted by Chinese State News Agency. The Chinese Government cannot see how the carrying of these articles and materials by the Embassy bulletin can in any way adversely affect Sino-Indian friendship and thus be subjected to censure.

The Chinese Government notes with regret that contrary to the news bulletins issued by the Chinese Embassy in India the news bulletins issued by many Indian Embassies in Foreign countries failed to pay full attention to the maintenance of Sino-Indian friendship and strictly abide by the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. The news bulletins of many Indian Embassies abroad widely carried the several so-called statements of the Dalai Lama. The news bulletins of the Indian Embassy in Indonesia, Afghanistan and the U.A.R. further carried ill-intentioned commentaries of some Indian newspapers on the so-called statements of the
Dalai Lama. The news bulletin of the Indian Embassy in Afghanistan even carried an article on the Tibet question written by British Labour Party leader Bevan. What is particularly surprising and regrettable is that the news bulletins of the Indian Embassy in Burma entirely took, on the Tibet question, an attitude of hostility towards China and interfering in China's internal affairs. The following are some of the contents and headings carried in the bulletins of that Embassy:

Number 68 (20th April) carrying the so-called “statement of the Dalai Lama” under the heading “Dalai Lama sought sanctuary in India voluntarily and not under duress, China dishonoured 17 Point Agreement on Tibetan Autonomy.”

Number 71 (23rd April) carrying the so-called “second statement of the Dalai Lama” under the heading “Chinese news agency circulates pure bunk.”

Number 72 (24th April) carrying a so-called Indian political observer's commentary on the statement of Panchen; under the heading “Panchen Lama only echoes his master’s voice. Peking throws India-China friendship in jeopardy.”

The Chinese Embassies in the above countries returned the news bulletins issued by the above-mentioned Indian Embassies abroad which carried the so-called “statements of the Dalai Lama” and ill-intentioned commentaries and pointed out in the covering letter that such action was far from consistent with the Five Principles and Sino-Indian friendship. Chinese Ambassador to India Pan Tzu-Li in his written statement to Foreign Secretary Dutt of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs on 16th May 1959 also pointed out that it was very difficult to consider this line of action of the Government of India as in conformity with well-known international practice. The Government of India have failed to give a satisfactory reply, but on the contrary raised untoward censure against the news bulletin of the Chinese Embassy in India. The Chinese Government cannot but express its deep regret.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the note presented by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of the People's Republic of China on the 23rd October, 1959, to the Embassy of India in Peking. The Government of India have to state with regret that they cannot accept the Chinese Government's note as a satisfactory reply to the Indian note of the 24th September, 1959.

2. As the Government of India have stated in their earlier note, according to international usage and diplomatic courtesy, a foreign mission is not entitled to publish in its bulletins any statement or comment which is critical of the official policies and declarations of the government to which the mission is accredited. The only exception which some governments permit is the inclusion in the official bulletin statements of government leaders and official press notes issued by the government of the country which the mission represents. This usage is expected to be observed by all missions but in case a particular mission offends against this usage and violates this courtesy, the receiving government is entitled to draw the attention of the offending mission to this lapse and ask it to desist from the circulation of the objectionable material. It is for the Government of India to decide whether a foreign mission accredited to them has overstepped the limits of diplomatic courtesy and international usage in a matter of this kind and they must state that they cannot accept the judgment of the Government of the People's Republic of China. The Government of India must, therefore, ask once more that the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in Delhi and other Chinese posts in India, should desist from publishing in their official bulletins any material other than official statements of the Chinese Government, which is critical of the official statements, policy and actions of the Government of India.

3. As the Chinese Government must be aware, the Embassy of India in Peking and other Indian posts in China scrupulously observe the correct international usage in this regard. They have never included in their bulletins any comments or quotations from the press or other unofficial sources which are critical of the Chinese Government.

4. The Government of India cannot accept the complaint of the Chinese Government that they have transgressed the limit of accepted international usage or diplomatic courtesy in the bulletins published by Indian missions in some other countries. In any case, it is not for the Government of the People's Republic of China to decide whether Indian official news bulletins in a third country have exceeded the limits of propriety. The Government of India are not aware of any complaint against any Indian mission from the governments of other countries. The Government of India are not, therefore, called upon to explain to the Chinese Government contents of Indian news bulletins published by Indian missions in other countries. For the same reason they did not wish to refer to the
attempts made by several Chinese diplomatic missions to create prejudice against India in some foreign countries by wide and organised circulation of Hsinhua news releases and other comments widely critical of India. They would, however, like to state, with reference to the inclusion of the Dalai Lama's statement in the news bulletins of some Indian missions abroad, that the Government of China had made baseless allegations in regard to the responsibility of the Indian Government for the events in Tibet. The Chinese Government had alleged, without any basis whatsoever, that the Dalai Lama was under duress in India and that Indian officials were in some unexplained way responsible for Dalai Lama's first statement on Indian soil. The publication of the Dalai Lama's statement enabled opinion in other countries to decide whether it was a spontaneous statement or a statement made under duress or instigation. The Government of India, of course, did not and do not take any responsibility for any of the statements of the Dalai Lama.

5. The Government of India would also like to point out that they allow a far greater latitude to the Chinese missions in India in regard to the publication of their bulletins and the discharge of their functions generally than is permitted to the Indian representatives in China. For example, only recently the Foreign Bureau in Yatung objected to, and returned to the Indian Trade Agent, a bulletin distributed by the Indian Trade Agency. It merely contained reproduction of the statements of the Prime Minister of India; it scrupulously avoided inclusion of unofficial comments in India critical of or in disagreement with Chinese policy or actions. The Chinese authorities' action in objecting to the circulation of the bulletin can be contrasted with the right which they claim to circulate in India, without any restriction, unofficial and miscellaneous statements critical of the Government of India.

6. The Government of India wish to make it clear that they fully reserve the right to object to the circulation of any material within India, which is critical of the Government of India, by Chinese missions, either direct or indirect, and to take appropriate action to enforce compliance with what they consider to be correct international usage and diplomatic courtesy in this regard.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ambassador of India to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 11 July 1959

Reports have been received from the Indian Consulate-General and Trade Agencies in the Tibet Region of China that since the recent disturbances there various difficulties have been placed in the functioning of the posts and in the legitimate activities of Indian traders, pilgrims and nationals. Two of these difficulties are of a nature which require urgent attention.

The first relates to the status of Indian nationals in Tibet. As is well-known, Indian nationals particularly Lamas and Muslim traders from Ladakh have been resident in the Tibet region from before the conclusion of the 1954 Sino-Tibetan Agreement. Preceding that Agreement, travel between Ladakh and Tibet was free. Travellers between the two regions were not then required to possess travel papers or identity certificates. Indian Lamas and traders (now resident in Tibet) thus arrived in the Tibet region without travel papers. Although they have been earning their livelihood in Tibet or been attached to monasteries for years, they have traditionally been treated as foreigners. It is known that between four to six hundred lamas who travelled as pilgrims before and after the 1954 Agreement were studying in Tibetan monasteries. Until the recent disturbances local regulations of the region did not require them to register or hold special identity certificates. It now seems that the local authorities in Tibet have raised questions about the national status of these Indian residents in the Tibet region. In view of the circumstances in which these persons arrived and lived in the Tibet region, the Government of India request the People's Republic of China either to maintain the position which existed prior to the present regulations, namely, to allow these Indian nationals to be in the Tibet region without travel papers (passports), or if all foreign nationals are now compulsorily required to possess passports to inform the Government of India definitely on the point so that arrangements could be made to issue passports to Indian nationals resident in Tibet region who hold no passports. If passports are now required, the Government of India would trust that no impediments would be placed in Indian residents obtaining visas or registering with their Consulate-General.

2. The second difficulty relates to the reconstruction of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse. While permission has been accorded to the Government of India for the reconstruction of the Trade Agency at Gyantse, there appears to be a lack of helpful co-operation on the part of the local authorities and the work of construction is being impeded. In the last fortnight on two occasions the construction site has been used for firing practice, much to the alarm of the labourers.

In addition, the local authorities have not been helpful in providing the transport required for the construction. In 1957-58 they were requested to accord permission to the use of two trucks and a jeep by the engineering staff to facilitate construction of the building. In according permission to the use of the Agency jeep by
the engineering staff they desired that the two trucks required for
the carriage of stores might either be hired from private owners
or from the local Transport Department. Now the local Foreign
Bureau is not agreeable to the exclusive use of the jeep by the
engineering staff, and as for the trucks, they have stated that none
is available owing to other pressing needs. As trucks are no longer
available on hire, the Government of India request that permission
be given for the plying of a jeep with trailer under the authority of
the Trade Agent, but with the principal purpose of helping the
engineering staff in the construction work. As for trucks it is re-
quested either the Transport Department should meet the require-
ment or the Government of India permitted to import their own
trucks from India for the purpose of construction.

The Government of India would appreciate to receive the helpful
co-operation of the authorities concerned for the speedy construc-
tion of the Trade Agency building at Gyantse.
Memorandum given by the Ambassador of India to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 14 August 1959

The Government of India have received further reports of difficulties that are being encountered by its representatives and nationals in the Tibet Region of China. The following is a summary of these reports:

The reconstruction of Indian Trade Agency in Gyantse and protective works remain at standstill. Meanwhile, Chinese authorities are insisting on demolition of spurs and have constructed a spur from the opposite bank diverting the main current towards the site on which the Trade Agency stands. In the absence of any protection, the embankment will be further scoured.

Because of restriction imposed on movements and the absence of guarantees for safety of the official bags, the courier service remains suspended. Bags and mail are accumulating in every post.

Recently in Gyantse the local bureau suggested that non-Tibetan class IV servants who had come on traders' certificates should go back to India and return with duly visaed passports. The Indian Trade Agent has proposed but without reply so far, the issue of passports to them locally. If this staff has to go back to India there will be unnecessary dislocation caused by delay in their return to Gyantse.

The Consul-General in Lhasa reports that members of the staff are shadowed even when they go for normal shopping and other purposes.

No reply has yet been received to the representation regarding Kashmiri Moslems. Meanwhile, it is reported that one Kashmiri Moslem who refused to attend a meeting on the 6th August was arrested and two to three hundred of his compatriots went in protest to the Foreign Bureau. About fifty to sixty Kashmiri Moslems who later endeavoured to come to the Indian Consulate were prevented by the Chinese guards at the point of weapons.

It is reported that five cobbler who are Indian nationals are held up in Gyantse and two cobbler and two Sikkimese drivers in Yatung are similarly awaiting permission to return to India.

Trade is declining and restrictions on movement of Indian traders continue.

The Government of India have to point out with regret that instead of improvements as a result of representations the restrictions continue and in fact have increased. The Government of India would urge once more that the same facilities be granted to its posts and nationals in the Tibet Regions as are enjoyed by the Chinese trade posts and nationals in India.
Memorandum given to the Embassy of India by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 21 August 1959

In 1953 the Embassy of India proposed to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that the staff members of the Embassy be allowed to assume the duty of temporary diplomatic courier and requested the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to grant them permission to hold diplomatic passports because as temporary couriers they frequently came across difficulties on their way from China to India. Taking into account the friendly relations between China and India and the difficulties on the Indian side, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs agreed as an exceptional case that the staff members of the Embassy may carry diplomatic passports when assuming the duty of diplomatic courier.

But later, the Embassy extended the personnel assuming temporary courier duty to the staff members of the Consulate General in Shanghai and recently the staff members of the Consulate General of India in Lhasa also held diplomatic passports on courier duty. This is not in line with the spirit of the original agreement between the two parties. In order to give considerations to the convenience on the Indian side, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs agrees not to change for the time being the practice of the staff members of Consulate General acting as temporary couriers. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, however, put forward two requests as follows:

1. There must be a fixed number of staff members who assume the duty of temporary courier. And with a view to facilitating the arrangements for the visas of the courier the Embassy is requested to give the Ministry of Foreign Affairs a copy of the name list of those staff members who often assume the duty of temporary courier, including name, date of birth and passport number.

2. When the staff members of the Consulate General of India in Lhasa assume the courier duty, it is not necessary for them to hold diplomatic passports, because there the border between China and India is closely adjoined. With service passport and the certificate for temporary couriers endorsed by the Foreign Affairs Bureau, the bags will be exempted from examination.
Memorandum given by the Ambassador of India to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 25 August 1959

The Government of India wish to draw the attention of the Government of the People’s Republic of China to certain new regulations issued in the Tibet Region of China which have caused great hardship to Indian traders by altering the customary practice in the trade between the Tibet Region and India.

For a long time past and until this year commercial transactions between Indian traders and Tibetans inside the Tibet Region used to be settled in Indian or Tibetan currency. The pattern of trade was such that the value of exports from India generally exceeded the value of imports from Tibet, and the balance of payments in favour of Indian traders was settled by return to India of trade accumulations either in

(a) Indian currency, or
(b) Tibetan coins, or
(c) Chinese silver dollars.

It may be mentioned that in recent years Chinese authorities had been giving permits for the export of Chinese silver dollars, and Indian traders used to bring their accumulated reserves with them into India. The Government of India also permitted the import of the silver dollars into India. The above was the most common method of adjusting the favourable balance of trade which India had with the Tibet Region.

In July this year, an official notification dated 15th July, 1959 was issued in the Tibet Region declaring Chinese paper currency as legal tender and standard money in the Tibet Region. Following this notification, executive measures were taken by the local Chinese authorities to devalue the Tibetan currency in terms of the Chinese currency. This has adversely affected the value of the Indian currency.

Further, Indian traders were directed to exchange accumulations of Tibetan coins and currency held by them with Chinese currency at the new rate fixed for the latter. Reports from Yatung show that the local authorities have fixed the value of Tibetan coins in terms of Chinese paper currency in such a manner that the present value of one rupee is 25 Sangs whereas formerly the rate used to vary between 6 to 7 Sangs for a rupee. As an immediate result of this measure the value of Tibetan currency already acquired by Indian traders in the course of normal trading operations has depreciated by 75 per cent in terms of rupees. It is reported that the Chinese authorities at Yatung called all Indians on the 10th of August and directed that they should exchange all Tibetan coins and currency in their possession by the 11th of August at the exchange rate of one Chinese silver dollar to 75 Sangs. At this meeting, the Indian traders expressed their willingness to abide by the new regulations in future, but requested that they should be allowed to return to India their accumulated stock of Tibetan Sangs under previous terms. Their request was turned down by the local Chinese authorities. The Indian traders have represented that they should
be permitted to take back into India the accumulated Tibetan coins, or exchange them into Indian rupees at the previous rate. This request seems to be fair because the traders supplied goods to Tibet at the previous value of Tibetan Sangs and not at the new reduced value.

A report from Phari says that on the 13th of August Chinese authorities confiscated Tibetan currency valued at Rs. 7,000/- (at the new rate of exchange) from Indian traders. The Indian traders were informed that these notes were forged in Kalimpong. There is absolutely no truth in this allegation. Moreover, no receipts were given for the currency which was confiscated. The Indian traders in Phari have registered their protest with the local authorities.

The Government of India wish to recall that the two Agreements signed between the Republic of India and the People's Republic of China in 1954 provide for the maintenance and development of border trade between the Tibet Region of China and India. It is true that the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 does not include any specific provisions as regards the currency in which trade is to be transacted or the manner in which the balance of payments between the two countries is to be adjusted. At the same time, this Agreement provides for the continuance of the customary trade between India and the Tibet Region of China and specifically provides for certain facilities to that end. Article VII of the Trade Agreement between the Republic of India and the People's Republic of China signed on the 14th October 1954 as amended by the exchange of letters in May 1957 provides as follows:

Para I—All commercial and non-commercial payments between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India may be effected in Indian rupees.

Para IV—Payments for Border Trade between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India will be settled according to the customary practice.

While the amended Article VII on the Trade Agreement lays down a detailed procedure for the purpose of facilitating payments between the two countries on account of commercial and non-commercial transactions (Para I) no specific procedure was laid down for the adjustment of the transactions in respect of border trade between the two countries. These latter were to be settled according to customary practice (Para IV). As stated above, the customary practice was for the balance, which was generally in favour of the Indian traders, to be adjusted in Chinese silver dollars, Tibetan coins or Indian rupees, Indian rupees being a medium of payment in Tibet. Also the customary practice was to permit the Indian traders to take back to India accumulated reserves of Chinese silver dollars. Since the Indian traders had no previous intimation of the new orders relating to currency in the Tibet Region, the Government of India would request that the Indian traders be permitted to take with them the present accumulated reserves of Tibetan coins or Chinese silver dollars.

If the Chinese authorities are not willing to recognise the customary practice, the question can be considered later of how payments
for Indo-Tibetan trade should be settled in future. Pending discussion between the two Governments on these and other related matters, it is requested that the customary practice should be allowed to continue and that arbitrary measures, such as, for example, demands for the exchange of the currencies already held by the Indian traders should not be enforced.

There is also one other matter to which the Government of India would like to draw the attention of the Government of the People's Republic of China. A report has been received from the Indian Trade Agent at Gartok that Indian traders at Taklakot have represented to him that the Chinese authorities have imposed a new tax at the rate of Rs. 8 per maund on wool purchased by them and are insisting on payment being made in Chinese silver dollars which are not available in the market. On account of this exchange difficulty, wool purchased so far by the Indian traders is detained at Taklakot. The imposition of the new tax may raise similar difficulties of payment in other Trade Marts also.

The Government of India would request that payment for the new tax in Indian currency may be accepted in terms of Article VII of the Indo-Chinese Trade Agreement of 1954 which has been extended till the end of this year. Alternately, Chinese silver dollars may be made available to the Indian traders to enable them to carry on their customary trade guaranteed in the Agreements of 1954.
Note given by the Embassy of India to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 29 August 1959

The Embassy of India presents its compliments to the Foreign Office of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows:

The Indian Trade Agent, Gartok, had to cross the border into Tibet through Lipulek Pass though he had already gone to Niti Pass with a visa from the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi. The change entailed a 21-days continuous journey and great expenditure. In insisting that the Trade Agent should enter Tibet through Lipulek, the Foreign Office of the People's Republic of China has said that transport and other facilities required by him were stationed at Taklakot.

Owing to the change in the point of entry the Trade Agent reached Taklakot several weeks after his schedule. But he was not able to proceed further as no mechanical or animal transport was provided for him. The latest information is that the Secretary of the local Foreign Bureau has told the Trade Agent that motor traffic is still unavailable and that the Trade Agent would be informed when it is available. The Secretary of the local Foreign Bureau also told the Trade Agent that he should proceed direct to Gargunsa without halting on the way. This would mean a continuous journey of about 250 miles over rough roads. It would also mean that though the Indian Trade Agent would pass through Gartok, he will not be permitted to visit or halt there.

Gartok is the headquarters of the Indian Trade Agent according to the 1954 Agreement. As such the restriction now sought to be imposed on the Trade Agents visiting and halting at Gartok is understandable and is not in keeping with the agreement between the two countries.

The Trade Agent is already behind schedule for reasons explained earlier. It is therefore urged that the local authorities may be clearly instructed to give all necessary facilities to him to travel and complete his tour on customary pattern visiting and halting at Gartok and other usual places to enable him to assist Indian traders.

The Embassy of India avails itself of the opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of the Republic of India in China and has the honour to acknowledge receipt of the note of the Government of India transmitted on 25th July 1959, the aide-memoire handed over on 14th August 1959 and the aide-memoire handed over to Chang Wen-Cheng, Director of the First Asian Department of the Ministry on 11th July 1959 by H. E. Ambassador G. Parthasarathi and to take note of the interview between H.E. the Indian Ambassador and Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs Chi Peng-Fei on 3rd August 1959. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China has also received the unofficial notes handed over by Mr. J. S. Mehta, Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs of India to Counsellor Yeh Cheng-Chang of the Chinese Embassy in India on 8th and 24th July, 1959. Except for individual specific cases to be checked and confirmed, necessary investigations have been conducted by the Chinese Government into the main question raised by the Government of India in the above-mentioned notes, aide-memoires and interviews regarding the various so-called difficulties encountered by the Indian Consular and Trade Organs and Indian nationals and pilgrims in Tibet in the past few months. According to the results of investigations conducted by the Chinese Government many things related by the Government of India are discordant with the facts, and its many demands are in contravention of the Sino-Indian Agreement on Trade and Intercourse between the Tibet region of China and India and, therefore, its various complaints against the Chinese local authorities in Tibet are unjustified. The Ministry hereby has the honour to give the principal facts of the questions raised by the Government of India and the views of the Chinese Government as follows.

1. **Regarding the Indian Trade Agency in Gyantse:**

   (i) The Chinese local authorities in Tibet have always shown concern for and given assistance in the reconstruction of the Indian Trade Agency in Gyantse. After the destruction of the building of the Trade Agency by flood, the Tibetan local authorities rendered active assistance in regard to the Agency's request for renting land. For a period of time, however, the Agency delayed the choice of the land it would rent. Later the agency decided to rent the land at its original site and the local authorities agreed to this. Although the Agency has not up to now signed a new lease with the owner of the land, the local authorities gave approval for the Agency to proceed with the reconstruction work before the completion of the lease procedures.

   (ii) On the question of construction of protective works as asked for by the Agency, the Tibet local authorities have agreed in principle to their construction on condition that they do not affect present and future local public projects. Yet the protective works plan made by the Agency directly endangers the security of the
bridge and highway nearby. For this reason the Tibet local authorities have more than once indicated their wish—the latest on 2nd June 1959 by the Office of the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Gyantse—that the Agency could make suitable modifications in the plan. The Agency, however, not only did not heed this wish, but peremptorily started construction work without obtaining the concurrence of the local authorities. After their repeated advice for halting the work proved to be of no avail, the local authorities could not but come out to stop it and ask the Agency itself to pull down the parts already constructed.

(iii) On the question of transport facilities asked for by the Agency the Tibet local authorities have all along done their best to render assistance. The local authorities agreed that Agency could hire the truck it needed from private owners or local transportation organs. It should not be difficult to understand that it is practically unavoidable in the present concrete conditions in Tibet, if the Agency should for the present encounter certain difficulties in hiring trucks from private owners or transportation organs owing to other pressing local needs. The Chinese Government is, however, convinced that with the lapse of time, the situation will improve gradually. As to the Agency's request to import its own trucks, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs already informed the Indian Embassy in 1957 that no foreigner-owned truck is allowed to carry on long-distance transportation over highways in Tibet.

(iv) It is found that a Chinese driver employed by the Agency was indeed detained by the local authorities. The reason was that the driver failed to pass the local driving tests and obtain a driving licence. Yet the Agency, ignoring the local traffic regulations and the repeated advice of the local authorities, insisted on the driver driving at will without licence. Under these circumstances the local authorities could not but detain the driver. But after admitting his error, he has been released. The Agency's truck was not withheld, however. It is not difficult to see from these simple facts that it is not the local authorities that created difficulties for the Agency, but the Agency that failed to respect the regulations laid down by the local authorities.

(v) It is satisfied that the units of the Chinese People's Liberation Army stationing in Gyantse have never carried out firing practice and shooting on the site of the Agency. They have conducted their regular practice on their own camp ground. The Chinese Government cannot but express its surprise and regret at the unreasonable intervention by the Government of India in raising objection to this and without any ground describing it as aimed at intimidating the workers hired by the Agency.

(vi) Regarding the present temporary accommodation of the Agency, the local authorities know nothing about the inability of the Agency to renew the lease. The Agency recently made a request to the local authorities for renting a certain number of houses in addition to the more than ten premises already rented. Owing to the present housing shortage in Gyantse, the local authorities are unable to give it any further assistance.
2. Regarding the repair and maintenance of the building of the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung:

It is satisfied that the Yatung local authorities have never interfered with the repair and maintenance of the building of the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung. The Agency, however, on more than one occasion when it built and reconstructed its premises, failed to report to the local authorities and obtain their approval as required by the lease contract. This has been brought to the Agency's attention by the local authorities. Recently the Agency formally informed the local authorities of its intention of expanding the library and constructing a table-tennis room, kitchen, bathroom, storage room and other buildings, and obtained approval for this. Obviously, the allegation of the Government of India that the Agency has encountered difficulties in the repair and maintenance of its building is not in conformity with the facts. It must be pointed out that the Agency has failed to respect the regulations laid down by the local authorities, not only in the construction and reconstruction of buildings, but also in other respects. For instance, according to the regulations laid down by the local authorities, the primary school attached to the Agency should confine its enrolment to children of the Indian staff members of the Agency and other Indian nationals, and should not enrol Chinese pupils. Yet the Agency has, in violation of the regulations, persisted in enrolling Chinese pupils. Again, the doctor specially serving the Agency has at the same time been taking outside patients. This is also not permitted by the local authorities.

3. Regarding the so-called "restrictions on movement":

The personnel of the Indian organs in Tibet have all along enjoyed normal freedom of movement in Tibet which has never been restricted by the Tibetan local authorities, nor has the Tibetan Military Control Commission up to now issued any order to this effect. But, as the Government of India are aware, Tibet is now in a period of military control, and sometimes the local authorities have to give necessary advice to the personnel of the Indian official organs in regard to their movement out of considerations for their safety. Out of these considerations, the local authorities suggest that the Indian Trade Agent in Yatung had better not go in person to Rinchengang to meet the Indian Trade Agent in Gyantse, but send a car to fetch him, because Rinchengang was quite far from Yatung city, and it was already past 17:00 hours. As regards the request of a junior official of the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung to leave China, it was also for the sake of his safety that the local authorities suggested that he would not leave for the time being. As for the Chinese Government's request that the Indian Trade Agent in Gartok enter China by another route, the Chinese Government has explained more than once that this was merely to enable the local authorities to give him the protection and the facilities of a mobile wireless set, as requested by the Government of India. For years on end the local authorities have, under great material difficulties, provided the Indian Trade Agent in Gartok with such protection and communication facilities; this is yet another proof that Tibet local authorities take the attitude of rendering every possible assistance to the Indian organs in Tibet. It can be seen from the
above cases that the Tibet local authorities, far from imposing any restrictions or difficulties on the normal movement of the personnel of the Indian organs in Tibet, have shown friendly concern for them. Yet this goodwill of the local authorities has been distorted by the Government of India as deliberate obstruction. The Chinese Government cannot but express its regret at this.

4. Regarding the question of Indian couriers and the carriage of mail:

(i) As stated above, at the present time there are actually transport difficulties in the Tibet region. In these circumstances, it should not be difficult to understand if the special diplomatic courier sent by the Government of India to Lhasa had to wait for a short time in Yatung. Nevertheless, the Tibet local authorities still tried their best to arrange means of transport for him so that he may safely arrive in Lhasa.

(ii) Regarding the carriage of the mail of the Indian organs in Tibet, the Government of India has up to now maintained the system of stationing Chinese Tibetan messengers along the Yatung-Gyantse road. This system contravenes the Sino-Indian Agreement and is also not in keeping with international usage. As early as in 1955, the Chinese Government asked the Government of India to abolish these messengers. Although the Government of India have indicated more than once their willingness, in accordance with the provisions of the Agreement, to despatch Indian couriers as soon as possible to replace this system, yet for four years the Government of India have delayed abolishing the Chinese Tibetan messengers and despatching Indian couriers under various untenable pretexts. Recently, the Tibet local authorities have suggested to the Indian Consulate-General more than once that if the Government of India had difficulties in the carriage of its mail bags, it could send them through the local post office. Yet this co-operative attitude of the local authorities was apparently not approved by the Government of India. The above facts cannot but make one suspect that the Government of India would rather maintain this illegal system of Chinese Tibetan messengers indefinitely and are seeking all sorts of pretexts for it. The Chinese Government holds that there is no justification at all for the Government of India to continue to maintain this system of Chinese Tibetan messengers, and hereby demands that the Government of India abolish it in the shortest time. If the Government of India, after abolishing the Chinese Tibetan messengers, should despatch normal Indian diplomatic couriers, the Chinese Government would be willing to provide transport facilities so far as possible; if the Government of India are not yet prepared for the time being to despatch couriers, they can send their mail-bags through the local post office. The refusal of the Government of India to trust the local postal service in Tibet and their arbitrary allegation that it is undependable are utterly groundless. The Chinese Government categorically rejects this insulting allegation.

5. It is surprising as well that the Government of India should have expressed dissatisfaction with the speed with which telegrams are transmitted by the Gyantse Telegraph Office. There is no need to point out that the Gyantse Telegraph Office does not discriminate against any one who sends telegrams.
6. Regarding Indian traders and pilgrims:

In accordance with the provisions of the Sino-Indian Agreement, the Tibet local authorities have always given due protection and facilities to law-abiding Indian traders and pilgrims in Tibet. It is, however, regrettable that not all Indian traders and pilgrims are law-abiding and observe the provisions of the Sino-Indian Agreement. To take some of the cases that the Government of India cited in their Notes. What was carried by the pilgrim to Kailas was not ordinary “medicines for himself” as alleged by the Government of India, but more than 10 bottles of strong poisons including arsenic, mercury and sulphur. According to the regulations of the Chinese Government, these contrabands should be confiscated. As to the two cobbler, they came to Shigatse, which was not a market for trade, without the permission of the local authorities. This was in the first place in contravention of the Sino-Indian Agreement. At the same time, the trader certificates held by the two men were overdue. The Chinese Government is by no means willing to see again and again such unpleasant happenings; it therefore hopes that the Government of India will urge the Indian traders and pilgrims in and proceeding to Tibet not to be engaged in unlawful activities.

At the same time, the Chinese Government wishes to point out that according to reports received by the Chinese local authorities in Tibet in recent months, Chinese traders going from Tibet to India for normal trade have been repeatedly subjected to unwarranted cross questioning, examination and harassment by the personnel of the Indian check-posts, and even been compelled to report to them the military situation in Tibet of China. The Indian officials have further spread among them all sorts of rumours, slandering Chinese domestic measures in the Tibet region and sowing discord in the relations between the Han and Tibetan peoples in China. The Chinese Government would like to draw the attention of the Government of India to such serious acts in violation of the Sino-Indian Agreement and the Five Principles.

7. Regarding the nationality of a part of the Tibetan Muslims:

There have been many contacts on this question between Director Yang Kung-Shu of the Tibet Bureau of Foreign Affairs and Mr. Chhibber, Consul General of India in Lhasa. The forefathers of these people migrated to and settled down in Tibet several hundred years ago and they have become part of the Tibetan people in China. There is ample evidence to show that the Tibetan local authorities at all times have treated them as Chinese Tibetans. They have never complained about their status and treatment as Chinese or applied for withdrawal from Chinese nationality. After the rebellion in Tibet was put down, however, the Government of India suddenly claimed that they are Indian nationals. What is particularly surprising, the Consulate General of India in Lhasa, without the concurrence of the Tibet local authorities, distributed on its own application forms for Indian nationality among those Muslims. This cannot but be regarded as a most unfriendly act. The Government of India claimed that they are Indian nationals, yet up to now it is unable to produce any adequate evidence or reasons. Although the Sino-Indian Agreement has been signed five years, yet they do not hold any related certificates as required of Indian nationals by the provisions of the Agreement. In spite of all this
should the Government of India produce sufficient evidence and reasons for each case to prove that individual persons among them are indeed Indian nationals, the Chinese Government has no intention to refuse to examine their case individually.

8. Regarding Indian Lamas.

The Tibet local authorities have never regarded Indian lamas as Chinese. But it must be pointed out that, whether they came to Tibet before or after the conclusion of the Sino-Indian Agreement, these Indian Lamas still do not hold today, five years since the signing of the Agreement, the necessary certificates in accordance with the provisions of the Agreement. The same is true even of individual Indian personnel of the Consulate-General of India in Lhasa, who, though coming to Tibet after the conclusion of the Sino-Indian Agreement, also do not hold certificates. All these cannot but be regarded as in violation of the Agreement.

9. Regarding the family of Mrs. Shahabir and living Buddha Tromo Geshe:

(i) Both the Tibet Bureau of Foreign Affairs and the Chinese Embassy in India have told the Indian side that Mrs. Shahabir and her daughter and daughter-in-law are all Chinese. They were arrested on account of breaking the law, and are still under trial. This is a matter completely within the scope of China's sovereignty, into which the Government of India have no right to enquire. Yet the Government of India, disregarding the explanation of the situation given by the Chinese Government, once again asked the Chinese Government to set them free. The Chinese Government cannot but sternly reject this act of interfering in China's internal affairs by India.

(ii) In the course of putting down the rebellion in Tibet, the Chinese military authorities in the Tibet region arrested a number of foreigners who colluded with Tibetan rebels and participated in the rebellion. Living Buddha Tromo Geshe is one of them. The military authorities in Tibet will try and deal with these foreigners according to law. As these people are not ordinary criminals, the military authorities in Tibet have ruled that they are not to be visited by anybody.

10. Registration of arms:

According to orders of the Military Control Commission in Tibet, all arms held by foreigners in Tibet should be registered. In registering the arms of the personnel of Indian organs in Tibet, the Military Control Commission in Tibet discovered that not only Indian officials but some ordinary Indian staff members too have arms. This is against what the Chinese Government have previously explicitly informed the Government of India, that is, only Indian officials (excluding other staff members) of the Indian organs in Tibet may carry arms of self-defence. Nevertheless, the Military Control Commission has only taken into custody but not confiscated the arms of the ordinary Indian staff members, and has promised to return them when they leave China.

Those arms belonging to the Indian officials were returned immediately after registration on the spot. The sporting rifle left by
Mr. Chhibber in Yatung was taken into custody because the Military Control Commission did not know then that it was his. After Mr. Chhibber raised the matter with the Tibetan Bureau of Foreign Affairs, the sporting rifle has been returned. As to the two revolvers, it was found that one belongs to a staff member of the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung, and was returned to him when he left China; the other belongs to an engineer attached to the Trade Agency at Yatung, and is temporarily kept in the custody of the Military Control Commission. Apart from these, the Military Control Commission does not know of any revolver left by Mr. Chhibber in Yatung.

Since the question of arms is being discussed, the Chinese Government would like to take this opportunity to draw the attention of the Government of India to the fact that in January this year an Indian Vice Consul in Lhasa asked in private somebody to sell a revolver and cartridges for him in Lhasa. Such an act is obviously, in violation of international usage and an abuse of Consular privileges.

11. Regarding so-called “anti-Indian propaganda”:

The Government of India assert in their notes that the official organs in the Tibetan region were consistently carrying out propaganda deliberately intended to create hostile feelings against India and Indian organs in Tibet. This is totally inconsistent with the fact. Whether now or in the past, no organ of the Chinese Government has ever conducted any “anti-Indian propaganda”. It is not difficult for any one with the slightest sense of justice to see from the public utterances of the officials of both sides in the past several months what a difference there is between the attitude taken by the two sides towards Sino-Indian relations. The utterances of not a few Indian responsible officials on the putting down of the rebellion in Tibet, a question within the scope of China’s internal affairs, in varying degrees interfered in the internal affairs of China. As to the publication in the Lhasa Daily (there is no Lhasa Daily in Lhasa; it should be Tibet Daily) of an article alleged to be hostile towards India referred to by Mr. J. S. Mehta of the Ministry of External Affairs of India on 24th July, the Government of India should be aware that according to the Constitution of the People’s Republic of China, the Chinese people enjoy full freedom of speech and have the right to express different kinds of views. The author of the article published in the Tibet Daily expressed his personal attitude towards the large quantity of words and deeds against China, interfering in China’s internal affairs and damaging Sino-Indian friendship, which had appeared in India in the past several months, or merely related to past facts, which can in no way be described as so-called propaganda deliberately hostile towards India. The Government of India, instead of checking in the least the large quantities of words and deeds against China, interfering in China’s internal affairs and damaging Sino-Indian friendship which appeared in India, have lodged an unwarranted “strong protest” in an attempt to interfere with the freedom of speech of the Chinese people. The Chinese Government rejects this unjustifiable protest.

From the facts set forth in the above paragraphs it is not difficult to draw the following conclusion:
The Chinese Government has been consistently implementing the 1954 Agreement on Trade and Intercourse between the Tibet region of China and India in accordance with the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence and in the spirit of Sino-Indian friendship. The Government of India's complaint that the privileges of the Indian organs in Tibet as laid down in the Agreement are not guaranteed is groundless. On the contrary, many actions and demands of the Indian organs in Tibet have violated or gone beyond the Sino-Indian Agreement and the relevant regulations of the Chinese Government. In individual cases, they even encroached on China's sovereign rights. Although some questions have been repeatedly pointed out by the Tibet local authorities and the hope for correction expressed, yet they have not won the sufficient attention of the Government of India. The Tibetan local authorities have always taken a friendly and co-operative attitude towards the Indian organs in Tibet. In spite of the great material difficulties in the Tibet region, and in the present period of military control in particular, the local authorities have still given the Indian organs in Tibet every possible assistance, facilities and solicitude within the scope of the provisions of the Agreement, and have given full protection and facilities of all law-abiding Indian traders and pilgrims. Such facilities as the Chinese Tibetan messenger system for long maintained by the Government of India and the mobile wireless sets and safety protection provided to the Indian Trade Agent in Gartok each year are unique even in international practice. Furthermore, the Indian organs in Tibet have all along maintained their radio stations which have not been recognised by the Chinese Government. In a word, the Tibet local authorities have done their best to satisfy all those demands made by the Government of India in the past which are proper and reasonable; while with regard to others which they are in no position or for the time being unable to meet owing to actual difficulties, they have always tried to find some substitute solution or acquainted the Indian side with the situation to gain its understanding. It is, however, regrettable that the Indian organs in Tibet often failed to adopt the same friendly and co-operative attitude. They do not pay enough respect to some of the advices and regulations of the local authorities, and sometime make excessive demands and even launched intolerable criticisms of a fault-finding and insulting nature against the Chinese telegraph and post offices. Being a consular organ, the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa has the obligation to urge the Indian traders and pilgrims to strictly abide by Chinese laws and regulations. But actual facts show that it often sides with and shields those Indian nationals who are not law-abiding, and speaks for them or supports them in making unreasonable demands to the Tibet local authorities.

True, it is unpleasant to refer to the above-mentioned questions. But since the Government of India have repeatedly made groundless complaints against China in disregard of the facts, the Chinese Government deems it necessary to give a detailed account of the facts and make clear its stand so as to distinguish between right and wrong and locate the responsibility. The Government of India, moreover, used most unfriendly language in their notes, saying that the continued functioning of the Trade Agencies in China and India on a reciprocal basis would depend on the Chinese Government.
answer. This is tantamount to placing the Chinese Government under coercion. The Chinese Government cannot but express its special regret at this.

In conclusion, the Chinese Government wishes to reiterate that it has always scrupulously abided by the Five Principles and the Sino-Indian Agreement, and that the Government of India have no reason to suspect the Chinese Government as taking an unfriendly and un-cooperative attitude towards Indian organs in Tibet. But the Chinese Government must point out at the same time that should the Indian organs in Tibet fail to strictly abide by the Five Principles and the Sino-Indian Agreement, to respect the laws and regulations of the Chinese local authorities in the Tibet region, and to cherish the desire of co-operating with the Tibet local authorities, this would certainly create difficulties for the implementation of the Sino-Indian Agreement and the enhancement of friendly relations between China and India. Through the present note, the Chinese Government hopes that the Government of India will understand the actual situation more correctly, thus contributing to better friendly co-operation between the two sides in the future.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Counsellor of India to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 17 September 1959

The Ambassador of India had left a Memorandum with the Director of the First Asian Division of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the 25th August 1959, regarding currency and exchange difficulties experienced by Indian traders in Tibet. Since then the Government of India have received further representations from Indian traders in Yatung, Gyantse and Phari. Under the existing position all Indian traders in the Tibet region stand to lose 75 per cent of their accumulated stock of Tibetan currency as a result of currency devaluation. At Gyantse and Phari the Chinese authorities issued their drafts to Indian traders in lieu of the Tibetan currency which worked out to 25 per cent of the face value of the Tibetan currency notes in terms of Chinese paper currency or Indian currency. The Indian traders were instructed that these drafts were to be converted between the 21st and 25th August.

2. Two Indian firms at Yatung who approached the Chinese authorities with Chinese paper currency received against sale of goods for issue of Indian rupee drafts were told that they should give an undertaking to import goods of equivalent value. It may be pointed out that such a demand that the traders should bring back goods of equivalent value before being granted bank drafts is contrary to the trading practice. It is also possible that owing to the increasing difficulties experienced, a number of Indian traders may be thinking of winding up their business and returning to India. It will cause serious difficulties therefore if such people are to be asked to give an undertaking to import goods before they are given bank draft facilities for the transfer of their assets. It is requested that the Chinese Government allow the repatriation of money representing sale proceeds of goods without any conditions.

3. Indian traders are much exercised about recovery of substantial amounts of trade debts from Tibetans as they are not permitted to visit even recognised marts at Phari and Gyantse, much less Shigatse and Lhasa. All these factors have made Indo-Tibetan trade increasingly difficult and are likely to render nugatory important clauses of the 1954 Agreement.

4. While the Government of India do not deny the sovereign right of the People's Republic of China to fix its currency value at any figure it chooses, they would like to bring to the notice of the Chinese Government once again the serious hardship imposed on Indian traders by the fixation of the exchange value of Tibetan currency at 25 per cent of its previous value. It is once again requested that the Government of China may give instructions to the local authorities in Tibet to accept exchange of the accumulated Tibetan currency held by Indian traders previous to the devaluation at the old rate and permit them to export Tibetan coins and Chinese silver dollars to India.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of People's Republic of China and has the honour to invite attention to the letter from the Director of Foreign Bureau in Lhasa addressed to the Consul General of India on 17th July 1959 and paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Chinese Government's note of the 11th September 1959 regarding the status of Indians resident in the Tibet region of China.

2. The Government of India cannot but express their surprise and regret at the unhelpful attitude adopted by the Chinese Government. They wish to clarify the position in the following paragraphs and trust that the Chinese Government will after reconsideration permit persons of Indian origin entitled to Indian citizenship to contact the Consulate General of India and return to India, should they so wish.

3. The right to Indian citizenship derives its sanction strictly from the provisions of the Indian Constitution and Indian Citizenship Act of 1955. The Government of India have neither the power nor the desire to claim as Indian nationals any person who does not qualify under the Indian laws as an Indian national.

4. According to Article V of the Indian Constitution, any person, who himself or either of whose parents was born in the territory of India, is ipso facto an Indian citizen without being required to apply for registration as an Indian national. Secondly, under Article VIII, those who or either of whose parents or any of whose grandparents were born in undivided India and are resident abroad are qualified for Indian nationality and such persons upon registration with any diplomatic or consular representatives of India in a foreign country are fully entitled to Indian citizenship. No time limit is prescribed within which persons must register themselves with an Indian Mission abroad. Persons of Indian origin falling in this category are eligible for registration as Indian citizens and cannot legally be excluded from the privileges of Indian nationality, unless such a person has expressly and voluntarily acquired a foreign nationality and thus in effect renounced his claim to Indian citizenship.

5. The persons of Indian origin residing in Tibet at the time of disturbances in March 1959 are qualified for Indian nationality either under Article V or VIII of the Indian Constitution and fall under one of the following categories:

   (i) Registered Indian nationals.—Persons holding Indian registration certificates, traders' certificates or other documents clearly establishing their nationality.

   According to our information, apart from the traders and Indian nationals in Yatung, Phari and Gyantse, twenty-eight such persons were registered with the Consulate General in Lhasa or hold such Indian registration certificates and are therefore, fully entitled to Indian protection.

   (ii) Ladakhi Lamas.—As is well-known, the Ladakhi Buddhists, who are followers of the Mahayana sect of the Buddhist faith have
traditionally gone from Ladakh to the monasteries in Tibet for theological studies. No travel documents were prescribed for such movements before 1954, and even thereafter the responsibility for issuing the appropriate papers (pilgrim permits) rested with the authorities of the Tibet region of China. A substantial number of these Lamas was studying in the monasteries in Tibet long before the 1954 Agreement. These Ladakhi Lamas were born in Jammu & Kashmir State of India and are therefore ipso facto Indian nationals under Article V of the Indian Constitution. It was not necessary for them to register themselves with the Indian Consulate General in Lhasa in token of their Indian citizenship. As stated in the previous Note of the Government of India, no regulation had previously been prescribed requiring such persons, resident in Tibet prior to 1954, to register with the local authorities or to obtain any special kind of documents even if they were not actually travelling across the border.

(iii) Muslims of Kashmir origin.—According to the information available to the Government of India, one hundred twenty-nine families of Kashmiri Muslims involving about six hundred persons are residing in Lhasa-Shigatse area of the Tibet region of China. The names of these families will be found in the enclosure to this Note. Some of the persons who belong to these families are already registered with the Consulate General and fall under category (i) above. Others, prima facie, are potential Indian citizens with a right to register as such under Article VIII of the Indian Constitution. The Government of India agree that the Kashmiri Muslims who have been resident in Tibet since the 17th century and severed connections with Kashmir would not qualify for registration under Article VIII of the Constitution. But persons whose permanent domicile remained in the State of Jammu & Kashmir and who visited India from time to time and whose parents or one of whose grandparents were born in undivided India, are potential citizens of India. It is this group of persons, who have stated repeatedly to the Chinese authorities that they were Indian citizens. They have apparently submitted applications in writing for registration as Indian citizens and are entitled to claim the benefits of Indian nationality in accordance with the provisions laid down under the Constitution and the Citizenship Act.

The Chinese Government's contention as stated in the letter of the 17th July 1959 from the Foreign Bureau in Lhasa is that the Kashmiri Muslims were subject to the jurisdiction of Tibetan courts, that the selection of their leader was confirmed by the Dalai Lama, that they recognised the 5th Dalai Lama and further that they sometimes fought alongside Tibetan forces. Even if these assertions were accepted, they would not by themselves constitute conclusive evidence regarding their Chinese/Tibetan nationality. Under International Law, foreigners are subject to the jurisdiction of local courts and even the affairs of the foreigners may be supervised by the local authorities. It appears that those of the Kashmiri Muslims who rendered military service did so under compulsion and that the majority did not voluntarily accept such an obligation. The fact that some may have paid homage to the 5th Dalai Lama may be no more than a courtesy to the spiritual and temporal leader of the Tibet region of China. The Indian Government have no desire to claim
as Indian citizens persons who had accepted adherence to the Dalai Lamas and have since severed their connections with India. But according to the Government of India's information, most of these persons do not fall in this category. The fact that some of the Kashmiri Muslims travelled on Chinese certificates does not necessarily mean that thereby they repudiated their claim to Indian nationality. It is possible that they accepted Tibetan or Chinese travel papers on some occasions for convenience. It may be mentioned that instances have occurred during the last few years in which Chinese check-posts harassed and placed difficulties in the way of Indian traders and nationals carrying Indian traders' and registration certificates when on their way from Tibet to India. In August 1956, the certificate of nationality of one Ghulam Rasul was actually retained by the Chinese check-post at Yatung. It may also be mentioned that notwithstanding any papers, which these Muslims may have carried for entry into India, they almost invariably travelled from India to Mecca on Haj as Indian nationals in special Indian pilgrim-ships and not as foreigners through normal shipping services.

On the other hand, historical evidence indicates that Kashmiri Muslims have throughout maintained their separate identity. They were exempted from poll-tax and compulsory levies or work which was prescribed for persons of Tibetan origin. Though they were tried by Tibetan courts, any fine levied on the Kashmiri Muslims were returned to the community in recognition of their status as foreign nationals. During the 1912 Sino-Tibetan conflict, the Kashmiri Muslims were actually provided with white flags to indicate that they were foreigners and neutral in the then prevailing conflict. That these people wished to maintain their connections with India is also evident from the fact that nearly one hundred boys of this community are studying in institutions in India.

The conclusion is obvious that this community of Muslims from Jammu & Kashmir State of India did not assimilate themselves with the Tibetan population and considered themselves as a distinct community of foreigners although they had resided in Central Tibet for a long time. Being primarily interested in their trade and somewhat indifferent to the political changes in Tibet, they continued to live in their traditional manner without taking the trouble of registering themselves as Indian citizens not suspecting at any time that there would be danger of their connection with their home-land being arbitrarily severed.

The Government of India have read with surprise the statement that Shri Chibber, the former Indian Consul General in Lhasa, instigated the Kashmiri Muslims to apply for Indian registration. The Government of India repudiate such a baseless charge against a responsible officer. The facts are that these Kashmiri Muslims are now anxious to exercise the right to Indian citizenship and have been trying persistently to make their claim accepted by the Chinese authorities, and that Consul General in pursuance of his duty, had made representations on their behalf to the Chinese authorities. In fact on 14th July, the persons sent a joint written representation to the Consul General of India drawing attention to their hardship and the pressure that was being put on them by Chinese local authorities to renounce their claim to Indian citizenship. The Chinese
armed sentries at the gate of the Consulate General building have steadfastly barred entry of these persons into the premises of the Consulate General. On 14th July and 6th August, large groups were turned away by force. Indeed, the local authorities have apparently threatened and intimidated these persons on account of their persistent demand to be treated distinct from the Tibetan nationals Registration forms, which were voluntarily filled in by these persons, were actually confiscated by the Chinese local authorities. It is even alleged that important documents containing proof of their firm connections with India have been confiscated, by the local authorities and their leader intimidated for voicing the demand of his compatriots. No facilities have been given to the Consul General to meet members of the Indian community held in custody by Chinese authorities. Persons who have been anxious to seek the assistance of the Indian Consulate General have been denied any facility whatsoever.

The Government of India wish to re-affirm that it is not the intention of the Government of India to confer citizenship on persons who do not strictly qualify for this privilege or who have surrendered their claim of Indian citizenship. Such persons who have voluntarily accepted Chinese nationality and renounced their claim to Indian citizenship should by all means be treated as Chinese nationals. At the same time, the Government of People's Republic of China should give the right to these persons who consider themselves as Indian citizens and have all the attributes of Indian citizenship to contact the Consulate General of India, and if they so wish, to return to India. The denial of access to the Consul General can only lead to the suspicion that legitimate and voluntary claims of bona fide potential Indian citizens of Indian origin are being forcibly denied. In particular, the Government of India cannot understand how persons who had already been registered as Indian nationals before the recent disturbances broke out, or how Ladakhi Lamas who could have been in the monasteries only for limited periods should be prevented from exercising their right of protection by the Indian Consulate and for repatriation to their home-land.

While it is not possible to give names of all persons entitled to Indian citizenship as stated earlier, list of Heads of families of Muslims of Indian origin is appended to this Note. Similarly, a general enquiry has been addressed to the Foreign Bureau in Lhasa in respect of the Lamas of Ladakhi origin in Tibet. The names of some of the senior Lamas are given in a second list attached to this Note. A third list contains the names of Indian nationals who, according to information received, are apparently held in custody in the Tibet region of China. The only fair course in the spirit of friendly understanding between the two countries would be to scrutinise the claims of all such persons of Indian origin and permit them to exercise their option as Indian or Chinese nationals. The Government of India would request that this be done.

Even if some of these persons of Indian origin are found eligible both for Indian and Chinese nationality, in accordance with international usage, they should be given option of exercising their choice freely. As is well-known, a large number of persons of Chinese origin have been resident for decades, if not generations, in the various countries of South-East Asia without having actually accepted
the nationality of the countries in which they reside. In the Agreement which has been concluded by the People's Republic of China with Republic of Indonesia, to take only one example, persons of Chinese origin have been given option to choose between Chinese nationality or the nationality of Indonesia. The Government of India seek no greater concession in respect of persons of Indian origin in the Tibet region of China than the application to them of a principle which the People's Republic of China have accepted in respect of persons of Chinese origin resident outside China.

The fate of Kashmiri Muslims, Ladakhi Lamas and other Indians in Tibet region of China aroused great concern in Parliament and among the people of India. A representation from the Kashmiri Muslims resident in India who have their relatives in Tibet has been received by the Prime Minister of India urging arrangements for the repatriation of their compatriots to their home-land. The Government of India can see no reason or advantage in compelling these persons to remain within Tibet against their own wish. In the spirit of friendship, the two Governments can readily settle the matter by both agreeing not to claim any person who does not qualify for citizenship under its respective laws and giving the option to all those who by domicile or birth are entitled to both nationalities to choose one of them.

The Government of India trust that in the light of the foregoing the Chinese Government will see their way to review the attitude so far adopted by them and in this confidence they take this opportunity of renewing to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Annexure I to the Note of the Indian Government,
24 September 1959

List of Heads of Families of Muslims of Indian Origin residing at Lhasa and other places of Tibet for trade purpose

1. Haji Karimullah Ishamo
2. Abdul Ghani
3. Fazlullah Masle
4. Abdul Ghani Chisti
5. Haji Tayab Jo
6. Abdul Qadar Naeq
7. Ghulam Rasool Ganaee
8. Mohd. Iqbal
9. Faizullah Sheikh
10. Mohd. Ishaq
11. Abdur Rahman
12. Ataullah
14. Ghulam Nabi
15. Khaja Sanaullah
16. Ghulam Rasool Sheik
17. Ahmedullah Ganaee
18. Habibullah Ganaee
19. Sanaullah
20. Mohd. Shaﬁ Malik
21. Ahmedullah Ganaee
22. Abdur Rahman Daot
23. Haji Abdul Qadar Masle
24. Habib Ullah Nangro
25. Mohd. Yahya Shakoli
26. Haji Abdul Qadar Ganaee
27. Karim Ullah
28. Haji Abdul Ghani Nan’cro
29. Mohd. Ishaq
30. Mohd. Hussain
31. Habib Ullah Khalo
32. Faiz Ullah
33. Abdullah Khalo
34. Haji Ghulam Hussain Ganaee
35. Habib Ullah
36. Haji Hussain Sheikh
37. Faiz Ullah Buzurg
38. Haji Habib Ullah Ganaee
39. Zaha Uddin Khazi
40. Ghulam Hussain Khazi
41. Vali Ullah
42. Abdullah Sheikh
43. Haji Habib Ullah Shamo
44. Haji Faiz Ullah Sheik
45. Vali Ullah
46. Abdullah Vani
47. Ahmed Ullah Vani
48. Rahmatullah Vani
49. Abdur Rahman
50. Mohd. Moosa Shakuli
51. Barkat Ullah Shakuli
52. Vahab Joe Zarif
53. Mohd. Ali Shakuli
54. Haji Abdul Qadir
55. Haji Ghulam Rasool Khalo
56. Ibrahim Ganaee
57. Mohd. Suleman Khazi
58. Nizam Uddin
59. Ibrahim Sheikh
60. Haji Noor Uddin
61. Ahmad Ullah Gona
62. Haji Abdur Rahman Gona
63. Karim Ullah Malik
64. Amir Uddin
65. Ghulam Nabi
66. Abdul Qadir Gona
67. Abdul Qadir
68. Faiz Ullah Khazi
69. Faiz Ullah
70. Ghulam Moheuddin
71. Mohd. Moosa
72. Mohd. Ishaq
73. Abdul Qadir Noon
74. Ghulam Mohd.
75. Ahmad Ullah Khazi
76. Mohd Ramzan Khalo
77. Abdur Rahman Sheikh
78. Abdullah Sheikh
79. Abdul Aziz
80. Akhwand Habib Ullah Naeq
81. Abdullah
82. Ghulam Qadir
83. Haji Ghulam Mohd.
84. Habib Ullah Vani
85. Mohd. Yahya
86. Habib Ullah Malik
87. Fakhr Uddin Syed
88. Haji Mohd. Ramzan
89. Abdullah
90. Akhwand Abdul Aziz
91. Noor Uddin Syed
92. Abdul Aziz Daot
93. Ghulam Nabi Khazi
94. Ahmad Ullah
95. Abdul Qadir
96. Haji Abdul Halim Loa
97. Ahmad Ullah
98. Abdul Ghani
99. Akhwand Ahmad Ullah
100. Vahab Jola
101. Qa Qa Rasool
102. Jamal Uddin
103. Abdul Ghaffoor
104. Faiz Ullah Loon
105. Mohd. Yusuf
106. Haji Abdul Qadir
107. Ibrahim Sheikh No. 2
108. Abdur Rahman
109. Karim Ullah
110. Ghulam Mohd.
111. Ghulam Hussain
112. Habib Ullah Daot
113. Haji Ghulam Mohheuddin
114. Azam Jola
115. Nizam Uddin
116. Haji Mohd. Ramzan
117. Abdul Vahed
118. Akhwand Faiz Ullah
119. Mohd. Jalil Gona
120. Mohd. Bashir Gona
121. Abdur Razzak
122. Habib Ullah
123. Akhwand Mohd. Ramzan
124. Ibrahim Malik
125. Zaka Ullah
126. Haji Mohd. Ramzan
127. Mohd. Ali
128. Abdul Qadir
129. Hameed Ullah
Annexure II to the Note of the Indian Government, 
24 September 1959

LIST OF IMPORTANT LADAKHI LAMAS

1. Staksang Rimpoche—Head Lama of Hinus Gompa.
2. Gangon Rimpoche—Head Lama of Gangon Gompa.
3. Togdon Rimpoche, Kushok of Fiang Gompa, Ladakh.
4. Sharpakhampo Rimpoche—Head Lama of Theksey Gompa.
LIST OF INDIAN NATIONALS HELD IN CUSTODY IN THE TIBET REGION OF CHINA

1. Mrs. Shahabir Diyali, her daughter and daughter-in-law.
2. Trome Geshe Rimpoche of Sikkim from Dankar Monastery at Lhasa.

Ladakhi Lamas:
4. Lozang Thubstan Stokpa Stongkhorpa.
5. Zopa Bazgopa.
7. Gochhkapa Chungwa Tingmosgangpa.
8. Sonam Lingshetpa.
10. Lozang Chamba Tritspaa.
11. Lozang Giatso Zimgag Pishupa.
13. Todon Tabpa Tingmosgang.
15. Lonpo Fiangpa.
16. Stanzin Pishupa.
17. Ishey Dawa.
18. Lozang Rigdol.

Ladakhi Trader:
19. Foogyal.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24 September 1959

An Indian pilgrim, Swami Brahmachari Atma Chaitanya while proceeding on a pilgrimage to Kailash and Manosarowar was held up and subjected to harassment by the Chinese authorities after reaching Taklakot on the 6th May, 1959.

He was harshly interrogated by four Chinese soldiers, his baggage searched, and some of his belongings confiscated. These included some homoeopathic medicines which he was accused of bringing with him with the intention of poisoning the people of Tibet. After being detained for five days he was allowed to proceed to Kailash and Mansarowar, after giving an assurance that he would return by the same route and not via the Niti valley as he had intended. On his return to Taklakot Swami Chaitanya was once again thoroughly searched by the Chinese officials, and was given a document to sign in which he was to confess that he had brought poison with him. This he naturally refused to do. The medicines were not given back to him and he was allowed to return home.

It may be mentioned that the incident occurred before the warning communicated by the Foreign Bureau to our Consul General on 20th August 1959 cautioning Indians not to proceed on pilgrimage this year in view of military operations being launched against rebels by the Chinese forces in Western Tibet.

The Government of India cannot but express its surprise at this incident, and hereby lodges a protest at the harassment of this Indian national who was proceeding on a bonafide pilgrimage in accordance with the provisions of the Sino-Indian Agreement. In order to avoid such incidents it is requested that the officials of the People's Republic of China posted along the pilgrim routes may kindly be appropriately instructed so that Indian nationals are not subjected to such treatment in the future.
The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the note dated the 11th September, 1959 which was handed over by the Director of the Asian Department at Peking to the Ambassador of India in Peking. The Government of India notice with surprise and regret that the note of the Chinese Government does not appear to reveal a helpful attitude towards removing the difficulties of the Indian posts in the Tibet region of China and the disabilities of Indian nationals and traders. The Government of India cannot accept the contention that the requests contained in their earlier notes are in any way contrary to the letter and spirit of the 1954 Agreement. Indeed, these notes sought to ensure, in the spirit of friendly understanding which was embodied in this Agreement, that the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa and the Indian Trade Agencies in other parts of Tibet could function with dignity and effectiveness. The Government of India did not ask for their staff and other nationals any more rights and facilities than were being enjoyed by the Chinese posts and Chinese nationals generally in India. They were only anxious to continue the traditional pattern of trade and the exchange of pilgrims across the Sino-Indian border according to the Agreement of 1954.

2. The Government of India can only presume that the Chinese Government are still subject to some misunderstanding. In order therefore to clarify their position they intend to offer detailed comments on all the points made in the Chinese Government's Note. For the sake of convenience the present note deals with the points relating to the Indian Trade Agency in Gyantse. Two other notes in regard to the difficulties of the other Indian official representations in the Tibet region of China and with the difficulties of Indian traders and pilgrims are being delivered separately.

3. The Government of India note the contention of the Chinese Government that the local authorities have been rendering due assistance to the Trade Agency in Gyantse. Facts, however, will speak for themselves. The following paragraphs describe the difficulties to which the Indian Trade Agency in Gyantse have been subject and the generally unco-operative attitude of the local authorities in the Tibet region of China.

Reconstruction of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse

4. In 1943, the then Government of India concluded a lease valid upto 1.4.1971 with the owner of the property and the representative of the Tibetan Government for the housing of the Indian Trade Agency in Gyantse. Para 4 of the notes exchanged on the occasion of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 specifically provided that the Government of India might continue to lease the land within the Agency compound walls which was then being occupied by the Indian Agency. Subsequent to the floods of 1954 and the consequent loss of the buildings of the Trade Agency, the Indian Consul General in Lhasa confirmed to the Chinese Foreign Bureau in November, 1956 the
Government of India's desire in the spirit of the Agreement to retain the land stipulated under the existing lease. In February 1957, he contacted the Foreign Bureau to convey the information that the Government of India wished to commence reconstruction of the Agency buildings on the old site during the following summers. He was then informed that necessary details might be discussed between the corresponding officials in Gyantse. In pursuance of this in March 1957 the site was visited by Mr. Kou of the sub-office of the Foreign Bureau at Gyantse, but later the Indian Trade Agent was informed that the area covered by the lease was too big for the requirements of the Trade Agency. The Trade Agent informed Mr. Kou that not only was the land necessary for the Agency's requirements, but the right to retain it was recognised in the notes exchanged. In fact nearly one-third of the original property had already been scoured away by the current of the river along the embankment. On this Mr. Kou merely promised to refer the matter to his Government. Considerable time elapsed before any final reply was received. In the meanwhile according to the Government of India's information the owner of the property was privately advised by the local authorities not to lease the entire area to the Indian Agency.

5. It was only in March 1958, when preparations for the reconstruction of the Agency were ready, that the Government of India were informed by the authorities in the Tibet region of China that they could not accept the validity of the lease signed in 1943 on the ground that the lease was signed during the British days and could not be recognised by the People's Republic of China. Not only is such a contention contrary to the International Law and State practice regarding the rights of a successor State but this objection was all the more extraordinary in view of the provisions in the 1954 Agreement and the subsequent notes and of the fact that no objection to the continuance of the Agency on this property had been raised any time earlier. But for the severe floods of 1954 the Government of India would have continued to retain effective control and possession of the leased property. The Government of India were fully convinced of the validity of the existing lease, but with a view to expediting the reconstruction of the Agency building and alleviating the difficulties of the Trade Agency staff, they agreed to execute a new lease-deed for the same property. It was only on the 19th May 1958 that the Chinese authorities conveyed their agreement in principle to the commencement of the reconstruction of the Agency on the understanding that a new lease-deed would be executed. The deed has not yet been executed nor has any substantial progress been made in the reconstruction of the Agency buildings. The Government of India have to say with regret that this is due mainly to the lack of co-operation from the local authorities of the Tibet region of China.

The protective Works

6. The history of the negotiations relating to the protective works has been briefly explained in the Government of India's Aide Memoire of 23rd March 1958. The necessity of such works was realised soon after the visit of the Indian engineer deputed to prepare plans for the reconstruction of the Agency building in 1957. The plans were formulated with the sole purpose of preventing further erosion of the property and affording protection to the new buildings to be constructed on the site. The Government of India readily agreed to the condition
stipulated by the local authorities in May 1958 that management of the protective works should vest in the Chinese authorities after they had been erected by the Government of India. The Government of India also agreed to transfer these works which would cost several lakhs, free of charge, to the Chinese Government when the local authorities decided to extend the embankment along the river for the general protection of the Gyantse township. Indeed, had the local authorities been prepared to undertake the latter works immediately the Government of India would not be under the necessity of building any protective works themselves for the protection of the Agency property. In that event the designing and construction of the protective works would have been the sole responsibility of the local authorities.

7. In October 1958 the Indian Consul General at Lhasa was informed by the local Foreign Bureau that the protective works designed by the Indian engineer might damage the highway, the bridge and some lands further down-stream of the river. With a view to satisfying the Chinese authorities that no such danger was involved, a senior Indian engineer was specially sent to Gyantse in November 1958 to explain the designs on the spot to the corresponding local officials. But no permission for the commencement of the building was forthcoming. Nor was any modification of the plan suggested by the local officials but the Indian engineer was informed that higher authorities would have to be consulted before a final clearance could be granted. To avoid further delay revised plans were prepared by the Indian side. Although these would be more expensive, they would do away with the necessity of acquiring additional land along the river embankment beyond the limits of the leased property. These plans were submitted in Gyantse on 8th January, 1959, and to the Chinese Foreign Bureau in Lhasa by the Consul General of India on 29th March 1959. This was soon after the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India had presented an Aide Memoire to the Chinese Ambassador in New Delhi requesting that urgent facilities be provided for the reconstruction of the Trade Agency buildings during the 1959 season. On enquiry from the Director, Mr. Yang Kung Su, the Indian Consul General was informed at Lhasa on 27th April 1959 that if the plans did not affect in any way the bridge and the highway, the reconstruction of the Trade Agency might be commenced. On 22nd May, this was reiterated by the Director. The Director's statement as reported by the Indian Consul General is quoted below:

“So the position standing at present is that we have always agreed to this principle and we still agree to the principle that you may carry on construction of buildings before signing the lease-deed between your side and Phunkangs (the owner) and you can proceed with the construction of the embankment within your area as you said it will not damage the bridge and the highway”.

8. With a view to confirming this on the spot, the matter was taken up by the Indian Trade Agents in Gyantse itself. On 2nd June, Mr. Moo Yu Ting, Chief of Gyantse Foreign Bureau, reiterated that there was no objection to the commencement of the protective works provided they were within the agency boundary and would not affect the bridge and the highway and that the Government of India would agree to break the works at a future time, when the Chinese Government would undertake their own river taming works. No reservation
regarding the actual plans or construction was stipulated on any of these occasions. It was in this situation—after permission had been given by the local authorities and Indian engineers had satisfied themselves that the proposed protective works within the boundary of the leased property were in no way likely to endanger the local highway and bridge further down-stream, that some preliminary stone-work for protecting the property was undertaken. The monsoon was approaching and the Indian engineer was anxious to ensure that during the rainy season there should not be any further damage to the Indian property by erosion. Considering the loss of nearly 10 acres since 1954 (representing one-third of the total area) this precaution was surely justified.

9. Thus, there is no basis for the suggestion contained in the Chinese note that the work was started in a peremptory fashion without the concurrence of the local authorities.

10. Later the Chinese authorities in Gyantse, without notice asked the Indian Trade Agent to stop the protective work, and the work was accordingly stopped. In September the local authorities themselves demolished the protective works which had been started by the Indian engineer. As a result an additional 5 feet of land along the river embankment included in the Indian lease-hold has been scoured away by the river this season. This proves that the advice of the Indian engineers about the necessity of the protective works along this embankment was sound.

11. It may also be recalled that with a view to removing the apprehensions of the Chinese authorities the Government of India conveyed an offer through their Consul General at Lhasa in June 1959 to send the Indian Chief Engineer to Gyantse from Delhi. The Chief Engineer could explain the nature of the revised plans and assure the Chinese authorities that no damage to their public highway would be caused by the proposed protective works. The Chief Engineer was also authorised to make necessary modification in the plans to satisfy the local technical authorities at Gyantse. In response to this offer, the Consul General was informed on 18th July that no useful purpose would be served by such a meeting between senior engineers on the spot. The conclusion is inescapable therefore that the local authorities were merely using technical objections with a view to delaying the reconstruction of the Trade Agency buildings. It should be clear from the narration given above that the Government of India have throughout tried their best to meet the requirements of the local authorities and that delay and difficulty in reconstruction is entirely due to lack of reciprocal co-operation from the other side.

Transport and supplies

12. As early as September, 1957 the Government of India had requested the permission of the Chinese authorities for the import of two trucks for bringing supplies and one jeep for the use of the engineering personnel engaged in the reconstruction of the Trade Agency. The Government of India were informed that while the import of jeep would be permitted, import of trucks into the Tibet region could not be permitted. They were told, however, that local assistance in providing trucks either officially or by hiring private owned vehicles would be given. Apparently all privately owned
trucks have been confiscated after the present disturbances and trucks of the official Transport Department cannot be spared for the Indian Agency. In these circumstances the Government of India are constrained to point out that the suggestion earlier made by the Chinese Government has had no practical value and in effect an insuperable impediment has been placed in the way of the construction work of the Agency building.

13. While the Government of India cannot complain against Chinese laws preventing the use of foreign owned trucks over the highways of Tibet, they wish to point out that they had only sought permission to import trucks for specific use in the reconstruction of the Indian Agency buildings. Under international usage, foreign missions are permitted to import their own transport especially when transport is not readily available locally. Such a concession is enjoyed by foreign missions in India and could be claimed by the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi for the construction of their Embassy premises. However, if the Chinese authorities can ensure that Indian requirement would be met locally at economical rates either by private hire or through official agencies, the Government of India would not press their request.

In the past the attention of the Chinese Government has been drawn to other difficulties encountered in the reconstruction of the Agency. Explosives for blasting work are not locally available and no facilities were given for their import. Horse carts and labourers engaged by the Agency were diverted from the work apparently under instruction of the local authorities and bricks which were to be carried to the Agency sites are still lying in the fields for want of transport.

In November 1958 a request was made by the Indian Trade Agency for a permit to purchase timber from the Yatung area but no helpful response was forthcoming for a long time. Recently authorisation was given by the local authorities for obtaining timber from Yatung, but in actual practice the permission has proved of no avail. The price quoted by the Foreign Bureau Yatung for supply from the official factory was five times the cost of timber in the open market at Yatung. Later it was suggested by the local authorities that the Government of India should pay for the timber not in currency but in exchange for rice. Actually the total quantity of timber required (about 10,000—12,000 cubic feet) was readily available in the Yatung market but the Indian Agency was denied permission to acquire it. Surely this is an example of the lack of co-operation and deliberate difficulties created by the local officials.

**Firing near the Agency premises**

14. The Government of India are surprised at the repudiation of the report about firing practice over the Agency premises. The firing actually took place near the Agency offices and the staff premises which are nowhere near the camping ground of the Chinese Army. There were a number of incidents and these could hardly be part of ordinary firing practice:

(i) On 28th June at 9 A.M. IST 2 bullets were fired over the head of the Indian Assistant Engineer when he was counting bricks at the Agency site.
(ii) At 10 p.m. IST on 4th July 1959 firing practice took place near the residence of the Trade Agent.

(iii) On 18th July when two members of the staff were going to take delivery of the Agency car which had been kept in custody, two bullets were fired over their heads. Empty cartridges of the 7.9 m. service rifles and 5.9 mm. revolvers were collected from near the Agency premises and are in the possession of the Government of India. The Government of India do not wish to suggest that this firing was intended to intimidate the labourers working on the Agency premises. In fact, subsequent to the firing all work stopped as the labourers subsequently left their jobs.

15. After considerable effort work was resumed only recently but following a visit on 5th September by Mr. Yang of the Foreign Bureau and Chinese military engineer the local persons and workers asked to be relieved and the work again stopped.

Arrest of the driver of the car of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse

16. It is not easy to get drivers at Gyantse. The particular driver appointed by the Trade Agency had passed a driving test at Lhasa. He was in possession of a driving licence issued by the Chinese authorities and this licence was withdrawn when a private truck he was driving was requisitioned. Full particulars of the driver were furnished to the Chinese sub-office on the 25th June—the day he was appointed. Between then and the date of his arrest on 12th July, the Foreign Bureau were reminded twice (on 30th June and 10th July) to arrange for a driving test. In reply the Agency official was told that a driving licence would be issued after a test at Yatung. No mention was made by the Foreign Bureau that the driver should not drive the car pending the issue of a fresh licence. Yet the driver was summarily arrested and released only after one week. The local authorities have stated that this was the normal punishment for such offence and it is therefore not understood how the Chinese Government hold that the driver was released after admission of his error. If this was so, he could have been released the same day. Incidentally, no fresh test has yet been arranged for the driver even though 3 months have passed since the date of his arrest.

17. The note of the Chinese Government is silent about the detention of the car of the Indian Trade Agency by the local authorities. The detention of the official car of the Indian Agency was against all international usage and the Government of India repeat their protest against this unfriendly action. The treatment meted out to the Trade Agent himself when he endeavoured to secure the release of the car was far from courteous. Hearing of the detention of the car and the driver, the Indian Trade Agent went to the Military headquarters at 18.15 hours IST and asked for an interview with the Chief of the Foreign Bureau. No reply was forthcoming. In fact the sentry did not allow him to take the car away. This treatment was undoubtedly against the normal international practice relating to the privileges and courtesies to be shown to representatives of foreign countries.
18. The Chinese Government in their note have shown ignorance of the difficulties with regard to the temporary accommodation of the Trade Agent. In fact attention to these difficulties was drawn specifically in a note presented by the Foreign Secretary to the Chinese Ambassador at New Delhi on 23rd March 1959. No reply has yet been received to this note. The lease of the premises which the Trade Agent now occupies became due for renewal in April 1959. He has been endeavouring to secure its extension ever since but has not yet succeeded. It has been reported that confidential and indirect pressure has been brought to bear on the family of the owner of the property not to renew the lease of the premises. It is also reported that the premises of a member of the Indian staff was forcibly vacated when he had been temporarily deputed to stay in the Agency premises. A recent report indicates that on 1st October notice was given to two members of the staff of the Agency to vacate their residential premises in 2 or 3 days time. The Indian Trade Agent has informed the Foreign Bureau that this would only be possible if alternative accommodation were provided.

19. The Government of India remain deeply concerned at the present accommodation difficulties of the Trade Agent and his staff in Gyantse. These difficulties can be judged from the fact that eight rooms in one part of a private house held by the Agency on hire are utilised for the Agency offices and the dispensary, the residential accommodation of the Doctor and the Head Assistant and several of the junior personnel of the Agency. Only two small rooms are available for accommodation of the entire office and the official records. This is extremely inadequate. The house is surrounded by manure pits and cattle refuse and its entrance is next to an open community latrine. In a place situated at an altitude of over 13,000 ft. and subject to severe climatic conditions and living in a house with such unhygienic surroundings, it is not a matter of surprise that the members of the Agency are constantly suffering from ill health and disease.

20. According to the Government of India's information, additional accommodation to relieve this congestion is in fact available in Gyantse. But whenever efforts were made to take on lease some vacant premises, accommodation was denied to the Agency. Some time later the Chinese authorities themselves occupied the premises which had been denied to the Indian Trade Agency. The Government of India would once more urge the Chinese authorities to assist the Trade Agent to secure adequate accommodation for himself, his office and his staff. The present difficulties to which Indian staff are being subjected are in sharp contrast to the facilities in regard to accommodation and other things which are enjoyed by the Chinese posts in India.

21. As regards the reconstruction of the old premises, the Government of India will be prepared to exchange, in lieu of the land within their leasehold along the river bank, additional land of the corresponding area on the north and north-eastern side of the Agency site. The embankment side of the Trade Agency premises would be surrendered so that the Chinese authorities would be free to undertake the construction of protective works according to
their own design for the safety of the bridge and public highway. Detailed proposals are now being worked out and will be communicated to the Chinese authorities separately. The new proposal can only be effective if the Chinese Government agree in principle to lease out an equal area of land on the other side of the Agency premises and to ensure that necessary facilities of access to the river for water etc., will be guaranteed to the Agency.

Conclusion

22. The difficulties of the Indian Trade Agency in Gyantse are real and have to be removed without delay if the Agency is to carry on its normal functions. It has been without proper accommodation for years and the living conditions of the Agency staff are deplorable. If the Agency premises are to be reconstructed, essential transport has to be provided for the carriage of materials and facilities provided for the purchase of timber and other building requirements. The Government of India would request the Government of China to issue appropriate instructions to the local authorities at Gyantse to give all required facilities and assistance to the Indian Trade Agent in accordance with and in the spirit of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 and the correspondence exchanged at that occasion.

23. The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity of renewing to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 October 1959

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Chinese Government’s note presented to the Ambassador of India in Peking on the 11th September 1959. The following paragraphs deal with that note in so far as the difficulties of the Indian representatives at posts in Tibet other than Gyantse are concerned. Two separate notes are being simultaneously presented to the Embassy in regard to the difficulties in Gyantse and the difficulties of Indian traders and Indian nationals in general in the Tibet region of China.

The Trade Agency at Yatung

2. The lease of the Trade Agency in Yatung only prescribes that permission of the local authorities should be obtained in respect of the construction or reconstruction of the Agency premises. On no occasion has any construction involving extension of the plinth area been undertaken without due notice to the Foreign Bureau. At the same time the Government of India have to state with regret that whenever permission even for small alterations was sought, considerable time elapsed before it was granted. Requests for such minor alterations and repair works were submitted to the local Foreign Bureau on the 1st January, 6th March, 2nd, 8th and 15th April, 1959 but the approval of the Foreign Bureau was conveyed to these requests by Director Hung Fei only on the 11th July, 1959. On the 2nd April 1959 plans were submitted for rebuilding the quarters of the sweeper. These quarters had been demolished by the fall of a tree. Since the sweeper and his family had no shelter, a reminder was sent on the 15th April saying that presumably there would be no objection to the work of reconstruction being started. Since no objection was raised by the Foreign Bureau and no reply was received and since the poor family was in miserable plight, reconstruction was started on the 28th April. Thus, it would hardly be correct to say that no intimation was given to the local authorities or that their permission was not sought.

3. On the 23rd July 1958, the Head Assistant of the Trade Agency in Yatung was informed by Mr. Lu Ching Wu of the Foreign Bureau that unauthorised repairs had been undertaken by the Agency. The only works that had been undertaken were fixing glass panes, white-washing and minor repairs. Mr. Lu stated that even for such repairs prior permission had to be obtained. Objection was also taken to the restoration of a boundary wall which had fallen down and to the erection of a fence around a flower and kitchen garden in the agency compound after the melting of the winter snows. It is difficult to understand why even such ordinary maintenance work or minor improvements or restoration in the existing buildings should be subject to the prior approval of the local authorities. The Chinese posts in India are not subjected to such difficulties or
interminable delay. In any case, if previous permission is insisted on by the local authorities, the Government of India would urge that expeditious clearance be given in respect of alterations or minor construction and that a more reasonable attitude be taken in respect of ordinary maintenance and repair works.

4. The primary school to which reference is made in the Chinese Government’s note was opened soon after the visit of the Indian Prime Minister to Yatung in 1958 with funds presented by the local Indian trading community. The school is located within the Agency premises and is intended exclusively for the benefit of the children of the staff working in the Trade Agency. The total number of such children is less than 25. It would seem extraordinary to prohibit the children of local staff of the Indian Agency from availing of the facilities of this elementary school. The children are of course free to attend a local school elsewhere if they so wish. Similarly, the Doctor and the dispensary attached to the Trade Agency are intended for the members of the Agency staff and their families. Local people from the neighbourhood however often come to the dispensary for treatment of minor ailments. This has been the practice for years. While no encouragement for the use of the Agency dispensary is given to the local people, the Government of India cannot understand why facilities of treatment should be denied to suffering people who choose to visit the dispensary on their own. Such an attitude seems strange and somewhat inhuman. However, the Government of India will abide by the wishes of the local authorities.

5. The Government of India would like to point out in this context that the school supported by the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong enrolls Indian children on its rolls and no objection has been taken to this by the Government. The Government of India can only attribute the hesitation of the Chinese Government to some unaccountable distrust of the elementary school maintained by the Indian Agency at Yatung. In such matters full reciprocity is desirable.

Local regulations

6. The Chinese Government in their note have referred to the Indian Agencies not respecting local regulations. In fact, except for ad hoc decisions which are conveyed verbally by the local officials in Tibet, no set of regulations for the guidance of foreign representatives in Tibet has been provided. A request for such codified regulations was addressed to the Foreign Bureau in Lhasa in November, 1956 and repeated in Peking in November, 1957. Whenever reminders were given, the reply was received by Indian officials that local laws were changing progressively and no codified regulations existed. It will be appreciated that in the circumstances it is not possible for the Indian posts in Tibet to know what local regulations they are expected to observe. The Government of India emphatically repudiate the allegation that Indian representatives deliberately flout local regulations.

Restrictions on movements and contacts

7. The Government of India appreciate that regulations which are imposed by the Government of China in the interest of public
security have to be followed. At the same time, if Indian representatives have to discharge their normal functions they should have reasonable freedom of movement and other facilities. A few instances may be quoted in which such facilities were withheld for no apparent reason. Thus the Trade Agent, Yatung, was prevented from going in the Agency car to meet the Indian Trade Agent from Gyantse at Rinchengang. If it was safe for the Trade Agent, Gyantse, and his wife to travel to Yatung from Rinchengang, it is difficult to understand why there was any danger in the Trade Agent, Yatung, meeting them at the same place and driving back with them.

8. There are other similar instances of unreasonable and objectionable restrictions imposed on the movement of Indian officials. In February 1959 the Head Assistant of the Indian Agency at Yatung was refused permission to proceed to Rinchengang which is on a recognised route, to meet another official of the agency in Gyantse. In October 1958 the Trade Agent in Yatung was refused permission to accompany Mrs. Jigmie Dorji, the wife of the Prime Minister of Bhutan, on her way back to Gangtok. The last two incidents took place long before the recent disturbances and at that time no emergency security restrictions were in force.

9. In August 1959 the Consul General designate of India while on his way to Lhasa was held up for nearly two hours by the Chinese check-post at Chumbi despite his possessing diplomatic passport. Difficulties also arose in clearing his luggage even though all items had been declared in advance. On 8th August Shri S. K. Chakrabarti who was returning to India from Lhasa as a courier holding a diplomatic passport was stopped and harassed for a few hours for some unaccountable reason after he had cleared through Chumbi check-post and before he reached Champithang. As recently as 28th September, the Head Assistant at Yatung, despite a properly visaed official passport in his possession, on his way back from Gangtok to Yatung, was compelled to return to Nathula by the Chinese check-post soldiers at Champithang. The Indian Trade Agent at Yatung is not permitted to move beyond a mile of the Agency towards Chumbi and not even a yard on the road towards Lhasa. The Trade Agent in Gyantse is confined to an area approximately two miles on either side of the Agency. The movement of the Indian Consul General in Lhasa is restricted to the Lhasa township. The sentry guard posted outside the Consulate General prevents all people including even Indian nationals from having access to the Consulate. It may be added that Chinese nationals of the Tibet region are forbidden even to attend cinema shows and purely cultural performances in the Agency or Consulate General. Cinema shows attended mainly by Indians are frequently organised by the Chinese representatives in India in their own premises and, with permission in public places outside and no exception has ever been taken by the Government of India to attendance at these shows by Indian nationals. In India, complete freedom of movement and contact with Indian nationals has been allowed to the Chinese representatives. It is hardly necessary to point out that restrictions of the kind mentioned above are not in accordance with the spirit of mutual trust and friendship which is embodied in the 1954 Agreement.
The tour of the Indian Trade Agent in Western Tibet

10. The Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 envisages a permanent Trade Agency at Gartok in Western Tibet to assist Indian traders and pilgrims visiting the area. No suitable building is locally available on hire at Gartok and despite the efforts of the Government of India, it has not been possible till now to conclude a lease and commence the construction of the Trade Agency at that place. Pending availability of suitable accommodation, the Trade Agent therefore endeavours to discharge his functions by a tour lasting about four months during the summer season every year. It has been the traditional practice for decades for the Trade Agent to enter Tibet by the same pass through which he returned from Tibet at the end of the previous season. All his camping equipment is left at the nearest frontier check-posts and thereby the trouble of bringing the equipment down to the plains at the conclusion of every season is saved. The local authorities are clearly aware of the practice and knew that the Indian Trade Agent who had left Western Tibet by Niti pass in November 1958 would re-enter by the same pass in 1959. The Ministry of External Affairs had also forwarded his detailed itinerary for 1959 to the Chinese Embassy at New Delhi and specifically requested a visa for the Niti pass in a note dated the 18th May 1959. As a result the Trade Agent's passport duly visaed for the Niti pass was received from the Embassy on the 29th May 1959. If the Chinese authorities were unable to make the necessary security and communication arrangements beyond the Niti pass and wished the Trade Agent to follow a different route, it would have been expected that information to that effect would be given to the Government of India in time so that the Trade Agent could be asked to proceed through Lepulekh pass as subsequently desired by the Chinese authorities. Thereby considerable delay and great personal hardship to the Trade Agent could have been avoided. For want of timely intimation, the Trade Agent had to retrace his journey when he was already nearing the frontier at Niti pass and there was delay of one month in the schedule of his entry into Tibet.

11. Despite the Trade Agent's compliance with the last minute requirement of the Chinese authorities at great personal inconvenience and hardship he was surprised to find after he had arrived at Taklakot through the new route that he could not proceed further since no mechanical transport was available. He was therefore held up at Taklakot for six weeks. The Trade Agent was willing to avail of animal transport, but even this was not provided by the local Chinese authorities. In the 3rd week of August he was advised to proceed straight to Gargunsa while his destination in accordance with past practice, which must have been well known to the Chinese authorities, was Gartok. Gargunsa is an important Chinese military headquarters but is of little importance from the point of view of the work which the Trade Agent is supposed to do under the 1954 Agreement. Gartok is the most important market in Western Tibet and is also the administrative headquarters for that region. Finally, when transport was arranged by the Chinese authorities, the Indian Trade Agent and his staff had to perform the journey of more than a hundred miles from 5 in the morning till 8 in the evening on the back of an open truck. This lack of
consideration for an official of a friendly country who had been sent to Western Tibet to discharge his normal functions in accordance with an international agreement could hardly be regarded as evidence of friendship or co-operation and the Government of India cannot but express their regret at this strange treatment to which their Trade Agent was subjected.

12. The Chinese Government have suggested in their note that the special facilities which they are called upon to provide for the Indian Trade Agent are unique and extraordinary. This suggestion is obviously misleading. As the Chinese Government must be aware, it had been the practice for the Indian Trade Agent in Western Tibet to take his own rifles for the protection of himself and his party during their long journeys across wild and uninhabited regions. He also used to carry his own wireless set in order to be able to keep in touch with the Government of India. In 1953 however, the Chinese authorities summarily seized the rifles and the wireless set which the then Trade Agent had been carrying and these were returned to him at the Indian border on his return journey. It was only when the Chinese authorities prohibited the Trade Agent from carrying any weapons in self-protection or any wireless set that the Government of India requested the local authorities to provide for security guard and a wireless unit for the Indian Trade Agent. It is of course well known that a regular system of postal communication or even of police protection is not available in that area. If now it is the contention of the Chinese Government that they have no responsibility for providing either escort or wireless facility for the Trade Agent, the Government of India would like to know whether they have any objection to the Government of India themselves arranging for these facilities for their Trade Agent. If the Chinese authorities would neither provide these facilities themselves nor permit the Trade Agent to make his own arrangements it need hardly be said that the Trade Agent would not be able to discharge his functions and to that extent the corresponding provision in the 1954 Agreement would be rendered nugatory.

13. The Government of India are anxious to sign the lease for a plot of land for the construction of the Trade Agency in Gartok. They are gratified that the lease has now been all but completed. Information has however been received recently that the local authorities in the Tibet region have been insisting that the rent for the leased property will have to be paid in Yuans. This is contrary not merely to the customary practice but to the specific provision in para. 2(v) of the letter of His Excellency the Ambassador of China in India dated the 25th May 1957 which amplified the Trade Agreement between China and India signed in October 1954.

**Couriers and communications**

14. The Chinese Government could not be unaware of the fact that since the disturbances in Tibet the Indian bag service for all the Indian posts in Tibet has remained suspended for months. In the circumstances a special courier permit was requested as early as the 3rd June 1959 for an Indian official Shri Bhupindra Singh to proceed as courier up to Lhasa. Despite this advance request he had to wait for 18 days at Yatung before any transport was provid-
ed for him. It is understood, however, that all this time there was official Chinese transport plying between Yatung and Lhasa. Somewhat earlier than this an Indian engineer who was proceeding to Gyantse in connection with the construction work of the Indian Agency premises there was held up for three weeks for lack of transport. Since officially-owned transport of the Government of India cannot be permitted to ply to Lhasa on courier duty and since private transport is not available on hire, the Indian posts have to rely entirely on the assistance of the local authorities in securing transport. On all occasions Indian couriers are required to sit at the back of trucks and make themselves as comfortable as they can. It appears from the manner in which requests for transport were ultimately complied with that the local authorities were completely indifferent to the requirements of the Government of India and the hardships which are imposed on their staff.

15. It is true that the Chinese authorities had asked the Government of India to discontinue the existing messenger system in 1955. It will be recalled, however, that the road for use of mechanical transport between Lhasa and Yatung was completed only in 1956. In 1957, a detailed scheme for a jeep courier system in replacement of the old messenger system was worked out by the Government of India and requests were made to the Chinese authorities in Lhasa first verbally and then in writing to agree to this arrangement. The Chinese authorities, however were not prepared to permit the Government of India to run their own jeeps even for the exclusive purpose of carrying official mails and bags to the Indian posts. It was only in these circumstances that the existing system had to be continued but this was done with the full knowledge and authorisation of the local authorities in Tibet. It may be observed that Article I of the Sino-Indian Agreement gives to both the sides the privileges of communication through couriers and despatch of mail bags containing official communications. Para. 7 of the notes exchanged at Peking at the time of conclusion of the Sino-Indian Agreement provides that the Trade Agent may hire employees locally. Thus the continuance of the messenger system with local personnel, pending the institution of modern courier system, is fully in consonance with and in no way contrary to the 1954 Agreement.

16. Nevertheless, in view of the objection of the Chinese Government the Government of India are agreeable in principle to start a courier system with Indian couriers which would use transport provided by the Chinese authorities. Such a system will be feasible only if suitable mechanical transport is made available by the Chinese authorities regularly and at reasonable rates. For the safety of bags it may also be necessary to provide transport for the exclusive use of the Indian couriers. Detailed arrangements involved in the system are now being worked out and will be communicated to the Chinese authorities shortly.

17. The attention of the Chinese Government has already been drawn to instances in which the bags of Indian Government were opened while they were handled by the local postal authorities. It will also be recalled that four cases of baby food for the infant child of the Consul General were handed over by the Trade Agent in Gyantse for onward despatch to Lhasa in April, 1959. They were
kept for over a month in the sub-office of the Foreign Bureau and thereafter returned to the Trade Agent on the plea that no transport was available. Finally the food for the child was delivered to the previous Consul General through the local authorities in August, a few days before the Consul General left on transfer. The bags, urgent supplies, etc., which had accumulated for over 4 months at Yatung were transported by the special courier (Shri Bhupindra Singh) who proceeded to Lhasa in June this year.

With regard to the suggestion to use the local postal facilities, it may be stated that letter sent through the local post office have taken as much as a month between Yatung on the one hand and Phari and Gyantse on the other, when in fact the journey can be performed in one or two days. Ordinary letters from India to Lhasa through Tibetan postal channels have taken even longer. In contrast under the messenger system (which is dependent on animal transport) official bags only took four days from Gangtok to Gyantse.

18. It is also reported that telegrams for despatch are only accepted in Yatung and Gyantse on 3 days in the week; no telegrams are accepted in Lhasa on Monday and in all cases no telegrams can be sent except during certain fixed hours. On the 6th July, the Indian Trade Agency, Gyantse gave details to local authorities of three specific cases where telegrams were delayed in transmission or never delivered at all. A telegram from Delhi marked most immediate was despatched on 3rd, reached Gyantse on 4th and was actually delivered to the Agency on the 6th September.

19. While no reflection on the Chinese Postal Department is intended, it will be clear from the above instances that the normal post and telegraphs facilities are not sufficiently developed in the Tibet region. The Government of India are only interested in ensuring that official communications to and from them reach their posts in Tibet in safety and without delay.

20. The Government of India deplore the arbitrary action of the Chinese authorities in stopping the messenger system through which official communications had hitherto been maintained between India and the Indian trade posts and the Consulate General in Tibet. So far as the Government of India are aware, the system has never been misused and even though the messengers were local people, at no time could any exception be taken to their conduct. In accordance with international usage facilities must be given to a foreign representative to keep himself in touch with his Government. The facility of a bag service is well recognised and this was specifically provided in the 1954 Agreement. In fact, as the Chinese Government are aware Government of India have been very generous in giving courier permits to the Chinese representatives and as many as 38 Chinese couriers hold multi-entry Indian visas for movement between India and China. It is particularly regrettable, therefore, that before an alternative system with Indian couriers could be worked out, the Government of India should have been deprived by the Chinese Government of the facilities of communication with the Indian posts in Tibet. The bag service to the Indian posts in Gyantse and Lhasa has remained suspended since July. The difficulties of these posts for lack of suitable bag facilities can well be imagined.
21. The statement of the Chinese Government's note that the Government of India have been maintaining wireless sets in their agencies in Tibet in an unauthorised manner is hardly in consonance with facts. It will be recalled that as early as September 1955 the Chinese Government agreed in principle to the retention of the Indian wireless Links at Lhasa, Gartok and either Gyantse or Yatung on a reciprocal basis. Details were being worked out when suddenly, in September, 1957, the Chinese check-post at Yatung summarily seized some essential parts required for repairing the wireless set of the Trade Agency at Gyantse. This seizure was not even intimated to the Indian Trade Agent, Yatung and only later when enquiries were made by him was he informed of the detention of the equipment. This was justified by the local authorities on the ground that it was a prohibited item of import. The seized equipment has not yet been released. However, in March this year the Government of India made a comprehensive proposal to the Chinese Government for establishment of wireless sets on a reciprocal basis by Indian posts in China and Chinese posts in India. No agreement to these proposals has yet been received from the Chinese Government. In these circumstances, to say that wireless stations are being maintained by the Indian posts in an unauthorised manner does not present the facts of the situation correctly.

Conclusion

22. The Government of India find no pleasure in enumerating the facts given in the foregoing paragraphs. Facts have however to be stated clearly to contrast the treatment accorded by the Chinese authorities to Indian trade posts in Tibet with the facilities and privileges enjoyed by corresponding Chinese posts in India. The Government of India have to say with regret that repeated requests from their representatives in the Tibet region for the minimum facilities of transport, communication and accommodation have not been dealt with by the local authorities in the Tibet region with the sympathy and attention which are due to the representatives of a friendly country. They would also like to state that unless these facilities are forthcoming the Indian posts in Tibet cannot function with dignity and discharge the responsibilities intended for them under the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954.

23. The Government of India take the opportunity of renewing to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 26 October 1959

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to
the Embassy of People's Republic of China and have the honour to
refer to the note which was handed to the Ambassador of India in
Peking by the Director of the Asian Department of the Chinese
Foreign Office on the 11th September 1959. That note dealt with
a variety of matters. The Government of India have dealt with
some of them in two other notes. The present note is, therefore,
confined only to the difficulties of Indian traders in particular, and
Indian nationals in general, in the Tibet region of China.

2. As the Chinese Government must be aware, the 1954 Agree-
ment between India and China envisaged that the traditional trade
and religious connections between the Tibet region of China and
India would continue to be maintained to the mutual advantage of
the people on both sides. The Government of India are not un-
aware of the special difficulties which have arisen as a result of
the recent disturbances in the Tibet region. It occurs to them,
however, that some of the restrictions imposed by the local authori-
ties in Tibet have hardly any relation to the security and other
aspects of the recent disturbances. If these restriction continue,
the arrangements contemplated in 1954 will completely break down.

Difficulties of Indian trades in Central Tibet

3. The traditional border trade between India and the Tibet
region of China was based on a free exchange of goods and pre-
supposed that no difficulties would be placed in the way of remit-
tance of profits of Indian nationals engaged in this trade from Tibet
to India. The Government of India have explained the difficulties
which have arisen as a result of new currency measures introduced
by the Chinese Government in a note presented by the Ambassador
of India in Peking on the 25th August, 1959. The new measures in-
troduced by the Chinese authorities make it extremely difficult to
exchange goods according to the traditional pattern of trade. Indian
traders are being subjected to great hardship by the restrictions
imposed which have inevitably caused serious loss on goods which
had been exchanged or sold prior to the devaluation. Moreover,
they are being confronted with serious difficulties in the remittance
of profits because payments are no longer being made in Indian
rupees and the customary method of adjustment through export to
India of either silver dollars or silver coins is being denied to them.
Obstacles are also being placed in the barter of goods taken by the
Indian traders to Tibet with the goods which they used to receive
traditionally from the Tibetans. The Government of India do not
contest the right of the Chinese authorities to introduce such
currency measures as they consider necessary in the interest of
their country, but since these measures adversely affect the tra-
ditional pattern of trade envisaged in the 1954 Agreement, it is
only fair that some method should be devised to save the Indian
traders from the severe loss to which they are being put by the
devaluation of the local currency. Further there should be some
reasonable means for Indian traders to repatriate their earnings back to India.

4. It has been suggested that Indian traders could repatriate their earnings through drafts on the Bank of China in Calcutta by depositing Chinese currency with the local authorities. It should be realised, however, that small traders who are engaged in transactions in remote areas in the Tibet region particularly in Western Tibet would have serious practical difficulty both in obtaining and in cashing rupee drafts with the Bank of China in Calcutta. Moreover, it has been reported that Chinese authorities are insisting that before any rupee bank draft can be issued in favour of an Indian trader, he must enter into a bond for the import of specified goods of equivalent value in future. This condition, if it were to be fulfilled literally, would impose great hardship on the traders. Apart from the fact that this would interfere with the freedom of a trader to continue or not to continue his trade in future, a trader has compulsory obligations to meet in India to his suppliers, in addition to the personal expenses of himself and his family. It may be stated in this context that on many occasions in the past when Indian traders took goods to the Tibet region in fulfilment of earlier contracts, the Chinese authorities refused to accept them, thereby causing severe loss to them.

5. There are still other difficulties which are being experienced by Indian traders. On account of the restrictions imposed by the local authorities, Indian traders are not free to travel to recognised markets in Tibet. Unless the Indian traders receive permission to move to the recognised markets, they will be unable to dispose of the merchandise which they have taken this season to the Tibet region or to collect old debts. Some of the Tibetans to whom they had earlier supplied goods have now moved to Shigatse and Lhasa. The Indian traders are not able to contact these persons now. It is requested that in view of the circumstances arising out of the disturbances the traders should, as a special case, be allowed to go up to Lhasa and Shigatse to realise debts from their old customers. Further unless reasonable facilities are given to them to hire transport, a right embodied in the 1954 Agreement, they will be unable to carry on trade. The Government of India would request that the difficulties enumerated in this and the preceding paragraphs should be sympathetically examined by the Chinese authorities and remedial action taken without delay. Otherwise, the 1954 Agreement, insofar as it concerns the maintenance of the traditional trade between the two countries, will be rendered nugatory.

Difficulties of traders in Western Tibet

6. The Indian traders who visit Western Tibet are mostly petty traders who usually barter their goods for wool, salt, borax etc. In the hope that this traditional basis of exchange would continue these traders crossed into Tibet as usual, but by and large little trade or exchange of goods has been possible this year. It appears that a deliberate effort is being made to prevent the Tibetan suppliers of wool etc. from exchanging their produce with the Indian traders. The few Indian traders, who managed to purchase a small amount of wool, have been put to serious difficulties by the imposition of a new export tax on wool of the equivalent of Rs. 8
Indian traders have expressed their willingness to pay this new tax. In practice they are not finding it possible to do so, because while they are paid by the Tibetans as well as by the Chinese authorities in Indian rupees, they are required to pay the tax in Chinese silver dollars. Three months ago, a decree was issued by the Chinese authorities that Chinese paper currency would be legal tender in the Tibet region of China. It is all the more surprising, therefore, that local authorities should insist on payment of tax in silver dollars. Besides, silver dollars are not available in Western Tibet markets. Indian traders are, therefore, faced with an impossible situation and the Government of India cannot help feeling that these new requirements are meant to prevent export of wool and to disrupt the traditional pattern of border trade. The Government of India would repeat their earlier request that instructions should be issued by the Chinese Government to enable the Indian traders to carry on their traditional trade in wool and other commodities and to pay tax in a convenient medium, and also to repatriate their wares and legitimate profits to India.

7. The Government of India have recently received reports that the local authorities of Western Tibet, contrary to the customary practice, have imposed a ban on the export of sheep and goats to India. These animals were traditionally purchased by Indian traders not merely for the purpose of gathering wool but also for use as beasts of burden on the return journey to India. Further, petty Indian traders visiting Western Tibet traditionally left their unsold merchandise at the end of the season at the various trade marts and local authorities of the Tibet region have assisted them by ensuring the safe custody of the merchandise. The responsibilities of the Tibetan authorities have now been assumed by the Military Control Commission. The latter informed the traders towards the end of September 1959 that unsold merchandise should be taken back to India. This instruction was received by the traders at a time when many of the passes had already been blocked by snow. Basing themselves on the traditional practice, the traders had made no transport arrangements to repatriate their unsold merchandise and will, therefore, be compelled to leave it behind. It is feared that if no safety precautions are arranged by the local authorities, the traders will lose a substantial, if not the entire value of these goods. The Government of India would, therefore, request that at least for the season just attended, the customary practice should be observed by the Chinese authorities in Tibet, and necessary arrangements for the protection of the goods left behind should be made. Otherwise, thousands of small traders will be subjected to serious loss and suffering.

Difficulties of pilgrims and other Indian nationals

8. The Chinese Government have mentioned a number of specific cases in their note. The Government of India have examined all the points mentioned in the Chinese note. Full information regarding the complaint of an Indian pilgrim who was harassed on his way to Mansarovar has been given in a separate note presented to the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi on the 24th September 1959. The particular pilgrim was carrying a few ordinary homoeopathic medicines. To subject him to delay and harassment on the suspicion
that he might be carrying poison was uncalled for. It should have occurred to the persons responsible for this harsh treatment that a pilgrim on this way to a sacred place could have no use for poison. In this as in other similar matters, the Chinese check-post official must have given free play to their imagination.

9. As early as April 1957 the Embassy of India presented to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking a list of the difficulties which were experienced by Indian pilgrims proceeding to Kailash and Mansarovar. There were no security arrangements on the way nor any arrangement for sanitation and hygiene. Paragraph 10 of the letters exchanged after the 1954 Agreement envisaged that the Chinese Government would construct rest houses for the use of pilgrims. The Government of India even offered to supply timber to assist in the expeditious construction of these rest houses, but this offer was not accepted by the local authorities. It appears that in 1958 one or two rest houses had been built, but by and large the old difficulties still continue. However, in accordance with the wishes of the Chinese Government, all intending Indian pilgrims have been warned not to undertake any pilgrimage this season. It is hoped that when conditions return to normal, the facilities which the Indian nationals have traditionally enjoyed of visit to the two places held sacred by them will be restored.

10. A separate note has already been presented to the Embassy on the 24th September, 1959, on the question of Indian nationals other than traders residing in Tibet. The Government of India seek no concession except that persons who are entitled to Indian nationality should be given option to exercise the right of Indian citizenship and return to India, if they so wish.

11. A reference has been made in the Chinese Government's note to the case of two cobblers. It was for the local authorities to prevent them from proceeding as far as Shigatse. The Government of India were certainly not aware of their movement. At all events, the fact that they had done so was no reason to subject them to delay and harassment on their return journey when they were merely anxious to go back to India.

12. With reference to the family of Shahbir and Tromo Geshe the Government of India seek only to obtain details of the specific charges which have been preferred against them. It may be recalled that paragraph 6 of the letters exchanged at the time of the conclusion of the Sino-Indian Agreement specifically provides for access to the representatives of both sides by their nationals involved in criminal or civil cases. International usage also requires that facts relating to the arrest and the nature of the charges against foreign nationals should be communicated on request to the representatives of the countries concerned. The Government of India would suggest once more that, if only on humanitarian grounds, the wife and children of Shahbir be permitted to return to India and join their husband and father, who is now residing in Kalimpong.

13. The Government of India are surprised at the allegation in the Chinese Government's note that false rumours were being spread by Indian nationals visiting Tibet. They have fully satisfied themselves that such an allegation is entirely unfounded. The allegation
that Chinese nationals have been subjected to unwarranted questioning by the Indian border check-posts is equally unfounded. In the past whenever such a complaint was received, the Government of India had immediate investigations made into it but in the case was the charge found true. If specific complaints were brought to their notice, they will certainly examine them.

Registration of arms

14. The arms held by Indian nationals and representatives were imported or acquired at a time when there was no proper system of issuing fire arms' licences in Tibet. The Chinese Government must be aware that all Indian nationals including the junior personnel of the Indian posts have complied with the recent orders of the local authorities asking them to surrender their arms. The Government of India trust that satisfactory arrangements will be made for the protection of life and property as laid down in para 9 of the notes exchanged at the time of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954. It is extraordinary that at the time these arms were deposited the local authorities refused to issue receipts on the basis of which the owner could claim them back when returning to India. At the time when the Vice Consul endeavoured to sell his revolver, to which reference is made in the Chinese note, no system of licence or restriction on sale existed in the Tibet region of China.

Anti-Indian propaganda in Tibet

15. The Government of India are glad to be assured that the articles to which they had drawn attention in their note of 24th July, 1959, alleging that India was a successor to the British imperialism do not represent the official thinking of the People's Republic of China. Since, however, these articles were published in organs which are officially controlled, the Government of India could only conclude that such views did have official support. The Government of India wish to recall in this context the anti-Indian demonstration which was organised in Yatung on 1st May 1959 with official support and connivance, when India was denounced as 'Imperialists, blood-suckers, expansionists' etc. Posters with anti-Indian slogans were pasted by the Chinese officials such as Lu Ching Wu of the Foreign Bureau on the quarters occupied by the Indian Overseer and on the main gate outside the Indian Trade Agency. The Government of India take serious notice of official participation and encouragement of such direct anti-Indian propaganda. The Government of India are concerned to note that certain officials in the Tibet region of China have been suggesting openly that in due course China will 'liberate' Bhutan, Sikkim, Ladakh and other parts of India. They hope that such irresponsible and unfriendly propaganda will immediately be stopped and suitable action taken against the persons responsible for such suggestion.

16. The details given in the preceding paragraphs provide clear evidence of the harsh and unsympathetic treatment to which Indian traders and Indian nationals in general have been subjected in the Tibet region of China in recent months. Such treatment is not in accordance with the spirit of the 1954 Agreement and the notes on border trade and other connected matters which were exchanged at the time. Unless remedial measures are taken by authorities in the Tibet region of China, there is bound to be a complete disruption of
the border trade. This will inevitably cause hardship to people on both sides of the border. If this happens, the responsibility has to be borne by the authorities responsible for the control of trade and other connected matters in the Tibet region. So far as the Government of India are concerned, they would undoubtedly deplore a breakdown of the traditional arrangements for trade in the border regions between the two countries. At the same time, they could not allow their nationals to proceed to the Tibet region without an assurance of protection and fair treatment. The Government of India do not seek any special privileges for their nationals or for their Trade Agents, but they will expect the Chinese authorities in Tibet, if these authorities are keen on continuance of the trade connections, to make it possible for Indian traders to carry on their business in fair conditions and in a friendly atmosphere.

Conclusion

17. It will be clear from what has been stated in this and the other two notes which have been presented simultaneously to the Embassy that the allegations in the Chinese Government's note of September 11 are unfounded. It is not the Government of India who have violated the spirit of the 1954 Agreement. The instances given in these notes will show that the facilities to which the personnel of the Indian posts and Indian nationals in general are entitled under the 1954 Agreement have been denied to them on many occasions. The Government of India repudiate the allegation that any attempt has been made by them to encroach on China's sovereignty. The Government of India which is jealous of its own sovereignty, could not encroach on the sovereignty of any other country or support any attempt to do so. The facts given in these notes disprove any such contention. The allegation contained in the Chinese Government's note that "many actions and demands of India organs have violated or gone beyond the Sino-Indian Agreement" is also without any basis whatsoever. The Government of India only ask for their officers and nationals treatment and facilities which are guaranteed by the 1954 Agreement and the correspondence exchanged on the occasion and are implicit in them. They are surprised to be accused of having used unfriendly language. Neither in this note nor in any of the earlier notes or memoranda, which have been delivered to the Chinese Government by or on behalf of the Government of India, has any expression been used which is not recognised by normal diplomatic usage. On the other hand the language used in some of the Chinese Government's notes and memoranda has exceeded the bounds of normal diplomatic courtesy. The Government of the People's Republic of China appear to have taken exception to the reference in the Government of India's earlier note about the functioning of Trade Agencies in India and China on a reciprocal basis. Reciprocity is inherent in the Sino-Indian Agreement and the Government of India would not expect any treatment for its official agencies or for the Indian nationals which they themselves would not be prepared to accord to the official organs of the Chinese Government and Chinese nationals in India. There can be no question of coercion in stating this fact. The Government of India would reiterate that both parties to the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 should observe the Agreement in letter and in spirit. On their part the Government of India have been seeking to do so
ever since the Agreement was signed and even despite their unfortunate experience in recent months.

18. The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity of renewing to the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 29 October 1959

The Government of India have already had several occasions in the last few months to draw the attention of the Chinese Government to the position of Indian nationals particularly Muslims from Kashmir and Lamas from Ladakh resident in the Lhasa and Shigatse areas of Tibet region of China. A comprehensive note on the subject was presented to the Chinese Embassy on the 24th September, 1959. It was then pointed out that under the Indian law these persons were entitled to Indian nationality. Even if it is argued that under the Chinese law these persons, by virtue of their residence in China, are entitled to Chinese nationality or are to be regarded as Chinese nationals, they should, according to international usage, be given the option to choose which of the two nationalities they would like to adopt and be permitted to leave Tibet and return to India if they so desire.

2. Recent reports indicate that despite the representations of the Government of India, consistent pressure is being brought on the Kashmiri Muslims to observe regulations which can only be obligatory for Chinese nationals, and to accept Chinese nationality against their own wishes. It is understood, for example, that the Kashmiri Muslims in Lhasa are being required to attend meetings which are held every day and sometime twice a day but which are obviously intended for the instruction of the Chinese nationals only. The Kashmiri Muslims have pointed out to the local authorities that since they have applied for registration as Indian nationals and since the question of their nationality and their future residence in the Tibet region is a matter under discussion between the Governments of India and the People's Republic of China, there should be no compulsion on them to attend such meetings. It is understood that on the 21st October about 15 Kashmiri Muslims were summoned by the local authorities and warned to attend the daily meetings. They were warned that failing compliance, they would be subjected to punishment. Similarly on the 22nd October 1959 at 19.00 hours IST, members of the Kashmiri Muslim community (both men and women) were summoned to a meeting and detained till 23.00 hours. They were individually interrogated and pressed to accept Chinese nationality. The members of the community re-affirmed their desire to be treated as Indian nationals and as a result at least one of their spokesmen was placed under house arrest. On the 23rd October at 08.30 hours IST, some Kashmiri Muslims were taken under guard to the Chinese area office and similarly harassed and pressed to accept Chinese nationality. They were warned that if they persisted in their refusal to accept Chinese nationality they would be imprisoned and put to difficulties and harassment. On the 24th October, at a meeting, similar efforts were made to persuade them to denounce their claim to Indian nationality and, on their refusal to do so, one couple was put under house arrest.

3. The Government of India protest strongly against the pressure and intimidation to which persons of Indian origin, who are entitled to Indian citizenship are being subjected in order to compel them to
accept Chinese nationality against their wishes. The Government of India would again urge that the Chinese Government should desist from such pressure and allow these persons to exercise their option in favour of Indian nationality to which they are clearly entitled. These people have committed no crime; they wish merely to return to the country of their origin. Just as China has always claimed the same freedom for persons of Chinese origin living in South-East Asia regardless of how long they may have been away from China, the Government of People's Republic of China should allow persons of Indian origin living or residing in the Tibet region to exercise their choice of citizenship freely. The Government of India would, therefore, urge that those who have already been taken into custody should be released immediately and pressure on others to accept Chinese nationality should cease forthwith.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of India to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 30 October 1959

The Government of India have considered the memorandum presented by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of People's Republic of China to the Embassy of India on the 21st August 1959 regarding the arrangements for the carriage of diplomatic bags intended for the Embassy of India, Indian Consulates and the trade posts in People's Republic of China.

2. The Government of India would like to point out that it is a fundamental principle of international law and is recognised by international usage that diplomatic and consular missions should be able to communicate freely and in secrecy with their Home Government and with other posts in the same country. For this purpose, persons acting as couriers who carry official bags are given exemption from the local jurisdiction not only by the receiving State concerned but also by countries through which they may have to traverse while engaged in the performance of such duties. The Home Government or the Diplomatic Envoys concerned are unrestricted in the choice and number of their messengers. Further, according to the international practice, there is nothing to prevent non-diplomatic members of the staff being selected to act as couriers on a particular occasion. During the time such persons are designated as couriers and act as such, they do not perform their work as members of the non-diplomatic staff in the Embassy. They are, therefore, entitled to protection and immunity customarily accorded to a courier. They revert, however, to their normal functions and privileges when not engaged on courier duties.

3. Further, the Home Government are not only within their rights in designating such persons as couriers, but persons so designated have to be equipped with the most respected form of travel documents such as diplomatic passports to ensure special protection for the bags and documents. When a person who is normally a junior functionary, is performing the duty of a courier, it is only proper that he should hold similar documents to ensure the secrecy and safety of the official bag. It is regretted therefore that the Government of India cannot accept the contention in the memorandum of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs that it is in any way objectionable for non-diplomatic personnel to be chosen for courier duties.

4. The Government of India are gratified to note that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of People's Republic of China are agreeable to the Indian members of the staff of the Indian Embassy in Peking and the Consulate General in Shanghai acting as couriers and being accorded temporarily for the duration of the assignment the privileges normally allowed to a courier. The Government of India, however, fail to appreciate the reason for denying the same facility to the members of the staff of the Consulate General in Lhasa. In fact, because of the geographical situation of Lhasa, it is not practicable for the same courier who travels to Peking to carry special bags for the Consulate General in Lhasa or other posts in Tibet.
5. The Government of India trust that the Government of People's Republic of China will agree that, in accordance with international usage, the Government of India may continue to designate Indian nationals regardless of their permanent functions to perform duties as couriers to the Embassy of India in Peking, Consulates in Shanghai and Lhasa and the trade posts in Tibet and that further, such couriers may for the satisfactory performance of their responsibilities be given diplomatic passports for the duration of their assignment and afforded the usual protection and amenities to couriers under international usage.

6. The Government of India would like to mention that as many as 38 Chinese nationals hold diplomatic passports at present on which the Government of India have issued multiple entry visas because they have been designated as couriers by the Government of Chinese People's Republic.
APPENDIX I

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE HIMALAYAN FRONTIER OF INDIA

India’s northern frontier is a traditional one, in the sense that it has laid approximately where it now runs for nearly three thousand years. The areas along this frontier, which is nearly 2,500 miles long from the Kuen Lun mountains in the far north to the junction with Burma in the east, have always been a part of India. At times they were independent principalities, and in other periods they were incorporated in large empires like the Mauryan and the Gupta; but always the people and the rulers regarded themselves as Indians and remained within the Indian fold. Occasionally Tibetan rulers overran these areas; but these invasions were always exceptional and temporary, and never did these territories become part of Tibet. It is a long and continuous tradition that lies behind the present frontier of India.

This northern frontier of India is for much of its length the crest of the Himalayan ranges. The Himalayas have always dominated Indian life, just as they have dominated the Indian landscape. One of the earliest Sanskrit texts, though its exact date is uncertain—the Vishnu Purana—makes it clear that the Himalayas formed the frontier of India. It states that the country south of the Himalayas and north of ocean is called Bharat, and all born in it are called Bharatiyas or Indians.

uttaram yat samudrasya himadres caiva daksinam
vargas tad (tam) bharatam nama bharati yatra santatih.

The earliest reference to the Himalayas is in the Rig Veda which was written about 1500 B.C. It states that the Himalayas symbolise all mountains (10th Mandala, 10th Adhyaya, Sukta 121.4). The Kena Upanishad, written sometime about 1000 B.C., speaks of Uma the daughter of the Himalayas—उमाहिमान्तौं. The legend is that Uma, the daughter of the Himalayas, revealed the mystic idealism of the Upanishads to the gods. This is an imaginative expression of the historical fact that the thought of the Upanishads was developed by the dwellers in the forests and fastnesses of the Himalayas. For centuries thereafter, the striving of the Indian spirit was directed towards these Himalayan fastnesses. Siva was the blue-necked, snow-crowned mountain god; Parvati was the spring-maiden daughter of the Himalayas; Ganga was her elder sister; and Meru, Vishnu’s mountain, was the pivot of the universe. The Himalayan shrines are still the goal of every Hindu pilgrim.

These references to the Himalayas continue down the centuries, and show that the inhabitants of India had a first-hand knowledge of this region. The Mahabharata, written sometime after 400 B.C., states that all the rulers of India took part in the war. The list of kingdoms may not establish the historical fact of their participation in the war, but it is adequate evidence of geographical knowledge.
It has even been held that the Pandavas—‘pale-face’—belonged to a yellow-tinted, Himalayan, non-Aryan tribe which practised polyandry. The Panancha-Sudani says that one branch of the Kuru lived in the trans-Himalayan region known as Uttara-Kuru. In the days of Aitareya Brahmana and the Mahabharata some of the Kuru were still living beyond the Himalayas. The unity of this whole Himalayan region during this period is shown by the statement in the Sabhaparva of the Mahabharata, that Arjuna, on one of his campaigns, returned from Pragjyotisha (Assam) to Uluka (in northern Punjab), through the inner, outer, and adjacent belts of the Himalayas. In fact, Pragjyotisha was a name transplanted from the eastern Punjab to Assam. Arjuna is also stated to have defeated the people living around lake Manasarowar. The Himalayas became a symbol of steadfastness and dignity. The Bhagavat Gita, describing the perfection of the Almighty, states that of immovable things he is the Himalaya—स्थावराणां हिमालय

sthāvāranām himalaya. The Ramayana, probably of about the same date as the Mahabharata, compares the steadfastness of Rama to the Himalayas—स्थायियं हिमालिनिः शाहिर्येन himavaniva. It also says that king Amurtaraja founded the city of Pragjyotisha, and his grandson Viswamitra practised tapas upon the banks of the Kausiki, flowing through the Himalayas in the north-west part of the Pragjyotisha region.

After the period of the Epics, we are on firmer historical ground. It is highly probable that both Gautama the Buddha and Mahavira belonged to the Himalayan tribes. The empire of Chandragupta Maurya, towards the end of the 4th century B.C., comprised the whole of India north of the Narbada, as well as Afghanistan. Kautilya’s Arthasastra refers to the worship of mountains, and looks on the Himalayas as divine mountains. The distribution of Asoka’s inscriptions shows that his empire included Afghanistan, Baluchistan, Nepal, and the whole of India except Assam up to Mysore and Madras. Inscriptions have been found near Kalsi, in the northern part of Dehra Dun district, and at Lalitapatan in the Nepal valley. Further evidence of the inclusion of the Himalayan terrain in Asoka’s empire is provided by Rock Edict XIII, which refers to the Nabhapamitś of Nabhaka, probably identical with Na-pei-hra, referred to by the Chinese pilgrim Fa-Hien early in the 5th century A.D. as being located near Kapilavastu.

The next great development in Indian history was the establishment of the Kushan Empire in north-west India in the first century A.D. These rulers belonged to the Yueh-chi tribe of nomads in Central Asia. But they were neither Tibetans nor Chinese; the description we have of them is that of large pink-faced men, who came under Hindu and Buddhist influence. One of the later rulers was called Vasudeva, a Hindu name. In fact Kadphises II came into collision with the Chinese who were now for the first time entering into relations with Central and West Asia. Kadphises was defeated by the Chinese, but his successor Kanishka avenged this defeat; and a Chinese prince is reported to have lived in Kanishka’s court as a hostage. At its height the Kushan empire included the Central Asian provinces of Kashgar, Yarkand and Khotan, and extended to the borders of Parthia and Persia. But it was essentially
an Indian empire, in that Indian influences percolated into these provinces, while Central Asian influences on India were superficial. The Kharoshti records discovered in what is now Chinese Turkestan bear traces of Indian names like Krishnasena and Indian titles like Devaputra. The Kharoshti script and the Prakrit language were introduced. Even the Sassanians of the third century A.D. regarded Bactriana as virtually an Indian kingdom and the Oxus as a river of the Buddhists and the Brahmins. Kanishka was a Buddhist, and Buddhist texts as well as a large number of other Kushan documents have been found in numerous places in Central Asia where Indian colonies had flourished. During the days of the Kushan empire, which straddled the mountains which now form India's northern boundary, India's political and cultural influence swept deep into China.

If, however, the Kushans were of foreign stock who became, if we may use the phrase, 'naturalised' Indians, the Guptas, who ruled the greater part of India from about 320 to 647 A.D., were of Indian stock. Samudragupta, the second of the line, thoroughly subdued the princes in the northern plains, and the boundary of his empire ran along the Himalayas. On his coins appears the figure of the goddess Haimavati. Kamarupa (Assam), Nepal, and Kartripura (Kumaon and Garhwal) are said to have been tributary kingdoms situated on the frontiers of his dominions. The literature of the period shows that the Himalayas were a part of India, and the people were familiar with it. Kalidasa in the Raghuvamsa says that Raghu conquered areas to the north of the Himalayas, from Hemakuta (Kailas) to Kamarupa, thereby suggesting that this Indian kingdom (which is now Assam) stretched even beyond the Himalayas. His Kumarasambhava opens with a verse in which the Himalayas are referred to as a measuring-rod spanning the whole land from the east to the western sea—a metaphor suggesting that the culture developed in the Himalayan regions could serve as the measuring-rod of the cultures of the world.

अष्टुत्तरस्य विष्णु देवता हिमालयः नाम नगाभिराजः।
पूवानिरी तोवंतरी वगाशः रिख्त: पृथिब्य: इत्व मानदशः॥

asty uttarasyam disi devatatma
himalayo nama nagadhirajah
purvaparah toyanidhi vagahya
sthitah prthivyav iva manadandah

The Himalayas are said by him to be the source of precious gems and medicinal herbs. His graphic descriptions of the Himalayan scenes read like those of one who has first-hand knowledge of this region. Another drama, written perhaps by a younger contemporary of Kalidasa, the Mudrarakshasa, states that the empire of Chandragupta II Vikramaditya extended from the Himalayas to the southern ocean.

The Gupta empire was finally destroyed by the Huna invaders from Central Asia, but their power was in turn broken by
Yashodharman, king of Malwa, in about 530 A.D. The Mandasor pillar inscription says that his authority was acknowledged over the vast area bounded by the Himalayas in the north, the Mahendra mountains in the south, the Brahmaputra in the east and the ocean in the west. Harsha, who became king of Kanauj in 606 A.D., also established a vast empire in northern India. Banabhatta says that he exacted tribute from “an inaccessible land of snowy mountains”—obviously some Himalayan state. At the assembly he organized at Kanauj in honour of the Chinese pilgrim Hieun Tsang, one of the tributary kings present was the king of Kamarupa. Hieun Tsang has given an account of all the Indian kingdoms through which he passed. Immediately south of the Hindu Kush mountains was Kapisa, ruled by a Kshatriya king. East of the Sindhu, the first important state was Kashmir. It consisted not only of what is now Kashmir but also a considerable part of the Punjab. East of the Yamuna lay the kingdoms of Mo-li-pa-lo, Suvarnagotra, Nepal and Kamarupa. Mo-li-pa-lo is Mar-po, the actual name of Ladakh. Suvarnagotra was a state in the Himalayas which was said to be ruled by women.

After Harsha, a Tibetan king, Sron-btran-sgam-po, annexed Nepal, defeated the usurper who had occupied Harsha’s throne, and occupied Tirhut. But this Tibetan occupation of Indian territory was short-lived. In 731 Yasovarman, one of the later rulers of Kanauj, sent an embassy to China, probably to seek the assistance of the Emperor of China against his enemies in India. But nothing came of this mission, and Yasovarman was defeated by the king of Kashmir, Lalitaditya Muktapida.

Tibetan and Chinese influences, in fact, never gained a permanent footing on the Indian side of the Himalayas throughout the centuries of Hindu rule in India. The Himalayan regions often changed hands, but it was almost always between Indian rulers. Only once—and that too for a very short period—did a part of this territory come under Tibetan sway. Ladakh was an Indian state, and its kings traced their descent from the Sakya family. Spiti was ruled by Hindu rajas who bore the surname or suffix of Senas. In the possession of the Parasuram temple at Nirmand is a copper-plate deed, probably of the 7th century A.D., granted by Raja Samudra Sena. The Kulantapitha Mahatmya mentions two Rajas of Spiti by name, belonging to the 7th century. They too have the suffix of Sena. Garhwal seems to have been, in the later period, part of the kingdom of Brahmapura. The earliest dynasty of which records exist is that of the Katyuris. Hieun Tsang wrote that in Kamarupa (Assam) the chief ruler was a Hindu, Bhaskaravarman, who claimed to be a Kshatriya. That this kingdom was a large one which included most of what is now the North-East Frontier Agency is established by evidence derived from various sources. Ptolemy, the Egyptian geographer who wrote in the 2nd century A.D., describing “India beyond the Ganges”, refers to the Dobassa mountains, which are the eastern extremity of the Himalayas. In the Kalika Purana it is said that the Kamakhya temple (situated near what is now Gauhati) was in the centre of Kamarupa; and it is added in the Vishnu Purana that the kingdom extended round this temple in all directions for 100 yojana or about 450 miles. Even allowing for

---

1. It may be mentioned, as a matter of curiosity, that according to Tibetan medieval chronicles, the founder of the Tibetan royal dynasty was the son of an Indian king.
exaggeration, this would include the whole of present Assam, East Bengal and even Bhutan. This is borne out by Hieun Tsang, who estimated the territory of Kamarupa as being 10,000 li, or an area with a circumference of 1667 miles.

It was indeed, from the north-west and not from the north that India was successfully invaded. The Moslem conquest of India was really begun in the last quarter of the twelfth century by Mohammad Ghuri. For the next five hundred years, various Moslem rulers established their authority right up to the Himalayas. In fact, the northern boundary of India dwindled in significance, attention being centred more on the north-west. Two Moslem rulers tried to conquer Tibet and push their frontier beyond the Himalayas. In 1205, Muhammad bin Bakhtiyar crossed into Tibet via Assam with a large army. He is said to have reached “the open country of Tibbat”, but thereafter he was obliged to retreat, and on his way back was routed by the King of Kamarupa. In 1325, Muhammad Tughlak sent another expedition, but this one perished in the Himalayan passes. The disastrous results of these two efforts served to limit the territorial ambitions of Indian rulers to the Himalayas. To the Moguls, these mountains were a natural barrier imposed by God, to be watched carefully but not to be crossed. But they extended their authority up to them. Babar’s authority was that of a pioneer and, therefore, rootless; and the rule of Humayun, who for a time even lost his throne, was always weak. But Akbar had by 1576 consolidated Mogul authority in these Himalayan areas. Thevenot, a French traveller who visited India in 1666, wrote that the province of “Ayoud or Haoud” contained “the most northern countries that belong to the Great Mogul”. Ayoud and Haoud have been interpreted by Cunningham as corrupt forms of Himavat, which the Greeks called Emudos and Imaus. This seems the correct interpretation, and not that “Ayoud” is Oudh, for Thevenot mentions certain areas as being part of Ayoud which we know were not in Oudh. But even if the latter interpretation is accepted, it does not nullify the conclusion that the Mogul empire in this region extended up to the Himalayas, for the Ain-i-Akbari says that the northern boundary of Oudh province was the mountains. Military officers called faujdars were stationed all along the Himalayan border to keep the turbulent hill chiefs under control and to collect tribute from them.

More varied was the history in this period of the areas at the two extremities of the northern frontier—Kashmir and Assam. They were both parts of India, and there were clearly contacts between them. The Rajatarangini, the Kashmir chronicle of the 12th century, mentions that Samdhimat and Lalitaditya Muktapida visited Kamarupa. But the Moslem rulers did not find it as easy to subdue these two areas as they had found the rest of northern India. In 1586, Akbar annexed Kashmir, but Ladakh remained independent. In 1640, she went to war with Tibet and acquired the whole of Ngari Khorsum (south-western Tibet) including Mount Kailas and Lake Manasarowar. But a few years later, the fortunes of war swung the other way, and Ladakh was forced in 1664 to accept the suzerainty of the Mogul and seek his military assistance. Emperor Aurangzeb sent an Army which defeated the Tibetans, but when the Mogul army retired, the Tibetans returned and imposed terms on King Delegs Namgyal. He seems to have surrendered Spiti, which had by this
time become part of Ladakh, but promptly received it back as part of the dowry on marrying the Tibetan commander's daughter. Ngari Khorsum was returned to Tibet, but the village of Minsar was retained. From about 1690, the gyalpos or chiefs of Ladakh began to pay tribute to the governors of Kashmir.

In Assam, the Hindu kings—the Varman, the Salastambha and the Pala dynasties—found themselves, from the eighth century onwards, under the pressure of the Ahoms, a branch of the Shan tribe. Finally, in 1228, the kingdom came under the rule of Chukupha, who is said to have been the first to assume for himself and his people the name of Ahom—"the peerless"—and to have given this name, now softened to Assam, to the country. The new rulers successfully resisted Muslem efforts to subdue them. In 1554, the Ahom ruler adopted the Hindu religion and changed his name, Chatamba, to Jaiyadhaja Singh. From then onwards, the Ahom kings always took Hindu names; and the Ahom Shans, adopting the language and customs as well as the religion of the conquered people, became absorbed in the Hindu fold. Aurangzeb sought to conquer Assam; but though the Ahom raja surrendered in 1662, he regained his territory four years later.

In the 18th century, European Powers entered the Indian political scene, but as they moved in from the sea-coasts, they did not at the beginning affect the northern frontier regions of India. Though the Mogul empire was disintegrating, central and northern India remained in Indian hands. The central sector of the Himalayan range was the boundary of the kingdom of Oudh, while west of it sprouted small kingdoms, whose only visitors were pilgrims to Hindu shrines and whose chief article of commerce was ice for the courts. In 1801, Wellesley first thrust British influence into Oudh, and it gradually increased and culminated in annexation by Dalhousie in 1856. In the early years of the 19th century, the Gurkhas of Nepal had occupied Garhwal and the neighbouring hill states, and turning their attention to the plains came into clash with the British. War dragged on for three years, from 1813 to 1816, till the Gurkhas were finally defeated; and by the Treaty of Sagauli, the Raja of Nepal recognized British sovereignty over these border areas. In the Punjab, Ranjit Singh had set up a strong Sikh kingdom. In 1818-19, he occupied Kashmir; and between 1834 and 1841, Ladakh was conquered by Gulab Singh of Jammu, then a feudatory of the Sikhs, and annexed to his kingdom. In 1841, one of Gulab Singh's generals invaded western Tibet. He was defeated and expelled, but when the Tibetans, with the aid of the Chinese, advanced to Leh, they were in their turn driven back. A peace treaty was signed in 1842. Four years later, Kashmir came under the suzerainty of the British. Gulab Singh was recognized as the Maharaja of the whole area, including Ladakh; but some months later, Spiti was taken over by the British in exchange for certain other territory, and added to Kulu district. The Punjab itself was finally annexed by the British in 1849.

Assam was annexed in 1838. But in the north, east and south, there were numerous tribes over whom the Ahom rulers had gradually lost control. The British policy was one of acquiring loose political control over these areas, with the minimum of interference compatible with the protection of these tribesmen and restraining them from raiding either Indian or Chinese territory. Administration
had gradually to be pushed up into these regions, and the frontier between Assam and Tibet ascertained. This was not just a question of political division. The tribesmen in the north—the Monbas, Akas, Daflas, Miris, Abors and Mishmis—were ethnically different from the Tibetans. Towang inhabited by the Monbas had been part of India for centuries and Tibetan influence had grown in it only since the early years of the nineteenth century.

The leaders of the Aka tribes bound themselves in 1842 and 1844, in return for stipends, to maintain the peace. Over forty years later, in 1883, they raided a forest office, and a military expedition was despatched against them. They, however, only surrendered in 1888, and signed an Agreement under which their stipends were to be restored after a probation of two years. Thereafter, they kept the peace, and when Nevill visited the area in the winter of 1913-14, he found the rajas and people friendly. “The most excellent relations,” he reported, “were established with the Akas. I believe this friendliness will be permanent”. But less amenable from the start were the Daflas. Though they agreed informally in 1835, 1937 and 1852 to curb their raiding activities, they did not desist from attacking their fellow-tribesmen living on the plains. In 1874-75, the British sent a military force into the hills. There were no disturbances after that, but nor was there any cordiality towards the British. When Nevill’s mission visited the area in 1913, it was ill-received and he even opened fire on one occasion.

With the Miris and Abors, two tribes in close relation with each other, the British were at first on friendly terms. But there was a conflict in 1848 and a serious raid ten years later; and a British military expedition into the hills was turned back. A second expedition was sent the next year and the Abors overawed into submission. Three treaties were signed between November 1862 and January 1863, and a fourth in 1866, with various branches of the tribe. One curious feature of the agreements with the Abors was that the stipends were to be in kind, of articles such as hoes and salt which could be distributed among the whole community. It was in a sense a recognition of the democratic nature of the Abor system of government. In 1893 they attacked an outpost, and in consequence an expedition was sent. It was by no means a success. The Abors were never really subdued, and in March 1911, an Assistant Political Officer who ventured into the area was murdered. Once more an expedition was sent to punish the Abors and exact reparation, and advantage was taken of the occasion to ascertain the frontier with Tibet.

In the north-eastern corner of India lived the Mishmi tribes. The British concluded no written engagements with them, and despite numerous raids for long took no stricter measures than occasional blockades. In 1899, what Lord Curzon termed a “miniature army” was sent, but with little result. In 1910, it was learnt that the Chinese had occupied Rima in Tibet, entered the Delei valley in Mishmi country and planted their flag at Menilkrai also in Mishmi territory. The Assam Government, therefore, recommended that the Mishmis should be brought definitely under British control. A friendly Mission was sent in 1911, and as Tibetan settlements and
influence were discovered round Walong, road-building was commenced and British administration carried into this area.

The British, therefore, took nearly seventy-five years to secure all the territory that had been formerly parts of Assam. But by 1912-13, the administration of this northern region of Assam had been established sufficiently to necessitate the formation of two large units, the Sadiya and Balipara Frontier Tracts. Sufficient information about the frontier had also been acquired to enable the definite delineation of the Assam-Tibet boundary. Throughout the tribal areas, whatever the difficulties of the British administrators, normally their problems were not complicated by the presence of Tibetan influence and control.

Indeed, this broad survey of the frontier areas from the earliest days down to modern times shows that India's present northern frontier is along its whole stretch the historic frontier. Few, if any, land frontiers in the world can claim as strong a sanction of long and unbroken tradition

Historical Division
Ministry of External Affairs.
2. The precise nature of the Chinese claim to Indian territory has not been stated by Chinese authorities and is not known to the Government of India. In the Chinese maps some parts of Indian territory have been shown as part of China. These areas are roughly indicated by standing lines in this map and the southern border of these areas as they appear in Chinese maps has been shown by a broken line.

2. The places on the traditional indo-Chinese border whose status have not been clearly marked in the map. So in the road built by China across Aksai Chin in Ladakh in North West India.
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Memorandum given to the Indian Ambassador in Peking by the Chinese Vice-Minister Chang Han-fu, 12 November 1959

The Chinese Government has now received a report from the Sinkiang frontier guards that the Chinese frontier guards are prepared, at a time between November 13 and 15, and at a point on the track on the southern bank of the Changchenmo River and three hundred meters to the east of the Silung Barma River (approximately 78°59'30" E, 34°18'15" N), to deliver the three armed Indian personnel detained on October 20, the seven Indian soldiers captured on October 21 and the bodies of nine Indian soldiers to the personnel to be despatched by the Indian side for the taking over. The arms and ammunition of the Indian troops which were captured by the Chinese frontier guards will also be returned at the same time.

The Chinese Government agrees to the proposal made in the Indian Embassy's memorandum of October 27 that three Indian police officers, twenty Indian constables and twenty porters come, with twenty transport ponies and carrying a white flag, to take back the Indian captured personnel and the bodies of the Indian soldiers, and also agrees that they carry with them a small number of rifles for self-protection. In order that the handing-over may proceed smoothly, the representatives of the Chinese frontier guards are prepared to meet the representatives of the Indian side (no more than ten persons including the staff) at 11.00 hours Peking time on November 13 at the above-mentioned spot to consult first on the specific time and method for the handing-over. The representatives of the Chinese frontier guards will be led by Captain Liu Shao-tsi. If, for technical reasons, the representatives of the two sides should fail to meet at the above-mentioned appointed time, the time can be postponed to 11.00 hours Peking time on November 14, or to 11.00 hours on November 15. After the meeting between the representatives of the two sides, all the Indian captured personnel, bodies of Indian soldiers and arms and ammunition can be delivered to the Indian personnel who are to take them over on the same date.

It is requested that the above be transmitted to the Indian Government at once.
Memorandum given to the Indian Ambassador in Peking by Vice-Minister Chang Han-fu, 14 November 1959

The following are the main facts about the border incident of October 20 and 21 in the area south of Kongka Pass as admitted by the Deputy Commander of the Indian force Karam Singh and the other eight Indian soldiers, Mohd Khalil, Sonam Dorje, Rulia Ram, Sring Nalbu, Gur Bahadur, Abdul Majit, Rudar Ban, Shiv Diyal who were detained or captured in the incident. These main points fully confirm the account of this border incident given by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs in its memorandum of October 22, its note of October 24 and its statement of October 26.

1. The Indian military personnel involved belonged to the Indian Tibet Boundary Force under the Indian Ministry of Home Affairs. They were led by Commander S. P. Tyagi and Deputy Commander Karam Singh. They started from Leh towards the end of September for Tsogstsalu, Kiam and Shamal Lungpa to the northeast of Kongka Pass, to set up check-posts there, and arrived at Kiam on October 19. They had never been to the place before where the present clash occurred south of Kongka Pass.

2. On October 20, Mohd Khalil, Sonam Dorje and a guide called Chadan were sent from Kiam to the area south of Kongka Pass. Khalil and Dorje were each issued a rifle, 10 rounds and a field-glass. They admitted that they were sent for the purpose of reconnoitring the conditions of Chinese troops within Chinese territory. At 13.00 hours that afternoon, they were discovered by 3 patrolling Chinese frontier guards. The Chinese frontier guards shouted to them and waved to them to go away. The Indians failed to do so, and were then detained.

3. On October 21, Tyagi and Karam Singh took more than 60 Indian troops to the area south of Kongka Pass to search for the three missing armed Indian personnel. Before starting, Tyagi expressed he had a mind to fight against Chinese troops. The Indian military personnel carried with them four bren guns and about 50 rifles, as well as two or three sten guns and 25 hand grenades.

4. When the Indian military personnel approached a hill in the area south of Kongka Pass, they discovered six Chinese soldiers on the hill. Tyagi ordered Karam Singh to take 30 men with him to the back of the hill and himself proceeded in front with 30 men to surround and capture the Chinese soldiers. They saw one or two Chinese soldiers waving their hands for them to go away. Instead of going away, they pressed forward.

5. Then Indian soldier Ali Raza fired first. Another Indian soldier Manohar Lal caught a horse of the Chinese frontier guards. Thereafter, fire was exchanged.
6. The Chinese soldiers were equipped with no mortar and other artillery. They were armed with rifles, tommy guns, light machine guns and hand grenades.

7. The 9 Indian military personnel were killed while they were attacking uphill.

8. The detained and captured Indian military personnel admitted that they had been given good treatment by the Chinese officers and soldiers during their detention.
The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the note which the Ministry handed to the Embassy on November 4, 1959, in regard to the incident in the Chang Chenmo Valley. A first-hand account of the incident, received from the second in command of the Indian police patrol party, was attached to that note. The Government of India have since received further accounts of the incident from the Indian personnel who had been captured by the Chinese forces on October 20 and 21 and released after several reminders on November 14. These accounts corroborate the earlier reports which had been given by the members of the Indian police patrol party who had returned to the base after the clash.

2. The Government of India would also like to refer to a constable named Makhan Lal who remains still unaccounted for. According to the statement of Shri Karam Singh, he and constable Rudra Man were made by the Chinese forces after the clash on October 21 to carry Makhan Lal, who had sustained injuries, for a distance of 2 miles. They were then made to leave behind Makhan Lal on a river bank. What happened subsequently to him is not known to any of the released personnel. The Government of India would like to have any further information which the Chinese authorities might have about Makhan Lal.

3. The Government of India are surprised and shocked to hear of the treatment to which the Indian prisoners were subjected by their captors. The prisoners were kept in torn tents in bitterly cold weather and without any bedding for four days. As a result of this, the leader of the party, Shri Karam Singh, and three constables were severely frost-bitten. One of the prisoners, Constable Abdul Majid, who had a bullet wound on his back, received no medical attention until the fourth day. Besides, the prisoners were subjected to continuous interrogation from the time of their arrest till the time of their release. They were asked under threats and pressure to make statements to the effect that the Indian party had gone forward knowingly into Chinese territory and that they had sent two constables and a porter the previous day to carry out espionage there. The Government of India have no knowledge of the statements which the prisoners are supposed to have made to the Chinese authorities, but, obviously, statements made under such circumstances cannot be regarded as voluntary.

4. The Government of India protest strongly against the deplorable treatment to which the Indian personnel were subjected while in Chinese custody. Under Article 17 of the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949, relating to the treatment of prisoners of war, a prisoner of war is only bound to give his surname, first names and rank, date of birth and army regimental, personal or serial number, or failing this, equivalent information. No physical or mental torture, nor any other form of coercion, may
be inflicted on prisoners of war to secure from them information of any kind whatever. Prisoners of war who refuse to answer may not be threatened, insulted or exposed to unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind. Whether or not the Geneva Convention applies to the Indian personnel taken prisoners by the Chinese forces on October 21, it is obvious that they should not have been subjected to treatment worse than to which prisoners of war are entitled. It is most regrettable that the Chinese authorities should have subjected the Indian prisoners to interrogation, threats and harsh treatment in order to compel them to make statements desired by their captors.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Memorandum given to the Indian Ambassador in Peking by the Chinese Vice-Foreign Minister, 28 November 1959

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China, and, with reference to the note delivered on November 24, 1959 to the Chinese Embassy in India by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, has the honour to reply as follows:

In its memorandum of October 22, its note of October 24 and its statement of October 26, the Chinese Government gave detailed and incontestably correct accounts of the border incident which occurred at the Kongka Pass on October 20 and 21, 1959. The facts admitted by the captured Indian military personnel are in agreement with the accounts given by the Chinese Government. On November 14, the Chinese Government handed over to the Indian Embassy in China a written material setting out the facts admitted by the captured Indian military personnel and drew the attention of the Indian Government to it. It is proved by the material that the report of the Second-in-Command of the Indian police patrol party attached to the Indian Government's note of November 4 is completely inconsistent with the facts.

Out of traditional Sino-Indian friendship and humanitarian considerations, the Chinese Government on the third day after the Kongka Pass incident already took the initiative in notifying the Indian Government that it was prepared to let the Indian side take back the captured Indian military personnel and the bodies of the Indian soldiers. The Chinese Government is gratified that they were handed over to the Indian side smoothly on November 14. However, the Chinese Government cannot but be surprised that, at a time when the Kongka Pass incident is drawing to a close and the two governments are actively exploring avenues to eliminate border clashes, the Indian Government should create a side issue by levelling a groundless charge and even lodging a protest against the Chinese Government on the pretext of so-called "deplorable treatment" of the captured Indian personnel. The Chinese Government categorically rejects this protest of the Indian Government.

Throughout the period of their custody, the Indian military personnel were given friendly and generous treatment by the Chinese frontier guards. The Kongka Pass area was difficult of access and hard to get supplies, yet the Chinese frontier guards did their utmost to look after them in various ways. A few of the captured Indian personnel got frost-bitten. That was because their own outfits were very thin. As soon as the Chinese frontier guards obtained supplies, they issued to them cotton-padded suits, felt boots, beddings and articles of daily use, and gave them necessary medical treatment. In respect of board and lodging, they were treated in no way inferior to the Chinese frontier guards themselves. They were quartered in warm underground rooms or in complete new tents. The assertion that they were kept in torn tents is a pure fabrication. The Indian Government's statement in its note that Abdul Majid had a bullet wound in his back and went
without medical attention for four days is also inconsistent with the facts. Majid never indicated that he was wounded or ill. As a matter of fact, his movements showed that he was whole and sound. The captured Indian military personnel all expressed more than once during the period of their custody that they were well treated. When they were handed over to the Indian side to be taken back, they all expressed warm thanks.

It is normal that the Chinese frontier guards conducted necessary interrogation of the captured Indian personnel to make clear the facts about the armed Indian personnel’s trespass and provocation, as this was their duty. The captured Indian personnel were finally interrogated once again; this was only because there were important discrepancies between the report attached to the Indian Government’s note of November 4 received by the Chinese Government and the facts as told by the captured personnel, and it was necessary to check it up with them. It is also merely for this reason that their handing back was postponed several days. The interrogations of them by the Chinese frontier guards were always made in a free and unrestrained atmosphere; so-called pressure or threats was completely out of the question. The Indian Government’s allegation in its note that the Chinese frontier guards subjected the captured personnel to threats and pressure in the interrogations and gave them harsh treatment is an utterly unwarranted charge.

The Indian Government in its note expressed the hope of receiving any information which the Chinese side might have about an Indian military personnel who was unaccounted for. On November 13 when the representatives of the frontier guards of the two sides discussed on the border at the Kongka Pass the concrete steps of handing over the captured Indian military personnel and the bodies, the Indian representative also made the request that the Chinese frontier guards search for the body of that Indian military personnel for the Indian side. The Chinese representative agreed then to make a further search. The Chinese frontier guards made an active search at and about the spot of the incident but still found nothing. It could be affirmed that this Indian military personnel was not on Chinese territory. The following day, the Chinese representative informed the Indian representative of the result of the search, and expressed the hope that the Indian side might search on its own territory. The Indian representative agreed to this.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 December 1959

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the note of the 28th November presented by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to the Ambassador of India in Peking. The Government of India have now received full details from the released Indian police personnel as to the incident at Kongka Pass and the subsequent treatment to which the Indian personnel were subjected while in Chinese custody. These details confirm the account of the incident contained in the earlier notes. The statements of the released prisoners entirely contradict the assertion in the Chinese note that the Indian personnel were given friendly and generous treatment by the Chinese frontier guards. On the contrary the treatment which the Indian prisoners received was most harsh and inhuman and opposed to all canons of civilised behaviour. A text of the statement made by Shri Karam Singh, who was the leader of the Indian police party, is attached to this note. This statement is corroborated in substance by other members of the Indian party.

2. It will be seen from Shri Karam Singh's statement that the Indian prisoners were denied adequate food and shelter. It also appears that Shri Karam Singh was subjected to interrogation on 12 days for a total period of nearly 70 hours. Under threats and prolonged interrogation, he was made to subscribe to certain statements which his captors wanted him to make. He was further made to repeat similar statements on subsequent occasions so that these statements could be tape-recorded. Attempts were made by the Chinese frontier guards to re-enact the incident at Kongka Pass with the forced participation of the Indian prisoners with a view to taking photographs which could be used presumably as evidence in support of the Chinese version of the incident. Similarly, photographs of the prisoners arranged in various poses were taken presumably to show that the prisoners enjoyed certain facilities and amenities while in Chinese custody. The Government of India must state that no credence whatsoever can be given to any statement made by Shri Karam Singh or any other Indian prisoner in these circumstances. The certificates of good treatment which the prisoners might have given their captors at the time of release are equally valueless.

3. The Government of India are also surprised at the statement in the Chinese Government's note that Constable Abdul Majid was "whole and sound" and "never indicated that he was ill". In fact, Constable Abdul Majid received a bullet injury in the encounter and even now he has a splinter in his back. No medical attention was given to him for the first few days, and terrified at the treatment to which the arrested personnel were being subjected, he did not ask for medical care.

4. The note of the Chinese Government suggests that they are unaware of the whereabouts of Constable Makhan Lal, who still remains unaccounted
for. It will be seen from the statement of Shri Karam Singh that Constable Makhan Lal had received an abdominal injury and was helped by him and Constable Rudra Man to walk a distance of nearly two miles. He was then left by the Chang Chenmo river in the custody of two Chinese soldiers as ordered by the Chinese escort. It is extraordinary that the Chinese authorities should now profess ignorance as to the whereabouts of Constable Makhan Lal. The Government of India would request that enquiry be made of the Chinese frontier guards once again as to the circumstances in which Constable Makhan Lal was left behind on the Chang Chenmo River on the 21st October and what happened to him subsequently.

5. The Government of India once again record their emphatic protest against the deplorable treatment to which the Indian personnel were subjected while in the custody of the Chinese soldiers. This treatment which the Indian personnel received was much worse than that to which even prisoners of war are entitled under the Geneva Convention of 12th August, 1949. It is obvious that the reports which the Chinese Government have received from their frontier guard, both about the incident and about the subsequent treatment of the Indian personnel, are entirely unrelated to facts. The Government of India would urge that adequate action be taken against the persons responsible for subjecting the helpless Indian prisoners to such inhuman treatment.

The Ministry of External Affairs take the opportunity of extending to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Statement of Shri Karam Singh

I reached Hot Springs on the 19th October, 1959. On the 20th morning, two parties of two constables each and the third of two constables and a porter were sent out to reconnoitre the area. Two parties returned but the third one, consisting of Constables Khalil and Sonam Dorje and Porter Chettan failed to do so. The same evening search parties were sent out to look for them but they returned without any success.

2. Next morning (21st October 1959), I decided to go out and search for the men myself. Shri Tyagi also accompanied me. We left with a party of about 20 men, including a section and some personnel of the ITB Force. We left instructions for the main party to follow on foot.

3. After I had gone about five miles to the east of Hot Springs, I noticed hoof marks which appeared to be those of the Chinese horses. We followed these hoof prints for a few hundred yards. We also observed the area through binoculars but we noticed nothing of special interest. After the main party had joined us, we advanced further into the plain which was over-looked by a hill. The hoof prints appeared to be running along the right of this hill. I, therefore, decided that I would, with about 20 men, follow them to find out whether there were any Chinese introducers in the vicinity. I told Tyagi to wait with the main party until I returned and to keep a look out for any signs of the Chinese; if he saw any, he was to demand the return of our missing members and to ask them to leave Indian territory.

4. I, along with Jemadar Rulia Ram, Head Constable Man Singh, Head Constable Babu Wadkar and Constables Abdul Majid, Gur Bahadur, etc., followed the hoof prints which went along a track skirting the hill on our left. As we did not apprehend any danger, we were not marching in any order but were moving in twos and threes. I was not even carrying a weapon. When I had covered about six to seven hundred yards, and had almost passed the hill on the left, one of my constables noticed some movement in front along a nullah and shouted "Chini, Chini". I looked at all sides but before I could spot anything in front, I noticed on my left a Chinese soldier on the hill shouting something and waving his hands upwards as if he was asking us to raise our hands and surrender. I shouted back at the top of my voice that it was our area. Instead of receiving any answer, we were fired upon both from the front as well as from the hill top. We were taken by complete surprise and so all the members of the party made for such cover as was available and returned the fire. Some retreated towards the hill on the right. Jemadar Rulia Ram, Constables Abdul Majid, Ali Raza, Gur Bahadur, Beg Raj and Norbu Lama ran with me and we took shelter behind a mound. Some of the others ran towards the hill on the left but were struck down with bullets and hand-grenades. Our firing was ineffective as we had inadequate cover and the Chinese were in a favourable position. After some time I ordered those who were near me to discontinue firing as their firing was having no effect and the ammunition was being wasted.
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5. The Chinese continued to fire on us almost incessantly. We could also hear firing on the other side of the hill. Constable Ali Raza made a bid to get away in the afternoon and although he was fired upon, was able to escape. The Chinese used LMGs, rifles, tommy guns and hand-grenades. At about 5 P.M., firing from the front increased in intensity and a few bren-gun bursts were fired at us from our right and Constables Beg Raj and Norbu Lama were killed. Realising the overwhelming superiority in numbers of the Chinese soldiers and their fire power, I thought that it was futile to resist any further and, therefore, decided to surrender. We raised a white handkerchief after which the Chinese stopped firing and asked us to drop our weapons and advance towards them with our hands raised. I, accompanied by Jemadar Rulia Ram, Constables Abdul Majid and Gur Bahadur surrendered to the Chinese. Later, Constables Shiv Dayal, Rudra Man and Tsering Norbu, who were apparently lying concealed elsewhere, also surrendered and we were all herded together.

6. When we were being searched etc., I looked around and I thought there were about 30 Chinese soldiers in position on the hill. The soldiers that were on the side of the nullah were no longer visible to me. After our search, we were sent to Kongka Pass with an escort of 11 Chinese soldiers.

7. From the place of the encounter, five of us were made to carry the dead body of a Chinese soldier who had been killed. Constable Rudra Man and I were asked to help Constable Makhan Lal, who had been injured seriously in the abdomen. His condition was really very bad. We carried him for two miles, where the Chinese soldiers ordered us to leave him on the bank of the Chang Chenmo river. Two of the Chinese soldiers stayed back near Makhan Lal and nine escorted us to our destination. From this place, I and Constable Rudra Man were made to carry heavy loads. We were completely exhausted and were finding it extremely difficult to walk with this heavy load but we were repeatedly prodded by rifle butts to move on. We reached the Chinese Kongka La Post (above 16,000 ft.) at about 2 A.M. on the 22nd of October, 1959. We were all put together in a pit, 6 feet deep, 7 feet wide and 15 feet long, normally used for storing vegetables. It was covered with a tarpaulin which left several openings through which ice-cold breeze penetrated. We had to spend the night on the frozen ground without any covering. No water for drinking was provided nor were we permitted to ease ourselves during the night and the following day. The sentries adopted a menacing attitude.

8. On the morning of October 23rd, all of us were taken out of the pit for the first time and taken to a place about two miles towards Lanak La. We remained there the whole day and returned to the pit at night. We do not know why we were kept away from the camp that day. During the day, I was merely asked through an interpreter to write out the names of the captured persons but I expressed my inability to do so for want of spectacles. I told the Chinese officer to take down the names, which he did.

9. On the evening of 24th, I was again taken out in a truck to a distance of about one mile, where the dead bodies had been laid out and I was asked to identify them. As I could not identify all of them, I suggested that some Constables may be called to help me in identification. They brought me to the camp and asked me to select a couple of constables. We went back along with two constables—Shiv Dayal and Gur Bahadur—and identified the bodies. After this, we rejoined the others in the pit.
10. For the first 3/4 days, we were given only dry bread to eat. The intensity of the cold and our conditions of living were more than sufficient torture to demoralise us. By then I and 3 constables were suffering from frost bite and our repeated requests for medical attention and hot water were disregarded.

11. At about 4 A.M. on the 25th of October, 1959, I was called by two Chinese officers and taken for interrogation. I was removed to a tent about 50 yards away, where 5 Chinese officers, including an interpreter, interrogated me. One of them, at the very outset, threatened that I was a P.O.W. and that I could be shot dead any moment. He also warned me that they did not want any arguments or discussions. They asked me to write out my statement, to which I pleaded my inability as I did not have my spectacles with me. At first, they asked me to narrate the entire incident. As soon as I came to the point that firing was opened by the Chinese, their senior officer present became wild and shouted back that it was incorrect, and that I must confess that the Indians fired first. I refused to accept this despite repeated and constant threats that I would be shot dead. Ultimately, they made me say that I could not judge at that time as to who fired first.

12. They asked me to admit that Indian soldiers seized Chinese horses, which were standing near the foot of the hill towards Chang Chenmo river. As I was on the other side of the hill, I told them that I had not seen anybody taking away the horses. Despite this, it was recorded that my men had disclosed to me that some Indian constables had taken away the Chinese horses.

13. Utmost pressure was used to extort from me that Tyagi and I knew beforehand that the place, where the incident took place, was within Chinese territory. I told them that I could not make that statement because that place was miles within Indian territory but they continued to assert that it was Chinese territory and was in Chinese occupation. In this connection, it was finally recorded that “I have now come to know that the area, where the encounter had taken place, is under Chinese occupation”.

14. The Chinese wanted me to acknowledge that no member of the ITB force had ever visited that particular area. I told them that only in June this year, an ITB patrol had gone up to Kongka Pass and stayed there for a day or so. They wanted to know if I myself had ever visited Kongka La and when I said that I had not, after a considerable discussion, they recorded—“I and my men (who were prisoners with me), had never visited this area”. I insisted that they should also write that I camped several times at Hot Springs and had toured the adjoining areas, but they did not agree to include this.

15. As regards the objective of our patrol, they wanted me to admit that we intruded into their territory to attack and capture the Chinese as well as to establish a checkpost. I stated that we had no such intention. In any case, it was our territory and the question of intrusion into the Chinese territory did not arise. On this assertion, they threatened me, but I stuck to the position that we were in Indian territory and were looking out for the missing men. They then said that when fire was opened on us Tyagi and the main party were on the left of the hill and were advancing
further in order to surround it. I told them that I could not see anything
on the other side of the hill, and, therefore, there was hardly any point in
obtaining a statement to this effect from me. As far as I remember, they
finally recorded that though Tyagi did not tell me anything, it might be that
it was his intention to send us from the right side and himself proceed on
the left side in order to surround the hill and capture the Chinese.

16. The Chinese were emphatic that I should admit that they had
gesticulated to us from the hill to go back. I told the senior Chinese officer,
through the interpreter, that my party was advancing in small groups follow-
ing the hoof marks and that the forward group with me had noticed some
Chinese in front. Whereas it was quite correct that for a moment I noticed
some gesticulations from a Chinese on the hill to my left, no time was given
by the Chinese soldiers, to understand and to respond to the gesticulations.
In fact, I had, at the top of my voice, shouted that it was our area. The
answer to this was firing from in front and the hill to the left and rear. The
Chinese officer lost his temper on this and said I was a cunning liar and
threatened to take out his pistol and shoot me. I tried to argue that if their
intention was to ask us to go back then they should also have allowed the
patrol party to return and not have captured them. I told them that, in
fact, the Chinese soldier was gesturing to us to raise our hands and sur-
render and that is why I had shouted back that it was my area to which
the reply was a hail of bullets. In the statement, the Chinese
recorded that one of the Chinese soldiers on the hill had given a signal
indicating that we should go back and not adopt a hostile attitude.

17. I was asked to admit that our action was against the spirit of
‘Panch Sheel’. I told them that it was they who had opened fire on us; it
was they who had violated the principles. Ultimately, they recorded ‘that
the incident was against the spirit of ‘Panch Sheel’’.

18. When they asked me my rank, I told them that I was a Deputy
Superintendent of Police and was the Second-in-Command of the ITB Force.
Shri Tyagi was the Commander of the ITB Force. I had already decided
to conceal the fact that I was the leader of the party to avoid interrogation
about the police and Army dispositions and I had warned those captured
with me to refer to me as the Deputy Commander. The total number of
men in the party that had left Hot Springs in the morning was about 60 and
this was recorded.

19. This interrogation lasted from 4 A.M. to about 4 P.M., with short
breaks for meals, etc. By this time, I was almost frozen and mentally and
physically exhausted because of cold, persistent interrogation, intimidation,
threats and angry shoutings, and lack of sleep. In this condition I was
compelled to sign the statement recorded by the Chinese. At the end of this
interrogation, the Chinese then brought all the other captured personnel
before me and read out the statement, sentence by sentence. I was asked
to translate each sentence in Hindustani. All the captured personnel were
asked to append their signatures on the back of the statement and several
photographs were taken.

20. After this interrogation, I was separated and put in a tent where
insufficient bedding was provided. The tent had a big opening at the top
round the central pole to act as a chimney but as there was no fire in my
tent, this hole made the tent unbearably cold.
21. My interrogation was continued in my tent on the 26th from 0730 hours to 1700 hours. I was also told that my interrogation would continue the next day and until it was concluded, I would not be provided with a proper bedding.

22. On this day I was made to sign the following statement, as far as I can remember:

“Tyagi returned after having a meeting with Mr. Sharma in New Delhi on the 22nd September, 1959. I returned from Srinagar on the 24th September, 1959. Tyagi informed me that a decision had been taken to establish checkposts at Tsogstsalu, Kayam (Hot Springs) and Shamul Lungpa. We left Leh for patrolling the border area and for establishing checkposts at these places. Tyagi left Leh on 27th September, 1959 while I started on the 29th September, 1959. Tyagi had about 40 men with him. Three constables accompanied me. I reached Phobrang on the 4th October. Tyagi arrived on the 5th of October, 1959. Tyagi started from Phobrang for Tsogstsalu on the 7th October. I left Phobrang on the 14th October and arrived at Tsogstsalu on the 16th October, 1959. A checkpost was established at Tsogstsalu however, I had to establish one at Shamul Lungpa. On 21st October, 1959, Tyagi took 60 men and reached the hill (battle field). When we were at a distance of about 400 yards from the hill, some Chinese were seen. Tyagi ordered me to take some men on the back side of the hill and to surround the Chinese and himself went in front. There were some 30 men with me and about the same number with Tyagi. We surrounded the hill. A Chinese was seen waving his hand so as to say “go away and do not adopt hostile attitude”. I have heard from my men that the Indian soldiers fired first. Some Indian soldiers took away the horses of the Chinese.”

23. I protested that as regards firing, none of my men had told me that Indians fired first but they rejected the plea and said that they had obtained confessions to that effect from other captured personnel. When requested to confront them with me, I was told that as I was a prisoner I had no such right. Similarly, I pointed out that the story of surrounding the hill etc. was also not correct but to no avail.

24. My interrogation started next day (27-10-59) at about 0800 hrs. and it lasted for about three hours. The entire period was devoted to ascertaining from me the details of the ITB organisation.

25. My interrogation was resumed at 0800 hrs. on the 28th October, 1959, in my tent by three Chinese, two of them were officers and the third an interpreter. The interrogation lasted 5 hours and was confined to ascertaining the details of the checkposts.

26. Information was also obtained from me in regard to the strength of the checkposts, arms and their functions and was duly noted down in their own language.
27. The same afternoon, all of us were taken to the Chang Chenmo river where the dead bodies had been laid out. We were asked to remove their uniforms and wrap a muslin cloth in accordance with Indian custom. At our request hot water was supplied to give a bath to the dead bodies. A number of photographs were taken while we were busy in this operation.

28. In the evening, they issued us the following items of clothing:

(i) Cotton-padded coat.
(ii) Cotton-padded pant.
(iii) Cotton-padded caps.
(iv) Namda Gum boots.

I did not take these because items offered to me did not fit. Either on this day or the next a doctor examined my feet which had swollen up and administered an injection. Photographs were taken.

29. On the 29th morning at about 0900 hrs. the interpreter came to my tent and delivered some sweets as a gesture of goodwill. After sometime, a new face together with the previous officers and the interpreter came to me. This time, two stenographers had also been brought to take down my statement. This officer introduced himself as Commander of the Tibetan area. His questions were confined to details regarding our check-posts and their strength. I repeated the details as given on the previous day. He also enquired about the strength of the army. The Chinese disclosed to me, for the first time, that the Foreign Ministries of both the countries were in correspondence with each other about us (captured persons). The interrogation lasted for about 2 hours. I was not made to sign any statement.

30. At about 1300 hours on the same day (29-10-59), I was taken out of my tent together with Constable Shiv Dayal and escorted by three Chinese soldiers to the scene of the incident in a truck. The new officer, who had examined me in the morning, occupied the front seat of the truck and four other officers sat with us in the rear. After reaching the place, I was made to stand, even though it caused me intense pain, near the base of the hill on the Hot Springs side and was ordered to point with my hand towards the hill and a photograph was taken, (as if I was pointing towards the Chinese who were on the top of the hill). I was then taken to the base of a small mound behind which we had taken shelter when fire was opened on us. Constable Shiv Dayal was asked to take a lying position about 50 paces away from me towards the hill. I was given a handkerchief and asked to wave it as if to give a signal to the men to open fire. A snap was then taken. Constable Shiv Dayal was then taken to the place where one of the killed ponies was lying and another photograph was taken together with the dead pony. Then, the senior officer drew a sketch of the hillock and the adjoining area showing positions of the Indian and the Chinese soldiers at the time of the encounter according to the Chinese version and got the same signed by me and Constable Shiv Dayal. Photographs were also taken of a few Chinese soldiers gesticulating from the hill. Late in the evening we returned to the camp.

31. My interrogation was resumed on October 30 morning at about 0800 hrs. and it lasted up to 1300 hrs. They questioned me again about the strength of each post. They also obtained my signature on a
statement to the effect that the post at Hanley was established in June this year.

32. On November 1, interrogation started in the morning as usual. The senior officer had by then gone away. The other Chinese officers and the interpreter pursued the interrogation. I was asked how we could claim this area when we had never visited it. I told them that I had myself gone beyond Lingzi Thang with about 10 persons in 1957 and up to Shamul Lungpa in 1958 where we had established a checkpoint which remained there throughout the summer and was withdrawn during the winter. They asked me if we had set up any boundary pillar at Shamul Lungpa or Lingzi Thang and I told them that we had not done so because our boundaries extended hundreds of miles further. The interrogation lasted for about 5/6 hours. The following statement was briefly recorded and signed by me:

"In 1957, I visited Lingzi Thang with 10 men and stayed there for a few days. In 1958, I visited Shamul Lungpa, where we stayed for four months. On this occasion also there were about 10 men with me. We did not construct any huts at any place nor did we construct any boundary pillar at these places."

The Chinese said that Phobrang was our last post, and that we had no right to cross Marsimik La because the entire area beyond the pass was a part of Sinkiang and that this could be verified even from the older residents of Ladakh. I told them that our claims were based on authentic documents and, therefore, our maps were correct. They disposed of my argument by saying that our claims were based on demarcation by the British, who had usurped a lot of territory of Sinkiang and Tibet. They ridiculed our maps and said that these could be drawn by anybody while sitting at home. It was on this day that I was repeatedly asked about my maps and documents. I told them that I did not bring any such papers with me because I was well conversant with the area. The Chinese showed great anger during this discussion.

33. On the morning of November 2 at about 10.00 hrs., all the captured persons were brought to my tent. The interpreter then asked them in my presence whether it was a fact that all the dead had received bullet injuries in front which indicated that they were wounded while advancing towards the Chinese. To this, they replied in the affirmative. They said that they had wrapped up the bodies themselves and had actually seen the wounds. I was asked to attest their statement. I resisted, but was made to sign the following:

"All of our men had received wounds in the front during the battle which indicated that they were wounded while advancing towards the Chinese."

34. Afterwards those who had bathed the dead bodies disclosed to me at the first possible opportunity that in fact the injuries sustained by our men were on the front, back and sides and some had parts of their heads blown off.

35. The same afternoon we all were taken out in the sun and made to sit in a semi-circle. Two watermelons were cut and distributed amongst us and a photograph was taken.
36. On November 3, the Chinese asked me to sign the following statement:

“Chinese troops were armed with rifles, Tommy-guns, LMGs and hand-grenades only. No heavy artillery or mortars were used by them during the battle.”

I appended my signature as automatic weapons and hand-grenades had been used against my party and I was not aware whether any mortar had been used.

37. There was no further interrogation. In the afternoon we were taken out in the sun and given a lecture on the Sino-Indian friendship. On this occasion, I was pointed out to a new person dressed as a Chinese soldier. This person replied in the negative after looking at me. Later, this man was heard conversing in Ladakhi and remained at the camp throughout our stay there.

38. On the morning of November 4, interrogation started at about 08.00 hours. Only the interpreter examined me. He insisted that I should record in my own hand-writing the main points of the statement I had already signed. I pleaded I could not do so without my spectacles, but when he urged me again and again, I told him that as I was a prisoner they could force me to do anything, but it was not fair in view of their professed friendship for India. Ultimately, I scribbled down the following prepared statement which the interpreter had brought with him:

“On 20-10-59, two of our men missed. Tyagi took about 60 men with him. I accompanied him. When we were at a distance of about 400 yards from the battle field a few Chinese were seen. Tyagi ordered me to take some men on the back of the hill. He himself proceeded to the front. We surrounded the hill. I have heard from my men that Indian soldiers fired first. Some horses of the Chinese were taken away by Indian soldiers. I have nothing but to thank the Chinese officers and soldiers for the kind treatment that they had given us. Medical facilities were provided to us and we were neither beaten nor coerced.”

39. The same afternoon I was again interrogated by the Chinese officers and the interpreter. They brought a statement for my signature which included a sentence that on the 21st October, 1959, when we left our camp, Tyagi had disclosed that he was determined to fight the Chinese. I refused to sign it. They then took me down to a nullah threatening me on the way that they would dispose of me there. They threatened that I and my men were guilty of having killed their Second-in-Command and therefore, it would be quite legal for them to shoot me. When I did not yield, he compromised to change the wording “Tyagi might have had an idea to fight the Chinese”. It was extremely cold in the nullah. I was almost dying with pain in my feet and so I agreed to sign the amended statement which was as follows:

“On 20-10-59, two of our men missed. Tyagi took 60 men with him with heavy arms including four Bren-guns, four Sten-guns, about 50 rifles and hand-grenades. I also accompanied him. Tyagi might have had a mind to fight against the Chinese. We surrounded the hill where a few Chinese
were seen. According to our men, Indian soldiers fired first. According to Shiv Dayal, Constable, it was Manohar Lal, Constable, who took away the Chinese horses."

40. After that I was taken back to my tent and I was given a quilt. But in spite of this quilt the cold in the tent, where I had been kept since October 25, was so intense that I requested that I should be sent to the pit and this was conceded.

41. Right from the 25th October, 1959, pressure was brought to bear on me daily to confirm that Constable Mohd Khalil and his companions had been sent to Chinese territory for spying and that our object was to establish a checkpost in Chinese territory. After the first two or three days, they dropped the question of the checkpost and said that I might confess to the espionage mission. I told them that this was not a fact but that the patrol had been sent out to ascertain whether there were any Chinese patrols on Indian territory. They told me that they had already obtained a confession to this effect from Constable Mohd Khalil and all that they needed from me was confirmation. I did not have to sign any statement to this effect.

42. On the same day, the Chinese officer, drew a sketch of the encounter on the same lines as was done by their senior officer on October 29th, but on a bigger scale. After completing the sketch, signatures of all of us were obtained. My photograph was taken as I was signing.

43. On the afternoon of November 5, I was again taken out for interrogation which lasted three hours. Particulars of my service after partition were ascertained. On this day, the interrogator addressed me as the famous man of Ladakh.

44. On November 6, they took us all to the Chang Chenmo river, I sat on the bank of it and the others were asked to stroll along the river in a leisurely manner. The escort was kept away and a movie picture was taken in order to show that we had freedom of movement.

45. On the morning of November 7, we were again taken to the bank of the river where a Chinese Officer using a Ladakhi interpreter and Constable Shiv Dayal as Hindi interpreter, gave a lecture on communism, condemning landlordism and capitalism. A rosy picture was painted of the communist regime. During the same lecture, it was prominently brought out that even now when India was a free country, the British and the Americans owned a number of industrial concerns and that there were still a number of Indian capitalists and landlords. The lecturer said that he hoped that India would get rid of these evils and prosper on the lines of China.

46. In the evening (November 7), I was taken out from the pit to a tent and informed that Constable Abdul Majid had confessed that the first shot was fired by Constable Ali Raza of our force. I refuted this and said that Constable Abdul Majid be called to state this in my presence. Consequently, Abdul Majid was summoned and when questioned in my presence, he said that what he had actually stated was that Constable Ali Raza had fired back long after the Chinese had opened fire. On this, the
Chinese officer got enraged and threatened to thrash Abdul Majid. He lost his nerve and admitted that Ali Raza had fired first. I was then forced to sign the following statement:

“Constable Abdul Majid had stated that it was Constable Ali Raza who fired first. I believe that his statement is correct.”

Then Constable Shiv Dayal was brought before me and was asked to confirm his statement that the Chinese horses had been taken away by Constable Manohar Lal. Shiv Dayal insisted that he had not said so rather he had stated that he saw Constable Manohar Lal touching a Chinese horse. On this, the Hindi interpreter was sent for, who also confirmed the statement of Constable Shiv Dayal. Therefore I refused to sign the prepared statement in possession of the Chinese interpreter which was that according to Shiv Dayal, Constable Manohar Lal had taken away the Chinese horses. Instead, I signed a statement as follows:

“According to Constable Shiv Dayal, Manohar Lal, Constable of the ITB Force was seen touching a Chinese horse. I believe what he states is correct.”

47. Another lecture on Communist indoctrination was given on the morning of November 8.

48. At about 6 P.M., was segregated from my companions and taken to a tent nearly 50 yards away. They then disclosed to me that the Government of India in their note to the Chinese Government had admitted that I was the Officer Commanding of the ITB Force. As I had from the very beginning given myself out as the Deputy Commander, I tried to modify the statement by giving the following explanations:

(a) That I was a Deputy Superintendent of Police and so was Shri Tyagi. In his absence, I was always called as Officer Commanding.

(b) My promotion was due and it was possible that my Government may have promoted me since.

I was not made to sign any statement in this regard.

49. After this I was returned to the pit and Jem. Rulia Ram and Constable Shiv Dayal were taken to the tent for further interrogation about my exact designation. Jem. Rulia Ram on return informed me that the Chinese tried to argue with them that I was older than Tyagi in age and so how was it that Tyagi was senior in rank to me. They maintained that I was the second-in-command.

50. In the afternoon of November 9, we were informed that another senior officer had arrived and that we would be produced before him to make our statements.

51. It was either on November 9th or on the 10th morning that at about 08.00 hours the Chinese took away Jem. Rulia Ram, Constables Shiv Dayal, Abdul Majid and Mohd. Khalil informing them that they were to be released. In fact, they were not being released but were taken to the place of incident where a number of snaps and a cine film were taken to show that the Indian party had attacked the Chinese. They also took:
along the dead body of the Chinese soldier in a coffin and it was used during the filming.

52. At about 8 p.m. on November 10th, I was again taken out of the pit and escorted to a tent by two Chinese sentries who threatened to shoot me. Only one mattress was provided. My interrogation was immediately begun by one officer and an interpreter. They repeatedly threatened me to accept that I had sent the patrol into Chinese territory for spying but I refused to agree. They kept on interrogating me the whole night through; and as I was given insufficient bedding, I was in great agony from the cold and pain in my feet.

53. At about 0700 hours, I was compelled to write out the following myself:

“I and Tyagi started for patrolling of the border for establishing checkpost at Tsogtsalu, Hot Springs (Kayam) and Shamul Lungpa on 29th and 27th September, 1959. We established a checkpost at Tsogtsalu and arrived at Hot Springs where also we established a checkpost. On the morning of 20th, our two men missed. Tyagi took about 60 men, 4 Bren-guns, about 50 rifles, 4 sten-guns and hand-grenades. I accompanied him. Tyagi may have had a mind to fight against the Chinese. (They wanted me to write that Tyagi was determined to fight but I did not agree). I went to the back of the hill. We surrounded the Chinese. A Chinese was seen waving his hand so as to say “Go away; do not adopt hostile attitude”. According to Constable Abdul Majid it was Constable Ali Raza who fired first. According to Constable Shiv Dayal, Constable Manohar Lal was seen touching a Chinese horse. Chinese troops used only rifles, sten-guns, LMGs and hand-grenades during the fight. They did not use any heavy artillery or mortars. ITB Force knows that area north, south and east of Kongka Pass is a part of China. I and my men had never visited this area (battle field) before”.

54. The interrogation was continued till about 1100 hours when I was made to add the following paragraph to my statement:

“I and my men have been given good treatment by the Chinese Officer and soldiers. I will never do anything which is against the five principles of the Sino-Indian Agreement any more nor I will enter Chinese territory again.”

55. Before concluding, I was told that my statement would be tape-recorded sometime that day and that I must answer questions exactly as in the statement written out by me. I was feeling very depressed and did not refuse to comply.

56. In the evening at about 1600 hours, a new face, reported to be their senior officer, came into my tent together with the interpreter. He also brought a doctor along who dressed my frost-bitten feet and movie
and still pictures were taken. After this, a tape recorder was brought in my tent and the following conversation was recorded:

**Q:** Give brief details of the incident?

**A:** On the morning of 20th, a few of our horses were found missing and we sent two Constables and a Coolie in search. They did not return. On the morning of 21st, Tyagi and I started for their search with about 60 men. We had four bren-guns, three or four sten-guns, about 50 rifles and hand-grenades.

**Q:** What was Tyagi’s intention?

**A:** He did not express his intention to me although inference could be drawn that he may have had an intention to fight.

**Q:** Who fired first?

**A:** According to Constable Abdul Majid, Constable Ali Raza fired first.

**Q:** Do you know some Chinese horses were taken away by the Indian soldier?

**A:** According to Constable Shiv Dayal, Constable Manohar Lal was seen touching a Chinese horse.

**Q:** Did the Chinese use any heavy artillery or mortar?

**A:** Chinese soldiers had rifles, tommy-guns, bren-guns and hand-grenades. No heavy artillery or mortars were used by them.

**Q:** Did you and your soldiers surround the Chinese soldiers?

**A:** Yes.

**Q:** What did the Chinese do when they were surrounded?

**A:** The Chinese soldier was seen waving his hand.

57. At this stage, I was told that further questioning would be done the next day.

58. On the night between November 11 and 12, all my companions were taken out one by one from the pit for tape-recording their statements. Before they were actually taken each one of them was properly tutored and warned that he must stick to the statement that had already been signed.

59. After my statement had been tape-recorded, I was returned to the pit on the 11th evening and proper bedding was provided.

60. There was nothing of particular interest the next day.

61. On November 13, at about 1500 hours, we were all taken out of the pit. All of us were given a small towel each, sweets and cigarettes in the presence of a senior officer. Both movie and still pictures were taken. Then we were taken to another tent where a meeting was held. A tape-recorder had been fixed in this tent. The senior officer said that we would be released the next day but before that he wanted to hear our ideas and views, especially about the incident. I was asked to speak first in Hindustani. When asked about the incident, I said “One cannot clap with one hand alone and there is no fight without mistakes on both sides. Both sides should be careful in future”.

62. After that Rulia Ram and Shiv Dayal spoke briefly. There was nothing of interest in Rulia Ram’s speech. Constable Shiv Dayal said, if the Chinese had not captured their men, this encounter would not have
taken place as they had no plan to come in this direction. At this stage, as the Chinese felt that in my presence the men were not making statements to their liking. I was asked to go back to my pit and rest there. On the 13th evening, I was persuaded to accept the Namda boots which I did.

63. On the morning of November 14, we were woken up at 0400 hrs. and asked to get ready. A meal was served at 0430 hours. We were informed that we would be released at 10.00 hours, Peking time. We were taken in trucks to the place of handing over. The dead bodies and our arms and ammunition were also taken.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China to the
Embassy of India in China, 5 February 1960

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note delivered to the Chinese Embassy in India by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs on December 13, 1959, has the honour to reply as follows:

With regard to the Kongka Pass incident and the friendly and generous dealing with and treatment of the captured armed Indian personnel by the Chinese side after the incident, detailed accounts were given by the Chinese Government in its successive memoranda and notes delivered to the Indian Government. The Chinese Government thought that, with the related facts clarified and the matter itself a thing of the past, there was no reason for either side to stir up once again a dispute over this question. Unexpectedly to the Chinese Government, however, the Indian Government, following its note of November 24, 1959, handed over another note on December 13, 1959 attaching with it a statement of Karam Singh which distorts the facts in many respects, reiterated various groundless charges against the Chinese Government about the treatment of the captured armed Indian personnel, and published this note and statement. The Chinese Government cannot but deeply regret the fact that the friendly treatment given by the Chinese side to the captured armed Indian personnel should have been distorted to serve as material for anti-Chinese propaganda. Nevertheless, the Chinese Government still took a responsible attitude, and made repeated serious investigations into the related facts; it has received from the Frontier Guard Unit of the Chinese People's Liberation Army stationed at the Kongka Pass a “report on the intrusion and provocation by armed Indian personnel and handling of the captured armed Indian personnel.” In order to clarify the facts, this responsible report and the statements made by the armed Indian personnel during their capture are attached herewith, and reply is given to the Indian Government's note of December 13, 1959 as follows:

1. In its note, the Indian Government asserted on the basis of the statement of Karam Singh that the captured armed Indian personnel were subjected to “deplorable” and “inhuman” treatment during their custody. The Chinese Government absolutely cannot agree to this assertion. The unshakable facts are that the Chinese frontier guards, in line with the Chinese People's Liberation Army's tradition of giving magnanimous treatment to prisoners and in the interest of Sino-Indian friendship, made continuous efforts to overcome all sorts of difficulties and gave the captured armed Indian personnel such good treatment as was possible under the conditions then and there.

The Kongka Pass area not only has a severe climate but is also remotely situated and difficult of access so that it was extremely difficult
to bring up supplies. All this is known to the Indian Government. Further, the occurrence of this incident was totally unexpected to the Chinese side. Therefore, it is entirely conceivable that the Chinese frontier guards stationed at the Kongka Pass should in the first few days have great difficulties in providing food, lodging and heating for the captured armed Indian personnel. Nevertheless, they still did their best to look after the captured armed Indian personnel. At the same time, the Chinese side brought up various supplies for them as quickly as possible from a distance of several hundred kilometers. As the clothing of the captured armed Indian personnel themselves was very thin, the Chinese frontier guards issued them cotton-padded suits, beddings, felt boots and articles of daily use as soon as the supplies arrived. With respect to lodging, since there were no houses at all in the locality, they were quartered in a comparatively warm underground room and new tents. They were given exactly the same food as that for the Chinese frontier guards, which was adequately and timely supplied. Medical treatment and care was given to those among them who were already frost-bitten at the time of their capture. The Chinese frontier guards also carefully preserved the bodies of the dead Indian personnel, and, in accordance with the custom of the Indians, bathed them with hot water and wrapped them up in white cloth. The responsible report of the Chinese frontier guards stationed at the Kongka Pass attached to this note contains a detailed account of the treatment received by the captured armed Indian personnel, which sufficiently explains the actual situation at the time. Although in his statement attached to the Indian Government's note of December 13, 1959 Karam Singh made all sorts of distortions and false colouring of the living conditions during the period of custody, they cannot stand up to the test of the facts and are themselves full of contradictions. For instance, except for the morning of the first day when they ate dry rations because there was no time for cooking, the captured armed Indian personnel always ate hot meals with the staple food made of fine grain. Again, after the Chinese frontier guards obtained supplies, they regularly issued the captured Indian personnel sugar, black tea, cigarettes and other articles of daily use; this was absolutely not, as Karam Singh asserted, done incidentally for the purpose of taking photos. Again, Karam Singh described the underground room as being very cold and horrible, yet he admitted that later he requested on his own accord to move back to this "ice-cold pit" and not stay in a tent such as the Chinese frontier guards lived in. If the treatment received by the captured armed Indian personnel had indeed been "deplorable" and "inhuman" as described by Karam Singh, it would have been incomprehensible how, after 23 days of custody, they could still be affirmed as being in sound health by the Indian representative at the time of handing over and how, during the period of custody, they could several times happily and of their own accord gather together to sing and dance. Just from these two extremely simple facts, one can judge that the assertion that the treatment which the captured armed Indian personnel received was "most harsh and inhuman and opposed to all canons of civilized behaviour" is totally untenable.

2. In its note, the Indian Government, in disregard of the facts, further describes the statements made by the captured armed Indian personnel to the Chinese frontier guards as forced confessions made under "threats and prolonged interrogation," and attempts by such an assertion to overthrow these statements completely. However, this attempt will not succeed. The Chinese People's Liberation Army has a tradition of treating prisoners
magnanimously, and especially of refusing to get forced confession from prisoners. In this case of the captured armed Indian personnel, the Chinese frontier guards have also all along adopted a practical and objective attitude in checking up the facts with them, but never forced them to make any statement against their will, let alone subjecting them to pressure and threats. Although many such phrases as “threat to be shot dead,” “utmost pressure,” “persistent interrogation” were used in Karam Singh's statement attached to the note of the Indian Government as a pretext for overturning the statements made during their custody, it is not difficult to discern the following facts by comparing and analysing the responsible report of the Chinese frontier guards and the statements made by the armed Indian personnel during their capture, which are attached to the present note, and the latest statement of Karam Singh handed over by the Indian Government on December 13, 1959:

(1) Before the interrogation of the captured armed Indian personnel began on October 25, 1959, the Chinese side had already tried its best to satisfy their daily needs so far as local conditions at the time permitted and let them rest for three days. Afterwards, their living conditions were continuously improved. In the course of the interrogation, constant care was taken to give them food and necessary rest and keep them warm; and they had never been treated as prisoners. Even the latest statement of Karam Singh which distorts the facts in many ways cannot completely deny these facts. If the Chinese side had really wanted to subject the captured personnel to threats and get forced confessions from them, it is certain that it would have been absolutely impossible for them to receive such treatment. Karam Singh asserts that the Chinese frontier guards told him that he would not be provided with proper bedding until his interrogation concluded, refused to allow him to confront the other captured personnel, repeatedly threatened to shoot him, etc. But all this was entirely inconsistent with the fact. Moreover, Karam Singh himself goes on the admit that bedding was given him before long, and that he confronted the other captured personnel. It can be seen from this too that no credence can be given to these assertions of Karam Singh.

(2) During the first interrogation on October 25, 1959, Karam Singh already gave the basic facts of the entire Kongka Pass incident. Although at that time he was still evasive about one or two important points, such as the fact that the Indian armed forces fired first, yet on the following day he admitted that “some Indian soldiers took away a horse of the Chinese soldiers” and that “the Indian soldiers fired first.” Throughout subsequent interrogations, Karam Singh never tried to deny the facts he admitted during the above-mentioned two interrogations. If the Chinese side had subjected Karam Singh to various threats and pressure and he had put up firm resistance against such threats and pressure, it would have been impossible for preliminary interrogations to yield the above-mentioned result. The only logical explanation is that since both parties to the conversation had been participants and eye-witnesses of the clash, Karam Singh could not but frankly admit these facts. Moreover, although he harboured certain apprehensions at the beginning and made reservation on individual points, yet in the fact of the friendly attitude of the Chinese side, his apprehensions quickly vanished.

(3) The information given by Karam Singh and the other captured armed Indian personnel was indeed given of their own accord, and not
under compulsion, this is also borne out by the following facts: firstly, they
gave many facts which had been unknown to the Chinese side and which,
therefore, it was utterly impossible for the Chinese side to force them to
admit. For instance, on October 27, Karam Singh specifically described
how Tyagi received instructions from his superior Mr. Sharma, Deputy
Director of the Indian Ministry of Home Affairs in charge of border
questions, to proceed to Shamul Lungpa and set up a check-post there, and
then returned to Leh on September 24, 1959. Secondly, as for the facts
which he firmly refused to admit, the Chinese side, though being in posses-
sion of reliable material, did not press him. For example, the Indian Gov-
ernment formally informed the Chinese Government that Karam Singh was
Commander of the I.T.B.F., yet he only admitted himself to be Deputy
Commander. Regarding such an important fact, the Chinese Government
all along respected his own statement, and did not insist that he correct it.
It can thus be seen how incredible is the allegation that the statements of
the captured armed Indian personnel were made under threat and coercion.

(4) The interrogation would have come to an end when the basic facts
of the Kongka Pass incident had been established after the first few inter-
rogations. But the Indian Government repeatedly issued statements and
on November 4, 1959 delivered a note to the Chinese Government, putting
forth an account of the clash, which was diametrically opposite to the
incident as understood by the Chinese side. In view of this, the Chinese
Government could not but adopt a responsible attitude, further made a
detailed check up with the captured personnel and collected necessary evi-
dence. It is obviously unacceptable to describe such interrogation and
check up as “threats” and “prolonged interrogation”.

(5) Actually, the statement of Karam Singh attached to the Indian
Government’s note cannot negate or reduce the soundness of the statements
made by the captured armed Indian personnel to the Chinese frontier
guards; on the contrary, it in a way further proves that what the latter
statements gave were indeed the facts. The latest statement of Karam Singh,
in an attempt to relieve the Indian side of its responsibility for the clash,
tries hard to distort in various ways the course of the incident. Yet, in so
doing, it has inevitably landed in an extremely ridiculous position, being
full of inconsistencies and contradictions. Its evasive wording still cannot
help revealing the following unshakable facts: On October 21, 1959, the
whole party of armed Indian personnel, about sixty in number, led per-
sonally by its Commander and Deputy Commander, set out to look for
three missing persons. When they found hoof prints of Chinese horses
they immediately traced them without hesitation; on reaching the vicinity
of the hill where the Chinese patrolmen were, they divided themselves into
two parties and continued to advance along the two sides of the hill.
Karam Singh’s party “in twos and threes” (that is to say, in loose order for
attack) “almost passed the hill”—that is, actually outflanked to the back
of the Chinese patrolmen. At that time Chinese soldiers not only were
discovered by them, but were the first to call out and wave hands to them.
As to the number of Chinese soldiers, although Karam Singh says that he
“thought” there were about 30, actually he saw only 11. After shooting
started, a number of armed Indian personnel kept advancing on the hill
guarded by the Chinese patrol, and even got so close to the Chinese patrol
that they could be struck down by hand-grenades. The Chinese patrol did
not use mortars or other heavy weapons. The above points admitted not only refute the Indian Government's previous allegations that the Chinese frontier guards opened fire without warning, that they used mortars, that they, mounted on horses, advanced on the Indian troops, etc.; they are in full conformity with the statements made by the captured Indian personnel to the Chinese frontier guards. Judging by these facts alone, it is clear that the Kongka Pass clash was entirely started by the provocation made by the armed Indian personnel who, relying on their superior strength, encircled and advanced upon the Chinese patrol.

It can be seen from the above-mentioned facts that the allegations that the statements of the captured Indian personnel were entirely made under threats and pressure and that therefore "no credence whatsoever can be given to them," they are "valuless," etc., are groundless.

3. The Indian Government insisted in its note that Abdul Majid had a bullet wound and received no medical treatment. Nevertheless, the unshakable fact is that throughout the period of custody, Abdul Majid not only never asked for medical treatment, but moved about like a sound person. The Chinese Government cannot understand how he could still walk back to Indian territory without difficulty after being detained for 23 days, if he really had had a fairly serious wound.

4. As to the armed Indian personnel who is unaccounted for, the Chinese Government has repeatedly stated that Chinese frontier guards searched many times but failed to find this armed Indian personnel within Chinese territory. After receiving the Indian Government's note of December 13, 1959, Chinese frontier guards repeatedly made search but still could not find him.

In view of what has been stated in the above paragraphs, the Chinese Government must again reject the charge and protest made by the Indian Government in its note and categorically cannot accept its request for action against the Chinese personnel concerned. In order to help clarify the related facts, the Chinese Government encloses herewith, for the reference of the Indian Government, the responsible report on the intrusion and provocation by armed Indian personnel and the handling of captured armed Indian personnel submitted by the Chinese frontier guard unit stationed at the Kongka Pass and the statements made by the captured armed Indian personnel while they were on Chinese territory.

Before concluding this note, the Chinese Government would like to reiterate that it has never had the intention to argue endlessly with the Indian Government over the Kongka Pass incident. Its closest concern is only to prevent the recurrence of similar unfortunate incidents. Although the facts prove that responsibility for this incident does not in any way lie with the Chinese side, the Chinese Government and Chinese frontier guards have at no time had any ill-will against the Indian Government and Indian frontier guards. They hope that no such incident causing the loss of precious lives on both sides will recur. In view of this, the Chinese Government would like to express its eager desire that both sides would argue no more about the matter which has become a thing of the past, and that they, instead, actively devote all their energies to speedily consulting and
agreeing on effective measures so as to ensure the tranquillity of the border between the two countries and consolidate friendship of the two countries.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
ANNEXURE I


(1) How the armed Indian reconnoitring personnel trespassed into our territory and were arrested.

At one o'clock p.m. on October 20, 1959, when three of our patrolmen were on routine patrol duty within our territory south of the Kongka Pass and east of the Silung Barma River, they found two armed Indian personnel carrying rifles and field-glasses and a civilian who had unlawfully crossed into our territory for reconnaissance. Our patrolmen immediately waved their hands and called on them to withdraw from Chinese territory. But the Indians refused. Thereupon, our patrol party, doing their best to avoid a clash, finally succeeded by peaceful means in urging them to put down their arms, took them back to the outpost, and put them under temporary detention.

(2) How the armed Indian troops intruded into our territory and brought about the clash.

In the morning of October 21, 1959, thirteen of our patrolmen, led by Second Lieutenant Tuan Hai-chen, as usual were on routine patrol duty within our territory south of the Kongka Pass and east of the Silung Barma River. When our patrol party came along the Changchenmo River to Height 5,100 within our territory (approximately 79° 2' 10" E., 34° 17' N.), about five kilometers short of the customary international boundary line, about sixty armed Indian personnel, partly mounted and partly on foot, suddenly appeared about 400 meters west of this hill and were penetrating into Chinese territory. As soon as they discovered this unusual act of trespassing, our patrolmen waved their hands and called on the armed Indian troops to withdraw from Chinese territory. Instead of heeding our advice, however, the armed Indian troops, relying on their overwhelming superiority in numbers, divided themselves into two parties of about 30 men each, proceeded in the southern and northern directions respectively to encircle the hill where our patrolmen were, and advanced towards the hill-top in loose order, while shouting loudly "Take these Chinese!" After being encircled by the armed Indian troops from all sides, our patrolmen still continued to wave their hands and called out for the armed Indian troops to withdraw and not to take hostilities. But the armed Indian troops kept pressing forward until their vanguard came within about 30 meters of our patrol party. At 13.09 hours local time, the armed Indian personnel fired the first shot. At that time, our patrol party once again gestured and called out, asking the Indians not to open fire. But the armed Indian personnel followed up by a second shot at 13.19 hours, and took away horses which our patrol party had left at the foot of the hill. At that time, still firmly obeying the order of refraining from shooting until it was finally absolutely necessary for self-defence, and exercising the utmost self-restraint, our patrol party again and again asked
the armed Indian personnel to stop shooting. Especially, our deputy squad leader Comrade Wu Ching-kuo stood at the very fringe of the hill-top and waved his hands and called out energetically. But at 13.27 hours the armed Indian troops opened heavy fire on our patrol party. Being at the forefront, our deputy squad leader Comrade Wu Ching-kuo was hit and fell down. It was then 13.29 hours. It was under these circumstances when no room was left that our patrolmen returned fire in self-defence. The clash between the two sides lasted till about 15.17 hours, when the armed Indian troops started to retreat and return to Indian territory. At the two sides of Height 5,100, the scene of the clash, our patrol party captured seven armed Indian personnel, including Karam Singh, who claimed himself to be Deputy Commander of the Indo-Tibetan Boundary Force of India. After the clash, we made a careful inspection of the place of the armed clash and surrounding areas, collected the arms and ammunition left behind by the armed Indian troops, and found the bodies of nine armed Indian personnel.

(3) The treatment given to the captured armed Indian personnel.

To the nine officers and men of the armed Indian troops and the inhabitants of Ladakh who had acted as guide for the armed Indian troops, who were captured successively on October 20 and 21, 1959, we gave generous and friendly treatment, scrupulously adhering to the policy of our Army of treating well captured personnel. Although the number of the captured personnel was fairly great, our stock of supplies was limited, the Kongka Pass area was difficult of access and it was hard to bring up supplies, we still made the utmost efforts to take care of the captured Indian personnel, and at the same time, our higher authorities had supplies brought at top speed from Kashgar on October 28, 1959 to duly satisfy the daily needs of the captured armed Indian personnel.

The Kongka Pass area is over 5,000 meters above sea level, swept by bitter winds and capped by everlasting snows, and there was no house in the surrounding area. To protect the captured Indian personnel from the cold, we let them take a comparatively warm underground room. On October 24, when new tents arrived, we moved part of them into the newly erected tents so that they might not be so crowded. But two days later they said that the underground room was warmer, so at their request we let them move back to the underground room. From the first day they arrived here, we never stopped providing them with means of heating. The only kind of fuel available in the Kongka Pass area was grass roots, of which we had not stored many and which were hard to dig out. Nevertheless, we provided them all along with adequate quantities of grass roots.

Except for Karam Singh who had a cotton-padded jacket, the other captured Indian personnel upon capture had very thin outfits. On the very day when supplies arrived from Kashgar, we issued to each of the captured Indian personnel a brand-new set of cotton-padded suit, cotton-padded cap, quilt, mattress, and felt boots. As Karam Singh originally had a cotton-padded jacket and was further too portly to get a fitting cotton-padded suit and felt boots, we gave him a double issue of bedding instead. Later on we brought up from Kashgar the largest sized felt boots for him.
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The captured Indian personnel were given exactly the same food as provided to our own men, and even a little better. Except for the first time when there was no time for cooking, and they ate dry rations, they were given three meals a day, with the staple food hot and made of fine grain and a certain amount of meat. In consideration for their habit, we issued them sugar and black tea quite often. In addition, we gave them cigarettes every day and brought them some fruits over a long distance.

Those of the captured Indian personnel who had fallen ill and had been frost-bitten were given all the medical care that was possible. When they were brought to the outpost, we noticed that three of them were frost-bitten in the feet as a result of the thinness of their shoes and socks among them Karam Singh's case was more serious. Our medical personnel tended to them at once and on some days looked after Karam Singh even twice or three times a day. A few who had caught a light cold were also given timely medical care. By the time they were sent back to India, except for Karam Singh who had not yet wholly recovered from his frost-bite, the rest of them were all whole and sound.

The captured Indian personnel were satisfied with the treatment they received here. They indicated that we took very good care of them. They led a very pleasant life, and on more than one occasion rose to sing and dance for joy without any restraint, and even proposed to hold a get-together party with the personnel of our side. It was only due to bad weather that this desire was not fulfilled.

(4) Interrogation of the captured armed Indian personnel.

In order to get a clear picture of all the facts of Indian armed force's intrusion and provocation, we conducted from October 25, 1959 in succession interrogations of Karam Singh and the other captured personnel one by one. In face of the facts, and because both sides were participants in this clash, all the captured Indian personnel concerned from the outset of the interrogation gave of their own accord the basic fact that the armed Indian troops intruded into the Kongka Pass area of China and, relying on their superior force, launched an armed attack on our patrol, thus bringing about the clash between the two sides. Of course, they were not all free from apprehensions for us at the beginning, especially Karam Singh. When we asked him on October 25 about the first shot fired by armed Indian personnel, he evaded by saying, "I don't know which side fired first." His attitude was most likely connected with the fact that he was one of the commanders of the ITBF of India. He was much afraid, lest we would look into his responsibility for this incident. But after we made clear to him the consistent policy of lenient treatment of prisoners followed by our Army, his apprehensions were greatly reduced. On October 26, Second Lieutenant Tuan Hai-chen pointed out to Singh that at the time Singh was situated on a mound south of Height 5,100, and the soldiers led by him, from among whom issued the first shot, were all on the slope in front of him, so he should have been able not only to see but also to hear clearly the shooting of the Indian soldiers. It was very easy to distinguish between the rifles used by the Chinese soldiers and those by the Indian soldiers by the sound of their firing, one being dull and the other sharp. And the sound of that shot was unmistakably that of an Indian rifle. Thereupon Karam Singh promptly admitted that "The Indian soldiers fired first." Later, another captured Indian soldier Abdul
Majid explicitly gave the name of the Indian soldier who fired the first shot, and Karam Singh further confirmed this.

After the first few interrogations, the basic facts about the Indian armed force's intrusion and provocation were already confirmed. As we were going to conclude the interrogation, we received from higher authorities successive instructions for us to make detailed check-up with the captured Indian personnel on related facts with reference to the statements repeatedly made by the Indian Government and the Indian Government's note of November 4, 1959 and the report attached to it, because there were considerable discrepancies between the account of the incident given by the Indian Government and the facts known to our side. We immediately made a detailed check-up with the captured Indian personnel. The basic facts and details given by them once more confirmed that our understanding of the incident was correct, while the account of the clash given in the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs of November 4 and the attached report was inconsistent with the facts. As for the capacity of Karam Singh, although the Indian Government repeatedly stated that he was the Commander, yet Karam Singh himself and the other captured personnel insisted that he was Deputy Commander, so we had no way to confirm which statement was more consistent with the fact.

Most of the things admitted by the captured personnel were written out as statements, which were partly in their own handwriting and partly written on behalf of those who were illiterate by other captured personnel, but both categories were signed by themselves. In the case of Karam Singh, because his eye-sight was too weak for writing owing to his age, most of his statements were taken down by us in accordance with his own words and then checked and signed by him; however, two statements were written by himself with efforts. All the statements have been transmitted separately.

Throughout the interrogations, we maintained a calm and reasonable attitude and treated them with courtesy. We only put questions, and let the Indians answer entirely of their own accord. These captured personnel generally adopted a good attitude, were willing to tell us the facts of their own accord, and finally indicated on their own initiative that they would never again encroach upon Chinese territory in the future. Karam Singh also said: "I shall never do anything that is against the Five Principles and Sino-Indian friendship any more and I shall never intrude into Chinese territory once again."

(5) Disposal of the bodies of armed Indian personnel.

After the conclusion of the clash, we made a careful inspection of the area of the clash and discovered altogether the bodies of nine armed Indian personnel. After the identification of the dead bodies one by one by the captured Indian personnel, we registered their names and kept them properly. After receiving instructions from our superiors on October 24, 1959 for us to make preparations to release the captured personnel and hand over the bodies, we further wrapped up properly the bodies of armed Indian personnel in white cloth according to Indian custom, and before doing so, at the suggestion of Karam Singh, we washed each body with hot water.
The release and delivery.

In the morning of November 13, 1959, on instructions from our superiors we met the representative Tyagi and others of the Indian side at a place within Chinese territory on the southern bank of the Changchemno River, 300 meters to the east of the Silung Barma River, and the two sides consulted and made joint arrangements on the details of handing over the captured Indian personnel, the bodies, arms, ammunition and other articles. Tyagi, representative of the Indian side, mentioned that apart from the nine bodies of Indian soldiers, another Indian soldier might have died of serious wound somewhere near the battle-field and expressed the hope that we would search for him. He added that some magazines full of bullets had been buried near the battle-field, and expressed the hope that our side would permit an Indian soldier to search for them in the company of our personnel. Our representative said then that our side had made a careful inspection of the place of the clash and surrounding areas after the clash and only nine bodies of armed Indian personnel had been collected; however, since the Indian side had made the request, our side was willing to make a further search, and also agreed to help look for the magazines.

In the afternoon of the same day, we dispatched an appropriate number of personnel to make another careful search in the area of the clash, but still no trace of the Indian soldier said to be missing was found.

On November 14, 1959, the personnel of the two sides in charge of the handing-over met on time at the place of handing-over (78° 59' 30" E; 34° 18' 15" N) as agreed upon beforehand. The representative of our side, Captain Liu Shao-tsii, first of all told the Indian representative Tyagi about the resultless search made on the previous day, and expressed the hope that the Indian side would make search within Indian territory. The Indian representative agreed to this. Then we handed over to the Indian side all the captured Indian personnel, the bodies, arms, ammunition and other articles one by one as written in the lists. At the same time, the five magazines of bullets which were recovered by an Indian soldier in the bank of Changchemno River were also included into the list of articles being handed over. After checking and finding nothing wrong, the Indian representative signed receipts in the Chinese and English languages, acknowledging the receipt of all the captured Indian personnel, the bodies, arms, ammunition and other articles, and affirmed that the captured personnel were all in good health. The handing-over was completed smoothly at 14.30 hours, Peking Time, that afternoon.

The handing-over proceeded in a friendly atmosphere. The Indian representative Tyagi said that: "The Indian Government and I myself are very grateful to the Chinese people." On parting, the released Indian personnel also expressed repeatedly their gratitude to our side for the good treatment they had received. On parting Karam Singh even raised his arm and shouted aloud "Good bye, Chinese brothers!"
ANNEXURE II

Statements of Armed Indian Personnel Captured in Kongka Pass Incident of Intrusion and Armed Provocation by Armed Indian Forces on October 20 and 21, 1959.

CONTENTS

1. Statement of Karam Singh, October 25, 1959

On 20th October two of the I.T.B.F. soldiers missed. On 21st October, Tyagi, the Commander of the I.T.B.F., and I, the Deputy Commander of the I.T.B.F. led about 60 men, with light machineguns and other weapons, to go out for the search of the two missing men. We suspected very much, though without any evidence, that the two missing men were arrested by the Chinese. Therefore, we went towards the direction where the Chinese are. When we arrived at the vicinity of a hill, some of our men shouted that a few Chinese soldiers were on the top of the hill. Tyagi with his men about 30, approached the hill and spread his men along the foot of the hill. At the same time, he ordered me to go to the back of the hill with my men about 30, and to spread them along the foot of the hill on that side. I proceeded accordingly. When I with my men arrived at the back of the hill, the Chinese soldiers were surrounded. I saw six Chinese soldiers were on the top of the hill, some of them quickly disappeared. Some of them waved hands to our men, with an intention to show to our men not to approach to the Chinese. When I arrived at the back of the hill, our men formed a line along the foot of the hill, I stood at one end of the line. 10—15 of our men climbed towards the hill's top, and the others of our men stood. Later on, both sides changed fire, I did not know which side fired at first.

In 1957, I joined the I.T.B.F. For about more than two years, I patrolled many places, but I never arrived at the hill, which recently became a battlefield. And the men under my command also never reached this place. It was for the first time that I and my men reached the hill mentioned above. When I was captured, I found the hill and its vicinity were controlled by the Chinese troops.

What I have said are facts.

(Sd.) Karam Singh,
Deputy Commander,
I.T.B. Force,
At Chinese Check Post.

12 o'clock, Peking Time;
October 25, 1959.

We all agree to what Karam Singh has said above.

(Sd.) Abdul Majid.
(Sd.) Rulia Ram.
(Sd.) Gur Bahadur.
(Sd.) Sring Norbu.
(Sd.) Shiv Dayal.
(Sd.) Mohd. Khalil.
(Sd.) Rudraman.
(Sd.) Sonam Dorje.

Note:—The original statement is in the English language.
2. Statement of Karam Singh, October 26, 1959

On twenty-first October, Tyagi led about sixty men to cross the Karakoram Mountain, and arrived at an area. We discovered that there were six Chinese soldiers on a hill in this area. My Commander led about thirty men to approach to the front part of the hill, and he ordered me to lead the rest of the men, about thirty, to move to the back of the hill. The Indian soldiers very soon surrounded the Chinese soldiers, and approached to them. At the same time, some Indian soldiers took away the horses of the Chinese soldiers. In the course of time, the Chinese soldiers incessantly waved their hands, as much as to say, go away quickly, don't adopt military hostilities. They so continued for about half an hour. But the Indian soldiers made gestures to call the Chinese soldiers to surrender, and continued to approach to them. After a short time, the Indian soldiers fired first.

(Sd.) KARAM SINGH,
Deputy Commander,
At Chinese Check Post.

October 26, 1959.

NOTE:—The original statement is in the English language.
3. Statement of Karam Singh, October 27, 1959

Mr. Sharma, Deputy Director of the Ministry of Home Affairs, is in charge of the border question. S. P. Tyagi, the Commander of the I.T.B.F., is subordinate to and always in close connection with him. About on 24th September this year, Tyagi went back from New Delhi to Leh. On the same day, he imparted to me that a decision had been made, the purpose of which was to build small houses at Shamal Lungpa, to station some fifteen men there, and to patrol its surrounding areas. On the following two days, the I.T.B.F. started its way from Leh. We planned to reach Shamal Lungpa through Marsimik Pass, Tsogtsalu and Kiam (Hot Spring), and to build small houses at these places, except at Marsimik. Tyagi, arrived at Kiam on 18th October, and I the next day. The men both of us led were about sixty in total. On 20th October, two of our men and one coolie missed. A large number of our men were sent out for their search.

(Sd.) KARAM SINGH,
Deputy Commander,
At Chinese Check Post.

October 27, 1959.

NOTE.—The original statement is in the English language.
4. Statements of Rulia Ram, Sring Norbu, Gur Bahadur, Abdul Majid, Rudraman, Shiv Dayal and Karam Singh, November 1, 1959

The nine men dead were shot down when they were approaching the hilltop. The bullets ran into them from the front.

(Sd.) Sring Norbu.
(Sd.) Shiv Dayal.
(Sd.) Gur Bahadur.
(Sd.) Rulia Ram.
(Sd.) Rudraman.
(Sd.) Abdul Majid.

Shiv Nath was killed at a distance of two hundred yards from the Chinese, while the other two men, Narbu Lama and Beg Raj, were killed on a small hill seventy yards from the Chinese.

(Sd.) Rudraman.
(Sd.) Sring Norbu.
(Sd.) Shiv Dayal.
(Sd.) Gur Bahadur.
(Sd.) Rulia Ram.
(Sd.) Abdul Majid.

We were about sixty to sixty-five men. We saw nine or ten Chinese on the hill. We were greater in number than they. We encircled them.

(Sd.) Abdul Majid.
(Sd.) Rudraman.
(Sd.) Sring Norbu.
(Sd.) Shiv Dayal.
(Sd.) Gur Bahadur.
(Sd.) Rulia Ram.
(Sd.) Karam Singh.

When we came to an open place and discovered the Chinese soldiers, Tyagi immediately ordered us, “Disperse to the sides, charge up, encircle these Chinese soldiers and capture them”.

(Sd.) Rudraman.
(Sd.) Sring Norbu.
(Sd.) Shiv Dayal.
(Sd.) Gur Bahadur.
(Sd.) Rulia Ram.
(Sd.) Abdul Majid.
(Sd.) Karam Singh.
We saw that the Chinese soldiers carried and used bren guns, tommy guns, rifles and hand-grenades. The Chinese soldiers used no artillery and mortar; we neither saw nor heard these weapons.

(Sd.) RUDRAMAN.
(Sd.) SRING NORBU.
(Sd.) SHIV DAYAL.
(Sd.) GUR BAHADUR.
(Sd.) RULIA RAM.
(Sd.) ABDUL MAJID.
(Sd.) KARAM SINGH.

When we were approaching the hilltop, the Chinese soldiers waved their hands again and again, warning us not to approach them, but we kept advancing.

(Sd.) RUDRAMAN.
(Sd.) SRING NORBU.
(Sd.) SHIV DAYAL.
(Sd.) GUR BAHADUR.
(Sd.) RULIA RAM.
(Sd.) ABDUL MAJID.

Since we came here, we have been fed with what the Chinese eat and have been given as much as we can eat. We have been given very good clothing and beddings. A doctor has attended us carefully and given us medicine. Besides, we have been given cigarettes, soap, sweets, fruits and so on.

(Sd.) RUDRAMAN.
(Sd.) SRING NORBU.
(Sd.) GUR BAHADUR.
(Sd.) SHIV DAYAL.
(Sd.) RULIA RAM.
(Sd.) ABDUL MAJID.
(Sd.) KARAM SINGH.

Kongka Pass, China;
November 1, 1959.

NOTE:—This is a retranslation from the Chinese translation of the original statements which are in the Hindi language. The original statements are in Rulia Ram's handwriting, and each of them is followed by signatures.
5. Statement of Rulia Ram, November 1, 1959

1. On October 21, when Chinese soldiers were discovered on the hill-top, Shri Tyagi and Shri Karam Singh ordered us: “Surround these Chinese soldiers! Take them alive!”

2. Upon Shri Tyagi’s order, Karam Singh and I and other six or seven soldiers went up on a mound. We were then gathered together and I was close to Karam Singh. At that time we were only 70 yards away from the Chinese soldiers on the hill-top.

3. On October 21, I found the Chinese soldiers carrying rifles, automatic rifles, tommy guns and hand-grenades, and no other weapons. I neither saw nor heard the Chinese troops use artillery or mortar.

4. On 21, I saw nine Chinese soldiers only, while there were on our side about 70 soldiers. We encircled them with superior forces.

The above are all actual facts, for which I am wholly responsible.

(Sd.) RULIA RAM,
Warrant Officer,
3rd Grade of I.T.B.F.
At Chinese Check Post at Kongka Pass.

November 1, 1959.

Note:—The original statement is in the Hindi language, in Rulia Ram’s own handwriting.
6. Statement of Karam Singh, November 2, 1959

On 21st October the I.T.B. Force numbered about 60 under the command of S.P. Tyagi entered into an area which I and my men had never patrolled and has for a long time been controlled by China. As soon as a few Chinese soldiers had been discovered on the top of a mountain in this area, Tyagi took a part of the force to approach to its front part and ordered me to take the rest to go round to its back, so as to encircle the Chinese soldiers and capture them. The Chinese soldiers incessantly waved their hands as much as to say get out, do not adopt military hostilities. In despite of the friendly advice, the Indian soldiers continued to crawl towards the top of the mountain and fired first.

It goes entirely against the Sino-Indian friendship and the five principles that the I.T.B. Force intruded into the area controlled by the Chinese troops and attacked them with majority of men. I as Deputy Commander must bear a part of responsibility for the mistaken actions. I swear that I shall never intrude into the Chinese territory and adopt military hostilities against China once again.

Being very old, I cannot read and write easily without spectacles. Unfortunately, my spectacles were left in India. I cannot but request you the Chinese officers to dictate what I have admitted orally. I have personally and carefully checked all the affidavits thus made, without finding out any that is different from the original, naturally I have put my signature on every page of them. Please allow me to express my thanks for your assistance and I am willing to express my thanks for the good treatment you have given me. Now I must write the above lines though with great difficulty, otherwise I shall be uneasy.

(Sd.) KARAM SINGH,
Deputy Commander,
I.T.B. Force,
2nd Nov., 59.
At Kongka Check Post, China.

Note:—The original statement is in the English language, in Karam Singh's own handwriting.
My name is Mohd. Khalil. This is my statement.

I am thirty years old. I joined the police at Leh of Ladakh in 1955, and have been serving as a constable in the I.T.B. Force up to now. I started from Leh with Sahib Tyagi on September 28, 1959, and arrived at Kiam on October 19, 1959. After we arrived at Kiam, we did not know where the Chinese soldiers were stationed, and I was ordered to make a reconnaissance on them. At about eight o’clock in the morning of October 20, 1959, my superior Jamadar Karam Singh called me to a place 8 yards from his tent, and said to me, “Go to the gully in the south-east to reconnoitre what the Chinese soldiers are doing. If there are Chinese soldiers, report to me immediately after you have made the reconnaissance.” I asked the Jamadar for a telescope, with which I could see things a great distance away, so I brought a telescope with me. Together with me were Sonam Dorje and coolie Chadan. At about twelve o’clock, I came to a hill-top and observed the surroundings through the telescope, but found nothing. Consequently, I came to the side of a fountain in the gully (that was the place where armed clash took place on October 21, 1959). Again, I found nothing there. I drank water there and stayed there until about one o’clock. Then three Chinese soldiers came out from a gully in the east. They came towards us. They were probably patrolling. They gesticulated and shouted to us. But we did not understand what they were shouting. Then we laid down our arms. They took us to a Chinese post by the name of Kongka Pass. A few days later we received good food and clothing and other articles. We have not met difficulties of any sort. Nobody ill-treated us. It was my mistake to come within Chinese territory to make reconnaissance, and I shall never commit such a mistake again in future. This statement is made by me from my own mouth and written down at the Kongka Pass frontier post, China.

This statement is written down by Shiv Dayal for Mohd. Khalil, because Mohd. Khalil cannot write. All these remarks are made by Mohd. Khalil.

November 4, 1959 (Sd.) MOHD. KHALIL.

NOTE:—The original statement is in the Urdu language, in Shiv Dayal’s handwriting.
8. Statement of Karam Singh, November 9, 1959

I and Shri Tyagi started from Leh for patrolling the border area and setting up check-posts at Tsogstsalu, Kiam and Shamal Lungpa. Tyagi had about 40 men with him, I had 3 with me. Tyagi started on 27-9-59. I left on 29th. About 40 men had been called from check-posts at Phobrang. I arrived at Phobrang on 4-10-59. Tyagi arrived on 5th. Tyagi started for Tsogstsalu on 7-10-59 with about 40 men. I left Phobrang on 14th. A check-post was set up at Tsogstsalu. Tyagi arrived at Kiam on 18-10-59. I arrived there on 19th. A check-post was set up at Kiam. We had a programme to proceed to Shamal Lungpa. On 20-10-59 two constables Mohd. Khalil and Sonam Dorje missed along with a coolie. I suggested to Tyagi to send a small party to search for the missing men. But he said he would take a strong party lest there is a mishap. He had a mind to fight against the Chinese troops. He suspected that the missing men had been arrested by the Chinese troops.

Tyagi took about 60 men with him and ordered me to accompany him. Four bren guns and about 50 rifles were carried. Two or three sten guns and some 25 hand-grenades were also carried.

When we approached near a hill, some Chinese about 6 were seen. Tyagi ordered me to take some men with me to the back of the hill and himself proceeded in front to surround and to capture the Chinese. One or two Chinese were seen waving their hands as much as to say that you go away, while others took positions. The Indian soldiers fired first. According to Constable Abdul Majid, Const. Ali Raza fired first. Indian soldiers took away a Chinese horse. According to Const. Shiv Dayal, Manohar Lal Const. caught the horse. I believe statements of these constables are true. The Chinese soldiers were equipped with no mortar and other artillery. They were armed with rifles, tommy guns, hand-grenades and L.M.G. On most of the dead bodies of Indian soldiers the wounds are in front.

The areas east of, south of and north of the Kongka Pass are a part of China. I and my men had not visited the area where the battle occurred.

I shall never do anything that is against the Five Principles and Sino-Indian friendship any more and I shall never intrude into Chinese territory once again.

I wish that the border question between India and China should be decided amicably at the earliest.

I and my men have been given a good treatment by the Chinese officers and soldiers.

(Sd.) Karam Singh,
Deputy Commander, I.T.B. Force.
Kongka Pass, China.

NOTE:—The original statement is in the English language, in Karam Singh's own handwriting.
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Letter from the Prime Minister of China to the Prime Minister of India,
7 November 1959

Peking, November 7, 1959

DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER,

Your Excellency's letter dated September 26, 1959 has been received. It is most unfortunate that subsequently another unexpected border clash took place on October 21 within Chinese territory in the area south of the Kongka Pass. Regarding this clash, the Chinese and Indian Governments have already exchanged several notes, including the November 4 note of the Indian Government to the Chinese Government. Most regrettably, this note of the Indian Government not only disregards in many respects the basic facts of the question of boundary between the two countries and the truth of the border clash, but adopts an attitude which is extremely harmful to the friendly relations between the two countries. Obviously, it is in no way helpful to a settlement of the question to take such an attitude. Under the present circumstances, I consider the most important duty facing us is, first of all, to take effective steps speedily and without hesitation to earnestly improve the disquieting situation on the border between the two countries, and work for the complete elimination of the possibility of any border clash in the future.

As the Sino-Indian boundary has never been delimited, and it is very long and very far, or comparatively far, from the political centres of the two countries, I am afraid that, if no fully appropriate solution is worked out by the two governments, border clashes which both sides do not want to see may again occur in the future. And once such a clash takes place, even though a minor one, it will be made use of by people who are hostile to the friendship of our two countries to attain their ulterior objectives. There is a history of long-standing friendship but no conflict of fundamental interests between our two countries, and our governments are initiators of the Five Principles of peaceful coexistence. We have no reason to allow the tension on the border between our two countries to continue.

Your Excellency's letter of September 26 contains many viewpoints to which the Chinese Government cannot agree. Regarding these, I would like to state my views on another occasion. I am glad, however, that this letter reiterates that the Indian Government attaches great importance to the maintenance of friendly relations with China and agrees to the view consistently held by the Chinese Government that the border disputes which have already arisen should be settled amicably and peacefully, and that pending a settlement the status quo should be maintained and neither side should seek to alter the status quo by any means. In order to maintain effectively the status quo of the border between the two countries, to ensure the tranquillity of the border regions and to create a favourable atmosphere for a friendly settlement of the boundary question, the Chinese Government proposes that the armed forces of China and India each
withdraw 20 kilometres at once from the so-called McMahon line in the east, and from the line up to which each side exercises actual control in the west, and that the two sides undertake to refrain from again sending their armed personnel to be stationed in and patrol the zones from which they have evacuated their armed forces, but still maintain civil administrative personnel and unarmed police there for the performance of administrative duties and maintenance of order. This proposal is in effect an extension of the Indian Government’s proposal contained in its note dated September 10 that neither side should send its armed personnel to Longju, to the entire border between China and India, and moreover a proposal to separate the troops of the two sides by as great a distance as 40 kilometres. If there is any need to increase this distance, the Chinese Government is also willing to give it consideration. In a word, both before and after the formal delimitation of the boundary between our two countries through negotiations, the Chinese Government is willing to do its utmost to create the most peaceful and most secure border zones between our two countries, so that our two countries will never again have apprehension or come to a clash on account of border issues. If this proposal of the Chinese Government is acceptable to the Indian Government, concrete measures for its implementation can be discussed and decided upon at once by the two Governments through diplomatic channels.

The Chinese Government has never had the intention of straining the border situation and the relations between the two countries. I believe that Your Excellency also wishes to see the present tension eased. I earnestly hope that, for the sake of the great, long-standing friendship of the more than 1,000 million people of our two countries, the Chinese and Indian Governments will make joint efforts and reach a speedy agreement on the above-said proposal.

The Chinese Government proposes that in order to discuss further the boundary question and other questions in the relations between the two countries, the Prime Ministers of the two countries hold talks in the immediate future.

Respected Mr. Prime Minister! The peoples of our two countries desire that we act promptly. I think we should meet their desire and not let those, who seek every chance to disrupt by all means the great friendship between China and India, attain their sinister objective. I await an early reply from Your Excellency.

I take this opportunity to express to you my cordial regards.

CHOU EN-LAI,
Premier of the State Council of the People’s Republic of China.
Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

I have received your letter of November 7, for which I thank you. We have also received a report from our Ambassador, Shri Parthasarathy, on the talk which you had with him the same day.

2. In the note which was handed over to your Ambassador in Delhi on November 4, we have given full details, supported by factual data, of the international boundary in Ladakh. We also attached to the note a first-hand account of the incident at Chang Chenmo Valley on October 21 which resulted in the death or capture of a large number of Indian personnel. Earlier, in my letter of September 26 to you, we gave you full facts in support of our statement in regard to the Sino-Indian border along its entire length. I have not had any reply yet to my letter of September 26 or any detailed reply to our subsequent note of November 4. I notice with regret that you have not taken any account of the facts as given by us in these two communications and have dismissed them with the remark that our note “disregards in many respects the basic facts of the question of the boundary between our two countries and the truth of the border clash”. I am wholly unable to agree with this observation. We should certainly explore all avenues to reduce the present tension between our two countries, but our efforts will not succeed if we ignore facts.

3. I should like to repeat what I have said in a previous communication, that this entire frontier was a peaceful one for a long time and there was no conflict or trouble there. It is only recently that conflicts and difficulties have arisen in regard to the frontier. These difficulties have not arisen because of any action that we have taken. The cause of the recent troubles is action taken from your side of the frontier.

4. We are anxious that there should be a clear understanding about this frontier and that such border disputes as there are between our two countries should be settled by peaceful methods. In the immediate present, we think it is important to avoid all border clashes so as to assure tranquillity in the border regions and thereby create an atmosphere favourable for friendly settlement. We agree, therefore, that the two Governments should come to an agreement without delay, which would eliminate risks of border clashes.

5. The Government of India have given close and careful consideration to your suggestions in this regard. But, before I proceed to discuss them, I must inform you of the resentment aroused in India by the delay which took place in the release of the Indian personnel whom your forces had captured in the Chang Chenmo Valley on October 20 and 21 after inflicting casualties on our police patrol party. You will recall that on
October 24 we received your offer to hand over to us the captured personnel and the dead bodies of those who were killed during the clash. On October 26 our Ambassador in Peking informed your Government of our concern about the prisoners and our anxiety to receive them back as well as the dead bodies. We wished to know the time and place at which the transfer was to take place. In order to avoid delay we sent a forward party immediately to receive the prisoners and the dead bodies. This party waited at a place about five miles from the scene of the incident and, in spite of repeated reminders to your Government, no indication was given by your Government about the date and time of release until November 12. We are now relieved to know that the prisoners and the dead bodies were handed over to our forward party on November 14. In your talk with our Ambassador in Peking, you told him that the first-hand account of the incident which was attached to our note of November 4 was contradicted by the statements which the captured Indian personnel had made to you. We have since seen the official memorandum on the subject which your Vice-Minister handed to our Ambassador on November 14. We have not yet had any report from the released prisoners as to the course of events on October 20 and 21 and the circumstances in which they made their statements to their captors. It is clear from your letters that they have been subjected to repeated interrogation. Such interrogation of prisoners is deplorable.

6. In your letter, you have suggested that the armed forces of China and India should withdraw twenty kilometers from the lines which they occupy at present. This, in your view, would effectively prevent any border clashes. Before I discuss this suggestion further, I should like to state categorically that the Government of India had not posted any army personnel anywhere at or near the international border. Our border check-posts were manned by civil constabulary, equipped with light arms. The main purpose of these check-posts was to deal with traders or others going along the recognised routes and to prevent any undesirable or unauthorised check-posts were not intended for any aggressive purpose or for any persons crossing the border. This itself indicates that these border armed conflict. It was only after the recent unfortunate incidents that we asked our Army to take over responsibility for the protection of our border.

7. A proper understanding of the facts in regard to the Sino-Indian boundary is essential to the consideration of any proposal that is made for the avoidance of border clashes. The facts are that on our North-East frontier, the entire territory up to the border (which is referred to as the McMahon Line) has been for long years part of India. Our civil administration has been functioning there, and there are important civil divisional headquarters not far from the border. At no point, except at Longju, are Chinese forces in occupation of any area south of the Indian border. The boundary in this area passes over a terrain the height of which varies from 14,000 to 20,000 feet above sea-level. In this extremely difficult terrain, almost all our border check-posts are situated on high hill features. We do not know where the Chinese posts are, but I understand that at no point along the length of this sector are posts on the two sides situated within sight of each other. In view of the difficult mountainous terrain, even where the distance between two posts is short on the map or as the crow flies, the actual journey from one place to another might take several days.
8. In view of these facts, we think that there should not be the slightest risk of any border clash if each Government instructs its outposts not to send out patrols. It is only when armed patrols go out in these difficult mountainous areas that there is likelihood of clashes taking place. We have, in fact, instructed our border outposts not to send out any forward patrols for the present. It would be extremely difficult in practice to establish a new line of outposts in the rear, whether they are to be ten or twenty kilometers from the international boundary. The risk of border clashes will be completely eliminated if our suggestion is accepted by your Government.

9. Longju stands on a different footing altogether. As we have repeatedly stated earlier, we disagree with your statement that it is on your side of the so-called McMahon Line. We have no doubt that it is on our side. But whether it is on your side or ours, the facts are that your armed forces attacked and ousted our personnel from Longju, inflicting casualties on them, and forcibly occupied our outpost. We cannot, therefore, agree to any arrangement, even as an interim measure, which would keep your forcible possession intact. The proper course, which we have already suggested to you, would be for you to withdraw from Longju. We on our part will not re-occupy it. This suggestion, if accepted, will immediately result in a lowering of tension.

10. At no point on this border or elsewhere, have we taken over any post from you. In your talk with our Ambassador, you have stated that Khinzemane is north of the international boundary. I do not agree with this statement. As we have informed your Government previously, Khinzemane lies clearly south of this boundary and within our territory. It has throughout been in our possession.

11. I presume that your suggestion for a zone of withdrawal is intended also to apply to the Sino-Indian border in the middle areas, that is, where it touches our States of Uttar Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh and the Punjab. In these sectors also, there is no ambiguity about our border and at no point do the Chinese authorities occupy any area below the boundary. This would apply to the border of Sikkim also. If, therefore, we observe the precaution which I have mentioned above, all risk of border clashes will be eliminated in this sector of the frontier also.

12. I shall now deal with the international frontier in the Ladakh area of our State of Jammu and Kashmir. In my letter to you of September 26 and in our note of November 4, we have described in detail the international boundary in this sector, supported by factual data. Unfortunately, we do not yet know with any precision where the frontier line lies according to the claims of the Chinese Government. This is a matter for surmise based on small scale maps published in China. These maps themselves have not always been consistent, and different lines are sometimes indicated in them.

13. I regret I cannot accept the contention that you have been in occupation of the area up to the frontier line shown in your maps. On the contrary, the Government of India have exercised jurisdiction up to the frontier line specified by them. The nature of this possession has inevitably been different from that of an inhabited area. This area is uninhabited, mountainous territory of an altitude varying from 14,000 to 20,000 feet above sea-level, with the mountain peaks going up much higher.
of this, and because we did not expect any kind of aggression across our frontier, we did not think it necessary to establish check-posts right on the international boundary. But, as stated in my letter of September 26 and the note of November 4, we exercised jurisdiction over this area by sending regular patrols up to the international boundary. Certain police check-posts were established some distance from the boundary to control the trade routes, etc. Since this statement is controverted by you, it is obvious that there is complete disagreement between the two Governments even about the facts of possession. An agreement about the observance of the status quo would, therefore, be meaningless as the facts concerning the status quo are themselves disputed. As we are at present discussing a short term interim measure to avoid border clashes, it is essential that we do not get involved in interminable discussions on the status quo at this stage.

14. I suggest, therefore, that in the Ladakh area, both our Governments should agree on the following as an interim measure. The Government of India should withdraw all personnel to the west of the line which the Chinese Government have shown as the international boundary in their 1956 maps which, so far as we are aware, are their latest maps. Similarly, the Chinese Government should withdraw their personnel to the east of the international boundary which has been described by the Government of India in their earlier notes and correspondence and shown in their official maps. Since the two lines are separated by long distances, there should not be the slightest risk of border clashes between the forces on either side. The area is almost entirely uninhabited. It is thus not necessary to maintain administrative personnel in this area bounded by the two lines on the east and the west.

15. Mr. Prime Minister, I share Your Excellency's sentiments of friendship between our two countries. I have earnestly striven for this during the past ten years, but you will no doubt appreciate that mere expressions of friendship will not repair the breach that has already occurred. We have to face the realities of a situation, and the present situation is such that unless active efforts are made by the Governments of China and India, relations between our two countries are likely to grow worse. I am anxious that this should not happen as any such development will do incalculable harm not only to our two countries but also to the cause of world peace in general.

16. Your Excellency has been good enough to suggest that in order to discuss the boundary question and other outstanding issues between the two countries, the Prime Ministers of the two countries should hold talks in the immediate future. I welcome your suggestion and, as I have previously stated, I am always ready to meet and discuss with Your Excellency the outstanding differences between our countries and explore avenues of friendly settlement. It is our common desire that such a meeting should bear fruit. The nature of the discussion at our meeting should, therefore, be such that we do not lose ourselves in a forest of data. Our correspondence has shown that the issues involve a mass of historical data, maps etc. It is necessary, therefore, that some preliminary steps are taken and the foundation for our discussions laid. Unless this is done, there is danger of the meeting not leading to a successful result, which we so much desire, and disappointing the hopes of millions of people in our two countries.
17. While, therefore, I am ready to meet you at a suitable time and place, I feel that we should concentrate our immediate efforts on reaching interim understanding, which will help in easing the present tension and will prevent the situation getting worse. Thereafter, the necessary preliminary steps might be taken and the time and place of meeting, convenient and suitable to Your Excellency and to me, could be fixed. I need not assure Your Excellency of my earnest desire, as it is the desire of my people, to restore friendship between India and China on a firm basis.

With my expression of high regard.

I am,

Yours sincerely,

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU
Letter from the Prime Minister of China to the Prime Minister of India, 17 December 1959

Peking, December 17, 1959.

Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

Thank you for your letter of November 16, 1959. Although the Indian Government's opinions regarding the prevention of border clashes are still a certain distance away from the Chinese Government's proposal of November 7 and part of them obviously lack fairness, it is heartening that in your letter you have indicated the desire of trying to avoid all border clashes and to settle the boundary disputes between the two countries by peaceful methods.

The Chinese Government's proposal of November 7 for the withdrawal of the armed forces of the two countries 20 kilometers respectively along the entire border is aimed at thoroughly eliminating the risk of border clashes not wholly foreseeable, completely changing the present tense situation on the border where the two countries are facing each other in arms, and creating a favourable atmosphere of mutual confidence between the two countries. These aims are unattainable by other provisional measures. Furthermore, the adoption of this measure pending the delimitation of the boundary will in no way prejudice the advancing by each side of its claims when negotiations for the settlement of the boundary question take place. Therefore, the Chinese Government still earnestly hopes that we can reach agreement on such a measure for the sake of friendship between our two countries in the past and for hundreds of years to come. As to how far the armed forces of each country should withdraw, the Chinese Government is entirely willing to decide on a distance which will be deemed appropriate by both sides through consultation with the Indian Government.

Pending the above-mentioned agreement, the Chinese Government, in a conciliatory spirit and out of the desire to move toward the withdrawal of armed forces along the entire border, is prepared to agree first to reach a partial solution by applying the proposal you have made in your letter for the non-stationing of the armed forces of both sides at Longju to the other disputed places on the border as well. In the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, armed Indian personnel once occupied Longju and are now still in occupation of Khinzemane. In the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, armed Indian personnel are now in occupation of Shipki Pass, Parigas, Sang, Tsungsha, Puling-sumdo, Chuva, Chuje, Sangcha and Lapthal. Most of these places which definitely belong to China were occupied successively by armed Indian personnel after the signing of the 1954 Agreement on Trade and Intercourse. Between the Tibet Region of China and India in which China and India for the first time put forward the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence. Among them Puling-sumdo is one of the ten places which the Chinese Government agreed to open as markets for trade in the Aria area of the Tibet
region of China as specified in Article II Section 2 of the 1954 Agreement. Now since the Indian Government holds a different opinion on the ownership of these places, the Chinese Government proposes that no armed personnel of either side be stationed at any of them.

Pending a further agreement between the two sides, the Chinese Government also welcomes the Indian Government’s proposal for the frontier outposts of the two sides to stop sending out patrols. The Chinese Government has, in fact, instructed the Chinese frontier guards to stop sending out patrols from all their outposts on the Sino-Indian border after the Kongka Pass incident. Now that the Indian side has also taken the same step, this is of course a happy progress in safeguarding the tranquility of the border between the two countries. But the Chinese Government would like to ask for clarification on one point, that is: The proposal to stop patrolling should apply to the entire Sino-Indian border, and no different measure should be adopted in the sector of the border between China and India’s Ladakh.

The Chinese Government is very much perplexed by the fact that Your Excellency put forward a separate proposal for the prevention of clashes in the sector of the border between China and India’s Ladakh. The Chinese Government deems it necessary to point out the following: (1) There is no reason to treat this sector of the border as a special case. The line up to which each side exercises actual control in this sector is very clear, just as it is in the other sectors of the Sino-Indian border. As a matter of fact, the Chinese map published in 1956, to which Your Excellency referred correctly shows the traditional boundary between the two countries in this sector. Except for the Parigas area by the Shangat-sangpu River, India has not occupied any Chinese territory east of this section of the traditional boundary. (2) This proposal of Your Excellency’s represents a big step backward from the principle agreed upon earlier by the two countries of maintaining for the time being the state actually existing on the border. To demand a great change in this state as a pre-condition for the elimination of border clashes is not to diminish but to widen the dispute. (3) Your Excellency’s proposal is unfair. Your Excellency proposes that in this sector Chinese personnel withdraw to the east of the boundary as shown on Indian maps and Indian personnel withdraw to the west of the boundary as shown on Chinese maps. This proposal may appear “equitable” to those who are ignorant about the truth. But even the most anti-Chinese part of the Indian press pointed out immediately that, under this proposal, India’s “concession” would only be theoretical, because, to begin with, the area concerned does not belong to India and India has no personnel there to withdraw, while China would have to withdraw from a territory of above 33,000 square kilometers, which has long belonged to it, its military personnel guarding the frontiers and its civil administrative personnel of the Hotien County, the Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region, and of Rudok Dzong in the Ari area of the Tibet Autonomous Region respectively. (4) This area has long been under Chinese jurisdiction and is of great importance to China. Since the Ching Dynasty, this area has been the traffic artery linking up the vast regions of Sinkiang and western Tibet. As far back as in the latter half of 1950, it was along the traditional route in this area that units of the Chinese People’s Liberation Army entered the Ari area of Tibet from Sinkiang to guard the frontiers. In the nine years since then, they have been making regular and busy use of this route to bring supplies.
route, the motor-road over 1,200 kilometers long from Yecheng in southwestern Sinkiang to Gartok in southwestern Tibet was built by Chinese frontier guard units together with more than 3,000 civilian builders working under extremely difficult natural conditions from March 1956 to October 1957, cutting across high mountains, throwing bridges and building culverts. For up to 8 or 9 years since the peaceful liberation of Sinkiang and Tibet when units of the Chinese People's Liberation Army began to be stationed in and patrol this area till September 1958 when the intrusion of the area by armed Indian personnel occurred, so many activities were carried out by the Chinese side in this area under its jurisdiction and yet the Indian side was utterly unaware of them. This is eloquent proof that this area has indeed always been under Chinese jurisdiction and not under Indian jurisdiction. Now the Indian Government asserts that this area has all along been under Indian jurisdiction. This is absolutely unconvincing.

If the Indian Government, after being acquainted with the above view points of the Chinese Government, should still insist that its demand in regard to this area is proper, then the Chinese Government would like to know whether the Indian Government is prepared to apply the same principle equally to the eastern sector of the border, that is to say, to require both the Chinese and Indian sides to withdraw all their personnel from the area between the so-called McMahon line and the eastern section of the Sino-Indian boundary as shown on Chinese maps (and on Indian maps too during a long period of time). The Chinese Government has not up to now made any demand in regard to the area south of the so-called McMahon line as a pre-condition or interim measure, and what I find difficult to understand is why the Indian Government should demand that the Chinese side withdraw one-sidedly from its western frontier area.

Your Excellency and the Indian Government have repeatedly referred to the historical data concerning the Sino-Indian boundary as produced by the Indian side. The Chinese side had meant to give its detailed reply to Your Excellency's letter of September 26 and the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs of November 4 in the forthcoming talks between the Prime Ministers of the two countries, and thought it more appropriate to do so. Since the talks between the two Prime Ministers have not yet taken place, however, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs will give a reply in the near future. I do not wish to go here into the details of the matter. I would only point out again the simple fact that, according to objective history, the entire boundary between our two countries has indeed never been delimited, and it is impossible to deny this. I have noticed that the Indian side has, in its account of the boundary between the two countries, purposely left out many obvious basic facts. For example, it does not mention the fact that on the official maps compiled by the Survey of India in the past, up to the 1938 edition, the delineation of the eastern section of the Sino-Indian boundary still corresponded to that on Chinese maps while the western section of the Sino-Indian boundary was not drawn at all; even in its 1950, 1951 and 1952 editions published after the founding of the People's Republic of China, both the eastern and western sections of the Sino-Indian boundary, though incorrectly drawn, were clearly indicated as undelimited. The Chinese Government cannot see on what ground the Indian Government began suddenly in recent years to change the undelimited boundary in both the eastern and western sectors on its maps into delimited boundary. I have made a detailed study of the heap of data cited in Your Excellency's letter of September 26, still I cannot find any satisfactory answer.
The Chinese Government has pointed out many times that the boundary between China and India is very long and has never been delimited by the two Governments, that there are discrepancies between the maps of the two countries, and that therefore it is natural that the two countries should hold different opinions regarding the boundary. A reasonable settlement of this outstanding historical issue should not be difficult at all to achieve provided it is sought through friendly consultations. The People's Republic of China is a socialist country of the working people, where the exploiting classes and pro-imperialist forces who attempted to profit by outward expansion and provocations against other countries have long lost for good their footing for carrying out their activities. The People's Republic of China is consistently faithful to the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence; it absolutely does not allow itself to take an attitude of big-nation chauvinism towards other countries, let alone encroach one inch upon foreign territory. Further, China has such a vast expense of territory, more than half of which, moreover, is sparsely populated and will take great efforts to develop. It would be extremely ludicrous to think that such a country would still want to seek trouble in some desolate areas of a neighbouring country. Therefore, although there are some undelimited sections in the boundaries between China and some of its neighbouring countries in South Asia (whether they are big or small, friendly or unfriendly toward China), China has not taken and will never take advantage of this situation to make any change in the state actually existing on the border by resorting to unilateral action. China is moreover prepared, even after the settlement of the outstanding boundary issues, to work in unison and co-operation with all its neighbouring countries for the creation of a most peaceful, secure and friendly boundary. Your Excellency is aware that the so-called McMahon line in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border has never been recognized by past Chinese Governments, nor by the Government of the People's Republic of China, yet the Government of the People's Republic of China has strictly abided by its statement of absolutely not allowing its armed personnel to cross this line in waiting for a friendly settlement of the boundary question. It is quite obvious that China, which has not even stepped into the vast area south of the so-called McMahon line which, not long ago, was still under the jurisdiction of the local government of the Tibet region of China (part of the area up to 1951), would of course not think of stepping on to Indian territory at any place along the western sector of the Sino-Indian border. The Chinese military and civil administrative personnel over there, just as in other areas along the border, are only stationed on and guarding their own territory. However, the Indian Government has not only taken an unreasonable attitude of refusing to discuss the eastern sector of the border, but also laid territorial claim to an area in the western sector of the border, which has never been under Indian rule. This has indeed greatly surprised the Chinese Government and people. In the interest of upholding Sino-Indian friendship, the Chinese Government has always exercised the utmost self-restraint in the hope of settling these disputes with the Indian Government through friendly negotiations. Even after armed Indian personnel intruded into Chinese territory and provoked successively the incidents in the areas south of Migyitun and south of the Kongka Pass, the Chinese Government still maintained a conciliatory spirit, avoided aggravation of the situation and dealt in a friendly manner with the armed Indian personnel captured in the Kongka Pass incident. Yet the Indian side, disregarding the objective facts, arbitrarily asserted that both incidents were provoked by China, that China maltreated the cap-
lured Indian personnel, and even unscrupulously abused China as aggres-
sor, imperialism, etc. I must say that both our people and Government
feel extreme regret at such a serious state of affairs.

Your Excellency expressed welcome to my November 7 proposal for
the holding of talks between the Prime Ministers of the two countries.
Here indeed lies the hope for a turn for the better in the relations between
the two countries. Although there are differences of opinion between our
two countries on the boundary question. I believe that this in no way
hinders the holding of talks between the two Prime Ministers; on the con-
trary, it precisely requires its early realization so as to reach first some
agreements of principles as a guidance to concrete discussions and settle-
ment of the boundary question by the two sides. Without such a guidance,
there is a danger that concrete discussions of the boundary question by
the two sides may bog down in endless and fruitless debates. I therefore
make the concrete proposal that the two Prime Ministers begin talks on
December 26. If you wish to suggest any other date, I am also willing
to give it consideration. As to the site of the talks, if you agree, any
place in China can be chosen, because there are in China no activities
hostile to Sino-Indian friendship and you will be welcomed and respected
by our people as a distinguished guest of the Chinese Government. Should
you find it inconvenient for you to hold talks in China, Rangoon can be
fixed as the site of the talks, subject to the consent of the Burmese Govern-
ment.

Dear Mr. Prime Minister! Both our countries are still very backward
economically and culturally. We urgently need to engross ourselves in
long-term peaceful construction at home so as to free ourselves step by
step from the present state of backwardness. We have no need to create
tension between our two friendly nations or between us and any other
country, thus dissipating and diverting our people's attention from domestic
matters. The peoples of our two countries and the overwhelming majority
of the people of the world are inspired by the fact that the world situation
is developing in a direction favourable to peace. But unfortunately there
are still not a few influential groups in the world who obstinately oppose
this trend; they are trying to poison the international atmosphere, contin-
uing the cold war and creating tension to place barriers in the way of east-
west talks; they are slandering the peace policy of the socialist countries
and inciting discord between the Asian African countries and the socialist
countries, so that they may profit thereby. At present, they are obviously
exerting their utmost to sow discord between China and India. Under
these circumstances, the speedy holding of talks between the two Prime
Ministers is our unshirkable responsibility not only to our two peoples
but also to world peace.

With high respects.

CHOU EN-LAI
Premier of the State Council of the
People's Republic of China.
December 21, 1959.

Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

Thank you for your letter of December 17 the text of which our Ambassador in Peking has telegraphed to us. I deeply regret that you have not accepted the very reasonable proposals contained in my letter of 16th November. They were intended to secure an immediate lessening of tension along the Sino-Indian border by eliminating any risk of border clashes and to create the necessary atmosphere for a peaceful settlement of the border problem.

Your present letter once again reiterates claims to extensive areas which by history, by custom or by agreement have long been integral parts of India. I am particularly sorry to find that you have based your claim on recent intrusion by Chinese personnel into parts of Indian territory. It is these intrusions which have brought about the present situation and created apprehensions. You have not sent any reply to my letter of September 26 to you and our note of November 4 in which some salient facts bearing on the situation had been mentioned.

I only wish to say that I cannot accept your allegation that Indian forces have occupied any part of Chinese territory, or committed aggression at Kongka Pass or at Longju where our established check-post was attacked by Chinese troops.

Your letter also speaks of the 'friendly manner' in which Indian personnel who were captured in the Chang Chenmo valley were treated. Shri Karam Singh whom you returned to us has made his statement of the treatment that he and his colleagues received while they were prisoners in the custody of the Chinese border forces. This statement will show you the deplorable treatment to which the Indian prisoners were subjected by the Chinese forces.

Your Excellency has suggested that you and I should meet on December 26 so as to reach an agreement on the principles which are presumably to guide the officials on both sides in the discussion of details. As I informed you in my letter on November 16 and earlier, I am always ready to meet and discuss with your Excellency the outstanding differences between our countries and explore the avenues of settlement. How can we, Mr. Prime Minister, reach an agreement on principles when there is such complete disagreement about the facts? I would, therefore, prefer to wait for your promised reply to my letter of September 26 and our note of November 4, before we discuss what should be the next step. I wish to add that it is entirely impossible for me to proceed to Rangoon or any other place within the next few days.
I would not like to end this letter to you without referring to the sentiments which you have expressed in your last paragraph. I am in entire agreement with you that the principal concern of our two countries should be “with the programme of long-term peaceful construction to lift ourselves from our present state of backwardness”, to which you have referred. I equally agree with you that we should not be parties to the increasing of tension between our two countries or in the world. India has welcomed the fact that there is some lowering of world tensions and that “the world situation is developing in a direction favourable to peace”. It is for this last reason, even apart from the imperative need to improve the relations between our two countries, that in spite of all recent events I have continually stressed the need for a peaceful settlement of our problems.

With kind regards,

I am,

Yours sincerely,

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China to the
Embassy of India in China, 26 December 1959

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Peoples’ Republic of China
presents its compliments to the Embassy of the Republic of India in
China and has the honour to make the following observations on the
Sino-Indian boundary question, which the Embassy is requested to
transmit to the Indian Government:

On September 8, 1959, Premier Chou En-lai wrote to Prime Minister
Jawaharlal Nehru, giving an over-all account of the historical background
and the present actual situation of the Sino-Indian boundary question and
the stand and policy of the Chinese Government. Afterwards Premier
Chou En-lai and the Chinese Government received Prime Minister Nehru’s
letter of September 26 and the Indian Ministry of External Affairs’ note
of November 4. In the said letter and note, the Indian Government
indicated that it could not agree to Premier Chou En-lai’s account of the
facts regarding the boundary.

The Chinese Government is desirous at all times of maintaining
friendship with the Indian Government and people, and, on the boundary
question, of holding discussions with the Indian Government calmly and
amicably and with an attitude which is fair both to itself and to others
so as to seek a rapprochement of the views of the two sides. In view
of the fact that the Sino-Indian boundary question is rather complex and
that it would be extremely difficult to bring about a settlement through the
exchange of letters, the Chinese Government has always maintained that
face-to-face talks should be held speedily between the representatives of
the Governments, first of all between the Prime Ministers of the two
countries, so as more effectively to exchange views and reach agreement.
But since the talks between the two Prime Ministers are yet to be decided
on through consultations between the two sides, and the Indian Govern-
ment has moreover complained that the Chinese Government has given
no reply to the parts of the above-mentioned letter and note concerning
facts about the boundary, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China is
instructed to make further observations on the major questions concern-
ing the facts about the boundary, with reference to Premier Chou En-lai’s
letter of September 8, Prime Minister Nehru’s letter of September 26

China and India are two peace-loving, big countries with a long history
of mutual friendship and with many great common tasks both at present
and in the future. Friendship between China and India is in the interests
not only of the two peoples, but also of world peace, particularly of peace
in Asia. The Chinese Government is therefore very reluctant to engage
in arguments with the Indian Government over the boundary question.
Unfortunately, the Sino-Indian boundary has never been delimi-
ted. Britain left behind in this respect a heritage of certain di-
putes, and moreover the Indian Government has made a
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series of unacceptable charges against China, thereby rendering these arguments unavoidable. Because the Indian Government has put forth a mass of detailed data on the boundary question, the Chinese Government feels sorry that, though trying its best to be brief, it cannot but refer in this reply to various details so as to clarify the true picture of the historical situation and the views of the two sides.

For convenience' sake, in the following paragraphs the section of the boundary between China's Sinkiang and Tibet on the one hand and Ladakh on the other will be termed the western sector, the section of the boundary from the south-eastern end of the western sector to the converging point of China, India and Nepal the middle sector, and the section of the boundary east of Bhutan the eastern sector.

**QUESTION I**

**Has The Sino-Indian Boundary Been Formally Delimited?**

The reason for the present existence of certain disputes over the Sino-Indian boundary is that the two countries have never formerly delimited this boundary and that there is a divergence of views between the two countries regarding the boundary. According to the Indian maps, the boundary line in the western sector cuts deep into Chinese territory, including an area of over 33,000 square kilometers in India; the boundary line in the middle sector is relatively close to the delineation on the Chinese maps, but still a number of areas which have always belonged to China are included in India; and in the eastern sector, the whole boundary line is pushed northward, including in India an area of 90,000 square kilometers which originally belonged to China. The Chinese Government, therefore, consider it necessary to conduct friendly negotiations to bring about a reasonable settlement. The Indian Government, however, holds that the greater part of the Sino-Indian boundary line as shown on current Indian maps is defined by international agreements and therefore sees no reason to hold overall boundary negotiations. Thus, the negotiations themselves have run up against difficulties and there is the danger of the boundary disputes remaining deadlocked for a long time. The Chinese Government considers that to say that the greater part of the Sino-Indian boundary has been formally delimited by international agreements is totally inconsistent with the facts. The Chinese Government wishes to make the following explanations:

1. Concerning the western sector. The Indian Government holds that the boundary line it claims was fixed by a treaty concluded between the authorities of the Tibet region of China and the Kashmir authorities in 1842.

But firstly, this treaty merely mentioned that the boundary between Ladakh and Tibet would be maintained as it had been and that both sides would hold to their confines and refrain from encroaching on each other. The treaty contained no provision or hint whatsoever about the concrete location of the boundary. None of the arguments advanced by Prime Minister Nehru in his letter of September 26, 1959, to Premier Chou-En-lai to the effect that the location of the boundary has been long established can prove that the boundary line now claimed by the Indian Government is well-founded.
Secondly, the 1842 treaty was concluded between the authorities of the Tibet region of China and the Kashmir authorities, but the greatest part (about 80 per cent) of the area now disputed by the Indian Government is part of China's Sinkiang which was no party to the treaty. It is obviously inconceivable to hold that, judging by this treaty, vast areas of Sinkiang have ceased to belong to China but have become part of Ladakh. The British Government proposed in 1899 to delimit the boundary between Ladakh and Kashmir on the one hand and Sinkiang on the other, but nothing came of it. It is also inconceivable to hold that the territory of another country can be annexed by a unilateral proposal.

Thirdly, there are many indisputable positive evidences to show that the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary is not delimited. For instance, (a) Between 1921 and 1927, the British Indian Government made many representations to the authorities of China's Tibet region, asking to delimit the boundary between Ladakh and Tibet, but without any result. This is testified by many documents exchanged between the two sides at the time, and is also confirmed by Sir Arthur Lothian, the Briton who acted as the representative of India, in his letter to the London *Times* published on December 11, 1959. (b) According to data now available to the Chinese Government, no boundary line was drawn at all in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border on the official map published by the Survey of India as late as 1943. On the official Indian map of the 1950 edition, the present version of the boundary line was shown in a most equivocal way, but was still marked by the words "Boundary Undefined". It is only since 1954 that this undelimited sector of the boundary has suddenly become a delimited boundary. (c) Referring to this sector of the boundary in the Lok Sabha of India on August 28, 1959, Prime Minister Nehru declared that: "This was the boundary of the old Kashmir state with Tibet and Chinese Turkestan. Nobody had marked it". All the above-mentioned facts are absolutely incompatible with the allegation that this sector of the boundary was delimited long ago. It is unthinkable that the Indian Government which held that this sector of the boundary had explicitly been delimited in 1842 or 1899 would, between 1921 and 1927, still ask continually for negotiations to delimit it; that it would in 1943 still admit the absence of any determined boundary; that it would in 1950 still declare the mere existence of a boundary undefined; and that it would in 1959 still proclaim that nobody had marked the boundary.

(2) Concerning the middle sector. The Indian Government considers that the specification in Article IV of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement of six passes in this area as passages for traders and pilgrims of both countries indicates that the Chinese Government has already concurred in the Indian Government's opinion about this sector of the boundary. The Chinese Government holds that this allegation is untenable both factually and logically.

The question of the boundary between the two countries was not touched on at all in the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement or during its negotiations. The Chinese side's draft wording for Article IV of the Agreement was that "The Chinese Government agrees to open the following mountain passes in the Ari district of the Tibetan region of China for entry and exit by traders and pilgrims of both parties."
The Indian side disagreed with the Chinese draft; its own draft wording was that "Traders and pilgrims from India and western Tibet may travel by the routes traversing the following localities and passes." Later on the two sides agreed to change the wording into: "Traders and pilgrims of both countries may travel by the following passes and route." The concession made by the Chinese Government was only to adopt a wording which does not involve the ownership of these passes. Nobody can draw from this the conclusion that this sector of the boundary between the two countries has thus been fixed. On the contrary, the Chinese representative, Vice-Foreign Minister Chang Han-fu, in his talk with the Indian representative, Ambassador Mr. N. Raghavan, on April, 23, 1954 clearly stated that the Chinese side did not wish, in those negotiations, to touch on the boundary question. And Ambassador N. Raghavan agreed forthwith. The Chinese Government therefore maintains that there is no ground to say that this sector of the boundary has been delimited and that there is no need to conduct negotiations for its delimitation.

(3) Concerning the eastern sector. The Indian Government holds that the so-called McMahon Line is the product of the 1914 Simla Conference jointly attended by Britain, China and the Tibet region of China, and is therefore valid. The Chinese Government holds that the so-called McMahon Line is wholly illegal, and the Indian Government's assertion is utterly unacceptable to the Chinese Government.

Firstly, it is known to the world that the Simla Convention itself is void of legal validity. The Chinese representative Ivan Chen attending the Simla Conference not only refused to sign the Simla Convention, but acting under instructions from the Chinese Government formally declared at the Conference on July 3, 1914 that the Chinese Government would not recognize any treaty or similar document that might then or thereafter be signed between Britain and Tibet. Similar declarations were made in formal notes delivered to the British Government on July 3 and 7 the same year by Minister of the Chinese Government in Britain Lew Yuk-lin. All Chinese Governments since then persisted in this stand. Many dirty unequal treaties signed by the past Chinese Governments under imperialist oppression have already been proclaimed null and void. The Chinese Government feels perplexed why the Government of India, which has likewise won independence from under imperialist oppression, should insist that the Government of its friend China recognize an unequal treaty which the Chinese Government has not even signed.

Secondly, the Indian Government asserts that the boundary between India and the Tibet was discussed at the Simla Conference, that the Chinese Government never objected at the time or afterwards to the discussion of the boundary between India and Tibet at the Conference and that therefore the agreement which resulted from the Conference in regard to the McMahon Line boundary between India and Tibet must be regarded as binding on China. But this line of argument, from beginning to end, is inconsistent with the facts. As a matter of fact, the Simla Conference only discussed the boundary between the Tibet region and the rest of China and the boundary between so-called Outer and Inner Tibet, it never discussed the boundary between China and India. The so-called McMahon Line boundary between China and India was the
result of the exchange of secret letters at Delhi on March 24, 1914 between the British representative and the representative of the then Tibet local authorities. It was in no way made known to China. It also means that it was never placed on the agenda of the Simla Conference. A section of the red line shown on the map attached to the Simla Convention corresponds with the so-called McMahon Line, but that red line was presented as the boundary between Tibet and the rest of China, and it was never stated that part of the red line was the boundary between China and India. Since the so-called question of Sino-Indian boundary never existed at the Simla Conference and in the Simla Convention, the Chinese Government naturally would not refer to this question or the question of the so-called McMahon Line in its memorandum and its suggestions for the revision of the Simla Convention. The Indian Government has pointed to the fact that the Chinese Government at the time did not raise any objection to the so-called McMahon Line. But this fact only shows that the Chinese Government was completely unaware of the existence of the question of the so-called McMahon Line, and can in no way prove that the Line was legal or was accepted by the Chinese Government. It can thus be seen that the so-called McMahon Line is more unsavoury and more unpresentable than the Simla Convention, and it is indeed all the more strange to assert that it is binding on the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government would like to ask the Indian Government whether, among all the proceedings of the Simla Conference, it can point to any particular date of the Conference or any particular article of the Convention when and where the Sino-Indian boundary question, and particularly the question of the so-called McMahon Line, was referred to.

In addition, it must also be pointed out that it is beyond doubt that Britain had no right to conduct separate negotiations with Tibet. Indeed, the Chinese Government made repeated statements to this effect; as to the British Government, it too was strictly bound by the 1907 agreement on Tibet concluded between it and the old Russian Government not to enter into negotiations with Tibet except through the intermediary of the Chinese Government. Therefore, judging by this treaty obligation alone which was undertaken by the British Government, the secret exchange of letters in 1914 between the British representative and the representative of the Tibet local authorities behind the back of the Chinese Government is void of any legal validity.

Thirdly, the assertion that China did not raise any objection to the so-called McMahon Line boundary between China and India is also inconsistent with the fact. It was during the most difficult period of China's War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression that the so-called McMahon Line gradually and unofficially appeared on Indian maps; and after 1943 the Tibet local authorities were under the firm control of British imperialism and their relations with the Chinese Central Government steadily deteriorated. Nevertheless, on learning that Britain had gradually encroached on Chinese territory south of the so-called McMahon Line, the Kuomintang Government four times protested by addressing notes to the British Embassy in China after the conclusion of the Anti-Japanese War, in July, September and November of 1946 and January of 1947. Since Britain shifted its responsibility onto India, the Kuomintang Government protested by note with the Indian Embassy in China in
February 1947. Even up to November 18, 1949, Lo Chia-lun, Ambassador to India of the Chang Kai-shek clique which then still maintained diplomatic relations with the Indian Government, delivered a note to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, repudiating the Simla Convention which the Indian Government held to be valid. The Government of the People’s Republic of China, since establishing diplomatic relations with the Government of India has repeatedly stated the fact that the Sino-Indian boundary has not been delimited. During Prime Minister Nehru’s visit in China in 1954, Premier Chou En-lai made it clear that the Sino-Indian boundary was yet to be delimited. Premier Chou also said that the reason why the delineation of old maps was followed in Chinese maps was that the Chinese Government had not yet undertaken a survey of China’s boundary, nor consulted with the countries concerned, and that it would not make changes in the delineation of the boundary on its own. This was reiterated in the memorandum delivered to the Indian Embassy in China by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs on November 3, 1958. Besides, even the local authorities of Tibet did not regard as reasonable the so-called McMahon Line, which was the product of underhand schemes; they repeatedly objected to this line and asked for the return of occupied Chinese territory south of the line. This fact is not denied even by the Indian Government.

Fourthly, not only the so-called McMahon Line boundary between China and India has never been recognized by the Chinese Government; its validity was for a long time questioned by the Indian and the British Governments. The so-called McMahon Line was not adopted on the official map “Tibet and Adjacent Countries” published by the Survey of India in 1938, nor on the map “India” in the sixth edition of the Oxford Advanced Atlas, 1940, compiled by John Bartholomew, cartographer to the King of Britain. Neither was the so-called McMahon Line followed in drawing the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary on the map “India 1945” attached to the 1951 3rd edition in English of “The Discovery of India”, written by Prime Minister Nehru himself and first published in 1946. Although the so-called McMahon Line was drawn on the official maps of India published by the Survey of India in 1950, 1951 and 1952, it was still marked as undemarcated. Up to 1958, on the map “China West and Tibet” in the Times Atlas of The World edited by John Bartholomew, cartographer to the King of Britain, the traditional Sino-Indian boundary line and the so-called McMahon Line were both drawn with the words “Disputed Area” marked between the lines. All these authoritative facts squarely refute the Indian Government’s argument that this sector of the boundary has been delimited. The Indian Government contends that Britain withheld the publication of the Simla Convention for years in the hope that there would be an agreement about the status and boundary of Inner Tibet. That this assertion cannot help the Indian Government out of its difficulties is already explained as above, the assertion moreover adds to its difficulties. What meaning can the Simla Convention have, when the British Government also admitted that no argument was reached on it? And since the Convention itself has not acquired validity, what can be said for the so-called Sino-Indian boundary line which was never proposed to the Chinese Government and which the British unilaterally meant to smuggle into this Convention? In fact, British officials who once held posts in India, though by no means pro-Chinese, also admit that the McMahon Line is legally untenable and actually ineffective. For instance, Henry Twynam, who was acting
Governor of Assam, India, in 1939, testified in his letter to the London Times published on September 2, 1959, that this line “does not exist, and never has existed.”

From what has been said in the above the following incontestable conclusion can be drawn: The entire Sino-Indian boundary, whether in its western, middle, or eastern sector, has not been delimited. The 1842 Treaty, on which the Indian Government bases itself, did not define any boundary line for the western sector of the Sino-Indian border; and moreover, China’s Sinkiang region, which is most concerned with this sector of the boundary, was no party to this Treaty. The 1954 Agreement, on which the Indian Government bases itself, did not involve the middle or any other sector of the Sino-Indian boundary. The 1914 Convention, on which the Indian Government bases itself, is itself void of legal validity, and the Sino-Indian boundary was never discussed at the 1914 Conference. That the Sino-Indian boundary is yet to be delimited has been recognized by the Indian and British Governments over a long period of time, and is borne out by indisputable evidences. In order to achieve a reasonable settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary dispute satisfactory to both sides, there is no other way except the holding of friendly negotiations.

**Question II**

Where is the Traditional Customary Sino-Indian Boundary Line?

Although the Sino-Indian boundary has not been formally delimited, both sides acknowledge the existence of a traditional customary line, that is, the line formed by the extent of jurisdiction exercised historically by each side. The present question is that the two sides hold very different conceptions of the position of the traditional customary line. In drawing the boundary (mainly the eastern and western sectors) on its maps, the Indian Government has gone far beyond the extent of its original actual jurisdiction; it asserts that this is not only based on international treaties but is the traditional customary line itself. The Chinese Government holds that the delineations of the Sino-Indian boundary on current Indian maps, which differ greatly from those on Chinese maps, are not based on any international treaty, as stated above, and, what is more, are not based on tradition and custom.

(1) Concerning the western sector. The area of over 33,000 square kilometers now disputed by India has always belonged to China. This is conclusively borne out by Chinese official documents and records. Except for the very small area of Parigas which has been occupied by India in recent years, the remaining broad area has always been under the effective control of the Chinese Government. The major part of this area is under the jurisdiction of Hotien County of the Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region of China, while the minor part under that of Rudok Dzong of the Tibetan Autonomous Region of China. Though sparsely populated, this area has all along been a place for pasturage and salt-mining for the Uighur and Kirghiz people living in the south-western border of Sinkiang and a part of the Tibetan people living in the north-western border of Tibet. Many places of this area are named in the Uighur language. For instance, Aksai Chin, which is part of Hotien
County of Sinkiang means “the desert of white stones” in the Uighur language; while the Karakash River which flows through this area means “the river of the black jade” in the Uighur language.

This area is the only traffic artery linking Sinkiang and western Tibet because to its north-east lies the great Gobi of Sinkiang through which direct traffic with Tibet is practically impossible. Therefore, since the middle of the eighteenth century, the Government of the Ching Dynasty of China had established Karens (check-posts) to exercise jurisdiction over and patrol this area. In the decades from the founding of the Republic of China till the liberation of China, there were troops constantly guarding this area. After the liberation of Sinkiang in 1949, the Chinese People’s Liberation Army took over the guarding of the frontier in this area from Kuomintang troops. In the latter half of 1950, it was through this area that the Chinese Government dispatched the first units of the Chinese People’s Liberation Army to enter Tibet. In the nine years since then, the Chinese troops stationed in the Ari district have regularly and frequently brought up indispensable supplies from Sinkiang through this area. From March 1956 to October 1957, the Chinese Government built along the customary route a motor-road from Yehcheng of Sinkiang to Gartok of Tibet of a total length of 1,200 kilometers, of which a section of the 180 kilometers runs through this area, and over 3,000 civilian workers took part in its construction.

These unshakable facts should have been sufficient to prove beyond dispute that this area is Chinese territory.

The Indian Government asserts that this area “has been associated with India’s culture and tradition for the last two thousand years or so, and has been an intimate part of India’s life and thought.” But firstly the Indian Government fails to give any concrete facts to support its contention. On the contrary, Prime Minister Nehru said in the Rajya Sabha of India on September 10, 1959, that this area “has not been under any kind of administration”. On November 23, 1959, he said again in the Rajya Sabha of India: “During British rule, as far as I know, this area was neither inhabited by any people nor were there any outposts.” Though Prime Minister Nehru is in no position to judge correctly the conditions prevailing on the Chinese side, his words do prove authoritatively that India has never exercised control over this area.

Secondly, the Indian Government says that it has been sending regular patrols to this area, and that this is one way India exercises its jurisdiction. According to data available to the Chinese Government however, armed Indian personnel intruded only three times into this area to carry out reconnaissance, namely, in September 1958, July 1959 and October 1959, and on each occasion they were promptly detained and then sent out of China by Chinese frontier guards. Apart from these three intrusions, they have never been to this area. It is precisely for this reason that the Indian Government has been so unaware of the long-term activities of the Chinese personnel in this area that it declares that it was in 1957 that Chinese personnel first entered this area.

Thirdly, the Indian Government has referred to a number of maps to corroborate what it has claimed to be the traditional customary line. But
the situation in this respect is not favourable to India's arguments either. Despite slight discrepancies at some places, the delineations of the western sector of the boundary on the maps published in China in the past one to two hundred years have in the main been consistent. The Indian Government says that the delineation of the western sector of the boundary on an official Chinese map published in 1893 approximates to that of the Indian maps. The Chinese Government does not know what map is referred to here and, consequently, is unable to comment on it. As to the Atlas published in 1917 by the British-owned paper, the North China daily News and Herald, it can only represent the British view but not the Chinese, and there is no need to discuss it here.

By contrast, there have been considerable contradictions and confusion in the delineations of the boundary on maps published in Britain and India in the past century and more. This is because, after occupying Kashmir, Britain actively tried to use it as a base for aggression against China's southern Sinkiang and north-western Tibet and, therefore, it continually made arbitrary changes in the traditional customary boundary line in the western sector and sent surveying parties to intrude into China for this purpose. Prime Minister Nehru says that "accurate" maps, that is, maps in agreement with the current Indian maps, became possible only from 1865 after surveys. But, even so, some reputed surveyors did not wish to misrepresent the facts at will. For instance, the delineations of the boundary on the "Sketch Map of Eastern Turkestan" of 1870 by G. W. Hayward and on the "Sketch Map of the Country North of India" of 1871 by Robert Shaw—both surveyors being referred to by Prime Minister Nehru in his letter of September 26—are close to the traditional customary line as shown on Chinese maps. In his article in the Journal Of The British Royal Geographical Society, Vol. XL, 1870, Hayward stated explicitly that the boundary ran along the main chain of the Karakoram mountain to the passes in Changchenmo, that is to say it is the Chinese maps, rather than the current Indian maps, that have correctly delineated this sector of the boundary. What is of special significance is the fact that no boundary line, let alone an "accurate" boundary line, was drawn at all for this sector on the official map compiled by the Survey of India as late as the 1943 edition. On its 1950 map, though the same colour for Kashmir was painted in the area disputed by India, still no boundary line was drawn, and there were marked the words "Boundary Undefined". This fact already been pointed out above.

Fourthly, the Indian Government says that the traditional customary line claimed by it possesses in addition, distinct geographical features, that is, it runs along the watershed. However, to begin with, the principle of watershed is not the sole or main international principle for the delimitation of boundaries. It is particularly impermissible to use the watershed as a pretext for seeking a boundary line within the territory of another country. Next, the traditional customary line claimed by the Indian Government, instead of separating the Hotien River system from the Indus River system, actually cuts across the Hotien River system. On the contrary, the traditional customary line as shown on Chinese maps truly reflects the geographical features of this area, that is, having no steep slopes in the north-south direction, the area is easily passable and therefore, naturally forms the only route linking Sinkiang and western Tibet. To the west, however, there lies between this region and Ladakh the towering Karakoram mountain range which is extremely difficult to pass through.
The Indian Government also admits that this area is extremely difficult of access from Ladakh.

It can thus be seen that judging by the actual administrative jurisdiction at all times or by the maps and geographical features referred to by India, the line claimed by India to be the traditional customary boundary line in the western sector is without any foundation; while the traditional customary line for which China stands is truly well-founded.

(2) Concerning the middle sector. The disputed areas involved here owing to difference of conception between the two sides regarding the traditional customary line—Chuva, Chuje, Shipki Pass, Sang, Tsungsha, Puling-Sumdo, Wuje, Sangcha and Lapthal—are all traditional Chinese territory. Except Sang and Tsungsha which were invaded and occupied by Britain earlier, they were all occupied or intruded into by India only after the signing of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement.

The local authorities of the Tibet region have kept up to now the land-conferring documents or land deeds concerning these places issued in the past few centuries. For example, the mandate issued in the name of the 7th Dalai Lama in the 18th century stated specifically that Wuje was within the territorial limits of Daba Dzong of Tibet. Furthermore, the local authorities of the Tibet region have all along been collecting taxes in these places and the census record and taxation papers of some of these places have been well preserved down to the present time.

Nearly all those who have lived long in these places are of the Tibetan nationality of China. Despite foreign occupation of their places of residence, they still did not wish to be separated from their motherland. For instance, after Sang and Tsungsha were occupied by Britain, the local population still considered themselves Chinese nationals, and no more than one occasion pledged their allegiance to the local government of the Tibet region of China in statements made to the local authorities of the Tibet region.

It must be pointed out in particular that among the above mentioned places, Puling-Sumdo is one of the ten places which the Chinese Government agreed to open as markets for trade in the Ari district of Tibet as specified in Article II, Section 2 of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954. It was opened together with the nine other markets in compliance with request made by Mr. N. Raghavan, representative of the Indian Government and Indian Ambassador, at the first meeting of the negotiations. Puling-Sumdo, however, was occupied by India soon after the signing of the 1954 Agreement.

The Indian Government claims that it has all along been exercising jurisdiction over the above-mentioned places. However, in the note annexed to Prime Minister Nehru’s letter of September 26, 1959, apart from some extremely strained arguments in connection with Sang and Tsungsha, there are no concrete facts whatever to show that jurisdiction has always been exercised over the seven other places.

The principle of watershed put forward by the Indian Government cannot be applied here either, as it does not conform with the jurisdiction actually exercised by each side.
The maps published by the two sides also show that it is China, not India, which has abided by the traditional customary line. The delineations of this sector of the boundary on past Chinese maps, though leaving a few very small pieces of Chinese territory outside of the Chinese boundary, on the whole reflected the correct traditional customary line. On the other hand, no boundary line was drawn for this sector on official Indian maps even as late as 1950, and only the words “Boundary Undefined” were marked.

(3) Concerning the eastern sector. The area between the so-called McMahon Line and the boundary line at the southern foot of the Himalayas as shown on Chinese maps has always belonged to China, and was until recently still under Chinese Jurisdiction. This is proved by a mass of facts.

As early as the middle of the seventeenth century, the local government of the Tibet region of China had begun to exercise jurisdiction over this area comprising Monyul, Loyul and Lower Tsayul. Take the Monyul area for example. In the middle of the seventeenth century, when the fifth Dalai Lama unified Tibet, he sent his disciple Mera Lama and tribal chief Namka Drukdha, Dinpon of Tsona, to the Monyul area to establish their rule there. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, the local government of the Tibet region had unified the whole of Monyul and divided the area gradually into 32 “tso” (a few named “din”). At Tawang the capital of Monyul, an administrative committee known as “Tawang Shidrel” and a non-permanent administrative conference of a higher level known as “Tawang Drudrel” were set up to direct the affairs of the whole area. The local government of the Tibet region used always to appoint the officials of the administrative organs at various levels in Monyul, collect taxes (mainly grain tax, twice a year) and exercise judicial authority in all parts of the area. Monyul was included in every census conducted in Tibet in the past and was not treated as an exceptional case. The religious economic and cultural life of the local people, the Monbas, has been deeply influenced by the Tibetan nationality; they believe in Lamaism, can speak the Tibetan language, and used Tibetan currency. It is from the Monyul area that the 6th Dalai Lama, Tsanyun Gyaltso, hailed, and his house there received for all generations the mandates conferred by successive regimes of the Tibet region.

In addition, it must be pointed out that even after the so-called McMahon Line was defined and made public, the local government of the Tibet region continued to exercise extensively and for a long period of time its jurisdiction over this area. For instance, the Tibetan administrative institutions in Monyul had been almost kept intact until 1951. In Loyul and Lower Tsayul, up to 1946, the administrative organs of “tso” and “din” were maintained quite extensively, and the people continued to pay taxes and render corvee to the Lhasa authorities.

Therefore, the allegations of the Indian Government that “the Tibetan authorities have not exercise jurisdiction at any time in this area,” that the local “tribes have not been affected in the slightest degree by any Tibetan influence, cultural, political or other,” and so on are incredible.
The Indian Government claims that it has always exercised jurisdiction over this area. However, in Prime Minister Nehru's own words, Indian administration had "gradually moved up" to this area; the tribes had generally been left "more or less to look after themselves" until around 1914; and British political officers only "visited these areas." And what did the British officers who had visited this area say? The Captain Bailey referred to by Prime Minister Nehru in his letter of September 26, 1959, who was specially sent by the British Indian Government in 1913 to south-eastern Tibet to conduct illegal exploration and survey for the purpose of defining the so-called McMahon Line, described the jurisdiction of the Tibet local government over the Monyul area at the time in his book "No Passport To Tibet" published in 1957; he further stated in his letter to the London Times published on September 7 this year that, "When we reached Tawang (i.e. capital of Monyul), we found a purely Tibetan administration in force." Even Christoph Von Furer-Haimendorf, then Special Officer of the Indian External Affairs Department in Subansiri, who was sent by the Indian Assam authorities in 1944, that is, thirty years after the so-called McMahon Line was defined, to explore this area, also testified in his book "Himalayan Barbary" published in 1955, that the frontier in this area was undefined and unsurveyed, and remained unadministered by the Indian authorities. It can thus be seen how untenable are the assertions that the area has belonged to India for tens and hundreds of years, that the current boundary has always been the historical boundary, etc., etc.

The Indian Government says that the British concluded a number of agreements with some of the local tribes between 1844 and 1888 and that these agreements are evidence of Indian jurisdiction. However, the 1853 agreement with the Monbas cited by Prime Minister Nehru, begins with the statement by the Monbas: "We...being deputed by the Daba Rajas to carry letters of friendship to the Agent. Governor-General, North-East Frontier, desiring that the former friendly relations which existed between the Government of India and our Lhasa Government... should be again resumed..." This passage proves exactly and indisputably that the Monbas belong to Tibet, not India, and that it was under the premise of recognizing them as belonging to Tibet that the Indian Government concluded the agreement with them. The Daba Rajas referred to here was the Regent of the local government of the Tibet region. As to the agreements with the Abors and the Akas cited, it can also be seen clearly from their texts that the areas of those tribes were not British territory. Some of the agreements even stated explicitly that British territory "extends of the foot of the hills (i.e. southern foot of the Himalayas)." And these peoples were not British subjects.

It can be seen from the above historical data provided by the Chinese and Indian sides respectively that this area always belonged to China, not to Britain or India.

This conclusion is further confirmed forcefully by the authoritative maps published in the two countries. The maps published in China as a rule include this area in Chinese territory, that is, marking the boundary line along the true traditional boundary at the southern foot of the Himalayas. According to material now available to the Chinese Government, the same delineation was followed on the official maps published by the Survey of India up to and including the 1938 edition. After 1938
and up to 1952, the Survey of India changed its delineation by marking the boundary in accordance with the so-called McMahon Line, but still using marking for undemarcated boundary. Since 1954, it has again changed the undemarcated boundary into demarcated boundary. By these successive changes, it shifted from its original position of recognizing this area as Chinese territory to that of claiming this area as India’s lawful territory at all times. Nevertheless, the delineation on current Indian maps has not been accepted internationally. As stated above, the Atlas edited by John Bartholomew, cartographer to the King of Britain, and published in 1958 still considered it a disputed area, while the delineation on the map “India 1945”, attached to Prime Minister Nehru’s book “The Discovery of India,” was still the same as that on Chinese maps.

In the face of these authoritative facts, the Atlas of the Chinese Empire published in London in 1906 by the China Inland Mission, a British church organization, to which the Indian Government referred, is obviously without significance.

It can be seen from what has been said in the above that the Chinese Government’s view of the traditional customary line is based on objective facts and confirmed by a mass of factual data in all its sectors, western, middle and eastern. On the other hand, the boundary line marked on Indian maps, with the exception of the middle sector which for the most part conforms to reality, does not represent at all the traditional customary line. The eastern and western sectors of this boundary line, it can in particular be seen beyond any shadow of doubt, are the product of the British policy of aggression and expansion in modern history.

It should not have been necessary to discuss the British policy of aggression and expansion in modern history, as the history of India itself, the history of India’s adjacent countries which had once been a part of British India or its dependency, the history of China, and, in particular, the history of China’s Tibet region bordering adjoining India, all bear witness to this policy. While embarking on armed aggression against Tibet and conspiring to cause Tibet to break away from China, Britain also nibbled at the frontiers of Tibet both on the maps and in deed, which resulted in this boundary line that was later inherited by India and is marked on current India maps. Of course, the great Indian people, who treasure peace, can in no way be held responsible for all the acts of aggression committed by Britain with India as its base. It is, however, surprising that the Indian Government should claim the boundary line which Britain unlawfully created through aggression against Tibet and which even includes areas to which British authority had not extended as the traditional customary boundary line, while perversely describing the true traditional customary boundary line pointed out by the Chinese Government on the basis of objective facts as laying claim to large tracts of Indian territory. How would the Indian Government feel, if it were in the position of the Chinese Government? If this assertion is maintained, the inevitable conclusion to be derived would be that the British colonialists were most fairminded while oppressed China was full of undisguised ambitions; that the powerful British imperialism was, for the past one hundred years and more, invariably upholding the traditional Sino-Indian
boundary, while the weak China was ceaselessly encroaching upon British territory! The Chinese Government believes that no one would accept this conclusion.

**QUESTION III**

**What is the Proper Way To Settle The Sino-Indian Boundary Dispute?**

The Chinese Government, starting from the above-mentioned facts that the Sino-Indian boundary has never been formerly delimited and that there is difference of conception between the two sides regarding the boundary, has consistently held that an overall settlement of the boundary question between the two countries should be sought by the Chinese and Indian sides, taking into account the historical background and present actual situation, in accordance with the Five Principles and through friendly consultations; that pending this, as a provisional measure, the two sides should maintain the status quo of the border, and not seek to change it by unilateral action, let alone by force; and that as to some of the disputes partial and provisional agreements could be reached through negotiations.

The Indian Government disagrees with the Chinese Government’s statement that the boundary has not been delimited and an over-all settlement of the question should be sought through negotiations, and only acknowledges that certain minor, partial adjustments could be made. Yet the Indian Government agrees that the two sides should maintain the status quo of the border, avoid the use of force and settle the disputes through negotiations. Thus, although there are differences between the two sides, the tranquillity of the border and the friendship of the two countries could have been ensured. Contrary to the expectations of the Chinese Government, the Indian Government has time and again asserted that the Chinese Government had previously agreed that the boundary had been delimited and accepted the Indian Government’s claim regarding the boundary and that the Chinese Government changed its stand only recently. At the same time, the Indian Government has also made incorrect interpretations of the status quo of the border, repeatedly violated the status quo in actual deeds and even resorted to force, thus creating tension on the border. In these circumstances, the Indian Government has perversely charged that the Chinese Government should be held responsible for all this and said that China harboured ambitions of “aggression” and “expansion”. The above-mentioned attitude of the Indian Government has made the boundary question all the more difficult and complicated.

Therefore, the Chinese Government deems it necessary to clarify the following points:

1. Whether the Chinese Government has ever agreed that the boundary was delimited and accepted the Indian Government’s claim regarding the boundary and changed its stand afterwards.

The Indian Government has referred to the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954, holding that this Agreement has dealt with all the outstanding issues between India and the Tibet region, and that therefore the boundary question should be considered settled.
As a matter of fact, the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 is an agreement on trade and intercourse between the Tibet region of China and India and has nothing to do with the boundary question and no provision concerning the boundary can be found in any article of the Agreement. It may be recalled that at that time, the question which the two countries were most concerned about and which called for urgent solution was the establishment of normal relations between India and the Tibet region of China on a new basis. During the negotiations, neither side asked to discuss the boundary question; this was intended to avoid affecting the settlement of the most urgent question at the time. Both sides were clear on this point. At the very beginning of the negotiations, Premier Chou En-lai made it clear to the Indian Government Delegation that the task of the negotiations was “to settle those outstanding questions between the two countries which are ripe for settlement.” Afterwards, at the fourth meeting held on January 8, 1953 the two sides jointly defined the task of the negotiations as settling those outstanding questions between the two countries which were ripe for settlement in accordance with the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence. On April 23 of the same year, the Chinese representative further pointed out that the negotiations would not touch on the boundary question. The Indian representative agreed to this view of the Chinese side. There was, therefore, no fact whatever to show that the Chinese Government agreed to the Indian Government's conception of the boundary or that it would not bring up the boundary question for discussion afterwards.

The Indian Government has also referred to the talks between the two Prime Ministers in Peking in October 1954, expressing the view that Premier Chou En-lai’s remarks about Chinese maps implied that the Chinese Government would revise its maps in accordance with Indian maps, that is to say, the Chinese Government had accepted the Indian Government’s claim regarding the boundary.

The fact is that at that time Prime Minister Nehru took exception to the delineation of the Sino-Indian boundary line on Chinese maps and therefore Premier Chou En-lai explained that the delineation of the boundary on Chinese maps followed that of the old maps and that it would not be fitting for the Chinese Government, on its own, to change the delineation of the boundary before conducting surveys and consulting with the countries concerned. In particular, Premier Chou En-lai pointed out at the time that China has undelimited boundaries with India and some other south-western neighbouring countries. Prime Minister Nehru said, however, that he considered that no boundary question existed between China and India. It can be seen from this conversation that there was an obvious difference of views between the two sides regarding the boundary, and that Premier Chou En-lai clearly expressed his disagreement to any unilateral revision of maps.

The Indian Government has also referred to the talks between the two Prime Ministers held in India at the end of 1956, considering that Premier Chou En-lai’s remarks made at the time about the so-called McMahon Line implied that the Chinese Government recognized this line.

In fact, when Premier Chou En-lai referred to the so-called McMahon Line, he said that it was illegal and had never been recognized by the
Chinese Government. He explained at the same time that despite this, in order to ensure the tranquillity of the border and out of consideration for the friendship of the two countries, Chinese military and administrative personnel would strictly refrain from crossing this line and expressed the hope that a proper way to settle the eastern sector of the boundary might be found at a later date. This statement of Premier Chou En-lai can by no means be interpreted as recognition of this line by the Chinese Government.

It can thus be seen that the Chinese Government has been consistent in its attitude that the boundary has not been delimited and is yet to be settled through negotiations between the two countries. The Indian Government's implication that the Chinese Government has changed its original stand does not accord with the facts.

(2) Whether the Chinese Government scrupulously respects the status quo of the border.

It is a principle agreed upon by both sides that pending an over-all settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, the status quo of the border should be maintained.

The Chinese Government has faithfully abided by this principle. In the ten years since liberation, Chinese military and administrative personnel have been under orders not to go beyond the areas which have always been under Chinese jurisdiction, and even not to cross the so-called McMahon Line in the eastern sector.

The Indian Government's interpretation of the status quo of the border, however, is based not on the actual scope of jurisdiction of the two sides, but on the unilaterally fixed boundary line shown on Indian maps that includes large areas where Indian jurisdiction has never reached. Thus armed Indian personnel have repeatedly violated the status quo of the border and, step by step, extended the scope of its occupation by encroaching on Parigas, Chuva, Chuje, Shipki Pass, Puling-Sumdo, Sangcha and Lapthal, and intruded into Aksai Chin, Lake Pangong, Kongka Pass and Wujie. But the Indian Government describes all these actions as maintenance of the status quo. In the eastern sector, after the outbreak of the rebellion in Tibet in March this year, armed Indian personnel even overstepped the so-called McMahon Line, at one time occupied Longju and Tamaden, and is now still in occupation of Khinzemane, all of which are situated north of that Line.

Although the Indian side has occupied Puling-Sumdo, one of the Chinese markets specified in the 1954 Agreement and once occupied Tamaden which India itself admits to be Chinese territory, yet the Indian Government has all along denied having violated the status quo of the border. Moreover, basing itself on the boundary line shown on its own maps, the Indian Government accused China of violating the status quo of the border. To this the Chinese Government cannot agree.

(3) Whether the Chinese Government has earnestly avoided using force.
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Recently, two armed clashes which neither side wished to see occurred in the Migyitun area and the Kongka Pass area. This was extremely unfortunate. But it is not China that should be held responsible for them. The Migyitun area incident of August 25 was caused by the action of the armed Indian personnel who had invaded and occupied Longju in advancing further to the southern vicinity of Migyitun and attacking a Chinese patrol. Armed Chinese personnel never attacked the outpost established illegally by India at Longju; on the contrary, it was the armed Indian personnel from the Longju outpost who opened fire on an even larger scale on the following day, but the Chinese troops stationed at Migyitun never returned fire. The allegation that Chinese troops drove armed Indian personnel out of their outpost at Longju by superior force is not true. Armed Chinese personnel entered Longju only on September 1, that is, the sixth day counting from August 27 when the armed Indian personnel withdrew.

The case of the Kongka Pass incident of October 21 is even more obvious. On the day after three armed Indian personnel were detained on their intrusion into Chinese territory more than 60 armed Indian personnel carrying light and heavy machine guns and other weapons intruded further into Chinese territory, and launched an armed attack on a Chinese patrol numbering 14 only and carrying light arms alone. Both before and after the Indian party opened fire, the Chinese patrol gave repeated warnings not to shoot. The Chinese deputy squad leader, Wu Ching-Kuo, waved his hands to the Indian personnel and called on them not to shoot, but this esteemed comrade was the first man to be hit and killed. Only after this was the Chinese patrol forced to return fire.

That China has consistently refused to use force is further borne out by the following facts:

(a) When a situation of the armed forces of the two sides facing each other first appeared on the Chinese territory of Wuje in 1955, the Chinese Government took the initiative in proposing that neither side should station troops in Wuje pending a settlement through negotiations.

(b) With regard to Chinese territories of Parigas, Chuva, Chuje, Shipki Pass, Sang, Tsungsha, Puling-Sumdo, Sangcha, Lapthal and Kinzemeane, which have been occupied by the Indian side, the Chinese Government has never tried compelling the armed Indian personnel to withdraw by force of arms. Even in regard to such an area as Tamaden, which the Indian Government itself admits to be Chinese territory, the Chinese Government also patiently waited for the Indian troops to withdraw of their own accord and did not resort to force.

(c) With regard to armed Indian personnel who intruded into the garrison areas of Chinese frontier outposts, the Chinese frontier guard units first of all invariably advised them to leave Chinese territory and it was only when they refused to listen to such advice were they disarmed and afterwards sent out of Chinese territory together with their arms.

(d) All the Chinese frontier guards are under strict orders absolutely to refrain from using their arms unless they are already subjected to armed attack.
(e) After the occurrence of the unfortunate Kongka Pass incident, the Chinese Government immediately ordered its troops guarding the Sino-Indian border to stop patrolling the entire border.

(f) In order completely and effectively to prevent any border clashes, the Chinese Government has recently proposed time and again that the armed personnel of the two sides on the border respectively withdraw 20 kilometers or some other appropriate distance.

The above-mentioned facts prove that the Chinese Government has adopted all possible measures to maintain the tranquillity of the border and to prevent the use of force and the occurrence of armed clashes.

After the Kongka Pass incident, the Indian Government also instructed its frontier guards to stop patrolling and indicated to the Chinese Government that in any event neither side should resort to force except as a last resort in self-defence. This is undoubtedly worthy of welcome. Prior to the occurrence of these two clashes, however, the Indian Government in its note dated August 11 this year had informed the Chinese Government to the effect that Indian frontier guards had instructions “to resist trespassers and to use minimum force necessary for this purpose if warning given by them remains unheeded.” The Indian Government’s note also stated that “if any Chinese troops are still within Indian territory, they should be immediately withdrawn as otherwise this may lead to avoidable clash.” Even after the occurrence of the first clash, the Indian frontier guards, according to the note sent by the Indian Government to China on August 27, 1959, still had instructions to “use force on the trespassers if necessary.” It must be pointed out that since there are divergences both between the two countries’ conceptions of the boundary and between their maps, and since the Indian Government regards large tracts of Chinese territory which have always been under Chinese jurisdiction as Indian territory, Chinese military and administrative personnel stationed on the soil of their own country would inevitably be called “trespassers” by the Indian side. In this way, Indian subordinates in carrying out these instructions, could use force more or less freely according to their own judgement. Obviously, it cannot be said that the occurrence of the two unfortunate border incidents was unrelated to such instructions:

(4) Whether China wants to engage in “aggression” and expansion.”

Centering around the Sino-Indian boundary question, there has recently appeared in India a great deal of anti-Chinese pronouncements, which in cold war language slander China as “imperialism,” “expanding into India” and “committing aggression.” The Chinese people cannot but feel deep regret at such malicious attacks against China, which simply fly in the face of facts.

The Chinese Government has noted that there is at present in India a rather prevalent observation that China has now grown strong and, like certain Chinese rulers in history or modern imperialists, would seek expansion abroad. Apart from those who are obviously hostile to China, the great majority of those who spread this observation probably do so
because they lack an accurate understanding of New China. In these circumstances, the Chinese Government deems it useful to explain China’s stand once more to the Government and people of India.

Although the Chinese people have begun to score some achievements, China is still very backward economically and culturally and it will still take the Chinese people decades or even over a hundred years of arduous efforts to overcome such backwardness. But at no time in future will China become a threat to its neighbouring countries, just as China does not believe that India, after it has grown strong as China fervently hopes, would become a threat to China. To say that the growth of China’s population and industry would constitute a threat to its neighbours is utterly incomprehensible to the Chinese people. China’s social system is a socialist one under which political and economic powers are in the hands of the working people and the people and Government of socialist China have not, nor can they have, nor should they have, any intention of threatening others. Moreover, the following facts must be taken note of. Firstly, although China’s population has increased at a higher rate since liberation, yet the average annual rate of increase is only two per cent, while the average annual rate of increase in China’s grain output has reached 9.8 per cent, the highest annual rate of increase being 35 per cent. In the future, the per unit area grain output and agricultural labour productivity in China will still be greatly raised. Apart from that, China has a vast territory, more than half of which is sparsely populated and will take great efforts to develop. Therefore the Chinese people absolutely do not need to seize the territory of other countries to feed themselves. Secondly, although China’s industry has undergone some development, it still by far cannot satisfy the needs of the people at home. China is rich in natural resources and has a huge domestic market; its industry neither needs to grab raw materials from abroad nor needs to dump its products in foreign countries. Thirdly, the development of China’s industry and agriculture has led to a shortage, not surplus, of labour power in China. Therefore, China has no surplus population to send abroad.

In order to attain their great goals in peaceful construction, the Chinese people are in urgent need of a long-term peaceful international environment. Therefore, in conducting its foreign relations the Chinese Government has consistently pursued a policy of peace and is desirous of living in friendship with all countries, big and small, on the basis of the Five Principles. With regard to the outstanding issues between China and other countries, the Chinese Government has consistently stood for their fair and reasonable settlement by peaceful methods without resorting to force. It is not only impossible, improper and unnecessary for China to commit aggression against its neighbours, rather it is its earnest hope that they would all grow prosperous and strong rapidly. Because only thus can we altogether more effectively prevent imperialist war and aggression and maintain peace in this area; only thus can we better meet each other’s needs and help each other in construction work.

So far as the question of boundary is concerned, China absolutely does not want one inch of another country’s territory. There are undelimited boundaries between China and many of its neighbouring countries, but China has never taken, and will never take, advantage of this situation to make any changes in the actually existing state of affairs.
on the borders by unilateral action. Whether or not the boundary has been delimited, China is always prepared to work in close cooperation with its neighbours for the creation of the most peaceful, secure and friendly border zones so that there will be no mutual misgivings or clashes over the border questions.

With regard to Bhutan and Sikkim, some explanation may be given in passing. China has no other intentions than that of living with them in friendship without committing aggression against each other. Concerning the boundary between China and Bhutan, there is only a certain discrepancy between the delineation on the maps of the two sides in the sector south of the so-called McMahon Line. But it has always been tranquil along the border between the two countries. The boundary between China and Sikkim has long been formally delimited and there is neither any discrepancy between the maps nor any disputes in practice. All allegations that China wants to “encroach on” Bhutan and Sikkim, just like the allegations that China wants to commit aggression against India and other south-western neighbouring countries, are sheer nonsense.

The basic stand of the Chinese Government towards its neighbours has long been defined time and again and there should have been no need to deal with it at length. It is, however, unfortunate that recently, particularly since the putting down of the rebellion of the reactionary serf-owners in the Tibet region of China, India has in various ways distorted and attacked the Chinese attitude. In the interest of friendship of the two countries, the Chinese Government does not wish to answer attack with attack, but would rather assume that the Indian Government really has some misunderstandings about China’s intentions. It may be that, for certain reasons, the campaign against China would still continue. Even if unfortunately that should be the case, the Chinese Government absolutely refuses to think that the misunderstandings about China of those who harbour no ill-will would likewise continue for long. Because, if China were really committing aggression against and posing threat to India or any other country, ten thousand denials would not alter the fact; if it is otherwise, although ten thousand propaganda machines tell the whole world about China’s “aggression” and “threat,” they will only discredit the propagandists themselves. “The strength of a horse is known by the distance travelled, and the heart of a man is seen with the passage of time.” China’s peaceful and friendly attitude toward India will stand the test of time. The Chinese Government is convinced that, though the truth of a matter may be hidden for a while, it is impossible to hide it up for long.

(5) Where lies the key to the settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question?

There exist important differences between the Governments of China and India in their stand on the boundary question and there is still tension between the two countries on the border. But the Chinese Government has never had any doubt that the tension will eventually pass away and a reasonable settlement of the boundary question will be reached through friendly consultations.
The confidence of the Chinese Government is based on the following: There is friendship of thousands of years’ duration but no irreconcilable conflict between the two countries; both sides urgently need to devote themselves to long-term peaceful construction at home and are willing to work for the defence of world peace; and it is uncalled-for as well as unthinkable to go on arguing like this without end. On the boundary question, both sides have indicated their willingness to maintain the status quo of the border and to settle the boundary dispute by peaceful means. This shows that a basis exists for China and India to live together in friendship and that the boundary question could be settled in a reasonable way. Besides, looking at it the other way round, there is no alternative. It is impossible for the two sides to change the geographical reality of their being neighbours or to break off all contacts along the lengthy boundary line. It is particularly impossible to entertain the absurd idea that our two great friendly neighbours with a combined population of more than one thousand million might start a war over such temporary and local disputes. Therefore, a friendly settlement of the boundary disputes by peaceful means is the only logical answer.

What are the key questions which demand an urgent solution right now? The Chinese Government has the honour to present the following opinions to the Indian Government:

(a) The Chinese Government is of the opinion that no matter what views the two sides may hold about any specific matter concerning the boundary, there should no longer be any difference of opinion about the most basic fact known to the whole world, that is the entire boundary between the two countries has indeed never been delimited, and is therefore yet to be settled through negotiations. Recognition of this simple fact should not create any difficulties for either side, because it would neither impair the present interests of either side, nor in any way prevent both sides from making their own claims at the boundary negotiations. Once agreement is reached on this point, it could be said that the way has been opened to the settlement of the boundary question. Although up to now each side has persisted in its own views on the concrete disputes concerning the different sectors of the boundary, provided both sides attach importance to the fundamental interest of friendship of the two countries and adopt an unprejudiced attitude and one of mutual understanding and accommodation, it would not be difficult to settle these disputes. If India’s opinions prove to be more reasonable and more in the interest of friendship of the two countries, they should be accepted by China; if China’s opinions prove to be more reasonable and more in the interest of friendship of the two countries, they should be accepted by India. It is the hope of the Chinese Government that the forthcoming meeting between the Prime Ministers of the two countries will first of all reach agreement on some principles on the boundary question so as to provide guidance and basis for the future discussion and the working out of a solution by the two sides.

(b) Pending the formal delimitation of the boundary, the status quo of the border between the two countries must be effectively
maintained and the tranquillity of the border ensured. For this purpose, the Chinese Government proposes that the armed forces of the two sides along the border respectively withdraw 20 kilometers or some other distance considered appropriate by the two sides, and that, as a step preliminary to this basic measure, the armed personnel of both sides stop patrolling along the entire border.

The Chinese Government believes that if agreement can be reached on the two points mentioned above, the situation on the Sino-Indian border will undergo an immediate change and the dark clouds hanging over the relations between the two countries will quickly vanish.

The Chinese Government earnestly hopes that the views it has set forth here at great length on the past, present, and future of the Sino-Indian boundary question would receive the most good-willed understanding of the Indian Government, thereby helping to bring about a settlement of this question satisfactory to both the sides and a turn for the better in the relations between the two countries. Although some arguing cannot be helped in order to make reply to unfair charges, the intention and aim of the Chinese Government is not to argue, but to bring arguing to an end.

China and India are two great countries each with its great past and future. Guided by the great ideal of the Five Principles of peaceful coexistence, the two countries have over the past few years joined hands and cooperated closely in defence of world peace. Today, history again issues a call to the peoples of the two countries asking them to make still greater contributions internationally to the cause of peace and human progress, while accomplishing tremendous changes at home. The task falling on the shoulders of the Chinese and Indian peoples of the present generation is both arduous and glorious. The Chinese Government wishes to reiterate here its ardent desire that the two countries stop quarrelling, quickly bring about a reasonable settlement of the boundary question, and on this basis consolidate and develop the great friendship of the two peoples in their common cause.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the Republic of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Letter from the Prime Minister of India to the Prime Minister of China,
5 February 1960

New Delhi, February 5, 1960

MY DEAR PRIME MINISTER,

My Government is sending you separately, through our Ambassador in Peking, a reply to the note of the Chinese Government which was handed to the Indian Embassy on the 26th December 1959.

I confess that I do not particularly like this long distance correspondence which consists of a reaffirmation of our respective views, and yet there is no escape from this when questions of far-reaching importance are raised between Governments and statements made which cannot be accepted.

You were good enough to suggest that we should meet to discuss these matters and, so far as we are concerned, it has been our consistent policy to welcome such meetings and informal approaches which sometimes lead to helpful results. But I found that the respective viewpoints of our two Governments, in regard to the matters under discussion, were so wide apart and opposed to each other that there was little ground left for useful talks. I suggested in my letter of November 16, 1959, certain preliminary steps which would have eased the situation and facilitated further discussions. Unfortunately you have not found yourself able to accept those proposals. I still hope that you will reconsider your decision in this matter.

In the latest note from the Government of the People's Republic of China, emphasis has been laid on our entire boundary never having been delimited. That is a statement which appears to us to be wholly incorrect, and we cannot accept it. On that basis there can be no negotiations.

It has pained me deeply that the relations between India and China which have in the past been so friendly and which we had endeavoured so much to strengthen, should have deteriorated rapidly and led to bitterness and resentment. That is a tragedy for both our countries as well as for the larger issues in the world. For my part, I have endeavoured and shall continue to endeavour to find a way to a peaceful settlement and for a restoration of friendly relations. But for the moment, I do not see any common ground between our respective viewpoints.

Nevertheless I think that we should make every effort to explore avenues which might lead to a peaceful settlement. Although any negotiations on the basis you have suggested are not possible, still I think it might be helpful for us to meet. I am afraid it is not possible for me to leave India during the next few months. The budget session of our Parliament is
beginning on February 8 and this will require my presence here. I would, however, be glad if you could take the trouble to come to Delhi for this purpose at a time convenient to you and us. You will be our honoured guest when you come here. I would suggest that some time in the second half of March might be fixed for this meeting, if it is convenient to you.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

His Excellency Mr. Chou En-lai,
Prime Minister of the People's Republic of China,
Peking.
Note of the Government of India to the Chinese Government,
12 February 1960

The Embassy of India presents its compliments to the Ministry of
Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to
refer to the Chinese Government's Note handed on the 26th December,
1959, to the Embassy of India in Peking. In reply, the Embassy has been
directed by the Government of India to state as follows:

2. The Government of India regret that the Chinese Government have
not fully considered the various points raised in the Prime Minister of India's
letter of September 26, 1959 to the Chinese Premier and in the Note handed
by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Embassy of the People's Republic
of China on November 4, 1959. The Government of China have merely
reiterated their claims to vast areas of Indian territory and ignored the facts
mentioned in the letter. It was the earnest hope of the Government of
India that a proper appreciation of the facts and historical data presented
by them in support of their stand regarding the boundary would pave the
way for an amicable settlement by narrowing down the issues for discussion.
The Government of India have to state with regret, however, that the
Government of China in their Note not only do not accept incontrovertible
facts but disregard major frontier Agreements by untenable interpretation
of their terms or by questioning their validity. Such an approach can
hardly lead to an understanding which both countries desire.

3. The Government of China contend that the Sino-Indian boundary
has not been formally delimited and in support of that contention allege
that the boundary has not been determined by treaties and agreements.
The Government of India cannot accept this contention. The Sino-Indian
boundary, based on custom and tradition, follows natural features, and for
the major part this customary and traditional boundary is also confirmed
by treaty and agreement. This boundary throughout has been fixed and
well-known for centuries. According to international usage and practice a
customary boundary which follows well-known and unchanging natural
features like main watersheds stands defined and does not require further
or formal definition. It is significant that until recently no Chinese Govern-
ment ever challenged it, or protested against the exercise of the sovereign
jurisdiction of India up to this traditional boundary. In view of all these
facts, the Government of India cannot agree that negotiations have to be
conducted to reach new agreements for fresh determination of the Sino-
Indian boundary.

4. The Government of China have stated that the present controversy
has arisen because "the Sino-Indian boundary has never been delimited,
Britain left behind in this respect a heritage of certain disputes and more-
over the Indian Government has made a series of unacceptable charges
against China". The Government of India cannot accept either the asser-
tions or the imputations contained in this statement. In fact the present
controversy regarding the boundary and the tension on the border have
arisen because the Chinese Government laid claims to extensive areas of Indian territory for the first time on September 8, 1959, and intruded into Indian territory, both before and afterwards, in furtherance of their claims. The Government of India are particularly surprised and shocked by this attitude and action of a neighbour whose friendship they have always cherished. Despite these unwelcome developments, the Government and the people of India have shown the utmost restraint. They have always been willing to explore the possibilities of a peaceful settlement. But an amicable settlement cannot be reached on the basis that a new agreement has to be negotiated to determine afresh the entire Sino-Indian boundary. Such a basis for negotiations would ignore past history, custom, tradition and international agreements and is, therefore, entirely unacceptable to the Government of India. The Government of India wish to state again that they are prepared to discuss specific disputes in regard to the location of particular places on the boundary, and to make minor frontier rectifications by agreement, where they may be considered necessary.

5. The following paragraphs give in brief the basic data in regard to the international boundary. They also deal with the arguments advanced by the Chinese Government in their Note of December 26, 1959.

6. Taking the Ladakh sector first, it is wrong to say, as the Chinese Government have done, that according to the Government of India the boundary of Ladakh was fixed by the Treaty of 1842. In fact the boundaries of Ladakh were fixed and well recognised from the 17th century onwards. The 1842 Treaty did not fix the boundary but merely confirmed it. That this traditional boundary lay where Indian maps are showing it is confirmed by those who visited this area in the 19th century. The Government of China have quoted unofficial maps published by Hayward in 1870 and Robert Shaw in 1871, as well as an article by Hayward, to prove their contention that the traditional eastern boundary of Ladakh lay where the Chinese maps are now showing it. Hayward, however, surveyed only the western extremity of Aksai Chin, and Shaw's route lay even further westwards. Their opinions, therefore, are not authoritative for eastern Aksai Chin. The latter area was surveyed by Johnson in 1865 and visited by the second Yarkand Mission in 1873. It is their reports, therefore, that are authoritative in regard to the eastern boundary of Ladakh, and their maps and accounts substantiate the traditional Indian alignment.

7. The Chinese Government assert that the 1842 Treaty was between Tibet and Kashmir whereas about 80 per cent of the area now claimed by them is part of Sinkiang. The Government of India are surprised at this contention. Prime Minister Nehru has already dealt with this point in his letter of September 26. The Treaty itself makes it clear that China was a party to it. The following quotation from the Treaty is relevant:

“Now that in the presence of God, the ill-feeling created by the war which had intervened, has been fully removed from the hearts. and no complaints now remain (on either side), there will never be on any account in future, till the world lasts, any deviation even by the hair's breadth and any breach in the alliance, friendship and unity between the King of the world Siri Khalsaji Sahib and Siri Maharaj Sahib Raja-i-Rajagan (Raja of Rajas) Raja Sahib Bahadur, and the Khagan (Emperor) of China and the Lama Guru Sahib..."
of Lhasa. We shall remain in possession of the limits of the boundaries of Ladakh and the neighbourhood subordinate to it, in accordance with the old custom, and there shall be no transgression and no interference (in the country) beyond the old established frontiers. We shall hold to our own respective frontiers.”

In fact, the treaty was concluded to terminate a war in which Tibet had appealed to China for assistance against Kashmir. The statement in the Chinese note that 80 per cent. of the area was part of Sinkiang in 1842 is unfounded. Even Chinese maps of the 18th and 19th centuries show clearly that Sinkiang never extended south of the Kuen Lun mountains.

8. The Chinese Government state that nothing came of the proposal in 1899 “to delimit the boundary”. This again shows a failure to take into account the facts as stated in the Prime Minister of India’s letter of September 26, 1959. It was clearly stated in that letter that the proposal made in 1899 by the British referred not to the eastern frontier of Ladakh with Tibet but to the northern frontier of Ladakh with Sinkiang. That proposal stated explicitly that the northern boundary ran along the Kuen Lun range to a point east of 80 degrees east longitude, where it met the eastern boundary of Ladakh. This showed beyond doubt that the whole of the Aksai Chin area lay in Indian territory, and the Government of China did not object to this definition of the boundary. If nothing came of the proposal of 1899, it was not because the Chinese Government declined to recognise the boundary according to the traditional alignment shown on Indian maps, but because even then they did not seem to consider necessary any formal definition of the well-known boundary in this area.

9. The Government of India never contended that the boundary had been explicitly defined in 1842 or 1899. Indeed formal definition or demarcation is not necessary for recognition of a boundary so long as it is fixed by custom and tradition and is well-known. The Chinese Government state that there is much indisputable evidence to show that this sector of the Sino-Indian boundary was not delimited. In fact the evidence that they have brought forward shows only that the boundary was not demarcated on the ground. The proposals of the then British Indian Government between 1921 and 1927 were merely for the determination of the ownership of a few pasture grounds in one particular area. There was no dispute about the main alignment, let alone a demand for its determination. The letter of Sir Arthur Lothian in The Times of December 11, 1959 has been quoted in this context. But this letter referred to an effort to secure delimitation “on the ground”—i.e., demarcation. The map published by the Survey of India in 1950 showed this boundary as “undefined”, to indicate that this sector had never been described in detail from point to point or demarcated on the ground. The statement of the Prime Minister in the Lok Sabha on the 28th August, 1959, that the boundary had not been marked, indicated merely that it had not been marked on the ground.

10. The Chinese Government contend that, except for the Demchok (Parigas) area, which according to them has been “occupied” by India in recent years, the rest of the area in Ladakh, claimed by China, has always
belonged to her and has been under her effective control. These conten-
tions are wholly baseless. That the Demchok area has for centuries been
a part of Ladakh is proved by the treaty between Ladakh and Tibet signed
in 1684, and by the accounts of travellers who visited the area thereafter.
As for the rest of the area, it is wrong to state that the major part of it was
under the jurisdiction of Sinkiang. As already mentioned above, Chinese
maps of the 18th and 19th centuries make clear that Sinkiang never exten-
ded south of the Kuen Lun mountains. So, no part of this area could
ever have been a part of Sinkiang. Nor was any portion of this territory
a part of Rudok Dzong of Tibet. Moorcroft, who visited this area in
1820, stated that Pamgong Lake divided the district of Rudok from the
principality of Ladakh. This in effect conforms with the traditional align-
ment as shown on Indian maps rather than that shown on Chinese maps.
Strachey, who visited this area as a Boundary Commissioner in 1847, gave
a more specific alignment, which is essentially in consonance with the
alignment on Indian maps.

11. It is most regrettable that the Chinese Government should have
claimed, without bringing forward any evidence in support, that their
people have utilized this area for pasturage and salt-mining. In fact, the
pastures and salt-mines referred to have always been the preserve of
Ladakhi villagers who have regularly visited these areas; and these vil-
lagers never came across any Chinese trespassers. It is incorrect to say
that since 1750 the Chinese Government has established checkpoints to
exercise jurisdiction over and patrol this area. There were never any
Chinese outposts south of the Kuen Lun mountains. Throughout the
twentieth century, officials of the Kashmir Government and Indian traders
and hunting parties moved freely in this area and they did not come across
any evidence of the exercise of jurisdiction by the Chinese in that area.
During these years a detailed geological survey of the whole area was
carried out by the Governments of Kashmir and of India. It is only in
recent years that Chinese personnel have intruded into this territory; and
the Government of India are astonished that the Chinese Government use
this intrusion as the basis for their claim. The statement that Indian per-
sonnel came into this territory only thrice, and that too in recent times—
in September 1958, in July 1959 and in October 1959—is unwarranted
by facts. Indian personnel have patrolled this area regularly. Only on
the three occasions mentioned by the Chinese Government did they come
across Chinese troops.

12. It is strange that the Chinese Government should have brought
forward an argument based on philology and advanced a claim on the fact
that names such as Aksai Chin and Karakash are of Uighur origin. It
is not necessary to treat this argument seriously. The Government of
India will content themselves with drawing attention to the fact that
centuries ago Indian influence swept deep into China, and there are place
names in Tibet and Sinkiang of Sanskrit or Prakrit origin. The name
Khotan itself is derived from the Sanskrit word Kustana. Again, the
present name of the Ari district of Tibet is an abbreviation of the Sanskrit
term Nari in Nari (Ngari) Khorsum, a name by which Western Tibet is
known.

13. The Chinese Government have stated in their latest note that the
delineation of the boundaries of Ladakh in Chinese maps for the past
200 years have in the main been consistent. This is certainly true of the
Chinese maps published up to the twenties of the present century, but these maps consistently showed a boundary which was more or less in consonance with the traditional alignment as shown on Indian maps. It is only on Chinese maps published since the late twenties that different alignments have been shown. The broad trend in the recent Chinese maps has been to push the alignment deeper into Indian territory.

14. It is extraordinary that the Chinese Government should not be aware of their own official maps such as the one drawn in 1893, and that they should brush aside, *The New Atlas and Commercial Gazetteer of China* as the publication of a private agency. It was in fact based on authoritative official surveys as stated in the introduction. However, the Government of India would like to draw the attention of the Government of China to the *Postal Map of China* published in 1917 by the Chinese Government. This map shows the whole northern boundary of India more or less according to the traditional Indian alignment.

15. The Government of China attach little importance to the fact that the alignment shown on Indian maps runs along the main watershed. They seem unaware that traditional boundaries in mountainous areas tend to follow the main watershed rather than any other natural feature. This is because a watershed is the best of all possible natural boundaries. It is liable to no change and is readily recognisable. Where there are a series of mountain ranges, it is the watershed range rather than any other that becomes the traditional boundary, because the peoples on both sides tend to settle up to the sources of rivers but not beyond. That the alignment of the northern boundary of India throughout follows the major watershed supports the fact that this became the boundary through custom and tradition. The argument of the Chinese Government that the watershed boundary of Ladakh is vitiated by the fact that a river breaks through it, is untenable. There is hardly any major watershed in the world, however high and continuous, which is not pierced by some river; but that does not make it any less of a watershed. Equally untenable is the other argument that the alignment shown on Chinese maps is supported by the fact that the area now claimed by the Chinese Government is easily approached from the Chinese side and not from the Indian side. Accessibility is not a criterion for determining the alignment of boundaries.

16. The Government of India are glad to note the acceptance by the Government of China that the alignment of the boundary as shown on Indian maps between the Punjab, Himachal Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh in India and the Tibet "conforms to reality". This alignment conforms to the watershed principle and Chinese maps have also shown this alignment for the greater part of its length. The Government of India, however, reject the claim of the Chinese Government to certain areas in his sector—the Spiti area, Shipki pass, Nilang-Jadharg, Barahoti, Sangchamalla and Lapthal. The Prime Minister of India in his letter of September 26, 1959 has given sufficient data to show that these territories have always been part of India. The Chinese Government have ignored these precise data and have merely repeated their claim. In the circumstances the Government of India consider it unnecessary to repeat their earlier statements.

17. The Government of China have also accused the Government of India of having occupied Puling-Sumdo, one of the markets for trade in
the Ari district of Tibet, specified in the 1954 Agreement. The Government of India repudiate this allegation. They are not, and never have been, in occupation of this place. The Chinese Government are confusing this trade mart with a locality in the Nian-lang-Jadhang area in India called Pulamsumda. This latter place in India, however, has never been a trade mart. The co-ordinates of Puling-Sumdo (also known as Poling) are 31° 19’ north and 79° 27’ east, and these co-ordinates were communicated by Mr. Kaul with his letter of March 26, 1954 to Mr. Chen Chia Kang. The co-ordinates of Pulamsumda are 31° 18’ north and 79° 8’ east. During the negotiations leading to the 1954 Agreement it was Puling-Sumdo (Poling) which was mentioned since it was a traditional trade mark. It was then made clear to the Chinese delegation that Puling-Sumdo and Poling were different names for the same place. There was no occasion to refer to Pulamsumda (31° 18’ north and 79° 8’ east) and no reference was in fact made to it either in the discussions or in the subsequent Agreement. There should, therefore, be no room for misunderstanding.

18. The Chinese Government contend that the Tibetan authorities are in possession of land deeds and census and taxation papers concerning these areas which they are claiming, and give as an example a document of the eighteenth century concerning Barahoti. The Government of India are somewhat surprised to know of this. During the prolonged discussions on Barahoti which took place in New Delhi in 1958 between the Chinese and Indian delegations, the Chinese delegation did not refer to the existence of such documents. It will be recalled that the Indian delegation stated at the time that they had revenue records and other evidence in their favour.

19. The Government of India cannot accept the contention of the Chinese Government that these areas belong to China because their inhabitants are of Tibetan origin. Indeed, such arguments based on ethnic affinities had been rebutted by Premier Chou En-lai himself as early as July 1957. Addressing the Fourth Session of the National People’s Congress at Peking on July 9, 1957, Premier Chou En-lai said: “The boundary question has a direct bearing on the interests of the nationalities living in compact communities on the Sino-Burmese borders. Therefore, in tackling this question we must specially take into account the interests of these nationalities. We know that the boundary line between two countries is often found dividing into two parts a nationality living in compact communities on the borders. This is the result of historical development. On the various sections of the defined boundary between China and Burma and on the border between China and other countries we find people of the same nationality living on both sides of the boundary line. So, when we solve the question of the undefined boundary line between China and Burma, we must realise beforehand that it will be hard to avoid separating the nationalities concerned by the boundary line.” India is a State in which people of different races and creeds enjoy common citizenship. There are thousands of Indian citizens of Tibetan origin. The study of the Tibetan language is encouraged by the Government of India. These Indians of Tibetan origin have always been loyal citizens of India.

20. The Government of India cannot accept that the Agreement signed in 1954 between India and China had no bearing on the question of the boundary between the two countries. It is true that during the negotiations neither side asked to discuss the boundary question. The Indian delegation
did not raise it because, so far as the Government of India were concerned, the boundary was well-known and beyond dispute, and there could be no question regarding it. Not only was the boundary shown on official Indian maps, but Indian authorities had been exercising administrative control over all areas up to the international border shown on Indian maps. If the Chinese Government were at all serious about their claim to any of these areas, it would be expected that they would at least refer to their claims, if not discuss them. It is true that Premier Chou En-lai at the first meeting said that the relations between China and India were becoming closer every day and that from among the outstanding questions the two sides could settle questions which were ripe for settlement. The Indian Ambassador then pointed out that there were only small questions pending between India and China but he wished to see nothing big or small remaining outstanding between the two countries. Premier Chou En-lai replied that two large countries like India and China with a long common frontier were bound to have some questions, but all questions could be settled smoothly. In the context in which Premier Chou En-lai made this statement, it could hardly be inferred that he had in mind Chinese claims to vast tracts of territory which were shown as parts of India in Indian maps and were under Indian administration. At the meeting of January 8, 1954 the Vice-Foreign Minister of China stated that the negotiations between China and India were to settle, in accordance with the Five Principles, those pending questions that were ripe for settlement. The Indian side accepted the principles as the basis for discussions. In his speech on April 29, 1954, after the signing of the Agreement, the leader of the Indian Delegation stated, “we have gone through fully questions that existed between our two countries in this (Tibetan) region”, thus indicating that in the Indian view no dispute or question was left over. The Indian Delegation throughout took the line that all questions at issue between the two countries were being considered and, once the settlement was concluded, no question remained. In view of this the Chinese statement that Ambassador Raghavan agreed, in what is stated to be an informal talk, that the boundary question would not be discussed, is surprising.

21. In these circumstances the Government of India can only express their surprise at the contention of the Chinese Government that the question of the boundary between the two countries was not touched at all during the discussions leading to the 1954 Agreement. When Article 4, which specifies six passes in this area, was being discussed, the Chinese delegation brought forward a draft which stated that the Chinese Government “agrees to open” the passes. In other words, it was claimed that these passes belonged to China. This was contested by the Indian representative Mr. Kaul, who stated that they were Indian passes. It cannot, therefore, be asserted that the question of the ownership of these passes was not raised at all. The text as finally agreed upon was: “Traders and pilgrims of both countries may travel by the following passes and route”. This could only be interpreted to mean that the use of these passes does not involve ownership because they are border passes.

22. The Chinese Government have also contended on a priori grounds that the boundary question could not have been discussed in 1954 because at that time “the question which the two countries were most concerned about and which called for urgent solution was the establishment of normal relations between India and the Tibet Region of China on a new basis”.
But surely normal relations between India and Tibet region of China could not have been established if the Chinese Government had in mind at that time claims to large areas of Indian territory contiguous to the Tibet Region. The Government of China were then fully aware of the alignment of the international boundary as shown on official Indian maps. They must also have been aware of the authoritative declaration made in 1950 by the Prime Minister of India on the subject of India’s frontiers. Besides, the Government of China were aware that the Constitution of the Republic of India, adopted after lengthy discussions in open sessions of the Constituent Assembly, made specific mention in its Sixth Schedule of the Tribal areas of Assam and the North East Frontier Agency, which the Chinese Government now seek to claim as Chinese territory. In the 1954 Agreement the Chinese Government affirmed their respect for the territorial integrity of India. In the circumstances mentioned above they could not have done so if they intended to raise a demand subsequently for large areas of Indian territory. Further, in discussions with the Prime Minister of India in 1954 and 1956-57, the Prime Minister of China did not give any indication whatsoever that his Government had large territorial claims, but, on the contrary, gave the impression that the revision of the maps was essentially a procedural issue, which would be made in due course. The conclusion is obvious that the Chinese Government have changed their position since 1954.

23. The Government of India cannot accept the contention that the area south of the traditional boundary east of Bhutan has always belonged to China and was until recently under Chinese jurisdiction. The territory was under the Varman, the Salastambha and the Pala dynasties till the 8th century, when they came under the pressure of the Ahoms, a branch of the Shan tribe. Finally, in the 13th century, an Ahom ruler gained control over the whole kingdom and gave the name Ahom, now softened to Assam, to the country. The Ahom rulers held sway in this area for nearly six centuries till they were finally displaced by the British authority in India in 1826. During the last years of Ahom rule control over the tribal peoples in the north weakened, but authority was re-established by the then Government of India over a period of years. At no time, however, was the sovereignty over these areas lost by the rulers of Assam or acquired by the Tibetans. The tribal areas south of the traditional watershed boundary have always been part of India.

24. In the 19th century the Government of British India asserted their authority over the tribes who acknowledged the right of that Government to maintain law and order in their areas. References to the territory of the British in the agreements concluded by the British Indian Government with the tribes meant merely that such territory was then under the direct administration of the British Government in India, as distinct from the tribal areas where they only exercised loose control. But at no time did these tribesmen cease to be under the central authority of the British Indian rulers.

25. The only evidence that the Chinese Government have brought forward to support their claim to jurisdiction over this area is with reference to Tawang and the Walong area. But Tawang and Walong form only a tiny fraction of the large area now claimed by the Chinese Government, and the evidence brought forward in regard to these two localities has no relevance to the rest of the area. Even with regard to Tawang and Walong
the arguments of the Chinese Government are untenable. Tawang was never a part of Tibet. The local administration of Tawang was in the hands of a Raja, who was assisted by Chhoryens, or headmen of groups of villagers, and Kachungs or village headmen. The only functions which the Lama hierarchy exercised in this area was ecclesiastical. In Tawang there is a large Tibetan monastery, whose Abbot and monks collected religious dues from the local inhabitants, who are Lamaists. Collection of such dues could not and did not confer any territorial sovereignty on the Tibetan authorities in respect of Tawang. This view is also supported by the statement made by the Chinese plenipotentiary at the Simla Conference in 1914. Ivan Chen stated on the 7th March 1914 that "what is paid to the Tibetans is not in the shape of revenue, in the ordinary sense of the word, but merely contributions to the monasteries. It is rather charity than a tax". And on 13th June 1914 Sun Pao-Chi, the Chinese Minister for Foreign Affairs, informed the British Minister in Peking that "the Tibetans affected to think that they had rights over all places inhabited by Lamaists, but this was not so. The Lamas might have ecclesiastical authority but this did not necessarily mean that these places belonged to Tibet".

26. Again, certain Tibetan families owned private estates south of the traditional boundary and collected rents. These rents cannot be regarded as Government taxes. It is possible that these rents were paid even after 1914, for the agreement between the Indian and the Tibetan representatives on the boundary safeguarded the rights of private estates.

27. The Chinese Government have quoted the agreement signed in 1853 between the British Indian authorities and the Monbas, and claimed that the Indian Government by this agreement recognised the Monbas as belonging to Tibet. Had this been so, it would be expected that the British Indian Government would have signed the agreement direct with Tibet. The Tibetan Government were, during these years, negotiating on their own, as is shown by their treaty with Nepal signed in 1856. In fact, the agreement of 1853 concerned one specific instance in which a Tibetan was involved, and the local Rajas appeared to be acting on this particular occasion for the Tibetan Government. Indeed, nine years earlier, in 1844, these Rajas accepted British authority in India by a written agreement. The key sentence of the 1844 Agreement reads as follows: "We also pledge ourselves to act up to any orders we may get from the British authorities."

28. The Walong area in the lower Lohit valley, which the Chinese Government refer to as Lower Tsayul, consists of a few villages inhabited by Mishmis and refugee Tibetans. The presence of the latter does not prove that this area belonged to Tibet. These refugees resisted the attempts of the Tibetan authorities to collect taxes.

29. It is incorrect to state that the authoritative maps published in India and China showed the boundary in this sector according to the alignment now being shown on Chinese maps. As already stated, the Postal Map of China published in 1917 should the boundary in consonance with the Indian alignment as shown in Indian maps. In November 1925 the University of Peking published a map showing the Frontiers of China at a time when China had expanded most, that is, in the days of the Ching dynasty before 1911. Even then the frontier east of Bhutan was shown
approximately along the present alignment. As for official Indian maps, the Government of India have already drawn the attention of the Chinese Government to the Map of India published by the Survey of India in 1895, which showed the tribal area by a light orange colour wash. From 1938 to 1952 the Survey of India showed this boundary by an undemarcated symbol, because in fact the boundary had not been demarcated on the ground. As, however, the traditional boundary lay along a major watershed, the Government of India decided in 1954 that no demarcation on the ground was necessary. The undemarcated symbol was, therefore, omitted in subsequent maps.

30. The Government of China have mentioned in this connection the Map of India (1945) included in the third English edition of the book The Discovery of India by Mr. Nehru. The particular map was a sketch map inserted by the publisher, and the author could not be held responsible for its inaccuracy. Nor should any adverse conclusion be drawn from it, so far as the Government of India are concerned.

31. The Government of India regret that the Chinese Government should persist in questioning the validity of the Agreement reached in 1914 between India and Tibet confirming the traditional boundary east of Bhutan. This was not the first time that Tibet conducted negotiations and concluded treaties, in her own right, with foreign states. On several occasions before 1914 Tibet had conducted negotiations and concluded treaties with other states. For example, Tibet concluded a treaty with Nepal in 1856 and another with Great Britain in 1904. These treaties were never objected to by China and were fully operative. At the Simla Conference, the Tibetan and Chinese plenipotentiaries met on an equal footing. This position was explicitly and unequivocally accepted by the Chinese Government. The three Plenipotentiaries exchanged copies of their credentials at the first session of the Conference on October 13, 1913. The credentials of the Tibetan representative issued by the Dalai Lama made it clear that Tibet was an equal party at the Conference with the right “to decide all matters that may be beneficial to Tibet”, and the Chinese representative accepted the credentials of the Tibetan representative as being in order. The credentials of the British Indian representative, which were also accepted by the Chinese representative, confirmed that all the three representatives were of equal status, and that the Conference was meeting “to regulate the relations between the several Governments”.

32. It is not true to say that the Agreement of March 1914 between India and Tibet about the Indo-Tibetan boundary was secret. It was an Agreement between the authorised representatives of the two parties, reached after full discussion, and approved by the Government of Tibet. There was, therefore, nothing clandestine about it. Moreover, the Indo-Tibetan boundary was delineated on the map appended to the Tripartite Convention, which was also signed by the Chinese representative on April 27, 1914. The 1914 boundary Agreement was published in the 1929 edition of Aitchison’s Treaties, Engagements and Sanads, the previous edition having been published as early as 1909. The Chinese Government never protested against this Agreement. In fact, long before this Agreement the Government of British India had asserted their authority over these tribal areas, concluded Agreements with the tribes and created two Frontier Tracts comprising the entire territory. These facts were all well-known and neither the Tibetan nor the Chinese Government ever challenged the British Indian authority.
33. The Government of India cannot accept the contention of the Government of China that the Simla Conference only discussed the boundaries between Tibet and China and between Outer Tibet and Inner Tibet. It is also incorrect to say that the red line on the Convention Map which was signed by the Chinese representative represented only the boundary between Tibet and the rest of China, and that it was never stated that part of this red line was the boundary between China and India. The argument that the McMahon Line sector of the red line on the Convention Map represented the boundary between Tibet and China is fantastic. Article 9 of the Convention initialled by British Indian, Chinese and Tibetan plenipotentiaries, dealt with the boundaries of Tibet and the map attached to the Convention clearly showed Tibet's boundary with India. It is this boundary line which is known as the McMahon Line. The Postal Map of China published by the Chinese Government in 1917 showed this line as the boundary between India and Tibet, and marked the territory south of the line as India. By no stretch of imagination can it be contended now that any Chinese territory then lay south of the McMahon Line. The contention that the red line represents the boundary between Tibet and China is contradicted by the Chinese Government's own statement that jurisdiction had been exercised in the area south of the line by the Tibetan authorities and not by the Chinese Government.

34. It is strange that the Chinese Government should now seek to rely on the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907, and argue that the 1914 Agreement was invalid as Britain was precluded by the 1907 Convention from having direct negotiations with Tibet. As China was not a party to the Convention between Britain and Russia, she cannot invoke that Treaty in support of her contention. In fact, throughout the negotiations, the Russian Government were kept fully informed of the progress of the negotiations. A copy of the Agreement including the map was given to the Russian Government, who raised no objection to the negotiations and the subsequent Agreement.

35. The Chinese note refers to four protests made in 1946-47 by the Chinese Government. It may be stated that these protests related to acts of British Indian administration in a small area of the North-East Frontier Agency in 1943. The Government of India then replied that "the only activities in which the Government of India have been engaged in the area in question have been entirely restricted to the Indian side of the boundary between India and Tibet, which has been accepted for over 30 years". The protest of the Kuomintang Government of November 1949 merely stated that China had not signed the Simla Convention. No reply was sent to the protest as soon afterwards, in December 1949, the Government of India recognised the People's Government of China. A few months later, in August 1950, the Government of India mentioned in a note to the Government of China that the recognised frontier between Tibet and India should remain inviolate. The same year the Prime Minister of India declared publicly that India stood by the McMahon Line. There could, therefore, be no doubt about the Government of India's position in regard to the international boundary.

36. The Tibetans never protested against the Indo-Tibetan boundary as agreed upon in 1914. On more than one occasion, they acknowledged its existence and affirmed that they had no wish to dispute its validity. When
the McMahon Line was verbally re-affirmed by the British Indian representative in 1936 and 1938, the Tibetan Government replied that they were fully aware of the terms of the 1914 Agreement. It is the Government of India which protested in 1943 against illegal penetration by the Tibetans into Indian territory. Similar protests were made by the Indian Government whenever the Tibetans sought to take advantage of Indian preoccupations in order to levy illegal dues in Indian territory. When the Government of India protested, the Tibetans withdrew. As for the fantastic Tibetan claims put forward in 1947, Prime Minister Nehru's letter of September 26, 1959 has adequately dealt with them.

37. The Chinese Government are aware of the special treaty relations which the Government of India have with Bhutan and Sikkim. In view of this the Government of India welcome the explanations given in the Chinese note relating to the boundaries between Sikkim and Bhutan on the one hand and Tibet on the other. The note states that the boundary between Sikkim and the Tibet region of China has long been formally delimited, and that there is neither any discrepancy on the maps nor any dispute in practice. The Government of India would like to add that this boundary has also been demarcated on the ground. As for Bhutan, its northern boundary is traditional and well-known. Adjoining it on the east is the North-East Frontier Agency of India, whose boundary with Tibet is both traditional and delineated by Agreement. It is not, therefore, possible for any Tibetan territory to lie south of the McMahon Line. The Government of India note with satisfaction that the Chinese Government have not repeated their map claims to any part of northern Bhutan. In view of the responsibility of the Government of India for the defence and maintenance of the integrity of Bhutan and Sikkim, the Government of India welcome the assurance of the Government of China that they will not encroach on the territory of Sikkim and Bhutan.

38. The foregoing paragraphs have set out in brief the points of substance regarding the Sino-Indian boundary question. The Government of India can only express their regret that the Chinese Government should have repeated their earlier versions of the incidents at Longju and at Kongka Pass in the Chang Chenmo Valley. The true facts regarding these incidents have already been communicated to the Chinese Government in the earlier Indian notes, and the various points raised in these notes still remain unanswered. It is only necessary to point out that if in fact the Chinese personnel entered Longju 5 days after the withdrawal of the Indian personnel, the Indian casualties cannot be explained. Similarly, the detailed account of Shri Karam Singh, which was handed to the Chinese Embassy in Delhi on November 24, 1959 disproves the Chinese Government's version of the incident at Kongka Pass. The Government of India have to state once more that these unfortunate incidents, involving severe casualties among Indian personnel, would not have occurred, if the Chinese troops had not intruded into Indian territory and taken offensive action against Indian police personnel engaged on routine patrol duty on Indian soil.

39. The Government of India share the sentiments of friendship expressed by the Chinese Government. Even before they attained independence, the people of India demonstrated in ample measure their friendship for the Chinese people. Since the achievement of independence by India this
feeling of friendship has found expression in many concrete ways. The surprise and disappointment of the Indian people have therefore been all the greater at the challenge to the historic frontier of India by the Government of China. Recent developments have deeply disturbed the minds of the Indian people and created a feeling of uneasiness over the long frontier which for centuries had remained tranquil. In the interest of the two countries and of peace of the world, active steps must therefore be taken to remove the causes of the present tension and to establish a firm foundation of friendship between the two countries.

40. An essential first step is for the two Governments to agree on an arrangement without delay, which would completely eliminate the risk of border clashes and facilitate a friendly settlement of the disputes. In their latest note, the Chinese Government have repeated their earlier proposal that the armed forces of the two Governments should withdraw twenty kilometres or some other agreed distance from the border, and that the armed personnel of both sides should stop patrolling along the entire border. These suggestions have been discussed in detail in the Prime Minister of India's letter of November 16, 1959 to Premier Chou En-lai. The constructive proposals made by the Prime Minister of India in that letter are intended to secure the objective which both the Governments have in view. The Government of India would still hope that the Government of China would accept these proposals.

41. The Chinese Government have asked the Government of India to accept the position, as a preliminary to discussions, that "the entire boundary between the two countries has never been delimited and is therefore yet to be settled through negotiations". It is clearly impossible for the Government of India to accept this proposition which they consider unreasonable and against the facts of history, geography, custom, tradition and international agreements. The facts enumerated in the preceding paragraphs entirely disprove the Chinese Government's contention. The Government of India are anxious for a friendly settlement but they cannot possibly accept suggestions which gravely prejudice their basic position.

42. In his letter of November 16, 1959, to Premier Chou En-lai, the Prime Minister of India expressed his readiness to meet the Premier at a suitable time and place, but suggested that the immediate efforts of the two Governments should be concentrated on reaching an interim understanding, which would help in easing the present tension and prevent the situation worsening. Although no further border incidents have taken place in recent weeks, the urgent need for an interim understanding is paramount. The basic causes of tension and resentment remain. The Government of India are yet unable to understand why during the last year or so the long border which had remained tranquil through the centuries should have become a source of tension and anxiety. If there are any deeper reasons for this, they are unaware of them. Apart, therefore, from the boundary question, it is important, in the interest of both China and India and of world peace in general, that the two Governments should leave nothing undone, which could remove misunderstanding and restore the traditional friendship and cordiality between the two countries on a firm basis.
The Embassy takes this opportunity of renewing to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Peking, the 12th February, 1960.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
Government of the People's Republic of China.
Peking.
Peking, February 26, 1960

Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

I thank Your Excellency for your letter of February 5, 1960, which was brought here on February 12 by Indian Ambassador to China, Mr. Parthasarathi. At the same time, the reply to the Note of December 26, 1959, of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China made by the Indian Embassy in China on the instructions of the Indian Government was also delivered by Mr. Parthasarathi to our Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The reply Note of the Indian Embassy will be answered by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs after studying it.

You have in your letter agreed to the suggestion of the Chinese Government and myself for the holding of a meeting between the Premiers of China and India in the immediate future so as to explore avenues which may lead to a peaceful settlement of the boundary issue, and invited me to visit Delhi in the latter half of March. I express to you my deep gratitude for your friendly invitation. The Chinese Government has consistently held that the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples is eternal, that it is necessary and entirely possible to settle the boundary issue between the two countries in a friendly and peaceful manner, and that the two countries must not waver in their common desire for a peaceful settlement of the boundary issue on account of temporary differences of opinion and certain unfortunate and unexpected incidents. The Chinese Government, therefore, takes a positive attitude towards the forthcoming meeting and has confidence in it. As to myself, needless to say, I am very glad of the opportunity of once again visiting the capital of great India, meeting the great Indian people fighting for the prosperity, strength and progress of their motherland and for world peace, and seeing you as well as other friends whose acquaintance I had the honour of making during my last visits. I particularly hope to see the dark clouds hovering between our two countries dispersed through our joint efforts, so that the long-standing friendly relations between the two countries may be consolidated and developed.

Owing to reasons in connection with State affairs, I shall come to your country in April. The specific date will be discussed and decided upon through diplomatic channels.

With kind regards,

CHOU EN-LAI
Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Counsellor of China in India, 5 December 1959

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to state that during the last two months a number of unidentified aircraft, coming from the direction of the Tibet region of China, have flown over Indian territory. A statement of these violations of the air space of India, giving the places, time and the position of the aircraft, is attached to this note.

2. The Government of India protest against these repeated violations of air space over Indian territory. They request that immediate steps be taken to prevent such violations in future. It will be appreciated if strict instruction is given to the Chinese aircraft to respect Indian territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs take the opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Statement showing details of recent violations of our air space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S No.</th>
<th>Date and time of flight</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Approximate Latitude and Longitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>19/9/1959 2230 Hrs.</td>
<td>MOKOKCHUNG</td>
<td>26° 20' N 94° 32' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>21/9/1959 2215 Hrs.</td>
<td>ZUNHEBOTO</td>
<td>26° 10' N 94° 35' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>22/9/1959 0730 Hrs.</td>
<td>CHAMPANG (Tuesang Distt.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4/9/1959 0845 Hrs.</td>
<td>AININI (Lohit Frontier Division)</td>
<td>28° 45' N 96° 00' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>10/9/1959 0930 Hrs.</td>
<td>TUTING (Siang Frontier Division)</td>
<td>29° 00' N 94° 50' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>19/9/1959 2230 Hrs.</td>
<td>ZERO (Subansiri Frontier Division)</td>
<td>27° 35' N 93° 50' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>19/9/1959 2330 Hrs.</td>
<td>LIMEKING (Do.)</td>
<td>28° 20' N 93° 30' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>20/9/1959 0130 Hrs.</td>
<td>DOPORIJO (Do.)</td>
<td>28° 00' N 94° 15' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>17/10/1959 0910 Hrs.</td>
<td>BUMLA (Kameng Frontier Division)</td>
<td>28° 40' N 94° 50' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>18/10/1959 0915 Hrs.</td>
<td>TOWANG (Do.)</td>
<td>28° 30' N 91° 50' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>18/10/1959</td>
<td>CHUTANGMU (Do.)</td>
<td>28° 40' N 91° 50' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>19/10/1959 0720 Hrs.</td>
<td>TOWANG (Do.)</td>
<td>28° 30' N 91° 50' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>19/10/1959 1115 Hrs.</td>
<td>TOWANG (Do.)</td>
<td>28° 30' N 91° 50' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>31/10/1959 0830 Hrs.</td>
<td>LEH</td>
<td>34° 10' N 77° 40' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>24/11/1959</td>
<td>ZERO</td>
<td>27° 35' N 93° 50' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>23/11/1959 0912 Hrs.</td>
<td>SEPIA (Kameng Frontier Division)</td>
<td>27° 20' N 93° 50' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>15/11/1959 2200 Hrs.</td>
<td>HAYULIANG</td>
<td>28° 00' N 96° 30' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>15/11/1959 0035 Hrs.</td>
<td>WALONG</td>
<td>28° 10' N 97° 00' E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China to the Embassy of India in China, 21 December 1959

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note delivered by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India on December 5, 1959 concerning the alleged intrusions into Indian air space by unidentified aircraft from the direction of the Tibet region of China, has the honour to reply as follows:

The Chinese Government has enjoined the authorities concerned to investigate into the matter on the basis of the date regarding time and place provided by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs in the annex to its note. It is satisfied that no flight of Chinese aircraft over Indian territory occurred at all. Therefore, the Chinese Government cannot accept the protest of the Indian Government. The Chinese Government expresses deep regret at the fact that the Indian Government rashly protested with the Chinese Government without ascertaining the facts.

The Chinese Government wishes to point out at the same time that intrusions by Indian aircraft into Chinese air space frequently occurred in recent months along the Sino-Indian boundary. Despite two previous protests by the Chinese Government, such provocative intrusions still did not stop. According to the reports of the Chinese frontier guards, in the past three months, Indian aircraft still kept intruding into the air space over the Tibet region of China, circling around and carrying out reconnaissance. The main facts are as follows:

1. At 13.25 hours on September 23, 1959 a double-engined Indian transport aircraft intruded into Chinese air space over Sama in the Tsayu area in south-eastern Tibet from the direction due south of Tsayu.

2. At 11.45 hours on October 11, 1959 an Indian aircraft intruded into Chinese air space over the Lake Pangong area in western Tibet.

3. At 12.00 hours on October 17, 1959 an Indian aircraft intruded into Chinese air space over the Lake Pangong area in western Tibet.

4. At 11.40 hours on October 18, 1959 a double-engined Indian aircraft intruded into Chinese air space over the area of Le and Hsiao in eastern Tibet from the direction of Kechilang pasture.

5. A double-engined Indian aircraft intruded into Chinese air space over the Le area in eastern Tibet at 09.10 hours on October 19, 1959 from Bang Pass, and over the Shatze area at 09.30 hours on the same day.

6. At 12.00 hours on December 7, two Indian aircrafts intruded into Chinese air space over the area east of the Kongka Pass in Sinkiang.

The Chinese Government lodges a third protest with the Indian Government against these serious provocations of repeated violation of China's air space by Indian aircraft and demands that the Indian Government immediately adopt necessary measures to ensure against further violation.
of China's air space by Indian aircraft and to maintain the peace and tranquillity of the Sino-Indian border.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of China and with reference to the note delivered by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Indian Embassy in China on the 21st December 1959 concerning the alleged intrusion into Chinese air space by Indian aircraft, have the honour to reply as follows:

The Government of India have caused careful enquiries to be made into the six alleged intrusions into Chinese air space by Indian aircraft. The enquiries show that allegations are entirely baseless. Indian aircraft have strict instructions not to fly over foreign territory without the prior permission of the foreign Governments concerned and these instructions are carefully observed. The Government of India cannot accept the protest of the Chinese Government, and express regret that they should have done so without ascertaining the full facts.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China to the Embassy of India in China, 23 January 1960

The Government of the People's Republic of China has received the memorandum of the Government of India of October 29, 1959 in reply to the Chinese Embassy in India concerning the Chinese Government's protest against the intrusion of Chinese territorial sea by few Indian Naval Ships. The Chinese Government cannot but deem with regret that the above-mentioned reply of the Government of India is unsatisfactory.

As pointed out by the Chinese Government in its memorandum, September 7, 1959 there is south-east of Hongkong an international navigational route for entry to and exit from Hongkong. It is known to all and has always been followed by ships of other countries. If Indian ships should have taken this route in approaching and leaving Hongkong the question of violation of China's sovereign rights over its territorial sea would not have arisen. However the I.N.S. Magar instead of taking the international route and in disregard of the repeated warnings of the Chinese coastal guard units twice sailed in Chinese territorial sea at will. This cannot but be deemed deliberate intrusion of China's territorial sea. When I.N.S. Magar left Hongkong for Singapore on September 16 although it no longer took the water way west of the Chiapeng and Tankan Islands of China as it had done on August 9 but sailed to the south-east of them yet it still did not follow the international route but intruded into China's territorial sea. After leaving China's territorial sea for some time it again at 15:10 hours unlawfully intruded into China's territorial sea at the point 21 degrees 48 minutes 37 seconds N, 114 degrees 18 minutes 9 seconds E and sailed in the direction west-west-south cutting as deep as 5:5 nautical miles into Chinese territorial sea. To shed its responsibility for the I.N.S. wilful act of not following the international route but intruding repeatedly and arbitrarily into China's territorial sea the Government of India resorted to the pretext that "No ship could leave Hongkong harbour without coming within 12 miles limit imposed by China". This allegation can only be interpreted to mean that the Government of India is deliberately evading the fact that the I.N.S. Magar repeatedly intruded into China's territorial sea and the Chinese Government absolutely cannot agree to this.

The Chinese Government would like to state once again that Indian ships in approaching and leaving Hongkong should take the customary international route which is now consistently followed by ships of other countries and should not intrude at will into China's territorial sea. The Chinese Government once again asks the Government of India to adopt effective measures ensuring against similar incidents in future.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Counsellor of China in India, 6 November 1959

When His Excellency the Chinese Ambassador called at the Ministry yesterday, he informed the Foreign Secretary that there were demonstrations in front of the gates of the Chinese Embassy at least four times during the day, namely at 11.45 A.M., 12.50 P.M., 1.35 P.M. and 3.50 P.M. The Ambassador said that on all these occasions there were crowds outside the gates of the Embassy uttering objectionable slogans and on one occasion they burnt some documents. Further, at 3.50 P.M. the Ambassador himself could not leave his premises for the Ministry because of the demonstrations just outside his gates.

2. In accordance with the promise made by the Foreign Secretary, the Government of India immediately called for a report from the local officers. They are informed that throughout the day more than 200 police men accompanied by senior police officers and magistrates were present in the vicinity of the Embassy. At no time was any demonstration permitted in front or within 100 yards of the Embassy gates. In the circumstances, the Government of India cannot understand the basis of the Ambassador's complaint that persons were allowed to assemble just outside the gates of the Embassy obstructing passage through the gates or that the normal functions of the Embassy were affected.

3. As has been pointed out to the Chinese Embassy in the past, under the Indian law demonstrations cannot be prohibited so long as they are peaceful. The Government of India are well aware of the diplomatic usage and practice in accordance with which the Embassy of a foreign country is entitled to full courtesy and protection from the receiving government. They are satisfied that adequate steps were taken by the local authorities in Delhi to secure compliance with this usage and practice and that no demonstration was permitted within 100 yards of the Embassy. As the Chinese Embassy must be aware, there is great indignation in India over the recent incident in Ladakh, which has resulted in severe casualties to the Indian police reconnaissance party, and the Government of India would not be justified in preventing peaceful demonstrations intended to express popular feelings on the subject. They wish, however, to assure the Ambassador that no demonstration will be permitted in the immediate vicinity of the Embassy nor will any interference by outsiders in the work of the Embassy be tolerated.
On November 6, 1959, Mr. J. S. Mehta, Deputy Secretary to the Ministry of External Affairs of India, handed over an informal note to Mr. Yeh Cheng-chang, Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy, in reply to the serious protest lodged orally on November 4 by the Chinese Ambassador with the Foreign Secretary of India regarding the incident of Indians holding demonstrations on the same day in front of the Chinese Embassy. The Chinese Embassy considers that the reply of the Indian Government is not in conformity with the facts and is what the Embassy cannot agree. The actual situation is as follows: At 11.45 on the morning of November 4, about 200 Indians demonstrated in front of the Embassy. Some of these people held bamboo sticks and tree branches in their hands, shouting slogans insulting the People's Republic of China and its state leaders, and someone among them made a speech to incite anti-Chinese sentiments. The demonstrators shouted and clamoured loudly and made big noises, and at about 12.10 they burnt Chinese publications. At about 12.50 P.M. some 100 Indians demonstrated again in front of the Embassy. At 01:35 P.M., another Indian bringing with him about 30 small pupils came in front of the Embassy in demonstration. At about 03:50 P.M. when the Chinese Ambassador was to go by car to fulfil his appointment with the Foreign Secretary at the Ministry of External Affairs of India, some 100 Indians coming from the left side were shouting slogans in front of the gate of the Embassy, and the passage was blocked with the result that the Ambassador failed to leave the Embassy in time. (The Foreign Secretary was then informed of the delay by telephone.)

From all these facts, it can be clearly seen that the anti-Chinese demonstrations held by Indians in front of the Embassy on November 4 from the morning till the evening were carried out successively in an organised way. These activities took place either in front of or within 100 yards from the gates of the Embassy. As the Ministry of External Affairs is aware, the Chinese Embassy is situated on the side of a main thoroughfare and there are pedestrians and vehicles passing through constantly every day. The almost day-long clamouring, confusion and the blocking of the traffic in front of the Embassy on November 4 are known to all in Delhi. This should by no means be denied. Such a situation has affected the normal functions as well as the tranquillity of the Embassy, for which the Indian Government cannot evade its responsibility.

As to the question of the so-called "public feelings" referred to in the Ministry's note, the Embassy would like to point out that the Kongka Pass incident was entirely caused by the Indian armed personnel's intrusion into Chinese territory and their armed provocation against China's frontier guards and that the anti-Chinese demonstrations in India were apparently an outcome of deliberate instigation. The fact that not a few children of about 10 years of age were among the demonstrators on November 4 is a vivid proof.
It must be further mentioned that after the protest lodged by the Chinese Ambassador on November 4 with the Ministry of External Affairs of India regarding the aforesaid incident, there should have occurred an incident in which at approximately 5.00 P.M. on November 9, some 40 Indians openly burnt an effigy of Premier Chou En-lai of the State Council of the People's Republic of China in front of the Embassy. This is a gross insult to the state leader of the People's Republic of China. Regarding this, the Embassy hereby lodges a serious protest.

In view of the above, the Embassy holds that the aforesaid reply of the Indian Government is not only inconsistent with the facts but also exceedingly unsatisfactory. The Embassy must point out that at present such anti-Chinese demonstrations are still continuing in India, to which the Indian Government give serious attention.
Note given by the Counsellor of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 27 November 1959

The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India and hereby lodges a serious protest with the Ministry against the grave incident in which a group of Indians made provocations and disturbance in front of the gates of the Chinese Embassy and openly insulted the Chinese People’s leader and the head of the Chinese Government.

At 14.30 hours on November 17, 1959, more than 40 hooligans claiming to be members of the Indian “Bolshevik” Party made provocations and disturbance in front of the gates of the Chinese Embassy. They shouted such slogans as “Chini Luteron Hay Hay”, “Chou En-lai Murbad”, “Mao Tse-tung Hay Hay” and made speeches wantonly slandering the People’s Republic of China. What is most serious, they openly burnt on the spot two effigies of the Chinese People’s leader Chairman Mao Tse-tung and the head of the Chinese Government Premier Chou En-lai, which were made of straw, and the Indian police present watched on with folded arms, without intervening at all. These trouble-makers carried on their hulla-baloo and harassment and did not disperse till 15.50 hours.

Recently, some Indians who are hostile to the People’s Republic of China and to Sino-Indian friendship continually made disturbance in front of the premises of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates in India. These activities not only have seriously affected the normal functioning and tranquillity of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates, but have been calculated to incite an anti-Chinese campaign and to damage Sino-Indian friendly relations. And the Chinese Embassy has, upon instructions, more than once protested against these with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and asked the Indian Government to pay attention and take effective measures to stop them. The Chinese Government cannot but deeply regret that, up till now, these provocations, instead of being stopped, have grown more and more rampant, culminating in the extremely grave incident of burning the effigies of the Chinese People’s leader Chairman Mao Tse-tung and the head of the Chinese Government Premier Chou En-lai in front of the gates of the Chinese Embassy on November 17. The Indian Government cannot shirk its due responsibility for this incident. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government and asks it to deal with the matter speedily, give a satisfactory reply and take immediate effective measures to prevent the recurrence of similar incidents.

The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of External Affairs the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Counsellor of China in India, 5 December 1959

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Embassy's memorandum dated November 16 and note dated November 27 regarding demonstrations near the Chinese Embassy, have the honour to state as follows:

2. As has been explained by the Ministry on several occasions in the past, under the Constitution and laws of India, it is not possible to prohibit demonstrations so long as they remain peaceful. The Embassy must be aware that demonstrations in the country are not infrequent even against the Ministers of Government and many of these are organised by political parties. The Government of India are mindful of their obligation in regard to the protection of foreign missions in India. They have given strict instructions to the local authorities to ensure that no demonstration should be permitted within at least 100 yards of the main gates of the Chinese Embassy. Similar instructions have been issued in regard to protection to the Chinese Consulates and Trade Agency elsewhere in India. So far as the Chinese Embassy is concerned, a strong police force has always been deputed to enforce this instruction whenever information is received that a procession is proceeding towards the Embassy or that a procession or demonstration is planned. The Prime Minister of India has repeatedly condemned demonstrations against foreign embassies and consulates in India. In particular, he has expressed disapproval in public of the burning of effigies or shouting of slogans. The Government of India regret that a few people should have expressed their feelings in such an objectionable manner. They wish to assure the Embassy that they are determined to prevent such irresponsible demonstrations in front of the Chinese Embassy and other Chinese offices. The Government of India are not aware that the Embassy has, in any way, been prevented from carrying out its normal functions because of these demonstrations.

3. In regard to the reference to the incident in the Kongka Pass which has been referred to in the note of the Embassy dated November 16, the Government of India repudiate the suggestion that the Indian personnel were responsible for it. As the Embassy is aware, this has been the subject of detailed notes exchanged between the Governments of India and China and the Ministry do not propose to deal with it in the present note.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Chinese Embassy in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 17 December 1959

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of the Republic of India and has the honour to state as follows:

In recent months, there have been successive errors in the telegrams delivered to the Chinese Embassy by the Indian Central Telegraph Office, among them the following being the serious cases:

1. More than 20 errors and omissions were found in a telegram totalling about 300 words which was sent from the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong to the Embassy on September 19, 1959.

2. At 6 A.M. on October 28, 1959, the Embassy received a telegram from the Chinese Consulate General at Calcutta, which should have 180 words in all. But only less than 130 words were delivered to the Embassy by the Telegraph Office with 4 to 5 errors.

3. On November 26, 1959, the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong sent a telegram to the Embassy, which should have 213 words. But the Central Telegraph Office gave the Embassy only 154 words. After these apparent errors were found in the above-said telegrams, it was not until inquiries were made by the Embassy at the Indian Central Telegraph Office that the errors were corrected. However, the timely disposing of these telegrams by the Embassy was delayed.

The above-said successive errors of the Indian Central Telegraph Office have caused difficulties in the work of the Embassy, and affected the Embassy's normal contacts with other organs of China in India. The Embassy hereby requests the Government of India to pay attention to the above situation and prevent the recurrence of the errors mentioned above in the future.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India and has the honour to state as follows:

On October 10, 1959, some 400 Chiang Kai-shek clique elements and Tibetan rebels openly held a meeting in the vicinity of Kalimpong to celebrate the so-called "national day of the Republic of China". At the place of the meeting they even hung the national flag of India side by side with the so-called national flag of the Chiang Kai-shek clique, and the photographs of President Prasad and Prime Minister Nehru with that of Chiang Kai-shek. Not only the Indian local authorities failed to forbid such activities, but a director of the C.I.D. of Kalimpong and a police officer attended the rally in person. As instructed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, the Embassy hereby lodges a protest against the Indian local officials' connivance at such acts hostile to the People's Republic of China and detrimental to the Sino-Indian friendly relations as well as against their attendance at the above-mentioned rally.

It must be pointed out that in the first half of this year the "Chinese Journal of India" in Calcutta made venomous slanders and attacks against the head of state of China, and the Chiang Kai-shek clique elements openly hung the so-called national flag of the clique in the Meikwang School. The Consulate-General of China at Calcutta has in the Meikurang School. The Consulate-General of China at Calcutta has taken up the matter with the Government of West Bengal, demanding that the Indian local government stop such acts of directing hostility towards the People's Republic of China and of creating "two Chinas". While this just demand is not yet met with a reasonably reply, there appeared during August, in Kalimpong, Darjeeling and other places propaganda leaflets, "President Chiang's message to Tibetans", etc., printed and circulated in large quantities by the Taiwan Chiang Kai-shek clique to oppose the Chinese Government. On October 10, the Chiang Kai-shek clique elements in Calcutta also obtained permission to hold celebrations for the so-called "National day of the Republic of China". The occurrence of such a series of incidents shows that the Indian local authorities concerned are deliberately conniving at the Chiang Kai-shek clique elements to be engaged in activities against the People's Republic of China and carry out the plot of creating "two Chinas" on Indian soil. Such course of events is harmful to the normal development of the friendly relations between China and India.

In the hope of preserving and developing the friendly relations between China and India, the Embassy demands that the Ministry of External Affairs of India speedily take effective measures to prevent occurrence of similarly incidents in the future.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 December 1959

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to their note of the 29th October, 1959 and state as follows:

Investigations show that some sort of a meeting was held on the 10th October in which some foreign nationals participated. There was no prior indication that the meeting was intended to express sympathy with the KMT regime, and as it was believed that the demonstration would be peaceful, the local authorities did not prohibit it. Instructions have, however, been issued to prevent any pro-Kuomintang meeting and demonstration in future. The Government of India will not hesitate to use the power recently taken by them to turn out of Kalimpong, any foreigner who indulges in objectionable activities. As the Chinese Embassy must be aware, the Government of India recognise the Chinese People's Republic. They do not recognise any other Government of China and will not permit any activities designed to promote the idea of two Chinas.

This Ministry take the opportunity of extending assurances of its highest consideration.
The Embassy of India presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to report the following incidents:

At about 3 p.m. on 27th October, 1959, the maid-servant in the house at No. 14 Chun Shu Hutting occupied by a member of the staff of the Embassy, Mr. O. P. Puri, rang up to say that the ex-landlord of the house had unauthorisedly entered it and adopted a threatening attitude towards the female inmates. On receipt of this news Mr. Puri rushed back to his house and found the ex-landlord seated in his drawing room harshly abusing Mrs. O. P. Puri and Mrs. R. K. Sharma, the wife of another member of the staff who was visiting. When Mr. Puri entered the house the ex-landlord spoke disparagingly of the Indian people and the Government of India. The ladies who were taken by fright had locked themselves in the bedroom. On Mr. Puri’s return to the house the ladies came out crying. Mr. Puri begged the ex-landlord to leave the house. The landlord insisted that as the house was his property he was free to enter it any time he wished.

On the night of 26th October, the landlord had caused some misunderstanding. The house has two separate parts occupied by Mr. Puri and the landlord respectively. On the night in question Mr. Puri had locked his door and gone out to a party leaving his wife at home to attend to their sick child. He left the main entrance to the house unlocked in order to be able to get back to his quarters without disturbing anybody. He informed the landlord that he was doing so. The landlord, however, locked the main entrance making it difficult for Mr. Puri to re-enter his house. Mrs. Puri had to force the lock of their apartment in order to open the outer door to let her husband in.

The Embassy of India regrets these incidents and the offensive behaviour of the ex-landlord Mr. Ling Tien-Hsing. The Embassy hopes that action as may be deemed necessary will be taken by the Government of the People’s Republic of China to prevent a recurrence of this kind of harassment and ill-treatment of members of the Embassy.

The Embassy of India avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 November 1959

The Government of India wish to draw attention to the following incidents, which have recently been reported by the Indian representatives in Tibet:

(i) Kesong Tsering, who is the gardener attached to the dispensary of the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung, was arrested by the Chinese authorities on the 22nd October, 1959. Kesong Tsering is an Indian protected person and his arrest without any reason is open to serious objection. The Indian Trade Agency in Yatung took up the matter with the local Foreign Bureau and sought permission under the terms of the 1954 Agreement to meet him. In reply the Trade Agency was informed that Kesong Tsering is a Chinese national. This is completely contradictory to the facts.

Kesong hails from Sikkim and even though he has been in the employment of the Indian Trade Agency, he continues to own property in Lachan. His father and his relations are similarly residing in Sikkim. There are no grounds on which Kesong Tsering can be regarded as a Chinese national. In fact the name of Kesong Tsering was included in the list of the Indian nationals furnished to the Foreign Bureau in May this year and no objection was raised that Kesong Tsering was a Chinese national. The Government of India strongly protest against the arbitrary detention of an Indian protected person and the denial of the rights of access to him by the Trade Agent in accordance with the international usage. The 1954 Agreement provides for Indian representatives meeting Indian nationals even if they may have been taken into custody for justifiable reason. In this case no justification has yet been provided. The Government of India urge that instructions should be issued for Kesong Tsering release immediately.

(ii) Dawa Thondup, retired head-clerk of the Indian Trade Agency, Gyantse who had been residing in Yatung as a small trader, requested permission some time ago to send his family to India. Dawa Thondup is an Indian national holding an Indian Trader’s certificate. It is true that his wife was born in Tibet, but by virtue of her marriage, she is fully entitled to Indian nationality. Indeed, one of his sons has been in India for sometime and Dawa Thondup now desires to send his eldest son for study and the rest of the family back to India. The matter has been taken up by the Indian Trade Agency, Yatung, to seek permission for the family of an Indian national to return to India. It may also be pointed out that the mother of Dawa Thondup’s wife was also an Indian national and thus, according to the Tibetan custom by which the nationality of the daughters is derived from their mothers, the claim of Dawa Thondup’s wife to Indian nationality is well grounded.

The general question of nationality of Indian nationals in Tibet has already been explained in the Government of India’s note of the 24th September, 1959. The Chinese Government have recognised in principle in the Sino-Nepalese Agreement that persons resident in the Tibet region...
born of mixed parentage are entitled to exercise the option to choose one of the two nationalities. In the circumstances, the Government of India see no justification for placing restrictions on the return of Dawa Thondup's family to India.

The Government of India request that immediate instructions be issued for release of Kesong Tsering and for necessary permission to Dawa Thondup's family to leave for India.
Letter given by the Consulate General of India in Lhasa to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Lhasa, 21 December 1959

The Consulate General of India in Lhasa pays its compliments to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet and has the honour to invite attention to the meeting that took place between Mr. Chiang Su-Min, Vice Director of the Foreign Bureau and Mr. P. N. Kaul Consul General for India in Lhasa, wherein at the end Mr. Chiang narrated certain events that had taken place at Gyantse during the month of November. The Consulate General has in the meantime received instructions to lodge protest in regard to the incidents facts of which are reported to be as follows:

On 23rd November, a group of women entered the premises of Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse and searched the house of woman attendant. They were asked to leave by Mrs. Kapoor, the wife of the Trade Agent. Mr. Kapoor was then away in India. Similar intrusion took place on 22nd November and intruders were warned not to enter the premises. On 24th November, a group of 11 persons apparently under the influence of alcoholic drink, again entered the Agency premises and took out some articles from the premises. It was repeatedly explained to this crowd that they had no authority to enter the premises of a foreign Trade Agency without permission. When questioned, the crowd stated that they had been sent by the local Chinese authorities in the town. Thereupon Mrs. Kapoor and the Head Assistant of the Trade Agency went to report the incident to the Military Headquarters in Gyantse town. Only after waiting for some time was it possible for them to see and convey the narrative of the incidents to Mr. Mooyuting.

The Government of India take serious objection to repeated and apparently deliberate violations of the Agency premises by a crowd of persons. Whatever demand had to be made on the female attendant, the entry into Agency premises is clearly contrary to international usage and terms of 1954 Agreement between the two countries which enjoins mutual respect for the rights of the Trade Agencies. It is requested that the matter be investigated and action taken against the persons responsible for violation of Agency premises. Clear instructions may also be issued to ensure that no violation of Trade Agency premises should occur in the future.

The Consulate General of India takes this opportunity to renew to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs its assurances of highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China to the Embassy of India in China, 22 December 1959

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China has received the memorandum presented by the Embassy of the Republic of India in China on October 30, 1959, and hereby replies to it as follows:

Regarding the question of the non-diplomatic personnel of the Indian Embassy in China acting as temporary diplomatic couriers, in order to explain the situation, the Ministry would like to refer back to the related documents exchanged and verbal agreement reached on this question between the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Indian Embassy in China in 1953.

The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs issued on January 28, 1953 a note to the diplomatic missions in China (including the Indian Embassy in China) stating that in the case of non-diplomatic personnel of the missions in China wishing to act as temporary diplomatic couriers, the mission concerned could produce a 'certificate for temporary diplomatic courier', and that when the 'certificate for temporary diplomatic courier' has been endorsed with visas by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the diplomatic mail bags carried by the personnel concerned will be exempted from examination.

On February 20 and April 17, 1953 Mr. A. H. Safrani, First Secretary of the Indian Embassy in China, and Mr. R. Goburdhun, Counsellor of the Indian Embassy in China, respectively expressed the hope to Mr. Chin Li-chen, Director of the Visa Department of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, that the Chinese Government would agree to the non-diplomatic personnel of the Indian Embassy holding diplomatic passports and to issue them diplomatic visas when they act as temporary diplomatic couriers, because while they would not encounter problems in China for holding certificates for temporary diplomatic couriers, they would often be harassed by the Hongkong check-post for this, as they have to pass Hongkong both ways.

Taking into account those special difficulties mentioned by the Indian Government, and in line with the spirit of Sino-Indian friendship and cooperation, the Chinese Government made an exception in agreeing that non-diplomatic personnel of the Indian Embassy in China, while acting as temporary diplomatic couriers, may hold diplomatic passports and the Chinese Government will issue them diplomatic visas. However, in order to avoid the holding by these personnel of two identity papers concurrently and make them observe the regulations of the Chinese Government, the Chinese Government specifically made the point that, when non-diplomatic personnel acting as temporary diplomatic couriers hold diplomatic passports, the non-diplomatic passports originally held by them should be handed over to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the cancellation of the visas on them issued by the Chinese Government, and that, when their duty as temporary diplomatic couriers has terminated and they again become ordinary staff members, their diplomatic passports should be
handed over to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the cancellation of the visas on them issued by the Chinese Government. This measure was notified to M. R. Goburdhun, Counsellor of the Indian Embassy in China, on September 10, 1953 by Mr. Chin Li-chen, Director of the Visa Department of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Mr. Goburdhun thereupon expressed full agreement. It is regrettable that the Indian Embassy in China has never acted in accordance with the verbal agreement already reached, and especially, the holding of diplomatic passports by non-diplomatic personnel acting as temporary diplomatic couriers was extended to staff members of the Indian Consulate-General in Shanghai, and lately even staff members of the Indian Consulate General in Lhasa also held diplomatic passports and acted as temporary diplomatic couriers. Nevertheless, basing itself on Sino-Indian friendship, the Chinese Government for the time being did not take exception to the above-mentioned way followed by the Indian Government, which was inconsistent with the agreement between the two sides. In order to facilitate in future the issuance of visas for couriers, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in its memorandum of August 21, 1959 to the Indian Embassy in China, requested the Embassy to furnish the Ministry with a name list of those staff members who often would act as temporary couriers. However, the Indian Government has up to now failed to adopt a co-operative attitude in respect of this normal and entirely reasonable request, and even advanced various pretexts in its memorandum of October 30, 1959 to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs for refusing to furnish the name-list. It should be pointed out that as early as in 1954 the Indian Government asked the Chinese Government for name-list of couriers and the Chinese Government, in a spirit of co-operation, has in the past years been furnishing the Indian Government with such name-lists. It is hoped that the Indian Government will also co-operate by speedily furnishing the Chinese Government with a name-list.

Regarding the question of the holding of diplomatic passports by non-diplomatic personnel of the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa acting as temporary diplomatic couriers, as the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs pointed out in its memorandum of August 21, 1959 to the Indian Government, because the Tibet region of China and India are contiguous and couriers can come and go direct and do not have to pass Hongkong, the staff members of the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa acting as temporary couriers will not be subjected to harassment by the Hongkong check-post, as described by the Indian side on February 20 and April 17, 1953, and therefore naturally do not need to hold diplomatic passports, but should in compliance with the Chinese Government's requirement hold certificates of temporary diplomatic couriers. The Chinese Government would like to point out that the diplomatic mail bags carried by temporary diplomatic couriers holding certificates of temporary diplomatic couriers have always enjoyed due protection and immunities within Chinese territory, and no mishap has even occurred. The Indian Government in its memorandum of October 30, 1959 described the reasonable request made by the Chinese Government in its memorandum of August 21, 1959 as in any way objecting to non-diplomatic personnel being chosen for couriers duties. This is an untruthful assertion and is inconsistent with the facts.

It is worth pointing out that since the beginning of this year there have been not a few cases of procrastination and delay in the issuance of
visas for India by the Indian side to Chinese couriers. These unjustifiable delays cannot be regarded as in conformity with the immunities and facilities usually due to couriers in international practice.

Nevertheless, the Chinese Government has always taken an attitude of friendly co-operation with the Indian Government on the courier question, and has never had any intention of giving rise to unnecessary argumentation on the courier question. The Chinese Government would like to see the Indian Government take the same attitude, furnish name-lists of the personnel who will act as temporary diplomatic couriers and, in compliance with the requirement of the Chinese side, issue certificates of temporary couriers to those staff members of the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa who act as temporary diplomatic couriers, so that their diplomatic mail bags may be exempted from inspection.
According to the principle of the Government of the People's Republic of China in dealing with the question of nationality, a person born of a Chinese parent, father or mother, is a Chinese (except otherwise provided by treaty or agreement). Kesong Tsering's mother and Basang Chulma's father are Chinese. Therefore according to the above said principle Kesong Tsering and Basang Chulma are Chinese. Kesong Tsering was arrested on account of offence against the law and was meted due punishment corresponding with his guilt by the local authorities. This is entirely a matter of China's internal affairs. Yet the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung asked to "meet" him and the Government of India further unreasonably asked for his "immediate release" and even expressed "strong protest" etc. The Chinese Government is greatly surprised at this. These acts of the Government of India cannot but be conceived as an intervention in the Chinese Government's internal affairs and are incompatible with the five principles of peaceful co-existence jointly initiated by China and India as well with the friendly relations between our two countries. The Chinese Government expresses its deep regret at this and categorically rejects the protest of the Government of India.

2. On 22nd October 1959 Kesong Tsering who was in the employment of the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung was arrested by the local authorities for felling trees without permission. After being arrested Kesong Tsering admitted his offence, accepted the reprimand and expressed his willingness to amend. He was released by the local authorities on 7th November 1959. According to Kesong Tsering's confession it was at the instigation of Pappachan a staff member of the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung, that he felled trees without permission and that the objective of this theft was to set up electric poles in the compound of the Trade Agency. It should be pointed out that this act of Pappachan was very much out of keeping with his normal official duties in China's Tibetan region as a staff member of the Indian Trade Agency. Regarding Pappachan's instigation of other people to steal trees the Yatung office of the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet already took up the matter with the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung, asked the Indian side to deal suitably with him and expressed the hope that no similar cases will occur in the future.

3. Reference Indian national Dawa Thondup's request for permission for his family of Chinese nationality to leave China, according to the regulations of the Chinese Government, a Chinese national should go through necessary exit formalities before he goes abroad. On this question Dawa Thandup not only failed to cooperate with the local authorities; on the contrary India unreasonably prevented his family from fulfilling the formalities for going abroad, refused to observe decrees and regulations of the Chinese Government and brazenly filled the name of his family who are of Chinese nationality in his Indian trader's certificate in an attempt to change their nationality surreptitiously and sneak them out of China. This was an
offence against the law for which the Chinese authorities gave Dawa Thondup a severe reprimand. As to exit of Basang Chulma the local authorities in regard for the union of the whole family expressed consent once again on 10th November 1959 for them to leave China and gave them facilities by allowing them to go through the exit formalities locally.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China to the Embassy of India in China, 31 December 1959

Regarding question of nationality of the Indians and Ladakhi Lamas residing in the Tibetan region of China and the Kajis in the Tibetan region of China which has been raised by the Government of India on several occasions the Ministry would like to set forth the Chinese Government's views as follows:

1. Concerning the nationality of the Indians and Ladakhi Lamas residing in the Tibetan region of China:

The Chinese Government would like to reiterate that it has never had the intention of regarding Indian residents who are of Indian origin and the Ladakhi Lamas as Chinese. The local authorities have all along regarded them as having Indian nationality provided that they hold valid certificates of their Indian nationality. It should be pointed out that until now many among the above-mentioned persons still hold no legal certificates of nationality and so their nationality cannot be identified. Five years have passed since conclusion of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement on Trade and intercourse between the Tibetan region of China and India yet the Government of India have still failed to deal with the matter of the certificates which its nationals must hold in accordance with the provisions of the Agreement. This is an abnormal situation which it is hoped will be rectified speedily.

2. Concerning the nationality of the Kajis in the Tibetan region of China:

As pointed out by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China in its note to the Government of India, dated 18 September 1959 the ancestors of these persons moved to and settled in Tibet as early as several centuries back and they have become long since part of the Tibetans of China. There are adequate proofs to show that they have always been treated as the Tibetans of China by the local Government of the Tibetan region of China. Since 1951 most of them have been abroad with either Chinese passports or certificates for Chinese citizens going abroad and transit or exit visas were issued by the Indian Consul General in Lhasa on all the Chinese passports. Neither the Government of India nor the persons concerned ever complained about their status and treatment as Chinese nationals or asked that they renounced Chinese nationality. As Chinese they are naturally entitled to the rights and bear the obligations due to Chinese citizens. It is therefore entirely proper that they now continue taking part in various social activities and enjoy the right to education. The Chinese Government cannot agree to the fact that Government of India should lodge a so-called “strong protest” against this matter which is purely within the scope of China's internal affairs.

Even though according to the Indian Laws people can apply for and acquire Indian nationality the Government of India cannot ignore China's principle governing the handling of the question of nationality. It is
aniversally acknowledged that according to international law and practice, if, in dealing with a question of nationality there should arise any clash between the laws of two countries it must be dealt with in accordance with the law of the country in which the person concerned resided, before the two countries have come to an agreement through consultations. The Chinese Government absolutely cannot agree to the view expressed in Government of India’s note and the practice of Mr. S. C. Chibber formerly Indian Consul General in Lhasa which would force persons of Chinese nationality living in China to unilaterally accept the Indian law.

Nevertheless the Chinese Government in line with its stand to settle the question of nationality through friendly consultations and respecting the desires of the persons concerned themselves in regard to their nationality is willing to settle the question of nationality of the Kajis in the Tibetan region in a sympathetic and reasonable manner. The Chinese Government therefore hold that those of them who desire of their own will to acquire Indian nationality must go through the legal procedure of renouncing Chinese nationality in accordance with the regulations of the authorities of the Tibetan region of China before they can choose Indian nationality. As to those who do not go through the procedure of renouncing Chinese nationality they no doubt remain Chinese and will continue to enjoy the treatment due to Chinese.

3. The Chinese Government has never forced any foreign national (including Indian nationals) residing in the Tibetan region of China to stay in Tibet and prevented him from going back to his country. It is a fact known to all that foreign nationals in the Tibetan region or any other part of China who desire to return to their country are always given permission by the local authorities to do so when they personally applied to the competent local Departments provided they are not involved in any outstanding civil or criminal case or other disputes. In the recent period alone the authorities concerned in the Tibetan region have given permission for more than 120 Ladakhi Lamas to leave China, assisted them in overcoming their difficulties and even subsidised them with travel expenses. This spirit of sympathy, reasonableness and humanitarianism is apparent to all. However the Government of India repeatedly stressed that the local authorities of the Tibetan region of China placed various difficulties in the return of Indian nationals to their country. This does not conform to the fact and the Chinese Government cannot but express its deep regret at this.
Note given by the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Lhasa to the Consulate General of India in Lhasa, 25 January 1960

The Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet pays its compliments to the Consulate General of India in Lhasa and has the honour to have received the letter of the Consulate General, dated 21st December 1959. According to the information got by the Bureau of Foreign Affairs the course of the matter was to be as follows:

On 20th November 1959 there was a local resident entrusted by the wife of Nisho, a resident there to fetch from Chomo the woman attendant of Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse the articles which she borrowed from Nisho; Chomo promised to return these articles later on. During their talks Mrs. Kapoor, the wife of the Trade Agent suddenly came and slung abuses at that resident. In view of her daring manner and unreasonableness that resident returned without disputation with her. Four days later Chomo still did not return the articles borrowed. On 24th November as requested by the wife of Nisho, 8 peasants went to fetch from Chomo the articles she borrowed. While reaching the outside of Chomo's living quarters these peasants asked gardener there to tell Chomo to send out the articles borrowed but Chomo threw out the borrowed mattress and other articles from her room to the court for peasants to take. Though it is an extremely discourteous behaviour but the five peasants still took back the articles. At that time Mrs. Kapoor once again came and slung abuses at the peasants; the latter held that it is not beneficial to the matter to dispute with a madam with strong emotions and daring manners. The peasants returned at once from the spot. At about 3.00 p.m. on 24th November 1959 under the circumstances of no previous engagement Mrs. Kapoor suddenly arrived at the Military Control Commission of Gyantse and requested meeting Mr. Yin or Mr. Moo. Though this behaviour ran counter to the usual way yet Mr. Moo immediately received her. Mr. Moo expressed that the situation she described would be investigated. Later on 8th December 1959 Mr. Chiang Su-Min, Vice-Director for the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet informed Consul General Mr. Kaul the result after investigation.

According to the above-mentioned situation it appears that the peasants entrusted by the wife of Nisho to fetch from Chomo the articles she borrowed were entirely reasonable and also the attitude of the peasants was very fine. Neither had they ever entered anyone's living quarters nor made the so-called "search". The contention stated in the letter from the Consulate General is not fair, also is not in keeping with the facts. The Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet refuses to accept the protest lodged by the Consulate General of India. Simultaneously the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet regrettably noted that Mrs. Kapoor not only did not rein up her attendants rough behaviour but also did not edify Chomo to return the articles borrowed earlier. On the contrary discourteous abuse been slung at the peasants once and again. It was an unfriendly attitude towards the peasants, obviously was also extremely not in line with the status of
a madam Trade Agent. The Bureau of Foreign Affairs hope that no similar unhappy matter should reoccur in the future.

The Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet take this opportunity to renew to the Consulate General of India in Lhasa its assurances of highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China to the Embassy of India in China, 27 January 1960

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy and has the honour to acknowledge receipt of the note handed over by Mr. J. S. Mehta, Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs of India, to Counsellor Yeh Cheng-chang of the Chinese Embassy in India on October 26, 1959 on various questions concerning the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse. The Chinese Government, in its note of September 11, 1959, already made reply to the points set forth in this note of the Indian Government. Basing itself on facts, it has repeatedly and patiently made clear to the Indian side that the local authorities of China's Tibet region, consistently adhering to the spirit of Sino-Indian friendship and in accordance with the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement and the Notes exchanged, have given active assistance to the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse in its reconstruction. It is regrettable that the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse should lack a spirit of friendly co-operation with the active assistance of the local authorities, so that the questions which could have been settled long ago are procrastinated and remain outstanding up to now.

1. Regarding the extent of the land which the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse asked to lease.

Paragraph 4 of the Notes exchanged on the occasion of the conclusion of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement clearly provides that "The Government of China agrees that all buildings within the compound walls of the Trade Agencies of the Government of India at Yatung and Gyantse in Tibet Region of China may be retained by the Government of India. The Government of India may continue to lease the land within its Agency compound walls from the Chinese side." The Indian Government, however, in disregard of the agreement and on the pretext of the obsolete lease concluded at the time of the former British colonial government, repeatedly asked to lease large pieces of land outside of the compound walls. This is obviously unacceptable to the Chinese Government. According to the old lease, the area covered by the lease would have included a part of the Nienchu River at that place. This unreasonable demand made by the Indian Government is not only in violation of the Notes exchanged about the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement, but also inconsistent with the principle of sovereignty in international law.

The Chinese Government has noticed that the Indian Government, in its note of October 26, 1959, indicated that it would no longer lease land along the river, and has informed the Tibet local authorities about this. As to the Indian Government's request to lease lands north and northeast of the site, the local authorities of China's Tibet region would define a reasonable extent for the lease as permitted by local conditions and taking into consideration the actual needs of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government would instruct the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse to take a cooperative attitude towards
the Chinese local authorities and quickly submit a plan for the consultation and conclusion of the lease so as to settle as soon as possible this question which could have been solved long ago.

2. Regarding the building of spurs.

Since the site to be leased by the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse will be moved northward, the question of building spurs no longer exists. However, as the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, in its note, has given an account inconsistent with the facts, it is necessary to set forth the truth of the facts.

In 1958, the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse planned to build spurs in the local public river. According to this plan, the spurs would seriously endanger the bridge and highway further down-stream; and the local authorities, naturally could not agree to this. On March 29, 1959 the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa handed over a so-called revised plan to the Tibet Foreign Bureau, and explained that this plan only called for the building of a protective wall along the land formerly leased, but no longer that of spurs in the river. In line with its consistent spirit of friendly assistance, the Chinese local authorities in Tibet agreed that the Indian side could build a protective wall along the river-bank provided that it would not endanger the bridge and highway and that the plan is examined and approved by the competent local organs at Gyantse. But strangely, the blueprints later handed over by the Indian Trade Agency to the authorities concerned at Gyantse still envisaged the building of spurs in the river. When this was discovered by the authorities concerned at Gyantse, they further notified the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse that it might not build spurs in the river. As many as seven such notifications were made in succession. However, the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse paid no heed to the notifications of the local authorities, peremptorily started the construction work, and built a great number of spurs in the river, seriously endangering the bridge and highway further down-stream of the Nienchu River, and causing the erosion of land of the southern bank. Such an action of peremptorily building a great number of illegal works in a public river of the host country, disregarding the security of local public installations, paying no heed to the repeated notifications of the local authorities, and failing to act on the expressed intention of the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa to revise its original plan, is indeed extraordinary. The Indian Government, instead of stopping this action of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse, supported it and in many ways argued for it in its note. The Chinese Government expresses its extreme regret at this.

3. Transport and supplies.

Regarding the question of transport and supplies serving the reconstruction of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse, the Chinese local authorities have all along rendered active assistance in spite of great material difficulties locally. The Indian Government has obviously had some misunderstandings on this matter so that it should have described the consistent active assistance given by the local authorities as deliberate creation of difficulties. The Chinese Government absolutely cannot agree with such an unwarranted charge.

The Chinese Government has noted that the Indian Government no longer persists in its request for the import of trucks for its Trade Agency.
The Chinese Government believes that if only the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse consults with the local authorities in a friendly and cooperative manner, reasonable requests made in connection with the reconstruction of the buildings of the Trade Agency undoubtedly will be reasonably satisfied.

4. Regarding the detention of the driver.

The Indian Government stated in its note of July 25, 1959 that, “Recently the local driver who had been in the service of the Agency for a long time was questioned and detained by the authorities,” etc. This was a distortion of the facts. The fact was that the original driver long hired by the Agency died in the spring of 1959 and the Agency then hired another local driver who had not obtained a formal driving licence. The local authorities repeatedly notified the driver that he must obtain a formal driving licence before he could drive. However, the Indian Trade Agency insisted on the driver driving at will without licence. It was only when its repeated notifications were ignored that the local authorities could not but detain that driver. It is perfectly clear that the Chinese local authorities had full right to take action against the driver who violated the regulations. However, the Indian Government said in its note of October 26 that, “No mention was made by the Foreign Bureau that the driver should not drive the car pending the issue of fresh licence.” Such an allegation is obviously unreasonable.

In its note of September 11, 1959, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs made clear to the Indian Government that the local authorities had not detained the car of the Agency. Nor had the local authorities prevented personnel of the Agency from taking away the car. The Indian Government’s assertion in its note that “In fact the sentry did not allow him to take the car away” is inconsistent with the facts. The Chinese Government firmly rejects the protest made by the Indian Government on this matter.

5. Regarding the practice of the People’s Liberation Army units and the temporary accommodation of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse.

The Chinese Government, in its note of September 11, 1959, has given definite and clear replies to the Indian Government regarding these two questions. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will no more intervene unreasonably with the regular practice conducted by the Chinese troops on their own camp ground. As to the temporary accommodation of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse, the local authorities have exerted their utmost efforts and already properly settled the question by arranging more than ten premises.

6. Conclusion.

To sum up, the Chinese local authorities have all along given active assistance to the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse in its reconstruction work, and yet the latter has repeatedly made impracticable demands, and on many occasions failed to observe the regulations of the Chinese local authorities and even adopted various methods which impaired the Chinese people’s interests. It is regrettable that the accounts of the facts given by the Indian Government in its past notes are one-sided, and its arguments untenable. Therefore, its charges against the Chinese Government are also groundless.
Nevertheless, the Chinese Government, persisting in its desire of upholding Sino-Indian friendly relations and scrupulously adhering to the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement and the Notes exchanged, will instruct the local authorities to continue to assist the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse and to satisfy so far as possible the reasonable demands made by the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse in connection with its reconstruction work. It is hoped that the Indian Government will, in the same spirit, instruct the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse to cooperate with the Chinese local authorities so that concrete questions may be settled smoothly.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to express to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Embassy of India in Peking to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 2 February 1960

The Embassy of India in China presents its compliments to the Diplomatic Personnel Service Association of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and has the honour to state that the taps and water tanks at 36, Shun Chen Chieh, rented by this Embassy, are in need of immediate repairs. This has been repeatedly reported to the Housing Bureau.

2. The Housing Bureau informed the Embassy a few days ago that unless the house was properly heated, there was danger of water freezing and the pipes bursting. It was pointed out to them that all arrangements for heating existed at 36, Shun Chen Chieh and there was an immediate need for a servant to attend to the boiler. The D.P.S.A. was requested to recommend a person for the job. No person had been recommended for the work. In the circumstances, the Embassy was not in a position to accept any responsibility because it was not free to engage servants on its own.

3. The Press Attache, who is staying at the above residence has not yet been given a satisfactory cook. In the absence of servants, it is not possible to heat the house properly, even if fuel is supplied.

4. The Embassy of India requests that the Press Attache may kindly be given immediately the servants that the Embassy has asked for. The Embassy has rented the house for its use on payment of rent. The Embassy cannot accept responsibility for extensive repairs to the house. And as for any damage that may be caused to the installations from lack of adequate heating, the Embassy regrets it can accept no responsibility as the officer residing in the building was not given the servants necessary to fully operate the heating system.

The Embassy avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Diplomatic Personnel Service Association the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 February 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to invite attention to its note of the 26th October 1959 in regard to the Indian Trade Agency in Gyantse. The Government of India have now seen the Chinese note presented on the 27th January 1960 to the Counsellor of the Indian Embassy in Peking on the subject. The Government of India will communicate their detailed comments on the various points raised in the note as early as possible. Meantime, they wish to draw the attention of the Chinese Government to the continued difficulty of accommodation of the Indian Trade Agency in Gyantse and delay in the reconstruction of the Agency premises.

A brief history regarding the difficulties of accommodation has already been given in the previous notes on the subject. The Government of India would invite the attention of the Chinese Government to paras 4 and 5 of the note of 26th October, 1959. The Government of India have throughout maintained that the lease concluded in 1943 for the property, on which the Indian Trade Agency was situated, remains valid, regardless of the internal changes in the Tibet region of China. They have also consistently affirmed that an area approximately equal to that specified in the original lease was required to reconstruct the various Trade Agency buildings. The Government of India cannot now accept the contention that it is necessary to negotiate afresh "the reasonable extent of the site required for the needs of the Trade Agency".

As stated above, the Government of India’s contention in regard to the actual area of the Trade Agency in Gyantse is supported by the terms of the lease for the property concluded in 1943 between the representatives of the then Government of India, the Tibetan authorities and the owners of the land. Article I of the lease defines the area of the property as measuring 29.13 acres and refers specifically to the description of the property in the Agreement signed in 1908 between Great Britain (then representing the Government of India), the Tibetan Delegate, and also the Central Government of China. The 1908 Agreement, it will be recalled, was concluded between the three parties to amend the Trade Regulations which were agreed upon in 1893. It may be noted that the Central Chinese Government was a party to the 1893 Regulations: the two Chinese Commissioners namely, Ho Chang-Jung and James H. Hart signed on behalf of the Chinese Government. Similarly, the Special Commissioner Chang Yin Tang signed the Agreement of 1908 on behalf of the Chinese Emperor. It is also clear that the Government of the People's Republic of China accepted the continuing validity of the lease and the area specified in it. It is surprising that, on the one hand, the Chinese Government implicitly agreed, in paragraph 4 of the notes attached to the 1954 Agreement, to the continuation of the arrangements made under the lease of 1943 and on the other hand, they call it now an 'obsolete lease'. Certainly the words 'retained' and 'continue to
lease’ in this paragraph do not convey the existence of a legal vacuum concerning relations between the two parties in this regard before 1954.

As pointed out in earlier notes, the lease of 1943 is obviously endorsed by paragraph 4 of the notes attached to the 1954 Agreement regarding the Trade and Intercourse with the Tibet Region of China. The statement that “the Government of India may continue to lease the land within the Agency compound walls” should be read in the spirit of the agreement and in the context of the immediately preceding sentence in the notes. The fact is that there were no compound walls right along the perimeter of the Trade Agency either in Yatung or in Gyantse; and therefore the phrase ‘compound walls’ only signifies the boundary of the areas in question. The record of the proceedings makes it abundantly clear that under the provisions of the agreement, the Government of India would continue to remain in possession of the land occupied by its agencies prior to the conclusion of the 1954 Agreement. That the interpretation placed by the Government of India is correct and had been accepted by the Chinese authorities is clearly borne out by the fact that even after the conclusion of the 1954 Agreement India remained in possession of the entire area in Gyantse. The Trade Agency was obliged to leave the premises temporarily because of the unprecedented floods which washed away the buildings on this property in 1954. It may be added that on the authority of the same paragraphs in the 1954 Agreement the Government of India continue in possession of the original area of the Trade Agency in Yatung even up to this day and, in fact, the position has been recognised afresh by the Chinese Government in the lease agreement for the Yatung Agency concluded as recently as 1958.

The Government of India are therefore, greatly surprised by the suggestion now put forward that the Chinese Government dispute India’s right to continue to occupy and rebuild on the area remaining out of the original Agency compound. In November 1959 the Indian Trade Agent in Gyantse held discussions with the Local Foreign Bureau to finalise the exchange of land on the river side and to facilitate commencement of the reconstruction of the premises. In the meeting between Mr. Moo Uyu-Ting, Director of the Foreign Bureau in Gyantse, and the Indian Trade Agent on the 7th and the 14th November, Director Moo, on behalf of the Chinese Government, put forward for the first time the suggestion that the Government of India would be entitled merely to an area of land enclosed within the quadrangular compound near the tennis court and the main building of the previous Agency building. The area thus suggested would be approximately one fourth of an acre only. There could be little doubt in the mind of the local authorities that it would be quite impossible to build the office of the Trade Agency, the residential premises for the Agent and his staff in an area approximating to 1200 square yards only. The contention of the Chinese authorities is, therefore, not merely indefensible on the basis of previous agreements but is manifestly absurd.

Of the total area of 29.13 acres originally occupied by the Indian Trade Agency nearly a third has been eroded by the river and only about 19.13 acres remain. The Government of India are reconciled to the loss of the area along the river embankment and do not contend that its boundary limit should include any part of the river stream even though it originally lay within the leasehold. In fact, the Government of India have throughout tried to take an accommodating and reasonable attitude with a view to reaching an agreement and facilitating the reconstruction of the
Agency premises as soon as possible. Even though the Government of India are fully convinced of the continuing validity up to 1971 of the lease agreement of 1943, in the spirit of accommodation they agreed to conclude a new lease. But, throughout the protracted discussions on the subject, the Government of India made it repeatedly clear that they not only have the right to the continued occupation of their entire leasehold area but they also wish to retain occupation of the area which now remains, after a portion has been washed away by the river. In fact, both the Chinese Government in Peking as well as the local authorities in Lhasa had agreed in principle to the leasing by the Government of India of the entire remaining area and even some extra land, to construct the protective works and also to start construction of the building, without the formal execution of a new lease deed. This was confirmed in letters exchanged at Lhasa in May 1958 and discussion held in Peking in June 1958. It was with a view to by-pass the question of protective works and their management, which apparently presented difficulties from the Chinese side, that the Government of India offered to surrender the site along the river embankment but at the same time it was stipulated as a condition to this arrangement that Agency must be guaranteed the right to draw water for the Agency requirements and that an area equal to and in lieu of the land so surrendered and contiguous to the Agency property on the north and north-eastern side of the Agency site is made available by the local authorities. The Government of India are prepared to make this adjustment but are unwilling to enter upon fresh negotiations on the question of the extent of the area required for the Agency premises.

The foregoing paragraph would show that the Government of India have throughout taken a fully co-operative attitude. They firmly reject the assertion in the latest note of the Chinese Government that the Indian attitude has in any way been unreasonable or difficult. Indeed, it is the local Chinese authorities which have persistently delayed and obstructed, on one pretext or another, the reconstruction of the Indian Trade Agency in Gyantse. The Embassy must be aware that the question of Gyantse property has been taken up by the Government of India at different times and at different levels. For three years the Government of India have been trying to secure the necessary facilities and co-operation to rebuild its Agency, and engineers have been waiting at Gyantse to start the construction work. It has been pointed out repeatedly that in the difficult climatic condition of Tibet, the Trade Agent and the staff suffer serious inconvenience in the absence of proper office and residential accommodation. At no time in the past on the long discussions on this subject, was any reservation made by the local authorities about the area of the land for the Agency and the Government of India can only conclude from the unreasonable attitude now taken by the Chinese Government that they are not anxious to give facilities for the proper functioning of the Indian Trade Agency in Gyantse. The Government of India protest against this attitude. They firmly reject the interpretation which is sought to be placed on the Agreement and are of the view that the present attitude amounts to a clear violation of the 1954 Agreement. It is paradoxical that the principle of sovereignty under International Law, in the exercise of which states enter into treaty relations, is invoked, in the note of the Chinese Government, to justify their unwillingness to fulfil in good faith the solemn international obligation thus freely assumed under such treaties.
The Government of India would again urge that immediate steps should be taken for the conclusion of the lease for the establishment of the Indian Trade Agency in Gyantse providing for an area of at least 19.13 acres largely on the original site. The Government of India would not be prepared to surrender the site. If however, lease agreement is not concluded in the near future on this basis and no satisfactory arrangements are reached without delay, the Government of India would have to consider closing the Agency establishment altogether.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China to the Embassy of India in China, 27 February 1960

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to acknowledge receipt of the note on questions concerning the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung handed over by Mr. J. S. Mehta, Deputy Secretary of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, to Counsellor Yeh Cheng-chang of the Chinese Embassy in India on October 26, 1959, and the note regarding the trip of the Indian Trade Agent in Gartok to the western areas of China's Tibet delivered by the Indian Embassy in China to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs on August 29, 1959. Regarding many of the questions raised in the above-mentioned notes, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in its note of September 11, 1959 to the Indian Embassy in China already made clear the truth of the facts in a friendly and sincere manner. The Indian Government, however, has again brought up these questions and laid blame on the Chinese Government. This is obviously not conducive to the development of Sino-Indian friendly relations. The Chinese Government, out of the desire to safeguard the traditional friendship between China and India, would like to make further replies as follows:

1. Questions concerning the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung:

   (1) The local authorities of China's Tibet region have never obstructed the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung in its repair work such as white-washing of buildings, fixing of windows and painting of doors and window frames; they have also duly given permission to the plans for renovations or construction on its premises submitted by the Agency in accordance with the lease contract. This is sufficient to show the friendly and cooperative attitude of the local authorities of China's Tibet region towards the Agency. What should be pointed out is that the Trade Agency, in carrying out certain of its renovation or construction projects, did not always abide by the provisions of the lease contract. The local authorities of China's Tibet region will remain willing in the future to render assistance to the Trade Agency with regard to its reasonable requests in this respect; but it is also hoped that the Indian Trade Agency would likewise adopt a cooperative attitude and observe the relevant provisions of the lease contract.

   (2) With regard to the request of the local authorities of China's Tibet region that the Indian school in the premises of the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung should not enrol Chinese pupils, the Indian Government said in its note that this request "seems extraordinary", and that it indicates "some unaccountable distrust of the elementary school maintained by the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung." The Chinese Government is amazed by these assertions. It is stipulated by the local authorities of China's Tibet region that Chinese children must receive Chinese education. The Indian Trade Agency should respect China's internal measures.
(3) The Chinese Government notes with satisfaction that the doctor and clinic specially serving the Indian Trade Agency will abide by the wish of the local authorities and will no longer take in Chinese patients in the future.

(4) The Indian Government, on the excuse of the verbal notification of Chinese laws and regulations by the local authorities of China's Tibet region, asserted that "it is not possible for the Indian posts in Tibet to know what local regulations they are expected to observe." The Chinese Government is astonished by such a statement. According to international practice, all relevant regulations of a country notified by its government to foreign representative organs either verbally or in written form should be regarded as valid. The ignoring of regulations of the local authorities of China's Tibet region as shown by Indian organs, in Tibet is rarely seen in international practice.

2. Regarding so-called restrictions on the movement of personnel of the Indian organs in Tibet:

(1) In its note of September 11, 1959, the Chinese Government has made clear that the local authorities of China's Tibet region have always given adequate facilities so far as possible to the personnel of the Indian organs in Tibet in their normal functioning, and have never imposed any restrictions on it. It is well known that for a considerable period before and after the Tibetan upper-class reactionary clique launched armed rebellion, the rebel bandits carried out harassment in various parts of Tibet. It was very necessary for the local authorities of China's Tibet region to adopt some protective measures for a period of time to protect the smooth functioning of the Indian organs in Tibet and to ensure the safety of the Indian officials. In fact, along with progress in the suppression of the rebellion, some of the protective measures have been gradually lifted. The Chinese Government is of the belief that, should the Indian organs in Tibet and Indian officials adopt a cooperative attitude, such well-intentioned measures on the part of the local authorities will have the full understanding of the Indian Government.

(2) The local authorities of China's Tibet have no objection to the Indian Trade Agency inviting local people to attend cinema shows. It must be pointed out, however, that the contents of some of the films shown by the Indian Trade Agency are obviously unwelcome. To draw large numbers of Chinese inhabitants to see these films is most inappropriate and hence also not in the interests of the normal development of friendly relations between the two countries.

3. Regarding the trip of the Indian Trade Agent in Gartok to western Tibet:

(1) The local authorities of China's Tibet region have consistently, in accordance with the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954, given assistance to the Indian Trade Agent in Gartok in his annual trip to western Tibet for the performance of his duties. They will continue to do so in the future. Since the Indian Embassy in China last year asked for the provision of a mobile radio station and security protection for the Trade Agent, the Chinese Government, taking into account the situation in Tibet at the time, made the timely suggestion that the Trade Agent change his route and enter Chinese territory and proceed to Pulan Dzong through the Lipulek
Pass, so that this assistance could be rendered to him. This suggestion was entirely reasonable.

When the Indian Trade Agent arrived at Pulan Dzong on July 30, 1959, Chinese troops were mopping up remnant rebels in western Tibet. In order to ensure his security, the local authorities of China's Tibet region suggested to him that he ride in a car instead of using animal transportation, and also that he proceed to Gargunsa instead of Gartok for the time being. Moreover, as August is a rainy season in western Tibet, the road was impassable for motor traffic. It is understandable that under such exceptional circumstances the Indian Trade Agent should have been obliged to remain in Pulan Dzong for some time. In connection with this question, the Chinese Government has repeatedly enumerated the facts to make clear the good-willed attitude of the local authorities of China's Tibet region towards the Indian Trade Agent. However, the Indian Government has ceaselessly made complaints. The Chinese Government cannot understand this.

(2) Regarding the payment of rents by the Indian Trade Agency in Gartok, although, in accordance with the notes exchanged in 1957, it can also be made in Rupees through commercial banks in India, it is clear that when paying rents to the local authorities within Chinese territory, the Trade Agency should abide by Chinese regulations governing foreign exchange and pay in JMP. There is no room for argument on this question.

4. Regarding couriers and communication:

(1) The Chinese Government has noted that the Indian Government has agreed to start using Indians as couriers. As far as the various arguments made by the Indian Government in its note for the out-mode and unreasonable Chinese Tibetan messenger system, they are all untenable. This system is an old one left over by history, which does not conform to normal diplomatic relations and is totally inconsistent with the spirit of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954. The Chinese Government has from 1955 asked again and again that the Indian organs in Tibet stop using such messengers, and repeatedly indicated its willingness to assist the Indian organs in Tibet in the transmission of mailbags. However, the Indian side has not only adopted over a long period of time an attitude of not cooperating, but even labelled the Chinese Government's legal act of abolishing the Chinese Tibetan messenger system in faithful implementation of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 as an "arbitrary action." The Chinese Government expresses deep regret at this.

(2) The Indian Government alleged in its note that the Chinese local postal authorities, while handling the Indian Government's mail-bags, had opened these bags. The local authorities of China's Tibet region long ago explained to the Indian consulate-General in Lhasa that last year, when the post office of the former local authorities of Lhasa was taken over, it was discovered that one of the two mailbags destined to the Indian Consulate-General was torn. The Tibet local authorities could by no means be held responsible for this. As for delays in transmitting mailbags and food, it was difficult to avoid in April last year under the concrete conditions prevailing at that time in Tibet. But the situation has long since improved.

(3) As no formal agreement has yet been reached in the negotiations between the Chinese and Indian sides on the mutual establishment of
radio stations on an equal and reciprocal basis, it therefore goes without saying that the radio stations now in the Indian organs in Tibet have not been recognized by the Chinese Government. This was clearly pointed out by Deputy Director Li Chen of the Asian Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in January 1958 in his talk with Counsellor Singh of the Embassy. Any assertion that the radio stations set up by the Indian organs in Tibet have obtained the permission of the Chinese Government is obviously inconsistent with the actual fact.

Apart from the above clear replies were made by the Chinese Government in its note of September 11 to the questions of the delay of Indian courier Shri Bhupindra Singh in Yatung and so-called deprivation of the Indian Government of facilities of communication with the Indian posts in Tibet, which were raised in the Indian notes. As a matter of fact, the Chinese local post and telegraphic offices have never refused to accept the mailbags and telegrams of the Indian organs in Tibet and have always rendered assistance in their transmission.

Summarizing the above facts, it can be seen that the Chinese Government and the Tibet local authorities have all along treasured friendly relations between China and India and faithfully carried out the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954. Many of the questions raised in the Indian Government's notes have already been settled with the assistance of the Chinese local authorities; as to the remaining questions, so long as the principles of mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-interference in each others' internal affairs and equality and mutual benefit are adhered to, most of them can also be settled through on-the-spot friendly consultations made by the Indian organs in Tibet with the local authorities of China's Tibet region. The Chinese Government considers that endless disputes over these questions not only would not help settle the actual questions, but would leave behind an unpleasant effect on friendly relations between China and India. So far as the Chinese Government is concerned, it will continue to enjoin the Tibet local authorities to give the Indian organs in Tibet various facilities that are possible and necessary in the latter's normal functioning in line with the Sino-Indian Agreement and friendship between the two countries. It is true that in the course of putting down the rebellion and instituting reforms in Tibet, there have arisen individual, temporary difficulties. This is unavoidable and is also fully understandable. The Chinese Government believes that, with the gradual restoration of normal order in the Tibet region, these difficulties will be eliminated step by step. The Chinese Government, however, must urge the Indian Government to instruct the Indian organs in Tibet likewise to abide strictly by the Five Principles and the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 and show full understanding and cooperation with the local authorities of China's Tibet region in their good-willed measures and assistance.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurance of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 18 December 1959

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India and, regarding the unwarranted imposition of restrictions by the local authorities of Darjeeling on the normal functions of the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong while conniving at the forcible intrusion by Americans into the compound of the Chinese Trade Agency, lodges a protest as follows:

As reported by the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong, on November 27, 1959, Mr. A. B. Choudhury, Superintendent of police, Darjeeling District, and Mr. Nima Namchu, Deputy Superintendent, suddenly informed the Trade Agency that, for the purpose of avoiding unexpected incidents, they would send policemen to the Trade Agency to provide protection from November 28. At 8.30 on the morning of November 28, 1959 Mr. Namchu, the Deputy Superintendent, together with the personnel of the Foreigners' Registration Office, brought a group of armed soldiers to the gate of the Chinese Trade Agency and started posting them. Since then, fixed armed sentry guards were posted respectively at the front gate and the back entrance of the Trade Agency, and these armed soldiers were directed by plain-clothed persons of unknown identity who were stationed there all the time. These soldiers and unidentified plain-clothed persons obstructed and interrogated all the staff of the Trade Agency entering or coming out, either by car or on foot, of the Agency. Chinese nationals entering or leaving the Trade Agency were compelled to register their names, numbers of their Foreigner's Registration certificates, time of entering and leaving the Agency etc., and after that they were summoned to the Foreigners' Registration Office at Kalimpong for detailed questioning. The Chinese nationals were told that the Registration Office disliked their going to the Trade Agency, and that, should they go again, they must inform the Office in advance and submit the record of their conversations after their visit. Some Chinese nationals were prevented from entry into the Trade Agency without any reason. Even those Chinese nationals and Nepalese nationals who went to supply the Trade Agency with daily necessities or to work at the Agency also met with obstructions. When Chinese nationals stopped out of the Trade Agency after a film show given by the Agency for their entertainment, they were warned that they should go to the Foreigners' Registration Office for questioning.

It is surprising that, while the staff of the Chinese Trade Agency and the Chinese nationals were harassed without any justification as they entered or came out of the Trade Agency, the Indian soldiers and the unidentified plain-clothed persons twice connived at the intrusion of Americans into the compound of the Trade Agency. At 4.30 P.M. December 3, four Americans including Frederic Rheinstin of the U.S. National Broadcasting Co. and its Far East Bureau Chief, Cecil Brown, with the connivance of the Indian soldiers and the unidentified plain-clothed persons, arbitrarily intruded into the compound of the Trade Agency, in
disregard of the objection of the personnel of the Agency, and forcibly took moving pictures and photographs there. At 12-30 P.M., December 4, Rheinstein and Brown intruded once again into the compound of the Agency.

The Chinese Embassy considers that the situation stated above is extremely serious. The above-mentioned line of action taken by the Darjeeling local authorities of India against the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong has by far exceeded the scope of providing protection for a foreign official organ, and is apparently in contravention of international usage. The unwarranted harassment carried out by the local authorities against the staff of the Trade Agency and the Chinese nationals entering or coming out of the Chinese Trade Agency is in reality intended to restrict the normal functions of the Agency and to oppose the Chinese nationals making contacts with the Agency. It may be pointed out that, under the present circumstances of military control, the guards sent by the Tibet local authorities of China for the security of the Indian Consulate-General at Lhasa, have placed no restrictions on the normal functions of the Consulate-General. However, viewed from the very fact that, in disregard of the objection of the personnel of the Agency, the Indian soldiers on guard at the Chinese Trade Agency even twice connived at the intrusion of Americans into the compound of the Agency, it cannot but make one suspect what India is actually aimed at in adopting such a measure. The unjustified restrictions imposed by the Darjeeling local authorities against the Chinese Trade Agency have seriously affected the carrying on of the normal functions of the Agency. Meanwhile, taking it into consideration that not long ago the local authorities have attempted to acquire without any justification the plots of land which are being used by the Chinese Trade Agency, one also has reason to suspect whether or not it is the intention of the Indian side to put to suspension the functions of the Chinese Trade Agency, or simply to make it impossible for the organ to continue to exist at all. Regarding this, the Chinese Embassy is instructed to lodge a serious protest with the Indian Government, and demand that the Indian Government instruct the Darjeeling local authorities immediately to do away with the unwarranted restrictions against the Chinese Trade Agency, and inquire into the case in which the Indian soldiers on guard at the Trade Agency connived at the intrusions of the Americans into the compound of the Agency.

The Embassy avails itself of the opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 15 January 1960

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India sent a note to the Ministry of External Affairs of India on December 18, 1959, lodging a protest against the unwarranted imposition of restrictions by the Darjeeling local authorities on the normal functions of the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong while conniving at the forcible intrusion by Americans into the compound of the Chinese Trade Agency. Since then, however, the local authorities of Darjeeling have continued to carry on all sorts of harassments and place various restrictions on the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong, and they even went so far as to obstruct the delivery of telegrams to the Trade Agency and prevent Mr. Lee Chih-ken, the Deputy Trade Agent, and his wife from entering the Trade Agency. For instance, a telegram from the Embassy dated December 28, 1959 reached Kalimpong at 18:07 hours, December 29, but it was not received by the Trade Agency until 8.30 in the morning of December 30. The Trade Agency was told by the local telegraph office that a messenger had been sent to deliver the above-said telegram to the Trade Agency at 19:30 December 29, but failed to enter the Trade Agency because he was prevented by the sentry guard at the gate, and for this reason the time of the delivery was delayed. At about 12 o'clock, December 29, 1959, when another telegram was sent to the Trade Agency by the telegraph office, the delivery was also obstructed. The messenger said that the guard at the gate of the Trade Agency had told him that he was not allowed to enter without a “pass”. On December 27, 1959, Mr. Lee Chih-ken, the Deputy Trade Agent of the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong, and his wife were once prevented from entry when they came back to the Trade Agency from outside. It must be pointed out that the various harassments and obstructions to which the Chinese Trade Agency was subjected have put the functions of the Trade Agency to suspension. The Embassy requests that the Indian Government pay serious attention to this and immediately stop such improper measures against the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 6 February 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the
Embassy of China in India and with reference to the Embassy's note No.
M/450/59 have the honour to state as follows:

As the Embassy is doubtless aware, the Government of India are res-
ponsible for the protection of foreign Missions in India and their staff.
In pursuance of this general responsibility, and having particular regard
to recent developments which have roused popular feelings in the Darjeel-
ing area, the Superintendent of Police Darjeeling, and his Deputy informed
the Chinese Trade Agent at Kalimpong on the 27th November 1959 that
it had become necessary to post a protective police guard outside his office.
On the following morning police guards took up their positions at the two
entrances to the office of the Chinese Trade Agent. In order to provide.
an adequate measure of safety, the police guards were obliged to question,
as is customary in such circumstances, all those who desired to enter the
premises and to allow only those who satisfied them as to their bona fides
and identity. Many persons belonging to different communities and cer-
tainly all Chinese nationals were thus permitted to enter the Agency
compound after preliminary questioning. The staff of the Trade Agency should
be able to enter the premises freely on production of their identity cards.
The Government of India reject as baseless the suggestion that these precau-
tionary measures constitute an interference in the conduct of the legitimate
business of the Chinese Trade Agent.

2. With regard to interrogation of Chinese nationals, it is a fact that
the Foreigners Registration Office at Kalimpong interrogates Chinese
nationals as well as other foreigners as a part of its normal functions. The
Chinese Embassy must be aware that Chinese nationals, like other
foreigners, are required to comply with the provisions of the Foreigners,
the provisions of the Foreigners Registration Act and the rules thereunder,
and to provide to the Police authorities information concerning their
residence, business, movement etc. Foreigners' registration has been in
force in India for well over ten years.

3. As regards the alleged intrusion of two Americans into the Agency
compound, the facts are that on the 3rd December 1959, two United States
citizens, Mr. Cecil Brown and Mr. Fredrick Rhenstein, and two Germans
Mr. Amon and Mr. Lingburger, went to the Chinese Trade Agency with the
intention of seeking an interview with the Agent. The police guards at
the gate after ascertaining their identity and purpose let them in as the
authority to grant or refuse interviews vested not with the Police but with
the Chinese Trade Agent himself. Subsequently, when it became known
that the interview would not be granted, the persons in question with-
drew from the Agency peacefully. The Government of India feel
bound to point out that the account given by the Embassy is far removed
from the facts of the case and that the protest in the Embassy's note is
clearly unwarranted.
4. The Government of India are obliged once again to draw attention to the sharp contrast between the treatment accorded to their representatives stationed in Lhasa, Yatung and Gyantse and the courtesy and facilities extended to the Chinese Missions in India. The crippling restrictions on the movement of the Indian Trade Agent at Yatung, the confinement of the Indian Trade Agent at Gyantse to a radius of two miles from his office and the denial to Indian citizens of free access to their Consul-General at Lhasa are illustrative of the general attitude of the local Chinese authorities to the Indian representatives stationed in the Tibet region of China.

5. The Ministry take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 6 February 1960

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India has more than once requested that the Indian Government pay attention to the unwarranted imposition of restrictions by the local authorities on the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong. It is regrettable, however, that the abnormal treatment to which the Trade Agency has been subjected is not even slightly changed, and incidents of various unwarranted harassments have continued to occur. At 8-30 A.M. of January 19, 1960, an overseas Chinese trader, who used to supply the Trade Agency with bean curd regularly, was stopped by the Indian sentry guard at the back entrance of the Trade Agency, and that armed soldier even raised his rifle to threaten him into leaving the place. When the personnel of the Trade Agency came out to receive him on hearing the noise, three furious soldiers were still trying to prevent the trader from entering the Agency, saying that they had orders not to allow visitors to enter through the back entrance. Later, a plain-clothed man also confirmed that the orders had been issued by Mr. A. B. Choudhury, Superintendent of Police, Darjeeling District, India. At 10 A.M. on the same day, Mr. P. T. Maitra from the Darjeeling police office went to the Chinese Trade Agency, saying that what had happened in the morning was caused by "misunderstanding" and he denied the existence of the above-said orders, made apologies to the Agency on behalf of the Indian personnel involved and ensured against recurrence of similar incidents in the future. Yet, in fact, the various obstructions and harassments to which the Chinese Trade Agency was subjected has been not in the least reduced.

The Embassy hereby informs the Ministry of the above-mentioned incidents, and would like to point out that the very fact that the Indian Darjeeling police office made apologies to the Chinese Trade Agency is a proof of the gravity of the incident. The Embassy would like to request once again that the Indian Government pay serious attention to the various harassments and unwarranted restrictions to which the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong has been subjected, and hopes that the Indian Government will make an early reply to its note of December 18, 1959 and memorandum of January 15, 1960.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 27 October 1959

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India and, with reference to the attempt of the Darjeeling local authorities of India to acquire without any justification the land being by the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong, has the honour to state as follows:

According to the report which the Embassy has received, at 2 o’clock on the afternoon of October 5, 1959, a person claiming to be from an office of land acquisition of Darjeeling entered without prior notice the compound of the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong and, in disregard of the advice and prevention of the officials of the Agency, forcibly pasted up a notification of acquisition of land which was signed by the Deputy Commissioner of Darjeeling. According to the notification the land of the Trade Agency (plot Nos. 468A, 468/469A, 468/727, 468A/718 and 470/475) was to be subject to acquisition, and the Governor of West Bengal had authorised some officials with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey the land and do other acts on it. The Embassy and the Trade Agency cannot but feel greatly surprised at this sudden and unscrupulous act taken by the Indian local authorities.

The Ministry must be aware that since its establishment in March 1955, the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong has been all along using the land referred to in the notification and land No. 468/692 (extension) together with the buildings on them. Furthermore, as early as several years back, the Agency came into agreement with the owner of the above-mentioned property of buildings and land, R. Omo, regarding the transfer of the buildings and land to the Agency. On August 1, 1957, R. Omo wrote to inform the Sub-Divisional Officer of Kalimpong of the discussions which she had had with the Agency regarding the transfer, and formally filed an application for necessary permission of the transfer. Meanwhile, the Embassy would like to mention that, besides the buildings and land mentioned above, the Agency also uses the land, Touzi Nos. 955 and 1086 and the godown thereon. It has also been agreed with the owner, Jigmie Panda, that this property of buildings and land be transferred to the Agency, and Jigmie Panda wrote on August 5, 1957 to the Deputy Collector of Darjeeling applying for the permission of the transfer. After the filing of applications by R. Omo and Jigmie Panda respectively with the local authorities concerned, Mr. Lee Chih-kan, Deputy Trade Agent of China at Kalimpong also wrote on October 17, 1957 to the Deputy Commissioner of Darjeeling, inquiring about the position of how these applications were being dealt with. Although in his reply of October 28, 1957, the Deputy Commissioner of Darjeeling stated that the matter was receiving consideration and that he would duly inform Deputy Trade Agent Lee Chih-kan of the result of the consideration, yet no further reply whatsoever has been received up to the present. It must be pointed out
that the matter of the intended transfer to the Agency of the above-mentioned two properties of buildings and land has been undertaken completely in accordance with normal procedures, and that no objection has ever been raised by the Darjeeling local authorities. However, since then two long years have passed and the approval of the two applications for the transfer of the above-mentioned properties of buildings and land is still being awaited. This cannot but make one suspect that it was caused by the deliberate delay and shelving by the Darjeeling local authorities. It is extremely surprising that, in disregard of the fact that the above-mentioned two properties of buildings and land have all along been used by the Agency, and that the applications for the transfer of the properties have been made long ago and are still valid, the Darjeeling local authorities should have now issued, all of a sudden, a public notice to acquire the land on which the Agency is located.

The Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong has been established in accordance with the provisions of the Agreement between China and India on Trade and Intercourse between Tibet Region of China and India signed in 1954 and on a reciprocal basis. The notes exchanged between the Governments of the two countries have further provided that the Governments of both sides agree to render assistance to each other's Trade Agencies in respect of housing and the use of land. As the Ministry is aware, the Tibet local authorities of China have all along been given necessary facilities and assistance in regard to the question of house and land of the Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet. At the beginning of 1958, the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung completed the procedures of renewing the lease of land, and the Tibet local authorities of China are assisting the Indian Trade Agencies at Gyantse and Gartok in completing the procedures of leasing land and have also rendered them assistance in their work of construction. It is regrettable that the Darjeeling local authorities not only have failed to give necessary facilities to the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong in the transfer to the Agency of the buildings and land which the Agency has all along been using, but on the contrary, have attempted to use pretext to acquire the main part of the land of the Agency. Obviously it is intended to create difficulties for the Agency. The Embassy cannot but regard this as unfriendly and not in conformity with the provisions of the notes exchanged in 1954.

It must be further pointed out that the person of the office of land acquisition of Darjeeling, without obtaining the consent of the staff of the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong, should have arbitrarily entered the compound of the Agency and forcibly pasted up a notification there. This is apparently an unscrupulous act in contravention of international usage that foreign official organs be protected.

The Embassy holds that the fact mentioned above is very serious. In order that the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong may exercise its functions normally, the Embassy hereby demands that Ministry immediately take effective measures to enjoin the Darjeeling local authorities to withdraw the attempted acquisition of the land of the Agency, render assistance in completing at an early date the procedure regarding the transfer of the
two properties of buildings and land to the Agency, and ensure in the future against recurrence of any incident of violating the privileges that the Agency should be protected.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 November 1959

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of People's Republic of China in India and with reference to their note of the 27th October 1959 regarding the premises occupied by the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong have the honour to state as follows:

The house at present occupied by the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong is required urgently for use by the West Bengal Government for an important educational institution in the area. In order, however, not to inconvenience the Trade Agency, Government have agreed not to take possession of the property for the time being. Transfer of the property by sale or permanent lease by the owner will, however, not be permissible.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 15 January 1960

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India and, with reference to the Ministry's note dated November 16, 1959 regarding the acquisition of the land being used by the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong, has the honour to state as follows:

With regard to the attempt of the Darjeeling local authorities of India to acquire without any justification the land being used by the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong, the Embassy would like to reiterate to the Ministry that it is clearly laid down in the notes exchanged in 1954 pertaining to the Agreement between China and India on Trade and Intercourse between the Tibet Region of China and India that the two Governments agree to render assistance to each other's Trade Agencies in the use of land and in housing. The Embassy, therefore, still requests that the Government of India, in line with the above-mentioned provisions, withdraw the acquisition of the land being used by the Chinese Trade Agency and kindly give facilities so that the two properties of buildings and land concerned may be transferred to the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong at an early date. The Embassy would also like to point out that, even well after the Ministry of External Affairs of India informed the Embassy in a note on November 16, 1959 that possession of the said property would not be taken for the time being, the land acquisition staff of the office of the Darjeeling Deputy Commissioner, India, accompanied by the Director of the Foreigners' Registration Office, Kalimpong, should have been to the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong on December 7, 1959, and requested for taking measurements both inside and outside the building for its acquisition. The Embassy cannot but express regret at this, and request the Ministry of External Affairs to prevent recurrence of similar incidents.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Letter from the Prime Minister of India to the Prime Minister of China,
4 March 1960

New Delhi; March 4. 1960

My Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

I thank you for your letter of the 26th February. I am glad that you have accepted my invitation to visit Delhi so that we can have talks about our problems and explore avenues which may lead to a peaceful settlement of these problems. I shall look forward to your visit in April.

We shall naturally try to suit your convenience about the date of your visit here. If I may suggest it, about the 20th April might perhaps be suitable. I shall probably have to leave India for Europe on the 29th or 30th April.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU
NOTES, MEMORANDA AND LETTERS EXCHANGED BETWEEN
THE GOVERNMENTS OF INDIA AND CHINA

MARCH 1960—NOVEMBER 1960
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(ii)
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the note of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the 5th February. In reply the Ministry have to state that they cannot accept the version contained in the Chinese Government’s note of the incident which occurred near Kongka Pass in the Ladakh region of Jammu and Kashmir State on the 21st October 1959. There is no question of an Indian detachment having intruded into the Chinese territory, much less of any Indian patrol having had any aggressive intention towards a Chinese patrol party. The entire Chang Chenmo valley up to Lanak La falls within the Indian territory as has always been shown in official maps of the Government of India. As pointed out earlier, the Government of India had in fact specifically defined the border in this sector in a note sent to the Chinese Government as recently as the 13th August 1959 and no objection was taken to this by that Government. The place where the incident occurred is approximately forty miles within Indian territory.

2. The Government of India do not agree that a party of thirteen Chinese soldiers under a second lieutenant had come to this area merely on a routine patrol. It is quite apparent that a regular entrenched position had been established on the hill-top some time ago, and trucks, wireless equipment etc. were available ready at hand. Nor is it possible to believe that casualties were inflicted when the Indian party were advancing in attack towards the hill-top. Actually, the bodies of the members of the Indian party killed in the encounter were lying at the base of the hill; there was no evidence of any having rolled down the hill side and there were clear indications that the Indian party had been surprised by the Chinese armed detachment from their entrenched position.

3. The Government of India also cannot accept the contention that members of the Indian patrol party, who were taken into custody were provided with adequate food, lodging and other essential requirements to enable them to meet the climatic conditions of this terrain. The note of the Chinese Government admits that new tents for the use of the Indian police party arrived on the 24th October. The delay, which is admitted in the note, in providing necessary food, bedding, and clothing for the Indian personnel, remains unexplained. No Indian personnel on patrol duty in these regions, including the main party which returned to camp at Hotsprings after the encounter, have suffered from frost bites. Therefore the suggestion that the afflictions were due to the inadequacy of the Indian equipment has no basis. The frost bites were clearly the consequence of the prisoners not having been provided with adequate shelter and prompt medical attention. Shri Karam Singh who was later released by the Chinese authorities had to undergo an operation and remain under treatment in a hospital for over two months to recover from the frost bites and exposure which he had suffered during his detention.
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4. The Government of India cannot accept that the statements given by Shri Karam Singh and other members of the Indian party to their captors were voluntarily made. On the contrary, it should be self-evident from the details contained in the Chinese Government's note that these statements were either made under pressure or were written out by somebody else and subsequently the prisoners were made to append their signatures to them. For example, the statements, as recorded, constantly refer to 'Indian soldiers'. The prisoners were all members of the civil police. A member of the police force in India refers to his colleagues not as 'soldiers' but only as 'constables'. It is also surprising that Shri Karam Singh is alleged to have stated that he was unaware of the hill-features in Chang Chenmo valley and that the valley had been controlled by China for a long tie. Actually, Karam Singh was fully aware that several Indian expeditions had patrolled the Chang Chenmo valley up to Lanak La in the previous years and that an Indian patrol party had been to this area as late as June 1959. He could not therefore have made a statement attributed to him to the effect that the places to the east, north and south of Kongka Pass had always been Chinese territory. The manner in which the statements from the Indian party were secured and the certificates which have been appended thereto confirm the suspicion that these statements were either spurious or secured under threats or pressure.

5. The Government of India must again express their concern that the body of constable Makhan Lal still remains unaccounted for. He was carried by the Indian police party for two miles and left by the riverside in the custody of two Chinese soldiers. It is clearly the responsibility of the Chinese Government to explain his disappearance or to arrange for the return of the dead body.

6. The Government of India on their part do not find it pleasant to continue the exchange of notes on this unfortunate but serious incident. They share the hope that no such incident causing loss of life on either side would recur. At the same time they cannot but regret the manner in which the Indian party was attacked within Indian territory and the treatment which was meted out to the Indian prisoners during their detention under Chinese custody for over a period of three weeks.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 29 July 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to state that on 3rd June 1960 at about 1200 hours, more than 25 armed Chinese soldiers intruded into Indian territory in the Kameng Frontier Division of NEFA. These armed soldiers moved into Taktsang Gompa (91°51'E & 27°43'N) which is about 4½ miles inside Indian territory. A little later, when the soldiers attracted the attention of the local people, they returned towards Karsungla Gompa.

2. The Government of India are surprised by this armed Chinese intrusion into Indian territory particularly in the context of the decision reached by the two Prime Ministers that both sides would exercise every care to avoid border incidents. The Government of India take a serious view of this intrusion into their territory and urge the Government of the People's Republic of China to take all necessary measures to avoid a repetition of such incidents.

3. The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of the opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Memorandum of the Government of India to the Government of China,
27 September 1960

The Government of India have received a report that at 0830 hours on the 22nd September, 1960, a Chinese armed patrol consisting of one officer and 10 soldiers crossed and intruded several hundred yards into Sikkimese territory near Jelepla Pass. The party withdrew after some time on being detected by border administrative personnel in the region.

2. The Government of India strongly protests against this incursion into Sikkimese territory. This is yet another case of a further violation of the understanding reached between the two Prime Ministers that during the pendency of the Sino-Indian official level talks, both sides will avoid action which may result in friction or border clashes. Such an intrusion could well precipitate a serious incident.

3. The Government of India, therefore, urge that clear and unambiguous instructions may be given to ensure that no violation of this nature occurs in future.

4. The Government of India avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Government of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 October 1960

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows: The Chinese Government has seen the Note delivered by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India on 27th September, 1960 in which the Government of India alleges that at 0830 hours on 22nd September 1960 an armed Chinese patrol consisting of one officer and ten soldiers crossed and intruded into Sikkimese territory near Jelepla Pass. Detailed investigations by the Chinese Government have now shown that at the above mentioned time and place no armed Chinese personnel crossed the Jelepla Pass therefore the Chinese Government cannot accept the Government of India's protest. According to report of the local authorities in China's Tibet on 22nd September eight inhabitants of the border area concerned while gathering medicinal herbs near the Jelepla Pass according to their usual practice reached a spot not far to the South of the Jelepla Pass and returned from there soon afterwards. It seems that the Government of India has protested with the Chinese Government on the basis of incorrect information mistaking these border inhabitants for Chinese armed force. This is regrettable.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

The Indian Ambassador to China, Mr. Parthasarathi, forwarded your letter on March 5. You suggested that the time for my visit to Delhi might be about April 20. This time is suitable to me and I entirely agree to it. If it suits your convenience and that of the Indian Government, I am prepared to visit Delhi for seven days, from the April 19 to 25.

I am eagerly looking forward to meeting you again and visiting your great country.

With cordial regards,

(Signed) Chou En-lai
Premier of the State
Council of the People's
Republic of China

His Excellency Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru,
Government of the Republic of India,
NEW DELHI.
Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

Thank you for your message of the 19th March. The date you have suggested, that is, April 19th, for your arrival here will be convenient to us and we shall be glad to welcome you here then.

With warm regards.

I am,

Yours sincerely,

Jawaharlal Nehru.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of the Republic of India in China and has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government has received the Embassy's note of February 12, 1960 and has made a careful study of it. The Indian Government has indicated in the note that in the interest of the two countries and of world peace, active steps must be taken to remove the causes of the present tension and to establish a firm foundation of friendship between the two countries, and held that the two Governments must agree on an arrangement without delay, which would completely eliminate the risk of border clashes and facilitate a friendly settlement of the disputes. This accords with the long-cherished desire of the Chinese Government, and the Chinese Government heartily welcomes it.

The Chinese Government, in its note of December 26, 1959 already gave a detailed and comprehensive account of the facts about the Sino-Indian boundary and its stand on this issue. The Indian Government has, in its note, stated many differing views. But the objections raised by the Indian Government in its note cannot dispute the facts presented in the above-mentioned Chinese note or shake the stand of the Chinese Government. Moreover, the Premiers of our two countries will soon meet in New Delhi. Therefore, the Chinese Government does not propose to answer the Indian Government's above-mentioned note point by point. The present note will only give some necessary explanations about those major questions and some of the facts on which the Indian Government expressed disagreement, as a supplement to the Chinese Government's note of December 26, 1959. Now as before, the Chinese Government clarifies these questions and facts, not for arguing purposes, but in hopes of promoting the understanding of the Indian Government and narrowing down the differences between the two sides, so as to facilitate the forthcoming meeting of the two Premiers.

For convenience' sake, the terms of the western, middle and eastern sectors of the Sino-Indian boundary, as defined in the note of December 26, 1959, will be used in this note.

I. Has the Sino-Indian Boundary been delimited and is there any need to delimit it formally?

(1) The Indian Government does not accept the conclusion that the entire Sino-Indian boundary has never been formally delimited and that there is no boundary treaty or agreement between China and India. Yet it is unable to cite any fact to refute this conclusion. The Indian Government admits that the 1842 Treaty did not delimit the boundary in the western sector, yet it argues that this sector of the boundary was fixed from
the 17th century onwards. However, it is still unable to cite any treaty basis for the delimitation of this sector of the boundary. With respect to the middle sector, the Indian Government admits that there exists no boundary treaty whatsoever. With respect to the eastern sector, the Indian Government can only cite the Simla Convention between Britain and the Tibet local authorities and the secret letters exchanged between them on the so-called McMahon Line in 1914. But the Chinese Government proved long ago that these documents are illegal and null and void, and that the Simla Conference did not discuss at all the question of delimiting the boundary between China and India. Judging from what has been said in the above, there is no gainsaying the fact that no boundary treaty or agreement exists between China and India, and that the entire Sino-Indian boundary has not been formally delimited.

(2) The Indian Government claims that the entire Sino-Indian boundary, as is well-known, runs along the main watersheds, and that according to international usage, a customary boundary which follows such unchanging natural features stands defined and does not require formal definition again by the two sides. This argument is unacceptable to the Chinese Government. Firstly, the Chinese Government proved long ago that the claim that the entire Sino-Indian traditional customary boundary follows well-known main watersheds is groundless. Secondly, according to internationally accepted principles, an international boundary signifies a demarcation line up to which neighbouring states exercise their sovereignty over their respective territories, and must be jointly defined by the states concerned. Therefore, even though some sections of the Sino-Indian traditional customary line may have comparatively distinct natural features, it is still necessary for the two sides to define jointly their starting and terminal points and their specific alignments. Thirdly, even Britain never put forward the proposition that there was no need to formally define the Sino-Indian boundary. This is borne out by the following facts: In 1899 Britain proposed to define with China the boundary between Kashmir (including Ladakh) and Sinkiang. Between 1921 and 1927, it entered into talks with China for the delimitation of the boundary between Ladakh and Tibet, talks which were not merely for the purpose of settling the ownership of a few pasture grounds, as alleged by the Indian Government. In 1914 it drew surreptitiously and unlawfully, with the Tibet local authorities, a so-called McMahon Line in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary. If there had been no need at all to formally delimit the Sino-Indian boundary, as claimed by the Indian Government, why had Britain in the past asked again and again to delimit with China the various sections of the boundary between China and India? It can thus be seen that the assertion that there is no need to formally define the Sino-Indian boundary is untenable.

(3) Since the boundary between two neighbouring countries, according to internationally accepted principles, has to be jointly defined by the two sides, any unilateral announcement by either side of its boundary line or change in the delineation of the boundary on maps in any manner obviously has no legal validity and is not binding on the neighbouring country concerned. Naturally, violation of the traditional customary line and expansion of extent of occupation by unilateral action all the more cannot constitute a legal basis for acquiring territory. The Chinese Gov-
ernment has always persisted in this stand on the Sino-Indian boundary question. The following may be recalled: Firstly, no Chinese Government has ever recognized Britain's territorial claims on the Tibet and Sinkiang regions of China; secondly, at the Simla Conference and afterwards, the Chinese Government explicitly declared its non-recognition of any treaty or similar document that might then or thereafter be signed between Britain and the Tibet local authorities; thirdly, the Chinese Government and the Tibet local authorities repeatedly lodged protests and made representations against Britain's past unlawful acts of violating the Sino-Indian traditional customary line and seizing Chinese territory; fourthly, since the founding of the People's Republic of China, the Chinese Government has also clearly stated to the Indian Government that there exists between China and India the question of undelimited boundary and that China has always taken the stand of non-recognition of the so-called McMahon Line. These facts were set forth in detail in the Chinese Government's note of December 26, 1959. The Indian Government, however, repeatedly asserts that the Chinese Government has never raised any objection to the unilateral claims regarding the Sino-Indian boundary left over by Britain, that the Chinese Government has never protested against foreign encroachment on its territory, and that it was not until September 1959 that the Chinese Government suddenly changed its stand on the Sino-Indian boundary question, and so forth. This is both surprising and incomprehensible to the Chinese Government.

(4) The Indian Government further contends that since neither side asked for a discussion of the boundary question in the 1954 Sino-Indian negotiations, it proves that no boundary question remained between them. This contention does not hold good, either. It is both illogical and inconceivable to argue that an outstanding issue will automatically cease to exist merely because it is not mentioned during certain negotiations. Moreover, the Chinese Government, from the very beginning of the negotiations, repeatedly made it clear that those negotiations were to settle those outstanding questions between the two countries that were ripe for settlement, and the Indian representative agreed to this. It can thus be seen that the 1954 negotiations did not solve, nor tried to solve, all the outstanding issues between the two countries. The assertion that, with the boundary question unsettled, normal relations between India and China's Tibet region could not have been established on a new basis is also untenable. By the establishment of normal relations between India and the Tibet region of China on a new basis is meant, chiefly that, following the liberation of China and the independence of India and the establishment of diplomatic relations between them, the state of affairs with India holding privileges in Tibet left over by Britain must be changed, and that Sino-Indian relations in China's Tibet region must be regulated in accordance with the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence. As for the question of undelimited boundary between the two countries, so long as both sides are willing to maintain the status quo of the border pending a settlement, it need not prevent the establishment of normal relations between them. There have been quite a number of cases like this in international relations.

(5) It can be seen from what has been said in the above that no boundary treaty or agreement has ever been concluded between China and India to formally delimit the boundary between the two countries. The Chinese Government is fully justified in maintaining that the two
governments should conduct over-all negotiations and reach agreement on the boundary question. It is obviously incorrect to describe the Chinese Government's proposition as asking to reach a "new" boundary agreement to replace "old" ones, or to determine "afresh" the boundary between the two countries.

II. Individual Questions Concerning the Various Sectors of the Boundary

The Western Sector of the Boundary

(1) Facts about ownership and the exercise of jurisdiction. The Indian Government disagrees to the conclusion that the relevant area in the western sector of the boundary has always belonged to China and not to India, but it fails to produce any weighty piece of evidence to the contrary. In particular, the Indian Government has so far failed to give any explanations for the extraordinary thing that the Indian Government, which claims to have exercised jurisdiction and been sending personnel to carry out regular patrol in this area, should have for a long time been totally unaware of the fact that since 1950 Chinese personnel and supplies have been busily travelling between Sinkiang and Tibet through this area, and a road has been built across it.

(2) Regarding maps. The Indian Government asserts that Chinese maps up to the twenties of the present century drew the boundary line in this sector more or less in consonance with that shown on current Indian maps, and that it is only since then that the delineation has been changed; it also asserts that Chinese maps of the 18th and 19th centuries showed clearly that Sinkiang never extended south of the Kuen Lun Mountains. These assertions are all groundless. The fact is that many Chinese maps and gazetteers published since the 18th century, particularly authoritative ones like the "To Cing Yi Tung Chih" of 1784 and the "Chia Ching Revised Edition of the Ta Ching Yi Tung Chih" of 1820, clearly show that the limits of Sinkiang extend to the mountains southwest of the source of the Karakash River, that is, the Karakoram Mountains. This is in the main consistent with the delineation of the boundary on current Chinese maps, and inconsistent with that on Indian maps. As for the "Postal Map of China" of 1917 referred to by the Indian Government, it was compiled arbitrarily by French and British imperialist elements, who then controlled China's postal service, without the consent of the Chinese authorities. The Indian people who, like the Chinese people, were subjected for a long time to colonial aggression should find it easy to understand that that map did not represent the view of the Chinese people, but only that of the imperialist elements.

The Indian Government asserts that the maps and records of the British surveyors and some of the travellers who visited this area in the 19th century are in consonance with the maps currently published in India. This is also at variance with the facts. As a matter of fact, the maps and records of these persons showed great inconsistency and confusion. This precisely bears out the historical fact that for a hundred years and more Britain kept surreptitiously altering the delineation of the boundary to encroach upon Sinkiang and Tibet. Nevertheless, some of these persons still presented more or less accurately the actual state of the boundary. As the Chinese Government has pointed out, John Walker as well
as G. W. Hayward and Robert Shaw mentioned in Prime Minister Nehru's letter understood the boundary in a way approximating the traditional delineation on Chinese maps. Even the Indian Government is unable to deny this. Yet it repudiates their authority and asserts that only the reports of W. H. Johnson and the Second Yarkand Mission are authoritative. But this is also untenable. Take the case of Johnson as an example. There were even obvious mistakes in the topographical survey made by him, as pointed out in the book "Abode of Snow" written by K. Mason, Superintendent of the Survey of India, and published in 1955. Furthermore, without any ground, Johnson's map marked the Sino-Indian boundary line north of Shahidulla in Sinkiang, that is, about 150 kilometers deeper northward into Chinese territory than the line shown on current Indian maps, a delineation to which perhaps even the Indian Government would not agree.

The Middle Sector of the Boundary

The Indian Government has not advanced any new argument about the disputed places in this sector of the boundary. The Chinese Government would only make some additional remarks on the question of Puling-Sumdo. The Indian Government assert that Puling-Sumdo and Pulamsumda are two different places, but Puling-Sumdo and Poling refer to one and the same place. This does not accord with the fact. The fact is that Puling-Sumdo is the same place generally known in India as Pulamsumda. It is not hard to see that Pulamsumda is only a different pronunciation of Puling-Sumdo, whereas Poling is entirely another place and has never been called Puling-Sumdo at the same time. In the explanatory note attached to Prime Minister Nehru's letter of September 26, 1959, the Indian Government also explicitly admitted that Puling-Sumdo was none other than Pulamsumda under Indian control.

The Eastern Sector of the Boundary

(1) Historical facts about jurisdiction. The Indian Government indicates that it cannot accept the viewpoint that the entire area south of the so-called McMahon Line comprising the three component parts of Monyul, Loyul and Lower Tsayul always belonged to China and was until recently still under Chinese jurisdiction. The Indian Government tries hard to prove that the entire area always belonged to India. But the reasons newly advanced by the Indian Government are all untenable too.

(A) Firstly, in the Monyul area, the Tibet local authorities not only exercised ecclesiastical authority, which was also admitted by the Indian Government, but what is more important, they also exercised administrative authority there. The Chinese Government has already cited many facts in this connection which are adequate proof. In addition, one can point to the fact that the British geographer Kingdom Ward, who had engaged in exploration in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, in his article "The Assam
Himalaya: Travels in Balipara” published in the Journal of the Royal Central Asia Society in 1938, while asserting groundlessly that the Monyul area including Tawang “was ceded to India” in 1913-14, could not but admit that not only had Monyul, and particularly Tawang, been “within the Tibetan administrative system” before then, but “the Tibetan administration carries on” even in 1938 when he arrived in Monyul. Secondly, the area of Lower Tsayul including Walong not only was inhabited by Tibetans, but was always under the jurisdiction of Tibet. British troops unlawfully invaded and occupied Walong in 1944, and it was only after the Tibet local government sent a representative of the Dzong pon of Sangacho Dzong to make representations that the British troops withdrew. As to the Loyul area which is situated between Monyul and Lower Tsayul, it is a well-established fact that the Tibet local government had established extensively administrative organs of various levels and collected taxes there.

(B) The Indian Government claims that far back in the period before the 8th century, the area south of the so-called McMahon Line was under the rule of the Varman, the Salastambha and the Pala dynasties and not under that of Tibet. But it fails to produce any factual basis. The allegation that the Ahom dynasty gained control over this area from the 13th century onwards is also not true. The rule of the Ahom dynasty extended only to the plains on the northern bank of the Brahmaputra River, and never to the southern foot of the Himalayas. It can be seen clearly from the first chapter and the attached map of the book “Anglo-Assamese Relations” published in 1949 by the Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies under the Government of Assam of India that the Himalayas and the areas at their foot inhabited by the Akas, Duils, Abors and Mishmis were to the north of the bounds of Assam and not within them. As for the agreements concluded since the 19th century by Britain with certain tribes living in these areas, which were repeatedly referred to by the Indian Government, it is not difficult to see from their provisions that they were merely agreements on mutual non-aggression or the acceptance of British economic aid, and cannot be regarded as proof that these tribes were British or Indian subjects.

(2) Whether the so-called McMahon Line is legal. The Indian Government no longer stresses the assertion that the Simla Convention was binding on the Chinese Central Government. This is because the fact that the Chinese Central Government did not sign the Convention in the first place, and much less ratified it, can in no way be denied (although the Chinese representative Ivan Chen initialled the draft Convention, he stated that it was not a formal signature and that formal signing would have to be approved of by the Chinese Government, and the Chinese Government immediately declared the initialling to be invalid). The Indian Government, however, emphatically contends: (A) that the Simla Conference did discuss the so-called McMahon Line; and (B) that the Tibet local government had the right to conclude treaties on its own. The Chinese Government would like to further clarify these two questions.
(A) Article 9 of the Simla Convention did not touch on the Sino-Indian boundary, nor was the Sino-Indian boundary marked on the map attached to the Convention. This is all the more understandable when seen in relation to the following facts. Firstly, the Indian Government has all along been unable to point to any particular date of the Simla Conference or any particular page of proceedings of the conference when and where the question of the Sino-Indian boundary, and in particular that of the so-called McMahon Line, was discussed. It is obviously inconceivable that ownership of territory involving such a vast area could have been determined in a treaty and its attached map without any previous discussions. Secondly, the boundary line between China and India was not marked on the map attached to the Simla Convention. All the documents of the conference contained nothing in writing which could be used as a basis for interpreting a particular section of the red line shown on the map (which actually shows the boundary between Tibet and the rest of China) as a section of the Sino-Indian boundary.

(B) It is absolutely indisputable that the Tibet local authorities had no right to enter into talks and conclude treaties, on its own, with foreign countries. Tibet is part of Chinese territory. China has full sovereignty over Tibet. Without the authorization and consent of the Chinese Central Government, the Tibet local authorities had no right to hold talks and conclude treaties with foreign countries; even if these were done, they were illegal and null and void. Even the British Government of the past dared not ignore this. A case in point is the British-Tibetan Convention of 1904 referred to by the Indian Government, which was imposed on the Tibet local authorities by Britain as the result of war. It may be recalled that, after compelling Tibet to sign this Convention, Britain still asked time and again the Chinese Government to sign and approve it. The question became a subject of repeated negotiations, and it was not until 1906 that it came to a close when another Convention was concluded between China and Britain and the above-mentioned British-Tibetan Convention was annexed to it. As for the secret letters regarding the so-called McMahon Line exchanged between the British representative and the representative of the Tibet local authorities at the time of the 1914 Simla Conference, they were exchanged behind the back of the Chinese Central Government and kept secret for a long time. Moreover, during the Simla Conference, the Chinese Government already made a general statement on its non-recognition of any treaty or similar document that might be signed between Britain and the Tibet local authorities. Those letters exchanged, therefore, are all the more illegal and null and void.

The Chinese Government hopes that the foregoing statement will help further clarify the following facts concerning the boundary, that is, the entire Sino-Indian boundary has never been formally delimited, and the areas now disputed by the two sides have always belonged to China, not to India, with a considerable part of them remaining up to now under the effective control of the Chinese
Government. Nevertheless, the Chinese Government would like to reiterate that it has always hoped to achieve a reasonable settlement of the boundary question through friendly consultations with the Indian Government, so that there will be no more dispute between the two sides on the boundary question. Some people seem to think that differences between China and India are almost impossible to solve. The Chinese Government disagrees to this view. The Chinese Government feels that, no matter how great the present difference between China and India on this particular question, it is after all an issue of limited and temporary nature compared with the fundamental need of the two peoples to maintain friendly co-operation for thousands and tens of thousands of years to come. Provided the two sides value the fundamental interests of friendship between the two countries and world peace, display good faith, adhere to friendly consultations and the Five Principles, and adopt an attitude of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation, it is certainly possible to overcome all difficulties and bring about a settlement of the boundary question satisfactory to both sides. Although the Chinese Government has repeatedly set forth the facts about the boundary and its own stand, yet it has never set any pre-condition for the discussions between the two sides. The Chinese Government is willing, in the discussions, to explore together with Indian Government various avenues to a resolution of the differences with a conciliatory and reasonable attitude, and to try its best to promote the success of the discussions.

The Chinese Government has always advocated that, pending the settlement of the boundary question, both sides should maintain the present state of the border and preserve tranquillity along it, and see to it that this temporarily unsettled question do not affect the consolidation and development of friendly relations between the two countries. The Chinese Government has always been extremely careful on the Sino-Indian boundary question, and has never taken any step which might lead to clashes or tension on the border. For China the occurrence some time last year of tension and unfortunate incidents on the border of the two countries was totally unexpected, and China was utterly unprepared for it. After that, the Chinese Government promptly took measures and put forward proposals designed to ensure the tranquillity of the border and prevent the use of force or the occurrence of clashes. In its note of February 12, 1960, the Indian Government likewise expressed the hope that the two Governments agree on an arrangement without delay to eliminate the risk of border clashes and facilitate a friendly settlement of the disputes. This is worthy of welcome. The Chinese Government hopes that the proposals put forward by Premier Chou En-lai in his letter of December 17, 1959 will be accepted by the Indian Government as the basis for such an agreement, because the above-mentioned proposals were worked out on the basis of full consideration of the previous proposals of the two sides. The Chinese Government further hopes that both sides will not stop at this step, but will jointly make further efforts to arrange for the overall settlement of the boundary question so that the peoples of the two countries will no longer be troubled and worried about the boundary question.
Thanks to the efforts of the Chinese and Indian Governments and peoples, the once strained relations between China and India have improved. This is reassuring and encouraging. Now, the eyes of the whole world are turning towards the forthcoming meeting of the Premiers of our two countries. The Chinese people, the Indian people as well as other people of the world who love peace and are concerned for Sino-Indian friendship all cherish fervent hopes for this meeting of historic significance. Indeed, the importance of this meeting and the weight of responsibility on the Governments of the two countries can in no way be overestimated. The Chinese Government hopes that both the Chinese and the Indian sides will be fully aware of this, and will do their utmost so as not to disappoint the hopes of our two peoples and of all those who are concerned for friendship between our two countries. Of course, the Chinese Government has by no means overlooked the fact that there remain difficulties on the way ahead, and that there are still some people in the world who, harbouring ulterior motives, are trying by all means to split and undermine the relations of our two countries and to prevent the success of the talks. The Chinese Government, however, firmly believes that so long as the two Governments display good faith towards each other and endeavour to create conditions, they will certainly be able to bring about a speedy settlement of the boundary issue between the two countries, and the great friendship between the two countries not only will not be shaken, but will be further consolidated and developed.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the Republic of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Text of message sent by the leaders of the Chinese and the Indian official teams to the Prime Ministers of China and India, 24 September 1960.

The teams of officials of the Chinese and the Indian Governments have been meeting since June in accordance with the decision of the Prime Ministers of China and India as contained in the Joint Communique issued in Delhi at the conclusion of their meeting on April 25 this year. The teams met at first in Peking for six weeks, and have been meeting in Delhi for the last five weeks. Considering the size and scope of the assignment given to them, the two teams in mutual co-operation have covered a very substantial amount of ground towards the completion of the assignment.

2. The Joint Communique stated that the two teams should submit their report to the two Prime Ministers by the end of September. Despite our most determined efforts, we feel it may not be possible to complete the assignment in the prescribed time-limit. We hope, however, to finish or nearly finish the substantive work by the end of September.

3. In the circumstances, we, the leaders of the two teams, request that the two Prime Ministers may be pleased to extend the prescribed time-limit to enable the teams to complete the work and submit their report in the shortest possible time after the end of September. We would urge that in case the substantive work is not finished, we may be authorised to continue to meet in Delhi for a short while until we have done so; thereafter the teams may adjourn and re-assemble after a break to complete their work and finalise the report for submission to the two Prime Ministers.

4. The exact date and the venue of the subsequent meeting may be decided by the two Governments in consultation with each other.
I have the honour to refer to the joint message addressed to the Prime Ministers of India and China by the leaders of the teams of officials on 24th September, 1960.

I have been directed by my Prime Minister to inform Your Excellency that he agrees to the extension of the time-limit sought by the leaders of the two teams. The Government of India will of course be glad to have the Chinese team stay on in Delhi for the period necessary to complete the substantive work. The teams should reassemble as soon as possible and the Government of India would suggest that the teams should aim at the finalisation of their report by the first week of November. As regards venue of the third session the Government of India would suggest that it should be held in a third capital to be decided in consultation between our two governments through diplomatic channels and with the concurrence of the third Government concerned.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of the Republic of India in China and, referring to the joint message dated September 24, 1960, to the Prime Ministers of the two countries from the leaders of the official teams of China and India and the letter of His Excellency the Ambassador of India to Premier Chou En-lai on September 26, 1960, has the honour to state as follows:

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is instructed by Premier Chou En-lai to inform the Embassy and ask the Embassy to convey to His Excellency Prime Minister Nehru that holding the same view as His Excellency Prime Minister Nehru, Premier Chou En-lai also consents to the request of the leaders of the official teams of the two countries to extend the time-limit of their meetings.

The Indian Government has agreed that the officials continue their meetings in Delhi to complete the substantive work and proposed that the official teams of the two countries should try to finalize in the first week of November their report to be submitted to the Governments of the two countries. The Chinese Government is pleased to concur with this. As to the site of the third session, the Chinese Government, in accordance with the spirit of the Joint Communique issued by the two Prime Ministers in Delhi on April 25, 1960, would like to invite and welcome the team of Indian officials to come to Peking for the session. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will kindly agree to this proposal. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs will be most grateful for an early reply.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to state that further instances of a large number of aircraft coming from the Tibet region of China and flying over Indian territory during the last three months have come to the notice of the Government of India. A statement giving the places and time of such violations is appended.

The Ministry of External Affairs have had occasion to draw the attention of the Chinese Embassy before to Chinese aircraft violating Indian air space and to request that strict instructions be issued to Chinese aircraft to respect Indian territory. The Government of India regret that intrusions by Chinese aircraft into the air space over Indian territory are still continuing. They protest against these repeated violations and request that immediate steps be taken to ensure that further violation of India's air space is stopped.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Statement showing details of recent air violations of our air space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Date and time of flights</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Approximate Longitude &amp; Latitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6-12-1959 1730</td>
<td>UKHIMATH (Uttar Pradesh State)</td>
<td>30°30' N 79°10' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8-12-1959 0850</td>
<td>Ziro (Subansiri Frontier Division)</td>
<td>27°35' N 93°50' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do. 1730</td>
<td>Ukhimath (Uttar Pradesh State)</td>
<td>30°30' N 79°10' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9-12-1959 1300</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10-12-1959 0930</td>
<td>Huri (Subansiri Frontier Division)</td>
<td>28°15' N 93°15' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11-12-1959 1015 1345</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-2-1960 2000</td>
<td>Walong (Lohit Frontier Division)</td>
<td>28°10' N 97°00' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Do. 2010</td>
<td>Anini (Do.)</td>
<td>28°45' N 96°00' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Do. 2130</td>
<td>Tuting (Siang Frontier Division)</td>
<td>29°00' N 94°50' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Do. 2130</td>
<td>Along (Do.)</td>
<td>28°15' N 94°45' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Do. 2140</td>
<td>Yinkiong (Do.)</td>
<td>28°30' N 95°00' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Do. 2150</td>
<td>Changlang Tirap Frontier Division</td>
<td>27°00' N 95°45' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8-2-1960 1820</td>
<td>Mipi Area (Lohit Frontier Division)</td>
<td>28°45' N 95°45' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Do. 1945</td>
<td>Hayuliang (Do.)</td>
<td>28°00' N 96°30' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Do. 2130</td>
<td>Nampong (Tirap Frontier Division)</td>
<td>27°15' N 96°15' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Do. 2140</td>
<td>Yinkiong (Siang Frontier Division)</td>
<td>28°30' N 95°00' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Do. 2150</td>
<td>Bardumisa (Tirap Frontier Division)</td>
<td>Miao, Jairampur, Nampong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Do. 2200</td>
<td>Chukam Area (Lohit Frontier Division)</td>
<td>27°45' N 96°00' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>9-2-1960</td>
<td>Sunpura (Do.)</td>
<td>27°45' N 96°00' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10-2-1960 2000 2300</td>
<td>Bardumisa (Tirap Frontier Division)</td>
<td>27°30' N 96°00' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Do. 2000</td>
<td>Changlang (Do.)</td>
<td>27°00' N 95°45' E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Date and time of flights</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Approximate Longitude &amp; Latitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10-2-1960</td>
<td>Hunli Area (Lohit Frontier Division)</td>
<td>28.15 N 96.00 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Nampong (Tirap Frontier Division)</td>
<td>27.15 N 96.15 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Chukum (Lohit Frontier Division)</td>
<td>27.45 N 96.00 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Anini Lohit Frontier Division)</td>
<td>28.45 N 96.00 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Namsai (Do.)</td>
<td>27.30 N 96.00 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Changlang (Tirap Frontier Division)</td>
<td>7.00 N 95.45 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Passighat (Siang Frontier Division)</td>
<td>28.00 N 94.25 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Celling (Lohit Frontier Division)</td>
<td>28.15 N 96.45 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>11-2-1960</td>
<td>Damroh (Siang Frontier Division)</td>
<td>28.30 N 95.15 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>12-2-1960</td>
<td>Namsai (Lohit Frontier Division)</td>
<td>27.30 N 96.00 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Hayuliang (Do.)</td>
<td>28.00 N 96.30 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>(Siang Frontier Division)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Anini (Lohit Frontier Division)</td>
<td>28.45 N 96.00 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Roing (Do.)</td>
<td>28.05 N 95.45 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Changlang (Tirap Frontier Division)</td>
<td>27.00 N 95.45 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Hampong (Do.)</td>
<td>27.15 N 96.15 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>16-2-1960</td>
<td>Lungbatinga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Metilliang (Lohit Frontier Division)</td>
<td>28.15 N 96.30 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Midnight Sunpura</td>
<td>27.45 N 96.00 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Hayuliang (Do.)</td>
<td>28.00 N 96.30 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>17-2-1960</td>
<td>Chukum (Do.)</td>
<td>27.45 N 96.00 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Along (Siang Frontier Division)</td>
<td>28.15 N 94.45 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl. No.</td>
<td>Date and time of flights</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Approximate Longitude &amp; Latitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>17-2-1960 0250</td>
<td>Changlang (Tirap Frontier Division)</td>
<td>27°00' N 95°45' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nampong, Jairampur, Miao, Bardumisa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Do. 0205 0215</td>
<td>Kanumbari (Tirap Frontier Division)</td>
<td>27°00' N 95°30' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Khonsa, Lazu, Wakka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>16-2-1960 2000</td>
<td>Wakka (Tirap Frontier Division)</td>
<td>26°45' N 95°30' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>17-2-1960 0315</td>
<td>Basar (Siang Frontier Division)</td>
<td>27°45' N 94°45' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>23-2-1960 0330</td>
<td>Gelling (Do.)</td>
<td>28°15' N 96°45' E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>9-3-1960 2240</td>
<td>Along (Do.)</td>
<td>28°15' N 94°45' E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note delivered by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India on April 4, 1960 concerning the alleged flight of a large number of aircraft coming from the Tibet region of China over Indian territory, has the honour to reply as follows:

The Chinese Government has enjoined the authorities concerned to investigate into the matter on the basis of the data regarding time and place provided by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs in the annex to its note. It is satisfied that no flight of Chinese aircraft over Indian territory ever occurred at all. Therefore, the Chinese Government cannot accept the protest of the Indian Government. The Chinese Government expresses its regret at the fact that the Indian Government rashly protested with the Chinese Government without ascertaining the facts. The Chinese Governments always adhere faithfully to the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence and definitely would not permit its aircraft to fly into the air space of other countries without the consent of the states concerned.

The Chinese Government wishes to point out at the same time that, since the end of 1959, the Chinese Government repeatedly received reports to the effect that unidentified foreign aircraft were discovered intruding into Chinese air space over the southwestern border area of China. The Chinese Government is clearly aware that there exist at present certain forces who are bent on splitting by various means the relationship between China and its southwestern neighbours. Particularly at a time when the Prime Ministers of China and India are trying to seek a peaceful solution to the Sino-Indian boundary question, it is most likely that these forces would try to attain their aims of disrupting the Sino-Indian relations by means of air intrusions into India or China. It is hoped that the Indian Government as well as the Chinese Government would maintain common vigilance against this.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 July 1960

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and states as follows: According to the reports of the Chinese frontier guards, Indian aircraft have recently on many occasions intruded into China's air space above the southwestern part of Sinkiang and the Tibet region, circling and carrying out reconnoitering activities within Chinese territory, and there have also been cases of trespassing of the boundary by Indian military personnel. The main facts are as follows:

1. Something past 11·00 hours on May 30, 1960, two Indian military aircraft intruded into Chinese air space from the direction of southwest of the Kongka Pass; at 11·15 hours they intruded to the point 79° 06' E, 34° 20' N at the altitude of 2,000 metres, then flew northwestward to penetrate to the point 78° 56' E, 34° 23' N, from which they turned toward the southeast. At 11·20 hours these two aircraft left Chinese territory by turning toward the southwest at a point about four kilometres of the east side of the Kongka Pass. At 11·50 hours on the same day two Indian military aircraft again intruded into China's air space over the same area in the same direction and at the same altitude, and at 12·05 hours they made their return flight westward to Indian territory by the same route.

2. At 11·10 and 12·00 hours respectively on May 30, 1960, two Indian aircraft intruded southward into China's air space from the direction of the Kongka Pass up to the point 78° 54' E, 33° 57' N, and then turned westward to return to Indian territory.

3. At 11·00 hours on May 30, 1960, two Indian aircraft, flying from west to east, intruded into China's air space over the Lake Pangong area (78° 48' E, 33° 33' N) in the western part of China's Tibet region at the altitude of 1,000 metres, where they circled and carried out reconnaissance. It was not till 12·00 hours that they left Chinese territory by the same route of their intrusion. At 10·02 hours on May 31, an Indian aircraft intruded again into China's air space over the same area.

4. At 11·25 hours on May 31, 1960, four Indian military personnel carried out reconnoitering activities in the Chinese border area to the west of Spanggur in the western part of Tibet. One of them crossed into Chinese territory at 12·17 hours and penetrated to the point 78° 47' 20" E, 33° 33' 35" N where he stayed for four minutes before returning by the same route.

5. Indian military personnel on many occasions intruded into Chinese territory at the Nathu-la in the southern part of China's Tibet region. At 10·35 hours on May 21, 1960, nine Indian military personnel trespassed over the border and stayed in Chinese territory for more than forty minutes. At 13·01 hours on May 29, nine Indian military personnel again trespassed over the border and stayed in Chinese territory for over
20 minutes. At 11·30 hours on June 9, ten odd Indian military personnel trespassed over the border and stayed for three minutes in Chinese territory where they fired one shot and lit a fire. At 13·30 hours on June 9 eight Indian military personnel trespassed over the border and stayed for more than 40 minutes in Chinese territory where they lit two fires.

The Chinese Government is very much surprised at Indian aircraft's repeated intrusions into China's air space and Indian military personnel's trespassing over the border. The Chinese and Indian Premiers have not long ago stated explicitly in Delhi that during the period of further examination of factual material relevant to the Sino-Indian boundary by officials of the two countries every effort should be made by both parties to avoid friction and clashes in the border areas. The above-mentioned intrusions of Chinese air space by Indian aircraft and border-crossings by Indian military personnel not only violate the agreement between the two Premiers, but also contain a serious danger threatening the peace of the border areas. The Chinese Government cannot but take a serious view of these incidents, lodge a protest with the Indian Government, and demand that it immediately take necessary measures to prevent the recurrence of similar incidents.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 August 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and with reference to the Note dated July 2, 1960, from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China, has the honour to state as follows:

2. The specific details given in the Note regarding the alleged violations by Indian military personnel and Indian military aircraft on 21st, 28th, 30th and 31st May, 1960, as well as on 9th June, 1960, have been inquired into thoroughly by the Government of India. The result of the inquiries does not substantiate any of the allegations made by the Government of the People’s Republic of China.

3. The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurance of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 22 August 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and have the honour to bring to its notice instance of fresh violations of Indian air space by aircraft apparently coming from the Tibet region of China during the last few months. A statement giving the places and the time of such violations is appended.

2. The Government of India must once again, protest against repeated violation of Indian air space and request the Government of China to take immediate steps and issue strict instructions to stop recurrence of such incidents. The Government of India must point out that repetition of such incidents could easily result in grave consequences.

3. The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurance of their highest consideration.
### Statement showing details of Air violations of our Air Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Date &amp; time of flight</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Approximate Longitude &amp; Latitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9-3-1960</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>Bardumsa, Miao, Nampong and Jairampur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>Sunpura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2220</td>
<td>Manigong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>Kibithoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>Along</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11-3-1960</td>
<td>2345</td>
<td>Bomdila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Walong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>Amini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Kibithoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13-3-1960</td>
<td>0030</td>
<td>Chukam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>Hayuliang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14-3-1960</td>
<td>2218</td>
<td>Tezu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2230</td>
<td>Hayuliang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2215</td>
<td>Chukam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2205</td>
<td>Anini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15-3-1960</td>
<td>0110</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Do. 0110-0115</td>
<td>Bardumsa, Miao, Jairampur &amp; Nampong</td>
<td>27.30 N 96.15 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>16-3-1960</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Towang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2130</td>
<td>Tezu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>Sunpura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>17-3-1960</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Do. 2105—2235</td>
<td>Tezu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Do. 2000</td>
<td>Nampong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Do. 2210</td>
<td>Passighat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Do. 2225</td>
<td>Manigong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Do. 2230</td>
<td>Along</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl. No.</td>
<td>Date &amp; time of flight</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Approximate Longitude &amp; Latitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>12-4-1960 2018</td>
<td>Imphal</td>
<td>24:40 N 93:30 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Do. 2130</td>
<td>Amini</td>
<td>28:45 N 96:00 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Do. 2230</td>
<td>Yongkiong</td>
<td>28:30 N 95:00 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Do. 2100</td>
<td>Kanulbari</td>
<td>27:00 N 95:30 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>12-4-1960 2120</td>
<td>Changbar</td>
<td>27:00 N 95:45 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>Hayulang</td>
<td>28:00 N 96:30 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Zunhegoto</td>
<td>.. ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Do. 0300</td>
<td>Kepangto</td>
<td>28:00 N 96:40 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Do. 2330</td>
<td>Jairampur</td>
<td>27:15 N 96:15 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>13-4-1960 2359</td>
<td>Kong</td>
<td>28:15 N 94:45 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Do. 2110</td>
<td>Anini</td>
<td>28:45 N 95:30 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Do. 0130</td>
<td>Karko</td>
<td>.. ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Do. Gelling</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>28:15 N 96:45 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Do. 2100</td>
<td>Hayulang</td>
<td>28:00 N 96:30 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Do. 2100</td>
<td>Sunpura</td>
<td>27:45 N 96:00 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Do. 1150-1155</td>
<td>Changliang</td>
<td>27:00 N 95:45 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Do. 2015-2020</td>
<td>Bardumsa</td>
<td>27:30 N 96:00 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>9-3-1960 2359</td>
<td>Paum</td>
<td>28:30 N 94:25 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>14-3-1960 2244-2245</td>
<td>Kepangla</td>
<td>28:00 N 96:42 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>16-3-1960 2155</td>
<td>Gelling</td>
<td>28:15 N 96:45 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>16-3-1960 2125</td>
<td>Hunli</td>
<td>28:15 N 96:00 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>17-3-1960 0225</td>
<td>Manigong</td>
<td>28:45 N 94:00 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>23-3-1960 0900</td>
<td>Bomdila</td>
<td>27:00 N 94:45 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>31-5-1960 1800-1853</td>
<td>Spanggur</td>
<td>33:25 N 78:40 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>6-6-1960 1458</td>
<td>Fotula Pass</td>
<td>34:10 N 76:35 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>15-6-1960 1115-11220</td>
<td>Chilmiri</td>
<td>30:35 N 77:50 E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

1. On July 2, 1960, the Chinese Government addressed a note to the Indian Government on the repeated intrusions of China’s air space and territory by Indian aircraft and armed personnel in May and June. However, the Indian Government denied all these facts in its reply note of August 16, 1960. The Chinese Government cannot but express its regret at this. The Chinese Government has now received further reports that the following incidents of the intrusions of China’s air space and territory by Indian aircraft and personnel also happened in June:

(1) At 10.45 hours on June 9, 1960 an Indian aircraft from the southeast entered China’s air space northeast of Longju, and circled once before it flew southward.

(2) At 8.30 hours on June 23, 1960 an Indian aircraft entered China’s air space from the direction of the Nathu-la Pass and flew over Assam Village in China before it headed for Bhutan.

(3) Some time past 11.00 hours on June 29, 1960 six Indian personnel entered Chinese territory through the Nathu-la Pass and stayed there for about fifty minutes before leaving.

2. The following incidents further took place after the delivery of the above-mentioned note by the Chinese Government on July 2:

(1) On July 22, 1960 eight armed Indian personnel intruded into Kechilang pasture (west of Khinzemane) and kidnapped a Chinese inhabitant of the Le Village, Tsona Jong, named Kiayang-geltsen, who is still missing.

(2) Some time past 16.00 hours on July 28, 1960 an Indian aircraft entered China’s air space over the Lake Pangong area in the western part of China’s Tibet region, then it turned northwestward and skirted the southern bank of Lake Spanggur before leaving China.

(3) Some time past 10.30 hours on July 29, 1960 an Indian aircraft, flying from south to north, entered China’s air space over the southern bank of Lake Spanggur in the western part of China’s Tibet region, and left Chinese territory in the northwest direction.

(4) Some time past 11.00 hours on August 2, 1960 an Indian aircraft, flying from south to north, entered China’s air space over the southern bank of Lake Spanggur in the western part of China’s Tibet region, and
left Chinese territory in the northwest direction. At 12.00 hours on
August 3, an Indian aircraft again encroached on China's air space over
the same area in the same direction.

3. The Chinese Government has received a report from the local
authorities to the effect that on June 10, 1960 about seventeen Indian
official personnel carrying wireless sets entered into China's Wu-je and
forcibly occupied the lodging of Chinese mountain-keepers.

It must be pointed out that the entry of Indian official personnel
into Wu-je is another attempt to change the status quo of this area
belonging to China and being under Chinese jurisdiction, and
constitutes an encroachment on China's sovereignty and territorial
integrity.

4. As pointed out in the Chinese Government's note of July 2, the
recent repeated trespasses of Indian aircraft and armed personnel not
only constitute violations of the agreement between the Chinese and
Indian Prime Ministers that every effort should be made by both parties
to avoid friction and clashes in the border areas, but contain a serious
danger threatening peace in the border areas. What is particularly
regrettable is the occurrence of the incidents in which Indian official
personnel openly entered into Chinese territory Wu-je and kidnapped
a Chinese citizen from Kechilang pasture. For these incidents, the
Chinese Government once again protests against the Indian Government,
urgently demands that it promptly take effective measures to prevent the
occurrence of intrusions of Chinese territory and air space, and in
particular, order the Indian official personnel at once to withdraw
from Wu-je and release Chinese inhabitant Kiayang-geltsen who was carried
away from Kechilang pasture.

5. The Chinese Government has read the note which the Indian
Ministry of External Affairs delivered to the Chinese Embassy in
India on July 30, in which the Indian Ministry of External Affairs
stated that on June 3, 1960, more than 25 armed Chinese soldiers
crossed over the so-called McMahon Line. The Chinese Government
has now satisfied itself after detailed investigation that, at the place
and on the date furnished by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs
in its note, no armed Chinese personnel crossed over the so-called
McMahon Line, but nine local working personnel of Hsiao of Tsona
Jong in the eastern part of China's Tibet region, who went out to
tell bamboos, lost their way owing to low clouds and thick fog and
stepped over the so-called McMahon Line by mistake. As soon as
they perceived it, they turned back. As the Indian Government is
aware, although the Chinese Government has never recognized the
so-called McMahon Line, yet in order to maintain the status quo
of the boundary, ensure the tranquillity of the border and uphold
the friendly relations between the two countries, Chinese military
and administrative personnel are under the order not to overstep this
line and this order has all along been scrupulously observed. The
above-said inadvertent trespass of the so-called McMahon Line by
local working personnel of Hsiao was solely due to loss of way in
bad weather, and the Chinese Government has instructed the local
authorities concerned to take caution in the future. The Chinese
Government is surprised to note that, before the result of investigation into the facts is known and before a reply is made by the Chinese Government, the Indian Government has recently attacked the Chinese Government at the session of the Indian Parliament. This is an unfriendly act, and the Chinese Government expresses deep regret at it.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 16 September 1960

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the note that the Indian Ministry of External Affairs delivered to the Chinese Embassy in India on August 22, 1960, has the honour to reply as follows:

The statement attached to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs lists in all 52 alleged "instances of fresh violations of Indian air space by aircraft coming from the Tibet region of China". The result of investigations undertaken by the Chinese Government on the basis of the places and times of these incidents provided in the Indian note shows that there has not occurred at all any entry of Chinese aircraft into the Indian air space. Moreover, on the dates mentioned in the Indian note, no Chinese aircraft was in flight over those areas in China adjacent to the places listed in the note. Therefore, the Chinese Government cannot accept at all the protest of the Indian Government.

The Chinese Government notes that of the 52 cases of alleged violations of Indian air space by Chinese aircraft listed in the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, with the exception of the three dates of May 31, June 6 and June 15 which were after Premier Chou En-lai's visit to India, the other dates mentioned were all before Premier Chou En-lai's visit to India in April this year. It should be pointed out that during the period of the talks between the Prime Ministers of the two countries in Delhi, Premier Chou En-lai told His Excellency Prime Minister Nehru on April 25 that regarding the flights of aircraft discovered in the Sino-Indian border area as informed by the Indian Government to the Chinese Government, it had been found through investigation by the Chinese Government that these were aircraft of the United States. They took off from Bangkok, passed over Burma or China, and crossed the Sino-Indian border to penetrate deep into China's interior to parachute Chinese secret agents, weapons, supplies and wireless seats, and then flew back to Bangkok, again passing over the Sino-Indian border. Premier Chou En-lai assured His Excellency Prime Minister Nehru at the time that the Chinese Government would never allow its own aircraft to fly over the border and said that the Chinese Government had already sent a note to the Burmese Government, stating that should Burma discover any unidentified aircraft in its air space, it was fully entitled to take any counter-measure, either forcing them to land or shooting them down. Should China discover such aircraft in its air space, it would do likewise. Premier Chou En-lai then expressed his belief that India would do the same. Thereafter, in its Note of April 26 to the Indian Embassy in China, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs again emphatically pointed out: "The Chinese Government is clearly aware that there exist at present certain..."
forces who are bent on splitting by various means the relationship between China and its southwestern neighbours. Particularly at a time when the Prime Ministers of China and India are trying to seek a peaceful solution to the Sino-Indian boundary question, it is most likely that these forces would try to attain their aims of disrupting the Sino-Indian relations by means of air intrusions into India or China. It is hoped that the Indian Government as well as the Chinese Government would maintain common vigilance against this". The Chinese Government is extremely surprised that after such clear explanations from Premier Chou En-lai and the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs to His Excellency Prime Minister Nehru and the Indian Government, the Indian Government should continue to disregard the reality and once again make groundless charges and protest against the Chinese Government. This cannot but be considered as a very unfriendly act towards the People's Republic of China. The Chinese Government expresses deep regret at it. In order to be on guard against deliberate attempts by outside forces to wreck Sino-Indian relations, the Chinese Government proposes once again that the two sides maintain vigilance with regard to the flights by unidentified aircraft over the border between the two countries and notify each other in time, so that each side may take whatever measures deemed necessary.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances if its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24 October 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and have the honour to refer to the Note, dated August 27, 1960, handed over to Shri K. M. Kannampilly, Counsellor, Embassy of India, Peking, by Mr. Shen Ping, Deputy Director, First Asian Division of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China.

2. The Government of India have further examined the specific details contained in the note of the Chinese Government and are fully satisfied that none of the allegations of intrusion into Chinese ground or air-space has any substance. At the times mentioned in the Chinese note no Indian aircraft was flying anywhere in the neighbourhood of the specified areas either in the Eastern or Western Sectors, or along Sikkim’s border with the Tibet region.

3. The Government of India repudiate the suggestion that a Chinese national was kidnapped by an Indian patrol party from Chinese territory. The Chinese Government must be aware that during the last 18 months, over twenty thousand persons from the Tibet region of China have sought refuge into Indian territory. The border posts concerned have invariably taken prompt action to disarm such persons if they carried arms and to move them away from the frontier areas thereby to ensure that there was no abuse of the right of asylum permitted to them. The particular Chinese national referred to in the Chinese Government’s note has repeatedly affirmed in course of interrogation that he had come to seek refuge in India. In any case, no Indian personnel had crossed into Chinese territory either on the date mentioned or on any other date, and there could no question of their kidnapping a Chinese national and bringing him into India.

4. The Government of India cannot but express their surprise at the assertion in the Chinese Government’s note that Indian official personnel had entered “China’s Wuje and forcibly occupied the lodging of Chinese mountaineers”. It is hardly necessary to recall that the Government of India have throughout maintained that Barahoti, which the Chinese Government call Wuje, lies south of the traditional boundary and is clearly within Indian territory. Many notes have been exchanged between the two Governments on the subject. In 1958 discussions lasting for nearly two months were held between the Chinese and Indian official teams, and in course of these discussions the Government of India furnished clear and incontrovertible proofs that Barahoti was a part of the Uttar Pradesh State and has always been a part of India. However, pending the resolution of this dispute, it was agreed by the representatives of both Governments at the conference that both sides should continue to refrain from sending any armed personnel to the Barahoti area.
The Indian representatives put forward a proposal that even civil administrative personnel of the two sides should not be deputed to the areas, but the Chinese Government did not accept such a suggestion. In the absence of the Chinese Government's concurrence to this proposal the Indian side pointed out that the Government of India would be free to exercise their customary revenue and administrative jurisdiction over the area. The official personnel who were deputed to the area in 1958, 1959 and this year have been sent entirely in accordance with the traditional practice and within the confines of the understanding reached with the Chinese Government.

5. It may be further recalled that in a discussion which took place on the 24th April, 1958, between Shri K. M. Kannampilly, Counsellor of the Embassy of India, Peking, and Mr. Ho Ying, Deputy Director of the First Asian Department of the Chinese Foreign Office, Mr. Ho Ying recalled that the agreement not to send patrol parties to this area has been in force for the last several years and invited the Indian side to confirm that no such personnel would be sent in the future. As assurance was given by Shri Kannampilly that if the Chinese Government agreed not to send any armed personnel to the disputed area, the Indian side would continue to reciprocate and abide by this understanding. In course of the same conversation the Deputy Director informed Shri Kannampilly, in reply to an enquiry from him, that the suggested neutralisation did not affect the right to send officials. It is, therefore, a matter of extreme surprise that the Chinese Government should have ignored all these facts and alleged forcible occupation of the Barahoti area by Indian personnel. The Government of India could equally level the counter charge that the local administrative personnel of the Tibet region, who visited the area, unlawfully, intruded into Indian territory.

6. The Government of India would now deal with the Chinese Government's reply to their note of the 30th July, 1960. It has been stated by the Chinese Government that twenty-five armed Chinese soldiers had not entered India across the so-called McMahon Line, but that only nine local working personnel of Tsone Dzong who had lost their way because of inclement weather when out to fell bamboos had 'stepped across the so-called McMahon Line' by mistake. The Government of India cannot but state that this version of the incident is not in accordance with facts. The Government of India are satisfied after further enquiries that the intrusion was by no means an unintended one; that the number of personnel was twenty-five and not nine, and that the personnel carried arms which were slung from their shoulder. Taktsang is situated at a height of 12,000 to 15,000 feet and is about seven miles south of McMahon Line and there are no trees or bamboos at this height. Indeed the information of the Government of India is that the personnel, apart from carrying arms, were in uniform and there was nothing to indicate that they were out to cut bamboos.

7. Facts being as stated above, there is no truth in the Chinese Government's allegation that the Government of India attacked them in a session of the Indian Parliament; much less could there
be any question of an unfriendly act on the part of the Indian Government. Intrusion by Chinese personnel several miles within Indian territory is very serious matter. It violates the understanding reached by the two Prime Ministers that during the pendency of the official level talks, no action, which is likely to lead to friction or clashes in the border areas, should be undertaken. Any such intrusion might have very unfortunate consequences. The Government of India, therefore, hope that strict instructions will be given so that no such violation of the Indian territory occurs in the future.

8. The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurance of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 24 October 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to
refer to the Note dated September 16, 1960, which was handed over
to the Counsellor of Embassy of India, Peking, by Mr. Hu Chengfang,
Deputy Director of the First Asian Division of the Chinese
Foreign Office.

2. The Government of India note the statement in the Chinese
Government's reply that the aircraft which violated the Indian air
space did not originate from China and that the Chinese Government
were in no way responsible for such violations. The Government
of India could not ignore as many as 52 violations of their air-space,
and since the planes were noticed to enter Indian territory from
China they had to bring the details to the attention of the Chinese
Government. More particularly it is difficult to believe that the
planes which violated the Indian air-space in the western sector of
the Sino-Indian boundary were based any where other than on
Chinese territory. The Government of India repudiate any sugges-
tion that in sending their note of August 22, 1960, they committed
an unfriendly act.

3. The Government of India must point out that even subsequent
to the receipt of the Chinese Government's note of 16th September,
a further instance of the violation of Indian air-space has been
reported, and on this occasion by a helicopter. On 18th September,
at about 1730 hours, a helicopter was reported flying over Thratsang
La (7840 East Lat., 3505 North Long.). The helicopter flew into
Indian territory from Western Tibet and was clearly of Chinese
origin.

4. It has been reported that as recently as the 13th October two
armed Chinese personnel on horses intruded up to points approxi-
mately 1½ miles east of Hot Springs in the Kongka Pass area in
Ladakh. The Chinese personnel only withdrew when they were
surprised by an Indian grass-cutter. The place which was being
patrolled by the Chinese personnel is about two miles west of the point
where the bodies of Indian personnel killed in the Kongka Pass incident
were handed over to the Indian police personnel.

5. The instances mentioned in the preceding paragraphs, viz.,
intrusion into Indian air-space by a helicopter and into Indian
territory by Chinese personnel, are in violation of the understanding
reached between the two Prime Ministers that during the pendency
of the official-level talks both Governments will avoid taking steps
which may precipitate border clashes or friction. The Government
of India urges that the subordinate authorities concerned be instruct-
ed to take scrupulous care that such violations of the ground and
air-space of India do not recur. The Government of India need hardly state that they observe the utmost vigilance about the protection of their frontiers, whether on the ground or in the air, and are determined to take action against all intruders, whatever their origin.

6. The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of People's Republic of China in India the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 April 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to their Note of the 23rd January have the honour to state that further investigation regarding the course taken by I.N.S. 'Magar' when leaving Hong Kong harbour on her return voyage have been made. After careful scrutiny and check of the log-books of the ship, Government of India are satisfied that in accordance with the instructions issued by them, I.N.S. 'Magar' took the course mentioned in the opening sentence of the second paragraph of the Chinese Government's note. The Government of India do not accept the allegation that the I.N.S. 'Magar' violated the Chinese territorial sea on 16th September.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the
Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 11 July 1960

The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India has recently received a report from the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay that Mr. Lin Kuo-chang, functionary of the Consulate, was prevented at the gate of the Bombay Railway Station from coming out at 12.50 hours of June 2, 1960 by an Indian policeman who intended to search the Consulate’s car in which Mr. Lin was riding. This happened when Mr. Lin, who had entered the said station to check up the packing of some articles to be transported to the Chinese Embassy at 12.00 hours, was leaving the station. Mr. Lin told the policeman that the car belonged to the Chinese Consulate, but the latter insisted that it should be searched. Mr. Lin rejected the unreasonable demand, and went to see the police officer in the duty room at the station gate and made representation to him. The police officer remarked in a very unfriendly way that no matter whose car it was, it had to be searched, with no exception for the car of the Chinese Consulate-General, and that if Mr. Lin did not agree to the search, the car was to be left there. Although the car bore the Consular Corps plate and the car number and Mr. Lin made it clear to him again and again, yet the police officer insisted that it was difficult to prove that the car belonged to the Chinese Consulate-General, and it must be searched. The officer even refused Mr. Lin to contact the Chinese Consulate-General by the telephone in the room. It was not until some time later when a senior police officer came in, and following Mr. Lin’s representations, saw the Consular Corps plate and the car number, and contacted the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay by telephone that he consented to release the car. It was already 1.35 in the afternoon.

The Embassy would like to point out that, according to general practice, cars of the consulates are not subject to search. In the past, cars of the Chinese Consulate-General entering or leaving the Railway Station, have always been allowed to pass so long as it is informed that they belong to the Consular mission. Yet, this time, in spite of the fact that the identity of the car was well shown by the Consular Corps plate on it and that Mr. Lin made it clear time and again, the Indian police officer still persisted in searching the Chinese Consulate-General’s car, and did not allow Mr. Lin to inform the Chinese Consulate-General of the incident by telephone, thus resulting in a detention for as long as forty-five minutes. This was extraordinary, and can only be regarded as deliberate obstruction. The Embassy expresses deep regret at this, and requests that the Government of India take measures to ensure against recurrence of similar incident in the future.
The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, and, with reference to the Indian Government's refusal to permit Kao Liang, correspondent of China's Hsin Hua News Agency in New Delhi, to continue his stay in India and its request for the "withdrawal" of the New Delhi Branch Office of the Hsin Hua News Agency, expresses the following to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs:

The Chinese Embassy in India has learned that the Indian Government has informed Kao Liang, correspondent of China's Hsin Hua News Agency in New Delhi, that his period of stay in India will expire on August 2, 1960, that he is not permitted to continue to stay in India, and that the New Delhi Branch Office of the Hsin Hua News Agency is requested to "withdraw". In the conversations during the several interviews he had with Kao Liang, Mr. P. N. Menon, Director of External Publicity Division, Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India, attacked without any justification the dispatches of the Hsin Hua News Agency concerning India, slandering the dispatches of the Hsin Hua News Agency as "distorted, cooked up", "harmful to Sino-Indian friendship", "interfering in the internal affairs of India", etc. The Chinese Embassy expresses its regret at this measure taken by the Indian Government, which harms the friendly relations between China and India, ignores international practice and the principle of freedom of press, and discriminates against the correspondent of the Hsin Hua News Agency.

Dispatches of the Hsin Hua News Agency are factual, objective and fair. This has won universal recognition throughout the world, as well as enjoyed great popularity and fame. The reports about India sent by the correspondent of the Hsin Hua News Agency in New Delhi have always made according to facts, based on the true happenings in India and on Indian news agencies, newspapers and statements issued by Indian official quarters. Each and every item of the news and report sent by the correspondent concerning India is founded on facts and has its source. Even when Mr. Menon was accusing the reports of the Hsin Hua News Agency about India as "distorted, garbled and cooked up", he failed to give a single fact to support his allegation. Thus, it can only be regarded as an unfounded accusation against the correspondent of the Hsin Hua News Agency.

It is always in the spirit of enhancing mutual understanding between the peoples of China and India and of promoting their friendly relations that the Hsin Hua News Agency has made its reports on India. In spite of the fact that many newspapers and news agencies of India (including those representing official circles) have for a long period of time been attacking and slandering China by using all sorts of venomous terms,
the Hsin Hua News Agency has never adopted similar tactics in its news and reports about India. If the reports of the Hsin Hua News Agency are accused as being "harmful to Sino-Indian friendship" merely because their viewpoints and stand are different from those of the Indian Government, and under such a pretext the New Delhi Branch Office of the Hsin Hua News Agency is forced to "withdraw", then the Chinese Embassy cannot but point out with regret that it is precisely this unwarranted act on the part of the Indian Government that has done harm to the friendship between China and India.

It is the proper right of the correspondent of the Hsin Hua News Agency in New Delhi to report on what has happened in India, as any correspondent of a news agency reports on the various happenings in a country in which he resides; otherwise, he would have nothing to do. This is international practice as well as common sense. That the correspondent of the Hsin Hua News Agency in New Delhi reports on the happenings in India has, therefore, nothing to do with "interfering in the internal affairs of India" as alleged by Mr. Menon. As regards the dispatches about the strike waged by the Indian Government employees, not only the official Indian Information Service of the Indian Government, the Press Trust of India, the major newspapers in India, but also the correspondents of the various Western countries in India have all made a great many reports, and the Hsin Hua News Agency has only made objective, true and fair reports based on the above-mentioned sources, which is not at all connected with the so-called "interference in internal affairs of India", and no one is in any way entitled to interfere in the reports of the Hsin Hua News Agency, using "interference in internal affairs" as a pretext. As to what news the Chinese newspapers and radio are to report and what headlines are to be used by them, it is a matter of their own right, and, similarly, no one whosoever has the right to interfere in it.

The Government of India further used "reciprocity" as a pretext, alleging that Indian correspondent could not enter China, so the correspondent of the Hsin Hua News Agency should not stay in India either. As a matter of fact, for a long period of time in the past there has never occurred that any Indian news agency has made any request to the Chinese Government for sending permanent correspondent to China under the principle of reciprocity.

The Chinese Embassy considers, therefore, that it is obviously discrimination against the correspondent of the Hsin Hua News Agency that the Indian Government has baselessly refused to permit the correspondent of the Hsin Hua News Agency to continue his stay in India, and asked the New Delhi Branch Office of the Agency to "withdraw". Such an action of the Indian Government has not only crudely violated international practice, but also made one bound to suspect the principle of "freedom of press" claimed by the Indian Government. The result of this action taken by the Indian Government following the anti-Chinese campaign for more than one year in India, will certainly further undermine the friendly relations between the two countries, and aggravate the tension between them. The Chinese Embassy cannot but express its regret at this.
In the interest of maintaining the friendly relations between China and India and upholding the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence, and in order to preserve the principle of freedom of press, the Chinese Embassy requests that the Indian Government restore the legitimate right of the correspondent of the Hsin Hua News Agency in New Delhi to continue to stay, and cancel the decision of asking the Agency to "withdraw". It is hoped that the Indian Government will give serious consideration to and accept this request.

The Embassy avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 August 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China, and with reference to its note No. M/291/60, dated August 1, 1960, which was handed by His Excellency the Ambassador of the People’s Republic of China to the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, have the honour to state as follows:

As the Foreign Secretary informed His Excellency the Ambassador, the Government of India were satisfied from a study of the despatches and reports of the Hsin Hua correspondent during the last few months that his further stay in India would be detrimental to good relations between India and the People’s Republic of China. The Hsin Hua correspondent had made it a regular practice to select critical comments and highlight adverse opinions against the Government of India, picked from newspapers which are either not of any standing or are opposed to Government. The picture which these despatches presented of India was entirely one sided if not false, and the only object of the despatches appeared to be to bring down the credit of India in foreign countries. Public opinion in India was greatly agitated by the fact that a foreign news agency was allowed the liberty of maligning India on the pretence that the news agency’s despatches merely quoted comments and writing from Indian newspapers. The activities of the Hsin Hua correspondent in India, were creating bitterness in the minds of the Indian people, and thereby were undermining the friendship between India and the People’s Republic of China.

2. The Government of India cherish and uphold the principle of the freedom of the press. Even a cursory survey of the Indian and world press would convince an unprejudiced observer of the freedom of comments allowed to Indian and accredited foreign correspondents in India. The correspondent of the Hsin Hua news agency was abusing this freedom for the purpose of lowering the credit of India. The action taken against him had no element of discrimination; it was entirely reasonable and justified. Far from the action being a violation of international practice, the latitude allowed and the patience shown to the Hsin Hua correspondent was more than what would have been allowed under much less provocation in most countries of the world, including the People’s Republic of China.

3. The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China has stated in its note that “no one is any way entitled to interfere in the reports of the Hsin Hua news agency.” The Government of India must point out to the Embassy that it has no right to question the wisdom or the propriety of the action which a sovereign government have taken against a foreigner who is in their view had been indulging in mischievous
propaganda while resident in India. The Government of India cannot allow the Embassy to interfere in the exercise of their sovereign right to decide whether a foreigner, who has abused the hospitality extended to him, should not be allowed continued residence in India.

4. The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurance of their highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the
Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 2 September 1960

The Chinese Embassy has received a report that Mr. Chiang
Wen-kuei, manager of the Bank of China, Calcutta, and the Chinese
nationals who have long been residing in Calcutta or Kalimpong, Mr.
Chang Ching, principal of the Hsing Hua Middle School, Mr. Peng
Wei-hsia, principal of the Chinese School, Mr. Wu Tao-lung, printer and
publisher of the China Review, Mr. Liang Tzu-chih, head of the Board
of Directors of the Chung Hwa School, Hou Hsing-fu, Liu Wei-tai, Wei
Chien-wu, and a number of others, have received orders from the local
authorities of India to leave the country within a limited period of time,
thus, causing difficulties in their stay in India.

The Chinese Embassy would like to point out that the Bank of China,
Calcutta, has been playing a positive role in promoting trade between
China and India and has made beneficial contributions to promoting
Sino-Indian friendship, and that this is inseparable from the efforts of
Manager Chiang Wen-kuei, who, further more, has always abided by
Indian laws and regulations and maintained good cooperation with the
authorities concerned. At the same time, the Chinese Embassy would
also like to point out that the Chinese nationals who have been ordered
by the local authorities of India to leave the country within a limited
period of time have been living in India for a long time, some of whom
were born in India, and they all have proper occupations, always respect
local laws and regulations, uphold Sino-Indian friendship, and live in
amity with the local people, and most of them are responsible persons
taking care of the cultural and welfare undertakings of the Chinese
nationals. That they are ordered to leave India within a limited period
of time not only causes difficulties to them and affects the cultural and
welfare undertakings of the Chinese nationals, but also is detrimental to
the maintenance and development of friendly relations between the two
countries.

In consideration of the friendly relations between China and India
and the actual difficulties encountered by these Chinese nationals who
have been ordered to leave India within a limited period of time, the
Embassy hopes that the Indian Government will permit these Chinese
nationals to continue their long-term stay in India.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 27 September 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Memorandum presented by Mr. Ma Mu-Ming to Shri S. Sinha on July 11, 1960, regarding the detention of the car of the Consulate General in Bombay and its occupant Mr. Lin Kuo-Chang at Carnac Bandar Goods Depot.

2. It is the normal practice for all vehicles leaving the Railway Goods Depot to be checked for contraband and the stopping of the car was in accordance with this precaution. When Lin Kuo-Chang informed the sentry that it was a Chinese Consulate car, the matter was reported to the Sub-Inspector-in-charge who took steps to ascertain whether in fact the car belonged to the Consulate and to ensure that no unauthorised person was using the number plate. The Consulate General when first addressed on the telephone, informed the Sub-Inspector that no car of the Consulate was deputed to the Carnac Bandar Goods Depot. It was only on a subsequent call made by Mr. Lin Kuo-Chang that the identity of the car and the occupant as belonging to the Consulate General was fully established and thereafter the car was promptly released.

3. While the Government of India regret the unintended inconvenience caused, it may be mentioned that the detention could have been avoided altogether if, as is expected, Mr. Lin Kuo-Chang had carried his personal identity card which would have promptly established that he was a member of the Consulate staff and the vehicle, in which he was travelling, were entitled to a privileged position.

4. The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurance of their highest consideration.
On September 2, 1960, Mr. Yeh Chang-chung, Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy, presented a memorandum to Shri J. S. Mehta, Director, China Division, regarding the orders issued to some Chinese nationals to leave India within a specified period. In the memorandum the Government of India were requested to permit these Chinese nationals to continue to stay in India. It was asserted in the Memorandum that the Chinese nationals had contributed to the promotion of Sino-Indian friendship and that their departure from India would be detrimental to the maintenance and development of friendly relations between the two countries.

2. The Government of India's attitude with regard to the residence of foreigners in India is extremely liberal by any standards: so are the freedom and facilities given to foreigners to work and trade in a bona fide manner within the country. But such facilities to all foreigners in India, as indeed in China and elsewhere, are subject to the condition that they do not partake, directly or indirectly, in political activity and particularly associate with any activity against the national policies and interest of India. The residence of foreigners in India is at all times specifically subject to the Foreigners Act, 1946, and the regulations made in pursuance of this Act.

3. There are several thousand persons of Chinese origin who have been residing in India for a long time without any curbs or disabilities being placed on them. Many have been living in India since before Independence and some have come subsequently. In accordance with their democratic policies and liberal principles the Government of India have continued to afford them full facilities of work and also of remittance of their earnings to China. The handful of persons against whom notices to leave India have been given are persons who for over a period of time have been reported to be associating and participating in activities which are prejudicial to Indian national interests. The Government of India, after further investigations, cannot accept the Embassy's contention that continued stay of those persons in India is beneficial to the maintenance of Sino-Indian friendship; in fact their activities have not only been an abuse of the hospitality and freedom permitted to foreigners but have been prejudicial to the development of Sino-Indian friendly relations. It was with reluctance, therefore, that the Government of India, in exercise of its sovereign discretion in this respect, have been compelled to authorise action to terminate the stay of some of those persons. It is regretted the decision in principle cannot be modified in those cases. In the case of genuine individual hardship in view of Embassy's representation, Government of India may be agreeable to extend the time limit prescribed in the individual case by another month or six weeks.
Statement made by the Vice Minister of China to the Ambassador of India in China, 21 October 1960

We have received reports from our Embassy in India to the effect that, in the morning of September 26 this year, the Police Commissioner in Kalimpong called on Mr. Ma Chu-Tsai an old Chinese national and on pretext of wanting him for inquiry at the Police Office took him there under custody. Then Ma was arrested sent under guard to the court and imprisoned on the pretext that he was allegedly involved in the murder of an old Lama. On September 27 the Police Office further searched Ma's house and took away his tonic medicine and other belongings.

For this case Mr. Hsu Jen our Deputy Trade Agent in Kalimpong several times made representation with the local District Head and yet the Indian local authorities have hitherto failed to provide any reason and evidence warranting the arrest of Mr. Ma. Mr. Ma has been residing in Kalimpong for 40 years; he has always abided by the laws and is on good terms with the Chinese nations both Han and Tibetans and enjoys a good reputation there. Mr. Ma is 71 years of age and weak and sickly. After being imprisoned without warrants no bail is allowed nor visit or delivery of food and medicines by his family. This is totally against the humanitarian spirit.

As for the allegation that Mr. Ma is involved in the murder of an old Lama this is a sheer fabrication. In fact Mr. Ma has never been acquainted nor had any contact with the murderer. There is obviously something else behind the scenes when an old man who has always abided by the laws should have been charged with involvement in a murder case. The local authorities of Kalimpong have repeatedly refused to see our Deputy Trade Agent and even denied him access to Mr. Ma in accordance with provisions relating to the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement. All these acts are obviously not in the interest of the friendly relations between China and India.

It is also necessary to recall that since June this year the Indian local authorities in Calcutta and Kalimpong have successively given orders without any justification for Mr. Chiang Wen-Kuel, Manager of the Bank of China, Calcutta, and other responsible persons in charge of cultural and welfare undertakings of the Chinese nationals in the localities totalling over 30 to leave India within a limited period of time. Our Embassy in India on September 2nd and again on October 17th made representations with the Ministry of External Affairs of your country explaining that these persons have been lawfully living in India for a long time and they all have proper occupations, have always abided by local laws and regulations, actively upheld Sino-Indian friendship and living in amity with the local people and expressing the hope that the Government of India would permit them to continue their stay. However this question has up to now failed to be settled reasonably; on the contrary an ever increasing number of Chinese nationals have been
ordered to leave India within a set time limit. Moreover in its reply dated October 17 the Ministry of External Affairs of your country even asserted that these Chinese nationals told to leave India are “persons who for over a period of time have been reported to be associating and participating in activities which are prejudicial to Indian national interests”. We cannot agree at all to this reply. It must be pointed out that it is the consistent policy pursued by our Government to instruct the Chinese nationals to live in amity with the local people to abide by laws and regulations of the country they reside in and not to participate in the political activities of the locality. It is inconceivable that the charge of “associating and participating in activities which are prejudicial to Indian national interests” should be made without any grounds against these law abiding Chinese nationals. It is indeed difficult to understand why Indian local authorities should have given such unreasonable treatment to the nationals of a friendly country in such a great hurry.

The above mentioned events have already impaired the proper rights and interests as well as the rights of lawful residents of the Chinese nationals whose life and human rights are endangered. The continuous occurrence of these events in India have aroused the extreme uneasiness of the broad masses of Chinese nationals and our Government express serious concern over this situation. Proceeding from its desire to safeguard the traditional friendly relations between the Chinese and Indian people and to truly ensure the life and property of the Chinese nationals the Government of your country is requested immediately to adopt effective measures to release the innocent and falsely accused Mr. Ma Chu-Tsai to give the broad masses of Chinese nationals who abide by the laws including those who were informed of leaving India within a set time-limit the rights of lawful residents to stop the various unreasonable measures adopted by the local authorities to order Chinese nationals to leave India and to prevent disruptive activities of Tibetan rebels and elements of the Generalissimo Chiang Kai Shek clique.

I also hope that your Excellency Mr. Ambassador will convey to your Government the serious concern and requests of our Government.
The Consulate General of India in Lhasa presents its compliments to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet and have the honour to refer to Foreign Bureau's note of 21st January, 1960. In reply the Consulate General has to state that the version of the two incidents of trespass into the premises of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse, given in the Note, are at variance with what the Consul General was told by Mr. CHIANG SU MIN, Vice Director of the Foreign Bureau on the 8th December, 1959. For example, the Vice Director told the Consul General on 8th December that two women went to the hut of the maid-servant of the Indian Trade Agent and that their purpose was to register the material which the said maid-servant had borrowed from a rebel named NISHU. In the Bureau's note of 21st January, however, it has been stated that a local resident was entrusted by the wife of NISHU, a local resident, to fetch from CHOMO, a woman attendant of Indian Trade Agent at Gyantse, the articles which she had borrowed from NISHU. At the discussion on the 8th December also it was stated that on 24th November cadres of Chinese Peasants' Association went to the said maid servant's compound with a view to taking away material which the maid-servant had borrowed from rebel NISHU.

Apart from such contradictions, even the Chinese authorities have not denied the fact that some unauthorised persons did trespass into the Trade Agency compound. This would hardly be an appropriate method of recovering debts even from a local national of a Foreign Trade Agency residing within the premises of the Trade Agent. The entry of the two women and eight peasants into the residential premises of the Trade Agent without prior notice to the Trade Agent can only be regarded as contrary to the rights and courtesies which are customarily due to the representatives of another country. The Consulate General of India is, therefore, instructed to urge the Foreign Affairs Bureau to instruct the local authorities to ensure that such unwarranted intrusions do not occur again and the sanctity of Indian Trade Agency is duly respected.

The Consulate General of India takes this opportunity to renew to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs its assurances of highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of the Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 8 April 1960

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to acknowledge receipt of the note handed over on February 19, 1960 by Mr. J. S. Mehta, Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs of India to Mr. Ma-Mu-ming, Secretary of the Chinese Embassy in India, concerning the question of lease of land by the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse.

The Chinese Government notes with regret that the Indian Government, in its note, still claims the old lease concluded in 1943 at the time of the former British colonial government to be valid. This statement which is hard to comprehend obviously cannot be deemed consistent with the spirit of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement and exchange of notes. In its note of February 19, 1960, the Indian Government also clearly admits that it "agreed to conclude a new lease." Agreement to conclude a new lease signifies that the old one has ceased to be in force. These Chinese Government cannot understand why the Indian Government, while agreeing to conclude a new lease, maintains, in disregard of the fact, that the old lease remains valid, thus procrastinating for a long time a simple question which should have been settled long ago, and even complicating it. Such a way of dealing with the question is actually of no help to the settlement of the question of reconstruction of the premises of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse.

As to the extent of the lease, it is clearly provided in the notes exchanged in 1954 that “The Government of China agrees that all buildings within the compound walls of the Trade Agencies of the Government of India at Yatung and Gyantse in Tibet region of China may be retained by the Government of India. The Government of India may continue to lease the land within its agency compound walls from the Chinese side.” It should be pointed out that both the premises of the Indian Trade Agencies at Yatung and Gyantse had compound walls, and that during the 1954 negotiations for the Sino-Indian Agreement, the Indian representative Mr. Ragavan repeatedly stated to the Chinese representative Mr. Chang Han-tu that the Indian Trade Agencies at Yatung and Gyantse did have compound walls. In its note of February 19, 1960, however, the Indian Government asserts that “the fact is that there were no compound walls right along the perimeter of the Trade Agency either in Yatung or in Gyantse; and therefore the phrase ‘compound walls’ only signifies the boundary of the areas in question...” This assertion is wholly inconsistent with the fact. Such a strange interpretation of the Agreement and the notes exchanged is lacking in seriousness and is unfavourable to the development of friendly relations between China and India. The Chinese Government, therefore, is firmly against accepting such an interpretation.
In its note of January 27, 1960, the Chinese Government has again explained patiently to the Indian Government the facts about the question of reconstruction of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse. With respect to the extent of the lease, although the notes exchanged in 1954 only provide that the Indian Government may continue to lease the land within its agency compound walls, yet the Chinese local authorities in Tibet, in the spirit of Sino-Indian friendship, have still been willing to discuss and determine a reasonable extent for the lease, as permitted by local conditions and having regard for the actual needs of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse. Unfortunately, the Indian Government fails to appreciate this consistently friendly and helpful attitude taken by the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government cannot deem this a cooperative attitude.

It should be pointed out that the Indian Government at various places in its note of February 19, 1960, used discourteous and inappropriate language. This can by no means be considered as in conformity with diplomatic usage and the courtesy due to be shown between two friendly countries. The Chinese Government expresses its deep regret at this.

Nevertheless, the Chinese Government will still deal with the questions concerned with a goodwill, according to its consistent desire to uphold Sino-Indian friendly relations and in the spirit of the solemn Agreement and exchange of notes between China and India in 1954. The Chinese Government would like to state once again that it will still instruct the local authorities to continue to render assistance in the reconstruction of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse. The Chinese Government has noted that, in its note of February 19, 1960, the Indian Government indicated the desire of leasing 19.13 acres of land for the reconstruction of the premises of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse. The Chinese local authorities, in the spirit of friendly assistance, are willing to give consideration to this request. It must be pointed out, however that the concrete extent of the lease has to be negotiated and determined by the two sides, and that this has nothing to do with the old lease.

In conclusion, it is hoped that the Indian Government will instruct the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse to take a cooperative and practical attitude and no longer persist in its unreasonable demands. The Chinese Government fully believes that the various concrete questions encountered in the reconstruction of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse will be settled smoothly on the basis of mutual cooperation, mutual confidence and mutual understanding between the two sides.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurance of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and, with reference to the Note of 31st December, 1959, presented by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to the Embassy of India in Peking, have the honour to state once again the following position regarding the nationality of persons of Indian origin residing in the Tibet region of China.

2. The Government of India have stated clearly that, in terms of the relevant clauses of the Indian Constitution and the Citizenship Act of 1955, persons of Indian origin, who have been residing in the Tibet region of China, are entitled to the privileges of Indian citizenship and, that under the Indian law registration with the diplomatic and consular missions for Indian nationalities is a matter of option without any time limit. No general grounds can, therefore, be advanced by which Indian nationals can be deemed to have lost their claim to Indian citizenship. It is an accepted canon of international law, which was specifically upheld in a declaration by the Permanent Court of International Justice in 1923, that the question of nationality law lie solely within domestic jurisdiction of a state. The Government of India are therefore under no obligation to accept any law of nationality or executive decree promulgated in the People's Republic of China, which, in effect, would amount to depriving the persons, so entitled, of their rights to Indian citizenship. Further, the Convention on Certain Questions Relating to the Conflict on Nationality, concluded at the Hague Conference in 1930, stated that the law of each State on nationality shall be recognised by the other States in so far as it is consistent with international conventions, international custom and the principles of law generally recognized with regard to nationality. The Government of India and the then Government of China subscribed to this convention. The Indian laws on the subject are fully consistent with well accepted international principles of nationality. On the other hand, the Government of India were not aware of any law on nationality promulgated by the Government of the People's Republic of China. The traditional practice of the Government of China in regard to nationality was apparently based on the principles of *jus sanguinis*, that is, every descendent of Chinese nationals, irrespective of residence, was considered to be of Chinese nationality. The Chinese note under reference admits that the Kashmiri Muslims and the Ladakhi Lamas resident in Tibet are of Indian origin. The Government of India, are, therefore, all the more surprised that the Chinese Government should endeavour to challenge the right to Indian citizenship of the persons of Indian origin. This right is based on a principle to which the Chinese Central authorities have traditionally and specifically subscribed, and even now continue to subscribe.
3. It may be added that the considerations which the Chinese Government have adduced are totally irrelevant to the legal right to Indian nationality of this group of persons who came from India. For example, the fact that these persons did not hold Indian nationality certificates has no relevance since, as pointed out earlier, there is no time limit prescribed under Indian laws, within which they must register with Indian Missions abroad. Such registration abroad is a matter of option. Actually, as far as these persons residing in the Tibet region are concerned, they did endeavour to approach the Indian Consulate General, for the necessary papers and it was the Chinese authorities which obstructed them from doing so. The Government of India immediately drew the attention of the Chinese authorities to this in the letter sent by the Consul General on 13th May, 1959 to the Chinese Foreign Bureau in Lhasa. Indeed, the local authorities went as far as to forcibly confiscate the registration forms and papers of Indian nationals who had succeeded in obtaining them from the Consulate-General.

4. It is also equally irrelevant that the Tibetan local authorities treated these persons as Chinese Tibetans. Under international practice the treatment meted by any local Government cannot unilaterally be deemed to confer or determine the question of nationality of foreign citizens.

5. The Chinese Government in their note have also contended that many of the Indian nationals had been abroad with Chinese travel papers. Although some Indian nationals might have, for the sake of convenience and out of ignorance, taken Chinese papers, the Government of India believe that such assertion does not apply to the bulk of Kashmiri Muslims. In this connection it would not be inappropriate to recall, as was pointed out in the Indian note of 24th September, that as soon as these persons reached India, they claimed the benefits which were reserved for Indian citizenship even though they might be holding Chinese papers. They proceeded to the Haj as Indian nationals in pilgrim-ships which were intended for Indian citizens only. In any case, the possession of Chinese passports and certificates does not necessarily result in their losses of Indian nationality.

6. From such information and representations as have been received by the Government of India, they must categorically reject the Chinese Government's assertion that the Indian nationals were satisfied at being treated as Chinese nationals. Apart from the fact that Chinese nationality as such was never conferred on them, from all evidence these people appear to be waiting impatiently to return to the places in India from where they originated, whatever their economic losses.

7. The basic facts remain that these persons are of Indian origin and by tradition, common to both China and India and under Indian laws, they are fully entitled to be treated as foreign nationals in Tibet with the right to return to the country of their origin. The Ladakhi Lamas went to the Tibet region for the theological studies during their life time. The Kashmiri Muslims, even though they may have been in Tibet for more than a generation, have retained their separate identity and their traditional connection with their homeland. There is no evidence that these persons have expressly renounced their right to Indian citizenship.
and, as such, any unilateral attempt to treat them as Chinese nationals is contrary to international law and practice, apart from being at variance with the spirit of friendship between the two countries.

8. It is therefore unfair and illegal to insist that these persons should renounce their Chinese nationality when in fact there is nothing to suggest that they had acquired Chinese nationality much less that they had surrendered their Indian nationality.

9. Even if these Indians, by virtue of their residence, are deemed to have fulfilled the conditions which would qualify them for Chinese citizenship, they would be entitled to the benefit of dual nationality. According to the international conventions and the application of China’s own practice mutatis mutandis, in another context, Indian nationals retain the right title to Indian citizenship. The Government of the People’s Republic of China have the sovereign right to confer its own citizenship on foreigners, but they cannot claim the right to deprive foreigners of their nationality.

10. In this connection, it may be expedient to recall the Treaty between the People’s Republic of China and the Republic of Indonesia on the question of dual nationality. Article I of the Treaty upholds the principle that all persons who simultaneously hold the nationality of the two signatory countries have the right to choose according to their own will which nationality they would wish to adopt. Further, an authoritative comment on this treaty made by Mr. Wang Chi Yuan, Member of the Standing Committee of Peking—returned Overseas Chinese Association, published in ‘People’s China’ of June 16, 1955, may be recalled in this connection. It referred to the notable features which can be found in the Treaty. Among them he stated, is the principle of the choice of nationality at one’s own free will for men and women alike . . . . He went on to say that “The signing of this Treaty has set a precedent for the settlement of the dual nationality question between China and other countries in South East Asia. The Chinese Government is ready to settle it with other Government concerned.” The Government of India seek nothing more than the application of these same principles to persons of Indian origin.

11. Moreover the same principle of choice was in the Agreement concluded between the People’s Republic of China and the Royal Nepal Government in 1956 in respect of the persons of mixed parentage residing in the Tibet region of China. In fact, only recently, a decree issued in Lhasa has reiterated the terms of the agreement.

12. The Government of India finds it patently illogical that the Chinese Government should afford the right of persons of Chinese origin living for generations in foreign countries to Chinese nationality, regardless of their residence and birth, pledge themselves to the principle of option implicit in dual nationality, and at the same time persistently refuse to give the freedom to exercise the same option to the persons of Indian origin residing in the People’s Republic of China. Such an attitude is as inconsistent as it is unfair from the humanitarian point of view.
13. To summarise the Government of India wish to reaffirm that persons of Indian origin are fully entitled to Indian nationality. The Chinese Government have so far failed to give any proof of such persons having expressly acquired Chinese nationality under any recognised procedure or law and consequently it is presumed they do not enjoy dual citizenship. Even if it is established that these persons have simultaneously acquired Chinese nationality, the only fair course would be to give them option of choice of nationality. The Government of India are gratified at the arrival of some Ladakhi Lamas but at the same time the Government of India continue to receive reports of hardships suffered by a large community of Kashmiri Muslims and Ladakhi Lamas who are still in Tibet. A full list of the Kashmiri Muslims families in the Lhasa Shigatse areas has already been furnished with the Indian note of 24th September. The Government of India trust that in the spirit of friendship between India and China and in accordance with International law and custom the Chinese Government will facilitate the return to India of persons of Indian origin should they so desire and that local authorities in Tibet will be instructed to remove obstruction in the way of their doing so.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 17th May 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to invite their attention to the note regarding currency and exchange difficulties, experienced by Indian traders in Tibet, which was handed over to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China by the Counsellor of the Indian Embassy in Peking on September 17, 1959.

2. The Government of India regret to point out that although four months have since elapsed, no steps appear to have been taken to ease the difficulties faced by the Indian nationals who are engaged, in accordance with the provisions of the 1954 Agreement, in the customary trade between India and the Tibet region of China. In fact, it would seem that these difficulties have recently increased because of fresh restrictions placed by the Chinese authorities in Tibet. As has been mentioned previously, the traders feel that the authorities in the Tibet region are hampering the normal exchange or sale of goods which was the traditional basis of this trade. In the interest of preserving the traditional trade connections and removing the hardships which are being inflicted on individual traders, the Government of India would request the Chinese authorities might take urgent steps to remove the difficulties to which their attention has previously been drawn.

3. In the following paragraph, the Government of India would like to mention some of the more specific difficulties which have come to their attention. All these appear to be of recent origin:

(i) It is learnt that the local authorities in Tibet continue to refuse to issue rupee drafts to all Indian traders in lieu of the Chinese currency held by them, except when the trader proposes to close down his business and terminate his trading connections with Tibet. Such drafts are necessary in view of the regulations passed by the Chinese authorities in July last year. In the absence of some method of repatriation of the earnings and profits, these trading connections can obviously not continue. The Government of India fail to understand what objection there could be to the grant of rupee drafts against the legal currency of China.

(ii) It has been brought to the notice of the Government of India that even when such drafts are issued, the commission charged by the Bank of China is exorbitantly high. The commission which was two per cent in the past was in itself excessive. The decision to raise it hundred per cent cannot but be construed as a deliberately restrictive measure intended to deprive the trader of his legitimate profit from the trade. Such a measure acts as a deterrent to the continuance of trade.
(iii) The question of the recovery of debts owed to Indian traders by the officials and other Chinese nationals in the Tibet region has been the subject of many previous representations. It is regretted, that no significant effort seems to have been made to help the Indian nationals in the realization of their bona fide claims.

This difficulty is particularly unfortunate for the small Indian traders who, according to traditional practice, were trading with western Tibet where Indian traders habitually supplied goods on credit and even made cash loans to Tibetan inhabitants and officials. This was done in good faith because, in the past, no difficulty was experienced in securing repayments. At present, however, because of certain recent measures taken by the Chinese authorities the Indian nationals cannot contact most of their debtors and trading partners. It is true that the paragraph (15) of the notes exchanged provides that disputes between traders of both countries over debts and claims shall be handled in accordance with local laws and regulations. But for the reasons mentioned in the preceding paragraphs the Government of India urge intervention by the Chinese authorities so that, where the claims of Indian traders are bona fide the local authorities may help in the realisation of old debts. The total value of these loans outstanding in Western Tibet is approximately Rs. 11 lakhs. Since the Indian nationals concerned are petty traders, the loss of such a vast amount is causing serious hardship. The Government of India hope that some concrete steps for the realisation of these debts will be taken during the coming season in discussions with the Indian Trade Agent for Western Tibet.

Similarly, in Central Tibet, a large amount of debt is due to Indian traders. As the Government of India have already pointed out in their note of 26th October, 1959, the main difficulty in recovering the debts in this area has been that many of the Tibetan traders have moved to Shigatse and Lhasa, which are inaccessible to the Indian traders in the absence of travel permits. The Indian trader cannot even contact those Tibetans to recover their debts. The Government of India would, therefore, urge the Chinese Government either to afford necessary facilities on an ad hoc basis to Indian traders to visit Shigatse and Lhasa for expeditious realisation of their debts or to devise some other measure whereby local authorities might help in the realisation of these debts.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the correspondence resting with the Ministry's note dated April 13, 1960, on the question of the national status of persons of Indian origin residing in the Tibet region of China. The Ministry would further draw the attention of the Embassy to the informal note on the subject handed by the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India to H. E. Mr. Chiao Kuan-hun, Assistant Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China on April 25, 1960, and to the discussion which the Prime Minister of India had with H. E. the Chinese Premier on the same subject on the morning of April 25, 1960.

2. Even before the presentation of these notes there was much correspondence between the two Governments on the subject. The Government of India are aware of the arguments advanced by the Government of the People's Republic of China as embodied in the Embassy's note dated December 31, 1959. That note did not deny the Indian origin of Ladakhi Muslim families and Ladakhi Lamas, although it argued that these persons had by long stay become a part of the Tibet region of China, and that there was evidence to show that they had been treated as such by the local Government of the Tibet region of China. The legal implications of the issues raised in the Embassy's note were examined and answered in the Ministry's note dated April 13, 1960, wherein it was also pointed out that the basic fact remained that these persons were of Indian origin, and that by tradition common to both China and India, as well as under the Indian laws, they were fully entitled to be treated as foreign nationals in Tibet with the right to return to the country of their origin. The Ladakhi Lamas went to the Tibet region for theological studies during their life time. The Kashmiri Muslims, even though they might have been in Tibet for more than a generation, had retained their separate identity and their traditional connections with their homeland. There was no evidence that these persons had expressly renounced their right to Indian citizenship, so that any unilateral attempt to treat them as Chinese nationals was contrary to international law and practice, apart from being at variance with the spirit of friendship existing between India and China. It was further argued that even if these Indians by virtue of their long residence were deemed to have fulfilled the conditions which would qualify them for Chinese citizenship, they would be entitled to the benefit of dual nationality, and in accordance with international usage governing dual nationality, they should be given the option to return to India if they so wished. According to international conventions and the applications of China's own practice mutatis mutandis in other contexts.

(Cf. A) Agreement with the Republic of Indonesia on the question of nationality of persons of Chinese origin resident in Indonesia;
3. The Ministry of External Affairs regret that, while no reply has been vouchsafed to their representations referred to above, they have from time to time received disquieting reports of the increasingly harsh treatment to which the members of the Ladakhi Muslim community in the Tibet region have been subjected. More than once the Consul General of India in Lhasa was asked to express to the Foreign Bureau in Lhasa the Government of India's concern over the plight of these helpless people. He was asked to plead for them with the Chinese authorities in Lhasa and obtain for them treatment generally accorded to the nationals of a friendly country. Nevertheless, by all accounts it is clear that the condition of these persons deteriorated sharply as measure after measure was taken by the authorities in the Tibet region against the community. It has been reported that several persons of this community are under arrest, that the property and cash of some have been confiscated and that the entire community has been debarred from drawing rations. These and other disabilities have been imposed on the community on the ground that they have refused to register themselves as Chinese.

4. Recently there has been a report of a mass gathering summoned by the local authorities on the morning of June 20 in the new Athletic Stadium in Lhasa. Kashmiri Muslims were instructed to attend this meeting and it was given out to them that the meeting would be of interest and concern to them. Kashmiri Muslims, therefore, attended the meeting in a body. When they were ordered to break up into area-wise groups, they pleaded that they were Indian Kashmiris, and upon this they were told that they were not wanted at the meeting and should leave forthwith.

5. Thereafter some prisoners, both Chinese and Ladakhi Muslims, were brought in a prison van to the meeting. They were made to face the crowd hand-cuffed and with heads bent. The Chinese prisoners were first disposed of with sentences ranging from death to long-term imprisonment. The Kashmiri Muslim prisoners were then brought before the gathering. There were four of them hand-cuffed, and with heads bent, they heard the sentences passed on them. Three of them were given prison terms varying from 15 to 11 years. Their crime, according to the indictment, was 'incitement of Ladakhi Muslims to claim a foreign nationality'. One of them was additionally charged with 'continuing the movement for foreign nationality among his people and authorship of certain anonymous posters'.

6. The Government of India have for some time been perturbed by reports of the worsening situation of the Ladakhi Muslims in the Tibet region. They were, however, patiently hoping that the many amicable and legal representations made on behalf of these people at the highest
level were being given due consideration by the Government of the
People's Republic of China. The report of the incidents of June 20 in
Lhasa has belied this hope. The Government of India regard it as
extraordinary that, while the subject of the national status of these
persons is still in negotiation between the two countries, a public meeting
should have been held to announce extreme punishments on some of
the leaders of the community on the ground that they had claimed
Indian nationality. The Government of India are not aware what trial,
if any, was held before the sentences were pronounced. They are also
unaware whether the prisoners in question were given adequate facilities
to defend themselves. They are, however, aware that their representative
in Lhasa had no access to these prisoners, and was given no facility to
provide for their adequate defence. The Government of India, in these
circumstances, are left in little doubt that the events that took place at
the meeting in the Lhasa Athletic stadium on June 20 were calculated
to victimize certain leading Ladakhi Muslims and to intimidate the
rest of the community, as well as to display publicly the disrespect in
which responsible authorities in the Tibet region of China seem to hold
the representations made by the Government of India. In the light of
these facts the Government of India must register their grave and em-
phatic protest at the unprecedented methods resorted to by the responsible
authorities in Lhasa, and must ask in all earnestness that prompt steps
be taken to prevent further punitive measures against persons of Indian
origin residing in the Tibet region.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity
to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurance
of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 30 June 1960

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to an unofficial note and an official Note dated September 24, 1959 and October 26, 1959 respectively which were handed over by Mr. Mehta, Deputy Secretary of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs regarding the question of poisonous drugs carried by Brahmachari Alam Chaitanya while going on pilgrimage to Tibet, has the honour to state as follows:

About the question of holding up the poisonous drugs carried by the said pilgrim, a reply to this effect was already furnished in the Chinese Government Note of September 11, 1959 to the Indian Government. After again studying carefully a recent report by the local authorities in Tibet, the Chinese Government is even more confident that its original viewpoint is most appropriate. A laboratory test by the authorities concerned in Tibet already proved that the so-called "frequently required drugs for self use" contained in ten odd bottles carried by the pilgrim Brahmachari Alam Chaitanya were poisonous matters comprising such highly poisonous drugs like Arsenic Alb, Merc. Cor., Aconit Nap., Phosphorus, Nux Vom and so on. No one with a little commonsense would think that such a big variety of highly poisonous matters being in the possession of a single person can become the "frequently required drugs for self use". It is to be regretted that the Government of India in its Note also described them in the beginning as "drugs for self use" and then described them as "drugs for similar use in treatment", and even lodged protest with the Chinese Government for examining the law-breaking pilgrim and the confiscation of the poisonous drugs for the purpose of safeguarding the security of life of the Tibetan people and for protecting, in accordance with the exchange of Notes, the security of life of those going on a pilgrimage in Tibet from India. The Chinese Government categorically rejects this kind of reasonable protest and cannot but think that this attitude of the Indian Government is an irresponsible attitude on their part towards the unfortunate incident that might take place. The Chinese Government requests the Government of India to deal strictly with the pilgrim that carried poisonous drugs with him to Tibet and expresses the hope that measures will be adopted to prevent the recurrence of similar cases.

The Ministry avails of this opportunity to convey to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Chinese Bureau of Foreign Affairs, Lhasa, to the Consulate General of India in Lhasa, 11 July 1960

The Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet presents its compliments to the Consulate General of India in Lhasa and has the honour to reply to the Consulate General's letter of 1st April 1960 as follows:

The Foreign Bureau holds that Vice-Director Chiang Su-ming's talks with Mr. Consul General P. N. Kaul on the 8th December 1959, are not at variance with the facts set in the Foreign Bureau's letter of 21st January 1960 to the Consulate General. The facts still remain: That a few local peasants were twice entrusted to fetch from Chomola, a maid servant of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse, the articles which she borrowed from the rebellious bandit Nisho. These peasants had never entered anyone's living quarters, to say nothing of making the so-called "search". These peasants had, at all times, maintained a fine attitude and it is entirely reasonable of them in so doing. But Mrs. Kapoor adopted a daring and unreasonable attitude towards these peasants by hurling abuse and made statement distorting facts to Military Control Commission of Gyantse.

In view of what is said above, the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet hopes the Consulate General of India would tell the Trade Agency at Gyantse that no similar unhappy matter should recur in the future.

The Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet takes this opportunity to renew to the Consulate General of India in Lhasa its assurances of highest consideration.
Record note handed over by the Ambassador of India in China to the Vice-Minister of China, 14 July 1960

On June 30, 1960, the Secretary-General of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India handed over a Note to His Excellency the Ambassador of China regarding the treatment meted out to Kashmiri Muslims in the Tibet Region of China. In the Note the Government of India had asked in all earnestness that prompt measures be taken to prevent further punitive measures against persons of Indian origin residing in the Tibet Region.

The Government of India have to state, much to their regret, that since the Note of June 30th was delivered they have received a stream of messages from Lhasa reporting acts of terror and intimidation and indiscriminate arrests of Kashmiri Muslims. All these measures have been taken to force the Kashmiri Muslims to abandon their claim to Indian nationality.

According to our information Kashmiri Muslims are being called every day to the area offices, subjected to severe abuse and then admonished to line up with other Tibetans and attend indoctrination meetings. On July 8th and 9th, the Chinese authorities had them summoned to area offices and directed them to furnish lists of their property. They were then ordered to pay sales tax on their assessed sales of the past six months. In most cases, the Chinese assessed their sales at between JMP 8000–15000 per month whereas the actual sales till shops were closed down under protest on May 2, 1960, hardly exceeded between JMP 300–500 per month. Although the Kashmiri Muslims submitted to this arbitrary levy of sales tax they were summoned again by the authorities to the area offices on July 10th and there subjected to severe abuse and beating. It is reported that the beating lasted from five to six hours and was administered through the Tibetans. A leading member of the community Barkat Ullah Shahkali was beaten with fists and bled profusely. He and another Kashmiri Muslim called Ibrahim were not only beaten up badly but were threatened with rifles aimed at them that they would be shot dead. They were charged with having led the movement in the community for claiming Indian nationality. After this inhuman treatment the Kashmiri Muslims were abjured to forget about their claim to Indian nationality and to attend indoctrination meetings. They were warned that if they failed to obey the worst offenders would be shot and others sentenced to various terms of imprisonment.

The Government of India are gravely concerned over the continued persecution of persons of Indian origin residing in the Tibet Region and would urge once again that immediate instructions be issued to the responsible authorities in the Tibet Region to stop further punitive action. The Government of India would also request in all earnestness that facilities be given to persons of Indian origin in the Tibet Region to exercise their right to return to their country and arrangements made for their repatriation to India as soon as possible.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 27 July 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and, with reference to Note No. 10/3/(1) dated the 30th June, 1960 from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to the Embassy of India in China, have the honour to state that the views expressed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in that note are not based on facts. The medicines carried by Swami Brahmachari Atam Chaitanya and found in his possession by the Chinese authorities are as follows:

1. Aconite Napeilus
2. Arnica Montana
3. Arsenic Album
4. Belladonna
5. Bryonia Alba
6. China
7. Colocynth
8. Ipecacuanna
9. Mercurius Corresiuus
10. Mercurius Solubilis
11. Nux Vomica
12. Phosphorus
13. Rhus Tox
15. Sulphur.

2. These are well-known and commonly used homoeopathic medicines, and although they are derived from the poisons after which they are named, they are so diluted as to make them innocuous and absolutely safe for medicinal use. In fact such drugs are freely sold in India and other countries and no case of death or poisoning is known to have followed the administration of these medicines. The Government of the People's Republic of China must be aware that whether a drug is poisonous or not depends on its potency. In the circumstances the Government of India cannot but view the official note from the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs as a casual disposal of a genuine complaint of a pilgrim who was subjected to detention, interrogation and harassment by Chinese guards on the suspicion
that he was carrying poison. It is indeed interesting to know that the Chinese Government "examined the law-breaking pilgrim and confiscated the poisonous drugs to safeguard the security of life of the Tibetan people and to ensure the security of life of Indians on pilgrimage in Tibet." The Government of India are unaware that the mere existence of poison is a threat to life.

3. The Government of India firmly reject this wholly unsatisfactory reply from the Chinese Government and do not accept that their protest was 'unreasonable' or that their attitude was 'irresponsible'.

4. In view of these lapses on the part of Chinese guards in the Tibet region of China which are in contravention of the notes exchanged between the two Governments on the protection to be afforded to pilgrims, the Government of India would request the Government of the People's Republic of China to take necessary measures to ensure that similar unfortunate incidents do not occur in future.

The Ministry avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Consulate General of India, Lhasa, to the Chinese Bureau of Foreign Affairs, in Tibet, 4 August 1960

The Consulate General of India in Lhasa presents compliments to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet Lhasa and has the honour to state that Mr. KAUL Consul General discussed at previous few occasions with Hr. CHIANG SU MING Vice Director of the Bureau of Foreign Affairs about the early disposal of cases of TROME GESHE RIMPOCHE, NAMDOL ZANGPO, PHIGU driver and LOBZANGI RIGDO. Mr. CHIANG SU MING had assured of early disposal of these cases by the concerned authorities.

The above mentioned persons being Indians/India protected nationals, this Consulate is receiving constant requests from their relations for their welfare and early return to India. This Consulate General shall therefore feel grateful if it could be intimated about the welfare of these persons and assisted with early disposal of their cases. An early reply is requested.

The Consulate General of India in Lhasa takes this opportunity to renew to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs its assurances of highest consideration.
Note given by the Chinese Bureau of Foreign Affairs, Lhasa, to the Consulate General of India in Lhasa, 24 August 1960

The Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet presents its compliments to the Consulate General of India, Lhasa and has the honour to inform the latter, with respect to the taking into employment of local staff members and servants of Chinese nationality by your Consulate and Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet, as follows:

In order that the arrangements of labour and production of the local people may not be effected, it is hoped that when the Consulate General of India, Lhasa and Indian Trade Agencies wish to employ local staff members and servants of Chinese nationality, they would inform this Bureau and Sub-Offices of Foreign Affairs concerned, in advance, to assist in introducing. The Foreign Bureau also express the hope that the Consulate General of India and Indian Trade Agencies would inform this Bureau and Sub-Offices of Foreign Affairs concerned in writing, whenever there is any increase or decrease of their personnel.

The Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Consulate General of India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Chinese Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet to the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung, 30 August 1960

The Yatung Office of the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet presents its compliments to the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung and has the honour to acknowledge receipt of Mr. TASHI's letter to Mr. TANG dated 6th July 1960 through which the Yatung Office is aware of the disappearance of two Chinese staff members of the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung, Mr. SONAM GYATSO and Mr. TASHI, together with their families from the compound of the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung on the night of 4th July 1960. In these regards the Yatung Office of the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet would like to set forth its views as follows:

(i) The Yatung Office expresses its surprise at the disappearance of two Chinese staff members of the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung on the night of 4th July 1960.

(ii) These two staff members of Chinese nationality worked and stayed in the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung and disappeared suddenly. The Yatung local authorities are deeply concerned about it. The Indian Trade Agency in Yatung should be responsible for their safety and also has the responsibility to assist us in finding out their whereabouts by supplying the Yatung local authorities with clues, at any moment, to facilitate their searching for them.

(iii) The Yatung Office has notified the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung before that the Indian Trade in Yatung should on its own initiative inform the Yatung Office of any increase or decrease of its personnel. However the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung did not inform the Yatung Office in time after it approved, Mr. SONAM GYATSO's resignation. This is surprising and it is hoped that note is being taken in the future.

The Yatung Office of the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Trade Agency the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 23 September, 1960

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of the Republic of India in China and has the honour to put the following views with reference to the question of the nationality of Kajis in China's Tibet region and other questions referred to in the notes of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs delivered to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India on April 13 and June 30 respectively, and to the memorandum which H.E. Indian Ambassador to China, G. Partha-sarathi, personally handed to Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs Keng Piao on July 14, 1960:

1. In its notes of September 11 and December 31, 1959, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs cited many indisputable facts and made explanations to back the case that the Kajis in China's Tibet region are Chinese. But in its notes of April 13 and June 30, the Indian Government repeatedly ignored and distorted the theses of the Chinese Government, flagrantly rejected the proposal for a sensible and rational settlement of the question of the nationality of the Kajis, which the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in a spirit of friendly consultation, put forward in its note of December 31, 1959, and stuck to its unilateral stand that Indian law be imposed on persons of Chinese nationality living on Chinese territory. The reasons held by the Indian Government in the above-mentioned notes and memorandum are utterly untenable and the Chinese Government resolutely expresses its disagreement to them.

2. The Chinese Government has always considered the Kajis to be Chinese and is fully entitled to deal with such questions as their nationality and exist as China's internal affairs. The Chinese Government would naturally respect the wishes of the Kajis concerned, who do not want to remain Chinese, and settle the question of their nationality in accordance with the regulations of the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government would also give facilities, in accordance with the regulations concerned, to those among them who request to leave the country. Therefore, the question has never arisen of any obstruction on the part of the Chinese Government in settling the question of the nationality and exit of the Kajis. Hereafter, should they, out of their own will, apply to the Chinese Government for exit or ask to settle their nationality, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs believes that the Chinese Government, in view of the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples, will as before effect a sensible and rational settlement of their questions, and will be prepared to give whatever possible consideration to those who apply for exit.

3. The Indian Government, in its note of June 30 and memorandum of July 14 this year, also mentioned that of late these Kajis had been subjected to "increasingly harsh treatment" by the authorities in
China’s Tibet region. The Chinese Government made an investigation of this. The facts show that there are no grounds whatever to the allegations that the Kajis were subjected by the local authorities to “acts of terror and intimidation and indiscriminate arrests,” that they were “being called everyday to the area offices,” and “subjected to severe abuse,” and that the properties and cash of some of the Kajis were “confiscated,” etc. as stated by the Indian Government in the above-mentioned note and memorandum. According to reports received by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Chinese local authorities in Lhasa have never beaten and abused any Kaji, nor “confiscated” the properties and cash of any Kaji, much less resorted to any intimidation against them. The unwarranted charge made by the Indian Government in its note in such an irresponsible manner against the local Government of China’s Tibet region can only be considered as slanders against the authorities in China’s Tibet region, and is detrimental to the spirit of Sino-Indian friendship. As Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs Keng Piao pointed out to H.E. Indian Ambassador Parthasarathi, the present local government in Tibet was a government of the people, which always stood by its own people, maintained very close ties with them and would never subject its own people to any “harsh treatment”. As to the few Kajis who committed offences against the law, it is entirely correct for the Government to deal with them in accordance with the law, and is also a matter entirely within the scope of China’s sovereign rights in which the Indian Government has no right to meddle. Therefore, the Chinese Government firmly rejects the “grave and emphatic protest” lodged by the Indian Government in its note of June 30, regarding the sentences passed by the authorities in China’s Tibet region on a few Kajis who have committed offences against the law.

4. In its notes of April 13 and June 30, the Indian Government referred time and again to the questions of the nationality and exit of Ladakhi lamas on pilgrimage to China’s Tibet region. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs in its note, dated December 31, 1959, reiterated that the Chinese Government had never had the intention of regarding the Ladakhi lamas as Chinese. At the end of 1959 alone, more than one hundred and twenty Ladakhi lamas were given permission to leave China. According to recent reports, by the end of May this year, the great majority of Ladakhi lamas who remained in Lhasa and Shigatse on pilgrimage were also given permission one after another to leave China. Proceeding from the desire of upholding the traditional friendship between China and India, the authorities in China’s Tibet region, at the time of their departure, took the initiative in supplying them with means of transportation, and also helped those lamas in difficult economic straits by supplementing them with traveling expenses and food rations on the way. Such warm attentions of goodwill have won the praise of all Ladakhi lamas who left China, who before leaving China more than once expressed their heart-felt gratitude for the friendly solicitude shown by the authorities in China’s Tibet region. In its note, dated April 13, the Indian Government also stated that it was “gratified at the arrival of some Ladakhi lamas” in India. At present, the remaining small number of Ladakhi lamas are all those who stayed behind of their own accord to continue their pilgrimage. In deference to their religious desire, the Chinese Government has given them facilities to continue with
their stay. The Chinese Government would like to reiterate that if anyone among them wishes to apply for exit, he will likewise be given permission and friendly attentions by the Chinese Government. Disregarding the incontrovertible facts mentioned above, the Indian Government in its note of June 30, 1960 to the Chinese Government, nonetheless raised in a self-contradictory manner the non-existent question of the nationality of Ladakhi lamas and the question of their exit which has been smoothly settled long ago so as to pester the Chinese Government unjustifiably. The Chinese Government cannot but express its deep regret at this.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung to the Yatung Office of the Tibetan Bureau of Foreign Affairs, 1 November 1960

The Indian Trade Agency Yatung presents its compliments to the Yatung Office of the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet and has the honour to refer to its note dated August 30, 1960 regarding the disappearance of two Chinese members of the staff of the Indian Trade Agency together with their families.

In the note referred to above the Yatung office of the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet has suggested that the Indian Agency was aware and should assist in the location of these missing Chinese nationals.

The fact is that the Indian Trade Agency had no knowledge of the intention of Messrs. Gyatso and Tashi to leave the Agency premises nor are they aware of their present whereabouts or that of their families. In fact their disappearance was as much a matter of surprise to the Agency as to the Chinese authorities. Apart from their responsibilities in connection with the work assigned to them are Agency does not exercise any control over them. In deference to the Chinese Government's wishes even such facilities as schooling are not now being extended to the families of Chinese nationals serving the Agency.

Further, the Agency cannot accept the contention of the Foreign Bureau Yatung that it is any part of Agency's responsibility to assist the Yatung Office in finding out the present whereabouts of the persons who have disappeared. The suggestion that a foreign post is in any way responsible for the movement or whereabouts of local nationals of the country concerned, even though they may be employed in the foreign post concerned, is contrary to normal international practice. These Chinese nationals being the subjects of and owing allegiance to the People's Republic of China are not under the jurisdiction and control of the Agency and the Agency cannot be expected to be held responsible or be asked to render assistance in locating them. Indeed the Agency has no means of locating them.

The Agency has noted that the Yatung office would like to be informed of any increase or decrease in the Agency personnel and would be agreeable to supply such information at periodical intervals.

The Trade Agency of India takes this opportunity to renew to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs its assurances of highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 9 November 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have to state with regret that in contravention of the provisions and principles embodied in the 1954-Agreement for trade and intercourse between India and the Tibet Region of China, the Indian Trade Agent who has just concluded his visit to Western Tibet was subjected to various difficulties in the discharge of his normal duties.

2. The Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 stipulated the establishment of an Indian Trade Agency in Gartok in Western Tibet and its functioning throughout the year. Unfortunately, owing to the lack of any suitable accommodation and the delay in the conclusion of the lease to enable construction of a Trade Agency, the Indian Trade Agent has only been able to make seasonal visits in the summer to Western Tibet. The attention of the Chinese Government was drawn to the difficulties encountered by the Indian Trade Agent last year in the Government of India's note of the 26th of October, 1959. Even so similar difficulties were faced during the current season and the necessary co-operation from the Chinese authorities in Western Tibet was not forthcoming.

3. It will be recalled that the Embassy was informed in the Ministry's Note No. 1 (3)EAD/60, dated June 2, 1960 that the Trade Agent and his party would be entering Western Tibet via Lipulekh Pass in the 1st week of July, 1960. The Embassy was also requested in this Note to provide the usual facilities of a mobile wireless set, security guard and transport. The Chinese Government were further informed on 3rd June, 1960 by the Indian Embassy, Peking, of the Trade Agent's impending visit to Western Tibet. The Indian Consul-General also wrote to the Chinese Foreign Bureau at Lhasa on the 10th June, 1960 about the Trade Agent's visit. The detailed itinerary of the Indian Trade Agent was attached to the Ministry's Note No. 1(3)EAD/60, which was presented to the Secretary of the Embassy on the 10th June, 1960, with a view to enable the Embassy to give advance notice to the local authorities for making the necessary arrangements. This itinerary included the Trade Agent's proposed visit to some of the marts recognised by article II(2) of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 and places of pilgrimage mentioned in article III(1) of the said Agreement. The Embassy issued the necessary visas and the party left for their journey as planned. The Embassy also informed the Ministry in their Note No. K/308/60, dated 2nd July, 1960, that the contents of the Ministry's Note for provisions of usual facilities had been conveyed to the local authorities and that the Indian Trade Agent should contact them directly on arrival in Tibet.
4. On 29th June, 1960, the Indian Consul-General was informed by the Foreign Bureau at Lhasa that the Trade Agent and party should not enter Tibet till the 15–20th July, 1960, as local authorities were launching an offensive against the rebel elements. The Indian Trade Agent was then already on his way to Lipulekh but was instructed not to proceed further. After repeated approaches, the Chinese Foreign Bureau informed the Indian Consul-General that the Indian Trade Agent could enter Tibet only after 20th August, 1960. In the meanwhile, because of this delay, the difficulties and hazards of this journey had increased considerably owing to the arrival of the monsoon and the Trade Agent was able to reach Taklakot only on 31st August, 1960.

5. Unfortunately, the difficulties did not end there. The Trade Agent had not only no co-operation from the local authorities, but he had also to face a variety of impediments in the performance of his normal duties. The following are illustrative:

(i) The non-diplomatic staff of the Indian Trade Agency used to carry with them sporting guns and small arms for self-protection with the approval of the Chinese Government. This time, however, they were not allowed to do so. The staff accordingly complied with the instructions of the local authorities and deposited their arms with them. However, this caused much inconvenience to them and this could have been avoided if they had been notified at the time of the grant of visas.

(ii) The Trade Agent’s itinerary, which included visits to Gyanima and Chakra trade marts and to Kailash and Mansarowar between 6th and 20th August, 1960, was given to the Foreign Bureau’s representative at Taklakot. It would be observed that the names of these places along with others had been communicated to the Embassy as early as the beginning of June. The Trade Agent was told, however, that according to the instructions of the Foreign Bureau he should first proceed to Gartok and then apply for permission to visit other places. After his arrival at Gartok, he repeated his request for visit to the other places. He informed the Foreign Bureau that he would like to visit Tashigong and that a member of the Trade Agency should, in accordance with custom, be allowed to go to Kailash and Gyanima. In a conversation at the Foreign Bureau, the Trade Agent was told on 21st September, 1960, that he could not visit Tashigong due to the apparent non-availability of transport. The Trade Agent’s visit to any other trade mart was also not agreed to. Similarly, the visit of a member of the Trade Agency to Gyanima or Kailash was rejected on the ground that it was too late. The Trade Agent has an obligation to discharge certain responsibilities under the terms of 1954-Agreement and it is obviously contrary to the spirit of the Agreement that he should be prevented from performing these functions by the authorities concerned in Western Tibet. It may also be mentioned that the limited transport requirements of the Trade Agent had always been traditionally provided, and since animal and mechanical transport is controlled by the State authorities, it must be for the local authorities to make available such facilities for
the fulfilment of his stipulated responsibilities. For want of transport to be supplied by the local authorities, the Trade Agent was stranded at Taklakot for 10 days.

(iii) The local authorities totally stopped the Tibetans from visiting the Trade Agency even for selling the articles of daily use. A person who supplied his Yaks on hire to the Trade Agency for bringing firewood was ill-treated and told not to have any dealings with the Trade Agency. Another person who sold some sheep to the Trade Agency occasionally was stopped from doing so and the Trade Agency was asked to approach the Foreign Bureau whenever the Agency needed a goat. The goats were supplied by the Foreign Bureau at a rate which was double the market price.

6. The above facts will show that as in 1959 the Trade Agent’s stay in Western Tibet was not only curtailed but almost rendered infructuous by preventing his discharging the duties which devolve on him under the 1954 Agreement. He was not accorded the treatment which as an accredited representative of a friendly country performing his legitimate duties in accordance with a valid and binding international agreement he had the right to expect.

7. It may also be mentioned that although the agreement provides visits to Kailash and Mansarowar by Indian pilgrims, most of them could not fulfil their religious obligations as the local authorities during the last two years advised against such visits. Similarly the Indian traders again found various types of disabilities which have severely undermined the customary pattern of Indo-Tibetan trade along this border. A number of new taxes were imposed on them and they were prevented from exporting to India the traditional commodities of export taken by them in barter, like wool, salt, borax and beasts of burden. The Indian traders also could not recover the old debts from the local Tibetans owing to the ban on the export of these articles to India. They were also stopped from bringing to India their animal property which virtually amounted to confiscation by the local authorities. The unsold goods of Indian traders lying in deposit with the Bhutanese Representative were sealed by the local authorities and were not released to the owners in spite of their repeated representations. Due to non-availability of local currency, the Indian traders had to pay the local taxes in kind at low prices. The value of the articles so realised came to much more than the rate of taxes. These articles were later sold at cheap rates in Government sponsored shops with a view to ruin the Indian traders.

8. The Embassy is aware that Indian Trade Agents in Western Tibet traditionally used to enter Tibet through one pass and leave by another of the passes mentioned in Article 4 of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954. This practice had the advantage of enabling the Trade Agents to perform their duties in an approximate manner and to cover many of the markets without having to perform a double journey. It has been noticed that the Chinese authorities in Western Tibet have been restricting the entry and exit of Trade Agents to only one route and permission has been withheld to return by the other routes, even though they are clearly recognised as border
passes in the 1954-Agreement. Last year the Trade Agent wanted to enter Western Tibet via the Nito pan but after initially agreeing to and granting a visa for entry by this pass, the Chinese authorities suggested his entry through Lipulekh, involving a very tortuous diversion after he had virtually reached the frontier. This year the Trade Agent informed the authorities in Gartok of his desire to return to India via Shipki La, another recognised route, but the necessary arrangements were not made. It is hoped that in future the Trade Agent will be permitted to use the routes recognised in the 1954-Agreement.

9. As the Chinese Government are aware, the Chinese Trade Agencies in India function throughout the year without any impediments and Chinese pilgrims and traders enjoy freedom of movement and customary trade in India. By contrast the Indian pilgrims traders and the Indian Trade Agency in Western Tibet suffer severe handicaps and difficulties and Government of India cannot but state that these impediments render virtually nugatory the provisions of the Sino-Indian Agreement regarding Trade and Intercourse between India and Tibet region of China. The Government of India trust that the Government of China will take suitable steps to enquire into these difficulties and issue instructions to ensure necessary and customary facilities to the traders and pilgrims and also to render the usual facilities to the Indian Trade Agent, Gartok to enable him to discharge his normal duties in accordance with the principles of 1954-Agreement.

10. The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity of renewing to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and with reference to their note dated the 15th January, 1960, have the honour to state as follows:

On the 29th December, 1959, three telegrams addressed to the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong were received by the Kalimpong Post Office at 07.35 hrs., 10.55 hrs. and 18.07 hrs., respectively. The first two telegrams were delivered to the Trade Agency by mid-day on the same day. When the telegraph messenger reached the premises of the Agency at about 19.30 hrs. to deliver the third telegram, he found that the inner gate of the office building was closed from within. He tried to contact the Agency’s representative but having failed in his efforts he had no option but to return to the telegraph office. The telegram was consequently delivered on the following morning. It is not true that the messenger was denied entry into the premises by the Indian police sentry at the gate of the Agency. Incidentally, no sentry is posted near the inner gate of the building.

As the Embassy must be well aware, no restrictions have been imposed on the movement of any official of the Trade Agency at Kalimpong and therefore the statement that the Deputy Trade Agent was prevented by the sentry from entering the premises is unfounded and cannot be accepted.

The Ministry take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 April, 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and with reference to their note dated the 6th February, 1960, have the honour to state as follows.

2. As has already been clarified by the Ministry in their note dated the 6th February, 1960, it was to ensure an adequate protection for the personnel and property of the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong that sentry guards were posted at the main and rear gates of the Agency. The guard, who was on duty on the 19th January, 1960, at the rear gate, did not know the Chinese trader concerned and requested him to enter the Agency premises by the front gate. Since the guard was not satisfied of the bona fides of the person he was fully justified in diverting stranger to the main gate. It has been reported to Government that some employees of the Trade Agency actually got hold of the sentry and forcibly dragged the stranger into the Trade Agency compound. Some time later, these employees appeared again and demanded from the sentry his authority for guarding the gates of the Agency. The Government of India take serious exception to this gross interference with the sentry who was discharging his duties according to the instructions given to him. The sentries are strictly under the orders of their superior officers, and any communications, verbal or written, by the Agency officials should be addressed only to the Sub-Divisional Officer, Kalimpong, and not conveyed to the constable or any other junior official. In this case, but for the exemplary sense of calm and devotion to duty of the sentry, an ugly incident might have been precipitated. It may also be mentioned that the sentry guards posted around the Indian Consulate General in Lhasa strictly enforce the requirement that outsiders should enter the premises of the Consulate General from the main gate.

3. There is no truth in, nor indeed would there be any justification for the contention that Shri P. T. Moitra expressed apology for the so-called incident.

The Ministry take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 6 April 1960

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India. The Embassy considers that the reply, which the Ministry made in its note dated February 6, 1960 regarding the questions of the unwarranted restrictions by the Darjeeling local authorities on the normal functions of the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong and of the connivance at the forcible intrusion by Americans into the compound of the Chinese Trade Agency, is unsatisfactory.

The Indian Ministry of External Affairs stated in the note that it had become necessary to post a protective police guard outside the Chinese Trade Agency in view of the local conditions in Kalimpong. However, the many facts enumerated in the Embassy's note of December 18, 1959 and its memoranda of January 15 and February 6, 1960, have fully shown that such kind of guard has by far exceeded the scope of providing protection for a foreign official organ, and that it is obviously in violation of international practice. In the Ministry's note, it was further mentioned that "the staff of the Trade Agency should be able to enter the premises freely on production of their identity cards". The Embassy is surprised at this and expresses its entire disagreement. According to international practice, staff members of foreign official organs are entitled to free entry into and exit from their own premises without being subjected to any restrictions.

The explanations made by the Ministry in its note regarding the two arbitrary intrusions by Americans with apparent ulterior motives into the Trade Agency are utterly untenable. It must be pointed out that when these Americans intruded for the first time into the compound of the Trade Agency and made troubles, the staff members of the Agency protested strongly against it, which all the Indian soldiers then on the spot saw with their own eyes. In spite of this, however, these Americans were even again allowed to intrude into the Agency for the second time. For this there can be no other explanation except deliberate connivance on the part of the Indian soldiers.

The Embassy must point out that, in its previous notes sent to the Indian side on many occasions, the Chinese Government has made it clear that the Tibet local authorities of China has all along treated the official organs of India in Tibet in accordance with the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence and the spirit of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement. Even though under the present circumstances of military control the Tibet local authorities of China have posted sentry guards to ensure the safety of the Indian Consulate-General at Lhasa, no restrictions have been placed on the normal functions of the Consulate-General. The personnel of the official organs of India at Lhasa, Yatung and Gyantse have all along been enjoying full freedom of movement within the city.
area. No restrictions have ever been placed by the Tibet local authorities on Indian citizens entering or coming out of the Indian Consulate-General at Lhasa. As to the Indian citizens mentioned in the Ministry's note, if it is referred to the Kajis, then as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China has pointed out in its notes of September 11 and December 31, 1959, they are not Indian nationals but Chinese citizens. The Tibet local authorities certainly have the right to exercise due administration over the citizens of their own country.

At present, various unjustified harassments are still continuing to take place against the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong, to which the Embassy would like once again to draw the attention of the Indian Government, and requests that instructions be issued to the Darjeeling local authorities to stop immediately the improper measures against the Chinese Trade Agency.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 6 June 1960

The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of the Republic of India, and with reference to the notes of reply of the Ministry, dated April 4, 1960 to the memoranda of the Embassy, dated January 15 and February 6, 1960, regarding the unwarranted restrictions imposed by the Darjeeling local authorities of India on the normal functioning of the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong, has the honour to state as follows:

On January 19, 1960, there occurred the serious incident in which an Indian sentry guard threatened with a raised rifle an overseas Chinese trader in preventing him from entering the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong. In the above-mentioned note, the Ministry stated that it was because the Indian sentry guard did not know the Chinese trader concerned. The Embassy holds that such a contention should by no means be the pretext for the Indian sentry guard threatening the overseas Chinese trader with a raised rifle. The residence of the said trader is not far from the rear gate of the Trade Agency. For the last several years, the trader has been going to the Agency to supply it with bean curd generally once every three or four days, which has remained so ever since the posting of sentry guards at the Trade Agency by the Darjeeling local authorities of India. When the Indian guard was preventing the trader from entering the Trade Agency on January 19, 1960, the personnel of the Agency came out on hearing the noise and explained to the Indian guard that the man was a trader supplying the Agency with bean curd. The Indian guard, however, still attempted to prevent him forcibly. This is an undeniable fact. The Embassy has noted that the Ministry in its note evaded making an answer with regard to the serious incident of the Indian sentry guard threatening the trader with a raised rifle in preventing him from entering the Trade Agency. This is extremely regrettable. Furthermore, the Ministry even alleged that some employees of the Trade Agency got hold of the sentry and forcibly dragged the said trader into the Agency, thereby interfering in the discharge of duties by the sentry. This allegation not only has no factual basis whatsoever, but also cannot cover up the unwarranted behaviour of the sentry, because it is hard to imagine that the employees of the Agency could have, with bare hands, got hold of a furious sentry who was raising his rifle to threaten people, and it is even harder to conceive that in such an atmosphere, the employees of the Agency would have forcibly dragged the trader into the Agency. The Embassy, therefore, categorically rejects the above-mentioned charge of the Ministry.

The Ministry in its note went so far as to deny the fact that Mr. Maitra had been to the Trade Agency to make apologies for the incident in which the Indian sentry guard raised his rifle to threaten the above-said overseas Chinese trader. The Embassy would like to state once again that Mr. Maitra went and apologized to the Trade Agency on the same day of
the above incident after it had taken place. At that time besides three functionaries of the Trade Agency, there were present, on the Indian side, five or six sentry guards and two or three plain-clothed men of unknown identity. The Embassy considers that the fact that apologies were openly made on such an occasion cannot be altered by a single denial.

The Ministry also alleged in its note that employees of the Trade Agency demanded from the sentry his authority for guarding the gates of the Agency. This is not true. It was nearly two months since the Darjeeling local authorities of India posted sentry guards at the gates of the Trade Agency. Any one could see that it would be meaningless and also unnecessary then for the personnel of the Trade Agency to make such a query. Nevertheless, the Embassy is of the view that the personnel of the Trade Agency are fully entitled to question or protest on the spot against behaviours which they deem brutal and unreasonable.

With regard to the question of the delay in delivering telegram to the Trade Agency caused by the sentry guards at the gate of the Trade Agency preventing the messenger from entering the Agency, the contention of the Ministry also does not conform to the facts, and is unsatisfactory. The Ministry stated in its note that the delay was caused by the failure in contacting someone in the Agency to open the inner gate. The Embassy wishes to point out that the inner gate of the Agency is installed with electric bell, and that there are people living in the Agency's building both in the day time and at night, and there is no difficulty in contacting the personnel of the Agency at any time so long as one gets to the inner gate. And there has never occurred in the past any delay in the delivery of telegrams due to failure in getting the inner gate opened. Just as the local telegraph office has told the Agency, the fact is that the messenger could not enter the Agency because he was prevented by the sentry guards at the gate. This is the sole cause that delayed the Trade Agency in receiving the telegram.

It should also be pointed out that in its memorandum of January 15, 1960, the Embassy has pointed out that when the messenger went to the Agency to deliver a telegram on the morning of the next day of the said incident, the Indian sentry guard again prevented him from delivering the telegram to the Agency in time under the pretext that the messenger had no "pass", hence not permitted to get in. With regard to this fact, the Ministry was also unable to deny in its note of reply.

Speaking of the question of telegram delays, the Embassy wishes to take this opportunity to draw the attention of the Ministry to the fact that telegrams which the Embassy has received from the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong and other places have also time and again been delayed and there have been serious cases of omissions. On December 17, 1959, the Embassy took up this matter with the Ministry, however, the Ministry has not so far made any account for it.

It is surprising that in its note the Ministry has denied the fact that Chinese Deputy Trade Agent Lee Chih-ken and Mrs. Lee were once prevented by the sentry guard on December 27, 1959, from enter-
ing the Trade Agency. It should be pointed out that since the posting of the sentry guards, incidents in which Deputy Trade Agent Lee Chih-ken was obstructed by the sentry guards have taken place time and again. The above-mentioned incident took place on the mid-day of December 27, 1959, when Mr. Lee and his wife were walking back to the Agency from outside. After this incident, Mr. Lee was still subjected to such obstructions. For instance, on January 21, 1960, when Mr. Lee and his interpreter were going back to the Agency in a car, they were stopped at the gate of the Agency which drew more than thirty nearby wool workers and inhabitants to look on around them. The truth of the fact can never be obliterated by denial.

The Ministry also mentioned in its note the question of sentry guard at the Indian Consulate-General at Lhasa. The fact is that the premises of the Indian Consulate-General have only one gate on the northern side, and that the personnel of the Indian Consulate-General have neither in any way been interrogated nor prevented from entry into or exit from the Consulate-General by the sentry guards, thus forming a striking contrast to the treatment received by the personnel of the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong.

The Embassy would like to reiterate that the unwarranted restrictions imposed by the Darjeeling local authorities of India on the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong are now not in the least reduced but, on the contrary, keeping on increasing. Regarding this, the Embassy wishes once again to draw the serious attention of the Ministry, and requests that the Government of India instruct the Darjeeling local authorities to immediately abolish the various improper measures against the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong.

The Embassy avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and with reference to the latter’s note No. M/129/60 dated the 6th April, 1960 have the honour to state that the Government of India have viewed with surprise that notwithstanding the Ministry’s note dated 6th February, 1960 and the verbal explanation given to Mr. Ma-Mu-Ming by the Director of the China Division of the Ministry, the Embassy has thought it fit to return to the same unfounded allegations. The Embassy’s note has charged the Darjeeling local authorities with having placed unwarranted restrictions on the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong. These unwarranted restrictions apparently refer to the protective guard posted outside the Trade Agency at Kalimpong. It has been alleged that the guard has exceeded its responsibilities in violation of international practice. The Ministry of External Affairs are of the view that the Embassy’s note reveals a grave mis-conception of the status and privileges attached to the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong. The Trade Agency is not a diplomatic establishment and does not under international law enjoy customary diplomatic immunities and privileges. The Embassy’s attention is drawn to the “Agreement between India and China on trade and intercourse between Tibet Region of China and India (1954)” wherein the status and privileges of the Trade Agency have been defined on the following terms:

“The Trade Agencies of both Parties shall be accorded the same status and same treatment. The trade agents of both Parties shall enjoy freedom from arrest while exercising their functions, and shall enjoy in respect of themselves, their wives and children who are dependent on them for livelihood freedom from search.

The Trade Agencies of both Parties shall enjoy the privileges and immunities for couriers, mail-bags and communications in code.”

2. The above Agreement confers certain privileges and immunities on Trade Agencies of both countries, but these derive from the Agreement and not from international law and practice.

3. The Ministry of External Affairs must refer in this context to the restrictions imposed on the Indian trade posts and Consulate General in Tibet. In fact, restrictions have been imposed even on the movement of the diplomatic and non-diplomatic members of the Indian Embassy in Peking. The Chinese Government have sought to justify the various restrictions on members of the Indian Embassy by their right to the exercise of sovereign jurisdiction in their own territories. The Government of India have not imposed any reciprocal restrictions on the staff of the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi. They could not, however, agree to a privilege position for the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong.
4. The Embassy is aware of the circumstances in which a guard had to be posted outside the Chinese Trade Agency, Kalimpong to afford protection to the Agency and its members. The Government of India are satisfied that despite provocations and interference from members of the Chinese Trade Agency, the guard has discharged its duty. The Embassy has not produced any evidence of “excess” by the guard.

5. It seems to the Government of India that the few incidents to which exaggerated importance have been given by the Embassy, and on which the protests of the Embassy are made, go to show that the Chinese Trade Agency are anxious to have the guard rendered ineffective or have it withdrawn. As the safety of the foreign organ in question as well as its members is the sole responsibility of the Government of India, they must see that the measures taken in this behalf are effective. These protective measures do not impose ‘un-warranted restrictions’ on the Chinese official organ. The Government of China must be aware that considerable freedom is enjoyed by the members of the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong.

6. The Embassy’s note has referred to the “connivance” of the authorities “at the forcible intrusion by Americans into the compound of the Chinese Trade Agency.” The implications of this charge would have been grave, but for the fact that it is not substantiated. Firstly, the use of force by the Americans has not been proved. It was explained to the Embassy that the guard was not aware that the visitors in question who wished to call on the Chinese Trade Agency were Americans. The Americans allowed to go in were, however, not granted an interview and they withdrew from the Agency peacefully. There was no evidence that the Americans had caused any harm to the Chinese Trade Agency or its members.

7. It is strange that while the Embassy desire the Government of India to stop all Americans (and presumably other aliens) from entering the premises of the Chinese Trade Agency, they suggest that the guard posted there should not interrogate persons seeking admission into the Agency premises. To provide security, Government of India must insist that the guard check the identity of every person entering the premises of the Chinese Trade Agency. This is entirely a precautionary measure in the interests of security and safety of the Chinese Trade Agents’ establishment in Kalimpong. The Government of India regret that they cannot surrender their responsibility in this regard.

8. The Government of India would take this opportunity to state again that the views of the Chinese Embassy on the treatment given to the official organs of India in the Tibet Region of China are not in accordance with known facts. In fact, official organs of the Government of India in Tibet have been rendered virtually ineffective and the privileges and immunities assured them in the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 have been violated on numerous occasions. The Government of India have noted the Embassy’s reference to the Kashmiri Muslims in Tibet and are constrained to state that even on a matter of this nature, the authorities in the Tibet Region of China have adopted a harsh and arbitrary attitude. Instead of taking a sympathetic attitude to the plight
of these Kashmiri Muslims, they have used intimidation and persecution to force them to accept the unilateral Chinese view that they have ceased to be Indians.

9. While always maintaining due regard for the principle of reciprocity in international relations, the Government of India cannot agree to a specially privileged position for the Chinese official organs in India. The Government of India would request the Embassy to insure that in the interest of the safety of its members the Trade Agency in Kalimpong should cooperate with the local authorities.

The Ministry avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 June 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the latter’s note No. M/209/60 have the honour to state as follows:—

1. The Government of India consider that the protective guard posted outside the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong would have failed in its duty had it allowed an unknown individual to enter the Agency premises by the rear gate. The guard had appropriately asked the visitor to go by the front gate. The Ministry have no doubt that in the circumstances the guard had carried out its duty in directing a stranger whose bona fides were not known to seek admission through the main entrance gate. As to what happened thereafter, there is no reason to doubt that the bean-curd seller had raised a row, and there was swift physical intervention from 3 members of the Chinese Trade Agency. It is interesting to note that the Embassy has not denied that the stranger in fact did obtain admission into the premises of the Chinese Trade Agency through the rear door despite the guard’s contrary directions. The Government of India are informed that Shri Maitra did not enter the premises of the Chinese Trade Agency nor did he offer any apology.

2. The Ministry would like to draw the attention of the Embassy to the grave consequences that might follow if there should be any further interference with the duties of the official guard posted outside the Chinese Trade Agency. Should the Trade Agency have any questions to ask or any protests to make, these should be delivered to the appropriate quarters.

3. Regarding delay in delivery of telegrams or omissions in telegrams addressed to the Chinese Trade Agency, Kalimpong, and the Embassy in New Delhi, the originals of the telegrams delayed or in which omissions occurred, should be sent to the appropriate authorities for investigation in accordance with the regulations of the Directorate of Indian Posts and Telegraphs. No such case has been received from the Chinese official organs in India for investigation.

4. The allegation that the Chinese Deputy Trade Agent, Mr. Lee Chih-ken was prevented by the sentry from entering the Trade Agency on December 27, 1959, has on investigation proved unfounded. As to the incident of January 21, 1960 when it is alleged that Mr. Lee and his interpreter were stopped in a car at the gate of the Agency, the facts are not known and an enquiry is being ordered. It would seem, however, from the Embassy’s note that the car was stopped probably to see whether there was any unknown stranger in it. If so, this was not objectionable and it cannot be construed therefrom that Mr. Lee was deliberately stopped.
5. In conclusion, the Ministry of External Affairs would express the hope that the Chinese official organs resident in India would cooperate with the local authorities of the Government of India to ensure the safety of their members.

The Ministry avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 August 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and in continuation of their Note dated June 14, 1960, have the honour to state as follows:

In its Note No. M/209/60, the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China had alleged that on January 21, 1960, when Mr. Lee Chih-ken, Deputy Trade Agent in Kalimpong, and his Interpreter were going back to the Agency in a car they were stopped at the gate of the Agency. As promised in the Indian Note of June 14, enquiries were made by the Government of India and the facts are as follows:

On January 21, 1960, at about 1200 hours, the sentry on duty at the main gate of the Chinese Trade Agency noticed that a motor vehicle with two occupants besides the driver was about to enter the Agency. In the discharge of his duty the sentry signalled the car to stop in order to find out if any unauthorised Indian or foreigner was entering the Agency premises. It may be remembered that when in the first week of December, 1959, two Americans entered the Agency compound it was alleged by the Embassy that their entry was deliberately connived at by the local authorities. The sentry after satisfying himself that an official of the Agency was in the car signalled it to enter the premises. There is no truth in the Embassy’s statement that the above incident drew more than 30 nearby wool workers and inhabitants to the scene of the incident. The Government of India consider that the action of the sentry in requiring the driver of the car to stop was in bona fide discharge of his duties and in order to ensure the security of the Chinese Trade Agency, and there is no legitimate ground for objection or protest on this score.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurance of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 9 September 1960

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India, and with reference to the Ministry's two notes dated June 14, 1960 and one note dated August 16, 1960, has the honour to state as follows:

Regarding the unwarranted restrictions imposed by the Darjeeling local authorities on the normal functioning of the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong, the Embassy has in its three notes and two memoranda previously handed over to the Ministry enumerated not a few indisputable facts. It is highly regrettable that the Indian Government not only did not give consideration to the representations formally made by the Embassy and issue instructions to the local authorities to remove these unwarranted restrictions, but, on the contrary, tried to shirk its responsibility by various untenable arguments and made groundless assertions and charges.

In its note the Ministry mentioned that "these unwarranted restrictions apparently refer to the protective guard posted outside the Trade Agency at Kalimpong," and considered that "the Chinese Trade Agency are anxious to have the guard rendered ineffective or have it withdrawn." The Embassy would like to point out that this assertion is entirely inconsistent with the fact. The fact is that in its previous notes and memoranda to the Ministry the Embassy has never raised objection to the matter of posting guards itself, nor has it made any request for the withdrawal of the guards. The question now is whether the guards posted at the gates of the Chinese Trade Agency are really carrying out the duties they should perform. It can be seen from the facts given by the Embassy that on the one hand unwarranted obstructions and harassments were imposed on the personnel of the Chinese Trade Agency and Chinese nationals entering or coming out of the Agency, while, on the other hand, Americans with ulterior motives were connived with in intruding into the compound of the Chinese Trade Agency on two successive occasions in disregard of the objection of the staff members of the Trade Agency. This gives one reason to suspect what the Indian side actually aimed at in adopting such an attitude. Similarly, it is extraordinary to describe the request for the removal of the harassments imposed on the Chinese Trade Agency's staff entering or coming out of the Agency as a request by the Agency for enjoying privileges. As is well known, the personnel of any foreign official organ have the right to freely enter or leave their own premises without being subjected to any restriction, however, the personnel of the Chinese Trade Agency and even the Deputy Trade Agent himself, have been on many occasions subjected to obstructions and harassments. The Embassy has in its previous notes stated time and again that under the present condition of military control, the guards posted by the Tibet local authorities of China for the security of the
Indian Consulate-General at Lhasa have not placed any restriction on the personnel of the Indian Consulate-General and the Indian nationals entering or leaving the Consulate.

The Chinese Government is surprised at the allegation made by the Ministry in its note that “restrictions have been imposed even on the movement of the diplomatic and non-diplomatic members of the Indian Embassy in Peking” by China. The Chinese Government does not know that there has ever been any complaint made in this connection by the Indian Embassy, which, like all the other foreign missions in China, has been enjoying an equal treatment and has never been subjected to any discrimination. Likewise, the Tibet local authorities have always taken a friendly and cooperative attitude towards the various Indian official organs in the Tibet region of China. Since the Indian Government attaches importance to the principle of reciprocity, the Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will accord equal normal treatment to the Chinese official organs in India.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 27 September 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to its Note No. M/340/60, dated September 9, 1960.

2. The Government of India have examined the matter again in the light of the note from the Chinese Embassy. They are satisfied that the Guard outside the Trade Agency functions only with a view to ensure the protection of the Trade Agency. While in exercise of its functions, the Guard is obliged to take certain legitimate precautions to interrogate any person who cannot prima facie be recognised as belonging to the Trade Agency, the Guard carries strict instructions not to interfere in any way with the entry and exit of personnel belonging to the Trade Agency.

3. It may be added that there can be little doubt that the Chinese Embassy and Chinese posts in India enjoy far greater freedom of movement and functioning than is permitted to the Indian Missions in Peking or the Indian posts in other parts of China. From such incontrovertible information as is in their possession, Government of India cannot also accept the assertion contained in the Note that the local authorities in Tibet have taken a friendly and co-operative attitude to the various Indian officials and organs in the Tibet region of China.

4. The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India, and regarding the incident in which the Tibetan rebels who have fled to India openly held a meeting in Kalimpong to “observe” the first anniversary of the rebellion in Tibet, hereby lodges a serious protest with the Ministry as follows:

At 9:30 in the morning of March 10, 1960, over 500 reactionary Tibetan nobles, Tibetan rebels and Khamba rebel bandits, who have fled to India, and members of the so-called “Tibetan Association” in Kalimpong and the “Association of Tibetan India” openly held a meeting at the Tharpa Chholing Monastery to observe the first anniversary of the rebellion in Tibet. When these reactionary elements assembled for the meeting, and made demonstrations, they carried at the head of their processions, besides the Indian national flag, the so-called “Tibetan national flag” painted with lion and snow-covered mountains. At the meeting, Khemey Sonamwongdru, ring-leader of the Tibetan rebels and commander-in-chief of the former Tibetan army, and other representatives of the rebel bandits made speeches in succession, instigating the rebel bandits to continue their traitorous activities, and at the same time reactionary Tibetan songs were sung. After the meeting they demonstrated in processions along the main streets in Kalimpong, frantically shouted reactionary slogans such as “Ordure for the Hans”, “Communists go back” and “Long live Indo-Tibetan cooperation”, and put up many reactionary posters on the streets. They did not disperse until 1:30 in the afternoon. Not only the local authorities of India did not try to ban such anti-China activities, but the responsible persons of the police office attended the meeting themselves, and allowed the rebel bandits to continue their activities at the Kalimpong Town Hall on the afternoon of the same day. Such activities further went on in the evenings for four successive days. Obviously such an attitude taken by the local authorities of India is in grave violation of the assurance which has been given by the Indian Government that India by no means permits any activities on its territory directed against the People’s Republic of China. This is not in conformity with the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence, and seriously damages the friendly relations between China and India. The Embassy is, therefore, instructed to lodge a serious protest against the Indian local authorities’ act of connivance at the Tibetan rebel bandits to carry on activities against the People’s Republic of China and undermine the friendly relations between China and India, and the local officials’ taking part in the above-mentioned meeting, and demands that the Govt. of India take effective measures to prevent recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24th June, 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to its Note No. M/122/60, dated the 29th March, 1960, have the honour to reply as follows:

A meeting was held at the Tharpa Choling Monastery by a section of the Tibetan population of Kalimpong on the 10th March, 1960, for the purpose of offering prayers for the long life of the Dalai Lama. A substantial portion of the congregation consisted of Tibetan refugees, and during the meeting they gave expression to their feelings in a peaceful manner. The meeting was followed by a peaceful procession in the course of which some slogans were shouted. There were song and dance recitals at the Town Hall on the same afternoon, and elsewhere on the following days in order to raise money for the relief of Tibetan refugees.

Such demonstrations by sections of India's population are, as the Embassy of China must be aware, quite common and the authorities do not take any action against them unless a threat to law and order develops. The suggestion in the Chinese Note that Police officials attended the meeting is misconceived. The local Police were posted at the site of the meeting and along the route followed by the procession in pursuance of their duty to ensure that there was no breach of public peace. The statements made in the Note of the Chinese Embassy are not in accordance with facts and the Government of India feel bound to reject it.

The Ministry take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India, and with reference to the Ministry’s note No. F.1(4)EAD/60, dated June 25, 1960, has the honour to state as follows:

Regarding the incident in which the Tibetan rebels, who had fled to India, openly held a meeting in Kalimpong to “observe” the first anniversary of the rebellion in Tibet, the Embassy in its note of March 29, 1960 to the Ministry gave a detailed account of the facts of the incident which took place at the time. The Ministry in its reply note did not deny the relevant facts, but attempted to shirk its responsibility under some untenable pretexts, at which the Embassy cannot but express its deep regret.

As is well known, March 10, 1959, was the day when the Tibetan rebels started their rebellion. On the same day this year, the Tibetan rebels, who had fled to India, openly held a meeting to “observe” the day at the Tharpa Choling Monastery in Kalimpong. This is by no means an ordinary meeting for “offering prayers for the long life of the Dalai Lama” as described in the Ministry’s reply note, but is obviously a meeting of political character. This can be proved not only by the date of the meeting, but also by the speeches of the ringleaders of the Tibetan rebels present at the meeting as well as the slogans shouted and the posters pasted up during the demonstration following the meeting. Not only the Indian local authorities did not prevent in advance these activities carried out on Indian territory openly directed against the People’s Republic of China, but the responsible persons of the Indian local police office who were then on the spot deliberately connived at them instead of taking any action against them. This cannot but be a grave violation of the assurance previously made by the Indian Government that India by no means permits any activities on its territory directed against the People’s Republic of China. In its reply note, however, the Indian Government considered the incident to be “quite common”, and tried to shirk its responsibility with the so-called “peaceful manner”, “peaceful procession”, etc. as a pretext. The Embassy considers that such an assertion is unacceptable.

Tibet is a part of China’s territory. The Chinese Government cannot permit any one to interfere in China’s internal affairs on questions pertaining to the Tibet region. The occurrence of the abovementioned incident is harmful to the relations between China and India. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will attach importance to Sino-Indian friendship and adopt effective measures to carry out, in earnest, its previous assurance that Indian by no means permits any activities on its territory directed against the People’s Republic of China.

The Embassy avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurance of its highest consideration.
Informal note handed over in New Delhi by the Foreign Secretary to Mr. Chiao Kuan-Hua, Assistant Minister for Foreign Affairs of China, 25 April 1960

1. Bhutan and Sikkim.

Under India's Treaties with Bhutan and Sikkim, Government of India is clearly responsible for the external relations of these two States. This has been pointed out to the Government of the People's Republic of China, as also the fact that the question relating to the northern boundaries of Sikkim and Bhutan have to be considered at the same time as the boundary between India and China.

Our concern is all the greater because persistent reports have reached us over a period of months that propaganda organs as well as senior Chinese officials in the Tibet region have been saying that China intends incorporating Sikkim and Bhutan like Ladakh into the Chinese People's Republic. On some occasions it was even stated that China might take military steps to occupy these territories. It is hoped that in the interest of restoring Sino-Indian relations and assuaging apprehensions, India's responsibility in respect of the external relations of Sikkim and Bhutan would be fully understood and respected and such propaganda would be stopped.

2. Difficulties in the implementation of the 1954 Agreement regarding the Tibet Region.

Indian official representatives in the Tibet region as well as Indian nationals continue to suffer unnecessary and crippling restrictions even though the privileges are guaranteed on a reciprocal basis by the 1954 Agreement.

Following are some examples of such restrictions:–

(i) Accommodation Difficulties

(a) Gyantse.

Ever since the buildings of the Agency were washed away in 1954, we have been trying to negotiate with Chinese authorities for the reconstruction of the Agency premises. We even offered to construct protective works along the river embankment at our own expense and to send our Chief Engineer to explain that our proposals would in no way damage the public highway and bridge in the Gyantse township. Later, we even offered to surrender the area along the river bank if an equivalent area could be provided on the other side of the existing Agency site. The lease for the land on which the Agency was located is valid till 1971; but as a measure of goodwill we agreed to sign a new lease. Despite these offers and many representations no satisfactory agreement has been reached or facilities provided to resolve the difficulties. The Government
of the People's Republic of China in a recent note have suggested our resuming reconstruction of the premises; but no lease has yet been finalised. Government of India are anxious that the lease for at least 19.13 acres of land (which is the area left over from the original site) should be concluded to enable reconstructions to be started. Unless the lease is signed and this area, largely on the original site, made available, it would not be possible for the Government of India to embark on large-scale and expensive construction measures. This request is fully in accordance with the provisions of the 1954 Agreement.

We also hope that pending reconstruction, the local authorities would help in improving the temporary accommodation facilities of the Agency.

(b) Gartok.—A lease deed for the area was at last signed in 1959. We request that the Chinese authorities will give us active co-operation to enable us to start the construction of the Agency buildings this season.

(c) Functioning of the Trade Agencies.

Very strict restrictions have been imposed on the freedom of movement and functioning of the Indian Consulate General in Lhasa and the Indian Trade Agencies in Yatung, Gyantse and in Western Tibet. In contrast with the facilities enjoyed by the Chinese posts in India our officers are afforded no opportunity to move around or to have any contact even of a cultural nature with local nationals. Despite the provisions of the Agreement, in 1959 the Indian Trade Agent in Western Tibet was not only greatly delayed, but was not even able to visit the specified trade marts.

The Agencies have also experienced a variety of small but irritating difficulties in their functioning in such matters as the hiring of transport and communication facilities. Local servants have been discouraged from serving in the Indian posts.

(d) Indo-Tibetan Trade.

The traditional trade has suffered serious decline largely because the customary export of wool, salt, etc. is not being facilitated. Traders are not allowed to contact their traditional trading partners. Moreover, no remittance facilities are being provided to enable Indian traders to repatriate their legitimate profits. Either bank drafts are not provided at all or, if they are, under restrictive conditions, the rate of commission is exorbitantly high. The traders, especially in Western Tibet are also experiencing difficulties in obtaining premises, hiring transport and in realising old debts.

It is hoped that the Government of the People's Republic of China would ease these difficulties and continue facilities for the traditional exchange in accordance with the 1954 Agreement.

(e) Pilgrims.

Pilgrims were discouraged from proceeding to Kailash and Mansarover last year. In view of the sanctity attached to these places, it is hoped that necessary facilities to Indian pilgrims would be provided in accordance with the provisions of the 1954 Agreement.
(f) Indian nationals.

According to our information, about 125 families of Kashmiri Muslims residing in the Lhasa area and a few hundred Ladakhi Lamas now in Tibet region are extremely anxious to return to India. Under Indian laws, regardless of the period of their residence abroad, these persons of Indian origin are entitled to Indian nationality. We are not aware that they have accepted Chinese nationality under any law promulgated by the Government of the People's Republic of China. Even if they have qualified for Chinese nationality in accordance with international usage governing Dual Nationality, persons of Indian origin should be given the option to return to India if they so wish.

This is fully in accordance with the stand of the Government of the People's Republic of China in respect of persons of Chinese origin in Indonesia, and with the principles embodied in the Treaty of Dual Nationality signed after Bandung. It is also in accordance with the arrangement agreed between China and Nepal with regard to persons of mixed parentage residing in the Tibet region.

Apart from Indians wishing to leave Tibet, there are about 22 Indian nationals reported to be under arrest. According to the Agreement, they should have been treated as foreigners and in any case have been provided with opportunity to seek the help of the local Indian representatives.

In respect of all these matters pertaining to the 1954 Agreement, one or more representations have been made to the Government of the People's Republic of China, explaining the Indian requests in detail during the last year.

(3) Enclaves.

Apart from the above, it is also hoped that the Government of the People's Republic of China would respect the sovereign rights of the Government of Jammu and Kashmir and therefore of the Government of India over MINSAR in Western Tibet. Similarly, in accordance with the representation made last year, the control of Bhutan should be restored over the Bhutan enclaves near Kailash in Western Tibet.

It is also requested that Sikkimese nationals who have been residing in certain estates in the Chumbi Valley, and are traditionally treated as distinct from Tibetans might continue to receive the treatment which has been traditionally accorded to them and allowed facilities of movement to Sikkim.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 17 October 1960

On the 4th October 1960 an I.A.F. Hunter aircraft took off from Ambala at 0932 hours on a routine training flight. It was in normal contact with its base until 0954 hours when it was reported at a bearing of 080° from Ambala. Since then the aircraft has been reported missing and despite repeated searches no trace of the aircraft has been found. There was only one occupant of the aircraft, the Pilot Flt. Lt. K. P. Singh.

2. While all Indian aircraft carry strict instructions not to violate Chinese air-space, it is considered possible that owing to navigational error or mechanical failure the aircraft may have strayed and possibly crashed in Chinese territory. The Government of India would appreciate if the Chinese Government would instruct investigations to be made in the Western Tibet region in case any information pertaining to the missing Indian aircraft or the Pilot has been reported by the local authorities concerned.
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Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 December 1960

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to refer to the Note dated October 20, 1960 from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to the Indian Embassy in China.

2. The Government of India have made a further inquiry regarding the intrusion by a Chinese armed patrol on September 22, 1960 into Sikkim near Jelepla Pass and are satisfied that facts as communicated to the Embassy in the Ministry of External Affairs Note of September 26, 1960 are correct. The Government of India would, therefore, repeat their request to the Chinese Government to take steps to prevent such violation of Sikkim territory in future.

3. The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 10 December 1960

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the note that the Indian Ministry of External Affairs delivered to the Chinese Embassy in India on October 24, 1960, has the honour to state as follows:


2. In its note the Indian Government, while admitting that the Chinese inhabitant Kiayang-geltsen is now still retained unwarrantedly by the Indian authorities concerned, attempts to describe armed Indian personnel's intrusion into Chinese territory to kidnap a Chinese citizen as Kiayang-geltsen's going to India to seek asylum. The Chinese Government must point out that Kiayang-geltsen was kidnapped from Kechilang pasture within Chinese territory by armed Indian personnel who had illegally intruded into that area. Here the question of so-called asylum does not exist at all. A Chinese inhabitant named Chien Tseng of the Le village who was with Kiayang-geltsen at the time confirmed that Kiayang-geltsen was suddenly kidnapped by the trespassing Indian troops when he was at lunch in a villager's house in Kechilang pasture. The Chinese Government once again demand that the Indian Government order the authorities concerned to release immediately the Chinese inhabitant Kiayang-geltsen.

3. The Chinese Government has always stated that Wu-je is Chinese territory and has always been under the jurisdiction of Daba Dzong of the Tibet region of China. After a situation of armed forces of China and India confronting each other arose for the first time in Wu-je in 1955, the Chinese Government, with a view to avoiding armed clashes, took the initiative to propose that both sides should refrain from stationing troops at Wu-je, pending the settlement of the dispute through negotiations. This was done entirely out of the desire of maintaining tranquillity on the border, and by no means implied any change in sovereignty over this area. Therefore, as said in the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, when in 1958 the Indian representatives put forward a proposal that even civil administrative personnel of the two sides should not be deputed to the area, the Chinese Government did not agree to this proposal. In disregard of the stand of the Chinese Government, the Indian Government in 1958 and 1959 repeatedly sent official personnel into China's Wu-je area. This could not but be regarded as attempts to change the status quo of this area belonging to China. Hence,
the Chinese Government more than once lodged protests. Under these circumstances, the assertion that on April 24, 1958 (it should be 1959) Mr. Ho Ying, Deputy Director of the First Asian Department of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said that not sending troops did not affect the Indian side's sending officials to Wu-je is obviously a distortion of the Chinese Government's stand as presented by Deputy Director Ho Ying.

4. The Chinese Government must point out that, regarding the incident of June 3 referred to in the note of the Indian Government of July 30, 1960, in which more than 25 armed Chinese soldiers allegedly crossed the so-called McMahon Line, although nearly two months had passed before the Indian Government raised it to the Chinese Government and although it attacked the Chinese Government before the facts were looked into and before a reply was made by the Chinese Government, the Chinese Government still made serious investigations and informed the Indian Government of the results of the investigations. However, in its note the Indian Government, in disregard of the facts furnished by the Chinese Government, still persists in its original charge without any basis. The Chinese Government can only express its regret at this.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 19 December 1960

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state as follows:

The allegation of the Indian Government that an armed Chinese patrol entered the territory of Sikkim on September 22, 1960, has been proved untrue through investigation by the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government already gave an unequivocal answer to this effect in its note of October 20, 1960. Nevertheless, in its note of December 2, the Indian Government still clung to its original allegation without any basis. The Chinese Government cannot but express regret at this.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the 
Embassy of India in China, 30 December 1960

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China 
presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with 
reference to the incident that Tibetan rebel bandits who had fled to 
the south of the so-called McMahon Line intruded into China's Tibet, 
made harassment and kidnapped local Chinese inhabitants, has the 
honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government has received confirmed reports that at 
about 23:00 hours on November 10, 1960, a band of armed Tibetan 
rebel bandits, numbering 100 or so, intruded from south of the so- 
called McMahon Line into Pangtse Village (93° 47' E, 29° 1' N), Milin 
County, in the south eastern part of China's Tibet region. Most of 
the bandits carried pistols and some of them were in disguise. Among 
them were Paimalamje and Lapadenju, reactionary former chieftains 
of the Pangtse and Bajang villages, who had fled to Ba Cha Shi Ri, 
south of the so-called McMahon Line, after the rebellion in Tibet in 
the spring of 1959. Having surrounded Pangtse village and made 
harassment for about two hours, the rebel bandits forcibly kidnapped 
42 able-bodied youth and men from that village and fled south of the 
so-called McMahon Line via the Lo Pass.

The Chinese Government is surprised at the fact that the Indian 
Government should have permitted Tibetan rebel bandits who had 
fled to the south of the so-called McMahon Line to carry arms and 
even connived at their intrusion into China's Tibet to carry out 
harassment and kidnap peaceful inhabitants. Such planned activities 
of harassment and sabotage by this band of Tibetan rebel bandits 
have caused tension on the border, have breached the peace and 
tranquillity of the border area and may lead to serious consequences. 
In view of this, the Chinese Government lodges a serious protest 
with the Indian Government and demands that the Indian Govern-
ment immediately take due and effective measures to impose 
restrictions on those Tibetan rebel bandits and require them to 
release at once the 42 Chinese inhabitants kidnapped from Pangtse-
village.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to 
renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest 
consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and with reference to two incidents of Indian armed personnel intruding into Chinese territory has the honour to state as follows:

1. About 1800 hours on 26th November 1960 four Indian policemen carrying arms intruded into Pao-la (approximately 88° 34 minutes E, 28° 07 minutes N) in Chinese territory by crossing Kailu Pass from the direction of Sikkim. They threatened the local inhabitants with arms and seized a shotgun from PENG TO a herdsman. The four Indian policemen returned to Sikkim by the same route about 1830 hours on the same day.

2. About 1200 hours on 29th December 1960 three Indian military men carrying arms intruded into Sheralungma pasture (approximately 79° 40 minutes E, 32° 48 minutes N) of Kiah-Aghsiang Rudok Dzong in China's Ari District on horseback made stealthy observations with binoculars fired their guns and then returned to India.

The Chinese Government feel surprised at the repeated intrusions of Indian armed personnel into China's territory and their acts of threatening and robbing Chinese inhabitants. This cannot but be regarded as deliberate encroachment on the territory and sovereignty of China. Against this the Chinese Government lodges a protest with the Government of India and demands that it takes effective measures to prevent the recurrence of similar incidents in future.

The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 March 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and have the honour to refer to the note dated December 10, 1960, received by His Excellency the Indian Ambassador in Peking.

2. As has already been intimated in the note presented by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India on October 24, 1960, there is no basis for the allegation that a Chinese national was kidnapped by an Indian patrol from the Chinese territory. The Chinese national whose name has been mentioned by the Government of China has repeatedly stated that he had come to seek refuge in India and that he was not prepared to go back to China.

3. The Government of India have throughout maintained that Bara Hoti is part of India and this fact was indisputably substantiated with a mass of details during the discussions between Indian and Chinese officials in 1958 and more recently in the officials' discussions which took place last year. On the other hand, the Chinese Government produced no clear topographical detail of the area, much less any material evidence to prove their contention. Nevertheless, in order to safeguard against any armed clash, the Government of India, in a reciprocal understanding with the Government of China, have refrained from sending any armed personnel to Bara Hoti plain for a number of years now. The despatch of civil administrative personnel is a different matter altogether. In the absence of any agreement not to send civilian officials to the area the Government of India cannot agree that there has been any change in the status quo prevalent in the area. The Government of India must reserve their right to exercise their sovereignty in Bara Hoti in the traditional manner.

4. In regard to the intrusion by 25 armed Chinese soldiers into Indian territory on June 3, 1960, the Government of India cannot but express their surprise that the Chinese Government should persist in claiming that the local working personnel of Hsiao of Tsona Dzong merely lost their way into Indian territory while in search for firewood. Facts do not sustain this theory of unintended and innocent intrusion into Indian territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 April 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Note No. (60)/First Asian/No. 1315, dated December 30, 1960, presented by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to the Counsellor of the Indian Embassy in Peking, Shri K. M. Kannampilly, have the honour to state that the Government of India have thoroughly investigated the allegation contained in the Note mentioned above. As a result of the investigations, they are satisfied that there was no evidence of any person of Tibetan origin going into Tibet from Indian territory and compelling other Tibetans to flee back into India against their will. The Government of India have throughout taken effective steps to disarm all Tibetan refugees coming into Indian territory and prevent them from using Indian territory as a base for hostile activity. The Government of India firmly repudiate the insinuation that they connived at so-called "armed bandits" going across into Tibet or compulsorily detaining any Tibetans within India against their wishes. No Tibetan or Chinese nationals in India are prevented from returning to their homeland should they so wish. On the other hand, India, having granted asylum to those refugees, cannot force them to return to China.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note delivered by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India on March 30, 1961, has the honour to state as follows:

Regarding the intrusion into the Chinese territory of Wu-je by Indian official personnel, the intrusion into the Kechilang pasture and kidnapping Chinese inhabitant Kiayang-geltsen by armed Indian personnel and the allegation that 25 Chinese soldiers entered into Indian territory, the Foreign Ministry, in its notes to the Embassy, dated August 27 and December 10, 1960, has fully explained the truth of the related facts and the stand of the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government cannot agree to the various allegations inconsistent with the facts made by the Indian Government in its note, and cannot but express regret at them.

The Foreign Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China with reference to the Note, dated February 25, 1961, presented by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs to Shri K. M. Kannampilly, Counsellor of the Embassy of India, Peking, have the honour to say that the Government of India have carefully inquired into the alleged incidents of November 26, 1960, and December 29, 1960.

2. These investigations have established, to the full satisfaction of the Government of India that these allegations of incursions by Indian armed personnel into Chinese territory have absolutely no foundation in fact. The Government of India are constrained to observe that the Chinese Government appear to have been misled by unfounded assertions by irresponsible junior officials or local elements.

3. The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 May 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and have the honour to bring to their notice the following intrusion by armed Chinese personnel:

On April 20, 1961, three Chinese personnel carrying arms were detected in Sikkim territory near Jelapla. As soon as they realised that their unauthorised presence in the territory of Sikkim had been detected they withdrew.

The Government of India once again lodge a protest against the failure to respect the boundaries of Sikkim and renew their request that the Government of China instruct the subordinate authorities to ensure that such violation of Sikkim territory does not recur. Intrusions of this kind, even if brief, could easily lead to serious incidents.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 June 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, and with reference to Note dated May 23, 1961, handed over to the Indian Embassy in Peking by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, have the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India are surprised that despite their reply dated 13th April, 1961 which refutes on the basis of careful investigations allegations regarding intrusion into the Tibet region of China and kidnapping of Chinese inhabitants, the Government of the People's Republic of China have returned to the same charge.

As the Government of the People's Republic of China are no doubt aware refugees from the Tibet region of China have come, and continue to come, to India of their own free will. What is more if any of them wish to return to China, they are free to do so. No Tibetan refugee is being held by any one in India, either Indian or Tibetan. If the intention of the Government of the People's Republic of China is that the Government of India should exercise force or pressure on certain Tibetan refugees to compel them to return, this cannot be done under the internationally accepted principle of asylum.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 May 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and have the honour to bring to their notice the following intrusion by armed Chinese personnel:

On April 20, 1961, three Chinese personnel carrying arms were detected in Sikkim territory near Jelapla. As soon as they realised that their unauthorised presence in the territory of Sikkim had been detected they withdrew.

The Government of India once again lodge a protest against the failure to respect the boundaries of Sikkim and renew their request that the Government of China instruct the subordinate authorities to ensure that such violation of Sikkim territory does not recur. Intrusions of this kind, even if brief, could easily lead to serious incidents.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 June 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, and with reference to Note dated May 23, 1961, handed over to the Indian Embassy in Peking by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, have the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India are surprised that despite their reply dated 13th April, 1961 which refutes on the basis of careful investigations allegations regarding intrusion into the Tibet region of China and kidnapping of Chinese inhabitants, the Government of the People's Republic of China have returned to the same charge.

As the Government of the People's Republic of China are no doubt aware refugees from the Tibet region of China have come, and continue to come, to India of their own free will. What is more if any of them wish to return to China, they are free to do so. No Tibetan refugee is being held by any one in India, either Indian or Tibetan. If the intention of the Government of the People's Republic of China is that the Government of India should exercise force or pressure on certain Tibetan refugees to compel them to return, this cannot be done under the internationally accepted principle of asylum.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 5 August 1961.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China present its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the Note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs handed over to the Chinese Embassy in India on May 6, 1961, has the honour to state as follows:

Regarding the incident referred to in the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs in which three Chinese personnel carrying arms allegedly intruded into Sikkim territory near Jalepla on April 20, 1961, the Chinese Government has satisfied itself, after careful investigation, that no intrusion by any Chinese personnel carrying arms occurred at the above-mentioned time and place. Therefore the Chinese Government refuses to accept the protest of the Indian Government and expresses its regret at such a totally groundless charge made by the Indian Government.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 November 1961

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note delivered to the Chinese Embassy in India by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs on September 12, 1961, has the honour to state as follows:

Being unable to persist in denying flatly the indisputable fact that it connived at the intrusion and harassment of a Chinese border area by Tibetan rebel bandits and their kidnapping of Chinese inhabitants, the Indian Government went so far as to argue in its note that it "could have no knowledge of the happenings in Chinese territory". This effort is futile. In its past notes, the Chinese Government already presented facts in detail showing that that band of rebel bandits had their base established in an area south of the so-called McMahon Line illegally controlled by India at present. They intruded into China's Pangtse village from there and abducted local Chinese inhabitants to that base area. It is obvious that the Indian Government should bear unshirkable responsibility for that incident. Now, in its note, while brushing aside the concrete fact and the Chinese Government's proper demands, the Indian Government even counter-charge the Chinese Government with attempting to implicate India in China's internal affairs. The Chinese Government once again expressed its deep regret at such an unreasonable attitude and manner of the Indian Government.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 5 August 1961.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China present its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the Note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs handed over to the Chinese Embassy in India on May 6, 1961, has the honour to state as follows:

Regarding the incident referred to in the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs in which three Chinese personnel carrying arms allegedly intruded into Sikkim territory near Jalepla on April 20, 1961, the Chinese Government has satisfied itself, after careful investigation, that no intrusion by any Chinese personnel carrying arms occurred at the above-mentioned time and place. Therefore the Chinese Government refuses to accept the protest of the Indian Government and expresses its regret at such a totally groundless charge made by the Indian Government.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the
Embassy of India in China, 2 November 1961

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with
reference to the note delivered to the Chinese Embassy in India by
the Indian Ministry of External Affairs on September 12, 1961, has
the honour to state as follows:

Being unable to persist in denying flatly the indisputable fact that
it connived at the intrusion and harassment of a Chinese border area
by Tibetan rebel bandits and their kidnapping of Chinese inhabitants,
the Indian Government went so far as to argue in its note that it
"could have no knowledge of the happenings in Chinese territory".
This effort is futile. In its past notes, the Chinese Government already
presented facts in detail showing that that band of rebel bandits had
their base established in an area south of the so-called McMahon Line
illegally controlled by India at present. They intruded into China's
Pangtse village from there and abducted local Chinese inhabitants
to that base area. It is obvious that the Indian Government should
bear unshirkable responsibility for that incident. Now, in its note,
while brushing aside the concrete fact and the Chinese Government's
proper demands, the Indian Government even counter-charge the
Chinese Government with attempting to implicate India in China's
internal affairs. The Chinese Government once again expressed its
deep regret at such an unreasonable attitude and manner of the Indian
Government.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the
Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 November 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to Note No. (61) Pu Yi Tzu No. 877, dated November 2, 1961, sent to the address of the Embassy of India in Peking by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs have the honour to state that mere repetition to baseless allegations does not help to establish a case where none exists. It is the considered view of the Government of India, after careful investigations, that the incident to which the Chinese Note has referred is a fabrication. However it would serve no useful purpose to prolong a fruitless disputation in a case where the two Parties are unable to agree on the facts. It is extraordinary that in re-stating its case over an alleged intrusion from Indian territory the Chinese Government should bring up the issue of the so-called McMahon Line and insinuate that India is in illegal possession of her own territory south of that line. By multiplying imaginary charges all that the Chinese Government has so far succeeded in proving is its lack of respect for the territorial integrity of India ample evidence of which already exists in the territorial aggression committed by China in India's Ladakh. Barren charges will not cover up these acts of unlawful occupation of Indian territory by Chinese forces.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
and in a spirit of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation, so as to seek a reasonable settlement of the boundary question. This has been the consistent stand of the Chinese Government in the past and present, nor will it change in the future. The Chinese Government believes that, by this approach, the entire boundary question between China and India can be settled and, along with it, the question of the tri-junction of China, India and Burma will be finally decided.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 November 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to Note No. (61) Pu Yi Tzu No. 877, dated November 2, 1961, sent to the address of the Embassy of India in Peking by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs have the honour to state that mere repetition to baseless allegations does not help to establish a case where none exists. It is the considered view of the Government of India, after careful investigations, that the incident to which the Chinese Note has referred is a fabrication. However it would serve no useful purpose to prolong a fruitless disputation in a case where the two Parties are unable to agree on the facts. It is extraordinary that in re-stating its case over an alleged intrusion from Indian territory the Chinese Government should bring up the issue of the so-called McMahon Line and insinuate that India is in illegal possession of her own territory south of that line. By multiplying imaginary charges all that the Chinese Government has so far succeeded in proving is its lack of respect for the territorial integrity of India ample evidence of which already exists in the territorial aggression committed by China in India's Ladakh. Barren charges will not cover up these acts of unlawful occupation of Indian territory by Chinese forces.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
and in a spirit of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation, so as to seek a reasonable settlement of the boundary question. This has been the consistent stand of the Chinese Government in the past and present, nor will it change in the future. The Chinese Government believes that, by this approach, the entire boundary question between China and India can be settled and, along with it, the question of the tri-junction of China, India and Burma will be finally decided.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 March 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and, with reference to the Memorandum of the Chinese Government dated the 21st February, 1961, have the honour to state as follows:

1. The Government of India are surprised at the statement that the maps attached to the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty do not show the western extremity of the boundary between Burma and China as lying at the Diphu Pass. The first sheet of the Chinese maps attached to the Boundary Treaty, and explicitly captioned the "Map showing the Entire Boundary Between Burma and China", shows the alignment, proceeding westwards, from a point approximately Long. 98° 18' and Lat. 27° 36' to a point approximately Long. 97° 20' and Lat. 28° 9' 30"; and this line is shown as terminating at the Diphu Pass. This alignment shown on the map is clearly in accordance with Articles 5 and 7 of the Boundary Treaty, which specifically define the boundary up to the western extremity. It is obvious, therefore, that the Diphu Pass, and not any point either north or south of it, was delineated as the western extremity of the Sino-Burmese boundary. Indeed, Section 3 of Article 7 places beyond any doubt the fact that the Diphu Pass marks the western extremity:

"The alignment of the entire boundary line between the two countries described in this Article and the location of the temporary boundary marks erected by both sides during joint survey are shown on the 1/250,000 maps indicating the entire boundary and on the 1/50,000 maps of certain areas, which are attached to the present Treaty."

2. The western extremity of the Sino-Burmese boundary must perforce touch the boundary of India; and this determines the meeting-point of the Sino-Burmese, Indo-Burmese and India-China boundaries. The western extremity of the Sino-Burmese boundary is, therefore, the tri-junction of India, Burma and China.

3. The Government of India have already furnished to the Government of People's Republic of China precise indication of the traditional boundary in the eastern sector of the India-China boundary. The boundary was confirmed in the Instrument of Agreement between the Indian and the Tibetan plenipotentiaries when the so-called McMahon Line was delineated in respect of the eastern sector of India as well as the northern part of the Sino-Burmese boundary, and which has been accepted as the traditional boundary for north Burma. The official maps of the Government of India which showed this alignment were never disputed until September, 1959 by the Government of China and were further acknowledged.
settlement of the question of the boundary between them. So far as the question of the boundary between China and India is concerned, the Chinese Government has also always been willing, in accordance with the same principles, to reach a fair and reasonable settlement with the Indian Government and thereby to define the specific location of the tri-junction of China, India and Burma. It is regrettable that this friendly and reasonable desire of the Chinese Government has never received a corresponding response from the Indian Government. The Indian Government in its note of March 30, 1961 even openly stated that it could not accept that the boundary between China and India was a matter for negotiation. This attitude of the Indian Government of refusing to negotiate and trying to impose its unilaterally claimed alignment on China is in actuality refusal to settle the boundary question.

The Indian Government's charge that the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty and its attached maps which show the Diphu Pass as a dividing point of the boundary between China and Burma have an adverse implication on the territorial integrity of India, and its allegation that the tri-junction of China, India and Burma should be five miles north of the Diphu Pass are totally untenable. The only so-called basis of the Indian Government is still the so-called McMahon Line which is unlawful and invalid, and which was created single-handedly by British imperialism. Such basis has long been strongly refuted by the Chinese Government in the correspondence and talks between the two countries. Moreover, the Indian Government attempted to utilize the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty to back up this unlawful line; this attempt will also not succeed. The unshakable fact remains that it is only the boundary line running along the southern foot of the Himalayas, as consistently pointed out by the Chinese Government, which is the true traditional customary line of the boundary between China and India in the eastern sector. According to this line, the traditional tri-junction of China, India and Burma is not only not at a point five miles north of the Diphu Pass, as alleged by the Indian Government, nor at the Diphu Pass itself, but is obviously located far south of the Diphu Pass.

The Chinese Government, which has made consistent efforts to develop Sino-Indian friendly relations on the basis of the Five Principles, has always been willing to settle the boundary question between China and India through friendly negotiations in a spirit of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation, and to define jointly with the Governments of Burma and India the exact location of the tri-junction of the three countries. However, it must be pointed out that, so long as the Indian Government does not give up its attitude of refusing to negotiate and trying to impose its views on others, the Chinese Government will absolutely not retreat an inch from its stand on the questions of the Sino-Indian boundary and of the tri-junction of China, Burma and India. The Indian Government will never succeed in its unreasonable tangling.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 30 March 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to
the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and, with reference
to the Memorandum of the Chinese Government dated the 21st
February, 1961, have the honour to state as follows:

1. The Government of India are surprised at the statement that
the maps attached to the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty do not
show the western extremity of the boundary between Burma and
China as lying at the Diphu Pass. The first sheet of the Chinese
maps attached to the Boundary Treaty, and explicitly captioned the
"Map showing the Entire Boundary Between Burma and China",
shows the alignment, proceeding westwards, from a point approxi-
mately Long. 98° 18' and Lat. 27° 36' to a point approximately Long.
97° 20' and Lat. 28° 9' 30"; and this line is shown as terminating at
the Diphu Pass. This alignment shown on the map is clearly in
accordance with Articles 5 and 7 of the Boundary Treaty, which
specifically define the boundary up to the western extremity". It
is obvious, therefore, that the Diphu Pass, and not any point either
north or south of it, was delineated as the western extremity of
the Sino-Burmese boundary. Indeed, Section 3 of Article 7 places
beyond any doubt the fact that the Diphu Pass marks the western
extremity:

"The alignment of the entire boundary line between the two
countries described in this Article and the location of the
temporary boundary marks erected by both sides during
joint survey are shown on the 1/250,000 maps indicating
the entire boundary and on the 1/50,000 maps of certain
areas, which are attached to the present Treaty."

2. The western extremity of the Sino-Burmese boundary must
perforce touch the boundary of India; and this determines the
meeting-point of the Sino-Burmese, Indo-Burmese and India-China
boundaries. The western extremity of the Sino-Burmese boundary
is, therefore, the tri-junction of India, Burma and China.

3. The Government of India have already furnished to the Gov-
ernment of People's Republic of China precise indication of the
traditional boundary in the eastern sector of the India-China boun-
dary. The boundary was confirmed in the Instrument of Agreement
between the Indian and the Tibetan plenipotentiaries when the
so-called McMahon Line was delineated in respect of the eastern
sector of India as well as the northern part of the Sino-Burmese
boundary, and which has been accepted as the traditional boundary
for north Burma. The official maps of the Government of India
which showed this alignment were never disputed until September,
1959 by the Government of China and were further acknowledged.
settlement of the question of the boundary between them. So far as the question of the boundary between China and India is concerned, the Chinese Government has also always been willing, in accordance with the same principles, to reach a fair and reasonable settlement with the Indian Government and thereby to define the specific location of the tri-junction of China, India and Burma. It is regrettable that this friendly and reasonable desire of the Chinese Government has never received a corresponding response from the Indian Government. The Indian Government in its note of March 30, 1961 even openly stated that it could not accept that the boundary between China and India was a matter for negotiation. This attitude of the Indian Government of refusing to negotiate and trying to impose its unilaterally claimed alignment on China is in actuality refusal to settle the boundary question.

The Indian Government's charge that the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty and its attached maps which show the Diphu Pass as a dividing point of the boundary between China and Burma have an adverse implication on the territorial integrity of India, and its allegation that the tri-junction of China, India and Burma should be five miles north of the Diphu Pass are totally untenable. The only so-called basis of the Indian Government is still the so-called McMahon Line which is unlawful and invalid, and which was created single-handedly by British imperialism. Such basis has long been strongly refuted by the Chinese Government in the correspondence and talks between the two countries. Moreover, the Indian Government attempted to utilize the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty to back up this unlawful line; this attempt will also not succeed. The unshakable fact remains that it is only the boundary line running along the southern foot of the Himalayas, as consistently pointed out by the Chinese Government, which is the true traditional customary line of the boundary between China and India in the eastern sector. According to this line, the traditional tri-junction of China, India and Burma is not only not at a point five miles north of the Diphu Pass, as alleged by the Indian Government, nor at the Diphu Pass itself, but is obviously located far south of the Diphu Pass.

The Chinese Government, which has made consistent efforts to develop Sino-Indian friendly relations on the basis of the Five Principles, has always been willing to settle the boundary question between China and India through friendly negotiations in a spirit of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation, and to define jointly with the Governments of Burma and India the exact location of the tri-junction of the three countries. However, it must be pointed out that, so long as the Indian Government does not give up its attitude of refusing to negotiate and trying to impose its views on others, the Chinese Government will absolutely not retreat an inch from its stand on the questions of the Sino-Indian boundary and of the tri-junction of China, Burma and India. The Indian Government will never succeed in its unreasonable tangling.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 June, 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the revised English translation of the Chinese text of the Report of the Officials of the Governments of India and the People's Republic of China on the Boundary Question, made available to the Ministry in April, 1961. After careful comparison of the revised informal English translation with the original Chinese text, Ministry of External Affairs are of the view that at least nine (9) changes, as in the statement enclosed, take the meaning beyond what is warranted by the Chinese text. These changes on matters of substance are unwarranted by the Chinese text and therefore unacceptable to the Government of India.

Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of the opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Explanatory note on abbreviations:

CRPV = Chinese Report Printed Version (Govt. of India Publication).
RT = Revised Translation.
CT = Chinese Text

(Headings and sub-headings have not been counted for the purpose of indicating lines.)

(1) CRPV page 15 line 7 . The sentence "First, the treaty did not define any specific location of the boundary; regarding this the Chinese side submitted as evidence documents exchanged between the two sides at that time," has been changed to read "First, the treaty did not define any specific location of the boundary, as was proved by the documents submitted by the Chinese side, which were exchanged between the two sides at that time." The first translation is more in conformity with the Chinese Text.

RT page 19 line 23

CT page 19 line 6

(2) CRPV page 17 line 36 . The sentence "With regard to such a strange logic, the Chinese side will not deal with it for the time being," has been changed to read, "The Chinese side will not make any comment as far as such a strange logic is concerned," thus omitting the words "for the time being".

RT page 23 line 4

CT page 22 line 9

(3) CRPV pages 24 & 25 line 52 . The sentence "After the above mentioned correspondence of the Chinese Government, up to 1949, the Ambassador to India of Chiang Kai Shek clique which at that time still maintained diplomatic relations with the Indian Government, sent a note to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, repudiating the Simla Convention which the Indian Government held to
be valid," has been changed to read, "Subsequent to the above mentioned correspondence of the Chinese Government, even as late as 1949, the Ambassador in India of the Chiang Kai Shek clique which at that time still maintained diplomatic relations with the Indian Government, still sent a note to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, repudiating the Simla Convention which the Indian Government held to be valid," thus omitting the words "up to".

The sentence "As is well-known, a boundary should be delimited jointly by both sides through negotiations," has been changed to read, "As is well-known, a boundary must be delimited jointly by both sides through negotiations and agreement," thus adding the words "and agreement".

The sentence, "with reference to Shahidulla, which lies in the south-east of the area under the jurisdiction of Ghuma Bazar County now belonging to Hotien Tao, it is a district which on the southern side extends to Kalahulumu Tapan, borders on British Tiaopaiti (that is, Ladakh), and is an important place through which Chinese and Indian traders and people travel to and from India," has been changed to read, "With reference to Shahidulla, which lies south-east of the area under the jurisdiction of Ghuma Bazar County now belonging to Hotien Tao, it is a district extending on the southern side to Kalahulumu Tapan, which borders on British Tiaopai (that is, Ladakh) and is an important route through which Chinese and Indian traders and people travel"
to and from India,”, thus making out that is not Shahidulla but Kalahunmu Tapan which borders on Ladakh.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The sentence “Some of the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side including the so called official Chinese maps, likewise could not prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India,”, has been changed to read, “Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.

The words “Exercise of administration” have been changed to read “Exercise of administrative jurisdiction”.

The word “always” has been replaced by the word “invariably”.

The sentence “It is obvious that since this line did not exist at all at that time, how could the Chinese Government give it recognition?” has been changed to read, “Since this line did not even exist at that time, it is obviously out of the question that the Chinese Government could have given recognition to it.”

Similarly, nor can the Chinese maps cited by the Indian side, including so called official Chinese maps, prove that China has accepted the boundary claimed by India”, dropping the word “Some”.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 June 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and with reference to the Note dated May 4, 1961, handed over by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Indian Embassy in Peking have the honour to state as follows:—

In the Note under reference the Chinese Government have continued to contend that the Diphu Pass has not been shown as the western extremity in the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty and its attached maps. That this contention is absolutely groundless is clear from the points mentioned in paras 2 to 5 below.

2. The detailed description of the alignment up to the western extremity in the text of the Treaty leaves no doubt that the western extremity is at the Diphu Pass. An examination of the maps attached to the Treaty also proves this point indisputably.

3. The Chinese Government have sought support for their contention by drawing a distinction between the description in the Treaty of the western extremity and that of the southeastern extremity. The fact that the south eastern extremity has been described more fully is of no relevance. The description of the alignment leading up to the western extremity is so precise that it obviously ends at the Diphu Pass. Indeed, it was so clear that there was no need in the Treaty to give further elucidation as in the case of the south eastern extremity.

4. The Chinese Government have further stated that in the maps attached to the Treaty, Diphu Pass is “marked in a different way from the marking for the south eastern extremity of the boundary”, and that “according to the legend of the attached maps, the Diphu Pass is shown only as a dividing point of the boundary between China and Burma”. However, on examination of the maps and the legends thereon do not substantiate these two contentions. There is no difference between the markings of the western extremity and that of the south eastern extremity, and there is no specific legend in which Diphu Pass has been described as the dividing point on the line between China and Burma. Indeed, as the Government of India have already stated, the first sheet of the Chinese maps attached to the Treaty is explicitly captioned the “Map showing the Entire Boundary between Burma and China” and this map shows the alignment as terminating at the Diphu Pass.

5. From the above, it is clear that the Government of India have neither interpreted the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty in a distorted manner, nor have they tried to act arbitrarily for the two contracting parties. It is precisely because the treaty is being correctly interpreted, and this interpretation shows that a considerable area of Indian territory under Indian administration and control has been
assumed by the Treaty as falling within China that they object to the showing of Diphu Pass as the western extremity of the boundary between China and Burma.

6. The Chinese Government are correct when they say that the western extremity of the boundary between China and Burma is the tri-junction between China, Burma and India. However, from this it cannot follow that every tri-junction should now be decided anew by the parties concerned. As the Government of India have pointed out on innumerable occasions, the northern and eastern boundary of India is traditionally well known and well recognised and, therefore, requires no further definition. The Government of China seem to be exploiting the opportunity offered by the China-Burma Boundary Treaty to support their unwarranted claim for negotiating the question of the India-China boundary. As the Chinese Government are aware, the Government of India have pointed out repeatedly and in clear unmistakable terms that this boundary is well known and well recognised and has been so for centuries and cannot be a subject of any negotiations.

7. At the discussions held between the Indian team of officials and the Chinese team of officials it was conclusively proved that the eastern extremity of the boundary between India and China lies at a point approximately five miles north of the Diphu Pass. It is a travesty of truth to say that the only so-called basis of the Indian alignment in this sector, is the so-called McMahon Line. The boundary of India in this sector, as in the others, is a traditional and customary boundary lying along the main watershed in the region. Further, Indian administration and jurisdiction have extended it for centuries. What is more, the so-called McMahon Line which provided formal confirmation of this natural, traditional customary and administrative boundary, is valid in international law because it was arrived at after an agreement between the Governments of India and Tibet at a time when Tibet had treaty-making powers. The Chinese Government were always aware of it and accepted it.

8. The Ministry are surprised that the Chinese Government, contrary to the legal and factual position, not only exploit the occasion of their Treaty with Burma to question the established frontiers of India by suggesting Diphu Pass as the tri-junction of the boundaries of India, Burma and China but also to reiterate their baseless recent claim that the alignment runs along the southern foothills of the Himalayas. That this claim is totally untenable was conclusively proved during the talks between the officials. This claim has also been rejected by the Government of China themselves in the Sino-Burmese Treaty which shows the western extremity at Diphu Pass and not south of it. It is surprising that the Government of China persist in refusing to recognise the basic contradiction between their acceptance of the traditional boundary and the watershed principle, which the so-called McMahon Line confirmed, as far as Burma is concerned, and their repudiation of the traditional boundary and that very principle with regard to India.

9. It will be clear from the above that the suggestion that the Government of India are trying to impose their views on others is
wholly baseless. It is, in fact, the Government of China who, in
total disregard of a well-established boundary alignment continue to
claim large areas of Indian territory and seek to impose their chang-
ing views and expansionist claims on others. It is not the Govern-
ment of India who are trying to confuse the issues but the Govern-
ment of China who, not only seek new boundary settlements and
question the validity of traditional boundaries formalised by agree-
ments but continue to exploit every opportunity to expound their
recent untenable claims.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this oppor-
tunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China
the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 6 August 1961

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the Note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government to the Chinese Embassy in India dated June 16, 1961, has the honour to state as follows:—

The Indian Government continues to insist in its Note on its misinterpretation of the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty and the attached maps, arbitrarily asserting that the Treaty and the attached maps had defined Diphu Pass as the western extremity of the Sino-Burmese boundary. An exhaustive answer to this was already made by the Chinese Government in its memorandum of February 21, 1961 and its Note of May 4, 1961 pointing out clearly that the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty had not defined the location of the western extremity, i.e., the tri-junction of China, Burma and India and that this was because China and India still differ in their understanding of the eastern section of the Sino-Indian boundary and a settlement through negotiations was yet to be achieved. In its Note, the Indian Government merely indulged in repeating its untenable contentions and no new argument was advanced. Therefore, the Chinese Government holds that the explanations and clarifications it has already made on this question are clear enough and need not to be repeated any more. But, in view of the continued haggling by the Indian Government in its Note, the Chinese Government deems it necessary to stress the two following points:—

(i) **Regarding the text of the treaty.**—Even the Indian Government had to admit in its memorandum of December 30, 1960 that the relevant article “does not specify the exact location of the western extremity of the Sino-Burmese boundary.” In its Note of June 16, 1961 itself, the Indian Government, while misrepresenting the Treaty in various ways, could not after all totally disregard the basic fact that in the Treaty there is a clear distinction between the description of the western extremity and the specified definition of the south-eastern extremity of the Sino-Burmese boundary.

(ii) **Regarding the maps attached to the Treaty.**—According to the legend Diphu Pass is clearly shown only as a boundary dividing point on the Sino-Burmese boundary and not as its western extremity. This is also an indisputable fact.

In the above mentioned two replies, the Chinese Government has already clearly pointed out that the true traditional customary line in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary runs in the main along southern foot of the Himalayas, and that the traditional tri-junction of China, India and Burma is not at Diphu Pass much less
north of it but is located far south of the Pass. The Indian Govern-
ment's allegation that the eastern extremity of the Sino-Indian
boundary lies at a point approximately five miles north of Diphu
Pase is by no means tenable. As regards the so-called "McMahon
Line", the Chinese Government has more than once stated: it was a
product of British imperialist aggression against China and has al-
ways aroused the great indignation of the Chinese people; it has
never been recognised by any successive Chinese Governments, and
is therefore illegal and null and void. The Indian Government now
asserts again that the Chinese Government has accepted this line,
that is all the more a distortion of the facts. The Indian Govern-
ment further contends that, as the Chinese Government has accept-
ed the watershed principle on the Sino-Burmese boundary question
it should not deny the same principle in connection with the Sino-
Indian boundary question. This contention is totally groundless.
The Chinese Government has repeatedly pointed out that the geo-
graphical factor is only one of factors forming the traditional custo-
mary boundary line and that the watershed is but one feature of
the geographical factor. The Sino-Burmese boundary has been
delimited in accordance with various factors through friendly
negotiation.

The above mentioned position and view points of the Chinese
Government on the Sino-Indian boundary question are consistent
and known to all. Here, the alleged self contradiction, change of
opinion and expansionism are totally out of the question. Moreover,
having regard for the fact that the Sino-Indian boundary has not yet
been formally delimited and that there is a dispute between China
and India on the boundary question, the Chinese Government has
consistently stood for a reasonable settlement with the Indian Gov-
ernment of the question of the boundary between the two countries
in accordance with the Five Principles and the spirit of mutual
understanding and mutual accommodation and through friendly
negotiation. It is regrettable that the Indian Government has all
along adopted, on the Sino-Indian boundary question a rigid attitude
of refusing to negotiate. It is none other than the Indian Govern-
ment itself that attempts to impose on others its unilateral expan-
sionist claim. On the question of the western extremity of the Sino-
Burmese boundary the Indian Government has further deliberately
stirred up a dispute and wilfully distorted the Sino-Burmese Boun-
dary Treaty. It is incomprehensible on what grounds the Indian
Government deems its understanding of a treaty concluded to the
other countries more authoritative than the explicit explanation of
the treaty made by the parties to it. The Chinese Government has
to point out once again that the Indian Government's approach of
refusing to negotiate and haggling over and over cannot settle any
question.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in
China the assurances of its highest consideration.
I am instructed to make the following reply to the note delivered by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India on June 15, 1961:

First of all, the Chinese Government wishes again to draw the attention of the Indian Government to the fact that Chinese is the only authentic language for that part of the Report of the Chinese and Indian Officials on the Boundary Question which was drafted by the Chinese side. The English translation of that part was provided at the request of the Indian side and is merely an unofficial version. Because the translation work was done in a hurry, it was conceivable that there would be some imperfections in it, and the Chinese side reserved the right to revise it afterwards. There was a clear understanding on this question between the officials of the Chinese and Indian sides throughout their meetings.

The revised unofficial English version was provided for the purpose of correcting certain inaccuracies in the previous version and is undoubtedly closer to the sense of the Chinese original. A careful check of the nine changes in the revised version mentioned in the Indian note shows that they are closer to the sense of the Chinese original and do not, as charged by the Indian side, take the meaning beyond what is warranted by the Chinese text. Therefore, the Chinese Government cannot but express its surprise and regret at the totally groundless charge made in the Indian note.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 September 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Note dated August 6, 1961, of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs have the honour to state that the Government of India have already stated their position in this matter, which is fully supported by factual data and universally accepted principles regarding traditional international boundaries. The Chinese Government have themselves accepted these principles in their boundary agreements with other neighbouring countries. As the Government of India have already elaborated this in great detail in the previous correspondence regarding this matter, they see little purpose in continuing this present exchange.

2. It is of no concern to the Government of India, as contended by the Chinese Government, whether textually or in cartographic representation of the text of the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty the western extremity of the Sino-Burmese boundary has been left "undefined". The reason adduced by the Chinese Government for such an incomplete boundary treaty is that China and India differ in their understanding of the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary. This is an unwarranted misrepresentation of the position of the Government of India in regard to this matter. The Government of India are not aware of any doubts affecting this or any other sector of India's boundary with China.

3. The Chinese note, which purports to be a full reply to the previous Indian note, offers no comment on the implication and validity of the first sheet of the Chinese map attached to the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty captioned "Map Showing The Entire Boundary Between Burma and China." The Government of India have also not found the legend which is said to show the Diphu Pass as a 'dividing point' on the Sino-Indian boundary. Had such a legend been shown on the map, the Government of India would have been constrained to disregard and consider as void such an infringement of their own territory, and, in exercise of their inherent right of self-defence, adopt necessary and appropriate measures for the protection of the territories of the Indian Union.

4. It is a travesty of history for the Chinese Government to assert that the traditional Indian boundary, which has been well-known and recognized for centuries, is a product of British Imperialism. In fact, it is the Chinese Government who have, during the last few years, shown aggressive designs and imperialist ambitions by unauthorisedly occupying large areas of Indian territory in violation of the solemnly agreed Panch Sheel principle of respect for each others territorial integrity. It is this aggression by China on Indian territory that is the cause of differences between India and China.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 28 September 1961

Reference the Note handed over to Shri P. K. Banerjee, Charge d'Affaires, Indian Embassy, Peking, by Mr. Chen Tze-pisy, Vice-Director, Asian Division of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China on 13th September 1961 regarding the Officials' Report on the boundary question drafted by the Chinese side and the English translation thereof.

While it is indisputably correct that the Chinese text of the aforesaid Report is the authoritative one, the Government of India do not accept the view that the revised unofficial English translation of the Chinese text is closer to the sense of the Chinese original in every instance. In regard to 9 changes introduced therein to which the attention of the Chinese Government was drawn, the meaning conveyed alters the sense of the original. However, the Government of India recognise that there is, in this matter, a difference of opinion between the two sides.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 10 December 1960

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the note that the Indian Ministry of External Affairs delivered to the Chinese Embassy in India on October 24, 1960, has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government notes that the Indian Government still persists in its totally groundless charges, although the Chinese Government has repeatedly declared that no Chinese aircraft has intruded into Indian air space, pointed out the fact that U.S. aircraft were discovered on the Sino-Indian border, and suggested that both sides should maintain vigilance against crossings of the border of the two countries by unidentified aircraft. The Chinese Government cannot but express its surprise and regret at this. In its note, the Indian Government asserts that it finds it difficult to believe that the planes which violated Indian air space were based anywhere other than on Chinese territory. It is needless to point out that, on the same logic, the Chinese Government could also have charged that all unidentified aircraft which crossed the Sino-Indian border to intrude into Chinese air space were Indian aircraft, yet it has not made such an unwarranted charge.

The result of investigations undertaken by the Chinese Government on the basis of the times and places provided in the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs shows that the charges of intrusion of Indian air space by a Chinese helicopter and entry of Indian territory by two armed Chinese personnel were totally groundless. As a matter of fact, no flight of Chinese aircraft or patrol of armed Chinese personnel ever took place at the times and places mentioned in the Indian note. Therefore, the Chinese Government rejects the charge made by the Indian Government about the Chinese Government allegedly violating the understanding reached by the Prime Ministers of the two countries.

The Chinese Government once again states that no Chinese aircraft has ever crossed the Sino-Indian boundary and expresses the hope that the Indian Government, like the Chinese Government, would maintain vigilance against the crossing of the boundary of the two countries by foreign aircraft. Should India discover any unidentified aircraft in its border air space, the Indian Government is fully entitled to take any counter-measure and need not make any inquiry of China.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 February 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to bring to the notice of the Embassy the following violations of Indian air space by Chinese aircraft:

(i) On November 8, 1960 a Chinese aircraft flew over Chung-thang in Sikkim (27°40' N and 88°35' E) from 1200 hours to 1226 hours;

(ii) On December 24, 1960, a Chinese aircraft flew over Ukhimath (30°32' N, 79°05' E) at 0903 hours.

2. The Government of India protest once again against violations of Indian air space by Chinese aircraft. It is once again requested that the Government of China instruct its subordinate authorities not to violate Indian air space, as such violations can easily lead to serious consequences.

3. The Ministry of External Affairs avails themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 25 February 1961

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note delivered by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India on February 13, 1961, has the honour to reply as follows:

The Chinese Government has found through investigation that the allegation made in the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs that Chinese aircraft had twice flown into the territorial air of India and Sikkim respectively is groundless, as no flight of Chinese aircraft was made at the time over the places mentioned in the note. It may be recalled that even Prime Minister Nehru admitted in his speech before the Indian Lok Sabha on February 17 that the Indian Government had not identified the nationality of the aircraft in the alleged two flights. The Indian Government, on the mere basis of presumption, supposed the aircraft to be Chinese and went to the length of lodging a protest with the Chinese Government. This attitude cannot be regarded as correct and friendly. The Chinese Government rejects the protest of the Indian Government and cannot but express regret at the attitude taken by the Indian Government.

The Chinese Government once again declares that no Chinese aircraft has ever flown across the Sino-Indian border and that, in case India discovers any unidentified aircraft in the territorial air over its border areas, the Indian Government has every right to deal with the matter without having to make any enquiries of the Chinese Government.

The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 29 April 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to bring to their notice the following violation of India air space by a Chinese aircraft.

On March 17, 1961, a Chinese aircraft was observed flying over Askote (8020E, 2945N), Joshimath (7940E, 3035N) and Badrinath (7930E, 3045N), from about 1015 hours to 1100 hours.

The Government of India lodge an emphatic protest against the repeated violations of India's air space by Chinese aircraft and reiterate their request that the Government of China instruct their subordinate authorities not to indulge in such violations.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 June 1961

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note delivered to the Chinese Embassy in India by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs on April 29, 1961, has the honour to reply as follows:

The Chinese Government has made a detailed investigation into the alleged flight of a Chinese aircraft over Indian territory on March 17 referred to in the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs. The results of the investigation show that the allegation is completely groundless and that no flight of Chinese aircraft took place at the time and place mentioned in the note. Reference may be made to the fact that even Mr. Krishna Menon, the Indian Minister of Defence, admitted before the Indian Lok Sabha on May 4 that the Indian Government failed to identify the nationality of the said aircraft. The Indian Government has more than once imprudently made protests against the Chinese Government before any verification is made; this attitude cannot be regarded as correct and friendly. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the utterly groundless protest lodged by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs in its note of April 29 and deeply deplores such an unjustified attitude.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embasssy of India in China, 2 June 1961

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to three recent incidents of Indian aircraft encroaching upon China's territorial air, has the honour to state as follows:

1. On April 26, 1961, at 12.57 hours, an Indian airplane intruded into the air space over Dehra Village (approximately 34° 55' N, 78° 41' E) in the south-west of the Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region, China, at an altitude of approximately 3,000 metres, and circled three minutes over there for the purpose of reconnaissance.

2. On April 27, 1961, at 9-40 hours, an Indian airplane intruded into the air space over Kota Village (approximately 34° 29' N, 78° 55' E) Shamal-Lungpa (approximately 34° 29' N, 78° 55' E) and other places in the south-west of the Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region, China, at an altitude of approximately 1,000 metres, and circled seven minutes over there for the purpose of reconnaissance.

3. On May 3, 1961, at 10.00 hours, an Indian airplane intruded into the air space over Height 5819 (approximately 35° 27' N, 78° 09' E) in the southwest of the Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region, China, at an altitude of approximately 300 metres, and circled as long as thirty minutes over there for the purpose of reconnaissance.

Such repeated incidents of Indian aircraft encroaching upon China's territorial air cannot but be regarded as deliberate provocations and as a menace to peace in the area along the border between the two countries. In regard to this, the Chinese Government lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government and demands that it immediately adopt effective measures to prevent the recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 June 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to Note dated 2nd June, 1961, handed over to the Indian Embassy in Peking by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, have the honour to state that the allegations contained in the Note about violations of Chinese air space are without any foundation. Indian aircraft are under strict instructions to limit their operations within Indian territory, and on no account to encroach on the territories of others. The Government of India are unable to give credence to these baseless reports and are surprised that the Government of China should have thought it fit not only to lodge a protest against imaginary violations of their air space but also to describe them as "deliberate provocations".

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 22 June 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Note dated 2nd June, 1961 handed over to the First Secretary of the Indian Embassy in Peking by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs regarding an intrusion into India's air space by a Chinese aircraft on 17th March, 1961 have the honour to state that the reply given by the Chinese Government is unsatisfactory and evasive. As usual the reply seeks to draw support from an official statement, this time ascribed to India's Defence Minister, which the later never made. On 4th May, 1961 in reply to a starred question in the Lok Sabha India's Defence Minister stated that a Chinese aircraft had violated India's air-space inspite of earlier protests which had been lodged by the Government of India. The Government of India would again express the hope that the Government of the People's Republic of China would exercise the necessary authority to restrain Chinese aircraft from violating India's air-space.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurance of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 5 July 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the
Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and have the honour to
bring to the notice of the Embassy the following further violations
of Indian air space by Chinese aircraft:

(1) On May 26, 1961, at about 21:45 hours, an aircraft flew
over Kalapani (8055 East 3015 North).

(2) On May 31, 1961, at about 20:45 hours, an aircraft flew
over Kalapani (8055 East 3015 North).

(3) On June 2, 1961, at about 21:30 hours, an aircraft flew
over Gunji (1852 East 3012 North).

(4) On June 3, 1961, at about 21:00 hours, an aircraft flew
over Gunji (8052 East 3012 North).

In lodging a firm protest against these repeated air violations of
Indian air-space, the Government of India would again urge the
Government of People’s Republic of China to warn all Chinese
aircraft to cease forthwith violating Indian air-space as such unlawful
activity could lead to grave consequences.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew
to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of
their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 12 August 1961

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents his compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

In the recent period, Indian troops, personnel and aircraft repeatedly encroached on Chinese territory and territorial air in China's border areas and even openly made armed provocations. The Chinese Government now points out the following serious cases:

(1) About 12:00 hours on July 9, 1961, thirty odd armed Indian military men approached the traditional customary boundary line to the west of Spanggur in China's Tibet Region. Nine of the Indian military men intruded into Chinese territory at different times and reached a point approximately 33° 36' N, 78° 46' E, and jointly with other Indian Military men staying outside of Chinese territory, they, unprovoked, fired thirteen shots towards Chinese territory. About 16:30 hours on the same day, two more armed Indian military men intruded into Chinese territory and reached a point approximately 33° 35' N, 78° 47' E. It was not until about 17:00 hours on that day that all the Indian military men who had illegally crossed the border withdrew.

(2) Since last April, Indian troops, starting from their illegally occupied Parigas which is situated in China's Demchok area, continually pushed further into Chinese territory, and expanded the area of their unlawful patrol to include Cuje sheepfold (approximately 32° 41' N, 79° 26' E) and Rato (approximately 32° 42' N, 79° 29' E). In May, Indian troops went so far as to illegally set up a checkpoint at Oga (approximately 32° 50' N, 79° 26' E). More recently, on July 5, thirty odd Indian military men carrying light and heavy machine-guns and other weapons came on unlawful patrol to Kargo (approximately 32° 40' N, 79° 28' E), and on July 22 they penetrated still deeper to Charding La (approximately 32° 32' N, 79° 24' E) for unlawful patrol.

(3) Between July 21 and 22, 1961, six Indian military men carrying weapons, starting from Indian illegally occupied Tsungsha area of China, crossed Thaga Pass and penetrated deeply into a place about one kilometre southeast of China's Salan (approximately 31° 31' N, 79° 09' E) and carried out reconnaissance.

(4) Last June, some fifteen Indian official personnel, carrying a receiver-transmitter set, intruded again into China's Wu-je area and stationed there to carry out unlawful activities.

(5) Indian aircraft repeatedly encroached on Chinese territorial air. The instances of encroachment are as follows:

(a) On May 19 and about 10:00 hours on May 20 respectively, an Indian airplane intruded into the air space over
Chiakang (approximately 32° 54' N, 79° 37' E) of China's Tibet Region for the purpose of reconnaissance.

(b) About 11·00 hours on June 3 and at 10·48 hours on July 15 respectively, an Indian airplane, flying from the direction of the Tinruzhe airfield on the Indian border, intruded into the air space over Digra (approximately 33° 33' N, 78° 53' E) of China's Tibet Region for the purpose of reconnaissance. Afterwards, it flew back in the direction of the Tinruzhe airfield.

(c) At 12·45 hours on June 9, an Indian airplane, flying from the direction of Murgg of India, intruded into the air space over an area of China's Sinkiang (approximately at 35° 19' N, 78° 12' E) for the purpose of reconnaissance. Afterwards, it flew back along the Chipchap River in Chinese territory.

(d) About 09·00 hours on June 8 and at 12·11 hours on July 17 respectively, an Indian airplane, flying along the Subansiri River, overflew Migyitun (approximately 28° 40' N, 93° 37' E) in China's Tibet Region and further intruded into the air space over Yalep (approximately 28° 44' N, 93° 19' E) for the purpose of reconnaissance; thence it flew back by the same route.

The above-mentioned activities of the Indian side have gravely encroached on the territory, territorial air and sovereignty of China, and once again caused the tension in the border areas. The Chinese Government is consistently devoting itself to maintaining the status quo of the boundary and keeping tranquility along the border so as to facilitate the peaceful settlement of the boundary dispute between the two countries, and all the Chinese frontier outposts, for this purpose, are continuing to desist from sending out patrol parties. The Indian side, on the contrary, taking the goodwill of China for a sign of weakness, has wilfully carried out armed provocations and expanded its illegally occupied areas in the Chinese border region. The Chinese Government cannot but lodge a serious protest against this and point out that such practice may lead to serious consequences. The Chinese Government asks the Indian Government to order the immediate withdrawal of all the Indian troops and other official personnel who have crossed the border and adopt effective measures to prevent the recurrence of similar incidents.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 21 August 1961

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the notes handed to the Chinese Embassy in India by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs on July 5 and June 22, 1961, respectively, has the honour to state as follows:

1. In its note of July 5, 1961, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs asserted that from May 26 to June 3, Chinese aircraft allegedly flew over Kalapani and Gunji, twice over each. The Chinese Government has satisfied itself through investigation that no flight of Chinese aircraft took place at the time and place mentioned in the note. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the protest of the Indian Government in regard to the alleged intrusion into Indian air space by Chinese aircraft, and deeply deplores such a totally groundless charge made by the Indian Government.

2. The Chinese Government has noted that in the note of June 22, 1961, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, ignoring the statement made by the Chinese Government in its note of June 2, 1961 to the effect that no Chinese aircraft flew over Indian territory, persisted in its unjustified charge and did its utmost to argue away the statement made by the Indian Minister of Defence in India's Lok Sabha on May 4. The Chinese Government draws the attention of the Indian Government to the report carried by India's official news agency the Information Service of India on May 5 which unequivocally said: "There was further violation of Indo-air space by aircraft suspected to be Chinese on March 17 last, Defence Minister V. K. Krishna Menon informed Lok Sabha May 4." This passage clearly shows that the aircraft which was in "violation of Indo-air space" was merely "suspected" and not identified as Chinese aircraft. Thus, the arbitrary assertion made by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs in its notes of April 29 and June 22 that an alleged Chinese airplane intruded into India's air space is contradictory to the statement of the Indian Minister of Defence. The Chinese Government cannot but express once again its regret at the fact that the Indian Government keeps making imprudent charges against the Chinese Government without finding out the facts.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 31 October 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs Note (No. 61) PU Yi Ya tzu No. 648, dated August 12, 1961, handed over in Peking to the Charge d'Affaires of the Indian Embassy have the honour to state as follows:

2. Despite a searching enquiry into the allegations about encroachments into Chinese territory and violations of Chinese air space by Indian armed personnel and aircraft including an on-the-spot survey, Government of India have not discovered a single instance where Indian forces or aircraft transgressed into Chinese territory. The existing border establishments of the Government of India are well within Indian territory unlike a number of border posts of the Chinese Government unlawfully established on Indian territory in Ladakh. Indeed, according to recent reports, Chinese troops have made further inroads into Indian territory.

3. The specific allegations of intrusion mentioned in the Chinese note are dealt with below:

**Allegation I:** At about 1200 hours on July 9, 1961 thirty-odd armed Indian personnel allegedly approached the traditional customary boundary line to the west of Spanggur in China's Tibet region etc.

**Comments:** The customary boundary line, as the Chinese should be well aware, does not run to the west of Spanggur but cuts across the eastern part of the Spanggur lake. It follows that had nine Indian Army men reached a point approximately 3336 N, 7846 E, which is not a fact, they would have been 10 miles west of the Indian boundary. It has been further alleged that about 1630 hours on the same day two armed Indian personnel reached a point approximately 3335 N, 7847 E, and while this too is factually incorrect, had it been so, the two men would have been still well within the customary boundary line. All the locations mentioned in paragraph I of the Chinese protest note are on the Indian side of the international border and demarcated so in Indian maps. The allegation that Indian troops are intruding when they go to a part of the Indian territory is manifestly absurd. As to firing by Indian armed personnel on Indian territory, on careful examination, it has been established that no shots were fired from or near the locations in Indian territory mentioned in the note.

**Allegation II:** The Chinese note alleges that Indian troops have recently “pushed further into Chinese territory” in the Demchok area and patrolled up to the Guje sheepfold and Rato, etc.

**Comments:** Both Demchok and the other locations mentioned in the Chinese note are well within India's international border in this sector. The Chinese note refers to the setting up of a checkpost at
Oga. The Ministry do not see why the Government of China should have any concern with measures India adopts inside her territory for the defence of Indian territories. As regards patrolling up to Kargo and Charding La, while Kargo is well within Indian territory, Charding La is on the border, and has been under Indian control for several years. The Chinese Government would appreciate that it is illogical to expect the Government of India to leave their territories unprotected to facilitate Chinese incursions, and indeed unlawful occupation by the Chinese has already occurred in wide areas of India's Ladakh.

**Allegation III:** Six Indian armed personnel crossed Thagala and penetrated up to 1 kilometer deep south-east of Salan for reconnaissance etc.

**Comments:** Nilang which is called Tsungsha in the Chinese note has been a part of India for many years. It is several miles south of the border pass of Thagala. Detailed enquiries have revealed that no Indian patrol crossed the Indian border pass of Thagala or any other part of the international frontier in this sector.

**Allegation IV:** Last June, some fifteen Indian personnel intruded into the Wuje area etc.

**Comments:** It would be recalled that, in the discussions held on August 19, 1958, on Barahoti—which the Chinese call Wuje—between the Chinese and Indian delegations, it was mutually agreed that the two sides would refrain from sending armed personnel to Barahoti, while the area remained in dispute. The Indian side had further proposed that the civil authorities of either country should not extend their jurisdiction over Barahoti until the dispute had been finally settled. This suggestion was not found acceptable to the Chinese side. The Government of India have therefore been continuing to send their civil officials to Barahoti just as they used to do before in exercise of their traditional jurisdiction.

**Allegation V:** Violations of Chinese territorial air by Indian aircraft.

**Comments:** The Government of India, after a very thorough investigation, are in a position to assert positively that no Indian aircraft was involved in the flights mentioned in the Chinese note. However, the Government of India must enter a caveat to the unfounded Chinese claim that the air space over Digra and the point 35.19 N and 78.12 E [(b) and (c) of paragraph 5 of the Chinese Note] are Chinese. These locations are in Indian territory, so is the Chipchap river. If, as it seems from the Note, the Chinese are establishing posts on this river, the Government of India must denounce this further incursion into Indian territory.

4. It is surprising that the Chinese Government should draw up a list of groundless allegations against the Government of India based on false assumptions and imaginary provocations and conclude therefrom that the activities of the Indian side have “once again caused tension in the border area”. The facts are clear and they clearly establish that the tension in the border areas is caused by acts of transgression committed by the Chinese.
5. As late as December 17, 1959, H.E. Premier Chou En-lai writing to the Indian Prime Minister had, inter alia, said that "as a matter of fact, the Chinese map published in 1956 to which Your Excellency referred correctly shows the traditional boundary between the two countries in this sector (Ladakh-Tibet/Sinkiang)". The Chinese forces consolidated their hold on that line in 1959-60. Since then, however, aggression is being added to aggression and instances of China's misbehaviour against a neighbour bound to her by the Five Principles of co-existence are increasing.

6. It is not true that the Chinese 'are continuing to desist from sending out patrol parties'. Nor is there any factual basis for the ascertain that the 'Chinese are devoting themselves to maintenance of the status quo'. There are reports of intensive Chinese patrolling on the frontier, of numerous incursions into Indian territory, of new military roads close to the frontier in the middle and eastern sectors and deep inside Indian territory under unlawful Chinese occupation in the western sector and new army posts closer to the border than those of 1959. Of instances of recent Chinese intrusions into Indian territory, some are cited below:—

Western sector

(1) In April 1960 Chinese military personnel posted at Khurnak Fort patrolled the Suriah (E. 7852, N. 3347) area inside Indian territory.

(2) A Chinese survey party visited Suriah on June 25, 1960, and returned towards Khurnak Fort the same day.

(3) On October 13, 1960 two mounted Chinese soldiers were seen about 1½ miles east of Hot Springs (E. 7857/N. 3419).

(4) Four Chinese soldiers were seen at MR. E. 7901, N. 3417, about five miles from Hot Springs in the second week of October, 1960.

(5) Sometime in May 1961, the Chinese intruded into Indian territory near Chushul at MR E. 7848, N. 3331. A section of Chinese troops was also seen on May 22, 1961 towards the east of this location.


Middle sector

(7) On September 22, 1960, a Chinese armed patrol party consisting of one officer and ten soldiers crossed the Sikkim-Tibet border near Jelepla and came 200 yards inside Indian territory.

(8) On April 20, 1961, an Indian army patrol at Jelepla noticed three Chinese wearing khaki uniforms, approximately 80 yards within Indian territory.

(9) On September 12, 1961, 12 Chinese armed personnel in blue uniforms came 100 yards inside Indian territory from Jelepla.
Eastern sector

(10) One June 3, 1960, a Chinese patrol party consisting of 25 soldiers intruded four miles within Indian territory and came to Taksang Gompa (E. 9150, N. 2745).

(11) In the first week of July 1961, a Chinese patrol entered a point about one mile west of Chemokarpola in Kameng Frontier Division.

As against these, there is not one instance of Indian intrusion into Chinese territory.

7. This is not all. Reports received in August-September 1961 show that the Chinese forces have spread even beyond the 1956 Chinese claim line in Ladakh to establish the following new posts, and that they have constructed roads to link these posts with rear bases:

- Post at E. 78.12, N 35.19.
- Post at Nyagzu.
- Post at Dambuguru.

These fresh instances of violation of Indian territory by the Chinese establish conclusively that the Chinese are guilty of further aggression against India and their protestations to the contrary are only a cloak to cover up these renewed incursions and aggressive activities.

8. The Government of India reject the Chinese note of protest, dated August 12, 1961, and urge on the Government of China to stop further incursions into Indian territory and withdraw from areas of Indian territory illegally occupied by Chinese forces.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurance of their highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the note handed over to the Indian Embassy in Peking by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China on August 21, 1961, have the honour to state as follows:—

While the Government of China have rejected in their present note India's protest against violations of Indian air space by Chinese aircraft between May 26, 1961 and June 3, 1961, it may interest the Chinese Government to know that the Government of India satisfied themselves prior to lodging their protest that the aircraft concerned were of Chinese origin. The Government of India are unable therefore, to accept the Chinese contention that the charge was 'totally groundless', and would request the Chinese Government again to issue appropriate instructions to all concerned to cease indulging in these violations of Indian air space which could lead to unfortunate consequences.

In the note, dated August 21, 1961, a reference has been made to this Ministry's note dated June 22, 1961 in reply to the Chinese note of June 2, 1961. It is apparent that the Government of China are still relying on a mis-quotation from the Defence Minister's reply in Parliament to counter the facts of the case. The Chinese note now refers to a report carried by the Information Service of India on May 5, in its morse transmission. As already pointed out in this Ministry's note dated June 22, 1961, the Defence Minister replying to a question in Parliament on May 4, 1961, said that Chinese aircraft had violated Indian air space in spite of earlier protests lodged by the Government of India. The question and the answer given to it was in Hindi. The Press Trust of India mistranslated the answer, and the Information Service of India which gathers its material from news agencies among other sources carried this mistranslation in its transmission of May 5, 1961. There is, therefore, no material support for the Chinese contention in the Defence Minister's statement in Parliament on May 4, 1961.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the Chinese People's Republic the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Embassy of India in China to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 26 November 1960

The Embassy of India presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of the People's Republic of China, and has the honour to refer to a most unpleasant and serious incident which took place on the special train on the return journey of the Diplomatic Corps from Shaosin to Peking. The members of the Diplomatic Corps entertained at Shaosin at 6 p.m. on Monday, November 21, 1960. At about 11.30 p.m. the Ambassador of India was asked to see the Acting Director of Protocol who was accompanying the diplomats. The Acting Director alleged that at 6.40 p.m. that evening the Ambassador's Private Secretary, Mr. Sundaram, had "misbehaved" towards a Chinese girl attendant in the corridors of the train and had tried to embrace her. He further alleged that the girl had freed herself from Mr. Sundaram and Mr. Sundaram had then run away from the scene of the alleged incident. The Acting Director stated that the personnel of the train were indignant over what he called the "misbehaviour" of a member of the Indian Embassy who was also concurrently the Ambassador's Private Secretary. The Acting Director wanted the Ambassador to "educate" his Secretary and ensure that no repetition of the alleged incident would occur. The Ambassador expressed shocked surprise at the grave charge made against his Private Secretary Mr. Sundaram, and said that Mr. Sundaram was a happily married sober young man whose conduct had always been above reproach. The Ambassador added however that he would make enquiries.

Next morning (Tuesday November 22nd) the Ambassador spoke to Mr. Sundaram about the charge made against him. Mr. Sundaram was astonished and said that he had not been near a Chinese girl on the train, or at any time during the diplomatic trip. He added that the charge was fantastic and was a complete fabrication. He gave the Ambassador a detailed account of his movements on the previous evening and said that from 6.15 p.m. to 7.20 p.m., and consequently at the time of the alleged incident, he was sitting in another compartment along with six or seven others. At about 7.20 p.m. he left the compartment, along with the others, to take his dinner in the dining car. On checking all the facts given by Mr. Sundaram, the Ambassador was quite satisfied that the charge was completely false. The Ambassador then went to the Acting Director of Protocol at 10 a.m. and informed him of the result of his investigation. The Acting Director said that he regretted that Mr. Sundaram had flatly denied the charge and that the Ambassador "accepted the denial" and "repeated it" to him. The Acting Director again said that the leading man and the train personnel were indignant over the incident and wanted to know what action was being taken. He proposed that the alleged "victim" and Mr. Sundaram should be confronted with each other and their respective versions obtained. On this occasion the Acting Director added that there
had been an eye-witness to the incident, although he had made no mention of any witness to the alleged incident when he had talked to the Ambassador the previous night. The Ambassador pointed out that there were difficulties in carrying out such an investigation on a running train carrying the entire Diplomatic Corps. He also added that he had no Chinese knowing person with him who could check on what was being said by the supposed “victim” and eye-witness and who would also ensure that what Mr. Sundaram said was being properly interpreted. The Ambassador however said that he would think over the matter.

After dinner that evening, the Ambassador met the Acting Director again and told him that he could not accept an investigation on a running train. He pointed out that joint investigations of such a nature could be carried out only under proper conditions, with both sides having full facilities for presenting their respective cases. The Ambassador added that if an investigation was insisted upon, it could be carried out in Peking where each side would have the services of its own interpreters. The Acting Director regretted the Ambassador’s decision not to agree to an immediate investigation and also regretted what he called the Ambassador’s “judgment” in accepting Mr. Sundaram’s version. The Acting Director added that he would convey the Ambassador’s decision to the train personnel whose indignation, he said, would thereby increase. He further stated that he would not be responsible for any unpleasant incident that might take place as a result of “their increased indignation”. The Ambassador protested strongly against the Acting Director’s attempt to intimidate him and reminded the Acting Director that he and members of his party were the guests of the Chinese Foreign Office.

Half an hour later, that is at 11.30 p.m. Mr. Kallukaren, the Indian Press Attache, who was sharing the compartment with Mr. Sundaram, rushed into the Ambassador’s compartment and informed him that Mr. Sundaram had been dragged out of his compartment by members of the Protocol Department to the place of the alleged incident where a group of train personnel was demonstrating against him. The Ambassador and his wife went to the place where Mr. Sundaram was being heckled and shouted at, by a group of train personnel, with Foreign Office interpreters translating the abuses and repeatedly calling Mr. Sundaram “Rascal!, Rascal!” They were also shouting at him most violently: “Admit it! Admit it! Admit it!” One of them went so far as to shout, according to the Protocol interpreter himself, “What sort of an Indian Ambassador who will not take a responsible attitude!” The alleged “victim” and eye-witness were there but the militant demonstration was entirely carried on by another girl and a man who were assisted by Protocol interpreters. Mr. Sundaram was completely hemmed in and subjected to abuse and humiliation, physically debarred from leaving the spot and practically imprisoned, since the Chinese party had taken care to lock the door in front of which he was standing. The demonstrators were adopting an increasingly threatening and violent attitude, when the Ambassador and his wife arrived on the spot. The latter reminded the demonstrators that the Ambassador and his party were the guests of the Chinese Government and that their
behaviour was not in keeping with their position as hosts. They also reminded them that earlier on, the Ambassador had already told the Acting Director that he was agreeable to having an investigation held in Peking and that therefore this demonstration was completely unjustified. The staff of the Protocol Department, who were on the spot and in the vicinity, did nothing to pacify the demonstrators. On the other hand they encouraged them, repeating to the bystanders their version of the alleged “misbehaviour”. The Ambassador and his wife, however, were able to rescue Mr. Sundaram from the yelling and gesticulating crowd and take him to their compartment. There is no doubt that Mr. Sundaram would have been assaulted but for the Ambassador’s intervention. As the Ambassador, his wife and Mr. Sundaram were walking back to their compartment, the Acting Director and the Deputy Director of the Protocol Department, who had also been near the scene throughout this unruly demonstration, were returning to their compartment just ahead of the Ambassador.

Though by then it was midnight, the Ambassador walked across to the bogey where the Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs, His Excellency Mr. Lo Kwei-po, was seated with his staff, obviously getting a report of the demonstration. The Ambassador made a very strong protest against the unruly and unseemly demonstration which had just taken place and the insult deliberately offered to the Indian Embassy. The Ambassador reminded the Vice-Minister that he had already expressed his agreement to an investigation in Peking under proper conditions, and was therefore all the more shocked and surprised that the train personnel had taken the law into their own hands, and had been assisted in doing so by officials of the Foreign Office. The Ambassador said he refused to believe that the demonstration could not have been controlled by the officials of the Foreign Office. The Vice-Minister said that he would not accept the Ambassador’s protest and commended what the demonstrators had done, saying that “their action was right”. He added that the demonstration was not an insult to the Indian Ambassador but a protest against the “misbehaviour” of Mr. Sundaram. He also said that in not having agreed to an immediate investigation on the running train, the Ambassador had shown an “unfriendly attitude”. The Ambassador repudiated what the Vice-Minister said and pointed out that joint investigations in such cases had to be carried out under proper conditions and that the Chinese proposal to render summary justice on the spot, by holding an immediate investigation, was neither fair nor acceptable to him.

The Government of India are shocked at this incident and have directed their Ambassador to lodge a strong protest against the violent demonstration of the train personnel, actively assisted by officials of the Chinese Foreign Office, in dragging a member of the Indian Embassy out of his compartment on a running train and in subjecting him to violent threats, insults and humiliation in its corridors. The Government of India are shocked that the train personnel were allowed to take the law into their own hands, in spite of the assurance given by the Ambassador of India, that he would agree to a joint investigation on returning to Peking. The
Government of India strongly feel that the incident was specially deplorable, because of the pressure, not only of senior officials of the Chinese Foreign Office on the train, but also of the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs, His Excellency Mr. Lo Kwei-po. The Ambassador of India and his party were guests of the Chinese Government and it is incredible to the Government of India, that the subordinate staff of the train could have been allowed to take the law into their own hands in thus insulting them. The Government of India strongly protest against the whole incident which was deliberately designed to insult the Indian Embassy and bring it into disrepute.

The Embassy of India avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 10 December 1960

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China has read the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of India delivered to the Chinese Embassy in India on May 17, 1960 and has the honour to reply to this note as well as the memoranda of the Indian Embassy in China, dated August 25, 1959 and September 17, 1959, the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of India, dated October 26, 1959 and its informal note of April 25, 1960 as follows:

1. In the above-mentioned memoranda and notes, the Indian Government said that Indian traders allegedly encountered difficulties and restrictions in China's Tibet region, and claimed that certain proper measures and regulations of the Tibet region of China had altered or violated the so-called "customary practice" in trade between the Tibet region of China and India, and on this basis made a series of charges against and demands on the Chinese Government. Having made a serious check on all the cases mentioned in the above memoranda and notes, the Chinese Government deems it necessary to point out that the charges made by the Indian Government against the local authorities of the Tibet region of China are groundless, and the many demands made by the Indian Government are also unacceptable to the Chinese Government.

2. In the above-mentioned memoranda and notes, the Indian Government repeatedly objected to certain regulations and measures adopted by the local authorities of the Tibet region of China, charging that they had altered or violated the so-called "traditional pattern of trade" or "customary practice" in trade between the Tibet region of China and India. The Chinese Government rejects this charge. What the Indian Government means by "customary practice" is mainly that Indian traders may make trade payments in Indian rupees, Tibetan coins or Chinese silver dollars. It must be pointed out that there are no provisions at all on trade payments in the Sino-Indian Agreement on Trade and Inter-course Between the Tibet Region of China and India of April 1954. Article II of the Agreement specifies the places where traders of both sides known to be customarily engaged in trade may trade. Article IV specifies the routes by which traders of both sides travel. Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of Article V provide that traders of both sides or inhabitants of the border districts of the two countries or porters and mule-team drivers who perform necessary transportation services need not hold passports issued by their own country in travelling across the border. Obviously, there are in the Agreement no provisions on matters concerning trade itself such as payment. Needless to point out, these matters should be dealt with in accordance with the regulations and measures in force of the local authorities of the Tibet region of China. In its note the Indian Government also referred to Paragraphs 1 and 4 of Article VII of the Sino-Indian Trade Agreement of October 14, 1954 as a "reason" for making demands on the Chinese Government.
True, Paragraph 1 of Article VII stipulates: All commercial and non-commercial payments between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India may be effected in Indian rupees; and Paragraph 4 stipulates: Payments for border trade between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India, however, will be settled according to the customary practice. It must be pointed out that concerning trade between the Tibet region of China and India, there is a specific provision in Article V of the Sino-Indian Trade Agreement, which stipulates that the above-mentioned trade will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Sino-Indian Agreement on Trade and Intercourse Between the Tibet Region of China and India of April 1954. As pointed out above, there are no provisions at all on trade payments in this Agreement. It is, therefore, groundless for the Indian Government in the above-mentioned memoranda and notes to insist that Indian traders in the Tibet region of China effect trade payments in Indian rupees, Tibetan coins or Chinese silver dollars. And the Chinese Government cannot agree to this.

3. After the quelling of the rebellion and the carrying out of democratic reforms in the Tibet region of China, the local authorities of the Tibet region of China, in the light of specific conditions and actual needs, have introduced certain necessary financial and economic reforms, such as the exchange of the Tibetan currency into Jen Min Pi, with a view to stabilising finance and bringing about economic prosperity. This currency reform is purely a matter within the scope of China's sovereignty and no foreign country has any right to interfere with it. All foreign nationals and traders without exception are obliged to observe the relevant laws and regulations of the country in which they reside. The Indian Government in its memorandum of August 25, 1959 went so far as to describe this currency reform which is purely a domestic measure of China's as "arbitrary measures". This shows that the Indian Government not only fails to understand correctly the great significance of the currency reform introduced by the local authorities of the Tibet region of China, but also tries deliberately to interfere in China's internal affairs. The Indian Government demands that Indian traders be permitted to take to India Tibetan coins and Chinese silver dollars, and further asks that no difficulties should be placed in the way of remittance of profits of the Indian traders from Tibet to India, or that it should be allowed "without any conditions". It must be pointed out that monetary measures are matters within the scope of a country's sovereignty. The Chinese Government cannot accept these demands of the Indian Government. The regulation that Indian traders applying for foreign exchange must undertake to import goods of equivalent value has been in force for many years. Furthermore, this is also a matter of sovereign right exercised by a country in foreign exchange management in which no foreign country has the right to interfere.

4. The Indian Government, in the above-mentioned memoranda and notes, also mentioned other so-called "difficulties" encountered by Indian traders. These, too, are groundless. The Indian Government alleged that the commission of two per cent. had been doubled. The Chinese Government has been satisfied that this is absolutely
untrue. The local authorities of the Tibet region of China did suggest in the spring of 1959 that certain Indian traders in Western Tibet take back to India their unsold merchandise; this was done entirely out of consideration for protecting the security of the Indian traders' merchandise. However, the local authorities of the Tibet region of China indicated at the time that the Chinese side did not object to Indian traders leaving their merchandise in the locality, so long as the Indian traders themselves wished to do so. Regarding the export of sheep and goats to India, the local authorities of China's Tibet region, with a view to effecting economic prosperity and developing animal husbandry, have stipulated that, except for the necessary amount of meat sheep and goats, no sheep and goats are to be exported at will. This is not only a matter of China's internal affairs, but also a natural measure which should be understandable to the Indian Government. The Chinese Government wishes that the Indian Government would advise Indian traders to respect the regulations of the local authorities of China's Tibet region. It should also be mentioned here that the Indian Government's allegation in its note that the Tibet local authorities refused to accept goods shipped to Tibet by Indian Traders in fulfilment of earlier contracts is untrue. Check-ups have revealed that trade organizations of the Tibet region have always faithfully observed contracts, while Indian traders, on the contrary, more than once violated provisions of contracts. Some Indian traders failed to deliver goods according to the time stipulated in the contracts; individual Indian traders even failed to deliver goods according to the specifications of the contracts, in an attempt to pass inferior goods as high quality goods. For example, of the 180 woollen piece-goods which the trade organization of China's Tibet region ordered from the Indian-Sikkim Company, only one-third are conformable to the specifications. It was only in these circumstances that the trade organization of China's Tibet region, in order to avoid losses, had to refuse to accept them.

5. The Chinese Government has all along taken a positive attitude towards the promotion of trade between the Tibet region of China and India. Even in the situation of armed rebellion in the Tibet region, in which trade between the Tibet region and India met with certain temporary and partial difficulties, the Tibet local authorities still made the greatest endeavour to provide Indian traders with the possibility of carrying on trade. A proof of this is the fact that the Tibet local authorities have never discontinued the export of the important commodity wool. Although the Indian Government expressed its desire to develop trade between China's Tibet region and India, yet in the past period, there have occurred some adverse situations on the Indian side. On October 3 and 22, and November 1, 1959, the Indian Political Commissioner's Office in Sikkim issued successive orders prohibiting the export to the Tibet region of many kinds of goods such as kerosene and iron-made farm tools, and even food grain which the Tibetan border inhabitants used to exchange for. It is learnt that Indian traders have been obstructed again and again from taking orders placed by the trade organization of China's Tibet region. The Chinese Government does not know the purposes of the Indian side in adopting these and similar measures, nor wishes to raise any demands concerning measures which are India's internal affairs. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government
will take practical measures in the interest of the development of trade between China's Tibet region and India.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 12 December 1960

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of the Republic of India in China, and, with reference to the informal note delivered in Delhi by Foreign Secretary Dutt of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to Assistant Minister Chia Kuan-hua of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China on April 25, 1960, has the honour to reply as follows:

1. Regarding the question of accommodation for the Indian official organs in Tibet:

The local authorities of China's Tibet region have all along done their utmost to render assistance, in accordance with the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement, to all the Indian official organs in the conclusion of leases and the construction of buildings. For example, regarding the question of the lease of the Indian Trade Agency in Gyantse, the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet has conducted several discussions with the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa on the draft lease put forward by the Chinese side in June this year, and agreement has been reached on many questions in the draft lease. Now the local authorities of China's Tibet region are waiting for the final reply of the Indian Consulate-General. As regards the request of the Indian Trade Agency in Gyantse for renting three more rooms, energetic assistance has been rendered by the local authorities of Gyantse in the light of the local conditions.

Regarding the construction of the premises for the Indian Trade Agency in Gartok, the Tibet local authorities have, in the light of the present local conditions, agreed to assist the Indian Trade Agency in building some local-typed houses for temporary use.

Besides, the local authorities also rendered assistance to the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa when the latter wanted to build more houses this year.

The Foreign Ministry believes that, in the future, reasonable requests of the Indian official organs in Tibet will continue to be fulfilled with the assistance of the local authorities. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will instruct its official organs in Tibet to adopt an attitude of co-operation similar to that of the Chinese local authorities.

2. Regarding the question of the functioning of the Indian Consulate-General and Trade Agencies in the Tibet region of China:

(1) It must be pointed out that the allegation made by the Indian Government in its note that "very strict restrictions have been imposed on the freedom of movement and functioning" of the Indian Consulate-General and Trade Agencies does not tally with the fact
at all. This year, despite the very heavy transport duties of the communications departments, the local authorities of the Tibet region of China have provided members of the Indian official organs with the facility of vehicles needed for travel and transportation of supplies. In July this year, the local authorities asked the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa and the Trade Agencies in Gyantse and Yatung respectively to submit their transportation plans month by month so as to include them in the monthly plan of the communications departments so long as possible.

(2) The local authorities of China's Tibet region have never imposed any restrictions on the proper activities of the Indian official organs in Tibet. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs must seriously point out that certain members of the Indian Trade Agencies have repeatedly seizing various opportunities to carry on activities wholly incompatible with their status. For example, the officials of the Indian Trade Agency in Gyantse, during their visit to Pai Chu Monastery in Gyantse, distributed to the lamas donations wrapped in sheets of Indian newspapers carrying anti-Chinese statements and cartoons which slander the Chinese Government as committing aggression and dispatching spies to carry on activities in India, and sow discord in Sino-Soviet, Sino-Burmese and Sino-Nepalese relations. This was obviously an act which impairs friendship between China and India. It is regrettable that, without verifying the facts, the Indian Government should have charged the Chinese Government with failure to afford opportunities for Indian officials to move around to various places and make so-called “cultural contact” with local people; this is difficult to understand.

(3) The Chinese Government holds that whether the local people employed by the Indian organs are willing to continue their service is entirely up to themselves and they have all along enjoyed full freedom in this matter. The allegation in the Indian Government’s note that “local posts” is without factual basis.

3. The question of pilgrims:

In the past several years, the Chinese Government has consistently, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Sino-Indian Agreement and the notes exchanged, given various facilities to Indian pilgrims coming on pilgrimage to the Tibet region of China. For example: lodgings at 18 places have been cleared out by the monasteries around Kang Rimpocha (Kailas) and Mavam Tso (Manasarover) to house the pilgrims; free medical treatment has been given to them and relief to individual poor pilgrims. After the rebellion launched by the Tibetan upper strata reactionaries, the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet informed the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa that it would be advisable for Indian pilgrims not to come for pilgrimage in 1959. Last summer, when remnant bandits were still making harassment in parts of the Ari District of Tibet, the local authorities also advised Indian pilgrims not to come for pilgrimage for the time being. All this was done out of concern for the safety of the lives and properties of Indian pilgrims. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs believes that the pilgrimage by Indians to China’s Tibet region will return to normal gradually.
4. As regards the questions concerning the Indian Trade Agent in Gartok having remained for a period in Pulan Dzong on his way to Gartok in 1959 and the arrest of some foreign criminals, who were involved in the rebellion, by the military authorities of the Tibet region in the course of quelling the rebellion in Tibet, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs already made explanations in its notes dated September 11, 1959 and February 27, 1960. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will take notice of the explanations set forth in the successive notes of the Chinese Government.

5. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is much surprised at the hope expressed by the Indian Government in its note that the Chinese Government should “respect the sovereign rights of the Government of India over Minsar in Western Tibet”. Minsar is China's territory, and is a part of the Ari District of China’s Tibet region. Yet the Indian Government now hopes that the Chinese Government on Chinese territory, “respect” the “sovereign rights” of India. The Chinese Government cannot but firmly reject this.

6. As regards the question of China’s boundaries with Bhutan and Sikkim, it was already clarified in Premier Chou En-lai’s letter to His Excellency Prime Minister Nehru, dated September 8, 1959, and the note of the Chinese Foreign Ministry, dated December 26, 1959. Concerning the allegation in the Indian Government’s note that “China might take military steps to occupy” Sikkim and Bhutan, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs already reiterated the Chinese Government’s solemn and just stand in its note of December 26, 1959 and pointed out that “All allegations that China wants to encroach on Bhutan and Sikkim, just like the allegations that China wants to commit aggression against India and other southwestern neighbouring countries, are sheer nonsense”. Now the Indian Government still repeatedly resorts to these allegations, long refuted by the facts, that the Chinese Government wants to commit aggression against its neighbouring countries. The Chinese Government cannot but feel special regret at this.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 31 December 1960.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the note of the Embassy, dated November 26, 1960, has the honour to state as follows:

With regard to the insult offered by Mr. Sundaram, staff member of the Indian Embassy and private secretary to the Indian Ambassador, to a Chinese stewardess during the tour of the Diplomatic Corps, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs is surprised to note that His Excellency the Indian Ambassador, on the strength of Mr. Sundaram's disavowal, categorically denied the fact, although the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, out of goodwill, adopted a friendly attitude and well-intentionedly informed His Excellency the Indian Ambassador of the truth of the fact in the hope that he would give appropriate criticism and education to his private secretary and guarantee that no similar incidents would recur in the future. In the Embassy's note of November 26, 1960, the Indian Government went so far as to describe this incident as one "deliberately designed to insult the Indian Embassy and bring it into disrepute". The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs is astonished at this assertion by the Indian Government, which disregards the fact and falsely accuses the wronged party, and cannot but express the greatest regret at it.

The truth of the incident has been informed to His Excellency the Indian Ambassador by the Deputy Director of the Protocol Department of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs. At about 6:40 P.M. on November 21, 1960, on board the train from Shaohsing to Hangchow, Mr. Sundaram, on his way from his carriage (No. 7) to carriage No. 9, forcibly embraced a Chinese stewardess standing in front of the service room at one end of carriage No. 8. Mr. Sundaram denied being present at the scene at the time of the incident. But according to His Excellency the Indian Ambassador in his talk with the Deputy Director of the Protocol Department, Mr. Sundaram himself admitted that he was in carriage No. 7 when the train left Shaohsing at 6:00 P.M. on November 21, and that later he went to carriage No. 9. The incident occurred that very evening after the train left Shaohsing at 6:00 P.M. and at the very place at one end of carriage No. 8. Moreover, it was witnessed by a steward from the other end of the carriage (This was referred to when the Deputy Director of the Protocol Department first talked to His Excellency the Indian Ambassador). All this proves that the case is true.

The case could have been settled properly provided the Indian Embassy had respected the fact. On receiving the report from the head steward, the officials of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, having regard for the public reputation of the Indian Embassy and being unwilling to see expansion of the case, tried hard at the time to persuade and restrain the train personnel and in a friendly manner...
informed His Excellency the Indian Ambassador of the truth of the fact, in the hope that the Embassy would deal with the case properly on its own. Contrary to the expectations of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, His Excellency the Indian Ambassador showed a biased confidence in Mr. Sundaram’s one-sided denial and rejected the fact; at the same time, on the pretexts that there was no Chinese-speaking Indian present and that no investigation could be made on a running train, he rejected the reasonable demand of confronting the two parties concerned in the case so as to clarify right and wrong thus adopting an attitude of mistrust to the goodwill of the Chinese side. Under such circumstances, it was only natural that the train personnel should feel disappointed and dissatisfied with His Excellency the Indian Ambassador’s failure to settle this incident fairly; it was also fully justified that they sent five representatives to lodge face to face protest with Mr. Sundaram. At the time Mr. Sundaram requested that he would ask Mr. Mallukaran, Press Attaché of the Indian Embassy, to accompany him and the representatives of the train personnel agreed to this request. In response to the request of the representatives of the train personnel, Mr. Sundaram, also agreed to go to the scene of the incident for checking. The note of the Embassy has gone so far as to assert that Mr. Sundaram was dragged by personnel of the Protocol Department from the compartment to the scene of the incident, that the officials of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs actively assisted the train personnel in insulting Mr. Sundaram that he was practically imprisoned, that the train personnel adopted an increasingly threatening and violent attitude, etc. Needless to point out, these assertions are entirely untrue, but purely fabrications and slanders. As a matter of fact, in the course when the representatives of the train personnel lodged their protest with Mr. Sundaram, no official of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was present except the interpreter who was asked to go there to interpret. Although the representatives of the train personnel, including the stewardess subjected to insult, were extremely indignant at Mr. Sundaram’s bad attitude of flatly denying the fact and even making false counter-charges, they still maintained proper manners towards Mr. Sundaram. The assertion in the Embassy’s note that the Deputy Director of Protocol Department was in the vicinity of the scene during the whole process was also an arbitrary fabrication. The fact is that on his way to the scene of the incident on learning of the matter, he met the Indian Ambassador and his wife who were already returning from the scene.

The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs wishes to point out that the occurrence and development of the case was entirely caused by the Indian Embassy. It cannot but be deeply regretted that the Indian Embassy not only failed to make due response to the friendly attitude of the Chinese side, but, on the contrary, made charges which were totally in disregard of the facts and devoid of all justification. The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs refuses to accept the entirely groundless protest of the Indian Government and hopes that the Indian Embassy will respect the facts and adopt a cooperative attitude, and that no similar incidents will recur in the future.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Consulate General of India in Lhasa to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Lhasa, 7 January 1961

The Consulate General of India, Lhasa, presents its compliments to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet Region of China and has the honour to refer to the latter's Note dated August 24, 1960, regarding employment of local staff members and servants of Chinese nationality by the Consulate General and the Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet.

2. The Consulate General of India, Lhasa, and the Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet will inform the Foreign Bureau and the Sub Offices of Foreign Affairs concerned of their requirements of Chinese nationals to serve as members of staff or domestic servants. The Consulate General and the Trade Agencies have also noted that the Foreign Bureau and the Sub Offices of Foreign Affairs concerned would like to be informed of any decrease or increase in their personnel and they are agreeable to supply such information at periodical intervals.

3. The Consulate General of India in Lhasa avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet Region of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Embassy of India in China to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 28 January 1961

The Embassy of India in China presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of the People's Republic of China and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs dated December 31, 1960, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India are shocked to find that in their note of December 31, 1960, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs persist in defending and commending the unwarranted action of the train personnel in taking the law into their own hands and organizing a violent demonstration, subjecting a member of the Indian Embassy to threats, insults and humiliation, and in completely distorting the facts relating to the deplorable incident on the special train carrying the Diplomatic Corps on November, 22, 1960.

The true facts were stated in their entirety in the note of the Embassy of India dated November 26, 1960. When the Acting Director of Protocol made the charge against Mr. Sundaram, the Ambassador of India made full enquiries. Although his enquiries established that Mr. Sundaram, was innocent, the Ambassador nevertheless expressed willingness to hold a joint investigation in Peking. What the Ambassador did not agree to was the Acting Director's insistent proposal to hold an enquiry on a running train without the members of the Indian Embassy party having a Chinese-knowing Indian interpreter with them. Any impartial observer would agree that an investigation of a charge of such a serious nature should be carried out only under proper conditions and with full facilities being made available for both sides. The Ambassador's decision was therefore in accord with accepted procedure. To describe it as "a failure to settle the incident fairly" is a distortion of the facts. To go further and assert, as the Chinese Ministry's note does, that because the Ambassador declined an unreasonable demand, the train personnel were justified in taking the law into their own hands, is to find a pretext to defend the train personnel's reprehensible conduct.

It is a matter for deep regret that the fact of the incident, which were within the knowledge of the members of the Indian Embassy and many others, should have been distorted as they have been in the Chinese note in order to buttress up a case that does not exist. Soon after the train left Shaohsing Mr. Sundaram had, no doubt left his compartment and entered another compartment in carriage No. 9, but he had already done so by 6-15 p.m., from which time up to dinner at 7-20 p.m. and after dinner, he was continuously in carriage No. 9. Hence the relevant fact is not that he left his compartment that evening, but the time at which he left it; for long before 6-40 p.m., the time of the alleged incident, he was already in the company of several others in carriage No. 9, from where he did not move at all.
until 7-20 p.m. and then only in company with others. This fact is within the knowledge of all those in whose company he was from 6-15 p.m. onwards and proves that the charge against Mr. Sundaram is completely false.

Again the Chinese Ministry's note says that Mr. Sundaram "agreed to go to the scene of the incident for checking." This is entirely untrue. When Mr. Sundaram was confronted at the door of his compartment by a group of excited train personnel led by Mr. Shieh, the Foreign Office interpreter, he told Mr. Shieh and the demonstrators that he did not want to leave the compartment and say anything except in the presence of the Ambassador. But the demonstrators refused to allow him to get into touch with the Ambassador. It is wholly incorrect to say that Mr. Sundaram willingly accompanied the demonstrators to carriage No. 8. He was forced and elbowed out of his compartment into the corridor towards carriage No. 3 by the demonstrators. Again, Mr. Sundaram's request in regard to Mr. Kallukaran was not that the latter should accompany him but that the latter should report the matter to the Ambassador. On this point also the Chinese note misstatements the facts.

The note also gives a completely false description of the ugly demonstration. Mr. Sundaram was hemmed in by a gesticulating crowd of train personnel, who were adopting a threatening attitude, shouting abuses and insults and jabbing the air menacingly with their fingers. The demonstrators were certainly more than five in number and nearer 12 or 15. It is completely false to say that the demonstrators adopted "proper manners" towards Mr. Sundaram; on the contrary, they were excited, unruly and most hostile. This fact can be vouched for by the onlookers of the scene who were mostly junior diplomats. The attempt of the Chinese Ministry note to minimise the nature of this preplanned and hostile demonstration is utterly out of keeping with the facts.

It is extremely surprising that the Chinese Ministry's note should deny the facts in regard to the active part played by the Chinese Foreign Office officials in the whole incident. Mr. Shieh, the Foreign Office interpreter, took the demonstrators to Mr. Sundaram's compartment and insisted on his coming out, saying that the demonstrators wanted him. Again, at the scene of the demonstration Mr. Shieh was nearest to Mr. Sundaram, wholly identifying himself with the demonstrators and shouting in English the unseemly abuses and insults hurled at Mr. Sundaram. With the demonstrators was also Mr. Wang, another Foreign Office interpreter, and a few feet away was Miss Kuo, also a Foreign Office interpreter. Both Mr. Wang and Miss Kuo were loudly declaiming and broadcasting among the onlookers the false charges against Mr. Sundaram in an obviously concerted attempt to blacken his reputation. It is a matter for shocked surprise that the Chinese Foreign Office should provide interpreters for hostile demonstrators against their guests.

The statement made in the Embassy's note of November 26, 1960, that the Acting Director or Protocol and the Deputy Director were near the scene of the incident is in accord with the facts. It is surprising that the Chinese note should attempt to maintain that the
Deputy Director alone was on his way to the scene of the demonstration as if he had just learnt about it. When the Foreign Office officials must have been aware of it for quite a while, as is proved by the presence of Mr. Shieh with the demonstrators from the very beginning.

In the light of what has been stated above and in the Embassy's note of November 26, 1960, the statement made in the Chinese note that "the occurrence and development of the case was entirely caused by the Indian Embassy" is a complete perversion of the facts. The Government of India refuse to accept the wholly wrong version of the deplorable incident given in the Chinese note and the justification given therein for the demonstrators being allowed to take the law into their own hands. The Government of India strongly renew their protest against the violent demonstration of the train personnel, actively assisted by the officials of the Chinese Foreign Office, and against the deliberate insult offered to the Indian Embassy.

The Embassy of India renews to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 28 March 1961

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the notes delivered by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India on July 27 and November 9, 1960 respectively, has the honour to reply as follows:

1. The local authorities in China's Tibet, in accordance with the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement, received in the same friendly way as in previous years the Indian Trade Agent in Gartok who came to western Tibet in August 1960. They not only provided him with facilities in transport, communications, security guards, etc., but also designated officials of the Bureau of Foreign Affairs to give him help in various ways when he entered and left China and, according to the local conditions, rendered every assistance to him in his daily needs. For this, the Trade Agent himself more than once expressed his gratitude to the local Government. It is regrettable, however, that the Indian Ministry of External Affairs in its note of November 9, 1960 to the Chinese Embassy in India should have disregarded the above-mentioned facts and made utterly unreasonable charges and complaints against the Chinese side. This is what the Foreign Ministry cannot accept.

2. In its note of November 9, 1960, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs reiterated many things concerning trade between China's Tibet and India and the activities of Indian traders in the Tibet region of China which are inconsistent with the facts, and made unwarranted charges against the Chinese side. The Chinese side already made a detailed explanation of its position on this question in the note delivered by the Foreign Ministry to the Indian Embassy in China on December 10, 1960, and no repetition will be made in the present note. However, the Foreign Ministry must sternly point out that the allegation made by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs in the above-mentioned note that Chinese traders "enjoy freedom of movement and customary trade in India," is inconsistent with the fact. In recent years, many Chinese traders who went to India for normal trade and Chinese border inhabitants who carried on border trade were continuously subjected to unwarranted questioning and harassment by the Indian side. Regarding this question, the Chinese Foreign Ministry addressed a note to the Indian Embassy in China on September 11, 1959, drawing the attention of the Indian Government on it. Regrettably, however, after that such unfortunate incidents have still occurred one after another, and their nature has become more and more serious. For instance, since May 1960, there have occurred at the Indian checkpost at Chusul several cases of infringement on the human rights in which innocent Chinese traders were detained, beaten and interrogated. Therefore, the Foreign Ministry once again has to call the serious attention of the Indian
Government to this question, and ask it to adopt effective measures to prevent the recurrence of such unfortunate incidents so that Chinese traders can go back and forth between the Tibet region of China and India normally.

3. The local authorities in China's Tibet have always, in accordance with the provisions of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement and the notes exchanged, given protection and facilities to Indian pilgrims coming on pilgrimage to western Tibet in China. As for pilgrims who break the law, however, they should be dealt with according to law by the Tibet region. Regarding the medicines carried by Swami Brahmachari Atma Chaitanya, a law-breaking Indian pilgrim, even the list of the above-mentioned medicines given in the July 27, 1960 note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs itself clearly includes many poisons. The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs cannot but express its regret over the fact that the Indian Ministry of External Affairs should have repeatedly tried to defend the law-breaking pilgrims.

In conclusion, the Foreign Ministry reaffirms that the Chinese Government has consistently, in accordance with the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, acted on the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement on Trade and Intercourse Between the Tibet Region of China and India and the related notes exchanged. Despite certain temporary limitations in facilities and inconveniences faced by the Tibet region at present, the Chinese local authorities have still rendered necessary assistance to Indian officials, traders and pilgrims in their normal activities. The Foreign Ministry hopes that the Indian side will instruct its officials, traders and pilgrims in Tibet to take a co-operative attitude too in the interest of the consolidation and development of the friendship between the peoples of the two countries.

The Foreign Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Consulate General of India in Lhasa to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Lhasa, 18 April 1961

The Consulate General of India in Lhasa presents compliments to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet, Lhasa and has the honour to state that consequent upon the ban placed on the export of animals from the Ari District, many of the Indian traders visiting Ari District for trade were compelled to leave behind their animals such as yaks, sheep etc. with their trading parties in Ari District. As the animals left behind by the Indian traders are their own property, it is, therefore, requested that the authorities of the Ari District may kindly be requested to permit the Indian traders in question to take back their animal properties from Ari District during the forthcoming trading season, or in the alternative they may arrange for adequate compensation to be paid to the individual traders.

This Consulate General would feel grateful if it could be informed of the assistance forthcoming in this respect at an early date so that the traders in question could be informed in time of the procedure to be adopted.

The Consulate General of India in Lhasa takes this opportunity to renew to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet, Lhasa its assurances of highest consideration.
Note given by the Consulate General of India in Lhasa to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet, Lhasa, 21 April 1961

The Consulate General of India in Lhasa presents compliments to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet, Lhasa and has the honour to invite attention to the meeting of 15 April 1961, between Director YANG KUNG SU and Mr. P. N. KAUL, whereat Director YANG KUNG SU informed Mr. KAUL that the Indian pilgrims could visit Kailash and Mansrover during the forthcoming pilgrimage season, but suggested that entry and exit be restricted through Lipulek Pass only. As per Director YANG's suggestion, action is being taken to inform the intending pilgrims to proceed to Kailash and Mansrover and return therefrom by the Lipulek Pass. It may, however, be observed that the proposed restriction is contrary to Article IV of the Sino-Indian agreement of 1954 which lays down that pilgrims may travel by routes and passes mentioned therein; there is a possibility that some stray pilgrims may go through passes other than the Lipulek Pass.

The Consulate General of India in Lhasa takes this opportunity to renew to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs its assurances of highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of the Republic of India in China and, with reference to the Embassy's note dated January 28, 1961, has the honour to state as follows:

Regarding the question of Mr. Sundaram, private secretary to the Indian Ambassador, insulting a Chinese stewardess, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in its reply note to the Embassy of December 31, 1960, has already given a detailed account of the whole truth of the facts and the fair and reasonable attitude adopted by the Chinese side. In its note, the Embassy, still disregarding the facts, has persisted in defending the conduct of Mr. Sundaram, and repeated the previous wholly unreasonable charges and utterly groundless protest against the Chinese side. The Foreign Ministry cannot but express its extreme regret at this. It firmly rejects the unreasonable charges and groundless protest of the Indian Government.

The Foreign Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet, Lhasa, to the Consulate General of India in Lhasa, 16 May 1961

The Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet region of China has received the letter 21st April 1961 from the Consulate General of India in Lhasa, and, with regard to the question of pilgrimage by the Indian pilgrims to Ari District referred to in that letter, gives reply as follows:

The Bureau of Foreign Affairs wishes to reiterate that the local authorities of China's Tibet region have always done according to the relevant provisions of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement towards those pilgrims who come to Ari for pilgrimage. In view of the fact that at present there are still a very few scattered remnant rebel bandits in Ari District, the local authorities of China's Tibet region, in order to undertake the pilgrims' security, suggest that it would be advisable for them to come and leave through the Lipulek Pass which is also one of the passes as prescribed in the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement. This is not only in conformity with the provisions of the 1954 Sino-Indian agreement, but also is entirely out of goodwill of local authorities concerned for the pilgrims. It is unacceptable that the Indian Consulate General in Lhasa has gone to the length of charging this goodwill suggestion as contravention of the Sino-Indian agreement, the Bureau of Foreign Affairs cannot but express its regret at this unreasonable complaint.

The Bureau of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Consulate General of India in Lhasa the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Consulate General of India in Lhasa presents compliments to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet, Lhasa and has the honour to invite attention to its note of 18 April 1961 in which a request was made for permission to Indian traders visiting Ari District to recover their animal properties left behind because of the ban placed on taking of same out of Tibet Region of China.

As the traders have already started visiting the trade marts in Ari District it is, therefore, requested that an early assurance of assistance may kindly be intimated to this Consulate General.

The Consulate General of India in Lhasa takes this opportunity to renew to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet, Lhasa its assurances of highest consideration.
Note given by the Consulate General of India in Lhasa to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Lhasa, 5 June 1961

The Consulate General of India in Lhasa presents compliments to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet, Lhasa and has the honour to invite attention to its note of 12 April 1961 requesting for assistance in recovering some moveable properties of Indian lamas left behind in Tibet Region of China. The Consulate General of India shall feel grateful for early assistance in the said matter.

The Consulate General of India takes this opportunity to renew to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet, Lhasa its assurances of highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 July 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and with reference to the note of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China dated the March 28, 1961, have the honour to state as follows:

The treatment meted out to Indian traders, pilgrims and members of the Indian Missions in Tibet leaves much to be desired. Indian traders are no longer allowed to barter their goods with the inhabitants of the Tibet region of China. The export of conventional merchandise has been either stopped or controlled by the local authorities. Again facilities to remit normal profits or capital assets in the event of the closure of their trade establishments in Tibet are delayed or not given to Indian traders. In some cases these facilities are offered on a conditional basis. In one way or another the assets of Indian traders in the Tibet Region have been blocked. Loans given by Indian petty and customary traders to inhabitants of Aru region of China's Tibet are yet to be recovered.

In contrast Chinese traders in India have freedom of trade in accordance with tradition and custom. They can barter their goods and carry on their avocations as in the past. The allegation of the Government of China that traders of the Tibet region were subjected to unwarranted questioning and harassment in India is not in accordance with facts. All courtesy is shown to Tibetan traders and their entry into India is allowed in strict accordance with the provisions of the 1954 Agreement.

In regard to Indian pilgrims, the Government of China had advised that they should not go to Kailash and Mansrovar. Such of them as were able to visit the holy places were not permitted to perform the Parikrama. This year the Chinese authorities have allowed Indian pilgrims to enter and leave Tibet through Lipulekh Pass only. This is not in accordance with the 1954 Agreement.

The Indian Missions in Tibet region are facing many difficulties. They have been deprived of all social, cultural, and other normal contacts with the local inhabitants; their movements have been restricted and impediments continuously placed in the construction of buildings for Indian Trade Agencies. Thus, the provisions of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 have been circumvented.

In regard to paragraph 2 of the Chinese note relating to the alleged harassment of Chinese traders by the Indian checkpost in May, 1960 near Chusul, the Ministry of External Affairs would point out that the Government of India do not maintain any army or police checkpost at Dingroze where the Chinese nationals are said to have been detained. Further, as far as the Government of India
are aware, there is no such place called Zaha. Therefore, the allegations regarding Chinese nationals being detained and harassed at Dingroze checkpoint are without any foundation. The Government of India are unable to accept these unfounded accusations. It may be of interest to the Chinese Government that to date, no trader from the Tibet region has found it necessary to lodge any complaint of harassment with the local authorities at Chusul in India.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Indian Trade Agency in Gartok to the Ari Region Office of the Tibetan Bureau of Foreign Affairs, 21 July 1961

Indian Trade Agency, Gartok presents its compliments to the Foreign Bureau of Ari Region in Tibet of the People’s Republic of China and with reference to the discussions between the Foreign Bureau Chief and Indian Trade Agent at Gartok on 20th July, 1961 has the honour to forward herewith the plan of the portion of our Agency buildings to be constructed this year along with a list of our requirements of labour, materials etc. It will be highly appreciated if a favourable reply is given as early as possible to enable our Engineer to start construction, as the working season is very short in Western Tibet as also to enable the Trade Agent to return to Taklakot for starting tour of Trade Marts which is already getting late.

Looking forward to your co-operation, this Agency avails this opportunity to renew to the Foreign Bureau the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 August 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and have the honour to bring to the Embassy’s notice the uncooperative attitude of the local authorities of the Tibet region of China in facilitating the construction of the Indian Trade Agent building at Gartok. Paragraph 12 of the Notes exchanged between the representatives of the Government of India and China at the time of the conclusion of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 provides that the three Trade Agencies of both the parties may function throughout the year. In paragraph 4 of the said Note, the Government of the People’s Republic of China undertook to render all possible assistance for housing the Indian Trade Agency at Gartok. Accordingly, the Indian Trade Agent, Gartok, approached the authorities of Ari district of Tibet region of China for suitable accommodation to house the Trade Agency. In October, 1954, he was told that they would not be able to provide a house for the Trade Agency but would lease land for the purpose. In spite of the fact that this offer was accepted, it took more than three years to finalise the terms of the lease-deed for the land on which the building of the Indian Trade Agency, Gartok was to be constructed. The final draft of the lease-deed was handed over by the Indian Consul-General, Lhasa to the Chinese Foreign Bureau in January 1958, but no acceptance was received from the Foreign Bureau till October, 1958, when the working season at Gartok was over. Owing to the demand of the local authorities that the Trade Agent should enter via Lipulekh Pass though he had by then actually reached the Niti Pass caused further delay in the conclusion of the lease-deed which was actually signed in October, 1959, and thus making any construction impossible during that year.

2. During 1960, the Trade Agent, Gartok party which included Engineering staff was stopped by the local authorities while they were on their way to Western Tibet. The Indian Consul-General, Lhasa was informed on the 29th June that the Trade Agent, Gartok and his party should not enter Tibet till the 15-20th July. As the season would have been far too advanced for any constructions, when the party would have reached Gartok, the Engineering Staff was withdrawn. Early in 1961, the Consul-General, Lhasa, again broached the subject with the Foreign Bureau and he was told that the local authorities would assist in the construction of mud huts with sun-dried mud bricks. On 23rd May, 1961, a Memorandum was handed over to the Embassy in which it was stated that an Indian officer with technical experience would be deputed to Gartok in order to see that the construction is in accordance with our requirements. In the memorandum, the hope was expressed that the construction would be completed during this year. Accordingly, a Technical Officer accompanied the Trade Agent to Western Tibet. They reached Taklakot on the 2nd July, 1961. The Trade Agent requested the Foreign Bureau representative to arrange for transport for the Technical Officer to proceed to
Gartok for construction work as soon as possible. He was informed, however, that the Foreign Bureau representative had no knowledge about the construction programme. The Trade Agent was also asked to consult the local authorities at Gartok about the construction. Thereupon, the Trade Agent and the Technical Officer left Taklakot for Gartok. On arrival there, the Trade Agent approached the Foreign Bureau on 20th July, 1961, for facilities in regard to construction of the Agency building. The Chief of the local Foreign Bureau told him that he should first supply a blue-print of the building plans and then he would be able to let him know the concrete assistance which could be extended. The plan and the list of requirements were supplied to the Foreign Bureau immediately, but there was no response.

3. On July 26, 1961, the Chief of the Foreign Bureau informed the Trade Agent that he had not till then received any instructions in the matter and that he did not know how long these would take to reach. Further, on August 13, 1961, the Technical Officer was informed that material, tools and plant, including moulds for making bricks and masons were not available and that the position regarding unskilled labour was under consideration.

4. In the meanwhile, the Foreign Bureau also demanded Rs. 7,112 as the price for the old stock of rubble and 11,685 mud bricks which have been lying on the site since 1956. According to the information available with the Government of India 37,800 bricks and some quantities of earth and gravel were collected by the Garpons on the site during 1956. They had demanded a sum of Rs. 11,029 for all this material. Since the Indian Trade Agent had, at no time, placed a firm order with the Garpons for this material, the Government of India naturally could not accept the responsibility for the payment. Thereupon, the local authorities removed a major portion of this material for their own use. In the circumstances, the demand for Rs. 7,112 for 11,000 bricks, half of them unserviceable, and some quantities of gravel and earth is very unreasonable, especially as the local authorities had themselves taken 26,115 bricks for Rs. 3,917 only. However, in spite of the fact that the price demanded is exorbitant, the Trade Agent has offered to pay in the hope that construction will begin immediately. The trade Agent has been informed now that instructions are being sought from the higher authorities.

5. The above facts will prove beyond any doubt that the local authorities of Ari region, by adopting dilatory tactics, are making impossible the construction of the Trade Agency building and thus preventing the Trade Agency from functioning in Gartok throughout the year. In contrast, the three Chinese Trade Agencies in India function all the year round. Consequently, the principle of reciprocity accepted in Article I of the 1954 Agreement has not been honoured fully. Even at this late stage, the Government of India urge the Government of China to instruct the local authorities concerned to render all possible assistance in the construction of a Trade Agency building during the current working season.

6. The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Indian traders who went to Western Tibet sometimes stored their unsold goods with the Bhutanese Officer at Dharchin on the conclusion of the trading season. They did so in 1959. However, in October 1959, the Bhutanese Officer, Sonam Rajye left for India leaving his house in the charge of a watchman, and in his absence the Chinese local authorities sealed the house. When the Indian traders visited Western Tibet in 1960 and wanted to take delivery of the goods which they had left with the Bhutanese Officer, the Chinese local authorities refused to deliver the goods to them and insisted that the Bhutanese Officer should come there personally to hand over the goods. Our Trade Agent enquired whether the production of a letter of authority from the Bhutanese Officer would be acceptable but this apparently did not find favour with the local authorities.

On this account the Indian traders concerned have been put to great hardship. According to our information, there are at least 23 Indian traders whose goods are lying sealed in that house and these goods are valued at about fifty thousand rupees.

The Government of India have received a number of representations from these traders requesting their intercession in the return of these goods. The traders have pointed out that these goods deposited by them with the Bhutanese Officer in 1959 were not returned to them by the watchman under instructions of the Chinese authorities.

Our Trade Agent at Gartok has been authorised by these traders to receive the goods on their behalf and the Bhutanese Officer has also signified his approval to the handing over of these goods to the traders concerned through the Trade Agent.

We have already drawn the attention of the Chinese Government to this problem in the note sent to the Chinese Embassy on the 9th November, 1960, but the note remains unanswered. Our Trade Agent, Gartok again tried to discuss this question with the Chief of the Local Foreign Bureau on the 20th July, 1961 but the Chief evaded the question on the ground that it was beyond his competence.

The Embassy would perhaps appreciate that the sufferers in this case are poor Indian traders who had in good faith left their unsold merchandise in the Bhutanese Officer’s house. The Bhutanese Officer himself is willing to return these goods to their Indian owners. If there is any particular procedure which the Chinese authorities would wish to follow in this matter, this may be intimated to us soon particularly as further delay may mean deterioration of the goods. Government of India on their part are willing to take over the goods and arrange for their return to their owners, and have authorised their Trade Agent in this behalf. Early facilities in this regard by the Chinese authorities would be greatly appreciated.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 September 1961

It is with regret that the Government of India are bringing the following facts of life at Gyantse to the notice of the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China:—

(i) On about the 28th July, 1961 two seasonal gardeners and a watchman were asked by the Area Leaders at Gyantse to stop working for the Indian Trade Agency. The three workers accordingly stopped working for the Agency from 1st August 1961.

(ii) Two local boys are working as domestic servants for some officials of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse. They are under pressure through their parents to give up working for Indian officials. If their help is withdrawn from the Indian officials, the latter will have to do their own cooking and washing. As it is these officials live in Gyantse separated from their families who are unable to join them in Gyantse for want of accommodation.

(iii) Shri N. R. Sharma, a member of the engineering staff at Gyantse, took ill on 27th July, 1961, and his condition sharply deteriorated on the afternoon of 28th July. As the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse is not entitled to approach the local doctor direct and has to do so through the local Foreign Bureau, an official of the Agency was urgently despatched to move the Foreign Bureau for a doctor. However, the English Interpreter of the Foreign Bureau through whom alone an approach can be made to the Foreign Bureau raised the issue that in order to see him, an official of the Indian Trade Agency must first write and ask for an appointment. As the matter was urgent and could not wait for the correct performance of protocol requirements, the official of the Indian Trade Agency pressed the English Interpreter for help in obtaining the services of a doctor. Thus a precious hour was lost before a doctor could be obtained. The patient died. Upon his death the Indian Trade Agency asked for a death certificate which was refused on the ground that the local regulations did not permit the issue of a death certificate. The deceased was cremated on 29th July. His family was informed, and they were anxious to have his ashes for the performance of death rites which are held on the 13th day after death. In order to have the ashes sent in time for the death rites, arrangements were made to despatch an official of the Indian Trade Agency with the ashes to India. It was in these circumstances that a letter was addressed by the Trade Agency to the Foreign Bureau on 3rd August 1961.
asking for travel permit and re-entry visa for Shri Bharadwaj who was due to leave for India on 5th August 1961 with the ashes. Till 0700 hours on 5th August nothing was heard from the Foreign Bureau. An urgent letter was therefor sent to the Foreign Bureau as a reminder. The person who took the letter to the Foreign Bureau was asked to go back because the Foreign Bureau was very busy. On his return at about 1030 hours, on 5th August another letter was sent to the Foreign Bureau explaining the urgency of the request. The Foreign Bureau replied later that the matter was being reported and a further reply would be sent on 7th August. On 7th August the Foreign Bureau responded by inquiring whether Shri Bharadwaj was travelling alone or was being accompanied. Not until the evening of 7th August did the Foreign Bureau find it convenient to issue the necessary travel permit to Shri Bharadwaj, and the latter could therefore leave Gyantse only on 8th August. The result was that the ashes did not reach Delhi in time for the death rites on the 13th day after the death.

The attention of the Embassy is drawn to the Agreement between India and China on Trade and Intercourse between Tibet Region of China and India (1954), wherein the two Governments have agreed that “The Trade Agencies of both Parties shall be accorded the same status and same treatment”.

Item (7) of the Notes exchanged between the two Governments on April 29, 1954 contains the provision “The Trade Agents and traders of both countries may hire employees in the locality”.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and with reference to the Note of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China dated the 12th December, 1960, have the honour to state as follows:—

Accommodation

2. A few facts are mentioned below in regard to the construction of buildings for the Indian Trade Agencies at Gyantse and Gartok. These facts speak for themselves and are sufficient to belie the Chinese Government’s contention that they did their best to render ‘energetic’ assistance, in accordance with the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement, to the Indian Missions in Tibet.

(a) Indian Trade Agency, Gartok

3. In its Note No. 7(16)/NEF/56-111, dated 26th August 1961 the Government of India has already drawn attention to the unhelpful and uncooperative attitude of the local authorities in Ari District of Tibet in providing suitable accommodation to the Indian Trade Agency, Gartok. Though negotiations in the matter were started as early as October, 1954, the Agency has still no building of its own. Nor has it been given any facility to rent accommodation in order to function at Gartok permanently as provided for in paragraph 12 of the Notes exchanged between the representatives of the Governments of India and China on the 29th April, 1954.

4. The Indian draft of the lease for land, on which the Indian Trade Agency is to be constructed was based on mutually agreed principles and was handed over by the Indian Consulate-General to the Foreign Bureau at Lhasa in January 1958 but final acceptance was not communicated by the Foreign Bureau till October 1958 making any construction impossible in that year. The construction was further rendered impossible during 1959 and 1960 as the Chinese local authorities first delayed the entry of the Trade Agent in Western Tibet and then declined to give him the necessary facilities to proceed with the construction. Government of India even accepted the Lhasa Foreign Bureau’s suggestion that the construction programme of the Indian Trade Agency, Gartok, be phased in parts. This year again an Indian Engineer was attached to the Trade Agent’s party after full discussion with the Foreign Bureau, Lhasa and with knowledge of the Chinese Embassy here. At every stage Government of India fell in line with the wishes of the local authorities in Tibet but to no avail. The year 1961 has gone by without any progress being made which is entirely due to the unreasonable and obstructive attitude to the local authorities.

5. The Chinese note under reply has referred to their promise of assistance in building temporary local type houses. In fact when
the Indian Consulate-General at Lhasa broached the matter with the Foreign Bureau in May this year, the latter stated that even these temporary houses would have to be no more than mud huts because stones could not be made available. The offer to send stone masons from India was turned down. On 16th May, 1961, the Foreign Bureau offered to supply only sun-dried bricks. This was accepted along with the broad assurance that labour and other materials required for this primitive type of construction would be forthcoming. In the event when our Trade Agent reached Gartok on the 18th of July and approached the Foreign Bureau for the promised assistance, he was told that he must first submit a blue print of the building plans before the nature of any concrete assistance to be provided could be made known to him. The plans were supplied on the same day but there was no response. On the 26th July, 1961, the Foreign Bureau, instead of giving assistance, put forward another condition, namely, that the Trade Agent should first arrange to pay Rs. 7,112 on account of an old stock of rubble and mud bricks lying on the site since 1956. Unless this payment was made, the Foreign Bureau warned, no assistance would be provided nor would construction of the huts be allowed to commence. The Trade Agent sought in vain to explain that the local Foreign Bureau had raised a new issue which had no relation to the assistance they were committed to provide for the construction work. The fact is that this old stock of rubble and brick was brought to the site by the then local Garpons without any order having been placed with them. The Chinese had themselves removed two-thirds of the total stock of bricks for Rs. 3,917 approximately leaving a third of mostly unserviceable bricks for compulsory sale to the Indian Trade Agency at a cost of Rs. 7,112. Rather than give the Chinese local authorities an excuse to justify their obstructive and delaying tactics the Indian Trade Agent offered immediate payment of the amount demanded by the Foreign Bureau. At this stage the Chinese authorities insisted that payment should be made at Gartok. This was an impracticable proposition as the Trade Agent was on tour of the Trade marts, and was in no position to return to Gartok earlier than the end of September 1961. Although the payment for bricks was made early in October, there was no move on the part of the Foreign Bureau to extend assistance in the way of labour, material etc. for the start of construction. At the end of the trading season the Trade Agent left Gartok for Takalakot en route to India without being able to construct a single ‘mud’ hut.

6. Such are the facts. Had there been ‘energetic’ assistance from the Chinese local authorities as asserted in the Chinese note, there should have been a few mud-huts to show for it. Instead, nothing has been achieved except frustration. Government of India’s patient and laborious efforts to put up some kind of shelter for their Trade Agency at Gartok have been ‘energetically’ and successfully defeated. It is apparent that the Chinese authorities were determined to make it impossible for the Government of India to have buildings of their own at Gartok during the currency of the 1954 Agreement.

(b) Gyantse

7. At Gyantse it was the same story. Earlier notes state the position reached in the latter half of 1960 regarding the protracted negotiations for lease of land to the Trade Agency at Gyantse.
8. In November 1960 the Government of India had agreed to the new draft lease as proposed by the Chinese authorities. All that remained to be done was demarcation of the physical boundaries of the land for incorporation in the draft lease. The Chinese had earlier suggested that the Indian side should surrender some land along the river bank in exchange for land to the north and north-east of the Indian Trade Agency's existing site. The Government of India agreed to this.

9. On 22nd November 1960, the Consulate-General, Lhasa, was informed that instructions were being issued to Foreign Bureau, Gyantse to finalise the boundaries and sign the lease. However, on 9th December when the Indian Trade Agent approached the Foreign Bureau, Gyantse, he was told that the matter was still under examination. On January 5th, 1961, when approached again, the local Foreign Bureau informed the Indian Trade Agent that they could not finalise the boundaries until the lease for the buildings rented by the Trade Agent at Gyantse was signed. The Trade Agent was taken by surprise. The two matters were wholly unrelated. Foreign Bureau, Gyantse, however, insisted on compliance with this condition. Judging from subsequent delays, this was a further deliberate move to delay finalisation of the lease.

10. Urged on by the Indian Trade Agent, the local Foreign Bureau at last indicated the proposed boundaries to him in March, 1961, but to his great surprise the boundaries indicated differed from those agreed to earlier by him and the Foreign Bureau. Going back on the earlier understanding the Chinese side had now offered, instead of areas to the North and North-East of the site, areas to the South-East which were near the river bank and vulnerable to flood and erosion. The Foreign Bureau simultaneously raised another demand viz. removal of protective works which the Agency had per force to construct at considerable cost in order to prevent the continual erosion of the Agency lands—a danger greatly enhanced by the 'protective works' which the Chinese had themselves undertaken at another point on the river.

11. Thus, despite patient effort and a keen desire to accommodate the Chinese on every point, the Trade Agent found it impossible to sign the lease deed, much less to begin any construction work till the end of this year.

12. The Agency continues to be housed in rented accommodation insufficient for its needs. Repeated requests for additional rented accommodation have gone unheeded. Even the lease deed for the rented buildings in Gyantse could not be finalised because of diverse obstacles put up by the local Foreign Bureau, which sought inter alia to impose a condition that the Lessee should be responsible for damage to trees even from natural causes.

13. The facts cited above in regard to Gyantse and Gartok leave no room for doubt that far from giving "energetic" assistance to the Trade Agencies in the matter of construction the Chinese side has used devious means to cause delays and make it impossible for the Government of India to have buildings of their own either at Gyantse
or at Gartok. The result is that only two of three Agencies stipulated for are able to function through the year in Tibet. Chinese Missions in India, by comparison, are very comfortably accommodated.

14. The Government of India are unable to accept any suggestion from the Chinese side that its officers in Tibet have shown an uncooperative attitude or indulged in improper activities. This is manifestly absurd because no one much less a foreigner can afford to be uncooperative or act improperly on Chinese territory where they must live under rigid controls. It is no surprise therefore that while the Chinese note speaks of improper activities and uncooperative attitude of Indian officials, no example is cited. The Government of India knows only too well how under the most trying conditions its officers have endeavoured to establish rapport with the Chinese authorities in Tibet. If they have failed the blame lies on the other side. The local authorities in Tibet have for long shown a studied discourtesy in their dealings with the Indian Agencies. Appointments, on request, are unduly delayed. Local regulations are not communicated to the Missions even when requests for them are made. For instance in October 1961, Indian Trade Agency asked for a copy of the regulations governing trade at Yatung. The Foreign Bureau declined to meet this request on the ground that the traders should themselves have asked for it. Apart from the discourtesy this attitude puts the Trade Agency in an invidious position since it is not in a position to comply or advise compliance with regulations which are not made known to it.

15. Indian Missions in Tibet have continued to suffer from restrictions placed on their movements and contacts. They are restricted to the municipal limits of the station beyond which they cannot go without a permit from the local Foreign Bureau. Permits are also necessary if a car of one Mission has to go to another. They are stopped for meeting local visitors, or inviting local political or religious personalities except through the Foreign Bureau.

16. The Chinese side has often argued that there are no restrictions on the Indian Missions in Tibet. While all restrictions may not have been reduced to writing, they not only do exist but are rigidly enforced. These restrictions are part of the facts of life for India's Missions in Tibet. The Chinese side should know better the many direct and indirect restrictions imposed on Indian Missions in order to circumscribe their field of activity and render them completely immobile and helpless. Local people, for instance, are under pressure not to have any contacts with the Indian Missions. There is no written restriction in this regard but it is no less effective for that matter. In every way Indian Missions in Tibet are paralysed, rendered ineffective, immobilised and insulated from the life of the people.

17. Transport requirements of the Indian Missions are held up as a matter of deliberate policy. Reminders bring no response. In consequence rations and essential stores meant for staff members of the Indian Consulate General, Lhasa and the Trade Agency, Gyantse are held up at Yatung for long periods.

18. Furthermore, Indian Missions do not even have the option of choosing their local employees either for official or domestic work.
The Chinese note dated the 24th August 1960 has decreed that recruitment of local people shall be through the Foreign Bureau only. At the same time the local employees are under pressure not to serve Indian Missions or Indian personnel.

19. The Note para. 2(ii) has revived an old charge against the Indian Trade Agent, Gyantse. Some traditional gifts were sent to the monastery in question wrapped in old news paper sheets. Surely it is not being seriously suggested by the Chinese side that the Trade Agent used this silly means to carry out so-called anti-Chinese propaganda contained in these crumpled up newspaper sheets. The next thing the Chinese side might suggest is that the Trade Agent used this underhand means to teach these Tibetan monks a foreign language viz English for it would be conceded that not one of the monks of this monastery had any knowledge of this language with which these sheets were printed. The Government of India cannot but treat this charge with the levity it deserves.

20. The traditional pilgrimage from India to Kailash and Mansarovar has continued to suffer from lack of rest-house, medical and other facilities. Nor is any protection given to the pilgrims. Though paragraph 10 of the Notes exchanged between the representatives of the two Governments in 1954 provides that the Government of China will, as far as possible, construct rest houses for the use of pilgrims along the route from Taklakot to Kailash and Mansarovar, little has been done in the past seven years. One rest-house only was constructed at Rakshastal, and even this is reported to be sodden and sloppy, and in a state of collapse. The 18 other places said to have been abandoned by the monasteries and reserved for the use of Indian pilgrims have little to recommend themselves for the tiny rooms in them are said to be full of grime and dirt, and there is no arrangement for cooking. Government of India's offer to supply timber for the construction of separate rest-houses for the pilgrims has not, of course, been accepted. Medical aid is not easily had and can be obtained only with the permission of the military authorities at Taklakot.

21. Minsar as the Chinese Government must be aware is a part of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, and revenue was paid by that village to the State of Jammu and Kashmir until quite recently. There is a wealth of evidence in census reports and revenue records to prove Minsar's connection with Kashmir, and the Tibetan Government has always respected this fact. The Chinese Government's illegal occupation of Minsar and rejection of Government of India's sovereign rights over it constitute an entirely unjustifiable act of aggression. In this connection the attention of the Chinese Government is drawn to the Officials' Report on the Boundary Question where overwhelming evidence to prove that Minsar is a part of Jammu and Kashmir is marshalled.

22. Finally, the Government of India welcomes the assurance that its apprehensions regarding the aggressive intentions of China towards Bhutan and Sikkim which are bound to India by special treaty relations, are "sheer nonsense".

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 November 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Note of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, dated 10th December, 1960 have the honour to state that, as explained earlier in the Ministry's Note of 10th May 1961, Indian traders, customary as well as petty, have continued to suffer from various restrictions and disabilities in Tibet.

2. The Government of India has no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of China but in regard to the measures taken by the Chinese authorities to devalue and demonetise Tibetan currency which adversely affected the interests of Indian traders in Tibet, there is a legitimate issue for discussion between the two Governments under the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 on Trade and Inter-course between Tibet Region of China and India. Necessary protection was not afforded by the Chinese to the property and financial interests of Indian traders whose accumulation of Tibetan currency from sales of Indian merchandise was considerably reduced by these monetary manipulations which the Chinese Note describes innocuously as "currency reform".

3. Regarding trade payments Art. VII of the Trade Agreement between the Republic of India and the People's Republic of China signed on 14th October 1954, as amended by the exchange of letters of May 1957, provides as follows:—

Para 1—All commercial and non-commercial payments between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India may be effected in Indian rupees.

Para 4—Payments for border trade between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India will be settled according to the customary practice.

4. The Chinese Note argues that the above provisions do not apply to trade in Tibet. Apart from the specific mention of "border trade between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India" in the paragraph cited above, the letters exchanged between the Governments of India and China on 14th October 1954 which form part of the Trade Agreement of 1954 state inter alia that "both Governments desire to maintain and develop the existing customary trade between India and the Tibet Region of People's Republic of China". There is no doubt at all that the provisions of the Trade Agreement of 1954 were meant to apply to the Tibet region to give formal sanction to the existing customary practice in that region. Nevertheless, in disregard of the Agreement, new restrictive measures in the matter of trade payments were issued by the Chinese Government during the currency of the Agreement.

5. It has been customary for Indian border traders to barter goods direct with Tibetans without any official interference and to bring
pack Tibetan goods freely to India. Cash proceeds if any, of the trade was customarily brought back in bullion, silver dollars, coins and/or Indian currency. Thus Indian traders were able to return to India with their capital assets as well as normal profits whenever they wished to do so. At no time during the long course of this traditional border trade were Indian traders obliged to give an undertaking to bring back goods of equal value in return for facilities for the transfer of their assets. Under the new restrictive and arbitrary measures introduced in Tibet in violation of the International engagements cited above, Indian traders are unable to repatriate their profits and assets from Tibet. Remittance facilities are not being granted and applications in this behalf are being held up, even when an Indian firm is winding up its business in Tibet. To take a recent instance. M/s Tibet Motor & Cycle Co., an Indian firm at Yatung which served notice of its intention to close, has been given a bank draft for Yuans 5,220 only thereby compelling the firm to leave the balance of its assets amounting to Yuans 43,957.26 on deposit with a local bank. One result of the restrictive trade and fiscal policy of the Chinese authorities in Tibet has been the sharp decline in the number of Indian shops at Yatung. Many were forced to withdraw because of the loss incurred as a result of the sudden devaluation of Tibet currency and the lack of facilities to repatriate trade assets. The Chinese authorities in Tibet have also interfered in the direct barter deals of petty border traders and have imposed various restrictions on normal exports of the conventional produce of Tibet to India. In other ways, too, the Chinese authorities have interfered with the customary practices of Indo-Tibetan trade. Indian border traders customarily left their unsold merchandise and animals at the end of the trading season with their Tibetan friends and/or officials. Since 1959 the Chinese authorities asked Indian traders to take back their unsold merchandise with them to India. When the Chinese authorities were apprised of transport and other difficulties they allowed the Indian traders to keep their merchandise with local Tibetans but without any guarantee of safety. Some Indian traders kept their goods in the house of the Bhutanese officer at Tharchin. This house was later sealed by the local authorities and our traders were refused permission to reclaim their goods in the trading seasons of 1960 and 1961. Meantime the goods deteriorated but there was no redress. Although this was a legitimate trade matter, the Foreign Bureau refused to discuss it with India’s Trade Agent. An approach had to be made by the Government of India to the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi in the matter. At the close of the 1961 trading season when the passes were about to be snow-bound, the Chinese Embassy informed the Ministry, on 21st October 1961, that Indian traders could take back their goods left at Tharchin. This belated offer was of no practical help to the Indian traders concerned.

6. As the Chinese Government are no doubt aware border traders have been going across the Himalayan passes from time immemorial carrying their merchandise on the back of sheep and goats to the trade marts in Western Tibet or in search of Tibetan Dokpas (peasants) with whom they bartered goods. In this traditional trade and intercourse there has been a real problem regarding the safe
storage of merchandise. To meet this necessary requirement of the trade, a provision was made in para 13 of the Notes Exchanged between the Governments of India and China on 29th April 1954 which reads:

“The traders of each country may rent buildings and godowns in accordance with local regulations in places under the jurisdiction of the other Party”.

No such facility was in fact provided to the Indian traders by the Chinese authorities in Tibet. Again, as has been pointed out earlier, it is customary for Indian traders to use sheep and goats as pack animals to carry merchandise to Western Tibet, and to leave these animals with their Tibetan friends at the end of the trading season. The ban imposed on the return of these animals to India is tantamount to confiscation of animals owned by Indian traders. This ban is ultimately bound to affect the trade. At any rate, if the Indian owners cannot bring back their animals, they should be allowed to sell them, or in the event of outright confiscation, they should be given fair compensation.

7. Furthermore, there are large amounts of unsettled trade claims and credits of Indian traders in Tibet. Facilities for the recovery of these loans have not been given by the Chinese local authorities. Some Tibetan debtors have moved away to Lhasa or Shigatse but Indian traders are not allowed to go to these places to contact their debtors. Even where Tibetan debtors are present in the locality, the Chinese authorities do not allow Indian traders to contact them. Some of these debtors are reported to be under Chinese detention but no access to them is permitted. Attention of the Government of China was drawn to this important question in the Government of India Note of 17th May 1960 but there has been no promise of relief.

8. From time to time the Chinese Government has asked the Government of India to ‘advise Indian traders to respect the regulations of the local authorities of China’s Tibet region’. There is something mysterious about these local regulations which are not published and communicated to the Indian Trade Missions in Tibet even when requests are made for them. In October 1961, the Indian Trade Agent, Yatung asked for a copy of the regulations governing trade at Yatung. The local Foreign Bureau declined to meet his request. Apart from the discourtesy this negative attitude puts the Trade Agency in an invidious position since it is not in a position to comply or advise compliance with regulations which are not made known to it. In fact there has been a bumper crop of new regulations since 1959. Again in the application of these regulations there has been wide or confusing variations. Whenever unfair and arbitrary action was taken by the local authorities against Indian traders and pilgrims, India’s Trade Agents made representations to the Foreign Bureaus. But the latter did not accept the complaints of India’s Trade Agents in these matters describing them as ‘consular business’.

9. It has been alleged that Indian traders sometimes failed to deliver goods within the period stipulated in the contracts, and sometimes they failed to supply goods according to specifications. This is
not surprising as some of these traders were compelled to enter into contracts which they were not in a position to fulfil. The Government of India are informed that Indian traders are being forced to sign contracts in return for remittance facilities. It is obvious that this practice violates the spirit of the April 1954 Agreement.

10. Regarding the reference to export control orders made in the Chinese Note, these are not unilateral but rather the result of the arbitrary stoppage of exports of conventional Tibetan produce like borax and animals, and restrictive exports of wool and Pashmina to India.

11. In every way, therefore, the Chinese authorities have sought to strangle the traditional trade and intercourse between India and Tibet and to undermine the foundations of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954. Violating the stipulations of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 they have only recently refused permission to 15 Indian traders to trade at Yatung, which is a mart recognised by Article II of the Agreement. These traders had entered Tibet with valid traders certificates issued by competent Indian authorities in terms of Art. V(i) of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954. Further, an Indian firm, M/s. Indarchand Nathmall, Yatung, which had been trading at Yatung or many years was stopped from carrying on its normal business after it had withdrawn its application for the closure of the establishment. All this can hardly be said to be in consonance with the principles enunciated in the 1954 Agreement.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Statement made by the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of China to the Indian Ambassador, 21 October 1960

"We have received reports from our Embassy in India to the effect that, in the morning of September 26 this year, the Police Commissioner in Kalimpong called on Mr. MA CHU-TSAI an old Chinese national and on pretext of wanting him for inquiry at the Police Office took him there under custody. Then MA was arrested under guard to the court and imprisoned on the pretext that he was allegedly involved in the murder of an old Lama. On September 27 the Police Officer further searched MA's house and took away his tonic medicine and other belongings.

For this case Mr. HSU JEN our Deputy Trade Agent in Kalimpong several times made representation with the local District Head and yet the Indian local authorities have hitherto failed to provide any reason and evidence warranting the arrest of Mr. MA. Mr. MA has been residing in Kalimpong for 40 years; he has always abided by the laws and is on good terms with the Chinese nationals both Han and Tibetans and enjoys a good reputation there. Mr. MA is 71 years of age and weak and sickly. After being imprisoned without warrants no bail is allowed nor visit or delivery of food and medicine by his family. This is totally against the humanitarian spirit.

As for the allegation that Mr. MA is involved in the murder of an old Lama this is a sheer fabrication. In fact Mr. MA has never been acquainted nor had any contact with the murderer. There is obviously something else behind the scenes when an old man who has always abided by the laws should have been charged with involvement in a murder case. The local authorities of Kalimpong have repeatedly refused to see our Deputy Trade Agent and even denied him access to Mr. MA in accordance with provisions relating to the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement. All these acts are obviously not in the interest of the friendly relations between China and India.

It is also necessary to recall that since June this year the Indian local authorities in Calcutta and Kalimpong have successively given orders without any justification for Mr. CHIANG WEN-KUEI, Manager of the Bank of China, Calcutta, and other responsible persons in charge of cultural and welfare undertakings of the Chinese nationals in the localities totalling over 30, to leave India within a limited period of time. Our Embassy in India on September the 2nd and again on October the 17th made representations with the Ministry of External Affairs of your country explaining that these persons have been lawfully living in India for a long time and they all have proper occupations, have always abided by local laws and regulations, actively upheld Sino-Indian friendship and living in amity with the local people and expressing the hope that the Government of India would permit them to continue their stay. However this question has up to now failed to be settled reasonably; on the contrary an ever increasing number of Chinese nationals have been ordered to
leave India within a set time limit. Moreover in its reply dated October 17 the Ministry of External Affairs of your country even asserted that these Chinese nationals told to leave India are “persons who for over a period of time have been reported to be associating and participating in activities which are prejudicial to Indian national interests”. We cannot agree at all to this reply. It must be pointed out that it is the consistent policy pursued by our Government to instruct the Chinese nationals to live in amity with the local people to abide by laws and regulations of the country they reside in and not to participate in the political activities of the locality. It is inconceivable that the charge of “associating and participating in activities which are prejudicial to Indian national interests” should be made without any grounds against these law abiding Chinese nationals. It is indeed difficult to understand why Indian local authorities should have given such unreasonable treatment to the nationals of a friendly country in such a great hurry.

The above mentioned events have already impaired the proper rights and interests as well as the rights of lawful residents of the Chinese nationals whose life and human rights are endangered. The continuous occurrence of these events in India have aroused the extreme uneasiness of the broad masses of Chinese nationals and our Government express serious concern over this situation. Proceeding from its desire to safeguard the traditional friendly relations between the Chinese and Indian people and to truly ensure the life and property of the Chinese nationals the Government of your country is requested immediately to adopt effective measures to release the innocent and falsely accused Mr. MA CHU-TSAI to give the broad masses of Chinese nationals who abide by the laws including those who were informed of leaving India within a set time-limit the rights of lawful residents to stop the various unreasonable measures adopted by the local authorities to order Chinese nationals to leave India and to prevent disruptive activities of Tibetan rebels and elements of the Generalissimo CHIANG KAI SHEK clique.

I also hope that your Excellency Mr. Ambassador will convey to your Government the serious concern and requests of our Government.”

Vice Minister spoke in particular about MA CHU-TSAI stressing humanitarian aspect. He also mentioned arrest on October 5 of one WANG CHIN-SHAN a grocer in Kalimpong who was supplying Chinese Trade Agency.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the
Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 8 November 1960

The Embassy also finds it necessary to take up with the Ministry of External Affairs of India the case of a Chinese national in Kalimpong Mr. Ma Chu-tsai who has been falsely implicated in a crime and detained. It is quite a long time since he was detained unwarrantedly. The Embassy of China in India and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of People's Republic of China have taken up this case with the Ministry of External Affairs of India and the Embassy of India in China respectively, but the Indian side has not yet given any reply in regard to the case. The Embassy of China hereby makes representation to the Ministry of External Affairs of India once again; Mr. Ma Chu-tsai's health is now indeed extremely poor; the local authorities of India have neither given any account for his unwarranted detention, nor have they released him speedily, and what is more, he is not even allowed to be released and return home on bail. It is indeed surprising that such inhumane measures should have been imposed upon a Chinese national who is an innocent victim and also an old man of an advanced age of 71 years and in extremely poor health. The Embassy demands that the Government of India immediately instruct the local authorities to speedily release Mr. Ma Chu-tsai or to at once allow him to be released and return home on bail.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 8 November 1960

On October 21, 1960, His Excellency Mr. Ken Piao, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China took up with the Embassy of India in China the matter of Chinese nationals being ordered to leave India within a specified period. Pending a reply from the Indian Government, the Calcutta local authorities of India, however, successively issued orders at the end of October to further unwarrantedly restrict the movements of Mr. Chiang Wen-Kuei, Manager of the Bank of China, and other Chinese nationals, demanding them to report themselves at the Foreigners' Registration Office three times a week and not allowing them to change their residence unless they are given permission to do so, and went so far as to openly detain Chinese nationals who have always been law-abiding. This insolent action constitutes a grave infringement on their personal freedom, and seriously affects their livelihood, thus making it quite impossible for Mr. Chiang Wen-kuei, Manager of the Bank of China, and other law-abiding Chinese nationals to engage in their proper occupations and consequently placing them in a very difficult position. This is an unfriendly action. Out of a desire for maintaining the friendship between the peoples of China and India, the Embassy of China in India demands that the Government of India speedily instruct the authorities concerned to remove various unwarranted measures against Mr. Chiang Wen-kuei, Manager of the Bank of China, and other Chinese nationals who have suffered wrong, restore their freedom and reinstate them the right to continue their lawful stay in India.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 6 December 1960

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of the Republic of India, and has the honour to state as follows:

On the morning of November 24, 1960, the Indian authorities concerned suddenly dispatched policemen to detain Mr. Chiang Wen-kuei, Manager of the Bank of China, Calcutta. It is surprising that the Indian authorities should have taken such an unruly action as violates human rights in relation to the bank manager of a friendly country.

Since he received in July 1960 a notice to leave India within a specified period, Mr. Chiang has time and again made it clear to the authorities concerned that he has taken charge of his duties at the Bank of China for many years, has always been law-abiding and devoted to his duties, has all along valued highly Sino-Indian friendship, has made positive contributions to promoting trade between China and India and maintained good co-operation with the authorities concerned. Actuated by the urgent need of the business, he has applied for continuing his stay. The Chinese Embassy and the Chinese Consulate-General at Calcutta have made repeated representations with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and the West Bengal Government respectively, and the Indian Government has not provided any specific reason warranting withholding Mr. Chiang permission to stay. Later, Vice-Minister Ken of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China once again took up this question with the Indian Ambassador who replied that enquiries would be carried out. However, it is regrettable that even before the Indian Government gives its due reply to the representations made by the Chinese Embassy and the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs on October 17 and 21 respectively, and also before a reply is given to Mr. Chiang who has applied for continuing his stay, discriminative measures should have hastily been adopted to restrict the personal freedom of Manager Chiang, and what is more, policemen should have openly been dispatched to detain him. The Embassy expresses its utmost regret at such an extremely unfriendly action.

It is also necessary to point out that for a time certain Indian newspapers have carried remarks made by Indian officials, alleging that overseas Chinese nationals have been engaged in "anti-Indian activities". This kind of contention is inconceivable. It is the consistent policy of the Chinese Government towards overseas Chinese to instruct them to respect laws and regulations of the country in which they reside, refrain from participating in local political activities and live in amity with the local people. In case individual overseas Chinese actually offend Indian law and definite information is provided by the Indian Government in this regard, the Chinese
Embassy, in line with its consistent stand of maintaining Sino-Indian friendly relations, wishes to adopt a co-operative attitude and give due consideration to it. The Embassy hopes that the Indian Government would take the same friendly attitude in dealing with questions concerning overseas Chinese. But it is incredible that this year not a few responsible persons of overseas Chinese organizations have been asked to leave India within a specified period, and that in spite of the repeated representations made by the Chinese side the Indian Government has so far not given any factual grounds supporting the alleged cases of offending laws by overseas Chinese. What is particularly worth noting is the fact that when the Indian side has promised to make enquiries with reference to the representations by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs and a reply is still being awaited, such measures as imprisonment, detention, investigation, fine and restriction of freedom should have been adopted against law-abiding and bona fide Chinese nationals. All these are obviously no accidental happenings, and the Embassy cannot but express its grave concern over them.

Out of the desire for maintaining the friendly relations between the peoples of China and India and to seek a reasonable settlement of the question by means of friendly co-operation, the Embassy requests that the Indian Government speedily reply to the representations by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Chinese Embassy, and immediately remove such discriminative measures as violate the personal freedom of Mr. Chiang and other Chinese nationals. The Embassy hopes that while the two Governments are seeking a reasonable settlement of the above-said question through diplomatic channels the local authorities of India will not take any steps which might complicate the question.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with refer-
ence to the Embassy's Note No. L/568/60, dated December 6, 1960,
have the honour to enclose for its information a copy of the State-
ment presented to His Excellency the Vice Minister of China,
Mr. Keng Piao, by the Ambassador of India in Peking on December
15, 1960. This statement constitutes the reply of the Government
of India to the various representations, verbal and written, made to them
by the Chinese Government and the Chinese Embassy in India.

2. Apart from the matters of substance, the Embassy in its Note
referred to above stated that "in case individual overseas Chinese
actually offend Indian law and definite information is provided by
the Indian Government in this regard, the Chinese Embassy, in line
with its consistent stand of maintaining Sino-Indian friendly rela-
tions, wishes to adopt a co-operative attitude and give due considera-
tion to it". If this statement is intended to suggest that the Chinese
nationals resident in India will be duly advised by the Embassy to
desist from political activities and respect the Indian legislative and
administrative enactments, the Government of India welcome this
assurance. If, however, the statement in any way purports to sug-
gest that the Embassy be associated with the Government of India
in taking appropriate action or decision in matters pertaining to Chin-
ese nationals living in India, the Government of India are obliged to
point out that the question of the terms and conditions upon which
foreign nationals in India may continue to reside in India is a matter
solely within the discretion of the Government of India and this Gov-
ernment cannot in any way share its sovereign jurisdiction in this
respect with any other authority. The Government of India continue
to take an extremely liberal attitude towards foreign nationals, in-
cluding Chinese, to stay, trade and enjoy freedom and facilities within
India. But if any foreigner behaves in a manner contrary to or
against the security requirements of the country the Government of
India must take appropriate action against such an offender.

3. The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew
to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the
assurances of their highest consideration.
Enclosure to the Government of India note, dated 20 December 1960

The Government of India have examined the statement made by His Excellency, the Vice Minister of China, Mr. Keng Piao, to the Ambassador of India at Peking on October 21, 1960, regarding the arrest of Mr. Ma Chu-Tsai, a Chinese national residing in India. The Vice Minister also referred to the orders recently passed by the Government of India terminating the stay of certain Chinese nationals in India. The Government of India had also received representations, verbal and written, from the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi on the same subjects.

2. (i) Mr. Ma Chu-Tsai

It has been stated by the Vice Minister that Mr. Ma Chu-Tsai has been involved in the murder of an old Lama on a fabricated charge. The question whether Mr. Ma Chu-Tsai is guilty or innocent of the offence, on which he has been arrested, will be decided by a Court of Law, according to the Indian Penal Code and Criminal Procedures. The Government of India must await the court's verdict and, in the meantime, they cannot accept the allegation that the charge against Mr. Ma Chu-Tsai is fabricated.

The court before which Mr. Ma Chu-Tsai was produced has already ordered his release on bail. Since, however, he is not able to fulfil the conditions of the bail, he continues to be in detention. The Government of India are informed that an officer of the Chinese Consulate-General in Calcutta and the Chinese Deputy Trade Agent at Kalimpong have been permitted to interview the prisoner and the interview has already taken place. Delivery of food and medicines to an under-trial prisoner in custody by his family is governed by appropriate rules in India, applicable to all prisoners, and these rules are being followed in respect of Mr. Ma Chu-Tsai. There is no difficulty about supply of food to him by his family, but the supply of medicines from outside is strictly controlled. The jail authorities, however, take the fullest responsibility for the health of a prisoner. In fact, on November 13, 1960, Mr. Ma Chu-Tsai was removed to a hospital in Darjeeling, where necessary treatment was given to him.

(ii) Chinese nationals in India

A reference has been made in the Vice Minister's statement to the problem of Chinese nationals in India, and in particular to the orders passed recently by the Government of India asking some Chinese nationals to leave India within a specified period. As the Chinese Government must be aware, the Government of India are most liberal in respect of allowing foreigners to reside in India. Foreigners have full freedom and facilities of work and trade in the country, and thousands of Chinese nationals have taken advantage of these facilities. The Government of India cannot, however, permit a foreigner
to take part, directly or indirectly, in political activities or associate himself with any activity which is likely to damage the interest of India. The persons against whom orders have been issued to leave the country have been indulging, over a considerable period, in activities which are prejudicial to Indian national interest. The Government of India have, therefore, been forced to take action against them, and it is regretted that these orders cannot be modified. In case of individual hardship, however, the Government of India will be prepared to extend the time-limit prescribed in the ‘quit notice’ orders.
The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of the Republic of India, and has the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the Ministry's reply note of December 20, 1960 regarding the question of overseas Chinese nationals and a copy of the statement of December 15, 1960 of the Indian Ambassador to China, and the Embassy is now instructed by the Government of China to reply as follows:

1. The consistent policy pursued by the Government of China towards overseas Chinese nationals is to instruct them to observe laws and regulations of the country in which they reside, to live in amity with the local people and to refrain from participating in the local political activities. The Embassy and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China have time and again pointed out that the Chinese nationals who have been ordered by the authorities concerned of India to leave the country within a specified period have all been residing in India for a long time, have been minding their own business and law-abiding, have proper occupations and have made contributions to upholding Sino-Indian friendship. The Indian side in its several replies, however, failed to give a single concrete fact of Chinese nationals' breaking law. Therefore, the Embassy cannot agree at all to the allegation that the Chinese nationals "have been indulging in activities which are prejudicial to Indian national interest."

2. The Embassy has never had the intention to interfere in the sovereignty of India, but it is the Indian local authorities who have without any justification asked Mr. Chiang Wen-kuei, official functionary of the Bank of China, and other responsible persons in charge of the Chinese nationals' cultural, educational and welfare undertakings who have long been residing in India lawfully, to leave India within a specified period, and adopted such discriminative measures as restriction of personal freedom, detention and investigation. This can only be considered as an unfriendly attitude towards the nationals of a friendly country. The Embassy, out of the desire for upholding the friendly relations between the peoples of the two countries, expressed its serious concern over this matter, and hoped that a reasonable settlement of the question would be sought in the light of facts and in the spirit of the friendship between the two countries. It is regrettable that this attitude of friendly co-operation taken by the Embassy has not met with corresponding response.

3. At present, Mr. Chiang Wen-kuei's personal freedom has been repeatedly subjected to grave infringement, and this has made it quite impossible for Mr. Chiang to continue his normal functions and has also seriously affected the work of the Bank of China. In spite of these numerous unfriendly actions taken by the Indian authorities concerned, the Chinese side, out of its consistent desire for unholding
the friendship between the peoples of the two countries, still wishes to take another step and make new efforts. The General Managing Office of the Bank of China has decided to send Mr. Jun-chang, roving inspector of accounts of the Bank of China, who is now in Pakistan, to go to Calcutta and take over Mr. Chiang Wen-kuei’s post. The Chinese Embassy in Pakistan will approach the Indian High Commission in Pakistan for Mr. Shen’s entry visa for India, and it is hoped that the Government of India will, starting from the desire for maintaining Sino-Indian friendship on its part, grant the required visa as speedily as possible and give necessary time and facilities to the new and old managers in the handing over of the post. The Embassy also hopes that the Government of India will, also in the spirit of the friendship between the peoples of the two countries, give sympathetic consideration to the question of stay of other Chinese nationals who have long been residing in India lawfully, and have been minding their own business and law-abiding.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 2 February 1961

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India, and has the honour to state as follows:

Regarding the unwarranted request for Mr. Chiang-Wen-kuei, Manager of the Bank of China, Calcutta, to leave India, while a reply from the Ministry of External Affairs of India to the Embassy's note of January 3, 1961 is still being awaited, the local authorities of India suddenly detained Manager Chiang without any justification on January 25 in disregard of the serious representations of the Embassy and the reasonable demand already put forward by Manager Chiang himself to the authorities concerned to leave India soon. This is utterly an unfriendly act, at which the Embassy expresses extreme regret. As a result of the unjustified measure taken by the authorities, it has been rendered impossible for Manager Chiang to perform his banking duties. With a view to bringing about a speedy settlement of the question, the General Managing Office of the Bank of China has decided to transfer Mr. Chiang to China immediately, and it is requested that the Government of India release Manager Chiang expeditiously and unconditionally and grant to him an exit visa valid for two weeks.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Regarding the order issued by the West Bengal Government to Mr. Chiang Wen Kuei, Manager of the Bank of China, Calcutta, to leave India within a specified period, the Chinese Embassy in India and the Chinese Consulate General in Calcutta have for several times made representations with the Ministry of External Affairs of India and the Government of West Bengal. Mr. Chiang Wen Kuei himself also made repeated representations with the local authorities. However, the local authorities disregarding these strong and just representations once again arrested Mr. Chiang on January 25 and have detained him till now. This is an unfriendly action, for this the Chinese Consulate General expresses its deep regret.

As the local authorities have taken such unjustifiable measures, Mr. Chiang feels it impossible to carry on his bank duties. For the sake of an immediate solution of this problem, the Head Office of the Bank of China in Peking, has decided to recall Mr. Chiang back to China immediately. Mr. Chiang will leave for China within two weeks. The Chinese Consulate General demands that the Government of West Bengal find a reasonable settlement of this case and release Mr. Chiang Wen Kuei immediately and unconditionally, thus enabling him to leave India for China in due course.
Regarding the order issued by the West Bengal Government to Mr. Chiang Wen Kuei, Manager of the Bank of China, Calcutta, to leave India within a specified period, the Chinese Consulate General in its Memorandum, dated February 3, informed the West Bengal Government that the Head Office of the Bank of China in Peking has decided to recall Mr. Chiang Wen-Kuei back to China immediately, and demanded that the Government of West Bengal release Mr. Chiang immediately and unconditionally, thus enabling him to leave India for China in due time. After his release on bail on February 3, Mr. Chiang wrote a letter to the Office of Security Control on February 4 stating that he would leave India by February 25 and requested the Office to endorse his departure from India. On February 6, as Mr. Chiang was sick, he entrusted Mr. R. N. Dhar, Solicitor, to apply on his behalf to the Office of Security Control for withdrawing his court case. In the meantime, Mr. R. Gupta, Chief Secretary of the Government of West Bengal also expressed on February 3 that he would propose to the Government of India to withdraw this case. While the Chinese Consulate General in Calcutta and Mr. Chiang were awaiting the reply in respect of this matter, Mr. Chiang was again unwarrantedly arrested in the afternoon of February 7 by the local authorities. The Chinese Consulate General in Calcutta feels it inconceivable, expresses deep regret, and demands that the West Bengal Government release Mr. Chiang immediately and expedite his departure formalities.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 February 1961

As the Embassy is aware, the Government of India through the agency of the Government of West Bengal had given notices to Mr. Chang Ching, Principal, Hsinhua High School, Calcutta, and Hou Hsing-fu, Editor, China Review, Calcutta, to leave India within specified periods. The periods of notice expired some time ago but the two Chinese nationals have not so far left this country. In view of the serious nature of their anti-Indian activities, the Government of India have decided to deport them forthwith. They will be pushed across the land frontier at Nathula on Monday, the 13th February, 1961, at 9-00 A.M. I am giving advance notice of this intention of the Government of India to enable the Chinese Government to make arrangements to receive them if the Chinese Government so desire.
The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of the Republic of India, and has the honour to state as follows:

At three o'clock on the morning of February 11, the police authorities of Calcutta unwarrantedly and unlawfully arrested, all of a sudden, Mr. Chang Ching, principal of the Hsing Hua Middle School, who had long been residing in Calcutta, and Mr. Hou Hsing-fu, editor of the China Review, who was born in India, forcibly took them in custody to and deported them from Nathula Pass on February 13. When they were on the way under custody, they were subjected to inhuman treatment.

It must be pointed out that after receiving orders from the local authorities of West Bengal asking them to leave India, both Mr. Chang Ching and Mr. Hou Hsing-fu put forward, in accordance with law, legitimate reasons requesting to continue to stay in India. While the Indian local authorities referred their cases to judicial procedures and a just settlement by the court was being awaited by them, the Indian local authorities, however, took such a step as to have suddenly arrested them and deported them from India under custody. The Embassy expresses its regret at this unreasonable measure. It is requested that the Government of India put an end to such discriminative measures against the Chinese nationals.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 8 March 1961

In August 1960, Mr. Chang Hsiu-feng, Principal of the Chung Hwa School at Kalimpong, and his wife, who have long been residing in India, received orders from the local authorities not permitting them to reside in Kalimpong, and were arrested in December by the same authorities without any justification. Later Mr. Chang was sentenced to four months' imprisonment by the local court, and his wife Yao Pan-ying was also sentenced to two months' imprisonment by the local court on February 27, 1961.

The Chinese Embassy in September 1960 brought up the question of their stay to Mr. V. V. Paranjpe of the China Division of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, and the Chinese Consulate General at Calcutta also took up the matter with the West Bengal local authorities in 1960 and January 1961 on several occasions, in the hope that the question of their stay would be dealt with in a reasonable way, and it has been repeatedly pointed out that Mr. Chang has always been law-abiding, devoted to the education of the children of Chinese nationals, and enjoying popular respect. Chang's wife is a housewife, dependent on her husband and looking after their children. As entrusted by the Chinese nationals, Mr. Chang serves as the Principal of the Chung Hwa School of the local Chinese nationals and in the interest of the education of the children of the Chinese nationals and necessitated by his work in the school, he had applied to the local authorities for continuing to stay. When a formal reply to his application was still being awaited, he was suddenly arrested by the local authorities without any justification and was sentenced to rigorous imprisonment and to a fine.

It must be pointed out in particular that Mr. Chang's wife Yao Pan-ying was born and brought up in India, and that she has been ailing for a long time and is very weak, while five children are under her care, one of whom is still at the breast. She together with the children, lives entirely on her husband's income, and is also dependent on her husband as to where to stay. It is entirely necessary to show sympathy towards a woman in such a position. However, it is surprising that she was also unwarrantedly detained by the local authorities on December 5, 1960, and it was not until December 17, 1960, that she was permitted to come out on bail on condition that she should leave Kalimpong in the night of the same day. Thus, bringing all her children with her, she had to go to Calcutta and stayed there for the time being. Owing to the fact that her husband is in prison, she has been leading a poor and hard life and has been difficult to find a shelter, since she arrived in Calcutta. In order to save her family from plight, she has requested the local authorities to release her husband immediately so that they may go back to China together. The local authorities, however, in disregard
of her reasonable and appropriate demand based on the fact that she has five children to look after, and she is in bad health and has financial difficulties, twice forcibly ordered her to go to Kalimpong from Calcutta for trial, passed an utterly unjustified judgment and imprisoned her with a fine. It should be pointed out that even those who were present at the court were very much surprised at such unreasonable sentence.

In view of the above facts, the measures taken by the Indian local authorities against Mr. Chang and his wife are utterly unjustified as well as inhuman. This is inconsistent with the liberal spirit towards foreigners as claimed more than once in its note by the Indian Government.

In view of the fact that Mr. Chang’s wife is in bad health and her five children need the care of their parents and that she has applied for leaving India and returning to China, the Embassy requests that the Government of India adopt measures to release Mr. Chang Hsiu-feng and his wife, so that they may leave India.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 8 March 1961

In October and November 1960, the Chinese Embassy took up for several times with the Ministry of External Affairs of India the wronged case of an innocent Chinese national, Mr. Ma Tsu-tsai, who originally resided in Kalimpong. Owing to the condition of his health, Mr. Ma Tsu-tsai himself has for many times expressed his desire to return to China for rest and treatment, and has already submitted to the Chinese Consulate General at Calcutta a formal application for return to China at an early date.

According to his application, Mr. Ma has been in bad health for a long time as he is old and weak. Particularly since he was put into prison in October 1960, the several months' imprisonment has done serious harm to his health which is deteriorating daily and he himself and his family are very much concerned over his health. After a careful examination of his health, the doctor also advises that he needs a tranquil environment for rest and treatment. He has applied for return to his native place in China for rest and treatment, where members of his family will look after him and meet the charges for his medical treatment.

The Embassy hopes that the Ministry of External Affairs will, in a humanitarian spirit, render assistance to Mr. Ma Tsu-tsai so that he may return to China at an early date.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 March 1961

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government has received a report stating that three specialists sent to Nepal by China, Hsing Yi-hsing, Yang Yung-chi and Mao Hung-yuan, accompanied by an official of the Department of Industry of the Nepalese Government, were deliberately harassed and unreasonably detained by the Indian checkpost personnel at India's Nepalganj Station on their way to western Nepal at 11:00 A.M. on February 28, 1961. The Chinese specialists showed their passports with valid transit visas issued by the Indian Embassy in Nepal. But the Indian checkpost personnel detained the Chinese specialists, alleging that they did not possess legal transit documents. Despite the protests of the Chinese specialists and the repeated representations of the Nepalese official who accompanied them, the Indian checkpost personnel claimed that they had the right to detain any person for 24 hours. It was not until 20.00 hours that day that the passports of the Chinese specialists were examined and they were set free as late as 24.00 hours. The Chinese specialists were unreasonably detained for as long as 13 hours.

The Chinese Government is surprised at the unreasonable detention of the Chinese specialists by the Indian checkpost personnel and the deliberate delay in examining the valid visas issued by the Indians themselves. This cannot but be regarded as extraordinary and unfriendly. While expressing its deep regret at this, the Chinese Government requests the Indian Government to attend to it and give instructions to the authorities concerned against any recurrence of similar incidents.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 17 March 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the note of the Embassy, dated the 25th February.

Mr. Chang Ching and Mr. Hou Hsing-fu were Chinese nationals holding Chinese passports. In view of their undesirable activities, under the provisions of the Foreigners’ Act they were required to leave India within a stipulated period which allowed adequate margin for preparation and departure from the country. Since they did not comply with the orders served on them, the Government of India considered it necessary in the interest of security to compel them to leave Indian territory. The allegation that they were subjected to “inhuman treatment” is entirely unfounded. In fact, they were provided with adequate food and clothing and treated with consideration.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 21 March 1961

On March 8, the Embassy, at the request of Mr. Ma Chu-tsai's family, took up with the Ministry of External Affairs the matter that Mr. Ma Chu-tsai requested to leave India for China because of his old age, weakness and daily deteriorating health.

Now members of Mr. Ma's family have again reported at the Chinese Consulate-General at Calcutta and requested the Embassy to assist them in getting out of their difficult position.

Since Mr. Ma was put into prison on a false charge, great harm has been done to his health. When he was released on bail, he was not allowed to reside in Kalimpong, thus he moved to Calcutta. His whole family was also ordered to leave Kalimpong. His house in Kalimpong was sealed. He has reached an advanced age of over 70 and is suffering from serious illness. Several doctors have time and again advised him that he should not move within a short period of time, and his lawyer has presented the health certificate to the Kalimpong court. However, in disregard of the practical difficulties that Mr. Ma is extremely weak and that all his family has been forced to leave Kalimpong, the district court, Kalimpong, has now again ordered Mr. Ma to travel a long distance to appear at the Kalimpong court. Consequently, Mr. Ma has been obliged to go there though suffering from illness. In these circumstances, Mr. Ma's family is very much worried about his health and has great fear that his life will be in danger. Mr. Ma himself and his family earnestly hope that the authorities concerned will transfer the case to Calcutta for trial.

The Embassy considers that his request is proper and reasonable, and hopes that the Ministry of External Affairs will give it sympathetic consideration. The Embassy is seriously concerned about Mr. Ma Chu-tsai's health and his present difficult position, and would like to request the Government of India to pay due attention to his life and safety in the process of the case. It is also hoped at the same time that sympathetic consideration will be given to his request for an early return to China for rest and treatment on account of his illness.
Memorandum given by the Consulate General of China in Calcutta to the Government of West Bengal, 2 May 1961

The Chinese nationals in Calcutta Mr. Liu Wei-tai (Manager of Peking Restaurant) and Mr. Wu Tao-lung (ex-publisher of the Chinese Review) have been living in India for many years and have always been law abiding. The West Bengal Government, however, on July 25, 1960, unreasonably ordered them to leave India within 90 days, then again in November and December 1960, arrested them and sent them to the Calcutta local court for trial respectively, disregarding the representations made by the Chinese Consulate General in Calcutta and petitions submitted by themselves for continuing their stay in India. While they were waiting for the trial of the court, the Calcutta Police, all of a sudden, at 3 O'clock in the morning of April 29, 1961, arrested them again and deported them from India under Police custody. Such a series of unjustifiable and discriminative measures taken by the West Bengal Government against Mr. Liu Wei-tai and Mr. Wu Tao-lung, particularly that of deporting them unreasonably from India under custody, are obviously very unfriendly and inhumane. For them, the Chinese Consulate General lodged a protest with the West Bengal Government.
Reference Chinese Consul in Calcutta's letter of protest to the Government of West Bengal on May 2, 1961, regarding the deportation of Messrs Wu Tao Lung and Lee Wei Tai.

2. The Government of West Bengal firmly reject the assertion of the Chinese Consul that the deportation of Messrs Wu Tao Lung and Lee Wei-tai was unjustifiable and discriminatory. As the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi was informed on April 29, 1961, by the Ministry of External Affairs the two Chinese nationals had been served with notice to leave India within specified period. Even though the periods of notice expired they had not made any effort to leave the country. In view of the serious nature of their anti-Indian activities, the Government of India were constrained to effect their deportation across the land frontier.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24 May 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Note, dated March 13, 1961, handed over to Sri S. K. Bhutani, First Secretary, Embassy of India, Peking by Mr. Wang Chao Chen, Special Officer in the First Asian Department of the Chinese Foreign Office, have the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India have read with surprise the allegation in the Chinese Note that three (3) Chinese Officials were harrassed and detained by Indian Checkpost personnel at Nepalganj station at 11 A.M. on 28th February 1961.

2. The fact is that these Chinese Officials had repeatedly entered Indian territory by unauthorised routes from Nepal and had not heeded previous warnings given to them. On 25th February 1961 they entered Indian territory at Tanakpur again by an unauthorised route. After proper investigation of the case, the three Chinese were treated with leniency as it was felt that they had violated the Foreigners Order 1948 of the Government of India out of ignorance. They were verbally warned and instructed that under Indian regulations no foreigner should enter or leave India (from Nepal) except by an authorised route. Any contravention of these regulations renders the foreigners liable to prosecution under the Foreigners Act of 1946 of the Government of India. However, the three Chinese concerned demanded a written warning which had to be prepared and served on them.

3. Thus it will be seen that in the circumstances the three Chinese in question were treated with exceptional courtesy when under the law they should have been prosecuted.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of their highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China present its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of India dated May 24, 1961, has the honour to reply as follows:

With regard to the case in which three specialist sent to Nepal by China were unreasonably detained by Indian checkpost personnel, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs alleged in its note that the Chinese specialists had not heeded previous warnings and repeatedly entered Indian territory by unauthorised routes from Nepal. This allegation does not tally with the fact. It may be pointed out that at the time when they applied to the Indian authorities concerned for transit visas, the Chinese specialists listed specifically the places in Nepal to which they would proceed by land or by air via India territory. Either at the time of applying for the transit visas or when they were obtaining them, they received no notification in whatever form specifying the routes authorised for entering Indian territory. Each time when they entered Indian territory on transit, the Chinese specialists went to the authorities concerned of their own accord to go through the necessary formalities. Instead of making objections or warnings, the Indian officials who examined their documents told the Chinese specialists clearly that they had completed all the formalities and would have no trouble in continuing their trip. It was only when they were passing through the Nepalganj Station on their way from India to Nepal that they were deliberately harassed and unreasonably detained by local Indian checkpost personnel in spite of the fact that, as declared by the Indian checkpost personnel, the Nepalganj Station is precisely one of the points through which foreigners are allowed to enter or leave Indian territory as stipulated by the Indian Government. In its note, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs not only evaded the fact cited by the Chinese Government that the Chinese specialists were unreasonably detained by the Indian checkpost personnel, but put forward excuses without factual basis in a futile attempt to sophistically defend the unreasonable acts of the Indian checkpost personnel, and went so far as to glibly state that the Chinese specialists "were treated with exceptional courtesy." The Chinese Government cannot but feel regret at this. As to the allegation made in the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs that the Chinese specialists had demanded a written warning, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs wishes to point out that what really happened was that the Chinese specialists demanded the Indian checkpost personnel to make a written explanation for their unreasonable detention.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Chinese Bureau of Foreign Affairs, Lhasa, to the Consulate General of India in Lhasa, 18 August 1961

The Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet present its compliments to the Consulate General of India, Lhasa and hereby lodges the following protest with the Consulate General regarding illegal detention of a Chinese citizen by the Indian troops illegally entrenched in Tsungsha of China.

According to the report of the local authorities in Ari on the 7th June 1961, KADUP a border inhabitant of Tseda County in China’s Ari, passing through Tsungsha area of China to carry on petty trade customarily was illegally detained for 8 days by the Indian troops illegally entrenched in Tsungsha on the pretext that KADUP was not in possession of a trader’s certificate.

The Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet again point out the following two points to the Consulate General of India, Lhasa:

(1) Chinese Government has repeatedly stated that Tsungsha area has always been Chinese territory. India should respect the territorial integrity of China and withdraw all the Indian personnel who have illegally intruded into Tsungsha area.

(2) Leaving aside the question of ownership of territory, according to the item 2 of article V of the Sino-Indian Agreement signed in April 1954 and customary practice in border area, there has always been no need for border inhabitants on both sides to carry certificates for going back and forth. It can thus be seen that the detention of KADUP by Indian side on the pretext of his not possessing a trader’s certificate is entirely an unreasonable harassment, an act of arbitrary infringement on human rights and is in contravention with the agreement of 1954.

Based on what is mentioned above the Foreign Bureau hereby lodges protest against the unreasonable detention of a Chinese citizen by the Indian troops which have illegally intruded into Chinese territory and requests that the Consulate General convey to the Government of India to take effective measures for the prevention of reoccurrence of similar incidents.

The Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Consulate General of India, Lhasa, the assurances of its highest consideration.
Consul General of India presents his compliments to Foreign Bureau and with reference to latter's note dated 18 August 1961 has the honour to state as follows:—

The note is based on false assumptions and the allegations contained in it are entirely without any factual basis. It reveals both malicious and predatory motives.

No person by name KADUP of Tseda county attempted to pass through Nilang which the Chinese call Tsungsha on June 7, 1961. Nilang is an integral part of the territories of the Indian Union. That has never been in doubt, and for any foreign authority to ask the Government of India to withdraw their control over Indian territory is extraordinary procedure and an act of irresponsibility.

Regarding specific subject of complaint namely harassment and illegal detention of KADUP detailed enquiries have been made. While no person by name KADUP sought entry into Nilang a Tibetan named GHUTUK of village sarang arrived at Nilang on June 7th, 1961 and sought entry into India as a petty trader. But as he was an official of the local Government of Tibet there was doubt whether under Article V of the 1954 Agreement he could enter India for purposes of trade and intercourse without a duly visaed passport. The matter was referred to higher authorities for a decision but GHUTUK was not prepared to wait and left for Tibet on 14th June 1961. At no time was GHUTUK placed under detention.

The attention of the Foreign Bureau is invited to Article V(5) of the 1954 Agreement.

It is regretted that the Foreign Bureau should have framed false charges in order to lodge a protest. As there is no factual basis for the allegation, Foreign Bureau's protest is rejected.

The Consul General of India takes this opportunity to renew to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs its assurances of highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 1 June 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and have the honour to state that it has been brought to the notice of the Government of India that on February 13, 1961 the Chinese Deputy Trade Agent at Kalimpong along with three other members of the Chinese Trade Agency drove through Teesta Police Checkpost in a taxi ignoring the traffic signal. While the Police signalled the taxi to stop, the Chinese Deputy Trade Agent directed the driver to ignore the Police signal and proceed. Enquiries made into this incident show that the Chinese Deputy Trade Agent had wilfully directed an Indian national to violate the laws and regulations of the State. The Chinese Deputy Trade Agent who called at the Kalimpong Police Station stated that the driver was not at fault.

The Ministry of External Affairs regret this irresponsible conduct of a member of a Chinese Mission in India and hope that similar wilful violations of the law will stop.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of their highest consideration.
The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India, and with reference to the Ministry's note of June 1, 1961 and the conversation of May 24 between Mr. V. V. Paranjpe, Under Secretary of the Ministry, and Mr. Ma Mu-ming First Secretary of the Embassy, has the honour to state as follows:

With regard to the Ministry's allegation in the above note and conversation that the Chinese Deputy Trade Agent at Kalimpong ignored the traffic signal, the Embassy has made enquiries. The fact was that, at about 4.30 on the afternoon of February 13 when the Chinese Deputy Trade Agent at Kalimpong together with other three members of the Trade Agency was to pass through the Teesta Bridge in a taxi, the car began to slow down and the horn was repeatedly sounded. At that time, a policeman at the checkpost, after making out the passengers in the car, gesticulated that the car may pass, giving no signal to stop the car, thus the car continued to proceed. But when it was passing in front of the Kalimpong police station, the police suddenly stopped it and took the driver into the police station, accusing him of having ignored a signal to stop the car. Members of the Trade Agency then accompanying the Deputy Trade Agent followed the driver into the police station and explained the actual position of what happened.

It must be pointed out that the allegation made by the Ministry does not conform to the facts at all. The car was moving in accordance with the traffic signal by the policeman at the Teesta checkpost; the Deputy Trade Agent did not direct the driver to ignore a policeman's signal to stop the car; nor did the Deputy Trade Agent go into the police station himself. The assertion of the Ministry that the Chinese Deputy Trade Agent had wilfully directed an Indian national to violate the laws and regulations of the State is thus completely baseless. The Embassy categorically rejects this unwarranted charge and cannot but express regret at it.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 August 1961

The Government of India have decided that with effect from 16 August 1961, for security reasons, the officers and staff members of the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong will not travel beyond the municipal limits of Kalimpong less that portion of the Development Area falling south of the following points:

(1) Sub-Divisional Officer's bungalow (Adambari),
(2) Surja Sadan (on Ringkingpong Road), and
(3) Office of Block Development Officer, Block No. I (Bong Road),

except with the prior permission of the Sub-Divisional Officer, Kalimpong, to be obtained by application (in triplicate) in the proforma enclosed.

2. The Trade Agent and his staff may travel beyond the limits of Kalimpong municipality as defined in the foregoing paragraph only after the Sub-Divisional Officer, Kalimpong, has accorded his permission in writing.
PROFORMA

To

The Sub-Divisional Officer,
KALIMPONG.

Dear Sir,

This is to request you to allow me to travel beyond the Municipal limits of Kalimpong on ................. Details of the journey are given below.

(date)

Faithfully yours,

(Name)

Official designation

Details of the journey

1. Date of the commencement of the journey ......................
2. Purpose of the journey ........................................
3. Mode of travel ..............................................
4. Destination ...................................................

(Name of each city/town or other place to be visited should be mentioned)

5. Arrival time in each place and time of departure therefrom.....
6. Date and time of return to Kalimpong .........................
Letter given by the Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs at Kalimpong to the Deputy Trade Agent of China at Kalimpong, 14 August 1961.

Sir,

I am directed to say that the Government of India have decided that with effect from 16th August, 1961 for security reasons, the officers and staff members of the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong will not travel beyond the municipal limits of Kalimpong less that portion of the Kalimpong Development Area falling South of the following points:

(i) Sub-Divisional Officer’s bungalow (Adambari);
(ii) Surja Sadan (on Ringkingpong Road); and
(iii) Office of the Block Development Officer, Block No. 1 (Bong Road);

except with the prior permission of the Sub-Divisional Officer, Kalimpong, to be obtained by application (in triplicate) in the proforma enclosed.

2. The Trade Agent and his staff may travel beyond the limits of Kalimpong Municipality as defined in the foregoing paragraph, only after the Sub-Divisional Officer, Kalimpong, has accorded his permission in writing.

Yours faithfully,

(Sd.) D. C. MOOKERJEE,
Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, at Kalimpong.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 24 August 1961.

On August 10, 1961, Mr. B. C. Mishra, Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs of India, handed over an Aide Memoire to Mr. Ma Mu-ming, First Secretary of the Chinese Embassy in India, stating that the officers and staff members of the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong will not go beyond a limited area of the Kalimpong municipality except with the permission in writing of the Sub-Divisional Officer, Kalimpong. It must be pointed out that, following the various harassments and restrictions imposed on the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong, the Government of India has now again taken such a step as to stipulate that, except with permission in writing, not only the personnel of the Trade Agency are not allowed to travel beyond a limited area of the Kalimpong municipality, but they are not allowed even to enter the Development Area which is an important section lying within the Kalimpong municipality. This is further unwarranted restriction against the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong, and is not in conformity with the spirit of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement. The Embassy hereby expresses its regret at it.

Dear Mr. Hsu Jen,

I have the honour to invite your attention to my letter No. 474C, dated 14-8-1961 to your address containing some instructions of the Government of India regarding movement of staff members of the Trade Agency of the People’s Republic of China at Kalimpong and am very sorry to point out that instructions of my Government have not been acted upon and intentionally disregarded in as much as on the 24th August, 1961, at about 07.00 hours, two of your staff members came out of Kalimpong Municipal area in the CAR WBA 3730 and was proceeding towards Siliguri along our National Highway 31A till they were found out at Teesta Bridge when their Laissez Passer was asked for in terms of my above quoted letter, which they failed to produce.

2. May I request you kindly to take steps that your subordinate staff members do not violate security instructions of the Government of India and I would highly appreciate if you kindly confirm me the action taken by you to prevent recurrence of the same.

With warm regards,

I am,

Yours sincerely,

Sd/- D. C. MOOKERJEE,
Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India at Kalimpong.
Note given by the Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs at Kalimpong to the Trade Agency of China at Kalimpong, 28 August 1961.

The Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, at Kalimpong, presents his compliments to the Trade Agency of the People's Republic of China at Kalimpong and has the honour to state as follows:

(i) The Government of India desires that the Trade Agency of the People's Republic of China at Kalimpong should not deal with any other Departments of the Government, whether of the Central or State Government, or with any Indian citizens, except through the Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs at Kalimpong. Such communications, in future, may be sent for onward despatch to the undersigned and it is assured that the same will be despatched, if the Government of India, have no objection, with all convenient speed.

(ii) The Trade Agency of the People's Republic of China at Kalimpong should give previous notice to the Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs at Kalimpong of the arrival and departure from Kalimpong of the names of the diplomatic officers of the Trade Agency. The names of non-diplomatic personnel and other particulars should also be registered with the undersigned.

(iii) The Trade Agency of the People's Republic of China at Kalimpong should notify to the Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs at Kalimpong the name of all Indians who are employed by the Trade Agency and intimate him the change of personnel on their own initiative both in respect of Chinese and Indian personnel and diplomatic and non-diplomatic personnel.

(iv) It is further the desire of the Government of India that no function in which Indian nationals are proposed to be invited should be held in the premises of the Trade Agency of the People's Republic of China at Kalimpong except with the previous permission of the Government of India to be accorded by the Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs at Kalimpong on this behalf.

2. The Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, at Kalimpong, would highly appreciate if the Deputy Trade Agent of the People's Republic of China at Kalimpong would kindly note the request of the Government of India in the preceding paragraph and would favour the undersigned with information on clauses (ii) and (iii) of the same.
3. The Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, at Kalimpong, takes this opportunity to renew to the Trade Agency of the People's Republic of China at Kalimpong his assurances of highest consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Sd/- D. C. MOOKERJEE,
Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India at Kalimpong.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to their letter No. M/139/61, dated June 21, 1961 have the honour to state as follows:—

On the question of facts regarding the incident of February 13, 1961, when the Chinese Deputy Trade Agent, Kalimpong, made a taxi driver ignore the traffic signal while driving through Teesta police post, the Embassy asserts \textit{inter alia} "nor did the Chinese Deputy Trade Agent go into the police station himself". This could mean that he was dragged into the police station by some agency other than himself, for which there is no evidence. Therefore it could only mean that the Deputy Trade Agent went into the police station not because he wanted to but because he had to in the circumstances of the case where he was responsible for misguiding a citizen against the law.

As the facts of the case, it may interest the Embassy to know that the driver of the taxi cab in question pleaded guilty to the offence in court, and he was convicted and sentenced. The driver stated that he violated the traffic signal at the Teesta checkpost at the instance of the Deputy Chinese Trade Agent, and that he had no other reason for doing so.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 22 September 1961

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India, and with reference to the Ministry's Note No. 17(35)EAD/61, dated August 28, 1961, has the honour to state as follows:

With regard to the so-called incident in which the Chinese Deputy Trade Agent at Kalimpong was alleged to have ignored traffic signal, the Chinese Embassy, in its Note No. M/139/61, dated June 21, 1961 to the Ministry of External Affairs of India, already gave a detailed and exact account of the facts. The police at the checkpost did not ask the car to stop at the time; the Deputy Trade Agent did not enter the police station, he all along stayed outside. However, the Ministry of External Affairs in its note disregarded the facts and attempted to make a distorted interpretation of the translation of the above-mentioned note of the Embassy and draw inferences utterly devoid of any factual basis. The Embassy cannot but express its regret at such distortion and unreasonable tangling of the Ministry.

The Embassy avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Letter given by the Deputy Trade Agent of China at Kalimpong to the Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs at Kalimpong, 27 September 1961.

Dear Mr. Mookerjee,

Your letters of 14th, 25th and 28th August received. After imposing various restrictions on this Agency, the Indian Government have now made a further decision that officials and staff members of this Agency “will not travel beyond the municipal limits of Kalimpong” before obtaining written permission. Within the municipality there are again certain portions where their movement is restricted. And moreover, there has been such an occurrence that members of this Agency were prevented from going to Bagdogra Airport, Siliguri to receive Deputy Trade Agent home. On the 24th of August, two members of the Agency drove to the airport, and around 7 A.M. while passing through Teesta Bridge they were stopped by a police officer at the checkpoint there. Notwithstanding their explanation that they were proceeding to meet Deputy Trade Agent returning from Calcutta, the officer refused their pass. On indicating at that moment the refusal to be an unfriendly act, they retraced the journey, as compelled to, back to Kalimpong. You must be aware that the road connecting Kalimpong with the airport is the only one by use of which this Agency have been able to come into contact with the outside in carrying out official functions.

As is well-known, it is the least privilege of and a usual, indispensable business procedure for this Agency to deal with departments concerned of the Indian Government and Indian traders while as a Chinese official trade organ it is performing legitimate duties. It is, therefore, surprising that the Indian Government should openly place restrictions in this field, stipulating that this Agency should not deal with any official quarters of Indian traders except through the Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs at Kalimpong, the Sub-divisional Officer, Kalimpong, that communications to them should be despatched only through him and with his “no objection” first; and above all, that “previous permission” should be obtained before invitations are extended to Indian nationals to any function to be held at the Agency. Surely, these are all rarely heard.

It has to be pointed out that such a series or afore-said unwarranted restrictions and harassments further imposed on this Agency are in violation of the spirit of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement. I hereby lodge a protest.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

Sd/- HSUE JEN.

Deputy Trade Agent of the People’s Republic of China at Kalimpong.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 27 September 1961

Following the unwarranted restricting of the movement of the personnel of the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong to a limited area in August 1961, the Government of India has now further imposed various restrictions and obstructions on the Agency. As reported by the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong, the Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs of India, in a note sent on August 28, 1961 to the Trade Agency, went so far as to request that the Trade Agency should not deal with any other departments of the Government of India, whether of the Central or State Government, or with any Indian citizens, except through the Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs. It was also requested in the note that no function in which Indian nationals are invited should be held in the premises of the Trade Agency except with the previous permission of the Government of India. Moreover, on August 24, 1961 when the Chinese Deputy Trade Agent went back to Kalimpong from Calcutta, two officers of the Trade Agency proceeded in a car to the airport to meet him, but when they reached the Teesta Bridge, the check-post did not allow them to pass, with the result that when the Deputy Trade Agent arrived at the airport near Siliguri, no officer from the Agency received him. The Chinese Embassy hereby lodges a protest with the Ministry of External Affairs of India against these unreasonable restrictions and obstructions which are in violation of the spirit of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 7 October 1961

Reference Note dated 27th September 1961 handed over by Mr. Yeh Cheng-Chang, Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy, to the Director of the China Division of the Ministry of External Affairs.

The Note referring to the procedure instituted by the Government of India to regulate the movements of the personnel of the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong uses the term "uwarranted" and suggests that the SDO, Kalimpong, in communicating certain other procedures to the Chinese Trade Agency on August 28, 1961, went too far. The Embassy seems to question the Government of India's right to institute regulations and procedures for the conduct of affairs in this country. Indeed, a case has occurred in the past where a particular official Agent of the Chinese Government went to the extent of wilfully misguiding an Indian citizen to act against the law and public security. The Embassy will note that at all times there must be due and proper observance of Government laws and regulations in India, and wilful violations thereof cannot be permitted.

The Embassy's Note mentions that on August 24, 1961 two officials of the Trade Agency at Kalimpong were not allowed to proceed in a car beyond Teesta Bridge to receive the Deputy Trade Agent who was returning from Calcutta. The Embassy will note that the officials of the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong deliberately went to Teesta Bridge without a laissez passer as required under the regulations communicated by the SDO to the Chinese Trade Agency on August 14, 1961. It is hoped that, in future, the Chinese official agencies in India will comply with the regulations and procedures of Government and there will be no recurrence of such incidents in future.

The Chinese Trade Agency has not, so far, complied with the requirement that officers as well as staff of the Trade Agency should be registered with the SDO, Kalimpong, and names and particulars of Indian nationals employed by the Trade Agency should likewise be communicated to him. It is necessary that the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong comply with the official regulations of the country. We hope the Chinese Embassy will now issue necessary instructions to their Trade Agency instead of instigating their staff in non-observance of official regulations by lodging a "protest" in support of unjustifiable conduct of their staff.

The Embassy's note contains the perfunctory remark that the regulations instituted in Kalimpong are "in violation of the spirit of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement". The relevant provision in the 1954 Agreement states that "The Trade Agencies of both Parties shall be accorded the same status and same treatment". In the notes
exchanged at Peking on April 29, 1954, mention is made of trade as well as contacts in accordance with laws and regulations of the local Governments. The Embassy are aware that the Official Agencies of the Government of India in Tibet have been subjected to various official regulations and directives by local officials. There is no violation of the 1954 Agreement as this is purely a question of conforming to the laws and regulations of the local Government.

The Ministry of External Affairs, on the grounds stated above, reject the Chinese Embassy's protest of September 27, 1961.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of India in China, 27 June 1961

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has noted with regret that the No. 8/61 issue of the India News, published by the Indian Embassy on June 1, carried a resolution adopted by an Indian political party which slanderously charged China with "maintaining her violations" of Indian territory. The Embassy has, therefore, abused the hospitality and courtesy extended by the Chinese Government in taking advantage of issuing bulletins to arbitrarily slander and attack the Chinese Government. In this regard, the Ministry lodges a protest with the Embassy.

The Ministry would also like to draw the attention of the Embassy to the fact that materials have time and again appeared in the bulletins and publications distributed by the Embassy, which make groundless charges against the Chinese Government. This practice cannot but be regarded as most unfriendly.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the
Embassy of China in India, 5 July 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs refer to the note read on June 27,
1961, to Shri P. K. Banerjee, Counsellor, Indian Embassy, Peking
by Mr. Kang Mao Chao, Deputy Director of the Information Depart-
ment of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of China.

2. The Indian Embassy in Peking brings out a fortnightly news-
sheet entitled “India News”. This news-sheet is a modest effort on
the part of the Indian Embassy to give some news of India to the
Chinese people. The Government of the People’s Republic of China
must be fully aware of the extreme caution exercised by the Indian
Embassy in issuing its news-sheets and distributing its publications.
No material which can be construed to be an attack on the People’s
Government of China is ever used by the Embassy and the publica-
tions distributed do not include any literature which can be con-
strued as an attack on the People’s Government of China. Statements
made by non-officials in India and press comments from Indian
papers on China are never reproduced in the news-sheets. The
news-sheets only reproduce speeches by the Prime Minister and
other Ministers of the Indian Government bearing on India’s terri-
torial integrity.

3. The People’s Government of China are aware that even this
modest effort is closely circumscribed and the Indian Embassy bulle-
tin has virtually no circulation except among the few surviving
Indian nationals now in China and some members of the diplomatic
corps.

4. The Ministry of External Affairs are constrained to observe
that the accusation made in the Chinese note that the Embassy of
India in Peking puts out from time to time material in its bulletins
and distributes publications which make groundless charges against
the Chinese Government is based on no evidence whatever. No
examples have been cited nor was any complaint, even informally,
made to the Embassy in this matter at any time in the past.

5. The Government of China are aware that a garbled and inter-
polated version of the resolution passed by the All India Committee
of the Indian National Congress appeared in a Hsin Hua release on
May 31, and this was featured in the People’s Daily and other
Chinese papers on June 1, 1961, under the sensational headline
“National Committee of Indian National Congress Party turns Black
into White”. Having regard to these facts, it was the duty of the
Indian Embassy in Peking, in the interests of the centuries old
friendship of the people of India and China, to correct the false
impression created and all that the Indian Embassy did was to
publish without comments the true version of the resolution in its
news-sheet No. 8/61. As the People’s Government of
China know the Indian Congress Party, having secured a
majority in the Indian Parliament in free democratic elections under a system of universal franchise, constitutes the ruling party in charge of the Government of India and this Party has the responsibility of governing the country and formulating national policies. The resolution passed by the All India Committee of the Indian National Congress at its last session only reflects the official views of the Government of India which are well-known to the Government of the People's Republic of China in as much as these have been expounded in clear and unmistakable terms at the official talks on the border problem and mentioned in the Indian Parliament on several occasions by the leaders of the Government of India.

6. The above paragraphs show that the Embassy of India in Peking has all along strictly conformed to the requirements of international practice in the matter of its bulletins. The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in Delhi, on the other hand, carries on a wide propaganda offensive on Indian soil against the Government of India. The Embassy distributes literature, e.g. "Peking Review", "China Reconstructs", etc. which contain material highly offensive to the Government of India. Some of these Chinese publications have directly attacked the Government of India in matters concerning their internal jurisdiction.

7. It will be clear from the above that the charge of abusing 'hospitality and courtesy levelled against the Embassy of India in Peking is completely wide off the mark. It will be more appropriate for the Government of the People's Republic of China to advise the Chinese Embassy in Delhi to conform to the correct standards maintained by the Embassy of India in Peking and to curb the propensity of Hsin Hua to distort, "arbitrarily slander" and misrepresent the Government and the people of India in the Chinese press.
The Information Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India and has the honour to request the Embassy to send to the Information Department three copies of the material attacking Chinese press reports which the Embassy issued recently. The Embassy has not yet sent the said printed material to the Information Department.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Embassy of India in China to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 28 September 1961

The Embassy of India presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China and, with reference to their Information Department's letter No. (61) Hsin Tze Ti O/306/Hao, dated September 23, 1961, has the honour to state that the Embassy of India is not aware of any material, attacking Chinese press reports which is alleged to have been published by the Embassy.

2. The Embassy of India avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
On the 4th October 1960 an Indian Air Force hunter aircraft took off from Ambala at 0932 hours on a routine training flight. It was in normal contact with its base till 0954 hours when it was reported at a bearing of 080 degree from Ambala. Since then the aircraft has been reported missing and despite repeated searches no trace of the aircraft has been found. There was only one occupant of the aircraft, the pilot Flight Lieutenant K. P. Singh.

2. While all Indian aircraft carry strict instructions not to violate Chinese air space, it is considered possible that owing to navigational error or mechanical failure, the aircraft may have strayed and possibly crashed in Chinese territory. The Government of India would appreciate if the Chinese Government would instruct investigation to be made in the western Tibet region in case any information pertaining to the missing Indian aircraft or Pilot has been reported by the local authorities concerned.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 26 November 1960

It was stated in the memorandum delivered by the Indian Embassy in China on October 18, 1960 that an I.A.F. Hunter aircraft was reported missing on October 4, 1960, during its flight on Indian territory near the Ari district of China's Tibet region and that it might have strayed and possibly crashed in Chinese territory. The Chinese Government has instructed the local authorities concerned to conduct detailed investigation into this. It is satisfied that no foreign aircraft was found crashed on the above date in China's Tibet region.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 30 December 1960

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India, and with reference to the Indian Ministry's note of August 20, 1960 to the Chinese Embassy has the honour to state as follows:

In its note of August 20, the Ministry of External Affairs of India not only failed to give serious consideration to the proper request made by the Chinese Embassy in its note of August 1, but deliberately misrepresented what was stated in the note and made totally groundless charges against the Chinese Embassy and the correspondent of the Hsin Hua News Agency in India. The Embassy of China expresses its deep regret at this. In its note of August 20, the Ministry of External Affairs of India arbitrarily put blame on the reports of the correspondent of the Hsin Hua News Agency as "picked from newspapers which are either not of any standing or are opposed to Government", "entirely one-sided if not false". The Indian Ministry in its note, however, failed to give a single fact to support its above allegations. All those who pay heed to facts can see that the reports on India sent by the Hsin Hua correspondent are all well founded on facts and have their sources. In reporting about the happenings in India, the Hsin Hua correspondent based himself exclusively on the newspapers and journals openly published in India for his source of information. It is entirely a normal practice and there is nothing objectionable for a foreign correspondent to quote information from the newspapers and journals openly published in the country to which he is accredited. It may be asked whether the Government of India has ever laid down any stipulations which regulate that information from certain newspapers or journals may be quoted while information from others should not be quoted. If quotations of information different from the views of the Government of India are considered "false and one-sided", such kind of charge holds no water at all. Nevertheless, the Government of India, using this as a pretext, should have compelled the Hsin Hua correspondent and all other members of the staff of the New Delhi Branch Office of the Hsin Hua News Agency to withdraw from India; this is obviously a self-irony to "the freedom of the press" bragged about by the Government of India. Since the Government of India has deprived the Hsin Hua correspondent even of the right to objectively quote information from the newspapers and journals openly published in India, how can there be such contention as it is found in the Indian Ministry's note that "the Government of India cherish and uphold the principle of the freedom of the press"? If the Government of India exceptionally does not allow the Hsin Hua correspondent to objectively quote information from the newspapers and journals openly published in India while allowing "the freedom of comments" to Indian and accredited foreign correspondents in India, then how can it be said that this
does not constitute a discrimination against the Hsin Hua correspondent?

The Indian Ministry in its August 20 note also deliberately misrepresented what was stated in the Chinese Embassy's note of August 1, and groundlessly charged the Chinese Embassy with interfering in the Indian Government's exercise of its sovereign right. The Chinese Embassy cannot but express its surprise and regret at this. In the conversations during the two interviews he had with the Hsin Hua correspondent Mr. Kao Liang in the middle of July, Mr. P. N. Menon, Director of External Publicity Division, Ministry of External Affairs of India, asked Mr. Kao Liang to counsel the Head Office of the Hsin Hua News Agency, Peking, to change its policy of reporting on India. This action on the part of Mr. Menon obviously constitutes an interference in the affairs of the Chinese state news agency, and that is the reason why the Chinese Embassy pointed out in its note of August 1 that "no one is in any way entitled to interfere in the reports of the Hsin Hua News Agency, using 'interference in internal affairs' as a pretext". This is altogether necessary and appropriate. The Indian Ministry in its note, however, countercharged that the Chinese Embassy interfered in the Indian Government's exercise of its sovereign right. This charge is totally groundless and reverses right and wrong.

The Embassy of China holds that the Government of India by not allowing the Hsin Hua correspondent to continue his stay in India, particularly by compelling the entire staff (including a driver) of the New Delhi Branch Office of the Hsin Hua News Agency to withdraw, has created a situation in which the New Delhi Branch Office of the Hsin Hua News Agency has been forced to suspend its work. This is neither in conformity with the normal relations between China and India, nor in the interest of the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples. The Embassy of China, therefore, requests that the Government of India take steps so that the New Delhi Branch Office of the Hsin Hua News Agency may restore its work at an early date.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 February 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and with reference to the latter’s Note No. M/447/60, dated December 30, 1960, have the honour to state that it was with regret that the Government of India were obliged to take the decision requiring the Hsin Hua News Agency correspondent to leave Delhi and to obtain the closure of the News Agency Office. The Government of India cannot accept the substance or the analysis contained in the note and must point out that the decision regarding the closure of the Agency was taken after careful consideration and on the firm conviction that the reports which had been sent by the Hsin Hua News Agency over a period of time were contrary to facts and were calculated to cause further harm to the friendly relations between India and China. The Government of India do not admit the right of the Chinese Government to question the validity or the wisdom of a decision which lies entirely within the sovereign discretion of the Government of India. They firmly reject the contention in the Embassy’s note.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 March 1961

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state as follows:

A soldier of the Chinese frontier guards stationed in the Yatung area in the Tibet region of China, Liu Shu-jung, was found missing while performing his normal duties on March 7, 1961, and up to now he has still not returned to his base. Meanwhile, according to news reports, the Indian Government has declared that a Chinese soldier was arrested by an Indian armed patrol on the Sikkim border on March 10. Judging from the date and place, this Chinese soldier appears to be Liu Shu-jung, the missing Chinese soldier mentioned above. The Indian Government is kindly requested to assist in sending him back to China, for which the Chinese Government would be deeply grateful.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 9 May 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and with reference to the Note dated March 18, 1961, presented to Shri S. K. Bhutani, First Secretary of the Indian Embassy, Peking, by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China, have the honour to state as follows:

On March 10, 1961, an armed Chinese soldier was apprehended in Sikkim territory near the Sikkim-Tibet border. After his apprehension by an Indian patrol he declared that he did not want to go back to China and that he would like to seek asylum in India. In this circumstance, the Government of India regret their inability to return the soldier to China.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 24 June 1961

The Embassy of India presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to request for information concerning the opening of branches of foreign banks in China. The Embassy would be grateful if rules and regulations on the subject are given to it at an early date.

The Embassy of India avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 12 August 1961

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to address a reply to the Embassy’s note of June 24, 1961.

Regarding the Embassy’s request for supplying information on the rules and regulations for the setting up in China of the branches of foreign banks, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, after consulting the authorities concerned, came to know that no appropriate material of this kind is available.

We avail of this opportunity to convey to the Embassy the assurances of our highest consideration.
In September, 1961, Government of India's attention was drawn to the distortions in Chinese press reports on the proceedings of the Belgrade Conference, and in particular to the deliberate and mischievous misrepresentations of the Prime Minister's statement and the role of the Indian Delegation. The Foreign Secretary spoke to His Excellency the Chinese Ambassador on the subject on September 14, 1961 and the Indian Charge d'Affaires in Peking made a verbal démarche to the Chinese Foreign Office on the same day. The Chinese Government's response to the representations on the subject was conveyed verbally by His Excellency the Vice-Foreign Minister, Mr. Keng Piao, to our Charge d'Affaires in Peking on October 24, 1961. The Chinese reply denied that their press reports of the Prime Minister's speech at Belgrade contained deliberate and mischievous misrepresentations and asserted that Chinese newspaper reports had brought out the objective truth. In this reply there were further attacks on the Prime Minister, the Defence Minister and the Secretary-General of the Ministry of External Affairs. Other matters, irrelevant to the issue, were also raised. A note Verbale on the subject was handed over to the Chinese Counsellor in New Delhi on November 10, 1961, the text of which follows:

The Government of India have seen with surprise and regret a report from their Charge d'Affaires in Peking about Vice-Foreign Minister Keng Piao's talk with him on 24th October. The Vice-Foreign Minister made a series of allegations against the Government of India and the Indian Press. He also indulged in personal attacks on Prime Minister Nehru, Defence Minister Krishna Menon and Secretary General R. K. Nehru. No attempt was made to substantiate the allegations which were couched in language which is calculated to cause offence.

2. The Vice-Foreign Minister accused the Secretary General of making an "incorrect and untrue statement" to the Press on his return from Mongolia via China. The Secretary General's visit to China was not fortuitous. He was representing the Government of
India at the 40th Anniversary celebrations of the Mongolian Revolution. It was found expedient for him to return from Ulan Baton via China and Hongkong. He was asked to utilise the opportunity thus provided to renew his contacts with the Chinese leaders whom he had known during his tenure as Ambassador of India in Peking, and at the same time to inspect Indian missions in Peking and Hong Kong.

3. The visit to Peking was informal and the Secretary General's talks with the Chinese leaders were in the nature of an exchange of views on relations between the two countries in which the Secretary General had long been deeply interested. The Secretary General felt that it would be appropriate for him to seek the reactions of the Chinese leaders to the facts stated in the Officials' Report on the border problem. The whole purport of the talks, as the record will show, was to emphasise the fact that occupation of Indian territory by China had come in the way of friendly relations. This was repeated by the Secretary General in different words in a brief statement he made to the Press on his return to India.

4. These are the facts relating to the Secretary General's stop-over in China en route to India from Mongolia, and the facts were stated by the Prime Minister at a press conference prior to the Secretary General's departure for Mongolia and China and briefly related to Parliament on the Secretary General's return. It is surprising that, in regard to these facts, the Secretary General should be charged with prevarication and abuse of Chinese hospitality. Not content with this attack on the Secretary General, Vice-Foreign Minister Keng Piao has discourteously charged the Prime Minister of India with 'dishonest dealing'. Such accusations and offensive remarks are not conducive to high level contacts between the two Governments.

5. Vice-Foreign Minister Keng Piao referred to what he called "slandering speeches" made by Prime Minister Nehru, Defence Minister Krishna Menon and the Secretary General. There is no slander in these speeches and statements. They are a bare statement of facts about unlawful intrusion and occupation of Indian territory by Chinese forces. In 1957-58, while China was still bound to India by the five principles of peaceful co-existence, Chinese forces marched in and occupied Indian territory in Aksai Chin.
Since then they have extended their occupation further into Ladakh. Solemn assurances and official statements of the Chinese Premier notwithstanding, Chinese forces have gone even beyond the limit which Premier Chou En-lai had arbitrarily claimed for China in India's Ladakh up to 1959-60. When India's territorial integrity is at stake as a result of aggressive activities on the part of Chinese forces, how else should the Indian Government react? And if it reacts and tells Chinese representatives that they have acted wrongly, does it amount to slandering China?

6. There is very little criticism of China per se in the Indian Press although the Indian Press naturally reacts to the national preoccupation and concern over the threat posed by China to India's territorial integrity. As the Defence Minister put it "India is determined not to negotiate a surrender". How could this sentiment be objectionable to the Chinese Government unless it wants India to acquiesce tamely in the occupation of India's territory?

7. It should be apparent that Indian leaders and the Press are not anti-Chinese but rather pro-Indian and deeply interested in the security and integrity of the Indian Union. They do not go out of the way to attack or make offensive remarks about another Government or its leaders. As for the Chinese press which the Vice-Foreign Minister has described as 'always objective, never indulging in distortions, misrepresentations, or maligning', it has carried on a campaign of vilification against India. For sometime past, it has been propagating the view that India's Prime Minister was representing the Western Powers at the Belgrade Conference, that he was acting for the Colonial powers and that he confused issues by raising the question of "war and peace". While the Chinese Government may quite legitimately claim these as their authentic views and true appreciation of the Prime Minister's role at the Belgrade Conference, it is inconceivable that they who were not represented at the Conference should put out a version of the Prime Minister's speech at Belgrade holding it to be more authentic than the official version. Indeed the Chinese press has gone far and wide to search for words and phrases in foreign comments which it could touch up to suit its view of the Indian Prime Minister's role at the Belgrade Conference. It has even used fragmentary sentences torn out of context from India press reports and comments to buttress the campaign against India's Prime Minister.
8. The Indian Embassy in Peking who were for a while silent spectators of this growing campaign of calumny against India's Prime Minister, deemed it necessary to meet enquiries from friendly foreign sources by putting out on restricted distribution a comparative statement of the speech delivered by India's Prime Minister and the Chinese versions thereof. This was a modest effort which placed side by side the original speech and that put out by the Chinese press. But the Chinese press reacted to this with great vehemence. It has also shown extraordinary intolerance by resorting (as Hsinhua and China Youth Daily have done) to highly improper methods of intimidation against the Indian Embassy in Peking. The Government of India are unable to agree that the reproduction of speeches/statements of Indian leaders in the Indian Embassy news-bulletins is contrary to international practice.

9. The Vice-Foreign Minister touched upon a number of other small matters and these have been dealt with separately in notes from the Government of India. These allegations too are unfounded. If the Chinese Government need any clarification on any particular matter they can appropriately enquire through diplomatic channels before turning their own doubts into allegations against the Government of India. It is a malicious charge that the Government of India are 'continuing to encourage Tibetan rebels' because Tibetan refugees in India have all along been restrained from indulging in anti-Chinese activities. No 'armed Tibetan rebel' has carried out a raid on Chinese territory from Indian soil.

10. The Vice-Foreign Minister refurbished the disingenuous charge that while Chinese troops have been withdrawn from the border, Indian troops are making every effort to trespass into Chinese territory. As the Chinese Government know, there is intensive military activity entirely on the Chinese side, and India has recently lost some more territory to Chinese intruders.

11. Regarding strong notes since June/July 1961 these have in the main come from Chinese official quarters only, while Indian notes during the period have been restricted to a bald statement of facts.

12. As to the Chinese Ambassador in Delhi not being able to see anybody important, he has never been refused a request for interview by anyone from the Prime Minister downwards.
13. As the Chinese Government are no doubt aware for many years it was the Government of India's endeavour to have friendly relations with them. Even now that is the Government of India's wish. But the forcible occupation of Indian territory by Chinese forces, so long as it continues, cannot lead to friendly relations.
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Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 November 1961

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with regard to the repeated violations of China's territory and territorial air by India, has the honour to state as follows:

(1) In recent months, Indian troops have continuously expanded their illegal occupation and patrol range in China's Demchok area. On July 6, 1961, Indian troops intruded into the Rato area east of Demchok and set up a checkpost there. They openly carried out military exercises with solid shots there and time and again illegally sent their patrols to and around Gore (approximately 32° 38' N, 79° 34' E) to the east of Rato. On August 9, three Indian soldiers penetrated deep into the Deboche area (approximately 32° 27' N, 79° 25' E). 20 odd kilometres south of Demchok. On July 22, Indian troops went so far as to detain illegally in the Demchok area, which is China's territory, a Chinese citizen named Dopoe, who was held as long as five days and interrogated nine times before being released.

(2) In June 1961, fifty odd Indian military men intruded into China's Wuje area, stationed themselves around 30° 49' N, 75° 58' E, and built fortifications and other works there. On July 2, 3, 5 and 15, each day an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over that area and air-dropped supplies to these intrusive Indian troops. The intrusive Indian troops did not withdraw till early September.

The Chinese Government points out with regret that, despite its repeated protests to India against the latter's illegal activities in the two areas mentioned above, Indian troops have still been further expanding their area of occupation, setting up strong points and carrying out all kinds of illegal activities in China's territory. Moreover, the intrusion into and stationing at the Wuje area by Indian troops are in serious violation of the Sino-Indian agreement to refrain from sending armed personnel into the area. The Chinese Government hereby once again lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against all these activities on the part of the Indian side.

The Chinese Government has been following with great anxiety the Indian troops' steady pressing forward on China's borders and cannot but regard such action of the Indian side as an attempt to create new troubles and to carry out its expansion by force in the Sino-Indian border areas. It is not difficult to conceive that, had not the Chinese side restrained strictly its own border guards to avoid by all means any conflict with India in line with China's consistent stand of maintaining peace and tranquillity along the border, such gross violations of China's territory and sovereignty by the Indian
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troops would have led to very serious consequences. The Chinese Government deems it necessary to point out that it would be very erroneous and dangerous should the Indian Government take China's attitude of restraint and tolerance as an expression of weakness. The Chinese Government hereby demands that the Indian Government speedily change its present practice and order all the intruding Indian troops to put an end immediately to their violations of China's territory and territorial air and withdraw from Chinese territory and take effective measures to prevent the recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 30 November 1961

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India dated 31st October, 1961 has the honour to state as follows:

The Indian Government has in its note denied and quibbled about facts of Indian intrusions into Chinese territory and air space as pointed out in the Chinese Government's note of 12th August, 1961 and at the same time made groundless charges against Chinese Government concerning alleged intrusions into Indian territory by Chinese forces. Of late the Indian Government has further made use of these groundless charges to whip up another anti-Chinese campaign in India. The Chinese Government expressed its extreme regret at such actions of the Indian Government which seriously impair the friendship between Chinese and the Indian peoples.

All places listed in Chinese Government's note of 12th August which were invaded by the Indian side lie indisputably within Chinese territory and have all along been under actual jurisdiction of the Chinese Government. In disregard of the jurisdiction in these places the Indian Government has despatched armed personnel to push into these places and even cross the boundary line claimed by the Indian side itself. This is obviously an attempt to realise its territorial claim unilaterally and by force. Although trying hard to deny the fact that the Indian side has further invaded Chinese territory in Spanggur, Demchok, Salan, Wuje etc., and that Indian aircraft have continually intruded into China's air Space the Indian Government in its note nevertheless cannot but admit its unlawful activities such as the setting up of check post extending patrolling and despatch of personnel in the Demchok and the Wuje area. The Chinese Government has long since proved with large quantities of authentic documents and facts that both Demchok and Wuje are within Chinese territory. As the Chinese Government has pointed out in its note of 12th August armed Indian provocations within Chinese territory and the extended illegal occupation thereby the Indian side cannot but once again cause tension in the border area.

It is especially surprising that the Indian Government in its note of 31st October arbitrarily and unreasonably asserts that the above mentioned places invaded by the Indian side excepting Salan are within boundary line unilaterally claimed by India and that therefore whatever actions the Indian side may take these do not constitute intrusions into Chinese territory. Such logic of the Indian Government is untenable and also most dangerous. The Indian Government must be aware that the Chinese and the Indian Governments do not hold identical views concerning the boundary between the two countries. Taking the case of the Eastern
Sector of the Sino-Indian boundary the Chinese Government has always held that this sector of the boundary lies along the Southern foot of the Himalayas and that the so called “McMahon Line” is totally illegal. If the Indian Government’s above logic should be followed, the Chinese Government would have every reason to send troops to cross the so called “McMahon Line” and enter the vast area between the crest of the Himalayas and their Southern foot. But the Chinese Government has never done so and all Chinese military and administrative personnel, acting upon orders, have not crossed the so called “McMahon Line”. The Chinese Government has always held that pending final settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question both sides should maintain status quo of the boundary. The Chinese Government has proved by deed that it is true to this stand. The Indian Government however has ceaselessly tried to change unilaterally the status quo of the boundary and this can only harm peaceful settlement of the boundary question and the maintenance of the tranquillity of the border area. The Chinese Government once again asks the Indian Government to stop its unlawful action in the Chinese border area otherwise Indian Government must be held fully responsible for the new tension caused by such unlawful action.

For some time Indian Government has continually stepped up its military activities in border areas and established many new check posts. This was not denied even by responsible officials of the Indian Government including Prime Minister Nehru in their public statements. But the Indian Government has now groundlessly charged against Chinese troops with establishing new posts in western sector of the Sino-Indian border, going beyond so called “1956 Chinese claim line in Ladakh”, etc. It should be pointed out that the Sino-Indian traditional boundary in the Western sector has always been most clear and definite. It is the line marked on Chinese maps published in 1956 which was mentioned in Premier Chau En-lai’s letter to Prime Minister Nehru dated 17th December, 1959; it is also the line marked on the maps handed over to the Indian side by the Chinese officials during meeting of Chinese and Indian officials in 1960. The vast territory east of this sector of the boundary, except the Parigas area in the Demchok region, which has been occupied by India in recent years has all along been under the effective administrative jurisdiction of the Chinese Government. Out of consideration for Sino-Indian friendship and border tranquillity the Chinese Government has ordered its frontier guards to strictly observe this sector of the boundary and has kept Chinese troops from sending patrols within 20 kilometres on the Chinese side of the boundary. Hence the question of Chinese troops crossing the so called “1956 Chinese claim line in Ladakh” cannot possibly arise. The three places where Chinese troops were alleged by the Indian Government in its note of having established new posts are within Chinese territory east of this sector of the boundary line. The Chinese check posts at Nyagzu and at 35 degrees 19 minutes N, 78 degrees 12 minutes E have long been in existence and no check post has ever been established at Dambuguru. The Indian Government’s fallacious charge that China has established new posts at these three places not only is an open interference with China’s internal affairs but also shows the Indian Government’s irresponsible attitude of trumping up falsehoods. This
cannot but greatly pain the Chinese people and Government who have consistently upheld traditional Sino-Indian friendship.

In its note the Indian Government further lists 11 cases charging the Chinese side with intrusions into Indian territory. These 11 cases can be divided into two categories:

(1) 4 of the cases are repetition of old stories. Case (3) alleges that Chinese soldiers were seen near hot springs in Indian territory in the Western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary. Cases (7) and (8) allege that 11 armed Chinese personnel and three Chinese respectively crossed into the territory of Sikkim South of Jelpeila. Case (10) alleges that 25 Chinese soldiers went to Taksang Gompa in the area controlled by India in the Eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary. Concerning these four cases the Indian Government long ago sent note to the Chinese Government and the Chinese Government already pointed out in its respective replies that the result of the investigation showed that there was no case of armed Chinese personnel entering the above area referred to by the Indian side. In replying to the allegation (7), the Chinese Government on its own initiative explained that at the said time eight Chinese border inhabitants who were gathering medical herbs in the vicinity of Jelpeila according to their usual practice had reached a spot not far to the South of Jelpeila but returned from there soon afterwards. In replying to allegation (10) too the Chinese Government explained that nine local working personnel of the Tibet region of China while out to fell bamboos had lost their way because of the low clouds and thick fog and stepped over the so called "McMahon Line" by mistake but that as soon as they perceived it they had turned back. The above replies fully prove that the attitude of the Chinese Government is one of seeking truth from facts and is open and above board. Category II, the other seven so called new cases are mostly dating over a year ago; in some cases no specific dates have been supplied at all. In spite of this the Chinese Government has conducted serious and thorough investigations. The replies are given which are as follows:

A. Four of the cases pertain to the Western sector. Case (1) and (2) allege that Chinese military personnel and a Chinese survey party went to the Suriah area. Case (4) alleges that four Chinese soldiers were seen at 34 degrees 17 minutes N, 79 degrees 01 minutes E. Case (5) alleges that Chinese and Chinese troops were seen near 33 degrees 31 minutes N, 78 degrees 48 minutes E. The Chinese Government deem it necessary to point out that all the above places are within Chinese territory and have all along been under the effective administrative jurisdiction of the Chinese Government and so the Indian Government has no right to intervene. Moreover as mentioned above the Chinese Government in order to maintain the tranquillity of the bor-
der area has instructed the Chinese frontier guards not to send patrol within 20 kilometres on Chinese side of the boundary. The results of the recent investigations show that the Chinese frontier guards have always observed this instruction faithfully and have not trespassed into Indian territory at all. On the contrary as pointed out by the Chinese Government in its note of 12th August 1961, it is the Indian frontier guards who have not only occupied long ago Demchok and other places within Chinese territory in the Western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary but have pushed forward and expanded continually the extent of its illegal occupation.

B. Case (6) also pertains to the Western sector. It is alleged that a Chinese patrol was seen near, Dauletbeg Oldi. Of all the seven new cases brought up in the note this is the only case which concerns Indian territory. But the time given in the Indian note is extremely vague using only the loose expression of "sometime in the autumn of 1960". According to the result of investigation the Chinese Government can reply definitely that throughout the autumn of 1960 no Chinese patrol ever went into the area within 20 kilometres on Chinese side of the Western sector of the Sino-Indian traditional boundary to say nothing of course of trespassing into Indian territory.

C. Case (9) concerns the China Sikkim border. It is alleged that 12 armed Chinese personnel went 100 yards inside Sikkim territory from Jelepela. As is well known the China Sikkim boundary has long been formally delimited and its location is very clear. The result of investigation once again shows that this boundary has always been respected by Chinese side and that no armed Chinese personnel trespassed into the territory of Sikkim at the time mentioned in the Indian Note.

D. Case (11) says that in the first week of July 1961, a Chinese patrol was seen near Chemokarpla, South of the "McMahon Line" in the eastern sector. The Note fails to give the specific coordinate of the scene of the so-called incident or exact date. In spite of this Chinese Government has conducted an extensive investigation but no Chinese forces are found to have gone beyond the so called "McMahon Line" in early July.

It can be seen from the above that the Indian Government in order to make the fabricated charges of "aggression" against Chinese Government has not hesitated to repeat allegations which were refuted by the facts, and make new allegations in which even simple matter of date cannot be clearly stated and only one of the places involved
is really within Indian territory. Thus it is very difficult to make people believe that the Indian Government was taking a serious and responsible attitude. The Indian Government in its Note asserts that it was not true that the Chinese side had desisted from sending out patrolling parties and that there was no factual basis for China's maintenance of the status quo of the boundary and so on. This can only be regarded as an attempt to create pretexts for unlawful activities by Indian side in the Chinese border areas. The Chinese Government has never spared any effort to maintain status quo of the boundary and the tranquillity of the border area in the hope of creating favourable conditions for the settlement through negotiation of the boundary question by the Chinese and Indian sides in accordance with five principles of peaceful co-existence. The Indian Government however has acted in a diametrically opposite way, it has made incessant provocations in border areas in an attempt to realise its territorial claims by force, and turned back to falsely accuse China of committing so-called new aggression. Such practice of the Indian Government whatever needs it may be designed to meet will only result in the daily aggravating of tension in the Sino-Indian border areas the putting off of a settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question and the lack of improvement in Sino-Indian relations and these run counter to the common desire of the Chinese and Indian peoples. The Chinese Government earnestly hope that the Indian Government will change its line, treasure Sino-Indian friendship and the interests of the Chinese and Indian peoples, adopt a friendly and co-operative attitude, agree to settle reasonably boundary question and improve relations between two countries.

The Ministry is availing itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurance of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 9 December 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi, and with reference to the note dated 2nd November, 1961, handed over to the Indian Charge d'Affairs in Peking by the Chinese Foreign Ministry, regarding alleged intrusions into Chinese territory by Indian armed personnel, have the honour to state as follows:

The allegations contained in the present Chinese note are a repetition of the charges made earlier in their note of August 12, 1961, to which an answer has been given in this Ministry's note of October 31, 1961. It is all the more surprising that the Chinese Government should return to the same charges.

The specific allegations of intrusion mentioned in the present Chinese note are dealt with below:

*Allegation I.*—It has been alleged that on July 6, 1961, Indian troops intruded into the Rato area and set up a post there. They carried out military exercises with 'solid shots' and time and again sent patrols to Gore.

*Comments.*—The Demchok area and the other locations mentioned in the Chinese note are within India's international border in this sector and have been traditionally under Indian administration. For the Chinese Government to raise questions about Indian posts and patrols in Indian territory is an entirely unjustified interference in the sovereign affairs of the Government of India. However, Indian forces in this sector have not carried out any military exercise with or without "solid shots".

*Allegation II.*—On August 9, three Indian soldiers went into the Deboche area.

*Comments.*—No Indian soldier, as alleged in the Chinese note, ever went into the Deboche area.

*Allegation III.*—On July 22, Indian troops detained a Chinese citizen named Dopoje in the Demchok area and interrogated him.

*Comments.*—The Government of India has no information regarding the alleged detention of a Chinese citizen named Dopoje in the Demchok area of India's Ladakh. More particulars of this Chinese citizen should be furnished to facilitate enquiries.

*Allegation IV.*—In June 1961, 50 odd military men intruded into Waje and built fortifications there. On July 2, 3, 5 and 15 Indian aircraft intruded into the air space in the area and dropped supplies to Indian troops.
Comments.—Chinese Government’s attention is drawn to the comments under Allegation IV of the Ministry’s note of October 31, 1961, wherein it has been clearly stated that no armed post exists in Barahoti which the Chinese call Wuje. Indian posts in adjoining areas do not fall within the purview of the agreement on the demilitarisation of Barahoti so long as Barahoti is in dispute. The Government of India has rigidly adhered to the understanding between the two Governments in respect of Barahoti only.

It is a matter of regret that the Chinese Government should question the propriety of certain defensive measures taken by the Indian Government on its own territory. That the Chinese Government should also lodge a protest on this account is not only a mockery of truth but unwarranted interference in India’s internal affairs. In face of growing Chinese aggression on Indian territory since 1957-58, and expansion of unlawful Chinese occupation over parts of Ladakh it ill-behoves the Chinese Government to ask the Government of India to desist from taking measures to safeguard its territorial integrity. As to the profession that the Chinese Government has exercised restraint on its troops along the border, this has to be seen in the background of its record of aggression in recent years. The Sino-Indian border was always a border of peace and friendship until the Chinese Government embarked on a course of aggression. To restore peace and tranquillity on this border as well as to create fresh confidence in the Chinese Government’s professions, Chinese forces should first of all withdraw from Indian territory into Chinese territory. It would serve no useful purpose for the Chinese Government to go on pressing faked charges about Indian intrusions into Chinese territory in order to justify its own aggression on India.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 February 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the note of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China of November 30, 1961, has the honour to state as follows:—

The Government of India regret that the Government of the People's Republic of China ignore the clear and detailed information provided in the note of the Government of India of October 31, 1961, and continue to make baseless charges about Indian intrusions into Chinese territory and air space. In their note of October 31, 1961, the Government of India established conclusively that at no time had Indian forces or aircraft gone beyond what is, and has been for centuries, Indian territory. The territory west of Spang-gur, the Demchok area, Nilang and Barahoti (which the Chinese call Wuje) have always been parts of India and been administered by Indian authorities. To substantiate this position, a large amount of relevant evidence was produced by the Indian side at the talks which were held recently between the Indian and Chinese officials. It is, therefore, legitimate for the Government of India to establish check-posts and despatch personnel required for the administration of these areas.

It is, in fact, the Government of China who have during recent years been guilty of systematic and continuous aggression into Indian territory, and it is they who have sought to justify unlawful occupation by unwarranted territorial claims. These actions have been followed by a sustained campaign of falsehoods and propaganda against India.

It seems preposterous to the Government of India that the Government of China should argue that because the Government of India continue to exercise lawful jurisdiction over the territories that traditionally belong to them, the Government of China would be justified in crossing the so-called "McMahon Line" in order to assert their unfounded claims to the territory south of it. This territory, as the territory in the Western and Middle Sectors, has always been a part of India and been subject to Indian jurisdiction and administration. The "McMahon Line" Agreement of 1914 merely formalized what was the traditional boundary, well-known and recognized by the authorities on both sides. The Government of India take strong exception to the Chinese attempt to reply to Government of India's protest against Chinese aggression in the Western Sector by threatening aggression elsewhere. If the threat materialises and Chinese forces attempt to cross the "McMahon Line", the Government of India would regard it as a further instance of aggression and take such action as may be necessary to meet this further aggression.
The Government of India fail to understand the constant reference made by the Government of China to the need for a final settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. The boundary between the two countries has long been settled. It has the sanction of centuries of tradition and custom as well as the confirmation, for almost its entire length, of valid treaties and agreements. It is the Government of China who have in recent years sought to change unilaterally by means of force the long-existing status quo. This has violated what had throughout history been a frontier of peace and jeopardized relations between the two countries. Peace on the border and friendly relations between the two countries can never be restored until the Government of China withdraw from the Indian territory which they have unlawfully occupied.

The Government of India welcome the fact that the Government of China now recognize that the traditional boundary between the two countries in the Western Sector has always been most clear and definite. This has throughout been the position of the Government of India. The traditional boundary in this area is that which has been shown on official Indian maps and in support of which a vast amount of evidence was brought forward during the talks of the officials. In China, however, this well-known traditional boundary has been in recent years ignored and a bewildering variety of alignments have been shown on their maps. There was even, as has been shown in the Report of the Officials and in the note of the Government of India of October 31, 1961, a discrepancy between the map published in China in 1956, which according to His Excellency Premier Chou En-Lai showed the alignment correctly, and the map provided by the Chinese side at the talks between the officials. This has been repeatedly pointed out to the Government of China; and it is a matter of surprise that they continue to assert, without regard to the facts, that the alignments on these two maps are identical. The map of 1960 showed an alignment which ran due east from the Karakoram Pass whereas that in the map of 1956 ran south-east from that point. In the Pangong region, the map of 1960 cut across the western half of the Pangong Lake, while the map of 1956 left the entire western half in India. In the Spanggur area, the map of 1960 showed an alignment west of the lake but the map of 1956 showed the major part of the lake in India.

Regarding the three new check-posts established by the Chinese in Indian territory to which attention was drawn in the note of the Government of India of October 31, 1961, the Government of China continue to claim that they are within Chinese territory. This is, of course, a complete travesty of the facts. The post at the point East 78° 12', North 35° 19' is well within Indian territory and about 120 miles to the west of the traditional boundary alignment. The check-post at Nyagzu is one mile west of the traditional boundary alignment and that at Dambuguru is about two miles within Indian territory.

The Government of China have made no effort to deny the existence of the check-posts at the first two points but merely assert
that they have long been in existence. Aggression cannot be justi-
fied by time; but in fact, as the Government of India have stated,
they have been set up recently and constitute fresh incursions into
Indian territory.

The Government of India cannot accept the assertion of the Gov-
ernment of China that they have no check-post at Dambuguru. It
is beyond doubt that such a post has been recently established.

The three posts have also been linked to bases in the rear by
roads constructed across Indian territory. The Government of India
drew attention to these also in their note of October 31, 1961; and
the Government of China have not denied it.

The Government of India cited, in their note of October 31, 1961,
eleven instances of recent Chinese intrusions into Indian territory.
The Government of China have given no satisfactory explanations
for any of these. They have denied that Chinese soldiers were seen
east of Hot Springs on October 13, 1960 and south of Jelep La on
April 20, 1961. Mere denials cannot set aside first-hand evidence of
these incursions into Indian territory. As regards the crossing by a
Chinese patrol party of the northern border of Sikkim on Septem-
ber 2, 1960 and the intrusion by a Chinese patrol party four miles
into Indian territory south of the so-called “MacMahon Line” on
June 3, 1960, the Government of China assert that these were acci-
dental trespasses by local inhabitants. But in both cases there is
evidence to show that the violations were by large parties of Chi-
nese soldiers carrying arms.

The Government of India note that the Government of China
do not deny that their military personnel were present in Indian
territory, in April and June 1960 at Suriah, in October 1960 near
Hot Springs and in May 1961 near Chushul. All these areas form
traditional Indian territory which have for centuries been under
Indian jurisdiction and administration. The acceptance by the Gov-
ernment of China of the presence of their military personnel in
these areas is, therefore, tantamount to acknowledgment of unlaw-
ful incursions on their part.

These incursions belie the statement of the Government of China
that their patrols have been instructed not to proceed within twenty
kilometres of the alignment claimed by the Chinese Government.
The check-posts which have been recently established are also much
less than twenty kilometres away even from the alignment claimed

The Government of China deny that one of their patrols intruded
into Indian territory near Dauletbeg Oldi in the autumn of 1960.
But this patrol left behind sufficient traces and evidence to estab-
lish beyond doubt that it had intruded into what even the Govern-
ment of China accept to be Indian territory.

The intrusion of Chinese armed personnel across the Jelep La
on September 12, 1961, was noticed by Indian border guards, and
their evidence cannot be refuted by a mere denial.
As stated by the Government of India in their note of October 31, 1961, a Chinese patrol entered the Kameng Frontier Division of India in July 1961 and came to a point west of Chemokarpola. The co-ordinates of the point are East 91° 51’ North 27° 45’. The patrol left behind considerable evidence of its intrusion.

It is clear, therefore, that the Government of China are not only still in unlawful occupation of a large area of Indian territory but continue to violate the traditional boundary alignment between the two countries and to make repeated incursions into India. It is only when the Government of China withdraw from Indian territory and begin to respect the validity of the international boundary, which has been recognized in law and by history, that the relations between India and China can improve.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 1 March 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and with reference to the note of December 4 and the two notes of December 9, 1961, from the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government to the Chinese Embassy in India, has the honour to state as follows:—

(1) The Indian Government, in its notes, tried to deny the facts stated in the Chinese Government's note of October 7 and its two notes of November 2, 1961, concerning further Indian encroachments and intrusions into China's territory and air space. Not only this, the Indian notes, while levelling wanton slanders and attacks at the Chinese Government, asserted that the illegal Indian activities of encroaching and intruding into China's territory and air space were Indian measures to safeguard its territorial integrity. This shows that Indian encroachments and intrusions into Chinese territory and air space are by no means accidental, but deliberate attempts to realize by force the territorial claims put forward by the Indian Government to the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government cannot but seriously point out that this line of action of the Indian Government is most dangerous and may lead to grave consequences.

(2) In the interest of friendship between China and India, the Chinese Government has always worked for the peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. Although the boundary line pointed out by China is the genuine traditional customary line and that claimed by India is without historical or legal basis, the Chinese Government has all along insisted on a settlement of the boundary question through friendly negotiations. The Chinese Government held that, pending a settlement of the boundary question, the two sides should jointly maintain the status quo of the boundary and refrain from changing it by the use of force or by any other unilateral action. In order to ease the situation along the border, the Chinese Government further proposed that the armed personnel of each side withdraw twenty kilometres from the entire boundary and that they stop patrolling there. After these proposals were rejected by the Indian side, China has on its own stopped patrolling within twenty kilometres on its side of the boundary. The Chinese Government has done this because it is deeply convinced that maintenance of the status quo of the boundary is the only way to avoid military clashes and an indispensable pre-requisite to seeking a peaceful settlement of the boundary question.
(3) The Indian Government has taken a diametrically opposite stand. It has refused to hold negotiations. While persisting in its illegal occupation of the Chinese territory south of the so-called McMahon Line in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, it has repeatedly demanded that China withdraw from vast tracts of Chinese territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary. It not only groundlessly claimed these territories from the Chinese Government, but has actually been undermining the status quo of the boundary and nibbling at Chinese territory by unilateral action. Since 1954, the Indian Government, basing itself on the boundary line it unilaterally claims has occupied, one after another, not a few pieces of Chinese territory in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian boundary. In the past year and more, it has shifted its emphasis in occupying China's territory to the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, where Indian troops have steadily pushed forward, continually set up new check-posts and extended their scope of patrol of China's territory. Indian aircraft have intruded into Chinese air space again and again to carry out wilful reconnaissance and harassment. As a result, the situation along the Sino-Indian border, far from easing, has become increasingly tense since the talks between the Prime Ministers of the two countries in April, 1960.

(4) In spite of all this, the Chinese Government still hopes that these matters can be settled reasonably through diplomatic channels. Contrary to expectation, the Indian Government arbitrarily described its actions, which are liable to give rise to serious incidents, as measures to safeguard its own territory. Prime Minister Nehru himself also said, when speaking in Lok Sabha on December 5, 1961, that such actions were taken "in defence". This actually amounts to saying that the Chinese Government must unconditionally accept the territorial claims advanced by the Indian Government, and that even when the Indian side is imposing these territorial claims on China by force, China has no right to raise objection. As the Indian Government is aware, although the Chinese Government does not recognize the so-called McMahon Line unilaterally claimed by the Indian side in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, yet in order to maintain the status quo of the boundary pending a settlement of the boundary question it has strictly restrained all its military and administrative personnel from crossing this line. If, like the Indian Government, the Chinese Government had also taken unilateral actions to violate the status quo of the boundary, what would the relations between the two countries have been like? The Chinese Government has not done so and considers that it should not do so. Proceeding from the overall consideration for Sino-Indian friendship, the Chinese Government has all along exercised the greatest self-restraint. The Chinese Government
hopes that the Indian Government too will take account of the fact that the present unilateral actions of the Indian Government on the Sino-Indian border, if carried on, will never lead to a settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question.

(5) The Sino-Indian boundary question can be settled only through peaceful negotiations and not through any other means. The Chinese Government perseveres in this stand. It was precisely in accordance with this consistant stand of the Chinese Government that Premier Chou En-lai held talks with Prime Minister Nehru in April 1960. Although the talks failed to produce the desired results, Premier Chou En-lai still hoped that negotiations would continue between the two sides. As far as the Chinese side is concerned, the door for negotiations is always open. The Chinese Government has noted that in his speech at Poona on February 11, 1962, Prime Minister Nehru also indicated that India wanted to settle the Sino-Indian border dispute through peaceful means and not to create an everlasting enmity with China. The Chinese Government hopes that this indicated desire will be translated into action. The Chinese and the Indian Peoples are friendly to each other. China and India are two neighbouring great powers in Asia. No force will ever emerge that can alter the geographical proximity of China and India. However long it may be deferred, the boundary question between China and India will have to be settled peacefully some day. In the interest of the Chinese and Indian people and of Asia and world peace, an early settlement is better than a late one. It is hoped that these views will be given serious consideration by the Indian Government.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 March 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the note of the Government of China of 26 February 1962, has the honour to state as follows:—

The note of the Government of India of 4 December 1961, and their two notes of 9 December 1961, have shown conclusively that the charges of Indian intrusion into Chinese territory and air space, made by the Government of China, are without warrant. At no time have Indian personnel or aircraft crossed the traditional and well-recognised boundary of India. Clear instructions have been issued to all Indian personnel to avoid trespass into Chinese territory and air space, and these instructions have been scrupulously observed. On the other hand, Chinese troops remain in occupation of a large portion of Indian territory and continue to trespass at a number of places along the border. The Government of India have, in their earlier notes, cited many instances of the intrusion of Chinese armed parties into Indian territory. These facts belie the contention of the Government of China that their patrols have not approached within 20 kilometres of the line of control. The notes of the Government of India of 31 October 1961 and 26 February 1962 established indisputably that Chinese patrols have not only advanced into Indian territory well beyond the line of control claimed but the military posts, which have been recently established, are also well beyond the line of control claimed by the Government of China.

It is the legitimate right, and indeed the duty, of the Government of India to take all necessary measures to safeguard the territorial integrity of India. The Government of India regret that the Government of China have, in contravention of international law, and, in total disregard of the principle of respect for territorial integrity, taken steps which have violated the tranquillity and peace in the Indian border areas and compelled the Government of India to adopt protective measures to stop further inroads into Indian territory. The Government of China have, in recent years, upset by force the long existing status quo in the Sino-Indian boundary region, and sought to justify their forcible occupation of Indian territory by putting forward claims which were shown by the evidence produced by the Indian side at the recent meetings of the officials to be baseless.

Since 1957, Chinese forces have begun a process of intrusion and occupation in the Aksai Chin area of Ladakh. In September 1958, they captured an Indian patrol, led by Capt. Iyengar, at Haji Langar. This was the first attempt on the part of the Chinese to interfere with the lawful exercise of Indian jurisdiction in the area. It was with surprise and regret that the Government of India learnt of the road which the Chinese were then clearing through Aksai Chin and they protested about it. In disregard of this protest, Chinese forces, by
the end of 1959, spread further west and south of Aksai Chin and cleared roads from Lanak-la to Kongkala and along the bed of the Qara Qash river; which area was being regularly patrolled by the Indian border police. It was in these circumstances that an Indian police party on regular patrol duty was ambushed by the Chinese at Kongkala in October 1959 and suffered heavy casualties. Between 1960 and 1961 Chinese forces advanced further into Indian territory as was brought to the notice of the Government of China by the Note of the Government of India dated the 31 October 1961.

The Government of India have drawn attention repeatedly to the well-known fact that the traditional boundary of India as shown on official Indian maps, has been confirmed by tradition, recognized by custom and defined by treaty. Even the Government of China recognized this and did not, till 1959, question the validity of this boundary or object to the exercise of jurisdiction by the Government of India right up to the customary border. Facts do not sustain the statement of the Government of China that the latter have always worked for the peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. The true position is that this boundary had long been settled and there was no Sino-Indian boundary question till the Government of China saw fit to disturb the peace in the border areas in very recent times.

The Government of India are aware of course, that the boundary between the two countries, which lies along high watersheds, has not been, in many places, demarcated on the ground. But this was never, during all these centuries, a matter of concern because the boundary lies along well-known natural features and was recognised by both sides. It is true that the Government of India have been willing, to consider minor mutual adjustments in a few areas of the border in the interests of friendship between the two peoples and peace in Asia. However, the Government of India cannot accept that the entire boundary between India and China has not been delimited and should be the subject of negotiations. That would be to set aside centuries of history and the sanction of a large number of treaties and agreements.

The Government of India are in entire agreement with the Government of China that the two sides should maintain the status quo of the boundary and refrain from changing it by use of force or any other unilateral action. The status quo had been maintained by the peoples and Governments on either side of the boundary from ancient times. The Government of China have, however, in recent years, disturbed the status quo by forcibly occupying an area which has always been the territory of India. The Government of India hope that the Government of China, in accordance with the principle which they have themselves stated so clearly will withdraw from this territory and restore the status quo. Such a restoration of the status quo through the withdrawal of Chinese forces from Indian territory, into which they have intruded since 1957, is an essential step for the creation of a favourable climate for any negotiations between the two Governments regarding the boundary.
The Government of India are surprised that the Government of China, in face of all the evidence and their own recognition in the past, continue to assert that the territory south of the "McMahon Line" does not belong to India. This area is, and has always been, inhabited by peoples of India and administered by Indian authorities. The Governments of Tibet and of China have at all times in the past recognized that the boundary runs along the main watershed in the region. This traditional boundary had secured the added confirmation of the treaty in 1914. The Government of India fail to understand the basis for the accusation of the Government of China that India is guilty of unlawful activity in the Eastern Sector. This accusation is made without any basis merely to cover up the aggression committed by the Chinese authorities in the Western Sector. In the Middle Sector also, the areas right up to the watershed boundary have been traditionally parts of India and administered by Indian authorities. The Government of India reject the baseless charge that it is only since 1954 that some of these areas have been occupied by the Government of India.

The Government of India have, in their note of 26 February 1962, already dealt with the argument of the Government of China that because the Government of India objected to the Chinese occupation of Indian territory in the Western Sector, the Government of China could, but for their self-restraint, similarly object and occupy Indian territory in the Eastern Sector. It is strange that the Government of China should justify a wrong done by them in one area by taking credit for not committing a similar wrong in another area.

As the Chinese Government are well aware, the Government of India are dedicated to the use of peaceful methods for the settlement of international problems. They have adhered to this policy despite grave happenings in recent years in the border areas affecting Indian territory and lives. In fact, they have patiently refrained from any resort to force to bring about the vacation of Indian territory forcibly occupied by Chinese forces in recent times. The Chinese Government have rightly drawn attention to the Prime Minister's speech expressing India's earnest desire to achieve a peaceful settlement of the border problem with China for which the necessary foundation has to be laid, in the first instance, by the peaceful withdrawal of Chinese forces from territories which have traditionally been a part of India. Such action by China would re-establish faith in international law and respect for the traditional boundary between the two countries, and go a long way in restoring the traditional friendship between the peoples of India and China, and so assist in the maintenance of peace in Asia and the world.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 March 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:—

In its notes of August 12 and November 2, 1961 the Chinese Government lodged protests with the Indian Government against Indian troops’ illegal activities of setting up new posts, extending their scope of patrol in the Demchok area of Tibet, China, between April and July, 1961. However, Indian activities of advancing further into Chinese territory and expanding the scope of its illegal occupation have continued to increase. In July 1961 Indian troops occupied a place near Jara Pass (approximately 32° 48' N, 79° 32' E); in December they occupied Chang Pass (approximately 33° 01' N, 79° 22' E); and they illegally set up posts at these two places on Chinese territory. In October 1961, Indian troops also illegally set up a provisional post at Charding La (approximately 32° 32' N, 79° 24' E) within China. It is obviously the attempt of the Indian side through these illegal activities to annex about 1,300 square kilometres of Chinese territory in the Shangatsangpu River area. Furthermore on February 12, 1962 seven Indian military men even came beyond the boundary line unilaterally claimed by India and crossed the watershed between Chang Pass and Jara Pass to penetrate into Duobaozao within Chinese territory; and they declared to Chinese herdsmen that the boundary line was about another 800 metres east of Chang Pass.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest against these activities of Indian troops of continuously expanding its occupation of Chinese territory and further violating the status quo of the boundary, and asks the Indian Government to order the intruding Indian troops to withdraw from Chinese territory.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated February 26 and March 13, 1962, has the honour to state as follows:

In its note dated November 30, 1961, the Chinese Government, basing itself on facts established through close investigation and repeated verifications, pointed out that the charge made by the Indian Government about alleged Chinese intrusions into Indian territory and violation of the status quo of the boundary was totally inconsistent with the facts. In its note of February 26, 1962, the Chinese Government further stressed the importance of maintenance of the status quo of the boundary by both China and India and reiterated its sincere desire for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question through negotiations.

The Indian Government in its note of February 26, 1962, however, still repeated its entirely groundless charge that the Chinese Government had committed aggression against India. It was especially unexpected that the Indian Government in its note of March 13, 1962, took a negative attitude towards the Chinese Government’s friendly indication for a peaceful settlement of the boundary question through negotiations. The Indian Government stated in its note that “restoration of the status quo through the withdrawal of Chinese forces from Indian territory, into which they have intruded since 1957, is an essential step for the creation of a favourable climate for any negotiations between the two Governments regarding the boundary.” But what is called here “Indian territory into which they have intruded since 1957” is Chinese territory which has long been under Chinese jurisdiction. In the same note the Indian Government, moreover, said that it is legitimate for the Indian Government to take all measures in regard to the above-mentioned area in the western sector. The Indian Government even asserted in its note of February 26 that “peace on the border and friendly relations between the two countries can never be restored” until the Chinese Government withdraws from the said area in the western sector. The Chinese Government cannot but feel disappointment and regret at this attitude of the Indian Government of refusing to negotiate and refusing to maintain the status quo of the boundary.

In both its notes, the Indian Government asserted that there was no boundary question between China and India, that the boundary question between them had long been settled, and that the problem had now arisen merely because the Chinese Government had in recent years “violated what had throughout history been a frontier of peace.” These assertions are wholly untenable.
True, the Chinese and Indian peoples have always been friendly to each other since ancient times. Yet no fair-minded historian can ignore the fact, that, having gained complete control over India more than a century ago, British imperialism, taking advantage of the unfortunate situation in which the Indian people were powerless and using India as its base, expanded into China's Tibet and Sinkiang regions. This is exactly the root cause of the Sino-Indian boundary dispute. Therefore, how can it be said that no Sino-Indian boundary dispute has existed historically? The so-called international treaties the Indian Government cited to prove that the Sino-Indian boundary question has been settled, such as the secret notes exchanged in 1914 between the British and Tibetan representatives on the so-called McMahon Line, have in fact proved the very opposite, that is, the Sino-Indian boundary has never been formally delimited and, as a result of the aggressive policy pursued by British imperialism, a boundary dispute does exist between China and India. Even the then Government of old China clearly expressed its non-recognition of the so-called McMahon Line. What could that be, if not a boundary dispute? Even the government of old China took such an attitude, how can one expect the government of new China to recognize this line as legal? Moreover, the so-called McMahon Line exists only in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, while concerning the middle and western sectors even illegal secret boundary treaties are non-existent, how then can one expect the Chinese Government to accept the assertion that "the boundary between the two countries has long been settled"?

The Sino-Indian boundary question is a question left over by history. China and India, being both newly independent countries, could not be held responsible for the rise of these questions. Proceeding from this basic fact the Chinese Government has always held that the two sides should take into account both the past historical background and the present actual situation and peacefully settle the Sino-Indian boundary question in accordance with the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and through friendly negotiations, and that, pending the settlement of the question through negotiations, both China and India should maintain the status quo of the boundary so as to create the necessary atmosphere for its peaceful settlement. In the past several years, the Chinese Government has consistently adhered to this stand. The Chinese Government does not recognize the McMahon Line, yet it has all along respected the status quo of the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary and has not gone beyond this line. No deliberate distortion can alter this fact, a fact of which the Indian Government itself is aware. As for the area in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, it has always been under the effective jurisdiction of the Chinese Government. To say nothing of the remote past, after the founding of the People's Republic of China it was by the traditional route running through this area that Chinese troops in 1950 entered the Ari District of Tibet from Sinkiang. From 1954 to 1957, China surveyed and constructed the 1200 kilometre-long Sinkiang-Tibet Highway which traverses this area. Before the summer of 1958 the Indian Government had never questioned or objected to the exercise of sovereignty in this area by the Chinese Government. The Indian
Government stated in its note that it was in 1957 that the Chinese Government began to enter the Aksai Chin area. This statement is a distortion of the fact and does not merit any refutation. In the past twelve years and more, Chinese military and administrative personnel in the western sector have always worked for the maintenance of the status quo of the boundary and have never gone a single step beyond their own territory. The same is true with the middle sector of the Sino-Indian boundary. Whether in the eastern, western or middle sectors of the Sino-Indian boundary, it is India, not China, which in fact has gone beyond its own territory and entered the territory of the other side, and a record of this can be found in the previous notes of protests from the Chinese Government and other documents.

In order to ease the border situation and avoid clashes, the Chinese Government further decided, on its own, not to send patrols within 20 kilometres on its side of the boundary. The fact that this decision has always been earnestly carried through can by no means be distorted. The Indian Government on the one hand rejected the proposal but forward by China for the armed personnel of each side to withdraw 20 kilometres from the boundary, and on the other hand in its notes blamed China for failing to abolish its existing frontier-posts. This attitude can in no way be deemed fair.

As the Chinese Government repeatedly pointed out, it is the Indian side that has undermined the status quo of the Sino-Indian boundary by unilateral action. To justify its untenable position, the Indian Government in its note further charged that in recent years Chinese maps had ignored India's so-called "well-known traditional boundary" in the western sector. Here it should be pointed out that, in the Chinese and Indian officials' meeting, the Chinese officials proved with a great deal of factual material that the traditional customary line pointed out by China is well founded and that the alignment in Chinese maps published over the past several decades has in the main been consistent, whereas the boundary line shown on current Indian maps is without historical or factual basis. Up to 1954 official Indian maps had generally confirmed that the boundary in the western sector was undetermined and had marked no boundary line at all. How comes that this boundary line which has appeared in official Indian maps only since 1954 suddenly becomes a "well-known traditional boundary line"?

In disregard of the above-mentioned facts, the Indian Government continually charged China with aggression against India and repeated intrusions into Indian air space by Chinese aircraft. The Chinese Government categorically rejects these utterly groundless charges. The Chinese side has always strictly observed the status quo of the boundary and Chinese aircraft has never made any flight over areas along the Sino-Indian border. Therefore, this line of action of the Indian Government is indeed incomprehensible.
How could China possibly commit aggression against India? China suffered greatly from imperialist aggression for over a century, and to date China's Taiwan is still, under armed U.S. occupation and China's security is continuously threatened by U.S. imperialism. How is it thinkable that China in turn should commit aggression against Indian territory? The socialist system chosen by the Chinese people determines that China does not need war, that it would never permit itself to, nor should it ever, nor will it ever seize a single inch of a neighboring country's territory. What China needs from the new-born Asian countries, which have achieved independence from under imperialist oppression, is friendship. China is ready to live in amity with these countries, settle with them the questions left over by history and together with them enter the new era of peace and prosperity in Asia. China has never regarded India as its enemy, nor will it ever do so. China has never seized a single inch of Indian territory, nor will it ever do so.

The Chinese Government has noted the wish expressed by the Indian Government in its note of March 13 for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, however, it cannot but point out that what the Indian Government termed peaceful settlement is for China to withdraw from its own territory, which is in fact tantamount to the summary rejection of peaceful settlement. The Indian Government also talked about negotiations in its notes, but it insisted that pending any negotiations China must withdraw from its own territory, which is in fact tantamount to the summary rejection of negotiations. In its notes, the Indian Government also agreed that the status quo of the boundary should be maintained, but what is termed maintenance of the status quo is still for China to withdraw from its own territory, which is in fact tantamount to the summary rejection of the maintenance of the status quo. Anyone who is sensible and reasonable can see that such a rigid and threatening attitude will certainly lead to no solution, even if it were not intended to. What is more disquieting is that such an attitude will aggravate the unrest along the border and even augment the danger of clashes. The consequence of such an attitude will obviously only be advantageous to the imperialist and reactionary forces hostile to Sino-Indian friendship and absolutely cannot bring any good to the Chinese and Indian peoples.

There is no conflict of fundamental interests between China and India. The Chinese Government still believes that the Sino-Indian boundary question, though encountering difficulties at the present time, must be, and entirely can be, settled in a friendly way through peaceful negotiations. Although Premier Chou En-lai's talks with Prime Minister Nehru in the capital of India in April 1960 failed to produce the desired results, the Chinese Government still hopes that negotiations will continue between the two sides. It is clear that to refuse to maintain the status quo and reject negotiations is to reject a peaceful settlement. Such an important question as the Sino-Indian boundary question should not be treated so lightly. As far as the Chinese side is concerned, the door for negotiations is always open. The Chinese Government once again expresses the
hope that these sincere opinions will be given positive consideration by the Indian Government.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 April 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to draw the attention of the Embassy to yet another instance of Chinese violation of India's territorial integrity resulting from the setting up of a new Chinese Military post at MR 7834 E 3501 N, 6 miles west of Sumdo. This Chinese post has obviously been developed recently and constitutes, needless to say, a flagrant breach of the repeated assurances extended by the Chinese Government regarding maintenance of the status quo in the area.

The Government of India, in their note dated 31st October 1961, have already drawn the attention of the Government of the People's Republic of China to three new Chinese Military checkposts established on Indian territory between 1960 and 1961 and to the numerous other instances of intrusion by Chinese Military patrols and survey parties into Indian territory. The Government of China, however, have continued to make the untenable claim that these posts so set up are within Chinese territory although such an assertion cannot be sustained for a moment when examined on the basis of available facts.

It is a matter of deep concern to the Government of India that the Government of the People's Republic of China should continue in this manner to persist in their systematic and deliberate encroachments into Indian territory without proper regard to the grave consequences that these may entail.

While lodging a strong protest against the establishment of this latest Chinese post on Indian territory at MR 7834 E 3501 N the Government of India express the hope that the Chinese Government will take immediate action to withdraw from this new position that they have occupied.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs. New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 18 April 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state that another instance of Chinese intrusion into Indian territory in the Eastern Sector of the border took place in the second week of January 1962. Two Chinese officials of Migyitun accompanied by an interpreter and two platoon commanders crossed the Sino-Indian border near Longju and visited the village of Roi, which is about half a mile South of Longju.

The Government of India have taken serious notice of this unlawful intrusion into Indian territory which is contrary to the repeated assertions of the Government of China that their personnel have never violated the Sino-Indian border in the Eastern Sector. The Government of India regret the despite these solemn assertions Chinese personnel have again intruded into Indian territory and caused fear and tension among the local inhabitants.

In lodging a firm protest with the Government of China in regard to this illegal activity on the part of Chinese personnel in the Tibet region, the Government of India hope that appropriate steps will be taken by the Government of China to ensure that similar intrusions into Indian territory do not occur in future.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 21 April 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

Around 12:00 hours on April 11, 1962, about 25 Indian military men crossed the Sino-Indian boundary in the western sector and intruded into the Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region of China. They penetrated as far as about 10 kilometres into Chinese territory, reaching a place south of Height 5,500 metres (approximately 35°22′ N, 78°07′ E), and carried out prolonged reconnaissance. About 13:00 and 15:00 hours respectively on April 13, two other groups of Indian military personnel intruded into the same area in China and sneaked to appoint at 35°20′N, 78°03′E for reconnaissance. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against such grave activities for further violation of Chinese territory by the Indian side.

In the past one year and more, Indian military personnel have repeatedly violated the status quo of the boundary between China’s Tibet Region and India, seizing pieces of Chinese territory and making intrusions. Regarding this the Chinese Government has lodged many solemn protests with the Indian Government and pointed out that the grave danger couched in those activities. The Indian side, however, not only disregarded the protests of the Chinese Government, but has furthermore expanded its illegal activities to the Chinese frontier areas along the Sinkiang-India border. With full knowledge of the existence of a Chinese post at 35°19′N, 78°12′E, in this region, the Indian side, however in January 1962, sent an aircraft over there, carrying out reconnaissance at a low altitude and making provocative air-droppings. And now, the Indian side has gone even further and openly made armed reconnaissance on the ground near the post. This cannot but seriously endanger the peace and tranquility along the border and greatly increase the danger of clashes. It must also be pointed out that over a long period of time the Indian side has continually set up additional posts on the Sino-Indian border and strengthened its military dispositions. In recent months, news reports have been disseminated from New Delhi to the effect that Indian troops are preparing to make armed provocations against China when the thaw comes to the border areas. The Chinese Government has reasons to believe that the above mentioned Indian intrusion into Chinese territory is a sign of deliberate violation of the status quo of the boundary in the said region. The Chinese Government once more seriously urges the Indian Government to stop immediately such activities which may lead to grave consequences.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 26 April 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

Around 12:30 hours on April 16, 1962, three Indian Military men trespassed into a place 33° 36' N, 78° 46' E, west of the Spanggur lake in the Ari District in Tibet, China, and did not leave there until they had conducted reconnaissance for about 40 minutes. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a protest with the Indian Government against this fresh illegal action undertaken by the Indian side in that area, which could entail serious consequences, and urges the Indian Government to take prompt measures to prevent similar activities of intrusions.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the
Embassy of India in China, 27 April 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of
China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China
and, with reference to the note from the Indian Ministry of External
Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India dated April 15, 1962, has
the honour to state as follows:

The Indian Government in its note charged the Chinese Govern-
ment with setting up a new post at 35° 01’ N, 79° 34’ E, six miles
west of Sumdo in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary,
and thus violating the status quo of the boundary. The Chinese
Government categorically rejects this charge.

The entire area east of the traditional customary Sino-Indian
boundary line in the western sector, including the aforesaid place,
is part of China’s territory and has been and is under the effective
control of China. Exercise of China’s jurisdiction in the entire
area is completely within China’s sovereignty and also in full
conformity with the principle of maintaining the status quo of the
boundary. The place where China has allegedly set up a new
post according to the note of the Indian Government is deep within
Chinese territory, being over thirty kilometres from the boundary
line. Whether China does or does not adopt any measure there is
entirely China’s internal affair with which the Indian Government
has no right at all to meddle. Moreover, so far as the fact is con-
cerned, the Indian charge is totally untrue, because China has never
set up any post, let alone a new one, at the aforesaid place at 35°
01’ N, 78° 34’ E. Therefore, it is entirely unjustifiable for the
Indian Government to charge China with something China has not
done on its own territory and describe it as a violation of India’s terri-
torial integrity and of the status quo of the boundary. The Chinese
Government categorically rejects the protest of the Indian Gov-
ernment.

The Chinese Government has always advocated and practised
maintenance of the status quo of the boundary. This is a fact
which the Indian side can in no way distort. It is in fact the Indian
side itself that has repeatedly violated the status quo of the
boundary, and especially in the western sector where the Indian
side itself that has repeatedly violated the status quo of the
boundary and made further intrusions and encroachments into
side recently has again and again violated the status quo of the
boundary and made further intrusions and encroachments into
China’s territory and airspace, as recorded in the great number of
notes of protest from the Chinese Government. The Indian Gov-
ernment now once again makes a fabricated charge against China
and repeats the accusation previously put forward in its note of
October 31, 1961 but long refuted by the Chinese Government. This
can only be deemed an attempt of the Indian side to cover up its
continual intrusions into China's border areas and to create a pre-text for carrying out more such unlawful activities. The Chinese Government expresses its resolute opposition to this line of action of the Indian side.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 April 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the note of the Government of China of 22nd March 1962.

2. The Government of India have, in their earlier notes of 26th February and 13th March 1962, reiterated the basic facts of the Sino-Indian border problem which clearly establish that Government of China's contentions, based on a subjective approach, are completely untenable. It is indisputable that, by stages since 1957, the Government of China have occupied unlawfully a large area of territory which has always been a part of India. Until this process of intrusion and occupation began, the Sino-Indian frontier had been peaceful.

3. In 1954, the two Governments negotiated an Agreement which contained a solemn assurance that each would respect the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the other. At that time, the clear and precise alignment of India's northern boundary was well-known to the Government of China, and there was no doubt or misgiving of any kind.

4. In signing the Agreement, the Government of India had unreservedly accepted the bona fides of the Government of China in regard that solemn covenant. There was no dispute, but warm regard and friendship between the two countries. When, therefore, the fact of Chinese intrusion into Aksai Chin territory of India came to the knowledge of the Government of India, they protested to the Government of China in the expectation that the intrusion had been committed in ignorance rather than on purpose and that, once this error was known, the intruding forces would be withdrawn. At that time, the Government of India had, because of Chinese assurances on incorrect maps and the friendly and cordial relations between the two countries, no reason to suspect that the Government of China were contemplating making extensive claims to Indian territory. It was only in 1959 that the Government of China suddenly faced the Government of India with a claim over nearly 50,000 square miles of Indian territory. To say, therefore, that a Sino-Indian boundary dispute existed earlier than 1959 is contrary to facts, and, indeed, contrary to the relations which had developed between the two countries on the basis of mutual respect for each other's sovereignty and firm acceptance of the territorial limits of the two countries.

5. In the course of the correspondence between the two Governments, and in the talks between their officials in 1960, an overwhelming amount of evidence of tradition, custom, administration and jurisdiction was produced to establish that the boundary between the two countries, which had been accepted without question by both
sides prior to 1959, was the boundary alignment shown on official Indian maps. There was no need, therefore, for negotiations to unsettle this firm boundary, sanctioned by history, law and treaty.

6. The Government of India agree with the Government of China on the need to maintain the status quo of the well-recognised traditional boundary. In recent years, however, the Government of China have violated the status quo, made numerous incursions at various points along the boundary, and unlawfully occupied large areas of Indian territory. These developments have disturbed the peace in the border areas and disrupted friendly relations between the two countries. The Government of India have, therefore, sought the cooperation of the Government of China, in the best interests of the two countries, for a reversal of these aggressive measures which have caused tension and for withdrawal of Chinese forces unlawfully posted in Indian territory.

7. It is a matter of regret to the Government of India that the Government of China continue to disregard the Report of the officials of the two sides which examined the factual evidence regarding the Sino-Indian boundary problem. In fact, the Government of China not having seriously considered the Report of the officials are still reiterating, without any evidence, that the Indian territory in Ladakh which is now under their occupation has for long been under Chinese jurisdiction. This is an entirely subjective view, unwarranted by facts.

8. The territory in Ladakh, now under Chinese occupation had always been under the administrative control of Indian authorities; and evidence establishing the continuous and comprehensive exercise of Indian administration of this area for over a hundred years has been provided by the Government of India. The Government of China, on the other hand, were unable to establish on the basis either of historical evidence or of administrative record that these areas had at any time been under the effective jurisdiction of the Government of China or that they had ever been there prior to the recent unlawful occupation. This is also confirmed by the claim made by the Government of China themselves that they had sent their forces through this area for the first time in 1950. In fact, there is evidence to show that the Chinese forces did not enter into this area in 1950, and that the Government of China are now obviously ante-dating their aggression. It is a well established principle of international law, that such trespass and unlawful incursions cannot create title to the territory of another country.

9. The Government of India regret that the Government of China should have deliberately confused the situation regarding the boundary by referring to British Imperialism in the context of the Indo-Chinese border. The records of British rule in India, which are now accessible and open to examination, show that the British only extended their authority over those territories which were historically and traditionally parts of India. These records also show that the British far from expanding into Tibet or Sinkiang region, actually helped the Chinese to consolidate their authority in these regions. As the Government of China are aware, the Government of India who
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are opposed to Imperialistic or aggressive policies, in any form, undertook negotiations in 1953-54 to terminate extra-territorial rights and privileges inherited from the British in Tibet and to establish close and friendly relations with China. The results of these negotiations were reflected in the Agreement of 1954.

10. It is surprising that the Government of China have again questioned the validity of the treaties and agreements which have provided added sanction to the traditional boundary between the two countries. In the Western and Middle sectors, there are treaties and agreements between the Governments of India and China which confirm the traditional boundary. In the Eastern Sector, the Simla Convention and the “McMahon Line” Agreement merely formalised what had for centuries been the traditional boundary between India and Tibet. It is clear from the records of the Simla Conference that the then Government of China had full knowledge of the formalisation of the India-Tibet boundary and of the “McMahon Line” and had approved of them. This is attested by the initials and seal of the Chinese plenipotentiary on the document, and by the subsequent correspondence between the Governments concerned. If ratification of the Simla Convention was subsequently delayed, it was not because of any opposition to the formalisation of the boundary between Tibet and India as shown in the “McMahon Line” but because the then Government of China did not agree to the line of demarcation between Inner Tibet and Outer Tibet, it being understood that the former would be under Chinese influence.

11. It is clear that so far as past history is concerned, there is nothing to show that there was ever a Sino-Indian boundary question. The only legacy left by history in this respect is an unbroken tradition of friendship between the two countries based on mutual respect for a firm, delimited boundary. Even after the establishment of the People’s Republic of China, almost for ten years, the two countries were aware of no Sino-Indian boundary problem. The present situation is a new creation, and the result solely of certain policies pursued by the Government of China since about 1957. They cannot, therefore, evade responsibility for it by attributing it to history.

12. The Government of India fail to understand on what grounds the Government of China allege that it is India and not China, who has entered the territory of the other side. The extent of Indian jurisdiction has never exceeded the traditional boundaries of India; and no new claims to territory have ever been put forward by the Government of India. As the Government of China are aware, in view of the situation created by recent Chinese activities on the border, the Government of India had necessarily to take additional measures for the protection of their territory and stop further inroads by the Chinese. In view of the fact that the Government of China have gradually occupied a large area of Indian territory and of the numerous instances of violation by them of the boundary between the two countries, it is absurd for the Government of China to claim that they have all along maintained the status quo and their patrols have not been sent within 20 kilometres of their side of the boundary.
13. As for the alignment shown on Chinese maps, the Indian side established that even official Chinese maps had, for long, shown the traditional boundary between the two countries correctly. It was only from the late thirties of the 20th century that these maps began to vary the traditional boundary alignment and to show large parts of Indian territory within China. That the Chinese Government had no fixed ideas as to what territory was theirs or where they thought their boundary line lay, was clear from the many variations and inconsistencies in these maps. As has already been pointed out by the Government of India, there is even a contradiction between the alignment shown on the map of 1956 which Premier Chou En-lai had stated to be correct, and the alignment on the map given to the Indian side at the talks of the officials in 1960. On the other hand, there has never been any doubt about the limits of Indian territory or about the traditional boundary which lay along well-known natural features. The official Indian maps have always shown the alignment correctly. If certain Indian maps did not show the alignment, this did not mean that there was no traditional and customary boundary alignment, or that India had no international boundaries. These maps only showed either the internal divisions or physical relief. This is a generally accepted cartographic practice and prevails even in China. There are a number of Chinese maps which do not show all the regions of China within China's international frontiers. For some years the Survey of India showed the northern boundary of India by an undemarcated symbol because the boundary though delimited had not actually been demarcated on the ground.

14. The Government of India are glad to see an affirmation in the Chinese note that "the Socialistic system chosen by the Chinese people determines that China does not need war" and also that "what China needs from the new-born Asian countries, which have achieved independence from under imperialist oppression, is friendship." If Chinese policy were based strictly on these objectives which are in harmony with the spirit of the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence, there would be a proper foundation for her relations with her neighbours and no cause for a Sino-Indian boundary problem. As the Government of India have repeatedly shown there was no Sino-Indian boundary problem of any consequence until 1959 when the Chinese Government for the first time unfolded extravagant and totally untenable claims to Indian territory. The Government of China have in recent years shown scant respect for the status quo of the boundary between the two countries and have resorted to measures since 1959 to push their forces across the accepted boundary line to occupy Indian territory. It is most regrettable that these activities which involved loss of Indian lives and territories took place after the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 which bound the two countries to respect each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty.

15. This is, therefore, no quarrel of India's seeking. The boundary problem is China's quarrel with India. Throughout history, the Indian people have shown sincere affection and warm regard for the Chinese people. Even before attaining independence, the people of India extended warm support and help to the Chinese people in their struggle for national independence. After independence, India's foreign policy was based on establishing close and friendly relations
with China. From 1950 to 1954 the Government of India went a considerable way to accommodate the Government of China in the Tibet region and on this account willingly gave up all those rights and interests which India had inherited in Tibet. Elsewhere, too, the Government of India made strenuous efforts to establish the Government of China in their rightful place in international organisations. Since 1949, the Government of India have made unremitting efforts not only to bring about close understanding and cooperation between India and China but also to create through this understanding stable and peaceful conditions over a wider region of Asia in order that the newly independent States of Asia could develop rapidly in an atmosphere free from cold-war influences and reconstruct their long neglected economy. There was so much to be done, and little time to fritter away in quarrels. The Government of India regret that their hopes and aspirations in this regard have been frustrated through lack of cooperation from the Government of China who have pursued policies in total disregard of the fundamental interests of the region and have created situations of conflict and tension among the nations of Asia.

16. There is in India a long tradition of peace and non-violence. The people of India by custom and tradition adhere to peace and do not look for quarrels. It is in this tradition that the Government of India have consistently used their influence in international affairs to bring about cessation of hostilities wherever these took place and create conditions which are for stable peace and cooperative relations among nations. The people of India need peace to enable them to forge ahead with the tremendous task of economic regeneration which the country has undertaken since its independence. They have consequently no urge for any adventurist policy in international affairs; nor do they ever wish to encroach on the territories or others.

17. It is a travesty of facts to suggest, as the Government of China have done, that the Government of India has adopted a negative attitude on the question of the Sino-Indian boundary. Despite Chinese aggressive activities, the Government of India have shown considerable restraint and taken, during the last two years, various measures to promote peaceful settlement by negotiations. There have been numerous exchanges and high-level meetings between the two Governments on the subject. A committee of experts have also gone into the evidence of the case of the two sides. Conclusive evidence has been produced to establish the Government of India's intention that there is no boundary problem except the one created by recent Chinese encroachments on Indian territory. The Chinese incursions into Indian territory, however, still continue. While the Government of India are always willing to negotiate with the Government of China, they cannot obviously compromise with any aggression on Indian territory. Nor can they negotiate as long as their territories remain under Chinese occupation. It is for the Government of China to correct the errors of the recent years and, by withdrawing from Indian territory, create the essential conditions for peaceful negotiations so that the boundary question is settled and peaceful and cooperative relations are reestablished between India and China.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with respect to the grave situation in which Indian troops have intruded into China's Sinkiang region, established new military posts, carried out continual provocative activities and menaced the security of a Chinese frontier post, has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese side has discovered that Indian troops have intruded into China's Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region and established two new military posts. One is at a place approximately 35° 16' N, 78° 08' E, southwest of the Chinese post at 35° 19' N, 78° 12' E, and is about eleven kilometers within China's territory. The other is at a place approximately 35° 22' N, 78° 05' E, northwest of the aforesaid Chinese post, and is about four kilometres within China's territory. Indian troops have moreover constructed fortifications at these two new posts and carried out provocative activities around them. The Chinese side is in possession of indisputable facts showing that the two aggressive posts of the Indian side were set up recently.

Furthermore, after making the three intrusions on April 11 and 13, 1962 into the area near the aforesaid Chinese post and carrying out provocative activities there, against which the Chinese Government already lodged a protest in its note of April 21, 1962 with the Indian Government, Indian troops again made as many as fifteen successive intrusions into the same area from April 15 to 27. The cases of Indian troop intrusions are as follows:

(1) On April 15, 1962, two Indian military men intruded at about 11:00 hours into a place a approximately 35° 22' N, 78° 04' E, northwest of the aforesaid Chinese post, did not leave until 19:00 hours.

(2) On April 17, 1962, over forty fully armed Indian troops crossed the boundary at about 12:00 hours, and approached Height 5,000 metres (approximately 35° 22' N, 78° 07' E) northwest of the Chinese post. More than twenty of them sneaked farther to the top of the Height, penetrating about six kilometres within China's territory. These Indian troops made prolonged reconnaissance on the Chinese post.

(3) At about 15:30 hours on April 17, 1962, three Indian military men intruded into a place at approximately 35° 16' N, 78° 11' E, south of the Chinese post, to make reconnaissance.

(4) At about 11:00 hours on April 18, 1962, two Indian military men intruded into a place at approximately 35° 22' N, 78° 04' E, northwest of the Chinese post.
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(5) At about 16.30 hours on April 19, 1962, eight mounted Indian military men intruded into the same place at approximately 35° 22' N, 78° 04' E, northwest of the Chinese post.

(6) At about 11.00 hours on April 21, 1962, one Indian military man intruded into a place at approximately 35° 23' N, 78° 06' E, northwest of the Chinese post for parrying.

(7) At about 19.00 hours on April 22, 1962, six Indian military men intruded into a place at approximately 35° 15' N, 78° 12' E, south of the Chinese post, and made reconnaissance for about half an hour.

(8) At about 14.40 hours on April 23, 1962, three mounted Indian military men intruded into a place at approximately 35° 21' N, 78° 04' E, west by north of the Chinese post and did not leave until about 15:40 hours.

(9) On April 24, 1962, three Indian military men taking a round approached at about 7:30 hours to a place at approximately 35° 15' N, 78° 14' E, southeast of the Chinese post, and carried out reconnaissance for as long as three hours.

(10) At about 11:10 hours on April 25, 1962, three Indian military men leading three horses intruded into a place at approximately 35° 23' N, 78° 06' E, northwest of the Chinese post, to make reconnaissance.

(11) At about 17:40 hours on April 25, 1962, eight Indian military men (four of whom were mounted) intruded into a place at approximately 35° 21' N, 78° 04' E, west by north of the Chinese post.

(12) At 10:45 hours on April 26, 1962, three Indian military men intruded into a place at approximately 35° 22' N, 78° 03' E, northwest of the Chinese post.

(13) At about 12:50 hours on April 26, 1962, 120 odd Indian military men in three groups (one group was mounted) intruded into a place at approximately 35° 21' N, 78° 04' E, west by north of the Chinese post. The mounted group came at about 15:10 hours to a place at approximately 35° 18' N, 78° 05' E, southwest of the Chinese post, and further moved to the south of the Chinese post.

(14) At 10:35 hours on April 27, 1962, twenty one mounted Indian military men intruded into a place at approximately 35° 22' N, 78° 07' E, northwest of the Chinese post, to make reconnaissance.

(15) On April 27, 1962, five Indian military men intruded at about 15:30 hours into a place at approximately 35° 21' N, 78° 05' E, northwest of the Chinese post.

Within the seventeen days from April 11 to 27, Indian military personnel made eighteen successive intrusions into China's Sinking,
pressing towards the Chinese post at 35° 19' N, 78° 12' E from three
directions. What is more serious, both to the southwest and north-
west of the Chinese post, Indian troops have established aggressive
posts with fortifications, which are obviously meant for prolonged
entrenchment. This shows that Indian troops are pressuring on the
Chinese post and carrying out provocation, and even would not
scruple to create another incident of bloodshed. The Chinese Gov-
ernment hereby lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Govern-
ment against these new, planned and systematic Indian provocations
which seriously encroach on China's territory and threaten the
security of the Chinese post, and demands that the Indian Govern-
ment immediately withdraw the Indian military posts and intruding
Indian troops from Chinese territory. Should the Indian Govern-
ment refuse to withdraw its aggressive posts and continue to carry
out provocation against the Chinese post, the Chinese frontier guards
will be compelled to defend themselves. The Indian side will be
held wholly responsible for all the consequences arising therefrom.

In the past two years and more since the Indian side rejected
the Chinese proposals for the withdrawal of the armed personnel of
each side by twenty kilometres from the boundary and for the ces-
sation of patrols, the Chinese Government has one-sidedly stopped
sending patrols within twenty kilometres on its side of the boundary.
The Chinese Government has done this for the purpose of avoiding
misunderstanding and clashes on the border. However, the facts in
the past two years and more, unfortunately show that this step of the
Chinese side has not reaped the expected results; on the contrary,
the Indian side, taking advantage of the cessation of patrols by
Chinese frontier guards, has been pressing forward steadily into
China, encroaching on Chinese territory and threatening the security
of a Chinese post. In these circumstances, the Chinese Govern-
ment, exercising its sacred right to defend China's territory and
maintain the tranquility on the border, has ordered Chinese frontier
guards to resume border patrols in the sector from Karakoram Pass
to Kongka Pass, where recently the Indian side has made repeated
intrusions and harassment. The Chinese Government still believes
that cessation of border patrols by both China and India will help
maintain the status quo of the boundary and will create a favourable
atmosphere for the peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary
question. If India withdraws from Chinese territory the military
posts it has set up and no longer makes intrusions into China, the
Chinese Government will renew its efforts for the realization of the
above proposition. However, if India continues to invade and
occupy China's territory and expand the area of its intrusion and
harassment on China's border, the Chinese Government will be
compelled to consider the further step of resuming border patrols
along the entire Sino-Indian boundary.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of
China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy
the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the
Embassy of India in China, 6 March, 1962

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and with
reference to another recent case of intrusion and provocation by
Indian troops into the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, has
the honour to state as follows:

Recently, Indian troops, about twenty in number, again intruded
into Chinese territory in the area south of the Spanggur Lake in
western Tibet, China. On May 2, 1962, they pressed forward to a
place (approximately 33° 28' 30" N, 78° 50' 30" E) only about four
kilometres from the Chinese outpost at Jecliung, and there they
set up a military post and constructed fortifications in preparation
for prolonged entrenchment. Moreover, on May 5, 1962, two of the
above-mentioned Indian military men continued to sneak deeper
into Chinese territory for about 600 metres and from there fired three
shots at the Chinese outpost (two shots were fired at 12:11 hours and
the third at 12:23 hours). If the Chinese frontier guards had not put
themselves on the alert in time and firmly maintained an attitude
of cool-headedness and self-restraint, the aforesaid unwarranted
provoking firing by the Indian troops would have led to very
serious consequences.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with
the Indian Government against the above-mentioned intrusion and
provocative activities of the Indian troops and demands that India
immediately withdraw its aggressive post and put an end to all its
intrusions and provocations. As the Chinese Government pointed
out in its note of April 30, 1962, India's encroachment on the border
of Sinkiang and its provocations against a Chinese post there has
already created a very grave situation on the border between the two
countries. And now the Indian Government, in disregard of the
warning of the Chinese Government, has further-more stepped up
its encroaching and provocative activities in western Tibet, threaten-
ing the security of another Chinese outpost. This shows that the
Indian Government has set its mind on aggravating tension in the
entire western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary and does not
scruple to create incidents of bloodshed. The Chinese Government
hereby reiterates, if India does not withdraw its aggressive posts
and intruding troops from Chinese territory and continues to carry
out provocative activities, the Chinese frontier guards will have to
defend themselves, and the Indian side will be held wholly respon-
sible for all the consequences arising therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the
assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 14 May 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its complements to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to
refer to the note handed over by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign
Affairs to the Indian Embassy in Peking on 30th April, 1962.

2. It is obvious that the allegations made in the Chinese note are
misconceived and are based on an erroneous notion of the territorial
boundary of the Sinkiang and Tibet regions of China. The Govern-
ment of India have repeatedly tried to correct this erroneous notion
but their patient and repeated efforts in this regard seem to have
had no effect on the Chinese Government.

3. It is an indisputable fact that, by stages, since 1957, the Govern-
ment of China have occupied unlawfully a large area of Ladakh
which has always been part of India. It is in this process of enlarg-
ing their occupation of Indian territory that the Chinese post on the
Chip Chap river was established at 35° 19' N, 78° 12' E in 1961.
The Government of India had, in their note dated 31st October, 1961,
drawn the attention of the Government of China to the fact of the
establishment of this new post and had urged the Government of
China to withdraw the post from Indian territory. This protest,
like many others before and after it, has gone unheeded, and mean-
time, a further gradual change has been brought about in the terri-
torial status quo in this region of the Sino-Indian border.

4. It is strange that inspite of this deep advance into Indian
territory, the establishment of military strong points and the con-
struction of roads through Indian territory linking these military
strong points with rear bases, the Government of China continue to
affirm "that they have stopped sending patrols within 20 kms. on
their side of the boundary". This claim, as the Government of
India's earlier notes have shown, is patently false and, in the context
of further inroads into Indian territory pointed out in the various
notes of the Government of India, absolutely meaningless.

5. The Chinese note alleges that the Government of India have
set up two posts at 35° 16' N, 78° 8' and at 35° 22' N, 78° 5' E. No
post at these points has been established by the Government of India
although the Government of India have had posts at approximately
78° 06' E, 35° 17' N and 78° 02' E, 35° 21' N. These latter posts
which are well inside Indian territory have been in existence for
some time.

6. The Chinese note cites 18 cases of alleged intrusions from
April 11 to 27. This entire area into which Indian troops are alleged
to have intruded is part of Indian territory and the Government of
India are responsible for the protection of this territory. In compli-
ance with this defence responsibility, the Government of India have
certain posts in the area and men at these posts have been going out occasionally for essential purposes. These posts have been established there to defend Indian territory from further inroads. They are not there to attack anybody or for any aggressive activity as alleged in the Chinese note.

7. The Government of China are doubtless aware of the aggressive patrolling which Chinese troops in the Chip Chap river area have been carrying out. A few recent examples of such patrolling are cited below:—

(1) On 16th April 1962, 11 Chinese soldiers reached a point at approximately 78° 14' E, 35° 16' N and tried to encircle 4 Indian soldiers at 78° 13' E, 35° 15' N.

(2) On 21st April 1962, 20 Chinese soldiers with 7 horses reached a point 2,000 yards to the north of the Indian post at 78° 11' E, 35° 16' N for reconnaissance.

(3) On 22nd April 1962, approximately 70 to 80 Chinese soldiers debussed from three 3-tons lorries immediately to the north of the Indian post at 78° 11' E, 35° 16' N. These men moved forward and occupied a hill feature at 78° 12' E, 35° 15' N, approximately 3,000 yards southeast of the Indian post.

(4) On 6th May, 1962, at 0930 hours, approximately 20 Chinese soldiers came within 150 yards of the Indian post at 78° 07' E, 35° 28' N. They were supported by a party of another 100 Chinese soldiers, who were approximately 1,000 yards away. When the 20 Chinese soldiers moved up closer to the Indian post, the Indian post commander walked up to within 100 yards of the Chinese party and asked them to withdraw.

The examples cited above show which of the two sides it pursuing an aggressive course in the area. The fact is that not only have Chinese soldiers been carrying on aggressive patrolling deep inside Indian territory and systematically violating India's territorial integrity and security but the Government of China have themselves been constantly threatening to extend these activities along the entire Sino-Indian boundary. Such threats and aggressive activities are not indicative of peaceful intentions.

8. In the context of the position stated in paras 3, 4 and 7 above, the Government of India must point out that the order which has now been issued by the Chinese Government to their frontier guards to resume patrolling in the sector from Karakoram pass to Kongkala and the further threat that Chinese troops in certain contingencies will resume patrolling along the entire border can only mean that far from maintaining "tranquility on the border" the Chinese Government propose to adopt further aggressive measures and precipitate clashes. The Government of India hope that the Chinese authorities will consider the grave consequences of what they have threatened to do and act with circumspection.
9. The Prime Minister of India stated in Parliament on 2nd May 1962, "India does not want, and dislikes very much, a war with China. But that is not within India's control". The Government of India hope that the Government of China are earnest about maintaining peace. If so, the two Governments should take necessary steps to prevent armed clashes on the border, ease the tension now existing in the northern sector of Ladakh and lay a proper foundation for peaceful negotiations or the boundary question between the two Governments. In this connection, the Government of India would urge the Chinese Government to give serious consideration to the offer made in the Indian Prime Minister's letter dated 16th November 1959 to Premier Chou En-lai, which inter alia proposed as an interim measure that, in the Ladakh region, the Government of India should withdraw their personnel to the west of the line shown in the 1956 Chinese map and the Government of China should withdraw their personnel to the east of the international boundary shown in Indian official maps. This will apply not only to armed but also to unarmed and administrative personnel which should be withdrawn and the entire area between the boundaries claimed by the two sides left unoccupied. The adoption of this suggestion will lead to the relaxation of tension in this border region and create the necessary atmosphere for settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary problem by negotiations and discussions. The Government of India are prepared, in the interest of a peaceful settlement, to permit, pending negotiations and settlement of the boundary question, the continued use of the Aksai Chin road for Chinese civilian traffic. In renewing the Prime Minister of India's offer of 16th November 1959 and also providing for the continued use of the Aksai Chin road, pending negotiations and settlement, the Government of India are solely motivated by their earnest desire to settle the boundary question by peaceful methods. The Government of India hope that the Chinese Government will give serious consideration to this proposal and avoid threatening and aggressive postures which solve no problem but only create a climate of conflict.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 15 May 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated April 18, 1962, has the honour to state as follows:

In its note, the Indian Government alleged that Chinese personnel entered Ruyu Village (referred to as Roi in its note) about half a mile south of Longju in the second week of January 1962, and, on this basis, charged that Chinese personnel had crossed what the Indian side unilaterally termed the Sino-Indian boundary and intruded into Indian territory. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the above-mentioned charge and protest of the Indian Government.

It must be pointed out that the place referred to in the Indian note is actually in Chinese territory, and in fact is even situated within Chinese territory lying north of the so-called McMahon Line, i.e., the Sino-Indian boundary in the eastern sector unilaterally claimed by the Indian side. Therefore, whether Chinese personnel had been there or not, the question of their having “crossed the Sino-Indian border” does not arise at all. The Chinese Government does not understand what right the Indian Government, which is in illegal occupation of large tracts of Chinese territory south of the so-called McMahon Line, has to interfere unwarrantedly even in affairs within China’s sovereignty north of this Line.

It must also be pointed out that neither is there any truth in the instance stated by the Indian Government. The fact is: no official of the Chinese side visited the place mentioned in the Indian note on any day in the second week of January.

The Chinese Government cannot ignore the fact that it was at a time when India was stepping up its encroachment on Chinese territory and violation of the status quo of the boundary that the Indian Government suddenly made this fabrication and charge. Moreover, the Indian side is now intensifying its military activities directed against China near the McMahon Line in the area unlawfully occupied by India close to Longju. It may still be recalled that in August 1959 it was precisely in this area that a military clash occurred as a result of unlawful intrusion and armed provocation by Indian troops. There is reason for the Chinese Government to believe that the aim of the Indian Government in raising the above-mentioned groundless charge is to seek pretexts for India’s further violations of the status quo of the boundary and precipitation of new armed clashes in this area. The Chinese Government
cannot but regard this with gravity and is closely following the development of events.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 May, 1962

* The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

At noon-time on April 28, 1962, ten fully armed Indian military personnel intruded into Chinese territory at Longju and disseminated the information that they would come for a prolonged stay; and they did not leave till they had carried out military reconnaissance there. Having made repeated verifications, the Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against the abovementioned act of provocation by the Indian troops which constitutes a grave violation of Chinese territory.

Just as predicted by the Chinese Government, the slanderous charge made by the Indian Government on April 18, 1962 to the effect that Chinese personnel had gone south of Longju was indeed a fore-token of India's further encroachment on Chinese territory in that area. The Chinese Government already pointed out in its note on May 15, 1962 that the Indian side had recently been intensifying its military activities directed against China in the area unlawfully occupied by India close to Longju. The aforesaid new action of Indian troops was obviously taken to pave the way for their renewed occupation of Longju and precipitation of new armed clashes; and at the same time it clearly indicates that India intends to disrupt the status quo of the boundary and create tension not only in the western sector, but also in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary. The Chinese Government demands that the Indian Government desist immediately from its intrusion into Longju; otherwise the Chinese Government will not stand idly by seeing its territory once again unlawfully invaded and occupied, and the Indian Government must bear the responsibility for all the grave consequences arising therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ note dated 20th March 1962.

2. The Chinese Government have commenced their note under reference by repeating certain unfounded allegations made by them in their earlier notes dated 12th August and 2nd November 1961. That these allegations were absolutely groundless has been fully established in the Government of India’s notes dated 31st October 1961 and 9th December 1961.

3. A reference to the Government of India’s earlier notes would show that the Demchock area has historically formed a part of India, and Indian border guards have long been stationed there to protect the area. The Government of China have been aware of these facts. However, extracts from the earlier notes of 31st October 1961 and 9th December 1961 are given below for ready reference:

“Both Demchock and the other locations mentioned in the Chinese note are well within India’s international border in this sector. The Chinese note refers to the setting up of a checkpoint at Oga. The Ministry do not see why the Government of China should have any concern with measures India adopts inside her territory for the defence of Indian territories. As regards patrolling upto Kargo and Charding la, while Kargo is well within Indian territory, Charding la is on the border and has been under Indian control for several years. The Chinese Government will appreciate that it is illogical to expect the Government of India to leave their territories unprotected to facilitate Chinese incursions, and indeed unlawful occupation by the Chinese has already occurred in wide areas of India’s Ladakh.”

“The Demchock area and the other locations mentioned in the Chinese note are within India’s international border in this sector and have been traditionally under Indian administration. For the Chinese Government to raise questions about Indian posts and patrols in Indian territory is an entirely unjustified interference in the sovereign affairs of the Government of India.”

4. It is obvious from the foregoing that the Government of China are reiterating old unfounded allegations which have been exposed as totally baseless and making false and unjustified claims to Indian territory. The Ministry regret that the Government of China should resort to this highly objectionable practice condemned by all civilized countries of first advancing groundless claims to the territory of a
neighbouring country and then following these up by false charges of encroachment on their territory.

5. The Government of India, after thorough investigation, have found that the latest allegation about 7 Indian military men having gone beyond the boundary line and crossed the water-shed between Chang pass and Jara pass to penetrate into Dubeezao within Chinese territory on 12th February 1962 is as groundless as the other allegations made in the Chinese note. It has been confirmed from the local command of Indian forces in the area that at no time had Indian troops penetrated into Chinese territory as alleged in the Chinese note. Indian border guards always scrupulously observe the instructions issued to them not to trespass into Chinese territory and unlike Chinese forces, they have a clear knowledge of the limits of Indian territory.

6. In rejecting these utterly baseless allegations, the Government of India must reiterate that it is the Government of China who in recent years have sought unilaterally to change the long existing status quo of the Sino-Indian border. It is they who have, since 1957, repeatedly set up posts and tresspassed into Indian territory; and it is they who are in unlawful occupation of over 12,000 sq. miles of Indian territory in Ladakh.

7. The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 21 May, 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to
refer to the note handed over by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign
Affairs to the Indian Embassy in Peking on May 11, 1962.

The note, under reference, contains certain totally unjustified and
baseless allegations. These are:—

(a) that on 2nd May 20 Indian troops intruded into a place at
33°22'30" N, 78°50'30" E about 4 kms. from a new Chinese
military post set up at Jechitung;

(b) that intruding Indian troops have set up a military outpost
in the area; and

(c) that on 5th May 2 Indian soldiers advanced 600 metres
deeper into the area and fired three rounds at a Chinese
post.

The Government of India firmly repudiate these allegations.
Indian troops did not enter the area on 2nd and 5th May as alleged
in the Chinese note. Nor have they established any fresh post. On
the contrary, Chinese troops moved down south from their post at
Spanggur and established a new post at 78°52'30" E 33°30' N approxi-
mately 8/10 miles south-east of Spanggur on Indian territory. This
has been fortuitously admitted in the Chinese note. Furthermore,
as the Government of China are aware, Chinese troops are digging in
at this new post and are constructing fortifications. As to the allega-
tion that intruding Indian troops resorted to firing on Chinese troops
on 5th May, this again is untrue. A similar allegation about firing by
Indian troops made in the Chinese note of August 12, 1961, was cate-
gorically repudiated in the Government of India's reply dated October
31, 1961 (vide under Allegation I).

In the face of the aggressive activities being systematically purs-
ued by Chinese forces on Indian territory, it is incongruous for the
Government of China to bring up charges against India of "aggravat-
ing tension" and "creating incidents of bloodshed". There can be no
doubt in any quarter that the Government of China are resorting to
these allegations as they had done in the past in order to cover up
their fresh sets of aggression on Indian territory.

As the Government of China are aware, the international boundary
in this sector of the border cuts across the eastern part of Spanggur
lake and follows the northern and eastern water-shed of the Indus.
The setting up of the new Chinese military post at 78°52'30" E
33°30' N about 6/10 miles south-east of Spanggur constitutes a further
serious violation of Indian territory and an act of grave provocation.

The Government of India lodge an emphatic protest with the
Government of China for thus continuing their aggressive activities.
and establishing fresh posts on Indian territory and accusing the Government of India of sending troops to intrude into what is indisputably Indian territory. If the Government of China are at all interested in maintaining the status quo and the peace on the border, they would be well-advised to restrain their forces and desist from constantly pushing forward and setting up new military posts on Indian territory. If any breach of the peace results from the unabated pursuit of aggressive ends by China, the responsibility rests solely with the Government of the People's Republic of China. Allegations against the Government of India, totally devoid of any substance whatever, only add to the mischief of aggression, which China conducts continually.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 May, 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Note No. 345 dated 26th April 1962 from the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The note has alleged that at about 12.30 hours on April 16, 1962, three Indian soldiers had trespassed into a place at 33°35' N 78°46' E, west of the Spanggur Lake and stayed at that place for about 40 minutes. The Government of India have checked and found that the allegation in question is entirely unfounded. On April 16, 1962, at 12.30 hours, no Indian soldier had gone to the place at 33°36' N 78°46' E.

However, the alleged act of trespass cited in the Chinese note is in respect of territory which lawfully forms a part of India. It is an established fact that the international boundary in this sector of the border cuts across the eastern part of Spanggur Lake and follows the northern and eastern water-shed of the Indus.

As the Government of China are aware, trespass in this area has been committed by Chinese troops. The Chinese note under reference only provides further evidence of the fact of such trespass. As pointed out in the Government of India's note dated 21st May 1962, Chinese troops have moved down south from their post at Spanggur and established a new post at 78° 52.30' E and 33°36' N approximately 8/10 miles south east of Spanggur on Indian territory. It is the Chinese forces who have, despite repeated assurances regarding maintenance of the status quo given by the Chinese Government, trespassed in this sector of Indian territory.

The Government of India, therefore, reject the Government of China's protest and urge them to order the prompt withdrawal of their troops who have trespassed into Indian territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 28 May 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and have the honour to refer to Note dated 19th May, 1962, of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China.

It is apparent from the note that the Government of China are again wanting to create disturbance in the Eastern Sector of the border, which has been peaceful since 26th August 1959 when Chinese troops crossed the international border and dislodged the Indian post from Longju by force. Since then, except for occasional intrusions by Chinese personnel, the international border in the Eastern Sector has been quiet although the Government of China in their recent notes dated 30th November 1961 and 30th April 1962 have held out the threat of extensive military action in the Eastern Sector in the event of the Government of India adopting measures for the defence of their territories in the Western Sector of the border.

In their note dated 18th April 1962, the Government of India have drawn the attention of the Government of China to the intrusion by Chinese officials and army personnel into the village of Roy (Ruyu), half a mile south of Longju on the 2nd week of January 1962. In the face of threats held out by the Government of China and the aggressive activities pursued by their personnel on the border, it is absurd for the Government of China to make false allegations of planning aggression in the Eastern Sector against the Government of India.

As to Longju, the past facts would bear reiteration. Longju which is south of the McMahon Line has always been a part of Indian territory. It is about two miles south of the international border and at about the same distance south of the Tibetan village of Migytun.

Longju has always been under the administrative jurisdiction of India and the Government of India maintained a border checkpoint there. As the Chinese Government are aware, in July 1959, the Officer-in-charge of the Indian Checkpost at Longju fell seriously ill. The Government of India informed the Government of China on 24th July 1959 in a note verbale that they proposed to paratroop a doctor at the post. While communicating this information to the Government of China, the Government of India gave the Grid Reference of the post. This was done as Longju was near the border, and lest the pilot of the aircraft by ‘error of judgment’ intruded into Chinese airspace. There was no objection from the Chinese Government.

Yet, on the 25th August 1959, a strong Chinese detachment crossed into Indian territory south of Migytun and fired without notice on an Indian picket. They arrested the entire picket. Thereafter, on the 26th August 1959, Chinese forces encircled the post at Longju and opened heavy fire on it. The Indian personnel at Longju had, in the
circumstances, to abandon the post. The Government of India lodged a strong protest with the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 28th August 1959. In their note dated 10th September 1959, the Government of India had offered to discuss with the Chinese Government the exact alignment of the McMahon Line at Khinzemane, Longju and Tamaden areas on condition that the status quo was maintained at all these places. As far as Longju was concerned, the Government of India had expressed their willingness not to send their personnel back to the area provided the Chinese also withdrew their forces from Longju. This meant that neither side would have their personnel at Longju pending discussion.

Thereafter, the Prime Minister of India had reiterated this proposal, and although there was news that the Chinese personnel at Longju had withdrawn sometime in 1961, the Government of India made no attempt to re-enter Longju.

The specific allegation made in the Chinese note that 10 armed Indian soldiers had intruded into Longju on 28th April 1962 is completely false. There are Indian checkpoints in the area adjoining Longju but, in accordance with the directive given by the Prime Minister, Indian forces have not re-entered Longju since 26th August 1959.

The Chinese note under reference suggests that Chinese troops have again trespassed into Longju and their forward patrols are engaged in reconnaissance around Longju. The Government of India register an emphatic protest against these aggressive activities on the part of Chinese troops in Indian territory. It should be clear to the Government of China that Longju is in Indian territory and that the Government of India will not allow any foreign aggression in Longju. If the Chinese Government have any doubt about the precise alignment of the border in this area, the Government of India would be glad to discuss the matter with them and clarify their doubt.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 28 May 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to India’s establishment of a new military strong point in Chinese territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary and further intrusions and provocation there, has the honour to state as follows:

1. India not only gave no heed to China’s protests and refused to evacuate its new aggressive strong points in the Chip Chap River Valley area in Sinkiang, China, but has recently set up another military strong point at Hongshantou (approximately 35°18’N, 78°05’30” E), which is barely some eight kilometers west by south of the Chinese post (approximately 35°19’ N, 78°12’ E) in that area, and built fortifications there. In addition, Indian troops have repeatedly intruded into the areas west, northwest and southwest of the Chinese post for harassment. It has been established through repeated check-ups that in the period from April 28 to May 17, 1962 alone, 18 such cases involving 131 person-times occurred. What is more, the intruding Indian troops and aircraft have kept on conducting reconnaissance and making provocations against the said Chinese post. For instance, at about 18:30 hours on May 1, 1962, 11 Indian military men intruded into the area around height 5,500 metres in proximity to the Chinese post and conducted reconnaissance for as long as over 40 minutes; at 9:15 hours on May 10, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over the Chinese post, flying audaciously at such a low altitude as no more than 400 metres from the ground, and circled there for reconnaissance for as long as 30 minutes or so.

2. In the Ari district in Tibet, China Indian troops have continued to make intrusions and made another provocative firing. Here are the outstanding cases:

(1) At about 14:00 hours on May 7, 1962 five Indian military men, three of whom were mounted, intruded into the area around 35°16’ N, 79°01’ E, that is, the place where Indian troops had provoked the Kongka Pass incident of bloodshed in October, 1959, and carried out armed reconnaissance there. On the same day, another group of Indian military men numbering about 20 intruded into the area at 34°18’N, 79°01’E for illegal activities there.

(2) At about 17:30 hours on May 9, 1962, Indian troops again fired three shots at the Chinese post at Jechiung from the Indian military strong point only about 4 kilometres away, which was set up recently in Chinese territory at a place south of the Spanggur Lake. This is another serious armed provocation by Indian troops since their firing at the same Chinese post on May 5.
(3) On May 3, 1962 four mounted Indian soldiers intruded deep into Chinese territory and even went beyond the boundary line claimed by the Indian side itself for about four kilometers and arrived at Goro (approximately 32°38'N, 79°34'E) in Tibet and conducted reconnaissance for quite some time.

The Indian Government, having remained indifferent to the repeated protests of the Chinese Government, has not only refused to withdraw its aggressive strong points newly set up on Chinese territory and put an end to its intrusions and provocations, but even set up new aggressive strong points on Chinese territory, expanded the scope of its encroachments and continued its intrusions and provocations. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against these actions, and demands that the Indian Government, in the interest of peace, evacuate immediately its military strong points set up recently in Chinese territory and put an end to all its unlawful intrusions into China. Otherwise, the Indian side must bear the responsibility for the consequences of such intrusions.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
1. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to acknowledge that the Chinese Government has received the Indian Government's note of May 14, 1962 in reply to the Chinese Government's note of April 30, 1962.

2. The Indian Government in its note not only refuses to withdraw its military strong points and intruding troops, but fraudulently contends that it is responsible for the protection of the areas it has intruded. This further shows that India is determined to encroach on Chinese territory and, to this end, does not scruple to provoke bloody conflicts. The Chinese Government cannot but express its utmost regret at this.

3. The Indian note again repeats the fallacy that large tracts of territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, which always belong to China, are part of Indian territory. The Chinese Government in its previous related notes has refuted in detail this completely groundless platitude. A lie is after all a lie and a truth a truth. A lie can never be turned into truth no matter how often the Indian Government repeats it. As a matter of fact, India admits in its reply note that it has set up strong points at approximately 35°17' N, 78°06' E and 35°21' N, 78°02' E and carried out activities around them, thus testifying to nothing but India's encroachment on Chinese territory. In order to cover up its own intrusions, the Indian Government slanderously counter-charges that the Chinese post at 35°19' N, 78°12' E, which was set up China years ago, is a newly-established one and describes the normal patrols by Chinese frontier guards as aggressive patrolling intended for encircling Indian soldiers. This is entirely a distortion of the fact and a reversal of right and wrong; it is like the trick of a thief calling "stop thief", which serves all the more to reveal the offence he intends to cover up.

4. The Indian Government in its reply note reiterates its proposal made in 1959 that, in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary the Indian Government should withdraw its personnel to the west of the line shown on Chinese maps and the Chinese Government should withdraw its personnel to the east of the line claimed by India as shown on Indian official maps. The note further states that the Indian Government is prepared, in the interest of a peaceful settlement, to permit, pending negotiations and settlement of the boundary question, the continued use of the Aksai Chin road for Chinese civilian traffic. Why should China need to ask India's permission for using its own road on its own territory? What an absurdity! As for the Indian Government's old proposal made in 1959, Premier Chou En-lai already pointed out in his letter to Prime Minister Nehru dated December 17, 1959 that it is unfair and that
though “equitable” it may appear, it in fact would require China to make a one-sided withdrawal. The Indian Government knows this only too well. Prime Minister Nehru said in Parliament on May 14, 1962 that this proposal “applies entirely to the Ladakh area (it should be read as ‘the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary’) and not the eastern area at all, because we are not going to withdraw in the east. In the Ladakh area, it meant a very small withdrawal for us—a few villages—and it meant a large withdrawal for them”. That is to say, this “very fair” proposal bragged of by India means in essence that India wants to secure the Chinese side's withdrawal from large tracts of Chinese territory, measuring more than 33,000 square kilometres, which have always belonged to China in exchange for the Indian side's withdrawal from a few points, which always belong to China but have only recently been occupied by India, while the Indian side continues to occupy, exactly as before, Chinese territories in the eastern and middle sectors of the Sino-Indian boundary. This is of course unacceptable to the Chinese Government, unacceptable now as before.

5. There is reason to believe that the Indian Government is not serious in making the above-mentioned proposal. If it truly wishes the Chinese Government to give earnest consideration to its proposal, it should be prepared to apply the principle embodied in the proposal equally to the eastern section of the border, that is to say, to acquire both the Chinese and Indian sides to withdraw all their personnel from the area between the so-called McMahon Line and the section of the Sino-Indian boundary as shown on Chinese maps. However, judging from Prime Minister Nehru's May 14 speech in the Indian Parliament, the Indian Government has renewed this proposal on the pre-condition of not doing that. How can one assume that the Chinese Government would accept such unilaterally-imposed submissive terms? Is China a defeated country? It is clear that the Indian Government, in making the proposal, did not expect earnest consideration from the Chinese Government. It is evident that, in doing so, it only attempted to divert people's attention.

6. But people's attention can in no way be diverted. The most urgent problem in the current Sino-Indian border situation is that the Indian side persists in changing by force the status quo of the Sino-Indian boundary and setting up military strong points on Chinese territory and is carrying on provocations, so that a border clash may touch off at any moment. As China pointed out in its note of May 28, since China lodged its protest on April 30, Indian troops have set up another new military strong point inside Sinkiang, China, and have continued their intrusions and provocations in Sinkiang and the Ari district. Facts speak louder than words. They show that what the Indian Government now seeks is to provoke bloody conflicts, occupy China's territory and change the status quo of the boundary regardless of consequences, and not at all to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question peacefully through negotiations.

7. The Chinese Government consistently stands for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question through negotiations. Even now when the Sino-Indian border situation has become so
tense owing to Indian aggression and provocation, the door for negotiations is still open so far as the Chinese side is concerned. However, China will never submit before any threat of force. What is imperative now is for the Indian Government to stop its military provocations and withdraw Indian military strong points and troops from Chinese territory. The Chinese Government renews its protest and demand made on April 30 and May 28. This is a serious test as to whether the Indian Government has the sincerity to settle peacefully the Sino-Indian boundary question and improve Sino-Indian relations.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

It has been verified through careful investigation by the Chinese Government that the activities of intrusion and provocation of Indian troops on China's border have recently been extended to another area in Sinkiang, China, that is, the area near the source of the Karakash River. Indian troops have set up another new military strong point at approximately 34°58'30" N, 78°22'30" E in that area, which is as deep as about 15 kilometers within Chinese territory and built an air-dropping ground and forts there. Large groups of Indian infantry and cavalrymen frequently came out from that strong point and made harassment all around. At the same time, Indian aircraft repeatedly intruded into China's air space and dropped large quantities of military supplies to that strong point. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the Indian troops' pressing forward step by step and continuously expanding its encroachment on Chinese territory.

The facts cited above more clearly show that the Indian side is deliberately encroaching on China along the entire western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary in an attempt to realize by force its claims to Chinese territory. The Chinese Government, while following with vigilance this serious situation, once again demands that the Indian Government immediately withdraw all its aggressive strong points recently set up in Chinese territory and put an end to all its intrusions and provocations, and urges the Indian Government to give earnest consideration to the serious consequences to which these activities may lead.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Note dated the 21st April 1962 from the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The Note makes two entirely unwarranted allegations: (1) That on 11th April 1962 at about 1200 hours, about 25 Indian soldiers penetrated 10 Kms. into Chinese territory, reached a point approximately 35°22’ North 78°00’ East and carried out prolonged reconnaissance; and (2) That on 13th April 1962 at 1300 hours and 1500 hours two parties of Indian soldiers “intruded into the same area and sneaked to a point approximately 35°20’ North, 78°07’ East for reconnaissance”.

Indian troops are in certain areas of Ladakh to defend Indian territory. If these Indian troops move about inside Indian territory, it should not be a matter of any concern to the Government of China.

However, since the Government of China made certain specific allegations, these were carefully investigated and it was found that no Indian soldier had been at either of the places at the time cited in the Chinese Note. Therefore it is clear that the Government of China preferred these charges and assumed the right to protest about so-called intrusions by Indian troops without any basis at all. Under the circumstances, the Government of India reject these protests which not only have no basis in fact but constitute unjustifiable interference in the internal affairs of India.

It has been noticed that the Government of China are increasingly taking recourse to such baseless allegations against the Government of India at a time when Chinese forces are themselves making fresh encroachments into Indian territory.

Such Chinese military activity has been noticed particularly in the vicinity of the Chinese Military Base illegally set up at 78°12’ East 35°10’ North, and a point 78°13’ East 35°15’ North.

Carefully verified reports from other sectors of Ladakh also show that Chinese troops are daily intruding into Indian territory, pushing forward on trucks and jeeps, blasting the mountainside with heavy explosives, constructing new military bases and extending military bases already set up.

It is on record that since 1960-61 Chinese intruders have set up no less than five new military bases on Indian territory at Nyagzu, Dambuguru, at point 78°12’ E, 35°19’ N on the Chip Chap river, at a point of six miles west of Sumdo, and at 78°52’30” E, 33°30’ N about 8/10 miles south-east of Spanggur.
Against this record of territorial aggression by Chinese forces, there is not even single case to show that Indian troops intruded into Chinese territory or set up a post there.

It seems clear that the Government of China are spreading rumours about the so-called “news reports disseminated from New Delhi” to prove that “Indian troops are preparing to make armed provocations against China when the thaw comes to the border areas” to cover up their aggressive activities. The Government of India have no wish to embroil themselves in hostilities with any country, far less to invade Chinese territory. They are, however, bound to do all they can to preserve the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Republic of India.

The Government of India lodge an emphatic protest with the Government of China for the fresh encroachments into Indian territory by Chinese intruders and urge the Government of China to put an end to such dangerous and illegitimate activities.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 June 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Note dated the 27th April 1962 of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China.

The Government of China’s Note under reference provocatively asserts that the location of the new Chinese post and other areas of Ladakh have always been under the effective control of China.

This assertion is against the evidence of history. Neither the present nor any other regime in China had ever exercised any authority in this region of India. Nor did the rulers of China ever lay any claim to it. It is entirely without warrant to suggest, as the Chinese Note has done, that they have always exercised “effective control” over it. As the Government of China are well aware, the traditional international boundary in these sector of the border runs from the Karakoram Pass along the watershed between the Shyok (belonging to the Indus system) and the Yarkand, and runs through the Qara Tagh Pass (Lon. 78°20’ East and Lat. 35°43’ North) to cross the eastern end of the Qara Qash river (north of Haji Langer) and to ascend the main Kuen Lun mountains. Thereafter the boundary runs through the Yangi Pass (Long. 79°25’ East and Lat. 35°55’ North) along the crest of the mountains separating the Yurungkash basin from those of the lakes in Aksai Chin. It leaves the main crest of the Kuen Lun mountains at a point approximately Long. 80°21’ East and descends in a south-western direction, separating the basins of the Amtogor and Sarigh Jilganang lakes in India from those of Leighton and Tsoggar lakes in Tibet, down to Lanak Pass (Long. 79°34’ East and Lat. 34°24’ North). Nor is the Chinese denial of the existence of the new post supported by the facts on the ground. The fact is that Chinese intruders in Ladakh set up a new post recently at 35°1’ North 78°34’ East six miles west of Sumdo, as stated in the Government of India’s Note dated 15th April 1962. That post still exists and continues to testify to a new violation of the status quo on the border.

In the light of facts cited above, the Government of India reject the contentions in the Government of China’s reply under reference which evades the charge fully supported by facts made in the Government of India’s note dated 15th April 1962.

It is a source of deep and continuous concern to the Government of India that the Government of China should persist in this manner in their systematic and deliberate unlawful encroachments into Indian territory without any regard to the grave consequences that these may entail.

The Government of India would again urge the Government of China to view the problem with the seriousness it deserves and to
take urgent steps to withdraw their new military post at 35°01' North, 78°34' East as well as all the other military posts which they have illegally set up on Indian territory since 1957.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 June 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the note dated 15th May 1962 of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China.

The Government of India do not accept the unwarranted ascertainment made in the Chinese note that the village of Roi, which is half a mile south of Longju, is situated in Chinese territory, north of the McMahon line. Longju itself is about 2 miles south of the international border and the village of Roi is further south of Longju. There can be no question but that Roi is well inside Indian territory.

About Longju the facts are well-known and these have been restated in the Government of India's note dated 28th May 1962 to the Government of China. A strong Chinese force had crossed the international border on 25th August 1959 and dislodged the Indian post at Longju by force on the 26th August 1959. Such are the facts which form part of the record of Sino-Indian relations since 1959.

It is not only false but definitely mischievous to describe the invasion of Indian territory south of the McMahon line by a strong Chinese force in August 1959 as a case of "unlawful intrusion and armed provocation by Indian troops". Such distortion of facts adds to the mischief of aggression, and militates against the fundamental principles on which international relations are based.

The Chinese note has denied the specific charge made in the Government of India's note of 18th April 1962. The facts about the intrusion into the village of Roi by a Chinese party in the 2nd week of January 1962 were carefully verified before a protest was lodged with the Government of China. The names of the Chinese officers who intruded into the Indian village of Roi are known to the Government of India. These intruders had sought to exert pressure on the inhabitants of Roi to make them go over to Tibet.

In the face of this evidence it is useless to deny that Chinese intruders had unlawfully entered the village of Roi and interfered with the internal jurisdiction of the Government of India.

The Government of India's charge is straight and simple. It is based on the direct evidence of village people who are unaccustomed to prevarication. The Government of China cannot evade responsibility for this act of intrusion into Indian territory by taking recourse of propagandist allegations against the Government of India.

The Government of India reject the Chinese note of May 15, 1962, and urge upon the Government of China to desist from further
intrusions into Indian territory and to respect India's territorial integrity and sovereignty.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest considerations.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 June 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to state that it has been noticed that Chinese intruders into Indian territory in Ladakh have cleared a new road through Indian territory running South East from E 78° 35' N 35° 0·33' to the West of E 79° 10' N 34° 43' and thence southward to E 79° 8' N 34° 33'. It has been further noticed that they have unlawfully set up a new post at E 79° 8' N 34° 33'. A considerable amount of Chinese activity has also been reported from the vicinity of the Chinese post unlawfully set up at E 78° 55' N 34° 25'.

All this is fresh evidence of the systematic and planned violation of Indian territory by Chinese intruders despite repeated assurances from the Chinese Government that their forces are maintaining the 'status quo' on the Sino-Indian border.

The Government of India lodge a firm protest against this fresh instance of violation of Indian territory by Chinese forces unlawfully posted on Indian territory and urge upon the Chinese Government to desist from such activities which are not conducive to good relations between the two countries.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 June 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

On May 29 '62 the Roma family of Lung Village, Lungtzu Country, Tibet, China, ten persons in all (4 men, 4 women and 2 children), were returning from the Taksing area. When they reached Natien-mula (at one o'clock in the afternoon of the same day), which is north of the so-called McMahon Line and east of Lung Village (approximately 28° 22' N, 93° 09' E), 6 Indian soldiers audaciously crossed the "McMahon Line" in their pursuit, and unwarrantedly fired 6 shots at them. Roma (male), Yekhu (female) and her five-year-old son Manfa and four-year-old daughter Yehmeng, both carried on Yekhu's back, were hit and fell down. The other six persons fortunately made a narrow escape. The whereabouts and the life or death of Roma and the three others are unknown up to now.

The Roma family were originally peaceful inhabitants of Lung Village. In May 1959, they were forced by the Tibetan rebels to go to the Taksing area south of the "McMahon Line". Now, out of their own free will, they were returning to Lung Village. This is their legitimate right that cannot be deprived of. It is astounding that Indian troops should have tried to obstruct them from returning to their original abode and did not scruple to cross the so-called McMahon Line, and pursue and shoot at innocent Tibetan inhabitants, including even women and children. The Chinese Government strongly protests against the intrusion into Chinese territory by Indian troops and their atrocity of shooting at peaceful Chinese inhabitants. The Chinese Government demands that the Indian Government immediately undertake thorough investigations and enquiries into this case, punish those criminals who fired at the peaceful Chinese inhabitants, compensate the family of the victims and adopt effective measures to ensure against the recurrence of similar incidents.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 22 June 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Chinese Government note dated the 28th May 1962.

The Government of India have not established any strong points in any part of Chinese territory. It is the Chinese who have unlawfully established various posts in Indian territory and violated India's territorial integrity. If the Government of India have, in the light of these Chinese intrusions, taken measures to prevent further intrusions by the Chinese, this is what any sovereign government would and must do in the exercise of its responsibility for maintaining the integrity of its territory. It is preposterous, therefore, for the Government of China to allege that not only Indian territories which have been illegally occupied by the Chinese forces in Ladakh are part of Chinese territory but some Indian areas beyond these are also Chinese territory. There seems to be no limit to Chinese expansionist aims.

The specific instances of alleged intrusions cited in the Chinese note are dealt with seriatim below:

Alllegation (1):  

India has recently set up another military strong point at approximately 35° 18' N 78° 05' 30" E. 8 Kms. west by south of the Chinese post at 35° 19' N 78° 12' E on the Chip Chap river.

Comments:

This is a repetition of an allegation made earlier in the Chinese note of 30th April 1962. It was then alleged that India had set up a new military post at 35° 16' N 78° 08' E. The Government of India in their note of 14th May 1962 had pointed out that there was no post as alleged at 35° 16' N 78° 08' E, but that they had had a post at approximately 35° 17' N 78° 06' E. It was made clear then that this Indian post which was well inside Indian territory had been in existence for some time. Nevertheless the allegation, already refuted, has reappeared in the Chinese note under reference with a new Chinese name given to the location and with a small change in the map reference of the post.

This allegation of intrusion into Chinese territory is entirely baseless.

Alllegation (2):

Between 28th April and 17th May Indian troops repeatedly intruded into this area. There were 18 cases of such intrusions.
Comments:

The Chinese note of 30th April 1962 carried more or less the same allegation, viz., that in 17 days Indian troops had intruded 18 times into the area. This time the number of intrusions remains the same although the period during which they took place has been extended by 3 days. In refuting the earlier allegation, Government of India had observed in their note of 14th May 1962 that “the entire area into which Indian troops are alleged to have intruded is part of Indian territory and the Government of India are responsible for the protection of this territory. In compliance with this defence responsibility, the Government of India have certain posts in the area and men at these posts go out occasionally for essential purposes. These posts have been established there to defend Indian territory from further inroads. They are not there to attack anybody or for any aggressive activity as alleged in the Chinese note”.

This allegation of intrusion into Chinese territory is not only baseless but is merely a repetition of an earlier allegation which had been dealt with fully. Introduction of phrases like “131 persons—times” does not alter the fact that it is a baseless repetition.

The two specific instances of intrusion cited in the Chinese note to illustrate the general allegation, viz., (1) that on 1st May 1962 11 Indian soldiers had gone to the area near Height 5500 metres and (2) that on 10th May 1962 at 9:15 hours Indian aircraft flew over the Chinese post unlawfully set up in Indian territory at 35° 19' N 78° 12' E, are both unfounded.

The truth behind these Chinese allegations is that

(1) Chinese troops are illegally posted in this area where they have no right to be;

(2) they have built a strong military base with fortifications in the area which is Indian territory;

(3) they are extending this fortified area; and

(4) strong patrols from this Chinese military base are threatening the adjoining areas and the Indian posts located there.

Allegation (3):

On 7th May 1962 at about 14:00 hours, five Indian soldiers intruded into the area at 34° 16' N 79° 01' E. On the same day another 20 men intruded into the area at 34° 18' N 79° 01' E.

Comments:

Although both the locations are inside Indian territory there is no truth in the Chinese allegation that Indian soldiers had been there on the 7th May 1962. On the contrary on the 7th May 1962, 20 Chinese soldiers had intruded into this very area at 15:20 hours. What is more, there is evidence to show that Chinese troops are daily intruding into this area and are carrying out various illegal activities.
Allegation (4):

On 9th May 1962 at 17:30 hours Indian soldiers again fired 3 shots at the Chinese post at Jechiung.

Comments:

A similar allegation was made in the Chinese noted ated 11th May 1962 which said that on 5th May 1962 Indian soldiers had reached the same location and fired 3 shots at the Chinese outpost. That allegation as pointed out in the Government of India’s note dated 21st May 1962 was untrue. An earlier allegation about firing by Indian troops made in the Chinese note of 12th August 1961 had also proved unfounded. The present allegation about firing at the Chinese post on 9th May 1962 has been checked, and it has been found to be untrue. The fact is that Chinese intruders have set up a new military base at ‘Jechiung’ in Indian territory and are covering this up by resorting to baseless allegations against Indian troops.

Allegation (5):

On 3rd May 1962, 4 mounted Indian soldiers intruded into Gore at 32° 38’ N 79° 34’ E for carrying out reconnaissance.

Comments:

The Government of India firmly repudiate this entirely baseless allegation. Indian soldiers did not visit Gore on 3rd May 1962 or on any other day. Unlike Chinese intruders, Indian soldiers are strictly forbidden to cross the international frontier. The Government of India are fully satisfied that there has been no case where Indian soldiers trespassed into Chinese territory across the international border.

The Government of India are constrained to observe that these and other baseless allegations are being repeated by the Chinese Government as part of their planned propaganda against India to further Chinese expansionist aims and to lay fresh claims to Indian territory and to divert attention from the unlawful activities which are being ceaselessly pursued by Chinese forces in Indian territory. The Government of India, therefore, cannot but reject the Government of China’s protest note based on these false allegations.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 28 June 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and have the honour to refer to their note dated 6th June 1962 in reply to the Chinese Government’s note dated 21st April 1962, wherein it was pointed out that intensified Chinese military activity had been reported particularly in the vicinity of the Chinese military posts illegally set up on Indian territory at 78° 12’ E, 35° 19’ N and at 78° 13’ E, 35° 15’ N.

It has of late been confirmed that the Chinese intruders have set up a new military post at 78° 15’ E 35° 15’:80 N, six miles south south-east of the Chinese post illegally set up at 78° 12’ E 35° 19’ N. This new Chinese post not only constitutes a further violation of India’s territorial integrity but is approximately 9/10 miles west even of the 1956 Chinese claim line which India did not accept and about which Premier Chou En-lai in his letter dated 17th December 1959 to the Indian Prime Minister said that “it correctly shows the traditional boundary between the two countries.”

The Government of India lodge an emphatic protest with the Government of China against this further aggression on Indian territory and the setting up of another military post further inside Indian territory. This constitutes a fresh act of provocation and a threat to peace as this new post has been set up in dangerous proximity to an existing Indian post south of the Chip Chap River.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 28 June 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs' Note dated the 4th June 1962 about the alleged establishment of a new Indian post at 34° 58' 30" N 78° 22' 30" E.

The precise location of the alleged Indian post given in the Chinese note shows that it is not only in Indian territory but is also at least five miles west of the nearest point even of the boundary claimed by China, i.e., the Chinese claim line of 1956 which had not been accepted by India. It is pertinent to mention in this connection that Premier Chou En-lai, in his letter dated 17th December 1959, to the Prime Minister of India had said that "it (the 1956 map) correctly shows the traditional boundary between the two countries".

It is a fact that the Government of India have had for some time posts in the region concerned but such administrative and other posts are for the legitimate protection of Indian territory and the Government of China have no right to raise any question about them. The Government of India emphatically repudiate the fight assumed by the Chinese Government to protest and interfere in the sovereign rights of the Government of India over what is clearly Indian territory.

As the record will show, since 1957, it is the Government of China who have step by step moved deeper into Indian territory and set up a number of strong military posts. The Government of China owe it to themselves, in the interests of peace and good neighbourly relations, to withdraw from Indian territory and restore the status quo as it prevailed before these recent Chinese aggressive moves.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 June 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs note dated 18th June 1962.

The Government of India ordered a full enquiry into the allegations made in the Chinese note, and the enquiry has led to the following findings:—

On 28th May, an Indian tribal Chadang Tameng, resident of the village of Lengbeng, two miles east of Taksing, came to Taksing and stole a rifle from the border police lines at Taksing. Later that evening, information was received that he and 10 other tribesmen had escaped from the village of Lengbeng. These 11 escaping Indian tribesmen were intercepted by Indian border guards near Asaiila (N 28° 21' E 93° 14') in Indian territory. As the tribesmen fired at the border guards, the latter fired back in self-defence. The tribes had actually used the stolen rifle to fire at the border guards. As a result of this exchange of fire, a tribal named Loma was killed. Tribals had actually used the stolen rifle to fire at the border guards, recovered the stolen rifle as well as a muzzle loader from the scene of action. A woman member of the tribal party, named Yaku, later returned to Taksing with her two minor children. The rest of the tribal party are still missing.

The Government of China, based on hearsay, have made two unfounded allegations, viz., (1) that the tribals in question were returning to their original home in Lung village in Tibet and that they were obstructed from doing so, and (2) that Indian troops crossed the McMahon Line and pursued and shot at them.

The facts show that the tribals in question were running away after stealing a rifle, and that they even used the stolen rifle to fire at the Indian border guards. What is more, the entire incident including the exchange of fire, took place on Indian territory.

As to the allegation that Indian troops have used force to prevent Tibetan refugees in India from returning to their homes in Tibet and have committed atrocities on them, it is well known that Tibetan refugees in India have been treated with generosity and compassion due to people who are rendered homeless. While the Government of India have helped to rehabilitate Tibetan refugees to the limit of their capacity, they have never stood in the way of any Tibetan refugee who wished to return to Tibet. Any Tibetan refugee who wishes to return to Tibet is free to do so.

It is obvious from the facts stated above that the Government of China are not only harbouring fugitives from India but are using
an incident which took place in Indian territory to make false and
propagandist allegations against the Government of India.

In the light of the facts stated above, the Government of India
firmly reject the Chinese protest note of 18th June 1962.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the
People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consi-
deration.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs note dated 2nd June 1962.

The Government of India's note dated 14th May 1962 gave the correct location of certain Indian checkpoints in North Ladakh, and pointed out that the posts in question had been there for some time purely for the protection of Indian territory from further Chinese inroads and not for any aggressive purpose. The Chinese Government have, however, derided the purpose and questioned the legitimacy of measures taken by the Government of India in exercise of their right of self-defence, and have even mischievously accused India of intruding into Chinese territory and provoking "bloody conflicts": The record shows that such "bloody conflicts" as have taken place invariably occurred when Chinese troops, trespassing into Indian territory, ambushed Indian border guards and fired at them.

The Indian checkpoints, to which the Chinese Government have taken exception, are at a distance of over 120 miles inside India from the nearest point on the international border in the east. The Chinese posts in the vicinity, on the other hand, are not only over 100 miles inside Indian territory but even beyond the alignment shown in the 1956 Chinese map about which Premier Chou En-lai said that "it correctly shows the traditional boundary in this sector of Ladakh" (vide Ministry of External Affairs note dated 28th June 1962).

As to provocation, there are reports of numerous daily intrusions by Chinese troops deep inside Indian territory. They are incessantly attempting to push forward, spying new ground, clearing roads and setting up new advance posts.

While the Chinese army pursues its illegal and provocative activities on Indian territory, the Government of China have made it a practice to send offensive notes as part of their campaign to denigrate India and convey threats. In their latest note, the Government of China have again adopted a menacing attitude and used intemperate language because Indian troops have not been withdrawn from posts south and west of the posts unlawfully set up by Chinese intruders in North Ladakh. Neither threats nor use of offensive language in violation of the usual standards of diplomatic intercourse can alter the basic factual position of progressive Chinese violations of Indian territory particularly since 1957.

The Chinese Government have all along maintained that their forces on the border are preserving the status quo and have stopped forward patrolling. Factually, however, it is clear that they have
continued to set up new military posts further inside Indian territory and have built new roads across Indian territory linking these new posts with rear bases (vide Ministry of External Affairs Notes dated 6th June and 28th June 1962).

A number of instances have already been cited in the Government of India's note 14th May 1962 when Chinese troops in superior strength manoeuvred to encircle small groups of Indian defenders in North Ladakh. These hostile manoeuvres have been innocently described in the Chinese note as "normal patrolling".

The record shows that in breach of the solemn covenant entered into by the two countries to respect each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, the Government of China have since 1957 started a process of intrusion and occupation of Indian territory. In 1960-61 while the two sides were engaged in talks and there was a gentleman's agreement that for the duration of the talks neither sides would push forward and alter the status quo on the border, Chinese troops made further inroads inside Indian territory and set up posts at Nyagzu, Dambuguru and at 78° 12' E, 35° 19' N on the Chip Chap river. A full account of these incursions with dates have already been given in the previous notes of the Government of India.

The Government of India have time and again made it clear that Indian and Chinese maps confirmed the traditional boundary alignment in this sector right up to recent times. When recent maps published in the People's Republic of China began to show certain inaccuracies in the boundary alignment in this sector, the attention of the Government of China was drawn to these inaccuracies and they readily gave the assurance that the erroneous maps in question would be corrected in due course. Now these incorrect maps have become blue prints of Chinese aggressive designs.

The territory unlawfully occupied by Chinese intruders in Ladakh is not Chinese territory. It has always been, and still is Indian territory. It is absurd for the Government of China to argue that any part of Ladakh had at any time formed part of Chinese territory or that large tracts of Ladakh 'always belonged to China'. This is a deliberate mis-statement of facts, which ignores treaty, tradition, facts of geography and actual jurisdiction. There has never been any doubt that the area unlawfully occupied by Chinese forces in Ladakh is part of Indian territory. Trespass and unlawful intrusion do not confer title to territory.

To claim, as the Government of China have done, that the area in Ladakh has always belonged to them is to use their own language "palpable distortion of the fact and reversal of right and wrong".

To ease the tension now existing in Northern Ladakh and in conformity with their peaceful aims, the Government of India had renewed their proposal that the two sides should withdraw as an interim measure from the disputed area in Ladakh (i.e. the area between the international boundary shown in official Indian maps and that shown in the 1956 Chinese map). The offer was well-intentioned and it was made in the interests of peace and honourable negotiations between the two countries. It offered the Government of
China the use of the road in Aksai Chin for civilian traffic pending a settlement. There can be no question but that the offer was solely prompted by an earnest desire to promote a settlement by peaceful negotiations in consonance with the dignity, self-respect and vital interests of the two countries. That the proposal involved withdrawal of the Chinese forces from larger areas is solely due to the fact that it is the Chinese and not the Indians who have altered the status quo in the area by progressive large scale violations of Indian territory particularly since 1957. Surely the Chinese authorities are aware of this factual position and of the need to restore the status quo to promote the right climate for settlement by peaceful negotiations.

The Government of India regret the tone and the contents of the Chinese note which further complicates the problem which the Chinese have themselves created in Ladakh. The Government of India hope that the Chinese authorities will, in the larger interests of peace, reconsider the matter and make a constructive response to the Indian proposal.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
On July 6, about twenty Indian troops intruded into Sinkiang, China, reaching a point at approximately 34 degrees 37 minute 30 second north, 78 degrees 35 minute 30 second east, as deep as about six kilometres inside the Chinese territory in the Galwan valley area and attempting to establish there a new base for aggression. This intrusion of Indian troops is a serious one; by seizing that place, they obviously intended to cut off the only rear route for the Chinese post located at the lower reaches of the Galwan river and to launch an attack on that Chinese post. Furthermore, the above-mentioned Indian troops, relying on their superiority in numerical strength, made provocations against a small Chinese patrol on the northern bank of the Galwan river; they crossed the Galwan river from the southern bank at 13:00 hours and pressed forward right up to a place only about one hundred metres from the Chinese patrol. A serious incident was averted only because the Chinese patrol exercised self-restraint throughout, repeatedly advised the Indian troops against a clash and withdrew a certain distance on their own. Nevertheless, the Indian troops have not stopped their pressing forward on the Chinese patrol and a dangerous situation there is not yet over.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned serious intrusion and provocation made by Indian troops.

The Chinese Government states once again that while always trying to avoid clashes with the intruding Indian troops, the Chinese side will never yield before an ever deeper armed advance by India, nor will China give up its right to self-defence when unwarrantedly attacked. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will fully realize the danger involved in the aforesaid intrusion and provocation by Indian troops and withdraw at once their intruding troops from the Chinese territory. It is hardly necessary to point out that if the Indian troops should persist in their intrusion and provocation, India will be held responsible for all consequences arising therefrom.
Of late, Indian troops have continued to intrude into China’s Sinkiang and have further set up four new military strong-points on the Chinese territory. Of these, one is located at approximately 35 degrees 14 minutes north, 78 degrees 9 minutes east, another at approximately 35 degrees 10 minutes north, 78 degrees 12 minutes east, the third at approximately 35 degrees 16 minutes north, 78 degrees 11 minutes east, and the fourth at approximately 35 degrees 25 minutes north, 78 degrees 5 minutes east. The first two strong-points are both as deep as about twelve kilometres, the third as deep as sixteen kilometres and the fourth nearly one kilometre inside the Chinese territory. The aggressive strong-points set up by Indian troops form a threatening encirclement of the Chinese posts. Meanwhile, the Indian side has kept sending more troops to these aggressive strong-points, constructing roads and building fortifications near the strong-points. Moreover, Indian troops have from time to time sallied out in different directions to harass and provoke Chinese frontier guards.

Recently, Indian troops have also established a new military strong-point at approximately 33 degrees 31 minutes and 30 seconds north, 78 degrees 47 minutes east, on the Sino-Indian boundary line west of the Spanggur Lake in China’s Tibet. This and the other strong-point established on the Chinese territory by the Indian side which was referred to in the Chinese Government’s Note of May 11, 1962, form a pincer threat on the Chinese post in the Spanggur Lake area. Moreover, Indian troops after firing provocative shots at the Chinese post on May 5 and 9, 1962 (See Chinese Government’s Notes of May 11 and 28, 1962) disregarded repeated protests of the Chinese Government and at about 11:40 hours on May 22, for the third time, fired on the said Chinese post from the same direction. It can be seen from these new serious cases that the Indian Government’s denial made in its reply Notes of 21 and 26, 1962, regarding the facts of the Indian troops’ intrusion into this area brought up by the Chinese Government is totally worthless and unworthy of refutation.

To the south west of the Kongka Pass, Indian troops have recently built a block house and trenches at approximately 34 degrees 18 minutes north, 78 degrees 59 minutes east on the Sino-Indian boundary close to the Chinese post in the locality and have crossed the boundary to make harassment.

Indian aircraft have continually acted in co-ordination with and support of Indian invasion on the ground, frequently intruding into Chinese air space and air dropping supplies to India’s aggressive strong-points established within the Chinese territory.

The above-mentioned facts once again show that the Indian Government far from intending to stop its encroachment and harassment on the Chinese territory is expanding and aggravating them.
The Indian Government talks glibly about the desire to 'maintain the status quo', 'reach a peaceful settlement' and so on. But a comparison of its words and deeds shows obviously that it is merely creating a smokescreen for an armed invasion.

In its reply Note of June 6, 1962, the Indian Government described a series of Indian intrusions into the Chinese territory as made 'for the defence of the Indian territory'. In the same Note and that of May 21, it further falsely accused China of 'daily intruding into Indian territory' and so forth. These assertions are great mockery of truth. As a matter of fact, it is the Indian side that has been intruding into and carrying on armed provocation against China while the Chinese side has always been in the defensive position on its own territory. In his speech in Indian Parliament on June 20, 1962, Prime Minister Nehru unwittingly let out the truth. He stated that to say that China had made 'a fresh intrusion' was 'hardly correct' and that it was due to the Indian movements 'sometimes going behind Chinese positions' and 'largely due to the movements on our (Indian) side that the Chinese had also to make movements'. Is it not clear enough who has incessantly been undermining the status quo and intruding into the other party's territory and who is creating tension on the Sino-Indian border?

The Chinese Government strongly protests against the aforesaid fresh activities of intrusion and provocation carried out by Indian troops and once again urges the Indian Government to withdraw immediately from the Chinese territory all its newly established aggressive strong-points and its intruding troops. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the groundless and false accusation levelled by the Indian Government. It reiterates that the Indian Government must bear full responsibility for all grave consequences that may arise from obstinate practices of the Indian side.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs Memorandum, dated the 8th July 1962.

The allegations made in the Chinese memorandum are entirely baseless. Indian border forces have regularly been patrolling the Galwan valley and have never encountered any Chinese infiltrators in the valley. It cannot therefore be true that Chinese troops have infiltrated and set up a post "in the lower reaches of the Galwan valley". The lower reaches of the Galwan valley are not only well inside Indian territory but also about 28 miles even from the claim line shown in the Chinese 1956 map about which Premier Chou En-lai wrote to the Indian Prime Minister in his letter, dated the 17th November 1959, that "it correctly shows the boundary alignment in this sector of the border". If as claimed in the Chinese memorandum Chinese troops have penetrated and set up a post "in the lower reaches of the Galwan river", it is a serious violation of Indian territory which must be vacated.

The Government of India have had for some time a post at approximately 73° 38' E, 34° 39:45' N which is 10½ miles west and beyond the claim line shown in the Chinese map of 1956. The Indian post is located there for the legitimate defence of Indian territory.

The Chinese memorandum has falsely charged that Indian border guards "made provocations" against a Chinese patrol on the north bank of the Galwan river that the border guards crossed to the north bank at 13:00 hours and went to within one hundred metres of the Chinese patrol that the Chinese patrol thereupon 'exercised self-restraint and repeatedly advised the Indian troops to avoid a clash'. On detailed verification it has been found that Indian border guards had not as alleged, encountered any Chinese patrol on and up to 9th July 1962.

However, more than 48 hours after the despatch of the Chinese memo, i.e., at 09:30 hours 1st on 10th July, 1962, a party of 25 Chinese soldiers took up position 200 yards opposite the Indian post. Ten minutes later the first party was reinforced by another party of 40—45 Chinese soldiers. These Chinese intruders immediately started to prepare for hostile action. A batch of Chinese soldiers soon after went from the rear up to within 75 yards of the Indian post, where they occupied a position astride the track leading to the Indian post. At 18:00 hours the same day 300 more Chinese soldiers arrived and encircled the Indian post from the east, south and west. They moved up threateningly to within 50 to 70 yards of the post. The Government of India register a most emphatic protest against the threat posed to the Indian post by Chinese intruders.
It is clear from the facts stated above that the Government of China have preferred entirely baseless allegations against Indian border guards making it appear as though the latter were in pursuit of the Chinese intruders. It is significant that after they had made these false and mischievous allegations about an imaginary encounter between the Indian border guards and Chinese intruders, large bodies of Chinese troops moved to take up hostile positions and to encircle the Indian post.

The Government of India lodge an emphatic protest against this unwarranted aggressive activity of the local Chinese forces and in view of the factual position stated above reject the Chinese memorandum of 8th July 1962.

If any Chinese patrol has erroneously infiltrated into the "lowe reaches of the Galwan river", it must return to its base. At the same time the Government of China should stop the incessant intrusions deeper inside Indian territory and ceaseless provocative activities against Indian border guards. Time and again Indian border guards have exercised the utmost restraint in the face of grave provocations and attempts at encirclement by Chinese troops. There can be no doubt that the present situation in Ladakh has developed as a result of the aggressive activities systematically pursued by Chinese forces in Indian territory. It any untoward incident should now occur, the responsibility for it would entirely rest on the Government of China.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of their highest considerations.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 12 July 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to
refer to the Ministry of External Affairs Note, dated 6th June 1962,
in which it was pointed out that "carefully verified reports from...Ladakh show that Chinese troops are daily intruding into Indian
territory, pushing forward in trucks and jeeps, blasting the mountain
side with heavy explosives, constructing military bases and extending
the military bases already set up".

The aggressive activities referred to above had led in recent
weeks to the establishment of a number of new Chinese posts deep
inside Indian territory. The particulars of these posts are given
below:—

A. Chip Chap River Region

(1) Post at 78° 08' E, 35° 28' N: This post is not only well inside
Indian territory but also 2½ miles even beyond the claim
line shown in the Chinese map of 1956.

(2) Post at 78° 08' E, 35° 29:45' N: This post is 4 miles south
of the international boundary in this sector.

(3) Post at 78° 07' E, 35° 24' N: This post is not only well inside
Indian territory but 6 miles further west from the claim
line shown in the Chinese map of 1956.

(4) Post at 78° 10' E, 35° 20:30' N: This post is well inside
Indian territory and 6 miles south-west of the claim line
shown in the Chinese map of 1956.

(4) Post at 78° 10' E, 35° 20:30' N: This post is well inside
Indian territory but also 9 miles further south-west from
the nearest point on the claim line shown in the Chinese
map of 1956.

(6) Post at 78° 12' E, 35° 16:30' N: This post is not only well
inside Indian territory but also 9 miles further south-west
from the nearest point on the claim line shown in the
Chinese map of 1956.

(7) Post at 78° 15' E, 35° 15:30' N: This post is not only well
inside Indian territory but also about 12 miles further
south-west from the nearest point on the claim line shown
in the Chinese map of 1956.

B. Chang Chenmo Valley Region

(8) Post at 79° 02' E, 34° 17' N: This post is more than 30 miles
west of the international border in this sector.

C. Spanggur Region

(9) Post at 78° 50:30' E, 33° 44:30' N: This post is 12 miles
beyond the international border in this sector.
Thus as many as 6 out of the 9 new Chinese posts referred to above are not only well inside Indian territory but well beyond even the boundary alignment claimed by the Government of China in their 1956 map, about which Premier Chou-En-lai wrote in his letter dated 17th December 1959 to the Prime Minister of India that "it (the 1956 map) correctly shows the traditional boundary between the two countries". Although this 1956 Chinese alignment is itself fallacious and untenable the fact that Chinese forces have pushed even beyond it is indicative of China's unlimited territorial ambition in the region.

These new Chinese posts, deep inside Indian territory, constitute further serious violations of India's territorial integrity. Not only are Chinese forces now poised in menacing proximity to existing Indian posts in the area, but their incessant aggressive and provocative activities are increasing tension and, if not restrained, may create a clash at any moment.

Recent Chinese moves have again given the lie to their much vaunted claims of maintaining the status quo on the border and not sending forward patrols. The Government of India while lodging a strong protest against the establishment of these new Chinese posts urgently call upon the Government of China, in the interests of peace and good neighbourly relations, to withdraw from Indian territory and restore the status quo on the border as it prevailed until the Chinese aggressive activities in the last few years.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the
Embassy of India in China, 13 July 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with
reference to the Indian troops' intrusion into the Galwan Valley in
China's Sinkiang in a deliberate attempt to provoke an armed clash,
states again the following:

The Chinese Government lodged a strongest protest on July 8,
1962, against the Indian troops' flagrant intrusion on July 6, 1962,
into the Galwan Valley in China's Sinkiang, cutting off the route of
a Chinese post to its rear and making armed provocations against a
Chinese patrol, and demanded that the Indian Government imme-
diately withdraw the intruding Indian troops so as to avoid any
unfortunate incident. The Indian side, however, has turned a deaf
ear to the Chinese Government's solemn warning and demand. Far
from withdrawing its troops from Chinese territory up to now, the
Indian side has actively reinforced its troops, tightened its encircle-
ment of the Chinese post and patrol in preparation for an armed
provocation at any time.

In the three days from July 7 to 9, Indian reinforcements kept
arriving at the Indian military strong point at 34° 37' 30" N, 78° 35' 30" E. On July 10, Indian troops in three groups advanced
further on the northern bank of the Galwan River to occupy positions
and close in on the Chinese patrol, coming as near as 50 metres. On
July 11, two Indian helicopters flew reinforcements to the aggressive
strong point and circle over the vicinity at a low altitude for
reconnaissance and intimidation against the Chinese post and patrol-
men. On the same day, a detachment of the Indian troops moved
down along the Galwan River for about nine kilometres and set up
a new aggressive strong point there, thus further threatening the
security of the Chinese post whose rear route had already been cut off.

By now, the above-mentioned Chinese post has lost touch with
the rear for as long as eight days, and the Chinese patrol is besieged
by Indian troops of superior strength. The Chinese Government
solemnly demands once again that the Indian troops immediately stop
their provocations and threats against the Chinese frontier guards
and withdraw from Chinese territory at once.

The Chinese Government has just received the Indian Govern-
ment's note, dated July 10, 1962 and cannot but express great
indignation at the attitude shown in it. While admitting that Indian
troops have set up a military strong point in the Galwan Valley, the
Indian Government has distorted the facts in an attempt to shirk its
responsibility for intruding into Chinese territory and threatening
Chinese frontier guards.

The Indian Government asserts that there is no Chinese post on
the lower reaches of the Galwan River and that Indian forces have
regularly been patrolling the Galwan Valley and have established a post there since long ago. This is entirely groundless. The plain fact is that the Chinese post has been there since long ago and is located at approximately 30° 42' N, 78° 26' E, while Indian troops had never been to the Galwan Valley in China before, let alone setting up a post there. As late as July 4, 1962 when a patrol sent by the above-mentioned Chinese post last patrolled the upper reaches of the River, no sign of any Indian troops or post was yet found. The Indian troops invaded this area only after July 4, 1962. It was only on its return after fulfilling a patrol task on July 6 that the Chinese patrol was hindered by the Indian post which had just been set up at 34° 37' 30" N, 78° 35' 30" E. This is an established and unchangeable fact. If India had earlier set up a strong point there (34° 39.45" N, 78° 38' E, as asserted in the Indian note), how could Chinese frontier guards get through the path controlled by the strong point to set up the post on the lower reaches of the Galwan River?

In its note the Indian Government has repeated its customary method of describing the Indian troop intrusions as "legitimate defence of Indian territory" on the pretext that "the lower reaches of the Galwan Valley are not only well inside Indian territory but also about 28 miles even from the claim-line shown in the Chinese 1956 map". This trick has long been repeatedly exposed and repudiated by the Chinese Government. As part of the whole Aksai Chin area, the lower reaches of the Galwan Valley have always been Chinese territory. Both the 1956 map of China, which was confirmed by Premier Chou-En-lai and cited by the Chinese side during the meeting of the officials of the two countries, and the map handed over by the Chinese side during the meeting of the officials of the two countries in 1960 show this area as within China. The delineation of the western sector of the boundary in the above-mentioned 1956 map of China is in full conformity with the boundary line which China has consistently pointed out. The Indian assertion about inconsistency in the Chinese Government's position is a sheer slander.

It is entirely a fact that on July 6 the Indian troops, as pointed out in the Chinese Government's memorandum of July 8, came within 100 metres to make provocations against the Chinese patrol. Yet the Indian Government falsely alleges that the Indian troops had not encountered any Chinese patrol on and upto July 9. Especially surprising is the fact that the Indian Government even fabricated the entirely groundless story that allegedly three to four hundred Chinese soldiers encircle the Indian post from three directions and thereupon lodged a most emphatic protest with the Chinese Government. So unscrupulous has become the Indian Government in order to relieve the Indian troops of their responsibility. Facts can in no way be covered up. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the unwarranted charge and protest of the Indian Government.

Since last spring, Indian troops have continually intruded into Chinese territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, established a series of aggressive strong points and made repeated provocations against Chinese frontier guards. In his speeches made in the Indian Parliament on June 20, 21 and 23, 1962, Prime Minister
Nehru again and again boasted about the many new posts established by the Indian troops, saying that those posts “give us (India) certain advantage”. He openly admitted: “Our (India’s) movements sometimes go behind the Chinese positions”. The Chinese Government has lodged repeated protests against these Indian aggressive activities, yet the Indian side has turned a deaf ear to them. There are many signs indicating that Indian activities in the western sector of the boundary in the past few months have been fully planned and systematic. India aims not only to assert its territorial claims on China by armed force, but also deliberately to provoke a military clash on the border so as to create an anti-Chinese atmosphere. Proceeding from the desire of maintaining friendship between the two countries and settling the boundary question peacefully, the Chinese Government has all along exercise forbearance and self-restraint. The Chinese Government is extremely unwilling to see any unfortunate incident occurring on the Sino-Indian border. But if the Indian side should overdo it and provoke an armed clash, and the Chinese side should be compelled to defend itself, the Indian side would have to bear the whole responsibility.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 July 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs note, dated the 10th July 1962.

It has been repeatedly pointed out in note after note from the Government of India that since 1957 the Government of China have started a process of intrusion and occupation of Indian territory. This process continued unabated even during the officials’ talks when it was expected that the two sides would not push forward or send out patrols. By September 1961, Chinese forces had made further advances into Indian territory and had set up three new posts as cited in Government of India’s note of 31st October 1961. Thereafter, they continued to push forward and set up more posts in Indian territory as cited in the Government of India’s notes of 15th April 1962, 21st May 1962, 16th June 1962, 28th June 1962 and 12th July 1962. Thus, in recent months, Chinese intruders have set up no less than 13 new posts in Indian territory.

The Government of India could not ignore the threat to the security and territorial integrity of India posed by Chinese forces advancing and illegally occupying Indian territory. They had to take necessary measures for the defence of Indian territory. These measures taken in Indian territory are however, purely for defensive purposes and threaten no one.

As to the Indian posts cited in the Chinese note, although the references given are not all correct, it is true that the Government of India have some posts in that general location. All these posts are, however, well within Indian territory and are there for the purpose cited in the preceding paragraph. Even assuming that the bearings given in the Chinese note are correct, these posts are not only well inside Indian territory but 20 to 25 miles west and beyond even of the claim line shown in the Chinese map of 1956 about which Premier Chou En-lai wrote to the Prime Minister of India in his letter, dated the 17th November 1959 that “it correctly shows the traditional border between the two countries in this sector”. As the Government of China are aware, this claim line in the Chinese map of 1956 has been rejected by the Government of India and detailed reasons for this position have been given by the Indian officials in the report of the talks between officials. The fact, however, that the Chinese authorities are now attempting to cover up their intrusions into Indian territory by protesting against Indian posts which are not only well inside Indian territory but several miles west even of the claim line in 1956 Chinese maps shows beyond doubt the aggressive and expansionist policy of the Chinese authorities.

The Government of India have repeatedly made it clear that their objectives are peaceful. They have no intention to embroil themselves in hostilities and armed clashes. The Government of India
hope that the Chinese authorities would carefully consider the contents in the various notes presented by the Government of India, revise their policy and peacefully withdraw from Indian territory which they are unlawfully occupying. It is false and mischievous to suggest that Indian troops have at any time threatened to encircle Chinese posts. There has not been to date a single incident of such encirclement. On the contrary, Chinese forces have set up new posts in the vicinity of Indian posts in order to encircle and harass them. The Chinese posts at 78° 08' E, 35° 28' N, 78° 12' E, 35° 16'30' N and 78° 15' E, 35° 15'30' N have been deliberately set up in Indian territory to encircle and harass the Indian post in that general location. More recently, Chinese troops have taken similar aggressive action against an Indian post in the Galwan valley (vide Ministry of External Affairs note, dated 10th July 1962).

The Chinese note makes a reference to road construction and fortifications by Indian troops in north Ladakh. It is the intruding Chinese forces who have incessantly carried on aggressive activities, constructed numerous roads and built fortified posts in Indian territory. In the face of these activities, Government of India had to take such minimum precautions as they considered necessary to stop further Chinese encroachment on Indian territory.

The Chinese note has referred to an Indian post at 33° 31'30' N, 78° 47' E. This post is not only in Indian territory but it is even beyond any boundary claim in this region made by the Chinese authorities in the past. As the Government of China are aware, the international boundary in this sector of the border cuts across the eastern part of Spanggur lake and follows the northern and eastern watershed of the Indus. It is the Chinese Government who have violated Indian territory by setting up posts at 78° 52'30' E, 33° 30' N and 78° 48' E, 33° 34' N in Indian territory. Indian posts in the area are not threatening anyone but are there only to exercise normal vigilance against any further Chinese intrusions into Indian territory. It is an entirely baseless allegation that they fired shots at the heavily fortified Chinese post at Spanggur. That this allegation is absurd is clear from the fact that no one would fire at a post which is more than five miles away. It is obvious that such baseless allegations against Indian troops are being repeated merely to cover up Chinese aggressive plans in this area.

There is no Indian post at 34° 18' N, 78° 59' E as mischievously alleged in the Chinese note. In any case, this location is well within Indian territory. It is the Government of China who have made a fresh intrusion into this area and set up a new post in Indian territory at 79° 02' E, 34° 17' N, 30 miles beyond the internation border in this sector (vide Ministry of External Affairs note, dated the 12th July 1962).

Indian aircraft have never violated Chinese air space. Indian maintenance aircraft fly on legitimate duty well inside Indian air space. In contrast, Chinese aircraft have on innumerable occasions violated Indian air space and carried out provocative activities.
The Chinese Government have made an out of context reference to the Indian Prime Minister's reply to a debate in Parliament. What the Prime Minister of India conveyed in his reply in Parliament on 20th June 1962 was that Chinese intrusions into Indian territory which had taken place in the immediately preceding months were not on the same scale as the earlier ones from 1957—60 which involved "over 12,000 square miles of Indian territory". It is a fact that Chinese forces are still attempting to nibble away at Indian territory but they are obviously unable to make the same deep inroads into Indian territory as they did from 1957 to 1960 because Indian posts and patrols are now standing guard against such intrusions. The Prime Minister's statement was an assurance to the country that the process of intrusion and occupation of Indian territory started by the Government of China, since 1957, had been, by and large, brought to a halt.

In the light of the facts stated above the Government of India reject the Chinese note of 10th July 1962. It is for the Government of China to call a halt to their aggressive activities and peacefully withdraw their forces from Indian territory. At the same time, the Government of India must urge that immediate steps be taken to end the recent menacing and provocative activities of Chinese forces against Indian posts in Indian territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 16 July 1962

The Indian troops have lately set up another three aggressive strongpoints in Ari, Tibet, China, one at approximately 33 degrees 44 minutes north, 78 degrees 51 minutes east near Sirijap on the northern bank of the Pangong Lake, about two kilometers within Chinese territory, another at Yula (approximately 33 degrees 41 minutes north, 78 degrees 52 minutes east) on the southern bank of the Pangong lake over ten kilometers within China; and the third at approximately 34 degrees 3 minutes north, 78 degrees 43 minutes east, northwest of Nyagzu and about five kilometers within China. Taking advantage of the fact that the Pangong lake is astride of the boundary, the Indian side has moreover kept sending motorboats to intrude into part of the lake within China, making wanton harassment and bringing men and material to support its newly established aggressive strongpoints. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against these serious new intrusions and provocations by India.

Since last April, Indian troops have set up a series of aggressive strongpoints at various places in the Chinese border area in the Western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary and recently even created a dangerous situation in the Galwan valley in Sinkiang in which an unfortunate incident may occur at any time. Now Indian troops again set up strongpoints in the Pangong lake area and the Nyagzu area within China and carried out provocations there. This shows that India's aggressive activities against China along the entire western sector of the boundary have grown most fanatic. Already more than once the Chinese Government has shown forbearance to Indian troop intrusions and provocations. The Indian side will make a fatal mistake if it should think that China is flabby and can be bullied in view of her self-restraint and forbearance and persist in its act of playing with fire in an attempt to assert its territorial claims by armed force. The Chinese Government sternly demand that the Indian Government immediately withdraw its aggressive strongpoints and stop all its intrusion and provocations.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state that on 21st July 1962 an Indian patrol in the region of Chip Chap river area, while performing routine patrol duties within Indian territory was attacked by Chinese troops with light machine mortar and rifle fire resulting in the wounding of two members of the Indian patrol. Our patrol exercised extreme restraint and did not return fire. Later, however, in the face of continuing firing by the Chinese, they were forced to return the fire in self defence.

On the same day, in the region of the Pangong lake Chinese troops fired at another Indian party. In spite of grave provocation, Indian forces exercised great self-restraint and did not return the fire.

The Government of India had warned the Chinese Embassy as late as July 12 that the establishment of Chinese posts deep within Indian territory apart from being a violation of the territorial integrity of this country was also aggravating tension in that area and increasing the risk of a clash. The Government of India strongly protest at the aggressive action taken by the Chinese forces both in the Chip Chap river area and in the Pangong lake area.

The Government of India deplore the continuing border tension in this area arising out of continuing provocations from Chinese forces and would urge the Chinese Government to issue orders to Chinese troops in the area to refrain from provocative armed action and to withdraw from Indian territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs' notes dated the 13th and 16th July, 1962.

As has been stated earlier in this Ministry's note of 10th July an Indian post is located for the legitimate defence of Indian territory at E 78° 33' N, 34° 39' 45" and not E 78° 35' 30" N, 34° 37' 30" as mentioned in the Chinese note. The Chinese allegations that reinforcements were sent to this post from 7—9th July, that on 10th July Indian troops advanced in three groups towards the north bank of the Galwan river and that two helicopters flew over the area on the 11th July are unfounded. The allegation that on 11th July a detachment of Indian troops moved down the Galwan river for about 9 kilometres and set up a new aggressive strongpoint is equally baseless. On the contrary, it is the Chinese forces who have as stated in this Ministry's note of 10th July made aggressive and threatening moves against the Indian post and are interfering with its communications and supplies. The Government of India hope that this interference will cease and the Chinese forces will withdraw peacefully to the east of the international frontier in this region.

The note of the Chinese Government that their patrol on its return after fulfilling a patrol task in a rear area was hindered by the Indian post on July 6th is without foundation. In their Memorandum of July 8th the Chinese Government vaguely referred to this post as "a post on the lower reaches of the Galwan". It was only on the 13th of July that coordinates of the post have been given. It appears that the Chinese allegations are an obvious attempt to confuse the issue and to find an excuse for establishing an aggressive base in that area.

The Indian Government have observed that in the Chinese note of 13th July after stating "both the 1956 map of China" and "the map handed over by the Chinese side during the meeting of the officials of the two countries in 1960 show this area as within China" the Chinese note goes on to maintain that the delineation of the Western Sector of the boundary in the above mentioned 1956 map of China is in full conformity with the boundary lines which China has consistently pointed out. That this contention is incorrect is clear from the fact that the Indian side at the Officials Conference referring to the 1956 and 1960 maps of the Chinese Government had stated that "the Indian side noted that the Chinese side were unable to explain the discrepancies between the alignment shown in this Sector on the 1956 map and authoritatively confirmed by Premier Chou En-lai in 1959, and that shown in the map provided by the Chinese side at these meetings. The latter map showed an alignment which ran due east from the Karakoram Pass rather than south-east as in the 1956 map, and then, making a sudden turn southward, it cut across the Upper Shyok or Chip Chap river, the Galwan river, and the Changlung river to reach the Kongka Pass. It did not run between the Shyok and the Qara Qash as the 1956 map had done. In the Pangong region, instead
of leaving the entire western half of the lake in India as in the 1956 map, it cut across the Western Pangong Lake." It is obvious that the Chinese authorities are either themselves confused or are deliberately confusing the question of the international frontier in this region. So far as the Government of India are concerned, the only frontier recognised by them is the international frontier that has been clearly established and indicated in the maps that have been handed over to the Chinese Government by the Indian side at the meetings of the officials of the two Governments.

The Chinese Note of July 16th refers to three Indian posts in Indian territory west of the international frontier. These are for defensive purposes and have been necessitated by continuing Chinese aggressive activities in the area. The Indian Government share the desire of the Chinese Government to see that no unfortunate incident takes place on the Indo-Chinese border and hopes that the Chinese Government will issue instructions to the Chinese forces in the area to desist from harassing Indian military posts established purely for the defence of Indian territory in this region and to withdraw to points outside Indian territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 November 1961

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of India to the Chinese Embassy in India dated September 19, 1961, has the honour to state as follows:

With regard to the question of the western extremity of the Sino-Burmese boundary, the Indian Government, basing itself on its own distortion of the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty and the Attached Maps, has on four successive occasions raised objection to the Chinese Government. Despite the fact that the Chinese Government has repeatedly given exhaustive explanations to the Indian Government, the Indian Government has persisted in its position of trying to impose on others the alignment claimed by the Indian side and continued to make unreasonable haggling. Under these circumstances, it would indeed be meaningless to continue the present exchange of notes. The Chinese Government only wishes to reiterate the following: No specific provisions are made in the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty regarding the exact location of the western extremity of the Sino-Burmese boundary, which is at the same time the tri-junction of China, Burma and India. This is out of the consideration that the Sino-Indian boundary has not yet been formally delimited, and there is a dispute between China and India over the boundary question. Once the Sino-Indian boundary is formally delimited through negotiation, as the Chinese Government has consistently desired, the question of the western extremity of the Sino-Burmese boundary will be finally settled along with it. It is not difficult to see that the above-described way of dealing with the question in the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty is reasonable and appropriate, and does not affect at all the respective positions held by the Chinese and the Indian sides on the Sino-Indian boundary. The Chinese Government cannot but express deep regret at the fact that the Indian Government has repeatedly made unreasonable charges.

In its note of September 19, 1961, the Indian Government once again tried to defend its unilaterally claimed alignment and the British imperialist activities of aggression against China. The Chinese Government has long ago thoroughly refuted these hackneyed arguments and there is no need to repeat here. But it has to be pointed out that in its note, the Indian Government flagrantly slandered the Chinese Government as having "aggressive designs and imperialist ambitions," violating the Five Principles and "unauthorisedly occupying large areas of Indian territory". The Chinese Government hereby strongly protests against these wanton slanders and provocations on the part of the Indian Government.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to state that according to a communiqué issued by the Government of the People's Republic of China on the 3rd May 1962, the Governments of China and Pakistan have entered into an agreement "to locate and align their common border".

As the Government of China are aware there is no common border between Pakistan and the People's Republic of China. It is the India-China boundary which starts from the tri-junction of the boundaries of India, China and Afghanistan at approximately long 74° 34' E and Lat. 37° 3' N and runs eastward upto the tri-junction of the boundaries of India, Burma and China.

There has never been any doubt that the sovereignty over the entire State of Jammu and Kashmir, including that part which is under Pakistan's unlawful occupation, vests solely in the Indian Union. The Government of India had so far believed that the Government of the People's Republic of China had accepted this basic position without any reservation. This was confirmed by Premier Chou-En-lai when he stated to the Indian Ambassador in Peking on March 16, 1956 "that the people of Kashmir had already expressed their will' on the issue of Kashmir's accession to India. The same impression was gained at the meeting between the Secretary General of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and the Chinese Prime Minister in July 1961. At that time it seemed that the Government of China still acknowledged the final accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to the Indian Union. The Government of India are, in view of this background, surprised that the Government of the People's Republic of China should have suddenly decided to enter into an international agreement to negotiate the boundary of that part of the State of Jammu and Kashmir which is under the unlawful occupation of Pakistan with the Government of Pakistan. This is a reversal of the attitude of the Government of the People's Republic of China in regard to India's sovereignty over the entire State of Jammu and Kashmir and is obviously a step in furtherance of the aggressive aims that China has been pursuing towards India in recent years.

In lodging an emphatic protest with the Government of the People's Republic of China for this interference with the sovereignty of India over the State of Jammu and Kashmir, Government of India solemnly warns the Government of China that any change, provisional or otherwise, in the status of the State of Jammu and Kashmir brought about by third parties which seeks to submit certain parts of Indian territory to foreign jurisdiction will not be binding on the Government of India and that the Government of India firmly repudiate any agreements provisional or otherwise regarding her
own territories arrived at between third parties who have no legal or constitutional locus standi of any kind.

It is clear that the Government of China are in this matter acting in furtherance of their aggressive designs and are seeking to exploit the troubled situation in Kashmir and India's differences with Pakistan for their advantage. The Government of India will hold the Government of China responsible for the consequences of their action.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of the opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 31 May 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Note of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese Government dated the 20th November 1961 have the honour to state as follows:

It is strange that the Chinese Government should continue ad infinitum to contend that the Sino-Indian boundary at the tri-junction of China, Burma and India has not been finally settled or that the Diphu pass has not been shown as the western extremity in the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty and its attached maps. The latter contention goes against the concrete evidence available in the text of the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty, and more particularly the first sheet of the map attached to the Treaty which is explicitly captioned "the map showing the entire boundary between Burma and China".

The northern and eastern boundary of India is traditionally well known and well recognised and requires no further definition. The Government of China, adopting an unhistorical and subjective view, have sought to exploit the opportunity offered by the China-Burma Boundary Treaty to raise a non-existent dispute in this sector of the Sino-Indian boundary which has been firmly fixed.

The Government of India wish to make it clear that they cannot accept this unhistorical and subjective stand taken by the Government of China.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of India dated May 10, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

1. The Indian Government in its note has gone to the length of lodging a protest with the Chinese Government against Sino-Pakistan negotiations for a provisional boundary agreement and wantonly slandering and intimidating China. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the unjustifiable protest of the Indian Government and, from the Indian Government's completely unreasonable attitude of imposing its will on others, cannot but draw with regret the conclusion that the Indian Government is bent on making use of the Sino-Pakistan negotiations to whip up anti-Chinese sentiments and aggravate the tension between China and India.

2. The Indian note alleges that the Chinese Government accepted without reservation the position that Kashmir is under Indian sovereignty, that there is no common boundary between China and Pakistan, and that therefore China has no right to conduct boundary negotiations with Pakistan. This allegation is totally untenable. When did the Chinese Government accept without any reservation the position that Kashmir is under Indian sovereignty? The Indian Government could not cite any official Chinese document to prove this arbitrary contention but, basing itself solely on the guesswork and impression of Indian diplomatic officials who have been to China, insisted that Chinese Government authorities had made statements to that effect. This is not only a unilateral misrepresentation of the fact but a conclusion imposed on others, to which the Chinese Government categorically objects. There is a boundary of several hundred kilometres between China's Sinkiang and the areas the defence of which is under the control of Pakistan, and it has never been formally delimited and demarcated. If one does not shut his eyes to the facts, how can he assert that there is no common boundary between China and Pakistan? Since both China and Pakistan are sovereign states, why cannot China conduct negotiations with Pakistan to settle the question of the actually existing common boundary so as to maintain tranquillity on the border and amity between the two countries? Long before it agreed with the Government of Pakistan to negotiate the boundary question, the Chinese Government had repeatedly proposed, and now still proposes, to conduct negotiations with the Indian Government for the settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. But the Indian Government has again and again turned down China's proposal, consequently the Sino-Indian boundary question remains unsettled and the situation on the Sino-Indian border becomes increasingly tense. Now the Indian Government not only refuses itself to negotiate a settlement of the boundary question with China, but object to China's negotiating a boundary settlement with Pakistan. Does it mean that the
Indian Government, after creating the Sino-Indian boundary dispute, wishes to see a similar dispute arise between China and Pakistan?

3. The boundary negotiations between China and Pakistan do not at all involve the question of the ownership of Kashmir. The agreement between the Governments of China and Pakistan made it crystal clear that after the settlement of the dispute between Pakistan and India over Kashmir, the sovereign authorities concerned shall reopen negotiations with the Chinese Government on the question of the Kashmir boundary so as to conclude a formal boundary treaty to replace the provisional agreement to be signed after the Sino-Pakistan negotiations. The signing of such an agreement will only help maintain tranquility on the existing boundary between China and Pakistan, and will in no way prejudice a peaceful settlement of the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan. The Indian Government is wholly unjustified in objecting to boundary negotiations between China and Pakistan on the pretext of the Kashmir dispute.

4. With regard to the Kashmir dispute, it has been the consistent position of the Chinese Government to be impartial and to wish that India and Pakistan will reach a peaceful settlement. This has been and still is, the Chinese position. The Indian Government is clearly aware of this. Suffice it to point out the fact that Premier Chou En-lai declared at a press conference in Calcutta on December 9, 1956, that the Chinese Government considered the Kashmir question "an outstanding issue between India and Pakistan". Furthermore, Premier Chou En-lai, together with the late Prime Minister Bandaranaike of Ceylon, made an appeal in their joint statement issued on February 5, 1957, to India and Pakistan to strive further for a peaceful settlement of the Kashmir question. This attitude of the Chinese Government of never getting involved in the dispute over Kashmir can in no way be distorted and is well-known throughout the world.

5. The Chinese Government has always refrained from making any remarks on the historical background of the Kashmir question. Nevertheless, the Kashmir question is after all a dispute between two legal governments, those of India and of Pakistan. China has diplomatic relations with India and also with Pakistan, and India, too, has diplomatic relations with Pakistan. The Chinese Government only hopes that this dispute between India and Pakistan will be settled by them peacefully, and has always been against anyone taking advantage of it to sow discord in the relations between the two countries. So far as China is concerned, nothing would be better than a peaceful settlement of this dispute by India and Pakistan through negotiation. However, more than ten years have passed, and despite the best wishes and expectations all along cherished by China, this dispute between India and Pakistan remain unsettled. In these circumstances, anyone with common sense can understand that the Chinese Government cannot leave unsettled indefinitely its boundary of several hundred kilometres with the areas the defence of which is under the control of Pakistan merely because there is a dispute between India and Pakistan over Kashmir.
It is entirely necessary, proper, legitimate and in accordance with international practice for the Chinese Government to agree with the Government of Pakistan to negotiate a provisional agreement concerning this boundary pending a final settlement of the Kashmir question. What fault can be found with this? Yet in the note the Indian Government rudely slanders the Chinese Government's agreeing to open negotiations with Pakistan as taking advantage of the difference between India and Pakistan and committing aggression against India. But unreasonable assertions can never hold water. The fact, on the contrary, is that the Indian Government itself is seeking to make use of the boundary question to sow discord in the relations between China and Pakistan. On May 7, 1962, Prime Minister Nehru openly admitted in the Indian Parliament that "we treated the Pakistan Government in a friendly way in these matters because we thought that any action which they might take should be in line with the action we were taking in regard to this border and should not conflict". Small wonder that the Indian Government should get so excited about Sino-Pakistan negotiations. Its scheme to sow discord in the relations between China and Pakistan has failed.

6. The excitement of the Indian Government will only bring results contrary to its expectations. Anyone in the world with common sense will ask: Since the Burmese and Nepalese Governments can settle their boundary questions with China in a friendly way through negotiations and since the Government of Pakistan has also agreed with the Chinese Government to negotiate a boundary settlement, why is it that the Indian Government cannot negotiate and settle its boundary question with the Chinese Government? Such a common-sense query is indeed rather embarrassing. But it is useless to get furious with China. As in the past, the Chinese Government stands for a friendly settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question through peaceful negotiations. The Indian Government's unenviable situation on this matter is of its own making. For example the Indian Government's note says: "It is the India-China boundary which starts from the tri-junction of the boundaries of India, China and Afghanistan ....... and runs eastward up to the tri-junction of the boundaries of India, Burma and China". Pray, what kind of an assertion is that? Not only are the areas the defence of which is under the control of Pakistan negated, but even Nepal no longer exists, Sikkim no longer exists, and Bhutan no longer exists. This is out-and-out great-power chauvinism. The Indian Government should realise that it is now in the sixties of the 20th century and that the cursed era in which great powers controlled everything has gone for ever. Anyone who persists in an attitude of great-power chauvinism in international affairs will always knock his head against a stone wall.

7. The Chinese Government is deeply convinced that it is a good thing to hold boundary negotiations between China and Pakistan, which are in the interests of both friendship among Asian countries and peace in Asia. No slander of any kind can ever distort this fact. The position of the Chinese Government is not difficult for any reasonable person to understand. One who tries to make use of
Sino-Pakistan negotiations to whip up anti-Chinese sentiments will only be lifting a rock to crush his own toes in the end. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will coolly think it over: Would it not be better to make some earnest effort towards a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, rather than wasting its strength in such fruitless quarrel?

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 June 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Government of China's note dated 31st May, 1962, regarding Sino-Pakistan agreement "to locate and align" their "common boundary."

The Government of China have made an attempt to minimise the grave implications of the step they have taken to enter into negotiations with Pakistan for the demarcation of Indian territory, and have also brushed aside the legitimate and well-founded objections of the Government of India in this regard as "wanton slander" and "intimidation." The Government of India deplore the use of such expressions which cannot, however, lessen the Government of China's responsibility for having taken a calculated step which is bound to further aggravate tension in the area.

It has been argued by the Government of China that "they cannot indefinitely leave unsettled their boundary of several hundred kilometers with the areas the defence of which is under the control of Pakistan merely because there is a dispute between India and Pakistan over Kashmir". To justify their untenable move, the Government of China have emphasised a particular necessity which in fact does not exist. There is no boundary dispute in this sector of the Sino-Indian boundary and no urgency for a fresh settlement over it. Even in 1847, the Government of China had informed the British Government that as the boundary in this sector was sufficiently and distinctly fixed there was no need for any additional measures for refixing it. The initiative in this matter was for political reasons taken by the Government of Pakistan who had committed aggression in Kashmir. Though the Chinese Government had not responded to this initiative earlier, it is clear that they decided to do so now for possible political advantage to be obtained by exploiting the Indo-Pakistan differences in this matter.

The position stated in the preceding paragraph is confirmed by the earlier Chinese attempts to exploit Indo-Pakistan differences. On 23rd May, 1959, the Chinese Ambassador in New Delhi had mentioned to the Indian Foreign Secretary that India could not afford to have "two fronts" against her. Now the Government of China have brought the "two fronts" together against India to further the territorial ambitions of Pakistan and China.

It is patent that the Government of China have now taken a new stand on the legal status of Kashmir. Hitherto, while not formally declaring their official stand on the status of Kashmir, they had, perhaps with mental reservations of their own, given the impression on a number of occasions that they had, by and large, accepted India's basic position in Kashmir. At other times, they had declared themselves
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against any third party interference in the situation created by Pakistan’s aggression in Kashmir.

On March 16, 1956, Premier Chou En-lai told the Indian Ambassador in Peking that “the people of Kashmir have already expressed their will”. Again on 16th July 1961, at the talks between Premier Chou En-lai and the Secretary-General of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, Premier Chou En-lai stated that “Pakistan had formally proposed border talks” but emphasised that the Chinese Government “have not discussed with them anything so far”. In the same discussions, Premier Chou En-lai went on to ask the Secretary-General, “Can you cite any document to show that we have ever said that Kashmir is not a part of India?” Now this position has been reversed. The Chinese note under reply asks, “Can you cite any document to show that we have ever said that Kashmir is a part of India?”

The issue in Kashmir is one of Pakistan's aggression, and there is no room in this for any third party intervention. That, as the Chinese note states, had been acknowledged in the Chinese Premier’s press conference in Calcutta on 9th December 1956 and in the joint statement of Premier Chou En-lai and the late Prime Minister of Ceylon Mr. Bandarnaike of 5th February 1957. At a press conference in Karachi on December 24, 1956, Premier Chou En-lai correctly observed “I hope Pakistan and India will settle this question directly between themselves”. The advice given by Premier Chou En-lai in his various statements refer to the situation created by Pakistan’s aggression in Kashmir and do not question India’s sovereignty based on the State’s accession to India. Again, in the joint statement issued by Premier Chou En-lai and Prime Minister Cyrankiwicz of Poland in Peking on April 11, 1957, it was stated that the Kashmir question “should be settled by the countries concerned through peacefull negotiations and should not be allowed to be made use of by external forces to create new tensions.”

The entire evidence cited above supports the view that, until recently, the Chinese Government had declared themselves in favour of the question of Pakistan's aggression in Kashmir being settled peacefully, and against any third party taking advantage of it. However, this stand of the Government of China has changed and a new situation now created by the Sino-Pakistan agreement to demarcate their non-existent common border. In departing from their earlier policy of non-interference in the Kashmir situation the Government of China are giving legal and moral encouragement to an aggressor State and prejudicing the prospects of a peaceful settlement of the Kashmir issue between India and Pakistan.

There is an out of context reference in the Chinese note to a statement made by the Indian Prime Minister about certain exchange of information between India and Pakistan in regard to the border. This step was essential to safeguard India's territorial integrity. The Chinese note has also referred to the Sino-Indian boundary question and has drawn attention to the settlements which the Government of China have reached with Nepal and Burma. It is known that these
are common principles which are the basis of the international frontiers of Burma, Nepal and India but this fact has been consistently ignored by the Government of China. If the same terms are applied in the case of India, there should be no boundary dispute between India and China.

India has not laid any claims to Chinese territory; nor has she exercised diverse pressures to force these claims on China. It is the Government of China who have used force and diverse other pressures and unlawfully occupied 12,000 square miles of Indian territory since 1957.

Only the Government of China’s persistent efforts at misrepresentation of facts can explain their deliberate misreading of the description of the India-China boundary given in the Government of India’s note of 10th May 1962. This description was not a complete description of the border but only gave two terminal points to show that Pakistan and the People’s Republic of China have no common border, whether in the West or in the East. Government of India regret that this limited description has been deliberately and mischievously twisted by the Chinese authorities in an attempt to cause damage to the existing friendly relations between India and Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim.

The Government of India on their part not only respect the independence and sovereignty of Nepal but are interested in seeing Nepal grow from strength to strength. They have full faith in their relations with Nepal, and have no doubt that their age-old fraternal ties with the Kingdom of Nepal will stand the test of time.

The Government of India have special treaty relation with Bhutan and have, at the request of the Government of Bhutan, taken up at various times with the Government of China such matters as Chinese cartographic aggression on Bhutan, protection of Bhutan’s right and interests in Tibet and violation of Bhutan’s air space by Chinese aircraft. There can be no question but that, in co-operation with the Government of Bhutan, the Government of India are bound to ensure the protection and inviolability of the territory of Bhutan.

The Government of India’s position in relation to Sikkim is clear. The Government of India are responsible for the defence and external relations of Sikkim and no foreign power has any right to interfere in Sikkim.

The Government of India, while rejecting the Government of China’s note under reference, would again reiterate that any change, provisional or otherwise, in the status of the State of Jammu and Kashmir brought about by third parties which seeks to submit certain parts of Indian territory to foreign jurisdiction will not be binding on the Government of India.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 7 October 1961

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the continued intrusions into China's air space by Indian aircraft, has the honour to state as follows:

(1) About 11:25 hours on the morning of August 8, 1961 an Indian airplane intruded into China's air space over Spanggur (approximately 33° 36' N, 78° 49' E) in Tibet, China.

(2) About 9:40 hours on the morning of August 9 and about 9:50 hours on the morning of August 14, 1961, each time one Indian airplane intruded into China's air space over Height 6,181 metres (approximately 35° 07' N, 78° 11' E) and Height 5,651 metres (approximately 35° 20' N, 78° 04' E) in Sinkiang, China. The one which flew in on August 9 circled over the said places as long as 30 minutes.

(3) About 10:00 and 10:40 hours on the morning of August 14, 1961, each time one Indian airplane intruded into China's air space over a place (approximately 34° 13' N, 79° 07' E) east of Kongka Pass in Tibet, China. The former circled at a low altitude for about 5 minutes and the latter for about 10 minutes.

(4) About 9:00 hours on the morning of August 26, 1961, an Indian airplane penetrated deep into China's air space over a place east of Lake Spanggur in China's Tibet region and then flew at a low altitude along the same Lake back to India.

(5) From September 11 to 25, 1961, Indian airplanes intruded into China's air space over the above-mentioned Height 5,651 metres in Sinkiang, China, for 10 sorties as follows: 12:18 hours at noon on September 11, one airplane; about 10:00 hours on the morning of September 12, two airplanes; about 11:20 hours on the morning of September 13, three airplanes; 10:12 hours on the morning of September 14, one airplane; about 10:00 and 11:10 hours on the morning of September 22, one airplane each time; and about 10:25 hours on the morning of September, one airplane. Each of these aircraft circled at least 20 minutes over the said place. The two airplanes which flew in on September 12 circled over there as long as 40 minutes.

(6) From September 23 to 25, 1961, Indian airplanes intruded into China's air space over the area around 35° 18' N, 78° 09' E in Sinkiang, China, for four sorties, one each, as follows. About 10:20 hours on the morning of September 23, about 10:05 and 10:30 hours on the morning of September 24; and about 10:00 hours on the morning of September
25. Each of these aircraft circled about 20 minutes over the said place.

Since recently, Indian aircraft have time and again violated China’s air space, thus creating new tension in the China-India border areas. Although the Chinese Government has made repeated representations, such Indian intrusions, instead of coming to an end or decreasing, have obviously been on the increase. In the period of one month and more since August 8, Indian airplanes have intruded into China’s air space for at least 20 sorties. What is particularly most disturbing is that these Indian aircraft time and again circled for a long time at a low altitude over the Chinese border areas where Chinese frontier guards were stationed. The Chinese Government lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against these deliberate provocations by the Indian side and demand once again that the Indian Government should take effective measures at an early date against the recurrence of such intrusions into China’s air space by Indian aircraft.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its high consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to incidents of Indian aircraft encroaching on China's territorial air, has the honour to state as follows:

(1) On October 4, 1961, about 12:00 hours at noon, an Indian airplane intruded into the air space over the Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region, China, and circled around the area of Lanak La (approximately 54° 23' N, 79° 32' E), Howeitan (approximately 34° 58' N, 78° 36' E) and Chipchap La (approximately 35° 19' N, 78° 25' E) for as long as one and a half hours.

(2) About 5:50 hours in the afternoon of the same day, an Indian airplane intruded into the air space over the area of Nischu (approximately 34° 37' N, 79° 06' E) in the Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region, China, and then circled as long as about 35 minutes over the area between Nischu and Howeitan.

The Chinese Government has noted that the Indian side, in disregard of the Chinese Government's repeated protests against Indian aircraft encroaching on China's territorial air, has again sent its aircraft to penetrate deep into China's territorial air and circle for an unusually long time over several thousand square kilometres of Chinese territory. Against these acts of deliberate provocation and tension-creating by Indian aircraft, the Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government and demands that it immediately adopt effective measures to prevent the recurrence of incidents of Indian aircraft encroaching on China's territorial air.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
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Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the 
Embassy of China in India, 4 December 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs presents their compliments to 
the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, and with 
reference to note dated October 7, 1961, handed over by the Ministry 
of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to the Indian 
Embassy in Peking, have the honour to state that the Government 
of India after due verification is in a position to state that there has 
been no violation of Chinese air space by Indian aircraft as alleged 
in the Note.

2. It has been noted that of the places mentioned in the Chinese 
Note all but one are in Indian territory now under unlawful Chinese 
occupation.

3. The Government of India does not accept the Chinese Govern-
ment's right to be present in these places which lawfully belong to 
and form part of the territories of the Indian Union.

4. In the interests of peace and international amity the Chinese 
Government may wish to consider the immediate withdrawal of its 
forces from Indian territories to Chinese territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew 
to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of 
their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 9 December 1961

The Ministry of External Affairs presents their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the note dated 2nd November 1961 handed over to the Indian Charge d'Affaires in Peking about alleged intrusions into Chinese air space have the honour to state as follows:—

(1) An enquiry into the specific instances of air space violation mentioned in the Chinese note has established that no Indian aircraft flew, as alleged, on October 4, 1961, at noon and at about 5:50 hours in the afternoon over Lanak La, Howeitan, Chip Chap La and Nischu.

(2) However, in recent months the Chinese Government has been sending note after note about alleged intrusions by Indian aircraft into "Chinese air space". There would be no occasion for such allegations had the Chinese Government not entertained an exaggerated notion of its territorial limits. As in the past it transpires that all the places mentioned in the present Chinese note are well within Indian territory. If Indian aircraft had flown over these places, which are inalienable parts of Indian territory, there would be no violation of any foreign air space. This effort to legitimise unlawful Chinese occupation of Indian territory by charging India with sending aircraft deep into 'Chinese air space' is fictitious in fact as well as law. In the interests of peace and international amity the Chinese Government should withdraw its forces from Indian territory and vacate its aggression on India.

(3) The Government of India rejects the Chinese note of 2nd November 1961 which is baseless.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:—

The Chinese Government points out with great regret that the Indian Government, in disregard of the previous protests by the Chinese Government, not only failed to take measures to prevent the recurrence of intrusions into China’s air space by Indian aircraft, but has of late stepped up the dispatch of aircraft for continued intrusions into China’s air space, numbering 49 sorties in the two months alone from October 6 to December 5, 1961. What is particularly serious is that on many occasions Indian aircraft penetrated deep into the air space over Chinese territory and flagrantly circled and reconnoitred over it for long periods, sometimes as long as an hour. Following are the facts of the intrusions of Indian aircraft in 49 sorties into China’s air space in the above-mentioned two months:

(1) At 10:05 hours October 6, 1961, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over Sama (approximately 28° 22’ N, 97° 03’ E) in Tibet, China, circling about 20 minutes.

(2) At 15:00 hours October 7 and 14:20 hours October 11, 1961, respectively, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over Spanggur area in Tibet, China.

(3) At 13:30 hours October 18, 1961, an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space over the area around Tashi-gong (approximately 32° 32’ N, 79° 41’ E) in Tibet, China.

(4) At 13:30 hours October 19 and 16:00 hours October 20, 1961, respectively, an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space over Chiakang (approximately 32° 54’ N, 79° 37’ E) in Tibet, China.

(5) At 12:40 hours October 20, 1961, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over China’s Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region, circling about an hour over the area between Howeitan (approximately 34° 58’ N, 78° 36’ E) and Qizil-jilga.

(6) At 16:00 hours, October 20 and 12:40 and 16:20 hours October 22, 1961, respectively, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over the area between Howeitan and the upper reaches of the Chipchap River, in China’s Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region. The aircraft which intruded on October 20 circled about an hour and the one which intruded at 16:20 hours October 22 circled for more than 40 minutes.

(7) At 16:45 hours October 20, 1961, an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space over Ngolo (approximately 32° 35’ N, 79° 36’ E) in Tibet, China.
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(8) At 14:00 hours October 23, 1961, an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space over the area around Shingzhang (approximately 33° 32' N, 79° 01' E) in Tibet, China.

(9) At 14:15 hours November 1, 12:14 hours November 3, 12:50 hours November 4 and 13:00 hours November 5, 1961, respectively, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over the area of the Spanggur Lake.

(10) At 15:00 hours November 1, 13:15 hours November 2, 14:25 hours November 3, 12:50 hours November 5 and 14:10 hours November 18, 1961, respectively, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over the area around Howetan in China's Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region. The aircraft which intruded on November 5 circled for 30 minutes and the one which intruded on November 3 circled for one hour and 50 minutes.

(11) Between November 3 and 18, 1961, Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over the area (approximately 35° 22' N, 78° 04' E) north of Height 5651 metres beside the Chipchap River in China's Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region in 7 sorties, i.e., one at 10:45 hours November 3, 10:40 hours November 4, 10:40 hours November 6, 10:30 hours November 7, 11:17 hours November 9, 11:02 hours November 11 and 11:15 hours November 18 respectively. These Indian aircraft all circled repeatedly over the said place.

(12) At 14:10 hours and 15:25 hours November 3 and 13:20 hours November 5, 1961, respectively, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space and circled over the upper reaches of the Chipchap River in China's Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region, the one which intruded at 15:25 hours November 3 circling about an hour.

(13) At 14:49 hours November 3, 1961, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over the upper reaches of the Chipchap river and the area around 35° 26' N, 78° 09' E in China's Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region, circling about 16 minutes.

(14) At 14:20 hours November 3, 1961, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space and circled repeatedly over the area approximately 35° 36' N, 77° 57' E, northeast of the Karakoram Pass in China's Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region.

(15) At 13:15 hours November 5, 1961, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over Hot Springs (approximately 34° 25' N, 78° 55' E) in China's Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region.

(16) At 13:20 hours November 6, 1961, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over the area (approximately 33° 44' N, 79° 01' E) south of the Khurnak Fort in Tibet, China.
(17) At 13:18 hours November 6, 1961, an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space over the eastern extremity (approximately 33° 31' N, 79° 30' E) of Pangong Mountain in Tibet, China.

(18) At 14:00 hours November 6, 1961, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over the Tashigong area in Tibet, China.

(19) At 10:48 hours November 20 and 10:25 hours November 25, 1961, respectively, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over the area around the Spanggur Lake in Tibet, China.

(20) At 12:05 hours November 29, 1961, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over Tashigong in Tibet, China.

(21) At 13:17 hours December 2, 1961, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over Howeitan in China's Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region. At 14:00 hours December 4, two Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over the same place, one of which circling there about an hour.

(22) At 13:40 hours and 13:45 hours respectively on December 3, 1961, an Indian Aircraft intruded into the air space over the area between the upper reaches of the Chipchap River and the Chipchap La in China's Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region, and circled there about 50 minutes.

(23) At 14:10 hours December 4, 1961, two Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over the area among Hot Springs (approximately 34° 25' N, 78° 55' E) the point approximately 34° 21' N, 79° 06' E and Nischu (approximately 34° 37' N, 79° 06' E) in China's Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region and Tibet Region, circling about 30 minutes.

(24) At 15:00 hours December 5, 1961, two Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over Nischu in China's Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region.

The fact that Indian aircraft so frequently intruded into China's territorial air cannot but be regarded as planned provocation against China and an attempt to create tension. The Chinese Government strongly protests against this, and once again asks the Indian Government immediately to stop dispatching its aircraft for further intrusions into China's air space, otherwise the Indian Government must bear responsibility for any consequences that may arise therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances to its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 January, 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:—

On January 14, 1962, at 12-15 hours, an Indian airplane bearing the marking of “BK 505” flying from the direction of the Indian post at Dauletbeg Oldi intruded into the air-space over the Chinese post at 35° 19’ N, 78° 12’ E in the Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region, China, and made repeated reconnaissance circlings at an altitude as low as about 200 metres from the ground for about 15 minutes and dropped scores of stuffed gunnies and wooden cases on the Chinese post. In its note of November 30, 1961, the Chinese Government already made an explicit reply to the Indian Government that China had a post at the above-mentioned place. It is obviously a deliberate encroachment on the Chinese territorial air and territory and a provocation that the Indian Government should have now gone so far as to send its aircraft to intrude into the air space over the said place for reconnaissance and air-dropping. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against this and demands that the Indian Government take effective measures at once to ensure against the recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

In its previous notes, the Chinese Government has already cited more than once large amounts of facts of repeated encroachments on China’s territorial air and reconnaissance and provocative activities carried out by Indian aircraft. The Indian Government, however has always tried its hardest to deny and quibble about it. But this time the Indian air-dropping of a large quantity of material into Chinese territory has once again thoroughly refuted the denials and quibbles of the Indian side and testified to the conclusive truth of the Chinese Government’s charges. The Chinese Government must also point out emphatically that the Indian side is certainly mistaken if it thinks it can benefit by unscrupulous provocations against Chinese posts.

In the consistent spirit of valuing Sino-Indian friendship, the Chinese Government is willing, given true assurance against the recurrence of such intrusions from the Indian Government, to consider letting the Indian side take back the material illegally air-dropped into Chinese territory. The procedures for the taking-back can be arranged through diplomatic channels. The Chinese Government requests an early reply from the Indian Government.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 25 January, 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, and have the honour to state that there has been yet another violation of India’s air space by Chinese aircraft. On January 6, 1962, at about 9:45 A.M. Indian standard time, a Chinese aircraft flew over Sherathang (approximately 2,722 North, 8,850 East) in Sikkim for about five minutes.

The Government of India protest against this renewed violation of Indian airspace by Chinese aircraft, and urge upon the Chinese Government to adopt measures to stop similar violations of Indian airspace which could have grave consequences.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 22 February, 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi, and with reference to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs note given to India's Charge d'Affaires in Peking on 24th January 1962, regarding the dropping of supplies at the wrong location, have the honour to state that the facts about the incident are as follows:

2. On 14th January 1962, an Indian aircraft bearing number "BK 505" went on a supply dropping mission to the Indian outpost at the track junction seven miles south south-east of Dauletbeg Oldi. The aircraft arrived in the area of the outpost approximately at 09-50 hours IST. The pilot of the aircraft spotted some tents and dropped the supplies.

3. Enquiries made since the receipt of the Chinese note of 24th January have elicited the information that the aircraft drifted 3-4 miles east of the track junction outpost due to a westerly wind. The airdrop occurred at the wrong location because the pilot mistook a Chinese patrol camp 12 miles further forward from the Chinese post set up on Indian territory at MR 35° 19' N, 78° 12' E on the Chip Chap river in September 1961, in regard to which Government of India has already entered a strong protest with the Chinese Government (vide Ministry of External Affairs' Note dated 31st October, 1961) to be the Indian outpost at the track junction seven miles south-east of Dauletbeg Oldi.

4. It is a matter of deep regret to the Government of India that the Chinese Government has been sending out advance patrols further inside Indian territory so soon after renewing the assurance that Chinese forces on the Sino-Indian border have been strictly enjoined to maintain the status quo. The Chinese Government's statement which claims that the supplies in question were dropped on the Chinese post on the Chip Chap river which is 12 miles east of the location where the supplies were actually dropped, in order to make out an untenable case of air space violation against the Government of India, is factually incorrect.

5. In the light of the facts stated above, the Government of India urges the Chinese Government to issue strict instructions to maintain the status quo and to direct that no patrols should be sent out to make further inroads into Indian territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the
Embassy of India in China, 7 March, 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China, and, with
reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian
Government dated January 25, 1962, has the honour to state as
follows:

With regard to the Indian Government's charge made in the note
that a Chinese aircraft flew over Sherathang, Sikkim on January 6,
1962, it has been established through detailed investigation conducted
by the Chinese Government that no Chinese aircraft has entered the
territorial air of Sikkim. The Chinese Government has repeatedly
stated that no Chinese aircraft has ever violated the territorial air of
other countries, but the Indian Government has now once again made
groundless charges in disregard of the facts. The Chinese Govern-
ment cannot but express its surprise and regret at this and reject the
Indian Government's protest.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in
China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 9 March 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to draw the latter's attention to the fresh violations of Indian air space by Chinese aircraft on the 11th January 1962. At 08-30 hours IST a Chinese aircraft painted white flew over Spiti (3205 N 7845 E) which is 5 miles inside Indian territory. The same day Chinese aircraft were detected flying over Chini (3130 N 7815 E) and Jangi (3137 N 7825 E) between 7-30 and 7-40 a.m. and 8-30 and 8-35 a.m. IST 15 miles and 30 miles respectively inside Indian territory. These fresh violations of Indian territorial air space so soon after the violation of Indian air space referred to in the Indian Government's note of the 25th January 1962, constitute grave provocation.

The Government of India protests against these violations and urge the Chinese Government to take necessary measures to stop such violations of Indian air space in future.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 March, 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Ministry's note dated 9th March, 1962 regarding fresh violations of Indian air space by Chinese aircraft has the honour to state that Chinese aircraft was detected flying over Chini (3130 N 7815 E) between 07-30 and 08-35 IST on 12th January, 1962. The details of the other Indian air space violations by Chinese aircraft are the same as in the Ministry's earlier note.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the
Embassy of India in China, 20 March, 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, in
regard to the serious cases of violation of China's air space by Indian
aircraft on 37 sorties from December 4, 1961 to the end of February
1962, has the honour to state as follows:—

(1) At 09·58 hours December 4, 1961, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over Digra (approximately 33° 33' N, 78° 50' E) in Tibet, China.

(2) At 14·40 hours December 5, 1961 two Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space over Shingzhang (approximately 33° 32' N, 79° 01' E) in Tibet, China.

(3) At 15·09 hours December 15, 1961, 10·17 hours February 2 and 17·10 hours February 26, 1962 respectively, an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space over Chiakang (approximately 32° 54' N, 70° 37' E) in Tibet, China. The Indian aircraft which intruded on February 2, 1962 even penetrated into the air space over the area near Kiagang (approximately 32° 55' N, 79° 47' E).

(4) At 15·25 hours January 2 and 13·30 hours January 7, 1962 respectively, an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space and circled over the area near Toling (approximately 31° 29' N, 79° 48' E) in Tibet, China. The Indian aircraft which intruded on January 7 further dived down to scare the local people.

(5) At 17·40 hours January 2, 1962, an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space and circled over Parkha (approximately 30° 52' N, 81° 18' E) in Tibet, China.

(6) From January 2 to February 5, 1962, Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space over Rudok (approximately 33° 27' N, 79° 42' E) and its adjacent areas in Tibet, China on eight sorties, one at each of the following times: 17·15 hours January 2, 14·00 hours January 16, 13·44 hours January 28, 16·20 hours January 29, 10·25 hours January 30, 16·37 hours January 31, 11·22 hours February 3, and 16·20 hours February 5.

(7) At 19·10 hours January 6, 1962, an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space and circled over Gyanima (approximately 30° 49' N, 80° 46' E) in Tibet, China.

(8) From January 16 to February 28, 1962, Indian aircraft intruded into the air space and repeatedly circled at low altitude over the area of Height 5,651 metres (approximately 35° 20' N, 78° 04' E) on the Chipchhap River in Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region, China, on eight
sorties, one aircraft at each of the following times: 14·10 hours January 16, 11·40 hours January 24, 11·20 hours February 19 and 11·20 hours February 28, and two aircrafts at 11·30 hours February 12 and 11·12 hours February 21 respectively.

(9) At 13·50 hours January 28, 1962, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over the area of Chang Pass (approximately 33° 01’ N, 79° 22’ E) and Tashigong (approximately 12° 32’ N, 79° 41’ E) in Tibet, China.

(10) At 10·00 hours February 1, 1962, an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space over the area of Gunsa (approximately 32° 11’ N, 79° 59’ E) in Tibet, China.

(11) At 09·32 hours February 2, 1962, an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space over Aunglajui Lake to the northeast of Rudok in Tibet, China.

(12) At 10·00 hours February 2, 1962, an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space over Tsaperang (approximately 31° 28’ N, 79° 40’ E) in Tibet, China.

(13) At 11·32 hours February 3 and 11·41 hours February 6, 1962 respectively, an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space over Chilong (approximately 33° 24’ N, 79° 33’ E) in Tibet, China.

(14) At 16·50 hours February 7, 1962, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space and circled over Height 5,200 metres approximately 33° 59’ N, 78° 53’ E) near Nyagzu in Tibet, China.

(15) At 17·55 hours February 7, 1962, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over Kota village (approximately 34° 29’ N, 78° 53’ E) in the Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region, China.

(16) At 13·20 and 15·06 hours February 13, 1962 respectively, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over the Chinese post (approximately 35° 19’ N, 78° 12’ E) and its vicinity in the Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region, China.

(17) At 16·24 hours February 14, 1962, an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space over Tashigong and Bongru Pass (approximately 32° 26’ N, 79° 33’ E) in Tibet, China.

The aforesaid cases show that since last December intrusions by Indian aircraft into China’s air space over Sinkiang and Ari, Tibet, have become more serious than ever before. Of the above-mentioned 37 sorties of Indian aircraft intrusions, 24 sorties have exceeded the alignment unilaterally claimed by India, and some even intruded into the air space over Rudok, Gunsa, Toling, Gyanima and Parkha, which are all towns well within Ari in Tibet, China. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against such deliberate Indian provocations in disregard
of China's sovereignty and in serious violation of China's air space, and demands that the Indian Government immediately stop such illegal actions.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself to this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 March, 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated March 9, 1962, has the honour to state as follows:—

With regard to the charge made in the Indian Government's note that Chinese aircraft had flown over Spiti, Chini and Jangi, it has been established through close investigation conducted by the Chinese Government that no such incidents as alleged have ever occurred.

The Chinese Government has more than once stated that China absolutely does not allow its aircraft to violate the territorial air of any other country, and that in case the Indian Government should discover any unidentified aircraft in the air space over its border areas, it is fully entitled to deal with them on its own. The Chinese Government has notified the Indian and Burmese Governments respectively that there are at times aircraft of the United States of America and the Chiang Kai-shek clique engaged in illegal activities over the Sino-Indian and Sino-Burmese borders, and expressed the hope that China, India and Burma would maintain common vigilance. Facts have proved that the Chinese Government is correct. The Burmese side has shot down an aircraft of the Chiang Kai-shek clique within the Burmese border, a fact which was testified to by Prime Minister Nehru himself in his speech before the Indian Rajya Sabha on December 11, 1961. Nevertheless, the Indian Government refused to accept the statement of the Chinese Government and repeatedly made groundless charges against the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government cannot but express deep regret at this. The Chinese Government states once again that the Indian Government is fully entitled to deal with any unidentified aircraft discovered in Indian air space without having to make any enquiries of the Chinese Government.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 24 March, 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to state as follows:

On 27th November 1961 at 08:30 hours a Chinese jet aircraft flew over Thimphu, Bhutan. Similar violations of the air space over Bhutan had occurred on the 24th and 25th November 1961 when Chinese aircraft flew over Paro. The aircraft in question were observed approaching from a North-East direction. The Government of India, on behalf of the Government of Bhutan, hereby lodge a protest against these violations of Bhutan's air space by Chinese aircraft and urge the Chinese Government to take all necessary measures to avoid similar violations in future, which could have serious consequences.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the
Embassy of China in India, 4 April, 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to
the Note dated 7-3-1962 of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the
People's Republic of China, has the honour to state as follows:

The Ministry of External Affairs' protest note dated 25th January,
1962 in regard to a fresh violation of India's air space by Chinese
aircraft over Sherathang (2722' N—8850' E) on January 6, 1962, at
about 9-45 A.M. IST, was lodged after a full verification of the facts.
It is a fact that the aircraft immediately after committing the aforesaid air space violation flew back into the Tibet region of China from
whence it came.

The Government of India regret that in the face of facts the
Government of China in their note under reference have disowned
responsibility for the air space violation. Considering the seriousness of the matter, the Government of India would again request
the Government of China to take necessary measures to prevent
similar violations of Indian air space in future.

The Ministry of External Affairs renews to the Embassy of the
People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 17 April, 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the note dated 14th March 1962 from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China.

All the facts concerning the dropping of supplies at the wrong location on 14th January 1962, have been stated in the Ministry of External Affairs Note of 22nd February 1962. The facts do not warrant the Chinese Government's contention that the air drop took place over the Chinese post at MR 35° 19' N 78° 12' E. The air drop of the 14th January 1962 had taken place a full 12 miles away from the illegal Chinese post set up on Indian territory referred to above, and the supplies dropped had been intended for the regular Indian outpost situated at the track junction 7 miles south south-east of Dauletbeg Oldi.

There is no doubt that on the day of the supply dropping mission, that is, on the 14th January 1962, a Chinese patrol had pitched tents some 3 to 4 miles east of the Indian track junction outpost, violating the status quo and committing fresh intrusion into Indian territory. In this context it is far fetched to suggest that the supplies had been dropped over the Chinese post at MR 35° 19' N, 78° 12' E, the existence of which is known to the Government of India and which had also formed the subject matter of the Ministry of External Affairs note dated 31st October 1961. In the light of these known facts, it is surprising that the Chinese Government should insist that it was "precisely at the Chinese post that the Indian aircraft made the air dropping". This view is neither consistent with fact nor with logic, for surely it is not the intention of Indian air-drop missions to supply Chinese posts illegally set up on Indian soil.

The Chinese Government's charge that India "has repeatedly taken unilateral action to disrupt the status quo" is a travesty of the truth and an obvious attempt to confuse the actual situation on the border. It is the Government of China who have been guilty of systematic and continuous aggression into Indian territory and it is they who have sought to justify unlawful occupation by unwarranted territorial claims as the evidence cited in the Ministry of External Affairs note dated 26th February 1962 has established.

In rejecting the contention of the Government of the People's Republic of China, the Government of India would once more urge that Chinese forces on the Sino-Indian border be strictly enjoined to maintain the status quo and to desist from attempting further inroads into Indian territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 April 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to acknowledge the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs' Note dated 20th March 1962, regarding alleged violations of China's air space by Indian aircraft.

It is remarkable that many of these alleged air space violations relate to the air space over Indian territory under unlawful Chinese occupation as has indeed been admitted in the Chinese note itself. Any protest from the Government of China on this account is, therefore, improper.

The Government of India are, however, after full investigation into all the cases of alleged violations of Chinese air space, satisfied that no Indian aircraft had been involved in any of these alleged cases. As the Government of China are well aware, there are strict instructions against Indian aircraft entering Chinese air space.

The Government of India regret that the Government of China are still persisting with these unfounded allegations about violations of Chinese air space by Indian aircraft which are not conducive to peace and friendship between the two countries.

The Ministry of External Affairs renews to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 23 April 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, and with reference to the latter's note dated 20th March, 1962, have the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India are reassured to learn that the Chinese Government "absolutely does not allow its aircraft to violate the territorial air space of any other country". However, the facts relating to violations of Indian air space over Spiti, Chini and Jangi had been communicated to the Chinese Government after full verification had been carried out. The Government of India would request the Government of the People’s Republic of China to issue once again necessary instructions in this regard to the concerned authorities so as to avoid similar occurrences in future.

In this connection the Chinese Government have suggested that the aircraft concerned could well belong to the United States of America or other third parties such as Taiwan. But there would appear to be little evidence to support this view, particularly as all the three air space violations specified relate to the western half of India's border.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of the opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 17 May 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China, and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated April 17, 1962, has the honour to state as follows:

Regarding the intrusion of an Indian aircraft into the air space over a Chinese frontier post in Sinkiang, China, for air-dropping on January 14, the Chinese Government has, in its notes of January 24 and March 14, brought forward indisputable facts which established the case conclusively. In its two reply notes, the Indian Government, while admitting the air-drop by Indian aircraft, wilfully insisted that the air-drop took place 12 miles away from the Chinese post and arbitrarily asserted that there had been Chinese patrol tents there. This is indeed very poor quibbling. As the Chinese Government already pointed out, since the place where the Indian Government alleged the air-drop was made was, as claimed by Prime Minister Nehru, precisely where an Indian post was located, there naturally could not be any Chinese "patrol camp" or tents there. The Indian Government had no other recourse but to leave this obvious flaw unmentioned in its reply note.

As for the false countercharges lodged by India that China has disrupted the status quo of the boundary and has been "guilty of systematic and continuous aggression into Indian territory", they are completely untenable. Facts are precisely to the contrary. As admitted in its note of April 17, the Indian Government has been clearly aware that China has a post at 35° 19' N, 78° 12' E. However, of late, the Indian Government has again sent its troops and aircraft to intrude into that area; the Indian troops have even set up aggressive posts around the said Chinese post, pressed on it and perpetrated provocations. It has now become crystal clear that the unlawful air-drop of January 14 is not only an act of flagrant contempt for China's sovereignty over its territorial air and a provocation against the Chinese posts, but also an action in direct coordination with the encroaching activities of India on the ground. The Chinese Government hereby once more solemnly and sternly urges the Indian Government to stop immediately all its intrusions into China's territory and territorial air.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
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Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the
Embassy of India in China, 21 May 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with
reference to the Indian Government's notes of April 4 and 23, 1962,
has the honour to state as follows:

In its notes, the Indian Government, completely ignoring the clear
and definite answer provided in the Chinese Government's notes of
March 7 and 20, 1962, continued to insist on its fabricated charge that
Chinese aircraft had flown into the air space over Sikkim and India.
The Chinese Government hereby once again categorically rejects the
Indian charge.

The Chinese Government has always firmly held that, pending a
settlement of the boundary question, the status quo of the Sino-Indian
boundary should be maintained by both China and India. The
Chinese Government has also on many occasions stated that China
absolutely would not allow its aircraft to violate the territorial air of
any other country. And in fact, no Chinese aircraft has ever violated
the territorial air of any other country. The slanders repeatedly
made in disregard of the facts by the Indian Government that Chinese
aircraft had flown across the border and that China had violated the
status quo of the Sino-Indian boundary are obviously intended for
camouflaging the stepped-up activities of Indian personnel and air-
craft in violating Chinese territory and territorial air.

Moreover, the Indian Government, in an attempt to sow discord
between China and Bhutan, made a groundless charge in its note of
March 24, 1962, that Chinese aircraft had violated Bhutan's territorial
air. The Chinese Government expresses its regret at this. As a matter
of fact, there does not exist at all the question of violation or threat
on the part of China in regard to Bhutan's territory and territorial
air. The repetition of such slanders can only be regarded as
representing ulterior motives.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the
assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 31 May 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

1. Of late, Indian aircraft have continued to intrude into China's air space and within the fifty-six days from March 6 to April 30, 1962, counting only those which have been verified, another sixty-seven sorties took place, raising the frequency of intrusions to an unprecedented height. (See annex for the list of intrusions). The Chinese Government hereby once again lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against this.

2. The intrusions of Indian aircraft took place all over the eastern, middle and western sectors of the Sino-Indian border, with the intrusions into China's air space over the western sector the most serious. It is obvious that such intrusions by Indian aircraft were made it direct co-ordination with the setting up of new military strong points on Chinese territory and other recent Indian activities of intrusion and provocation on the ground. Many of these intruding Indian aircraft repeatedly circled and carried out reconnaissance over Chinese territory and especially over Chinese posts, some even circling for as long as one hour. Of these, planes in twelve sorties even went beyond the boundary line unilaterally claimed by India and flew over Gyanima, Chilong, Risung and other places which are well inside the Ari district of Tibet, China.

3. In its notes of March 10 and April 19, the Indian Government tried to deny the established facts of the repeated intrusions of Indian aircraft into China's air space from last October to February as previously cited by the Chinese Government. This attempt is completely futile. It claimed in one of the two notes that 'there are strict instructions against Indian aircraft entering Chinese air space.' However, it can be seen from facts listed in the annex that the aforesaid assurance of the Indian Government is not a genuine one. Moreover, the extent of intrusions by Indian aircraft into China's air space has far exceeded the area for which India has groundlessly laid territorial claims on China, and extended to many towns well inside the Ari district of Tibet, China.

4. No arbitrary arguments or distortions by the Indian Government will help it shake off its responsibility for aggravating the tension on the border. The Chinese Government once again demands that the Indian Government immediately stop its intrusions into China's air space.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Annex

Cases of Intrusions into China’s air space by Indian Aircraft in March and April 1962

1. Indian aircraft successively intruded into the air space over Height 5,651 metres (approximately 35° 20’ N, 78° 04’ E) in Sinkiang, China, to tallying 31 sorties; some of them circled repeatedly at a low altitude over that Height. The specific dates and times of the intrusions are as follows:—

March 6, 1962, at 10.15 hours March 6, 1962, at 14.45 hours.
March 14, 1962, at 12.57 hours March 14, 1962, at 14.15 hours.
March 18, 1962, at 10.40 hours March 23, 1962, at 13.00 hours.
March 24, 1962, at 10.00 hours March 25, 1962, at 10.00 hours.
March 28, 1962 at 9.44 hours March 30, 1962, at 10.00 hours.
April 14, 1962, at 10.15 hours April 19, 1962, at 10.20 hours.
April 19, 1962, at 12.15 hours April 19, 1962, at 12.20 hours.
April 23 1962, at 10.15 hours April 24, 1962, at 9.35 hours.
April 28, 1962 at 9.35 hours April 28, 1962, at 10.00 hours.
April 29, 1962 at 14.58 hours April 29, 1962, at 15.05 hours.
April 29, 1962, at 13.00 hours April 29, 1962, at 13.07 hours.
April 29, 1962, at 14.58 hours April 29, 1962, at 15.05 hours.
April 30, 1962, at 13.10 hours.

2. Indian aircraft intruded into the air space and circled over Howeitan (approximately 34° 58’ N, 78° 36’ E) in Sinkiang, China, one at each of the following dates and time: March 7, at 12.00 hours; April 20, at 13:40 hours; April 28, at 10:45 hours; April 28, at 16:10 hours; April 29, at 14:20 hours; and April 29, at 14:30 hours all in 1962.

3. At 13:05 hours, March 7, 1962, two Indian aircraft intruded into the air space and made reconnaissance over the place at approximately 33° 58’ N, 78° 54’ E in Tibet, China, and Hot Springs (approximately 34° 25’ N, 78° 55’ E) and the place at 34° 27’ N, 78° 53’ E in Sinkiang.
4. Two Indian aircraft, at 13.05 hours, March 7, 1962, and one Indian aircraft, at 7.30 hours, March 13, intruded into the air space over the region around the Spanggur Lake in Tibet, China, and the place at approximately 33° 38' N, 78° 51' E.

5. At 16.20 hours, March 2, 1962, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over Tibet, China, in the area near Chang Pass (approximately 33° 01' N, 79° 22' E), the area west of Chiakang (approximately 32° 54' N, 79° 37' E) and Jara Pass (approximately 32° 47' N, 79° 33' E), and circled repeatedly over Jara Pass.

6. At 13.15 hours, March 13, 1962, an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space and circled over Sama (approximately 28° 22' N, 97° 03' E) and Ladin (approximately 28° 25' N, 97° 05' E) both located in Tibet, China.

7. At 12.40 hours, March 15, and 15:01 hours, March 22, 1962, Indian aircraft, one at each time, intruded into the air space over Khoja (approximately 30° 13' N, 81° 13' E) and Chihtai (approximately 30° 15' N, 81° 09' E) of Tibet, China.

8. At 12.50 hours and 13.42 hours, March 15, 1962, one Indian aircraft, each respectively intruded into the air space over Toyu (approximately 30° 18' N, 81° 10' E), Renkung (approximately 30° 25' N, 81° 05' E) and the nearby areas, all located in Tibet, China.

9. At 11.00 hours, March 16, 1962 an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space and made repeated circling over Chilong (approximately 33° 24' N, 79° 33' E) and Risung (approximately 33° 02' N, 79° 51' E), both located in Tibet, China.

10. At 14.20 hours, March 22, 1962, an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space over Gyanima (approximately 30° 49' N, 79° 51' E) and Renkung, both located in Tibet, China.

11. At 13.45 hours, March 25; and 12.10 hours, March 29, 1962, Indian aircraft, one at each time, penetrated into the air space over Tashigong (approximately 32° 32' N, 79° 41' E) in Tibet, China, and repeatedly circled over there for reconnaissance—the former for as long as one hour and the latter 40 minutes.

12. At 14.15 hours, March 25, 1962, an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space over Tashigong, the place at 32° 44' N, 79° 44' E) and Jara Pass, all these places being in Tibet, China, and repeatedly circled for as long as 35 minutes.

13. At 12.40 hours, March 29, 1962, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over Hot Springs, Nischu (approximately 34° 37' N, 79° 06' E) and Kota Village (approximately 34° 29' N, 78° 53' E) in Sinkiang, China, and repeatedly circled over there.

14. At 12.50 hours, March 29, 1962, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space of a place (approximately 34° 23' N, 79° 06' E) to the east of Kongka Pass in Sinkiang, China.
15. At 13.10 hours, March 29, 1962, an Indian aircraft penetrated into the air space over Chiakang and Kiagang (approximately $32^\circ 55'\ N, 79^\circ 47'\ E$) both located in Tibet, China, and circled over there.

16. At 14.50 and 15.30 hours, April 21; 10.40 hours, April 23; and 17:15 hours, April 28, 1962, Indian aircraft, one at each time intruded into the air space over the place at approximately $35^\circ 18'\ N, 78^\circ 54'\ E$ and its adjacent areas in Tibet, China.

17. At 10.30 hours, April 27; 16.25 and 17.05 hours, April 28, 1962, Indian aircraft, one at each time, intruded into the air space over Height 5,851 metres (approximately $35^\circ 17'\ N, 78^\circ 12'\ E$) Height 5,651 metres in Sinkiang, China. Moreover, the aircraft that intruded on April 27 circled repeatedly at a low altitude over Height 6,200 metres (approximately $35^\circ 14'\ N, 78^\circ 13'\ E$).

18. At 14.00 and 17.10 hours, April 28, 1962, Indian aircraft, two at each time, intruded into the air space over Hot Springs and the areas to the northeast in Sinkiang, China.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 June 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the note dated 17th May 1962 of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China.

Facts regarding the airdrop on 14th January, 1962 have been given in the Government of India's notes dated 22nd February and 17th April, 1962. There is nothing new to add to what has already been stated in these earlier notes. It is true that the airdrop in question went wide by 3 to 4 miles, and the pilot of the aircraft himself has confirmed that he dropped supplies where he spotted some tents similar to those at the Indian track-junction outpost. The error in this case was caused by a strong westerly wind on the morning of the airdrop.

The Government of India have known about the existence of the Chinese post at 35° 19' N, 78° 12' E since it was first set up in Indian territory between 1960 and 1961, and had lodged a strong protest in their note dated 31st October, 1961. The setting up of this post, deep inside Indian territory, coincided with official level talks between the two governments. This action of the Chinese authorities violated the tacit understanding that, for the duration of the talks, the two sides would keep to their actual line of control and refrain from pushing forward. Apart from this case, the Chinese authorities further violated this understanding by setting up, during the same period and immediately after two more new posts on Indian territory at Nyagzu and Dambuguru.

As to Indian posts which exist in certain parts of Ladakh, the Government of India would like to reassure the Government of China that these posts are not there for any offensive action but entirely for the defence of Indian territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 13 June 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the
Chinese Government's Note No. 439 dated the 21st May 1962 have
the honour to state as follows:—

The Government of India have no doubt about the facts concerning
the air violation over Cherathang (2722N—8850 E) on January 6, 1962
at 9.45 A.M. IST. These facts were carefully verified and confirmed
before a protest was lodged with the Chinese Government. Moreover
it is undeniable that the Chinese aircraft had, after committing the
aforesaid air space violation, flown back into the Tibet region of
China from whence it came. The Government of India regret that
faced with the truth the Government of China have disowned respon-
sibility for this unlawful act and have resorted to baseless allegations
against the Government of India. What is required is not a casual
dismissal of these charges as 'slander' but the adoption of firm mea-

sures to put an immediate stop to further unlawful encroachments
into Indian air space.

As to the specific instances when Chinese aircraft violated the air
space over Bhutan, viz., on the 24th and 25th November 1961 over
Paro and on the 27th November 1961 over Thimphu, the intruding
Chinese aircraft were distinctly observed approaching from the direc-
tion of the Tibet region of China. It is no use simply denying these
air intrusions.

The Government of India are surprised that their legitimate move
on behalf of the Government of Bhutan to ensure the protection and
inviolability of the territorial air space of Bhutan has been construed
by the Government of China as an attempt to 'sow discord' in the
relations between Bhutan and China. The Government of India are
not aware that China has any relations with Bhutan.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the
People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest
consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 28 June 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

During the month of May 1962, the Indian Government continued to send its aircraft to intrude repeatedly into China's air space, with a total of 59 sorties verified through repeated investigations (see Appendix for facts), reaching nearly two sorties a day on average.

It can be seen from the facts listed in the Appendix that all the intrusions of Indian aircraft during the month of May were concentrated on the air space over the Chinese territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border. It was in coordination with the intrusions of Indian troops on the ground that the Indian aircraft made these intrusions. They made long circlings for reconnaissance over Chinese territory especially over Chinese posts, dropped supplies on a large-scale time and again to the aggressive strong points illegally set up lately by Indian troops in Sinkiang, China. Obviously, these activities were done for the purpose of facilitating long entrenchment by Indian troops on these strong points and expansion of their encroachments on Chinese territory.

The Chinese Government once again lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against the increasingly frequent Indian aircraft intrusions and the activities deliberately intended for aggravating the tension on the border, and demands that the Indian Government immediately stop its intrusions into China's air space.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
APPENDIX

Facts of Intrusions into China’s Air Space by Indian Aircraft in May 1962.

1. At 12.30 hours, May 1; 11.50 hours, May 5; 10.10 hours, May 14; and 13.30 and 14.25 hours, May 16, 1962, Indian aircraft, one at each time, intruded into the air space over Height 6,200 metres (approximately 35° 14' N, 78° 13' E) and its adjacent areas in Sinkiang, China. The one that intruded on May 1 even circled over the Chinese post at 35° 19' N, 78° 12' E.

2. At 12.30 hours, May 2 and 10.00 hours, May 3, 1962, Indian aircraft, one at each time, intruded into the air space over the point at 35° 08' N, 78° 31' E and its adjacent areas in Sinkiang, China. The one that intruded on May 3 circled over there as long as 40 minutes.

3. Indian aircraft, totalling 11 sorties, successively intruded into the air space over Howeltan (approximately 34° 58' N, 78° 36' E) and its adjacent areas in Sinkiang, China, and made long-time circlings at a low altitude over there, some even lasting more than one hour. The specific dates and time of the intrusions are: 12.37 hours, May 2, 10.55 hours, May 5; 9.04 hours, May 9; 9.50 hours, May 10; 9.10 hours, May 13; 9.20 and 12.30 hours, May 14; 9.00 hours, May 15; 13.45 hours, May 17; 8.50 hours, May 23; and 12.45 hours, May 26, 1962.

4. Indian aircraft, totalling 18 sorties, successively intruded into the air space over Height 5,651 metres (approximately 45° 20' N, 78° 04' E) in Sinkiang, China, and some of them even repeatedly circled at a low altitude over that Height. The specific dates and time of the intrusions are: 9.15 hours, May 4 (two aircraft); 9.20, 10.17, 11.00, 11.05, 11.14 and 12.18 hours, May 8; 10.45 hours, May 11; 11.55 hours, May 14; 14.28 hours, May 15; 10.20 hours, May 17; 8.47 hours, May 21; 12.10 hours, May 23; 8.30, 10.10 and 13.00 hours, May 25; 8.36 hours, May 27, 1962.

5. At 11.20 hours, May 5 and 8.30 hours, May 9, 1962, Indian aircraft, one at each time, intruded into the air space over the area southeast of the point at 35° 15' N, 78° 16' E in Sinkiang, China.

6. At 9.30 hours, May 8 and 9.20 hours, May 9, 1962, Indian aircraft, two at each time, intruded into the air space over the point at 35° 16' N, 78° 08' E in Sinkiang, China and repeatedly circled over there. The two that intruded on May 8 circled as long as 50 minutes and the two on May 9 intruded, in addition, into the air space over Height 6,200 metres and repeatedly circled over there.

7. At 14.30 hours, May 8, 1962, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space of the area southwest of the Chinese post at 35° 19' N, 78° 12' E in Sinkiang, China.

8. At 9.15 hours, May 10 and 8.50 hours, May 23, 1962, Indian aircraft, one at each time, intruded into the air space over the Chinese
post at 35° 19' N, 78° 12' E and its adjacent areas in Sinkiang, China. The one that intruded on May 10 circled at a low altitude over the Chinese post as long as 30 minutes.

9. At 11.00 hours, May 11; 12.30 hours, May 15, and 13:35 hours, May 17, 1962, Indian aircraft, one at each time, intruded into the air space and repeatedly circled over the point at approximately 35° 16' N, 78° 09' E in Sinkiang, China. The aircraft which intruded on May 11 and 17 even made air drops over the aggressive strong point unlawfully set up there by Indian troops. Three bales of supplies were dropped on May 11 and three air-drops were successively made on May 17.

10. At 13.30 hours, May 13 and 12.05 hours May 21, 1962, Indian aircraft, one at each time, intruded into the air space over the vicinity of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet, China. The one that intruded on May 13 also repeatedly circled over the point at 33° 29' N, 78° 51' E.

11. At 12.20 hours, May 14, 1962, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over the area around 35° 34' N, 77° 50' E in Sinkiang, China.

12. At 15.30 hours, May 17, 1962, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space of Hongshantou (approximately 35° 18' N, 78° 03' 30" E) in Sinkiang, China.

13. At 8.50 hours, May 21 and 9:00 hours, May 23, 1962, Indian aircraft, one at each time, intruded into the air space and circled over the point at 35° 9' N, 78° 29' E in Sinkiang, China. The one that intruded on May 21 circled over Howeitan also.

14. At 8.50 hours, May 23; 8.30 hours, May 25; and 8.40 hours, May 27, 1962, Indian aircraft, one at each time, intruded into the air space and repeatedly circled over the point at 35° 0' N, 78° 29' E and its adjacent areas in Sinkiang, China and air-dropped large quantities of supplies over the aggressive strong point at approximately 34° 58' 30" N, 78° 22' 30" E unlawfully set up in Sinkiang, China by Indian troops. About 80 parachutes were dropped on May 23, over forty bales of supplies were dropped on May 25, and over thirty bales of supplies were dropped on May 27.

15. At 9.00 hours, May 26, 1962, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space and repeatedly circled over Height 5,651 metres in Sinkiang, China and dropped over thirty bales of supplies over the aggressive strong point unlawfully set up at approximately 35° 16' N, 78° 08' E by Indian troops.

16. At 14.15 hours, May 26, 1962, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space and circled over the point at 35° 27' N, 78° 09' E in Sinkiang, China.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 June 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated 31st May, 1962.

The Government of China have themselves admitted in their note that as many as 55 out of 67 sorties about which they have protested relate to the air space over areas which are inside India. The Government of India firmly repudiate the untenable position assumed by the Government of China to protest on a matter which is exclusively within the sovereign jurisdiction of the Government of India.

The Government of India have, however, made careful enquiries into each case of alleged intrusion by Indian aircraft including the other 12 instances of intrusion into Chinese air space cited in the Chinese note and have found that no Indian aircraft had been to any of the places at the time and date given in the note.

It is obvious that by repeating such baseless allegations, the Government of China are merely serving the ends of their anti-Indian propaganda. However, as the record shows, it is the Government of China who have steadily increased their wrongful occupation of Indian territory in recent years and have carried out activities there in violation of India's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

In the light of facts stated above, the Government of India reject the protest lodged by the Government of China in their note dated 31st May, 1962.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated June 1962.

The details given in the "Appendix" to the Chinese note show that all the places except one over which the alleged violations of air space are stated to have occurred, are well inside Indian territory. Any protest from the Government of China in regard to flights over Indian territory is not only highly improper but constitutes unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of India. The Government of India reject this untenable position assumed by the Chinese Government.

The Government of India have, however, carefully investigated each of these allegations about flights by Indian aircrafts, including the solitary instance relating to Chinese air space, cited in the Chinese note, and have found that no Indian aircraft had flown over any of the places at the times and dates mentioned.

It is noticed in this connection that the Chinese note has repeated the general allegations made in their earlier note dated 31st May 1962, which have been fully rebutted in the Indian Government's reply dated 30th June 1962. At no time have Indian military personnel or aircraft crossed the traditional well-recognised boundary of India. Indian maintenance aircraft on legitimate duty invariably keep well inside Indian air space. In sharp contrast, Chinese aircraft have violated Indian air space on innumerable occasions and Chinese troops have unlawfully established posts on Indian territory. The Government of India deplore this aggressive attitude adopted by the Chinese forces which has caused serious strain and tension in the relations between the two countries.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 25 July 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to draw the latter's attention to a fresh violation of Indian air space by Chinese aircraft.

On 7th July 1962 at 0900 hours I.S.T. a Chinese aircraft was observed flying over Chushul (33° 45' North 78° 40' East) which is 18 miles inside Indian territory. After committing the violation the aircraft flew back to the Tibet region of China.

Such repeated violations of Indian air space by Chinese aircraft constitute a deliberate provocation and serve to increase the existing tension on the border. While lodging a strong protest on the present violation, the Government of India once more urge the Chinese Government to put a stop to such aggressive activities.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Consulate General of China, Calcutta, to the Government of West Bengal, 28 November 1961

In the afternoon of November 18, 1961, four Chinese nationals namely Mr. Yeh Tien-lin, the acting Principal of Chinese Primary School in Calcutta, Mr. Ling Chi-kang, a shoe merchant in Calcutta, Mr. Hu Tung-hai, a barber in Calcutta and Mr. Fu Yin, a bean-curd seller in Kalimpong were arrested by the Indian Government and deported from India.

Mr. Yeh Tien-lin, Mr. Ling Chi-kang, Mr. Hu Tung-hai and Mr. Fu Yin are Chinese nationals who have long been residing in India. They have always been law-abiding, and have had proper occupations. The West Bengal Government, however, ordered them to quit India, arrested and detained them, put them on trial and finally unwarrantedly deported them to China through Nathula Pass under custody. This is obviously very unfriendly and inhumane. For this, the Chinese Consulate General in Calcutta lodges a protest with the West Bengal Government.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 2 December 1961

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India, and has the honour to state as follows:

(1) At about 5 O'clock in the afternoon of November 25, 1961, about 40 Indians gathered outside the Chinese Consulate-General at Calcutta, clamouring and shouting anti-Chinese slogans; they stayed there for about half an hour and dispersed.

(2) At about 5 O'clock in the afternoon of November 25, 1961, about 50-60 Indians demonstrated in front of the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay, holding anti-Chinese placards and shouting slogans, slandering China such as "Chinese aggressors quit India", etc. Among them some one made a speech. They went away at about half past five.

(3) At about 7 O'clock in the afternoon of November 27, 1961, some 100 Indians went to the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay, clamouring and shouting. They held anti-Chinese placards, such as "Down with red China" and "Shut up the Chinese Consulate-General".

The frantically shouted slogans, maliciously slandering China and insulting the Chinese leaders, such as "Chinese aggressors get out of India", etc. Among them, eight or nine persons rushed to the gate of the Consulate, burned effigies of Chinese leaders, Chairman Mao Tse-tung and Premier Chou En-lai; there was also another person who held a chain in his hand, approached the gate of the Consulate and attempted to lock it up from outside.

Since the Indian Government made baseless charges in the Parliament that China had further violated India's territory another new wave against China has been unleashed in India. A few ruffians have been permitted to make troubles in front of the Chinese Consulate-General and burn straw effigies of the Chinese peoples respected and beloved leaders Chairman Mao Tse-tung and Premier Chou En-lai. This is a serious provocation to China, for which the Government of China cannot but express indignation at it, and hereby lodges a strong protest and requests that the Indian Government immediately take effective measures to prevent recurrence of similar incidents.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 4 December 1961

On November 18, 1961, the Government of India unwarrantedly arrested, all of a sudden, Chinese nationals Ling Chi-kang, Yeh Tien-lin, Fo Yin (Wang Ching-shan) and Hu Tung-hai, and soon after that on November 21 brought them in custody to the desolate and bitterly cold Nathula Pass and deported them out of India, subjecting them to physical harm. Once more the Indian Government took such a rude measure as to have unwarrantedly arrested and deported Chinese nationals out of India, at which the Embassy expresses utmost regret.

This year, the Indian Government has more than once unwarrantedly arrested Chinese nationals and deported them from India under the pretext of the so-called “anti-India activities”. The persecution of Ling Chi-kang and three others this time is the fourth one of the series. The Indian Government again used “anti-India activities” as a pretext, but there is no factual basis at all. Ling Chi-kang, Yeh Tien-lin, Fo Yin (Wang Ching-shan) and Hu Tung-hai all resided in India for a long time and had proper occupations as teacher, shoe-maker, hair-dresser and bean-curd seller. During their stay in India, the Indian local authorities had never charged them with any act against the law. The Indian Government, however, first unreasonably ordered them to leave India within a stipulated period, then successively arrested, sentenced and imprisoned them, and despite the fact that they had, in accordance with law, applied for continuing to stay, forcibly deported them under escort out of India, with the result that they were separated from their families. This is an act utterly devoid of any justification.

The Chinese side, having regard for the friendship between the peoples of China and India, has time and again adopted an attitude of restraint and tolerance towards such continuous persecution of Chinese nationals by the Indian side. But it is regrettable that the Indian Government has unceasingly carried out various persecutions against Chinese nationals, and time and again deported under escort innocent Chinese nationals out of India. This absolutely runs counter to the wish for friendship of the peoples of the two countries. In the interest of maintaining the friendship between the two peoples, the Embassy requests that the Government of India respect the proper and legitimate rights of the Chinese nationals and immediately stop measures of persecution against Chinese nationals.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 12 December 1961

Regarding the case of the false charge against Mr. Ma Chu-tsai, a Chinese national who originally resided in Kalimpong, the Chinese Embassy, at the request of Ma's family, has on many occasions made representations to the Ministry of External Affairs of India. However, Ma's case, which has lasted as long as over one year, still remains delayed and unsettled.

As recently reported by Ma's family, the case has undergone several trials at the Court of Jalpaiguri, and from all the circumstances as shown in these trials it should have been very clear that Mr. Ma Chu-tsai is completely innocent, and even the Court has also indicated that it is difficult to consider the case as established, and that it should be settled speedily. Nevertheless, it has again decided that the case be transferred to another court for continued trial. Thus Ma's wronged case will again continue to remain unsettled, and Ma's health will continue to be subjected to suffering. It should be noted that Mr. Ma Chu-tsai has been compelled to move to Calcutta. He has been asked to appear at the Court of Jalpaiguri which is several hundred miles away. These long journeys have caused difficulties to him. His family is very much concerned about the health of this old man at an advanced age of over 70. Moreover, he is financially facing a helpless plight. He has repeatedly requested the Embassy to render him assistance so that he may be able to return to China at an early date.

The Embassy is much concerned over this. The Embassy once again hopes that the Government of India will out of humanitarian considerations give assistance to Mr. Ma Chu-tsai so that he may leave India for China at an early date.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 12 December 1961

On the morning of December 2, 1961, elements of the Chiang Kai-shek clique in Kalimpong, under the name of the so-called refugee school, intruded into the Chung Hwa School, Kalimpong, making disturbances and clamouring noisily in an attempt to seize the School. This seriously affected the normal studies of the students of the School.

It must be pointed out that, in June 1961, the elements of the Chiang Kai-shek clique were engaged in plotting to seize the Chung Hwa School. At that time, the Kalimpong local authorities confirmed to the Chung Hwa School that the Chiang Kai-shek clique elements had consulted the Sub-Divisional Officer of Kalimpong in an attempt to seize the Chung Hwa School. The Chinese Consulate-General at Calcutta took up this matter with the Government of West Bengal on July 3, 1961. It is surprising that the Chiang Kai-shek clique elements should have been further allowed to intrude into the school to make disturbances. This cannot but be considered as connivance by the Indian local authorities at the activities of the Chiang Kai-shek clique elements.

Since the beginning of 1960, the Indian local authorities have been, without any justification, carrying out planned persecution against the Chung Hwa School. They successively ordered Mr. Liang Tsu-Chin, Head of the Board of Directors of the School, Mr. Chang Nai-chin and Mr. Ma Chia-kuei, Deputy heads of the Board of Directors, to leave India or Kalimpong within a stipulated period. They further unwarrantedly detained the Principal of the School Mr. Chang Hsiu-feng and his wife, gave them extremely inhuman treatment, and finally compelled them to leave India. Since October 1961, the local government of India again carried out persecution against the Chung Hwa School. If first ordered the acting Principal of the School Wang Wei-chin and teacher Pema, and then ordered teachers Ma Fu-shou and Yang Lan-ying to leave Kalimpong within a stipulated period.

In the meantime, the parents of the children of the School have been subjected to constant threat that they should not send their children to study in the School.

This series of unwarranted persecution carried out by the Indian local government against the Head of the Board of Directors, Deputy Heads, Principal and teachers of the School as well as its connivance at the repeated plotting of the Chiang Kai-shek clique elements to seize the School cannot but lead one to the belief that the Indian local government is putting the School beyond any means of continued existence, thus achieving the aim of strangling the legitimate cultural and welfare undertaking of the Chinese nationals and facilitating the activities of the Chiang Kai-shek clique elements.
As is well-known, the Chung Hwa School in Kalimpong is a school run by the Chinese nationals in the locality with their contribution of funds. Over many years in the past, it has always been law-abiding and on amicable terms with the local people, and has made its due contributions to the education of the children of the Chinese nationals as well as to the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples. The Indian local government should have carried out continuous unwarranted persecutions against the School and connived at the activities of the Chiang Kai-shek clique elements. The Embassy expresses its regret at this. It is requested that the Government of India immediately stop its persecutions against the Chung Hwa School, Kalimpong, and prevent the elements of the Chiang Kai-shek clique from scheming against and sabotaging the School.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 14 December 1961

As reported by the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay, about 10:50 a.m. on December 5, 1961, the personnel of the Consulate-General heard some slight explosion in the courtyard; when they immediately came out to see what was happening; they discovered that a coconut tree in the courtyard was on fire and the sofas lying under the tree also caught fire. They extinguished the fire promptly, so it did not spread.

Judging from the circumstances at that time, it was obvious that somebody from outside the Consulate-General had thrown combustibles into the courtyard in an attempt to set fire. But the combustibles were blocked by the coconut tree which instantly caught fire and began to burn with the sofas below affected. After the fire was put out, a lot of half-burned combustibles such as old cotton and cloth rags soaked with something like oil were found under the coconut tree.

After the incident, some officers from the police station and firemen in the locality went to the spot for examination. They took notes and collected some of the said combustibles. On the afternoon of the same day, Mr. Wang Yen-chang, Consul of the Consulate-General, drew the attention of the State Government to this incident, and the State Government promised to make investigations.

The Chinese Embassy deems it necessary to point out emphatically to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs that the Government of India bears the responsibility for the protection of the security of the Chinese official organ in India. At a time when wanton anti-Chinese outbursts are being whipped up in India, the occurrence of this incident is of an extremely serious nature. The Embassy cannot but express its deep regret at it, and draws the serious attention of the Government of India to the matter.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 January 1962

Reference Chinese Embassy’s Memorandum dated 4th December, 1961, regarding the deportation of four Chinese nationals viz., Ling Chi-kang (shoe-maker), Yeh Tien-lin (primary school teacher), Fo Yin (Hair dresser) and Hu Tung-hai (bean-curd-seller) from India on 21st November 1961.

2. No Government can ignore the security and well being of its people, and permit aliens to work from within to subvert the state. From time to time the Government of India has had to expel aliens from the territories of the Indian Union for engaging themselves in anti-social activities (e.g., smuggling, trafficking in narcotics and other cognizable offences), for infringement of visa regulations and indulgence in activities, covert or overt, intended to subvert the security of the state.

3. The Embassy’s Memorandum takes a tendentious and distorted view of such cases and by its arrogant stand lends implied support to the anti-social and anti-state activities of certain Chinese nationals in India. For some time Chinese propaganda organs have seized on these stray cases of deportation to launch a virulent campaign attempting to disparage the Government of India in the eyes of the world by circulating stories of persecution of ‘innocent’ Chinese nationals in India.

4. The Embassy’s Memorandum is doubly objectionable because it constitutes an act of open interference in the internal affairs of India and because it wilfully distorts and misrepresents facts regarding the deportation of certain Chinese nationals from India on account of their indulgence in anti-state activities at the behest of a foreign power. It is clear that in this matter the Chinese Government’s intervention is neither disinterested nor impartial.

5. To expose the myth about the Indian Government’s persecution of Chinese residents in India it would suffice to state that out of a total Chinese population of over 12,000 in India, only eleven had to be physically deported across the border. It is relevant to point out that in all such cases the persons concerned defied notices served on them to leave the country by a specified date. Reluctantly, therefore, steps had to be taken to ensure their departure, but in each such case arrangements were made to ensure that the deportee was well provided not only with good food but with comfortable and well heated accommodation on Indian territory. In addition, each deportee was given a number of items of warm clothing, boots etc., to make his journey home as comfortable as possible. A list of articles given to the four deportees is enclosed. Timely notice was
also given to the Chinese Embassy for the reception of the deportees on the Chinese side of the border.

6. In such matters, instead of casting aspersions the Chinese Government could well emulate the humane and generous standards of the Government of India.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 18 January 1962

On October 27, 1961, Mr. Ma Mu-ming of the Chinese Embassy called at the Ministry of External Affairs and lodged a complaint with Shri B. C. Mishra, Deputy Secretary, about what Mr. Ma described as 'noise' made by a large number of Indians on 10th October, 1961 in front of the Chinese Consulate-General. Mr. Ma also alleged that the Indian had carried a straw effigy of a Chinese leader and some anti-Chinese posters.

The complaint has been investigated and the facts are as follows:

On 10th October, 1961 some peasants who came all the way from Igatpuri in Nasik District peacefully demonstrated in Bombay city against Chinese aggression on Indian soil. The procession stopped about 200 yards away from the Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay. No violence was committed, nor was there any threat of violence. The authorities in Bombay who watched over the procession were entirely satisfied about its peaceful character and apprehended no disturbance of the peace from it. One of the processionists wrapped himself in straw but no effigy of a Chinese leader, as mistakenly alleged by Mr. Ma was carried.

The right of freedom of speech and expression and of peaceful assembly without arms are guaranteed under Article 19 of the Indian Constitution. The procession in question was in lawful exercise of the fundamental rights of Indian citizens.

The only slogans raised by the processionists asked, as of right, the Chinese Government to vacate its aggression on Indian territory. The sentiment is national and common to all the people of India.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 18 January 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, and with reference to the Embassy Note No. M/578/61, dated 2nd December, 1961, have the honour to state that the facts in regard to the demonstration in question are as follows:

(1) In Calcutta on the afternoon of November 25, 1961, a procession came out of Hazra Park and moved on to Lower Circular Road. At about 5 p.m. it stopped at a distance of about 125 yards from the Consulate-General. The Police were present at the scene to prevent any disturbance of the peace. The processionists held a meeting to condemn Chinese incursions into Indian territory, and dispersed peacefully at about 5:20 p.m.

(2) In Bombay on the afternoon of November 25, 1961, some people went out in a procession towards the Chinese Consulate-General. They stopped at a distance of 100 yards from the Chinese Consulate-General building. The police were on hand to keep the peace. The processionists were all along peaceful, and there was no untoward incident. Their leader made a speech in which he condemned Chinese aggression on India and criticised Government of India's policy in regard to China. They dispersed peacefully at 5:10 p.m.

(3) On November 27, 1961, a procession of people went through the streets of Bombay and stopped at a distance of about 200 yards from the Consulate-General. The processionists then held a meeting to protest against Chinese aggression on Indian territory. Speakers criticised Government of India's weak policy towards China and demanded effective steps to oust the aggressors from Indian soil. One person tried to reach the gate of the Chinese Consulate-General to hand over a memorandum but he was stopped by the police. Some others tried to light a torch but the police seized and put out the torch. Persons who acted unlawfully were arrested by the police. The Embassy's account of this demonstration does not agree with the facts. Eight or nine persons did not rush as alleged to the gate of the Consulate-General, nor did any one burn effigies of Chairman Mao and Premier Chou. No one attempted to lock the Consulate gate. These are highly exaggerated accounts given by the Chinese Embassy which are not borne out by facts.

There are certain facts of life in India which the Chinese Embassy might well begin to appreciate. The rights of freedom of speech and expression and of peaceful assembly without arms are guaranteed by the Indian Constitution to every Indian citizen. These
rights are cherished as part of India's national heritage, and it is impermissible except under certain specified and exceptional circumstances to interfere with these rights of the people. The demonstrations in question were peaceful. No act of violence was committed or threatened by the demonstrators. The police watched even them, to prevent any excesses. There was no intrusion into or damage to the Consulates-General, nor was there any impairment of their dignity. Besides, the incidents to which the Chinese note refers took place well outside the premises of the Chinese Consulates-General. In view of the facts stated above, Government of India is satisfied that the demonstrations in question were in lawful exercise of the fundamental rights of Indian citizens, and that there was no cause for Government to take action to prevent them.

The Government of India take serious exception to the contents of the penultimate paragraph of the Chinese note. The fact of Chinese aggression on Indian territory forms the subject of protracted diplomatic exchanges and is not a matter of doubt in the public mind in India. Instances of recent Chinese incursions into Indian territory brought to the notice of the last session of Parliament have been admitted in its fashion by the Chinese Government. These do not, therefore, become 'baseless charges'. The Government of India resents the imputation contained in the Embassy's note that it unleashed 'another new wave' against China or that it permitted the people of India to whom the Embassy's note ungraciously refers to as 'ruffians' to make trouble in front of the Chinese Consulate-General.

The Indian people have reacted spontaneously and with dignity and restraint to Chinese incursions into Indian territory and the expressions of their just indignation against which the Embassy's note protests are as natural as they are sincere.

The Government of India cannot accept any protest, far less an unseemly protest based on miscomprehension of the constitutional rights of the Indian people and misrepresentation of facts against the lawful exercise of the fundamental rights of Indian Citizens.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 18 January 1962

Reference Chinese Embassy Memorandum dated the 14th December, 1961, about a fire on the premises of the Chinese Consulate-General, Bombay, which affected a coconut tree and an old sofa lying under the tree. The Embassy’s memo not only mis-states the facts but draws the wrong conclusions. The facts are as follows:—

On the morning of December 5, 1961, a servant in the neighbouring house (Shri Batliwalla’s) noticed a fire in the courtyard of the Consulate-General. This was reported to Shri Batliwalla, Managing Trustee of Bhulabhai Desai Institute, who immediately telephoned for the Fire Brigade. The first fire engine on reaching the spot was misguided by a Chinese employee of the Consulate-General to another location. When the second fire engine arrived, officials of the Consulate-General refused to allow the fire brigade personnel to enter the premises. It was only at the insistence of Shri Batliwala that the fire-brigade personnel were ultimately allowed to enter the premises and put out the fire.

It was a small fire which was easily extinguished. Damage caused by the fire was negligible. An old sofa lying under a coconut tree, at some distance from the Consulate-General building, was damaged by the fire. The sofa belonged to the Bhulabhai Trust which owns the building occupied by the Consulate-General.

According to preliminary investigations, some Diwali sparklers and charred cotton were found near the scene of the fire. An interesting aspect of the case is the part played by the officials of the Chinese Consulate-General, who adopted an unco-operative and unhelpful attitude not only in the matter of putting out the fire but in regard to the efforts of the police to investigate into the cause of the fire.

One fire engine was asked to go elsewhere, another was refused permission to enter the premises. An officer from the Control Room of the Fire Brigade who also arrived at the spot was not allowed to go in. Police officials who went there to investigate and collect evidence were refused permission to enter the premises.

A Chinese official of the Consulate-General gave a statement to the police officer but declined to sign the statement. Although the police did eventually take charge of some material evidence found on the spot, other evidence was removed by the Consul-General who refused to hand them over to the police.

The Government of India deplores this unfortunate incident and the inconvenience it has caused to the Chinese Consulate-General.
The Government of India must however, draw attention to the extraordinary behaviour of the Consulate-General which refused cooperation to the fire-men who came to put out the fire and police officials who went there to make investigations.

Needless to say there is a good deal of suspicion surrounding the 'fire' which broke out on the premises of the Chinese Consulate-General. The stubborn efforts made by the Consulate-General, to deny firemen and the police access to the scene of fire did not make the task of protecting the Consulate-General easier. Furthermore, the removal of material evidence from the scene by the Consulate-General deepens suspicion. It is clear that while at the time of the fire the Consulate-General behaved as though nothing of consequence had happened to warrant the admission of firemen and police into their premises, they used the incident later for political ends without hesitation.
The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India, and has the honour to state in the following:

About 7:10 in the evening of January 17, 1962, over ten ruffians bringing with them dangerous weapons and hammers suddenly broke open the doors and raided the office of the China Review and the Lita Press in Calcutta, indulging in violence and making wanton disturbances; they stabbed Mr. Liu Kuo-jui, office worker of the China Review, and destroyed the printing machines, type-setting frames, radio sets (two), telephones, typewriters and other office equipment. It was only after the ruffians had fled that the Indian policemen came to the spot, and then they orally told the Review to stop publication. It must be pointed that in the past two years the Indian Government expelled, without any justification, the publisher and the chief editor of the China Review from India, and took various unwarranted measures of persecution against its other members, such as ordering them to leave India within a specified period and putting them under arrest. This incident of wrecking the China Review by the ruffians is obviously another new calculated scheme following the unwarranted persecution of Chinese nationals and expelling the chief responsible members of the China Review by the Indian Government. This is a serious political incident. The Chinese Embassy expresses utmost regret at it. It is demanded that the Indian Government immediately take effective steps, severely punish the criminals, ensure the safety of the office of the China Review, and guarantee against recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 25 January 1962

As reported by the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay, about 9:40 in the evening of January 16, 1962, a window-pane of the Consulate's Building, which faces the street, was hit at from outside and a hole was caused to it. It may be recalled that on December 5, 1961, there occurred the incident of setting fire on the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay, to which the Chinese Embassy has drawn the serious attention of the Indian Government. The window-pane was broken soon after the above-mentioned incident of setting fire took place and the Chinese Embassy took up the matter with the Indian Government. However, the Indian Government has again failed to prevent such kind of sabotage and disturbance. The Embassy expresses regret at this. The Embassy once again draws the attention of the Indian Government to this matter and requests that steps be taken to prevent recurrence of similar incidents.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Embassy’s note No. L/507/62, dated the 23rd January, 1962, regarding an incident which took place at the office of the China Review and Lita Press in Calcutta on the 17th January, 1962. The incident has been investigated.

2. On the 17th January, at 19-05 hours 15 Chinese nationals armed with some implements made their way into the office of the ‘China Review’ and Lita Press where they kept the inmates of the office and Press gagged and caused some damage to property in the premises. Slight injuries were caused to Mr. Ssu Tu-jung an employee of the Press. Ten minutes later, hearing calls for help, members of the public came to the rescue and the persons responsible for the disorder made good their escape. Three of them were arrested by the Calcutta Police as they were trying to get away. A fourth member of the group was arrested later. The Calcutta Police have since apprehended the remaining members of the group and a process has been started against the offenders under the law.

3. The Calcutta Police arrived at the scene of the disturbance as soon as word reached them. The Embassy will have noticed that ‘China Review’ in its issue dated the 19th January, 1962—two days after the incident—stated that the Police “reached the spot in time”.

4. The police made no demand, oral or otherwise, that ‘China Review’ should stop publication. The allegation to this effect made in the Embassy’s note is factually incorrect. In India, the functions of the Police officials are limited to maintenance of law and order. They do not issue political directives of any kind. The latter task is performed by appropriate organs of the Government. Moreover, contrary to what the Embassy has stated the Calcutta Police were prompt both in taking action to apprehend the offenders and in posting a guard at the office and press of the ‘China Review’ with a view to ensure its safety.

5. As the Embassy is aware, for some years now, there have been groups of Chinese residents in Calcutta holding different political views. More recently, one such group has been seeking to impose its views on another, and to this end has been using ‘China Review’ to amount political attacks on its opponents. Tension between the groups was heightened by a series of slanderous items which appeared in the ‘China Review’ exposing private and family affairs of Chinese nationals of the opposite group to public ridicule and shame. It is this policy of the journal calculated to offend and intimidate the other Chinese group which appears to have set off the incident of 17th January, 1962.

6. It is a fact that ‘China Review’ published by a group of Chinese nationals in India has over a long time been carrying on a vigorous
anti-Indian campaign and operating as a mouthpiece of Chinese official propaganda in India. As the Embassy is aware some members of the staff of the 'China Review' were expelled because they had been engaged in objectionable and subversive activities which threatened the security of the State. The expulsion orders in their case were not only necessary but were strictly within the internal jurisdiction of the Government of India. In this connection, the Embassy may wish to refer to the Ministry of External Affairs Memorandum dated 5th January, 1962, wherein the reasons for Memorandum dated 5th January, 1962, wherein the reasons for detail. The Government of India are constrained to observe that the Embassy's attempt to link up this incident with the expulsion orders is misguided and mischievous. The inter-necine feud among groups of the Chinese nationals in Calcutta, which resulted in violence on 17th January, 1962, has, as the facts show been instigated by the support given to one group against the other by the Chinese Missions in India. The Government of India hope that no support of any kind will, in future, be given by Chinese missions to any unlawful elements which promote a breach of law and order as in this case.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China present its compliments to the Embassy of the Republic of India in China, and, with reference to the memorandum from the Ministry of External Affairs of India to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India dated January 5, 1962, has the honour to state the following, which the Embassy is requested to transmit to the Government of India.

In order to cover up its political persecution of Chinese nationals the Indian Government in its memorandum groundlessly accused Chinese nationals of indulging in activities intended to subvert the security of India and engaging themselves in anti-social activities. Moreover, the memorandum slandered the Chinese Embassy as lending implied support to the anti-Indian and anti-social activities of certain Chinese nationals and as openly interfering in the internal affairs of India. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China expresses its deep regret at this and strongly protest against these malicious slanders levelled by the Indian Government against the Chinese Embassy.

Since 1960 the Indian Government has been persecuting Chinese nationals on framed-up charges and unjustifiably ordering them to leave India by a specified date. Recently, things have developed to more serious proportions. To date more than 100 Chinese nationals have been expelled or given notices by the Indian Government to leave India by a specified date. They have been subjected by the Indian authorities to rude treatments—unwarranted summons, detention, imprisonment, fine and even deportation under armed escort.

In its memorandum the Indian Government falsely alleged that it expelled these Chinese nationals because they had been engaged in anti-social activities and in activities, covert or overt, intended to subvert the security of the state of India. Previously the Indian authorities had also repeatedly slandered the Chinese nationals as being engaged in so-called “anti-Indian activities” and “activities which are prejudicial to Indian national interests”. But what grounds are there for such charges and slanders by the Indian Government?

The Chinese nationals expelled by the Indian authorities had all lived in India for a long period of time, had normal occupations and always abided by the laws and regulations of the Indian Government. For instance, Mr. Wu Tao-lung, who was engaged in journalism, and his family had resided in India for generations, Mr. Ling Chi-kang, a shoe-maker, and Mr. Wang Ching-shan, who lived by selling beans, had both lived in India for many years. They have all along been residing in India with legitimate status and have lived in amity with the local people. However, it was these innocent Chinese nationals who were one after another arbitrarily arrested by the Indian
authorities in 1961, imposed with the charge of so-called anti-Indian activities and deported under armed escort.

In this connection the Chinese Government has more than once made inquiries to the Indian Government and asked it to give the concrete reasons for arresting or expelling the Chinese nationals, but the Indian Government has never been able to give any facts, it has refused to make any concrete explanation and only dodged the question by asserting that it was the policy of the Indian Government not to divulge the concrete reasons. In its memorandum the Indian Government still did nothing more than imposing on these Chinese nationals the charge of subverting the security of the state and failed to cite any facts. This cannot but arouse the suspicion that the above charge is a sheer fabrication.

The Indian authorities not only unreasonably expelled Chinese nationals but also applied various extremely inhumane measures against the Chinese nationals involved. Take the case of Mr. Chang Ching, Mr. Liu Wei-tai, Mr. Hou Hsin-fu, Mr. Wu Tao-lung and others, who were arrested by the Indian authorities when they, after receiving the order to leave the country by a specified date, were appealing according to law for permission for continued residence. At the time of arrest, they were not allowed to pack their luggage, some of them were even taken to the airfield in pyjamas. In escorting them to the border, the Indian armed personnel covered their eyes with black cloth and shut them in cold rooms, in disregard of the piercing weather in the mountainous areas on the border, thus greatly hurting them both spiritually and physically. In the case of Mr. Chang Su-fung, a Chinese national in Kalimpong, he was even denied legitimate defence before he was unjustifiably sentenced to imprisonment. His wife was first ordered to leave Kalimpong within a specified time-limit, and then recalled to Kalimpong to be tried; under various means of persecution by the Indian authorities, she finally fainted at the court. Later the Indian authorities sentenced her to imprisonment, thus separating her from her four young children and a suckling baby and throwing the family into a miserable state where husband and wife and parents and children were separated. Are these the "humane and generous standards" the Indian Government boasted of in its memorandum?

At the same time the Indian Government has gone back upon its promise and allowed and permitted Chiang Kai-shek clique elements and Tibetan rebels to carry out flagrant political activities in India against the People's Republic of China. How can such practice of the Indian Government of giving totally different treatment to different people be explained if it is not out of ulterior motives?

Judging from the above-said facts in three aspects, the Indian Government can in no way deny that it has subjected innocent and law-abiding Chinese nationals to political persecution.

What is even more surprising and regrettable is the fact that the Indian Government in its memorandum described the Chinese Embassy's proper and normal representations with the Indian Government concerning the Indian authorities' unwarranted persecution
of Chinese nationals as open interference in the internal affairs of India and alleged that the Chinese Embassy lent implied support to the so-called anti-Indian and anti-social activities of certain Chinese.

The consistent policy of the Chinese Government towards overseas Chinese is, in the spirit of the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence, to educate them to respect the laws and regulations of the country where they reside, refrain from taking part in local political activities, engage in economic and cultural work beneficial to the local national economy and people's livelihood, and live in amity with the local people. The Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General in India have consistently and strictly executed this policy. As for protecting the proper rights and interests of its nationals abroad and making reasonable representations to the government of the host country when they suffer unwarranted persecution there, this is the legitimate right as well as bounden duty of the Embassy and Consulate-General of every country, as is internationally acknowledged. As a country which has large numbers of nationals residing abroad, India cannot be unaware of this point. However the Indian Government actually considers the Chinese Embassy's diplomatic representations concerning Chinese nationals as constituting an act of open interference in the internal affairs of India; this is not only a malicious slander against the Chinese Embassy but also an obvious attempt to deprive the Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General of their legitimate right to protect the proper rights and interests of their nationals. This is something the Chinese Government absolutely cannot accept but must categorically repudiate.

At present, the Indian Government's acts of persecuting Chinese nationals continue to increase; this is completely against the wish of the people of China and India. Proceeding from the spirit of consistently upholding the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and safeguarding the friendship between the two peoples, the Chinese Government asks the Indian Government to treasure the friendship of the two peoples, respect the proper rights and interests of Chinese nationals, and immediately take effective measures to stop persecution of Chinese nationals. The Chinese Government once again expresses its readiness, together with the Indian Government, to seek fair and reasonable solutions to problems concerning Chinese nationals in the spirit of friendly negotiation.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 29 March, 1962

Reference Chinese Embassy's Memorandum dated 25th January 1962 regarding a broken window-pane in the premises of the Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay. When an investigation was held into the alleged incident, the Indian Police official who visited the Consulate General was shown a small hole about 2" in diameter in one of the windows. It is significant that the matter of a broken window-pane which is the subject of the Chinese Embassy's Memorandum was not promptly reported to the police at the time of its occurrence and that later when the police had started a process of investigation the officials of the Consulate-General had adopted an unco-operative attitude by refusing to give information requested for by the police. These facts have rendered the task of investigation difficult, and in consequence the investigation has yielded no positive result.

However, it has been established that the damage in question was trivial and probably due to accidental causes. The Government of India, therefore, reject the allegation contained in the Chinese Embassy Memorandum that the broken window-pane of the Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay was an act of "sabotage and disturbance". On the above facts there can be no basis for any charge of negligence or deliberate harassment of the Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay. There is no need to reaffirm that the Government of India have always taken and will continue to take all necessary steps to extend full protection to foreign missions in India.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 28 April, 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the two notes addressed by the Ministry of External Affairs of India to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India dated January 18, 1962 concerning Indian ruffians' provocative disturbance in front of the Chinese Consulates-General in Bombay and Calcutta, has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government completely disagrees with the reply of the Indian Government. That Indian ruffians created provocative disturbance in front of the Chinese Consulates-General and even wantonly insulted Chinese Consulate-General, but was reported in newspapers. Needless to point out, such activities constituted a serious provocation against China. The Indian Government in its notes tried to quibble with the pretexts of "the fundamental rights of Indian citizens", "Indian national heritage" and "the peaceful character of the procession". This shows that the Indian Government openly connived at and shielded such acts hostile to China, which is regrettable. Should the Indian Government persist in this attitude, to what state the relations between China and India would be reduced? The Chinese Government cannot but be worried about the eventuality.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 28 April, 1962

Regarding the incident in which an attempt was made to set fire to the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay has in its memorandum of December 14, 1961 given a clear and correct account. The Ministry of External Affairs in its memorandum of January 18, 1962, however, not only failed to account for the cause of the fire, but on the contrary made a narration inconsistent with the facts with regard to what had happened at that time and even charged the Chinese Consulate-General with refusing cooperation to the fire-men and police officials. Such an attitude cannot but make the Embassy feel disappointment and regret.

The Chinese Consulate-General accorded full co-operation and assistance to the police officials who went there for investigation. They were given facilities in conducting a detailed investigation on the spot. As for the question of a fire engine being misguided elsewhere, the fact is that, when the fire-men entered the courtyard of the Consulate-General, they blamed Mr. Batliwalla, secretary to the landlord, who informed the fire brigade of the incident by telephone, asking him why he had told them that it was Mr. Bhuilabhai Desai's house, and not the Chinese Consulate-General that had caught fire, with the result that the fire engine mistakenly went elsewhere and failed to reach the Chinese Consulate-General earlier. Mr. Batliwalla replied that he was not wrong in informing them that way because the house which the Chinese Consulate-General occupies is that of Mr. Bhuilabhai Desai. A member of the Consulate-General related the facts about the fire to a police official who went there for investigation but he found that in the statement recorded by the police official there were some discrepancies from what he had related. It is natural, therefore, that he could not sign on it.

The grave nature of this incident of setting fire is far too obvious. It is entirely necessary for the Embassy to draw the serious attention of the Government of India to it. The Government of India has unshirkable responsibility for ensuring the security of the official organs of a foreign country in India. The Government of India, however, not only has failed to carry out serious and earnest investigations but on the contrary made such assertions as "it was a small fire", "damage caused was negligible", there is a good deal of suspicion", and even went to the length of groundlessly accusing the Consulate-General of "using the incident for political ends". This is indeed exceedingly surprising and regrettable.

While noticing that the Government of India in its memorandum has deplored the incident, the Embassy once again requests the Government of India to see to it that the security of the Chinese official organs in India be effectively ensured.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 5 May, 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs Note dated 6-3-1962, have the honour to state as follows:

It is a matter of surprise and regret to the Government of India that the Government of China should continue to make baseless allegations regarding the treatment of Chinese nationals resident in India. It is particularly regrettable that the Chinese Government should have gone to the extent of making a false and malicious suggestion that their nationals are being persecuted on framed-up charges and are being unjustifiably ordered to leave India.

It is a perversion of the truth to describe the protective action taken against a few offending Chinese nationals resident in India as "persecution on framed-up charges". The fact that the number of such Chinese nationals is small relative to the size of the Chinese population in India should indicate that there is no general discrimination against Chinese residents and that the Government of India are only proceeding against a limited few who over a period of time have been found to indulge in anti-social activities. As already pointed out in the Government of India's memorandum dated 5th January 1962, every Chinese expelled from India has been guilty of a cognizable offence, e.g., smuggling or other criminal offences, infringement of visa regulations, or indulgence in activities, covert or overt, intended to subvert the security of the State.

The suggestion in the Chinese note, that Chinese nationals have been subjected to rude treatment, unjustified summons, detention, imprisonment, etc. is false and groundless. Action taken against the Chinese nationals has been strictly limited to the law and legal procedures obtaining in the country and adequate notice has invariably been given before taking action against the offending individuals concerned.

The Chinese note has attempted to cite specific instances in support of its allegations regarding 'unfair treatment' to Chinese nationals. It will be seen from the following data that the allegations of arbitrary arrest etc. are entirely contrary to the facts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of expiry of residential permit</th>
<th>Date of expiry of three month notice</th>
<th>Date of arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Wu Tao Lunk</td>
<td>17-4-1960</td>
<td>23-10-1960</td>
<td>28-12-1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Wang Ching-Shan</td>
<td>4-4-1960</td>
<td>7-3-1961</td>
<td>29-5-1961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not only had sufficient notice been given in these cases but even the arrest of the offending individuals had come after a further period of grace had been allowed to these persons to betake themselves from India. Besides, the utmost care had been taken to ensure that these offending, Chinese received the maximum facilities permissible under the law. Arrangements had been made to provide them with good food and comfortable accommodation on Indian territory and, in addition, they were given a number of items of warm clothing, boots, etc. to make their journey home as comfortable as possible.

The Chinese note refers to Mr. and Mrs. Chang Sui-fung. This couple had been served with orders on the 30th August 1960 to leave Kalimpong within a period of 15 days but as they did not comply with the order they were arrested on the 5th December 1960. The Court refused bail to Mr. Chang but allowed bail to Mrs. Chang on condition that she made arrangements to leave Kalimpong forthwith. Upon her refusal to do so, her bail application was rejected. But later, on the receipt of assurances on her behalf, she was released on bail on 17-12-1960. Mrs. Chang had been sentenced at her trial to two months simple imprisonment but in view of the special family considerations, the Government of India arranged to have the unexpired portion of the sentences on both Mr. and Mrs. Chang Sui-fung remitted and they were both permitted to leave the country. It will be seen from these facts that this Chinese couple had been released even before the expiry of their terms of imprisonment. Surely there was nothing inhumane about this.

In this connection, the Government of India firmly reject the absurd suggestion made in the Chinese note about the “Chiang Kai-shek clique elements” having been permitted to carry on political activities against the People’s Republic of China. The absurdity of this suggestion should be self-evident from the fact that the Government of India recognise and maintain diplomatic relations only with the People’s Republic of China, and have no relations with Taiwan.

The Government of China do not seem to be aware that the Indian Constitution and the laws of the land guarantee maximum liberty and equal treatment to all persons without distinction provided they do not act against the laws of the country. But where certain individuals, whether foreign or Indian, infringe the laws of the land they have necessarily to face the consequences that arise from their actions, and have only themselves to blame for it. Such enforcement of the law falls entirely within the internal jurisdiction of a country.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 15 May, 1962

The Chinese Embassy cannot accept the reply given by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs in its memorandum of March 29, 1962 regarding the incident in which a window-pane of the building of the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay, which faces the street, was broken through. This incident of the breaking of the window-pane occurred soon after the attempted setting fire to the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay. Its serious nature is thus obvious. The Government of India has the responsibility for ensuring the security of foreign official organs in India. What the Indian Ministry of External Affairs stated in its above-mentioned memorandum that "the damage in question was trivial" and "probably due to accidental causes" was intended to justify the act of endangering the security of the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay. The Government of India groundlessly charged the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay with failing to give cooperation in investigation. The Embassy is surprised at this extraordinary attitude of the Indian Government.

The Embassy has recently received further report from the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay that, at about 8 o'clock in the evening of April 26, 1962, another window-pane of the Consulate-building facing the street was broken through from outside. It was further discovered that, before that incident, the window-panes of three other rooms had also been broken with a hole on each of them. Besides, the glass cover of the gate light of the Consulate was smashed from outside on April 19. At about 7 o'clock in the evening of May 1, a piece of tile was thrown into the courtyard from outside the Consulate, almost hitting a member of the Consulate. All these incidents are of extremely serious nature. These incidents themselves serve to have refuted the untenable contention of the Ministry of External Affairs contained in its above-mentioned memorandum. It must be pointed out that the repeated occurrence of such incidents are by no means accidental. The Embassy expresses deep regret that the Government of India has failed to prevent such kind of sabotage and disturbance against the Chinese official organ, and requests that the Government of India pay serious attention to it and effectively ensure against recurrence of similar incidents in the future.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 17 May, 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and with reference to the Note of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese People’s Republic, Peking, dated the 28th April 1962, have the honour to state as follows:

The facts about the demonstrations which took place in Bombay and Calcutta in October/November 1961, have been communicated to the Embassy in the Ministry of External Affairs Notes dated 18th January 1962. It is, therefore, not necessary to restate that the demonstrations were peaceful, spontaneous and in lawful exercise of the fundamental rights of the Indian people. Nor is it necessary to reiterate that the Government of India found no cause to take action against the peaceful demonstrators who had posed no threat to law and order.

If the Chinese Government are as exercised over the future of Sino-Indian relations as their note would seem to indicate, they would have no doubt noted that the demonstrations in question were themselves the outcome of public indignation over the unlawful occupation of Indian territory by Chinese forces. It is this occupation of Indian territory that has caused a deterioration in Sino-Indian relations. While it is a matter of no small regret to the Government of India that their relations with the Chinese People’s Republic have worsened in recent years, it is obvious that normal relations between the two countries can easily be restored if Chinese forces posted on Indian territory are withdrawn. Such action would lay a true and lasting foundation for friendly relations between the two countries and also create a favourable atmosphere for negotiations to settle the boundary problem.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 17 May, 1962

Reference Chinese Embassy Memorandum dated the 28th April 1962, about a fire in the premises of the Chinese Consulate General, Bombay.

The facts about this incident were furnished to the Chinese Embassy in the Ministry of External Affairs Memorandum dated the 18th January 1962 in which the cause of the fire, as established on the basis of preliminary investigations, was also indicated. The same memorandum drew the attention of the Embassy to the obstructive and unhelpful attitude of certain officials of the Consulate-General which seriously hampered efforts of the local Police officials to investigate the case. The Government of India are satisfied that all the facts communicated by them to the Chinese Embassy are correct and incontrovertible. In the face of the facts, they are constrained to reject the prejudicated version of the incident put forward by the Embassy.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 23 May, 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the latter's Memorandum dated 12th December, 1961, have the honour to state as follows:

2. The Government of India have carried out a thorough investigation into the allegations made by the Embassy against the Indian local authorities in regard to the affairs of the Chung Hwa School in Kalimpong. The facts of the case are clear enough. On December 2, 1961, some members of the Chinese community in Kalimpong had come in person to the Chung Hwa School and had made a proposal that the school should henceforth be run jointly under the direction of the Board of Directors of the Chung Hwa School and the Chinese Refugee School. They contended that as the number of students in the Chung Hwa School had come down to a mere 30 and as there was no properly elected Board of Directors or a Headmaster to look after the Chung Hwa School, it would be in the best interests of the Chinese community as a whole for the two Schools to be placed under one management. These Chinese from the Chinese Refugee School claimed part-ownership of the building on the ground that some of them had been among the original sponsors of the Chung Hwa School and had contributed towards the construction of the building. This request made by the representatives of the Chinese Refugee School was summarily rejected by a lady teacher, Mrs. Yang Lan Ying of the Chung Hwa School, and thereupon an argument ensued between the two rival parties. At this moment an official of the Foreigners Registration Office in Kalimpong who had received information about the disturbance arrived on the spot and prevented the situation from taking an ugly turn. The disputants were advised by the Indian officials to decide the matter amicably by mutual negotiation and not by any unilateral action.

3. It is evident from the foregoing that the action taken by the Indian authorities in this instance was correct and proper. It is a matter of regret to the Government of India that the Embassy of the People's Republic of China should have seized this incident for levelling a number of totally unwarranted accusations and allegations against the Indian authorities charging them, amongst other things, with "connivance", "planned persecution", etc. The Ministry of External Affairs while totally and individually rejecting these incomprehensible charges cannot but point out a few examples of the erroneous and coloured statements contained in the Embassy's note under reference:—

(a) It is not a fact as stated in the Embassy's note that the Indian local authorities have interfered in the functioning of the Chung Hwa School. On the contrary, the local authorities had warned the members of the Chinese
Refugee School against attempting to take forcible possession of Chung Hwa School building and had thereby protected the interests of the Chung Hwa School.

(b) The expulsion of some Chinese nationals related to the Chung Hwa School had taken place only after an investigation had more than established their anti-social and anti-Indian activities. It is slanderous to impute any other motives to explain these expulsions which constitute an internal act of the Indian Government.

(c) The curious accusation of connivance with "the Chiang Kai-shek clique" deserves to be ignored, except that the Embassy has repeated it so often. The incongruity of the charge should be evident to the Embassy from the fact that India maintains diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China alone and has no such relations with Taiwan.

(d) The Embassy makes much out of the expulsion of some Chinese from India for their anti-social and anti-Indian activities. But other foreigners too have been similarly expelled from time to time when their behaviour warranted it. In those cases the Embassies concerned had invariably shown a proper appreciation of the sovereign jurisdiction of the Indian Government in the matter. The Government of India take strong exception to this charge contained in the Embassy's Memorandum which goes against all notions of accepted diplomatic behaviour and seeks to interfere in the purely internal affairs of India.

4. In the Chinese Embassy's Memorandum dated 12th December 1961, there is no mention of the Chinese Consulate General, Calcutta, letter dated 11th December 1961, to the Chief Secretary to the Government of West Bengal, regarding the taking over by the Consulate General of the Chung Hwa School. It has now been ascertained that without waiting for authorisation from the competent authorities, irregular and objectionable steps have been taken by the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong in closing down the Chung Hwa School. It should be obvious that the Consul General of China in Calcutta, can, in no way, authorise the Trade Agent in Kalimpong to take over the premises of the Chung Hwa School. Such action falls well outside the province of a Trade Agency and reveals a lack of respect for the local laws and regulations. This illegal action of the Chinese Trade Agent is further compounded by the fact that on the 14th December 1961, they had also surreptitiously removed furniture etc. from the school and taken the same to the Chinese Trade Agency premises. In this the Trade Agency has grossly exceeded its functions both under the 1954 Agreement as also under recognized principles of Customary International Law. It is not the function of a Trade Agency to take charge of private property on anybody's behalf and in so doing it will not be entitled to the privileges and immunities shown under Article I of the 1954 Agreement.
5. In view of the above irregularities and illegalities, the Government of India call upon the Embassy of the People's Republic of China to take immediate action on the following:

(a) The premises together with the keys of the building of the Chung Hwa School should be handed over to the Sub-Divisional Officer, Kalimpong, within 10 days of the receipt of this note.

(b) Any equipment removed from the premises of the Chung Hwa School should be restored to the premises in the presence of the S.D.O. within the same period of time.

(c) The Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong should be instructed in clear terms not to transgress the limits laid down in the 1954 Agreement and act in defiance of the law of the land.

6. The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 28 May 1962

The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of the Republic of India, and has the honour to state as follows:

About 6:45 on the afternoon of May 25, 1962, more than forty Indians shouted anti-Chinese slogans in front of the Embassy, insulting Premier Chou En-lai and the Chinese people. They viciously attacked China and burnt the Embassy’s bulletins and other Chinese publications. They did not disperse till 7 P.M.

It must be pointed out that the Government of India has time and again connived with a few elements hostile to China in making noises in front of the Embassy, and, what is even more serious, in insulting a Chinese leader. For this the Government of India cannot evade its due responsibility. The Embassy hereby lodges a protest with the Government of India, and urges the Government of India to adopt effective measures to prevent recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the
Embassy of India in China, 28 May 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and,
with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs
to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India dated
March 2, 1962, has the honour to state as follows:

The Indian Ministry of External Affairs in its reply note of March
2 did not mention a single word to condemn the ruffians for their
crime of unlawfully raiding the office of the "China Review" and
the Lita Press but, on the contrary, made groundless charges against
the victimized "China Review", even alleging that the violence was
"instigated by the support given to one group against the other by
the Chinese Missions in India". This is not only an act of turning
the facts upside down and shirking responsibility, but is a calculated
attack against the Chinese Missions. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs
of the People's Republic of China expresses its deep regret at this
extremely unfair attitude of the Indian Government and resolutely
rejects the unwarranted slanderous charges against the Chinese
Missions.

Both the depositions made by some of the criminals before the
Court in Calcutta and the police report show that the incident was
a premeditated and organised act of violence. The criminals, with
such implements of violence as chopper, axe and iron rods in hand,
smashed up the "China Review" office and wounded a member of
the Press. The hearings at the Indian Court have established the
guilt of these ruffians. The Indian Ministry of External Affairs
however, in disregard of the facts, turned around and slandered the
wronged party, so as to absolve the criminals of their crimes. This
unusual practice can only be regarded as proceeding from ulterior
motives.

This smashing up of the "China Review" office by the ruffians is
by no means fortuitous. This is another case of political persecution
following the unwarranted persecution of Chinese nationals and
expulsion of the leading members of the "China Review" by the
Indian Government. Therefore, the Chinese Government hereby
once again asks the Indian Government to respect the legitimate
rights and interests of the Chinese nationals, to ensure the safety of
the "China Review" and to assure that no similar incidents will
recur in the future.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India
in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note delivered by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India on May 23, 1962, has the honour to state as follows:

1. In its memorandum of December 12, 1961, the Chinese Embassy in India proved with indisputable facts that the Indian local authorities had systematically persecuted the Chung Hwa School in Kalimpong and connived at the scheming activities of Chiang Kai-shek elements. As a result of this persecution, the Chung Hwa School was compelled virtually to close down. The Indian Government’s arbitrary arguments and denial are futile.

2. The Chung Hwa School in Kalimpong is a school run by Chinese nationals in the locality with pooled funds. In the situation in which the School has been unable to continue functioning owing to persecution by the Indian local authorities, it is entirely proper and legitimate for the Chinese Consulate-General in Calcutta to take charge of the property of the School at the request of its Board of Directors. The Chinese Consulate-General in Calcutta notified the West Bengal Government of India of this by letter dated December 11, 1961, enclosing a copy of the letter from the Head and Deputy Heads of the Board of Directors of the Chung Hwa School requesting the Consulate-General to take charge of the School’s property. To perform its trusteeship over the School’s property the Consulate-General entrusted the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong which is in the locality to look after such purely technical matters as keeping the school building under lock, looking after the School property and paying taxes for the School. This is in no way “taking over” the School, and has nothing to do with the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement. Furthermore, the Chinese Trade Agency wrote to the Sub-Divisional Officer at Kalimpong, India, on December 12, 1961, informing the latter of its looking after the School. The Sub-Divisional Officer in his reply dated December 15 stated that the matter had been noted, and a letter would follow concerning this. However, more than five months have passed, and no objection has been heard from the Indian side. Now on the eve of the withdrawal of the Trade Agency, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs suddenly sent in a note on May 23, arbitrarily alleging that the Chinese Trade Agency “falls well outside” its province, “close down” the Chung Hwa School, and “takes charge of private property”. These allegations are groundless and can only be regarded as deliberate distortion of the facts and malicious slanders against the Chinese Trade Agency.

3. Especially surprising is the fact that the Indian Government should attempt to deprive the Chinese Consulate-General of its
right to take charge of the property of a school run by Chinese nationals. The Indian Government demanded that the Chinese side should hand over to the Sub-Divisional Officer, Kalimpong, India, the premises together with the keys of the building of the Chung Hwa School within 10 days of the receipt of the note from the Indian Ministry of External Affairs. The Chinese Government absolutely cannot agree to, and lodges its protest against, this rude demand which scorns the internationally acknowledged consular functions and powers and infringes on the legitimate property of foreign nationals.

4. The Chinese Government hereby states that to take charge of the property of the Chung Hwa School is a proper duty of the Chinese Consulate-General, and hopes that the Indian Government will respect the legitimate rights of the Chinese Embassy and Consulate-General to protect the proper rights and interests of their nationals.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 15 June 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to acknowledge the latter's Note No. M/552/62, dated the 28th May 1962.

On the evening of 25th May 1962, the Praja Socialist Party took out a procession as a protest against continued violations of Indian territory by Chinese forces. At about 6.45 p.m. the procession reached Lytton Road and was stopped by the police at a distance of over 50 yards from the gate of the Chinese Embassy. Elaborate police arrangements were made to ensure the fullest protection to the Embassy.

The processionists asked for the vacation of Chinese aggression from Indian territory and burnt certain publications, circulated in India, which dared to question the territorial integrity of India. The procession stayed on Lytton Road well outside the Chinese Embassy for a total of fifteen minutes.

The Chinese Embassy should be aware by now that under the constitution and laws of India, it is not possible to prohibit demonstrations in this country so long as they remain peaceful.

The Government of India reject the Chinese Embassy's protest note dated the 28th May 1962, which by questioning as it does the fundamental rights of the citizens of India, shows a regrettable disregard for the laws and constitution of India.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs delivered to the Chinese Embassy in India on May 17, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

Concerning Indian ruffians' provocative disturbance in front of the Chinese Consulates-General in Bombay and Calcutta and the insult flung at Chinese leaders, the Indian Government, in its note tries to explain it away by slandering that China has allegedly occupied Indian territory. This helps nothing. There is a dispute between China and India over the boundary, which remains to be settled equitably and reasonably through peaceful negotiations between the two sides. However, the essence of the Sino-Indian boundary question, as pointed out by the Chinese Government is that the Indian Government has laid claims on large pieces of Chinese territory, incessantly encroached on and set by aggressive strong points and made armed provocations inside Chinese territory. Such being the case, it is China which is hurt and feels indignant. But the Chinese peoples, proceeding from the overall consideration for Sino-Indian friendship and Asian-African solidarity, have long since held an attitude of self-restraint. The Indian Government's repeated connivance at and shielding of the acts hostile to China and insulting Chinese leaders has further deteriorated the relations between the two countries. One may ask what India would think about this if it were put in the position of the Chinese Government. The Indian Government's persistence in such a wrong attitude is not in the interest of the Chinese and Indian peoples and it lays bare the fact that the Indian Government is making use of the boundary question to create tension and poison the Sino-Indian relations.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 23 June, 1962


With regard to the case of ruffians attempting to set fire to the Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay, the reply of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs is entirely unsatisfactory. In its memorandum of January 18, 1962, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs did not make any account for the cause of the fire except the ambiguous assertion that some Diwali sparklers and charred cotton were found near the scene of the fire. It is only surprising that the Indian Government, which bears the responsibility for the protection of the security of official foreign missions in India, instead of undertaking serious investigations into the case, should have made fabricated charges against the Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay whose security had been threatened. Viewing this together with the fact that the window-panes of the same Consulate-General has been repeatedly broken through of late and the Indian Government has kept closing its eyes to the matter, the Chinese cannot but express its anxiety for the security of the Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the
Embassy of China in India, 26 June, 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to
the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour
to refer to note No. 52I, dated the 2nd June 1962 from the Chinese
Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

In their note dated the 23rd May 1962 the Government of India
have already refuted the baseless allegations about Indian persecu-
tion and interference with the Chung Hwa School in Kalimpong.
These are mischievous allegations and they do not confer legality on
the seizure of the School building or removal of equipment there-
from by the Chinese Trade Agent. The action of the Chinese Consul
General in authorising the Chinese Trade Agent to take charge of
the property on his behalf is highly improper. The Chinese Consul
General has only aided and abetted the Chinese Trade Agent in
performing an act in defiance of the duly constituted authorities of
the Government of India.

The attempt to justify the unwarranted action of the Chinese
Trade Agency in Kalimpong as being the legitimate exercise of a
Consular function betrays ignorance of well-recognised principles of
customary international law. The arbitrary seizure of property
cannot be considered to be in defence of the interests of its nationals
by a foreign Mission. Even if one ignores the fact that the request
of the so-called Board of Directors of the Chung Hwa School to the
Chinese Consulate-General in Calcutta to take over the school was
arbitrary and did not represent the wishes of the majority of the
original sponsors of the school, the action taken to assume physical
charge of this property is questionable under Indian laws and
regulations.

It is not customary in India to proceed arbitrarily against any
person or institution. The particular offence having been committed
by agencies of a foreign Government, the local authorities concerned
has to carry out a thorough inquiry before proceeding against the
offenders. It was in deference to the status of the main offender viz.
the Chinese Trade Agent that the Chinese Embassy was advised
that the premises and property of the Chung Hwa School should be
handed over to the Sub Divisional Officer, Kalimpong within 10 days
of the receipt of notice. Since this property, arbitrarily seized, was
not handed over as advised, the matter is now before the court.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this oppor-
tunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China
the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 4 July 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ note, dated May 28, 1962, regarding the incident which took place in Calcutta on the 17th January 1962.

The Government of China have already been informed in the Ministry of External Affairs note, dated 2nd March 1962, that case had been registered against the offenders before a court of law. The persons concerned have on the basis of the evidence been found guilty of certain infringements of the law by the court and sentenced.

The judgment of the court specifically dealt with the offences committed in this particular incident. Courts in India are above politics and impartial. The activities of the Chinese missions in India and their using the China Review as a mouthpiece of their official propaganda and fomenting internecine feud among groups of Chinese nationals resident in this country are matters which were never before the court and the court had no occasion to pronounce any opinions or findings on these activities.

The Government of India hope that the Government of China will appreciate the impartiality with which laws are administered by the courts in India and not draw any unwarranted conclusions from the judgment of the court.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 10 July 1962

Reference note No. 640 dated the 23rd June 1962 from the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

2. The facts regarding the old and derelict sofa set lying under a cocoanut trees in the courtyard of the Chinese Consulate-General which caught fire on the 5th December 1961 have already been given in the Ministry of External Affairs Memorandum, dated the 10th January 1962. There is nothing further to add except to reiterate that the members of the Chinese Consulate-General refused to cooperate and obstructed the investigation of the fire.

3. About the broken window-panes, the local Government have given the facts to the Chinese Consulate-General in their letter No. C.A.P.-4362-43729-E, dated the 21st May 1962. Little boys threw stones at the fruit of a mango tree and missed the target. The damage thus caused to the window panes was unintentional. However, the police apprehended the boys and admonished them. Apart from the mangoes, the boys had no other motive. Nevertheless, in view of the Chinese Government's political suspicions, further steps have been taken by the Bombay police to patrol the vicinity of the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 10 July 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to note No. 439 dated the 23rd June 1962, from the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The facts about the demonstrations which took place in Bombay and Calcutta in October|November 1961, have already been communicated in the Ministry of External Affairs notes of the 18th January 1962 and the 17th May 1962. There is nothing further to add to them.

It is surprising that, the Government of China, having illegally occupied by stages, since 1957, more than 12,000 square miles of Indian territory and laid claims over more, should attempt now to delude themselves that it is not they but the Government of India who have committed aggression. It is but natural that the people of India should express their feelings over these systematic Chinese violations of India's territorial integrity and sovereignty. The Government of India cannot interfere with this normal exercise of the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Indian Constitution so long as this is done in a non-violent and peaceful manner.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the
Embassy of India in China, 3 December 1961

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has
the honour to state the following which the Embassy is requested
to transmit to the Indian Government:

The Agreement between the People's Republic of China and the
Republic of India on Trade and intercourse between Tibet Region
of China and India, which was signed on April 29, 1954, came into
effect on June 3 the same year upon ratification by both Parties.
According to the provisions of Article 6 of the Agreement the Agree-
ment shall remain in force for eight years, so it is due to expire and
cease to be in force on June 3, 1962.

With a view to consolidating and developing the traditional
friendship between the peoples of China and India and promoting
the economic and cultural interflow between the two countries, the
Chinese Government proposes that the Chinese and Indian Govern-
ments hold negotiations so as to conclude, in accordance with the
Five Principles of mutual respect for each other’s territorial integrity
and sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, mutual non-interference in
each other’s internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit and peaceful
co-existence, a new agreement on trade in intercourse, to replace the
original Agreement. The Chinese Government is looking forward to
the reply of the Indian Government to this proposal.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China
avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in
China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state that it has received a proposal from the Government of the People's Republic of China through the Indian Embassy in Peking to hold negotiations between the two Governments to conclude, in accordance with the Five Principles of mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equal and mutual benefit and peaceful coexistence, a new agreement on trade and intercourse to replace the 1954 Agreement between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India on Trade and Intercourse between the Tibetan region of China and India, which will expire and cease to be in force on 3rd June, 1962.

2. As the Embassy of the People's Republic of China is aware, Government of India took the initiative to enter into negotiations with the Government of the People's Republic of China in 1954 with a view to reaching an agreement on the revised pattern of economic and cultural relations between India and Tibet so as to establish a climate of friendship and co-operation between India and China and to ensure and indeed to facilitate friendly and co-operative relations between India and China and to promote peace and rapid economic and cultural development not only in the two countries but also in South East Asia. It was with this end in view that the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence were enunciated and set out in the preamble to the Agreement. It was hoped that these Five Principles would not only regulate for years to come the relations between India and China but that the agreement would pave the way for a wider acceptance of these principles in inter-state relations more particularly in Asia.

3. The Government of India, ever since the signing of the 1954 Agreement, consistently pursued a policy of creating a zone in Asia free from cold-war conflicts and expected that the Government of the People's Republic of China would also co-operate in this commendable objective.

4. Within a year or two of the signing of this Agreement, the Government of the People's Republic of China not only began to curtail progressively the economic and cultural facilities provided for Indian traders and Indian pilgrims under the Agreement, but, what is more reprehensible, started to encroach, at first insidiously and later on openly, on territories which had clearly been accepted as Indian, and by 1958, began to make open claims, followed up by aggressive military activity, on several thousand square miles of Indian territory. The position today is that the Government of the People's Republic of China have not only violated both in letter and
spirit the Five Principles of co-existence set out in the preamble to
the 1954 Agreement but have actually occupied by force over 12,000
square miles of Indian territory and continue to expand their illegal
claims and pursue their aggressive military activities to forcibly
occupy large areas of Indian territory.

5. The Government of India always desired friendly and co-
operative relations with the Government of the People's Republic of
China. It was to this end that they negotiated the 1954 Agreement
even though this involved relinquishment of important rights and
privileges in Tibet that the Government of India had inherited from
the past. The Government of India willingly sacrificed these inherit-
ed rights and privileges with a view to laying a new and firm founda-
tion of friendship and co-operation between India and China. The
hopes and aspirations entertained by the Government of India while
negotiating for and signing the 1954 Agreement have, however, been
completely frustrated by the aggressive and expansionist policies
followed by the Government of the People's Republic of China during
the last few years.

6. The Government of India are still desirous of having friendly
and co-operative relations with the Government of the People's
Republic of China but they cannot see how, in the context of what has
been stated in paragraphs 4 and 5 above, they can start negotiations
for a new agreement in accordance with the Five Principles. The
first essential for the starting of such negotiations is the reversal of
the aggressive policies followed by the Government of the People's
Republic of China during the last few years and the restoration of
climate which assures the strict observance of the Five Principles
both in letter and spirit.

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India
avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the
People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the
Embassy of India in China, 3 March, 1962.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China
presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has
the honour to state its views again on the question of negotiations
for an agreement on trade and intercourse between China and India,
which the Embassy is requested to transmit to the Indian Govern-
ment.

The Chinese Government has read the note of the Indian
Ministry of External Affairs of December 15, 1961 in reply to the
Chinese Government’s note of December 3, 1961 in which the Chinese
Government proposed that the Governments of China and India hold
negotiations so as to conclude, in accordance with the Five Principles
of Peaceful Co-existence, a new agreement on trade and intercourse
to replace the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement on Trade and Intercourse
between the Tibet Region of China and India, which will expire on
June 3, 1962 and cease to be in force. It is wholly from the good
desire of safeguarding the friendship between the two countries
that the Chinese Government put forward this proposal. Contrary
to expectation, however, the Indian Government in its note not only
rejected this friendly proposal, but lacking elementary courtesy,
made wilful and ill-intentioned charges and slanders against China.
The Chinese Government can only express its disappointment and
regret at this extraordinary reaction.

The question of an agreement on trade and intercourse between
China and India and that of the Sino-Indian boundary are two
different matters. There is no reason why the boundary dispute
between the two countries should hinder the two sides from con-
ducting negotiations for an agreement on trade and intercourse.
That is why the Chinese Government, in putting forward the pro-
sal for holding negotiations on the question of an agreement on
trade and intercourse, did not link it with the Sino-Indian boundary
question. In its note, however, the Indian Government insisted on
linking the Chinese Government’s proposal with the Sino-Indian
boundary question. This can only complicate the matter. Since
the Indian note has referred to the boundary question, the Chinese
Government cannot but point out that it is India that has occupied
big tracts of China’s territory and laid claims to even bigger ones,
and not the other way round. Even Puling-Sumdo, which is
explicitly listed in the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement on Trade and
Intercourse as one of the markets for trade in western Tibet opened
by the Chinese Government, was occupied by the Indian side shortly
after the signing of the Agreement. Nevertheless, the Chinese Gov-
ernment, in proposing that the Chinese and Indian Governments hold
negotiations to conclude a new agreement on trade and intercourse,
has not put forward any precondition for the Indian Government
to fulfil,
The Indian Government in its note not only charge the Chinese Government with violation of the Five Principles, but stated that "the first essential" for starting the negotiations is "the reversal of the aggressive policies followed by China during the last few years and the restoration of a climate which assures the strict observance of the Five Principles both in letter and spirit". This charge is totally groundless. On the contrary, it is the Indian side that in fact has repeatedly violated the Five Principles and the 1954 Agreement. Apart from the boundary question, the following facts may be cited. At the time of the armed rebellion of the handful of reactionary traitors in Tibet, the Indian Government interfered in China's internal affairs by openly expressing its sympathy for the Tibetan rebels and conniving at their anti-Chinese political activities. Going back on its own pledge, the Indian Government even today allows the Tibetan rebels to operate in India in the virtual capacity of an exile government. Owing to various restrictions imposed by the Indian Government, the Trade Agency in Kalimpong, India, set up by the Chinese Government in accordance with the 1954 Agreement, has been placed in a situation where it is hardly able to perform its functions. These are undeniable facts. Now the Indian Government reverses right and wrong by slandering China as following aggressive policies, and preposterously asks China to reverse such non-existent policies as the first essential for starting negotiations for an agreement on trade and intercourse. Should the Indian Government persist in this attitude, the Chinese Government, regretably, can only derive from this the conclusion that the Indian Government harbours the intention of rendering it impossible to hold negotiations for an agreement on trade and intercourse between the two countries.

The Chinese Government, in proposing that the Chinese and Indian Governments hold negotiations to conclude a new agreement on trade and intercourse, is not seeking any interests of China alone, but proceeds from the long-term and all-round interests of the two peoples. Therefore, the Chinese Government reaffirms its proposal made in its note of December 3, 1961 and hopes that the Indian Government will reconsider the matter.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to acknowledge receipt of the Chinese Government's note of 3rd March on the subject of a new agreement on trade and intercourse between India and the Tibet region of China.

2. The Chinese Government have repeated their proposal for negotiations for a new agreement to replace the present agreement which is due to expire on 3rd June. They have suggested that an agreement will help "to safeguard friendship between the two countries" and that trade and intercourse should not be linked with the border question as this may lead to complications. They have alleged that it is not China, but India, which has "repeatedly violated the Five Principles and the Agreement". This baseless allegation has been made before and has been refuted in notes sent earlier, but the Government of India are taking this opportunity to restate their position in this matter in some detail.

3. From the very start, after India became independent, the Government of India have consistently followed a policy of friendly relations with China. For some years after liberations, China's attitude towards the independent neighbouring countries of Asia did not show proper understanding of the new forces at work in independent Asia. The Government of India, however, persisted in their efforts to cultivate friendly relations with China and, in 1953, took the initiative to enter into negotiations with the Chinese Government. The purpose of these negotiations was to reach a settlement which would clear the way for friendly and co-operative relations. These negotiations resulted in the Agreement of 1954 and the enunciation of the Five Principles.

4. The Agreement of 1954 was obviously intended to settle all outstanding issues which had been inherited from the past. It laid down regulations for trade and intercourse with the Tibet region across the common border. It also, for the first time in history, laid down the Five Principles as a code governing relations between two friendly Governments. Each side gave a solemn undertaking that it would respect the other's territorial integrity and sovereignty. The Chinese side had full knowledge at the time of the negotiations of what constituted the territorial boundaries of India. If it had any doubt, what was the purpose of the undertaking which it gave to respect India's territorial integrity? Surely, it is not open to a Government which enters into a solemn agreement on the basis of the Five Principles, first to give such an undertaking and then to claim part of the other's territory as its own?

5. It cannot be said that the Chinese Government was in any doubt at the time of the 1954 Agreement about what India regarded
to be the correct traditional boundary between the two countries. What Indian official maps clearly showed conformed to the territorial status quo of 1954 and earlier. The Government of India had published these Indian official maps which were precise and the Chinese Government knew about them. The Government of India had also repeatedly drawn the attention of the Government of China to the precise Indian official maps and to the bewildering variety of erroneous alignments shown in the Chinese maps. The Government of China in reply always assured the Government of India that the old Chinese maps were products of the incorrect cartography of the Kuomintang regime and that they had no time to revise them. There was no ambiguity in so far as the Government of India was concerned about the traditional boundary alignment precisely shown in Indian official maps; nor did the Government of India have any reason to believe that there was any uncertainty on the part of the Government of China regarding the correctness of this alignment. There can be no doubt at all that the 1954 Agreement confirmed the territorial status quo as it existed at that time. Surely, no agreement like that of 1954 negotiated over a period of some months could have been arrived at with substantial doubts and mental reservations on the question of the border in the minds of one of the parties to the Agreement.

6. The entire frontier was a peaceful one at the time of the 1954 Agreement and continued to be so far a few years thereafter. There was no conflict or trouble along the frontier. It is only during the last few years that conflicts and troubles have arisen along the frontier. These have not arisen because of any action taken by India. The cause of the recent troubles and conflicts along this frontier is the action taken by the Chinese authorities along this frontier. These actions taken by the Chinese authorities along the frontier have undermined confidence on the Indian side and led to conflict and misgivings.

7. So far as trade and intercourse are concerned many restrictions have been placed on Indian traders, officials and pilgrims in contravention of the provisions of the 1954 Agreement. There has been a long exchange of notes on the subject and it is not necessary to repeat the factual details given in these notes.

8. A more serious matter is the violation by the Chinese Government of India's territorial integrity and sovereignty. Since 1957, Chinese forces have begun a process of intrusion and occupation of Indian territory in the Aksai Chin area. In September 1958, they captured an Indian patrol at Haji Langar and interfered for the first time with the lawful exercise of Indian jurisdiction in the area. In disregard of the protests of the Government of India, Chinese forces, by the end of 1959, spread further west and south of the Aksai Chin. They built roads from there to Kongka La and along the bed of the Qaraqash river which was being regularly patrolled by the Indian Border Police. In October 1959, an Indian police force on patrol
duty was ambushed by the Chinese forces at Kongka La and suffered heavy casualties. Between 1960 and 1961, the Chinese forces advanced further into Indian territory. All these facts have been brought to the notice of the Chinese Government by the Government of India in a series of notes. In addition to unlawful occupation, the Chinese Government have made unlawful claims to large parts of Indian territory.

9. The Chinese allegation that it is not China, but India, which has violated the Five Principles is manifestly groundless. No territory has been occupied or claimed by the Government of India which is not actually part of India and which was not known to the Chinese Government at the time of 1953-54 negotiations to be part of India. The Chinese Government's allegations that Puling Sumdo has, since 1954, been occupied by India illustrates the prevailing confusion in the minds of the Chinese authorities and their lack of knowledge of the correct delineation of the border in this region. The factual position is that Puling Sumdo lies to the north of the main watershed. It has been listed in the 1954 Agreement as one of the trade marts in western Tibet. It is part of Chinese territory and continues to be in Chinese occupation. It has not been occupied by the Government of India.

10. Another Chinese allegation is that by showing their sympathy for the Tibetans who had to leave the Tibet region in 1959, the Government of India interfered in the internal affairs of China. Tibetan refugees have been given asylum in India in accordance with international law and practice in this matter. The Chinese Government seem to lack a proper understanding of the international law and practice on this subject. Tibetan refugees have received no encouragement from the Government of India to indulge in political activities. The Government of India took measures to disarm the refugees on their entry into India and applied various restrictions on their activities during their stay in India. The allegation that the Tibetans who have taken refuge in India have been allowed to form a government in exile is completely baseless.

11. The Chinese Government have also referred to restrictions imposed on the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong. The Government of India have already explained to the Chinese Government that certain regulations have been framed, under Indian laws, to control the activities of foreigners for reasons of national security. They regret that the Chinese Trade Agency has been found on many occasions to be violating these regulations and abusing its privileged position. In any case, the regulations in Kalimpong are not nearly as harsh and all-pervasive as the calculated measures which have been taken in the Tibet region to paralyse the activities of the Indian Missions.

12. The facts mentioned above show that it is not India, but China, which has violated the Five Principles and the provisions of the Agreement. Armed incursions and occupation of Indian territory by Chinese forces, since 1954, have aggravated the situation. This has
led to an undermining of confidence and has created deep resentment among the people of India.

13. Although the Chinese policy since the Agreement of 1954 and their aggressive activities on the border have caused serious disappointment, there is no change in the Government of India's basic policy towards China. The Government of India are convinced that friendly and co-operative relations between India and China based on the Five Principles are in the interest, not only of the two countries, but also of peace in Asia and the world. In conformity with their policy, the Government of India would welcome any genuine effort to restore friendly and cooperative relations between India and China. They cannot, therefore, have any objection in principle to negotiations for a new agreement to maintain and develop trade and intercourse between India and the Tibet region. These negotiations, however, can hardly be undertaken till confidence in the bona fides of the Chinese authorities that they will implement the agreement both in letter and spirit is restored. Nor can an agreement on trade and intercourse across the border be negotiated when the Chinese authorities continue to violate the territorial integrity of India along that border.

14. The facts relating to the border are now available to the Chinese Government in the Report of the Officials which has been published in India. The Report which has not been published in China shows conclusively that the territory occupied, or claimed, by the Chinese Government is Indian territory. As these facts do not seem to have been considered by the Chinese Government the Secretary General of the Ministry of External Affairs, during the visit to China, drew their attention to them. The Government of India will be glad if, in the light of these facts, the Chinese Government will take early steps to implement their undertaking to respect India's territorial integrity and sovereignty, withdraw their forces from Indian territory and restore the status quo along the border as it existed in 1954. This alone can restore confidence and create the requisite friendly atmosphere for negotiating a new agreement.

15. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 11 May 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to acknowledge receipt of the Indian Government's note of April 11, 1962, on the subject of the agreement on trade and intercourse between China and India.

1. The Chinese Government expresses its regret at the fact that the Indian Government once again turned down the proposal for negotiating and concluding a new agreement on trade and intercourse to replace the 1954 Agreement on Trade and Intercourse Between the Tibet Region of China and India. The various excuses made by the Indian Government in its note are totally unreasonable. In order to distinguish between right and wrong, the Chinese Government wishes to take this opportunity to restate its position.

2. The Indian Government asserted that, as the 1954 Agreement laid down the Five Principles as a code governing relations between two friendly governments and as each side gave a solemn undertaking that it would respect the other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, it meant that the Chinese Government had accepted the Sino-Indian boundary line unilaterally claimed by India. In its note, the Indian Government pretentiously said, "The Chinese side had full knowledge at the time of the negotiations of what constituted the territorial boundaries of India. If it had any doubt, what was the purpose of the undertaking which it gave to respect India's territorial integrity? Surely, it is not open to a government which enters into a solemn agreement on the basis of the Five Principles, first to give such an undertaking and then to claim part of the other's territory as its own". But the first of the Five Principles is "mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty," and does not stipulate that one party must accept the boundary claimed by the other party. If acceptance of the principle of "mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty" should be construed to mean the Chinese Government's acceptance of the boundary line claimed by India, then, by the same logic, can it not be construed also as meaning the Indian Government's acceptance of the boundary line maintained by China? Obviously, such argumentation can only be regarded as unilateral bigotry and is purely a distortion of an international document.

3. The fact is that the 1954 Agreement settled only those questions relating to trade, cultural relations and friendly intercourse between China's Tibet region and India; it did not settle all the questions existing between China and India, and did not even touch on the boundary question. As for maps, the fact is that only after the signing of the 1954 Agreement did the Indian Government bring up the question of maps with the Chinese Government, and only in 1958 did the Indian Government call the attention of the Chinese Government to the boundary alignment claimed by it and cite the Indian
map published in 1956. How can it be said that at the time of the negotiation and signing of the 1954 Agreement the Chinese Government already accepted the boundary alignment which has come to be drawn on Indian maps only in recent years? This is absurd.

4. Then there is the question of Puling-Sumdo. It is a crystal clear fact that Puling-Sumdo has been invaded and occupied by India. On the Indian maps published in recent years, it is included in Indian territory and renamed Pulam-sumda. To cover up the fact, the Indian Government arbitrarily alleged that Poling, which is situated deep within Chinese territory, is Puling-Sumdo. To say that Puling-Sumdo continues to be held by China while in fact to have invaded and occupied China's Puling-Sumdo—such practice, to put it mildly, cannot but be considered unseemly.

5. The Indian note, reviewing the development of Sino-Indian relations in the past ten years and more, alleged that responsibility for the deterioration of Sino-Indian relations lies with China and that "from the very start, after India became independent, the Government of India have consistently followed a policy of friendly relations with China". This allegation is groundless. It is true that, through the joint efforts of China and India, Sino-Indian relations were friendly. Our two countries early established diplomatic relations, jointly initiated the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and cooperated in international affairs in a friendly way. Even now the Chinese side is still making efforts to restore such friendly relations. But there is no reason to deem that the Indian side too has always done so. If one respects the objective historical facts, one cannot but acknowledge that there has been a dark side to the Sino-Indian relations since their very beginning.

6. In 1950 the Chinese People's Liberation Army advanced into Tibet. In a series of notes delivered to the Chinese Government between August and November in the same year, the Indian Government described China's exercise of its sovereignty in its own territory Tibet as "invasion" of Tibet, as being "deplorable" and "with no justification whatsoever" and asserted that China's action "has greatly added to the tensions of the world and to drift towards general war" and "affected these friendly relations (between India and China) and the interest of peace all over the world". After that the Indian Government has all along allowed a batch of Tibetan fugitives to carry out disruptive and subversive activities against China's Tibet in Kalimpong and other places in India. All this clearly constitutes interference in China's internal affairs.

7. In 1959 the Indian Government described China's exercise of its sovereignty in putting down the rebellion in Tibet as "armed intervention", "oppressing and suppressing" and "autonomy" of Tibet and held that by doing so the Chinese Government has not kept "the assurances given to India". The Indian Government connived at the political activities carried out in India by the Tibetan rebels, distributed traitorous statements for them, allowed them to stage demonstrations against the People's Republic of China and even publish a so-called draft construction for an "independent Tibet". All this has gone far beyond the scope of giving political
asylum and can in no way be justified by any international law or practice. Obviously the Indian Government is not reconciled to the fact that the Chinese Government is exercising its sovereignty in Tibet.

8. As soon as the Chinese Government put down the rebellion in Tibet in 1959, the Indian Government made comprehensive territorial claims on the Chinese Government and exerted pressure on China. In August and October 1959 respectively, Indian troops attacked with superior force Chinese frontier personnel at Migyutin in the eastern sector and at Kongka Pass in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, giving rise to the two unfortunate incidents of bloodshed. Thus began the period of speedy deterioration of Sino-Indian relations. Anybody who respects historical facts is clear about the long-term and immediate reasons for the sharpening of the Sino-Indian boundary question. But the Indian Government arbitrarily distorted the history, saying that it was only in 1957 that Chinese troops went to the Aksai Chin area in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary. Such clumsy tactics are not worthy of refutation. The Chinese Government has stated many times and now states again: The Aksai Chin area has always been China's territory; it is the communication artery linking Sinkiang and the Ari district in Tibet of China and has always been under the jurisdiction of the Chinese Government; in 1950 the Chinese People's Liberation Army entered Ari, Tibet, through this area from Sinkiang; from 1954 to 1957 China carried out in this area large-scale engineering work of road-building; both in law and in fact there is no room for dispute about China's sovereignty over this area. The September 1958 incident of the detention of an Indian patrol referred to in the Indian Government's note precisely proves that this area is China's territory and has always been under China's jurisdiction. If it had always been under India's jurisdiction, how is it conceivable that the Sinkiang-Tibet road across Aksai Chin involving gigantic engineering work should have been completed without the knowledge of the Indian Government?

9. Since the talks between the Prime Ministers of the two countries and the meeting of Chinese and Indian officials in 1960, the Indian side has stepped up its invasion and occupation of Chinese territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary and, taking advantage of the cessation of patrolling by Chinese frontier guards, has been pushing farther and farther into Chinese territory. At the same time, the Indian authorities have placed further restrictions on the normal functioning of China's Trade Agency in Kalimpong, reducing it to virtual paralysis. Of late the Indian side has further penetrated into Chinese territory to establish new military posts, thus threatening the security of a Chinese outpost and increasingly aggravating the situation on the Sino-Indian border. In its previous notes, the Chinese Government has already set forth in detail the facts regarding the above two aspects and refuted the Indian Government's groundless charges about alleged violations of the 1954 Agreement by the Chinese Government and no repetition will be made here.

10. The above-mentioned facts show that it is India, and not China, that has violated the 1954 Agreement and the Five Principles
of Peaceful Co-existence. Although China is the wronged party both on the question of the implementation of the 1954 Agreement and on the question of the maintenance of the status quo of the boundary, the Chinese Government, however, has never set any preconditions in proposing re-negotiation for the conclusion of a new agreement on trade and intercourse. The Chinese Government had hoped that to negotiate and conclude such a new agreement would ease the tense relations between China and India, create the necessary friendly atmosphere and open the way to setting other questions between China and India. But the Indian Government in its notes, while saying that it did not object to China's proposal, insisted on outrageous preconditions which demand China's subjugation. This only shows that the Indian Government is not at all willing to negotiate and conclude a new agreement on trade and intercourse to replace the 1954 Agreement due to expire on June 3, 1962.

11. Since the founding of the People's Republic of China, the Chinese Government has attached great importance to friendship with India and has made unremitting efforts to safeguard and consolidate this friendship. However, the liberated new China can in no circumstances allow itself to be plunged back to the position of the injured old China. China does not interfere in the internal affairs of any other country, nor will it allow any country to interfere in its internal affairs. China does not encroach on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of any other country, nor will it allow any country to encroach on its sovereignty and territorial integrity. China is willing to settle through negotiations its boundary questions left over by history with all its neighbouring countries concerned, but China will never accept any illegal territorial claims imposed upon it. This position of China's is in full conformity with the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and has won the sympathy and understanding of many of China's Asian neighbours. Although the Indian Government has violated the Five Principles and repeatedly rejected the friendly proposals of the Chinese Government, friendship between the peoples of China and India is a matter of thousands and tens of thousands of years and the Chinese Government will continue to make unremitting efforts to improve Sino-Indian relations.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
‘Aide Memoire’ given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 1 June 1962

Reference the talk which the Director, China Division, had with the Charge d’Affaires of the Chinese Embassy at the Ministry of External Affairs on the morning of 30th May 1962, regarding the withdrawal of Indian Trade Agencies from Tibet consequent on the Termination of the 1954 Agreement of Trade and Intercourse between India and the Tibet region of China.

As the Indian Trade Agencies have been at Gyantse, Yatung and Gartok for many years, it will be a big task to move them out with all their records and stores. However, the Government of India have tentatively decided to withdraw their Trade Agency at Gyantse by the 10th June 1962 and their Trade Agent at Yatung by the 15th June 1962, depending on facilities made available to them to pack, create and transport their records and stores.

The Indian Agent, Gartok, will visit Western Tibet as soon as possible to wind up his mission there. His visit to Western Tibet for this purpose has already been agreed to by the Chinese Government. The actual visit can, however, take place only after the Pass (Lipulekh), by which he has to enter Western Tibet, is open.

None of the Indian Trade Agents in the Tibet region will perform the duties of his office with effect from 3rd June 1962. The Government of India, however, request that their Trade Agents be given facilities to have privileged (diplomatic) communication with the Government of India until the date of their final withdrawal.

Although the Trade Agent, Gartok, will not perform the duties of his office, the Government of India will appreciate if he is accorded the courtesies and privileges due to his status during his final tour and also assisted in his winding up mission by the Chinese Government.

From the date the Indian Trade Agency is withdrawn from Yatung all properties and buildings of the Trade Agency will be in the charge of the Consul General for India at Lhasa. The Consul General for India at Lhasa will keep a small staff for the necessary upkeep and maintenance of the buildings and property which will hereafter serve as a resting place for officers and couriers proceeding to the Indian Consulate General at Lhasa and returning therefrom.

Regarding properties, etc., of the Indian Trade Agencies at Gyantse and Gartok, a further communication will follow.
In the case of Tibetan wives of staff members of the Indian Trade Agencies, it is requested that they may be allowed to accompany their husbands to India as it will cause needless hardship to break up these families.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 June 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China present its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, dated November 16, 1961 on trade between China's Tibet region and India and the part of its note dated July 15 of the same year on the same question (the other questions raised in that note have already been replied to by the Chinese Government in its note of March 21, 1962), has the honour to state as follows:

1. In its previous notes, the Chinese Government has already proved with conclusive facts that it has always faithfully abided by the provisions of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement on Trade and Intercourse Between the Tibet Region of China and India and of the Sino-Indian Trade Agreement, and made unremitting efforts to promote trade between China's Tibet region and India. Since 1959 trade between the two sides has decreased rapidly and nearly stopped. The Indian Government should be held responsible for this state of affairs, the root cause of which is the Indian Government's policy of embargo and restriction on China's Tibet. In its notes, the Indian Government did its utmost to distort the facts and tried to shift the responsibility onto China; that was futile. It is not difficult for anyone with a fair attitude to see that all the unreasonable charges made by the Indian Government against China are wholly untenable.

2. What the Indian Government takes interest in is not to develop traditional trade between China's Tibet and India on the basis of equality and mutual benefit, but actually to interfere in China's internal affairs in the name of developing traditional trade. For instance, the currency reform carried out by the Chinese Government in China's Tibet is clearly China's internal affair, in which no foreign country has the right to interfere, yet the Indian Government asserted that this is "a legitimate issue for discussion by the two governments". Again the Indian Government insisted that Indian traders should be able to carry on trade in Tibet "without any official interference", and to "bring back Tibetan goods freely to India" or "bring (them) back in bullion, silver dollars, coins and/or Indian currency" "whenever they wish to do so". The Indian Government further held that it is "not surprising" for Indian traders to fail to fulfil commercial contracts. It is clear that the Indian Government's attitude is absolutely not one of respecting China's sovereignty, but one of ignoring it. This is absolutely impermissible.

3. The Indian Government asserted that its unreasonable stand has the relevant agreements as its basis. This is entirely a crude distortion of the agreements. It is clearly written in the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement on Trade and Intercourse between the Tibet Region of China and India that the Agreement was entered into on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence. But does the Indian Government's attitude in any way conform with the
principles of mutual respect for each other’s sovereignty, non-interference in each other’s internal affairs, and equality and mutual benefit? Paragraph 14 of the notes exchanged on this Agreement further specifically provides that “traders of both countries may carry on normal trade in accordance with local regulations in places as provided in Article II of the Agreement”. Article II of the 1954 Sino-Indian Trade Agreement provides that “all commercial transactions between the two countries shall be carried out in accordance with the Import, Export and Foreign Exchange Regulations in force from time to time in their respective countries”. It can be seen from these provisions that the agreements stress that trade must be carried on and developed on the conditions of observing the laws and regulations of the country concerned, but not “without any official interference”, as the Indian Government asserted. As for paragraph 4 of Article VII of the Sino-Indian Trade Agreement, which reads “payments for border trade between the People’s Republic of China and the Republic of India, however, will be settled according to the customary practice”, it obviously refers to payments for petty trade between inhabitants of border districts as mentioned in Article V, paragraph 2 of the Agreement on Trade and Intercourse. The Chinese authorities have never interfered in such payments both when the Trade Agreement was in force and after it expired. It is absurd for the Indian Government now arbitrarily to misinterpret this provision about one specific question as stipulating that trade in China’s Tibet region shall not be altered in any aspects, and that the Chinese authorities may not make or revise their own laws and regulations.

4. The Indian Government charged the Chinese Government with undermining trade between Tibet and India, and violating the legitimate interests of Indian traders. This is entirely groundless. The Chinese Government has consistently devoted itself to developing trade between China’s Tibet region and India on the basis of equality and mutual benefit. Although for short time the rebellion in Tibet in March 1959 somewhat affected local public order and trade between the two countries, the Tibet local authorities actively restored and developed trade between the two countries as soon as the rebellion was put down. The local authorities have never suspended the export of important traditional goods. The Indian Government’s charge that the Chinese authorities impose restrictions on the export of wool (including pashmina) to India, which forms the largest item of export, is inconsistent with the fact. On the contrary, the trade organs in Tibet repeatedly provided Indian traders with large quantities of wool for export. Also, the Tibet local authorities have never restricted or interfered with the petty barter trade on the border. In the supply of foreign exchange, the Tibet local authorities have always given consideration to the needs of the Indian traders. Take the case of M/s. Tibet Motor & Cycle Co., the Indian firm at Yatung referred to in the Indian Government’s note of November 16, 1961, the facts concerned are contrary to what was alleged by the Indian Government. Instead of getting only 5,220 yuan’s worth of foreign exchange, the said firm on winding up its business, with the help of the Tibet local authorities, got 38,300 rupees and bought 9,821 catties of wool and other local animal products, thus its application upon closure for some JMP 49,000 yuan’s
worth of foreign exchange was granted. The Indian traders have never been obstructed from recovering their credits; in fact they have already recovered many credits. However, visiting rebel criminals who are serving prison terms is, of course, impermissible.

5. The serious undermining of traditional trade between Tibet and India is solely of the Indian Government's making. This fact can in no way be distorted. After the quelling of the rebellion in Tibet in March 1959 the Indian Government immediately brought pressure to bear on China in various ways, causing the rapid deterioration of the relations between the two countries. As one of the ways, the Indian Government adopted measures of embargo and restriction on trade between Tibet and India. To begin with, starting from April 1959 the Indian Government stopped the traditional export of grain to Tibet. In the subsequent months it took a series of restrictive measures, including in the list of embargoed and restricted items important traditional exports and other goods, such as daily necessities and articles of daily use: grain, cooking oil, beans, sugar, tea, kerosene, fuel, farm implements and utensils, as well as important materials for construction, telecommunications, motor and other transport. At the same time, Indian troops placed the entire border under strict control, forbidding border inhabitants to cross it, thus making it impossible for them to carry on their traditional petty trade. Tibetan traders and border inhabitants were continually illegally detained and persecuted by the Indian authorities, instances of which have been cited by the Chinese Government in many earlier notes and need not be repeated here. It is precisely the above-mentioned measures of the Indian Government that have led to the strangling of the traditional trade between India and Tibet and the undermining of the foundation of the 1954 Agreement.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the
Embassy of India in China, 7 June 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with
reference to the notes of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs of
August 26 and November 10, 1961, has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government has on many occasions cited facts to
show that the Chinese local authorities have all along rendered assist-
ance to the official Indian missions in Tibet in accordance with the
1954 Sino-Indian Agreement and the local laws and regulations, never
putting any special restriction on their normal activities. In its notes,
however, the Indian Government, making no scruple of distorting the
facts, levelled malicious and baseless charges against the Chinese
authorities. In categorically rejecting those charges and expressing
its regret, the Chinese Government wishes to clarify the relevant
facts as follows:

(1) Concerning the lease of land and construction of buildings by
the Indian Trade Agency at Gartok.

Since the independence of India, the Indian Trade Agent has all
along followed the practice of the British Government in bringing
his own tents with him to the Ari district, Tibet, China, every year.
After the conclusion of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement, as the local
inhabitants generally lived in tents and there was no building to rent,
the two parties agreed in October 1954 that the Indian side could
lease a piece of land in Gartok and construct its premises by itself
and the Chinese side would render it assistance so far as possible.

In September 1955, the Indian Trade Agent asked for a lease of 40
acres of land at a rent of merely 50 rupees per year. In a place like
Gartok where there were only 50 permanent inhabitants or so, such
an area of land was obviously too big. It was only after consulta-
tions that the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa agreed in May 1956
to reduce it to 10 acres. The Tibet Foreign Bureau submitted in July
1957 a draft lease for the land, but the Indian Consulate-General did
not reply till January 1958. In its reply, it raised a number of objec-
tions and insisted that construction should be started before the lease
was signed. It was only after further consultations that the two sides
reached agreement on the draft lease in November 1958. In order to
help the Indian side ensure an early start in the construction, the
Chinese side advised the Indian Trade Agent to come to Lhasa to
sign the lease in the beginning of 1959. But the Indian Trade Agent
failed to do so and only came in October to Gartok to sign the lease.
It may thus be seen that if the Indian side had taken a cooperative
and positive attitude, the lease could have been signed earlier. The
Indian side's complaints against China are groundless.

In the matter of the construction of the Indian Trade Agency's
premises, the local authorities have done their best to render assist-
ance, too. In view of the utter scarcity of manpower and materials
in the locality, the Foreign Bureau in Lhasa had suggested that the
construction be carried out in two stages, that is, to construct tempo-
rary houses of wood and earth at first, and then, when local condi-
tions permitted, permanent buildings. The Indian Consulate-General accepted this idea at that time, but the request it put forward later on again called for construction of permanent buildings. The Indian side asked the Chinese side to provide 1,800 cubic metres of stone, eight tons of cement, 100 unskilled workers, etc. All these requests could not possibly be satisfied under the local conditions. The Indian Trade Agent did not take up the matter of construction in 1960. However, on his arrival at Gartok in July 1961, he asserted that he gained an impression in Delhi that the Chinese Government would undertake the construction of the projected Indian Trade Agency premises and therefore, he had not made any preparations for the construction except for bringing in an engineer with him. This assertion is untenable, as he was clearly aware that the principle agreed upon by the two sides was for the Indian side to construct its premises by itself and for the Chinese side to render assistance so far as possible. After the Indian side brought forward its blueprint for the construction on July 21, the local authorities promptly expressed their agreement on August 9. The construction work was further delayed only because the Indian side had not made any preparations for it beforehand.

The Indian Government further made complaints against the Chinese local authorities because the Indian Trade Agent was asked to pay its debts on such things as mud bricks. But this only showed that the Indian Trade Agent was wanting in good faith and lacked cooperation with the local authorities. In 1956, at the request of the Indian Trade Agent himself, the local authorities hired civilian workers to make mud bricks, accumulate earth, carry gravel and dig water ditches for him. But the Indian Trade Agent withheld wages for the civilian workers for a long time. What is more surprising is that, in its notes, the Indian Government should have asserted that the Indian Trade Agent had not placed any order and therefore, “could not accept the responsibilities for the payment.” The fact, however, is that the local authorities had repeatedly approached the Indian Trade Agent on this matter for years, and the latter never denied that he had placed that order, and moreover, he paid these debts in the end. It should be pointed out that the wages owed for making the mud bricks amounted to 1,753 rupees, not 7,112 rupees as alleged in the notes of the Indian Government, the remaining 5,359 rupees being for the wages owed by the Indian side over a period for accumulating earth, carrying gravel and digging water ditches. The Indian side added the two sums together making it out as if they were the wages for making the mud bricks alone and charged that the “price demanded (by the local authorities) is too exorbitant.” This is a deliberate confusion of the facts. The allegation that the Chinese authorities insisted that payment should be made at Gartok is also unfounded, because the unsettled payment was in fact settled at Pulanchung. The non-cooperative attitude of the Indian Trade Agent caused many difficulties to the local authorities. For instance, the Indian Trade Agent requested in 1956 that stones be quarried for his house construction, and so the local authorities had to transport explosives for quarrying stones from distant Sinkiang. But after this was all done, the Indian Trade Agent refused to use the stones, thereby bringing unwarranted losses to the contracted agency.
Concerning the land to be leased and construction of buildings by the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse.

The terms of the land to be leased by the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse, including the site taking up about 85 per cent. of the total area of the land to be leased, were finalized through consultations in Lhasa in December 1960. The site covers the projected premises of the Trade Agency either already under construction or about to be constructed. As for from where in the vicinity will the remaining 15 per cent. or so of land be provided, it was stipulated that the two sides would specifically decide upon this through consultations at Gyantse. The Chinese local authorities, taking into consideration the convenience of the Indian side, proposed that the Indian side give up the plot of land on the river bank below the flood line and that it be provided with another piece of land located somewhere else within the extents of the land to be leased. The facts are contrary to what the Indian Government stated in its notes. It was the Indian side that repeatedly changed its mind about this piece of land and put forth again and again new plans for adjustments, making it impossible to have the extents of the land to be leased completely fixed at an early date. For instance, in March 1961, the Sub-Bureau of Foreign Affairs put forth a plan for adjustment of the land to be leased before the sowing so as to make it easier for the Indian side to choose the land. The Indian Trade Agent then said he wanted the plot of land northeast by north, and not the one in the north. But in August, when the peasants had already grown crops on the plot of land in the north and the local authorities concerned had made preparations against floods, the new Indian Trade Agent changed the original plan and asked for the plot of land in the north instead of the one northeast by north, thereby turning the extents of the land to be leased into a problem once again.

The allegation in its notes that the Trade Agency at Gyantse could not begin construction because the lease was not signed likewise cannot hold water. As early as 1958, the Chinese local authorities agreed that the Indian side might begin the reconstruction at the original site of the Trade Agency before the signing of the lease. As a matter of fact, the floor space completed by the Indian side in 1959 already covered about 900 square metres. Of the five buildings under construction, two were nearly completed and foundations were already laid for the other three. Besides, the buildings rented by the Indian Trade Agency were sufficient for their needs and the lease concerning the buildings was signed in November 1961.

Concerning the functioning of the Indian missions in Tibet, China.

The Indian Government’s allegations in its notes that the Indian missions in Tibet had met with various difficulties in their movement and functioning are groundless. The local authorities in Tibet, China have consistently rendered facilities to foreign official missions in Tibet for their normal activities in accordance with the Agreement and the local laws and regulations and have never discriminated against the Indian missions. Concerning the question of hiring employees in the locality by the Indian missions, the foreign offices
had shown their readiness to help, but they did not interfere in the matter when the Indian missions by themselves hired employees in the locality. Concerning the transportation facilities for the Indian missions, the local authorities, although under difficult conditions, gave all assistance within their power; and in June 1960 they informed the Indian missions to submit their plans every month and, thereafter, arrangements were always made in accordance with the plans submitted by the Indian side. But the vehicles thus provided often either had no loads to carry, or were only loaded to half capacity, thus causing a waste in transportation facilities. It should be pointed out that the Indian missions in Tibet often lack proper respect for China’s laws and regulations and abuse the hospitality and their privileges, their practice and demands often went beyond and violated the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement. For instance, in spite of repeated representations by the Chinese side, the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung still went outside its competence and checked goods from India, and the primary school of the Trade Agency continued to admit illegally pupils of Chinese nationality. In disregard of the stipulations in the notes exchanged on the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement, the hospitals attached to the Indian Trade Agencies at Gyantse and Yatung always remained open to the public. Furthermore, the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung for a long time kept and used an illegal radio station. The Indian Trade Agencies openly interfered in matters purely within the scope of China’s sovereignty, such as the local currency reform, regulations governing foreign exchange, registration of foreign business and collection of revenue in China’s Tibet. The Indian Trade Agent at Yatung even went so far as to demand a “Joint trial” of Indian nationals who violated the law. After the rebellion launched by the reactionary clique of the upper social strata in Tibet, the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung has even again and again shown to the local inhabitants films depicting the rebel clique’s flight into India. All these actions are obviously improper.

After the quelling of rebellion in Tibet, the Indian Government has placed various unwarranted restrictions on the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong and paralyzed it. The movements of the personnel of the Trade Agency were restricted to the narrow municipal limits which is about two miles in length, and could not get in touch with any Indian civilians except through the agent of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs at Kalimpong. Beginning from November 1959, the Indian local authorities set up a network of police posts and military tents around the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong, with forty to fifty armed men maintaining constant watch day and night. At the same time, the Indian side made all kinds of slanders and threats against the Chinese Trade Agency. That the Indian Government should under these circumstances again and again charge the Chinese side with placing so-called restrictions on the Indian missions in Tibet is what the Chinese Government cannot agree.

(4) Conclusion.

It can be seen from the above that the charges made by the Indian Government against the Chinese side are unreasonable. The
Chinese side always strictly adhered to the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement, while the Indian side repeatedly violated that Agreement, refused to co-operate and tried its utmost to maintain its unlawful special position in China’s Tibet. In its note, it even laid a "sovereign" claim for Minsar, which is situated deep in the An District, Tibet, China. This is absurd, but it precisely reflects to what an extent the Indian Government has forgotten itself.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 11 July 1962


2. It is a matter of deep regret to the Government of India that, instead of taking necessary steps to rectify the errors of the past few years and creating the right climate for negotiations of an agreement on Trade and Intercourse between India and the Tibet region of China, the Government of China continue to make baseless charges against the Government of India. Ceaseless reassertion of a wrong position cannot convert it into a right one.

3. It is not true that, by citing the undertaking in the Agreement of 1954 to respect each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, the Government of India are seeking to force China to accept a boundary alignment unilaterally claimed by India. The Government of India's contention is that, in 1954, there was no difference of opinion between the two countries regarding the boundary alignment and that the present tension on the border is the result of subsequent Chinese aggressive activities carried out in violation of the Five Principles embodied in the 1954 Agreement. The precise extent of Indian territory was in 1954 well-recognised and the traditional boundary alignment between the two countries had been respected for many centuries by both sides. There was certainly no reason to believe, during the negotiations leading up to the Agreement of 1954, that the Government of China were contemplating laying extensive claims to well-known Indian territory.

4. All the official maps published in China till then had delineated the boundary alignment correctly. In 1893, the Chinese Minister Hung Ta-chen gave officially to the British Representative a map showing the traditional Sino-Indian alignment. The map issued by the Postal Department of China in 1917, republished in later years and used in China for official purposes right up to recent times, correctly showed the traditional alignment throughout its length. The People's Government of China, on coming to power, also respected this traditional alignment. In August 1950, the Government of China expressed their anxiety to stabilize the boundary between the two countries, and, in reply, the Government of India reiterated that the "recognised boundary between India and China should remain inviolate". This exchange constituted a fresh formal reaffirmation of the traditional delimited alignment. Again, on 27 September 1951, Premier Chou En-lai informed the Ambassador of India that there was no territorial dispute or any controversy between India and China in respect of Tibet.
5. It is true that the 1954 Agreement did not touch on the boundary question. This was precisely because there was at that time no boundary dispute question between India and Tibet region of China. This boundary dispute was created subsequently by unilateral and aggressive Chinese activities in subsequent years. The Agreement did, however, settle all the questions outstanding between the two countries. The Government of India made this clear at every stage of the negotiations. The evidence for this has been brought forward in such detail in the note dated 12th February 1960 of the Government of India to the Chinese Government and in the note given by the Indian side during the talks of the officials on 26 August 1960, that the Government of India do not deem it necessary to deal with it again.

6. The Chinese Government's present contention that it was only in 1958 that the Government of India called the attention of the Chinese Government to the erroneous boundary alignment claimed by the latter and cited a map published in 1956 in a distortion of facts. Ever since July 1954 when, for the first time, the Government of China laid claim to a part of Indian territory, in Barahoti in Uttar Pradesh, the Government of India have been repeatedly drawing the attention of the Chinese authorities to the traditional boundary alignment. When, the same year, official maps published in the People's Republic of China, showing an incorrect alignment, came to the notice of the Government of India, the Prime Minister, of India in October 1954, on his own initiative drew the attention of His Excellency Premier Chou En-lai. His Excellency Premier Chou En-lai then replied that current Chinese maps were based on old maps and that the Government of the People's Republic of China had no time to correct them. In 1956-57 the Prime Minister of India again raised the question of incorrect Chinese maps in personal discussions with Premier Chou En-lai. The Indian map, published in 1956, was only the latest of the series, stretching over a hundred years, showing the traditional Indian alignment. It is strange that the Government of China should seek to display ignorance of this large number of editions of official maps published by the Survey of India on different scales and in general circulation for so many years. Indeed, some of these maps had been officially handed over to the authorities in Tibet at various times.

7. The assertion in the Chinese note that Aksai Chin area of Ladakh has ever been a part of China and that in 1950 Chinese troops moved across it is also factually incorrect. The facts, of course, are that this area has always been a part of Ladakh and Kashmir and both, in law and in fact, as the Report of the officials conclusively proves, India's sovereignty extends and has extended for centuries over this area. There is no evidence to show that Chinese troops had used this area in 1950, and the Government of China have not been able to bring forward any evidence to substantiate this. Indeed, far from any part of this area having even been under the administration of China, in 1875 China lost control of Sinkiang itself; and even after re-establishing her authority in that region in 1878 she could not extend it to the southern limits. Even as late as 1889, Chinese administration had not reached the Kuen Lun mountains. On the other hand, Indian patrols had been traversing this area throughout these years. To give
only recent examples, in 1951 an expedition went from Leh to Lingzi Tang and Aksai Chin; in 1952, 1954 and 1956 reconnaissance parties went unto Lanak La via Hot Springs and the Kongka Pass; in 1957 a patrol reached the Qara Tagh Pass; and in 1958 patrols went up to the Sarigh Jilganang and the Amtogor Lake regions, to Haji Langar and to the Qara Tagh Pass. But it was only in 1958 that they came across Chinese personnel in this area.

8. What, in fact, happened was that, taking advantage of India's friendship and the desolate nature of the region, the Chinese Government, since 1957, secretly occupied Indian territory and surreptitiously cleared a road across it. This grave betrayal of trust and surreptitious aggression cannot be regarded as evidence in favour of Chinese jurisdiction. Had the Government of China genuinely believed that they had a lawful claim to this area, they should have brought it to the notice of the Government of India and not violently and unilaterally changed the status quo in the area and created tension in the border areas. The Chinese action in this case is in violation not only of the accepted canons of international behaviour but also of the principle of mutual non-aggression cited in the Preamble to the Agreement of 1954.

9. As regards activity in the border areas since 1960, the previous notes of the Government of India have made clear that it is the Government of China who have advanced incessantly into Indian territory and set up at least six more military posts. The Government of India, on the other hand, while protesting against these aggressive activities and taking legitimate steps to defend their territory, have not sought to repel Chinese advances by force but have patiently sought to secure a voluntary withdrawal of Chinese forces from Indian territory.

10. It has been stated in the Chinese note that there has been a dark side to Sino-Indian relations since the very beginning. If this be so, it could only have been because the Government of China secretly nurtured undisclosed and unwarranted claims to indisputable Indian territory. The Government of India for their part have always been inspired with a deep feeling of friendship for the Government and the people of China. To this end, as the world knows, they not only gave up their extra-territorial rights and privileges in Tibet but sought constantly to secure for the People's Government of China their legitimate position in world affairs. They urged the Government of China to adopt a peaceful approach in Tibet in 1950, because they were anxious that the position of People's China in the world should not be damaged by hasty recourse to military force. As the Government of India stated in their note of 21 October 1950, "one of the principal conditions for the restoration of a peaceful atmosphere is the recognition of the position of the People's Republic of China and its association with the work of the United Nations. They feel that an incautious move at present, even in a matter which is within its own sphere, will be used by those who are unfriendly to China to prejudice China's case in the United Nations and generally before neutral opinion". The Government of China explicitly acknowledged at that time the legitimate interest of India in Tibet and the laudable motives which had inspired her friendly and disinterested advice to the Government of China on the subject.
11. The Chinese note has again referred to the two places of Puling Sumdo and Pulamsumda. It would appear that the Government of China are determined deliberately to confuse the issue by refusing to recognise that Puling Sumdo and Pulamsumda are two different places. Puling Sumdo, or Poling, lies on the northern side of the Sutlej-Ganges watershed and was mentioned in the Agreement of 1954 as one of the trade marts in Tibet. During the negotiations of 1954, it became necessary for the Indian side to inform the Government of China of the exact location of one of their own places in Tibet, and the Indian delegation, therefore communicated in writing to the Chinese delegation that the co-ordinates of Puling Sumdo were 31° 19' N and 79° 27' E. Pulamsumda, however, is a camping-ground in India. It lies on the southern side of the Sutlej-Ganges watershed and is situated at a distance of over 25 miles from Puling Sumdo. The co-ordinates of Pulamsumda are 31° 18' N and 79° 8' E. So Puling Sumdo and Pulamsumda have different names, are at a considerable distance from each other and have nothing in common. But the Government of China willfully and arbitrarily insist on confusing these two places.

12. The Government of China have further attempted to confuse the issue by alleging that Tibetan refugees have been allowed to carry out disruptive activities in India. The Government of India emphatically repudiate this allegation. The Dalai Lama and other refugees, who came to India after revolt in Tibet in 1959, have been given political asylum on the clear understanding that they should not indulge in any political activities. Under the Constitution and laws of India, which provide civil liberties which obviously the Government of China do not understand, meetings and demonstrations are permissible as long as they do not constitute a threat to law and order: and no action can be taken to prevent them. The Government of India, however, have used their influence to persuade all Tibetan refugees who have come to India to desist from activities against the Government of China.

13. The Government of China have seen fit to repeat the wild charges regarding the rebellion in Tibet in 1959 first made by their Ambassador in a discourteously worded statement on 16 May 1959, which the Government of India had then decided to ignore. The Prime Minister of India gave a correct narration of the facts and the developments in Tibet in Parliament on 27 April 1959, and the Government of India stand by this position. Government of India have recognised Tibet as a region of China. But in recent history the autonomous status of Tibet has always been accepted. The People's Government of China themselves recognise this special status of Tibet. It is incomprehensive to the Government of India how this recognition by the Government of China of the autonomous status of Tibet and an internal revolt in that region can be interpreted to mean that the Government of India are not reconciled to the exercise of sovereign power by China in Tibet. Government of India's position in this matter has, unlike the Chinese position regarding the India-China boundary, all along been clear and consistent with no mental reservations of any kind whatever.
14. The suggestion made in the Chinese note that after the rebellion in Tibet in 1959, the Government of India made comprehensive territorial claims and exerted pressure on China is not only false but palpably absurd. The factual position in this matter is given in paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 above. It was, in fact, the Government of China who, in September 1959, for the first time put forward claims to over 50,000 square miles of Indian territory. There have also, in recent years, been ceaseless incursions into Indian territory, unlawful occupation of a large part of India and, on occasions, even the shedding of Indian blood. To suggest that the incidents at Longju in the Eastern Sector and in the Kongka Pass in the Western Sector which were the results of Chinese cold-blooded aggressiveness, were the results of attacks by Indian troops is not merely a travesty of well-established facts but an unabashed perversion of them.

15. Again, it is the Government of China who virtually nullified the operative clauses of the Agreement of 1954. They obstructed the proper functioning of the Indian Trade Agencies in Gyantse, Yatung and Gartok and impeded the construction of Trade Agency buildings. Indian traders and pilgrims, as has been made clear in the notes of the Government of India of 15 July, 10 November and 16 November 1961, have also been subjected to harassment in various ways. The Government of India, however, have refused to adopt retaliatory measures. No special restrictions were placed on the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong.

16. When, in sharp contrast to their avowed desire to renew the Agreement of 1954, the Government of China decided to withdraw their Trade Agencies in Kalimpong and Calcutta, the Government of India provided them with requisite facilities for the purpose. But the Government of China denied diplomatic communication facilities to the Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet and held out veiled threats when reasonable time for withdrawal was sought. This does not show any genuine desire to maintain normal trade and intercourse between the two countries.

17. The Government and the people of India have always sought peace and friendship with the Government and people of China. Even in face of a sustained policy of dissimulation and encroachment into their territory culminating in the occupation of a large area of Indian territory, they have not renounced the methods of peace. In the same spirit, they once again call upon the Government of China to reverse their policy of aggression and respect the boundary between the two countries which has the sanction of law and of history. Only then can the climate of friendship and goodwill be restored, negotiations for a fresh treaty on trade and intercourse undertaken and peace in Asia strengthened.

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and have the honour to refer to Note No. 525, dated the 2nd June 1962 from the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 was intended in the main to preserve and protect the traditional character of the centuries old Indo-Tibetan trade and intercourse. That much is obviously undeniable as it is clearly borne out by the terms of the Agreement. It may be pointed out that even Premier Chou En-lai had recognised the special relations that historically developed between India and the Tibet region and expressed his anxiety to safeguard Indian interests in Tibet.

However, the record of the operation of the 1954 Agreement shows that the Chinese Government have not only violated the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence embodied in the preamble to the Agreement but have systematically and arbitrarily contravened each and every provision of the Agreement itself.

The Chinese Note under reference has deliberately attempted to ignore the facts and numerous specific instances of the violation of the 1954 Agreement cited in the Government of India’s Note dated the 16th November 1961. The serious problems faced by Indian traders, pilgrims, border inhabitants and the Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet had been, since 1958, repeatedly brought to the notice of the Chinese Government, but not only had nothing been done to redress their legitimate grievances but further arbitrary measures were adopted to strangle the traditional trade and intercourse between India and Tibet and to undermine the foundations of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954. It is obvious, in retrospect, that the Chinese Government had from the beginning no intention of abiding by the terms of the 1954 Agreement but had used the Agreement as a temporary expedient for tiding over the immediate problems facing them in Tibet. The Government of India, on the other hand, made important sacrifices and gave up considerable rights and interests which they had acquired in Tibet from the past in the hope that relations between India and China would thereafter be based on the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and develop in co-operation and harmony to the mutual benefit of the two countries and, thus, strengthen peace and stability in this region of Asia. These hopes have foundered.

It is significant that at the negotiations which preceded the 1954 Agreement, the Government of India had proposed a long term agreement of at least 20 years but the Government of China wanted only a short term agreement and finally agreed, with considerable reluctance, to a 8-year agreement.
Thus, the two sides entered into relations under the 1954 Agreement, with widely dissimilar motives. The Government of China, as and when expedient, took control of the trade, imposed new taxes and arbitrary levies, made monetary manipulations which spelt disaster for Indian traders, obstructed the recovery of debts and trade dues, denied remittance facilities and repatriation of Indian trade assets from Tibet. Barriers were put up against direct barter of goods between petty traders of the two sides and restrictions placed on the export of conventional Tibetan merchandise to India. Traders and pilgrims from India were frequently harassed and their movements severely circumscribed. Indian traders were denied the right to contact their traditional partners in Tibet. They were offered no storage facilities, nor always allowed to return with their unsold goods to India.

Not being able to deny the imposition of these and other measures, in contravention of the spirit and letter of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954, which crippled the traditional trade and intercourse between India and Tibet the Government of China have conveniently taken cover under the plea of “internal sovereign jurisdiction.”

It is absurd to suggest that the Government of India had not at any time respected “China's sovereignty over Tibet”. Nor is it a fact that the Government of India ever interfered in the “internal affairs of China”. What is more, these unwarranted allegations are extraneous to the problem of the non-fulfilment and violation of the obligations solemnly undertaken by the Government of China under the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954. Sovereign States, of their own accord, undertake certain obligations in an international engagement and bind themselves to carry them out. If such solemn engagements are allowed to be violated and abused by a contracting State “in the exercise of its sovereign internal jurisdiction”, there would surely be international chaos.

The Sino-Indian Trade Agreement of the 14th October 1954 is not relevant to “trade and intercourse between India and the Tibet region of China”, (the latter being regulated by the provisions of the Sino-Indian Agreement signed on 29th April 1954) except in so far as it provides under Article VII(4) that “payments for Border Trade between the Republic of India and the People's Republic of China, however will be settled according to the customary practice”. Article II of the Sino-Indian Trade Agreement cited in the Chinese note is entirely irrelevant to the conduct of the customary and petty trade between India and the Tibet region of China. The latter is regulated by the “Agreement on Trade and Intercourse” of 1954, and provides for the conduct of normal trade in accordance with “local regulations” at the place mentioned in Article II thereof. This bears obvious reference to local Tibetan regulations which had traditionally existed in these places and which had always been observed by Indian customary and petty traders. The Chinese authorities, however, arbitrarily changed these local regulations more particularly since 1959, and destroyed the traditional pattern of trade which the 1954 "Trade and Intercourse Agreement" sought to preserve and protect. As pointed out in the Government of India's note dated the 16th November 1961, there had been a bumper crop
of new laws and regulations, between 1959 and 1960 in Tibet, and these varied in application from one trade centre to another. The Chinese authorities refused to publish them or inform the Indian Trade Agents about them. Yet they expected 'strict observance' of these regulations from 'petty border traders' and others. There is no doubt that Indo-Tibetan trade sharply declined after 1959 as a direct consequence of the harsh application of new and arbitrary regulations imposed by the Chinese authorities.

It is, therefore, incongruous for the Chinese note to argue that the decline of the Indo-Tibetan trade followed certain partial controls exercised by the Government of India over the trade. Such limited controls as were introduced by the Government of India related to the export of certain "non-traditional" goods to Tibet, e.g., diesel oil, petroleum products, motor parts, etc. which did not form part of India's traditional commerce with Tibet. Besides, at a time when India herself was in short supply, there was a sudden increase in the import of these goods into Tibet for an obviously aggressive purpose.

It has been claimed in the Chinese note that Indian traders have "recovered many credits from their Tibetan debtors". This is not borne out by facts. Vast sums of money are still owing to Indian traders in the form of trade debts or capital assets. These have to be realised and repatriated to India. Full particulars of these assets will be furnished to the Chinese Government to enable them to meet these claims. As regards Messrs. Tibet Motor & Cycle Company, some exchange was provided to the firm, but only after the Government of India had protested in their note dated the 16th November, 1961.

The Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 has now run its course. During its currency it was systematically whittled down with the result that the centuries old trade and cultural ties between India and Tibet have been disrupted.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 23 July 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated 7th June, 1962.

Although the matters raised in the Chinese note are no longer live issues because of the expiry of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954, the facts are being re-stated below so that the Government of China may be fully aware of the ways in which their authorities constantly and deliberately obstructed the implementation of the provisions of the 1954 Agreement.

1. Concerning the lease of land and construction of buildings by the Indian Trade Agency, Gartok.

The facts refuting the baseless claims contained in the Chinese note have already been furnished in the Indian Government's notes dated 26th August and 10th November, 1961. The Chinese note refers to the practice that obtained in the past when the Indian Trade Agent used to bring his own tents for camping at Gartok. What is relevant here, surely, is not the pre-1954 practice but the understanding reached in the notes exchanged between the Representatives of the two Governments at Peking on 29th April, 1954, and appended to the main 1954 Agreement. Item (4) had provided that "The Government of China will render every possible assistance for housing the Indian Trade Agency at Gartok." Item (12) gave the further assurance that "The three Trade Agencies of each Party may function throughout the year". That the Indian Trade Agency at Gartok should have been, even eight years later, without any permanent accommodation is sufficient evidence of the obstructive and unco-operative attitude of the Chinese authorities.

2. Concerning the land to be leased and the construction of buildings by the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse.

The notes exchanged between the two Governments clearly stipulate at Item (4) that "All buildings within the compound walls of the Trade Agencies of the Government of India at Yatung and Gyantse in Tibet Region of China may be retained by the Government of India. The Government of India may continue to lease the land within its Agency compound walls from the Chinese side."

The lease relating to the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse was valid up to 1971. Yet, shortly after the Agency buildings at Gyantse had been washed away by floods in 1954, the Chinese Government insisted on the signing of a new lease deed. After agreeing in principle in May 1956, that construction may commence pending execution of the lease deed, the Chinese authorities continuously altered the location as well as the area of the site, thereby effectively preventing any progress in the work. The systematic way in which impediments were placed by the Chinese side has been dealt with in the Indian Government's notes dated 26th October, 1959, 19th February, 1960, and 10th November, 1961.
Despite patient efforts and a keen desire to accommodate the Chinese fully, the Indian Trade Agent found it impossible till the end of 1961 to sign the lease, let alone begin construction. Thereafter too no cooperation was extended by the Chinese. Their attitude in the matter seems to be clear from the remark fortuitously made in the Chinese note under reference that “the buildings rented by the Indian Trade Agency were sufficient for their needs….”

3. Concerning functioning of the Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet, China.

Chinese authorities, from the beginning appeared to have no interest in implementing the provisions of the 1954 Agreement. The Trade Agencies in Gartok and Gyantse had no proper accommodation provided to them while the Trade Agency in Yatung was quite frequently denied permission to carry out necessary repairs or alterations to their buildings. The personnel of the Trade Agencies were restricted in their movements and were prevented from having contacts with local inhabitants. Transport facilities were restricted and courier facilities interfered with. Firing practice had been sometimes carried out in the vicinity of the Trade Agency at Gyantse presumably in an effort to intimidate the staff. Medical facilities had been denied in at least one instance to members of one of the Trade Agencies.

As regards the wireless communications set at Yatung, it is surprising that the Chinese note should term it ‘illegal’. The notes exchanged between the two Governments in connection with the 1954 Agreement explicitly provided vide Item (4) that the properties “within the compound walls of the Trade Agencies of the Government of India at Yatung and Gyantse in Tibet Region of China may be retained by the Government of India.”

Under Article (1), (2) and (3) of the Agreement the Government of India had voluntarily agreed to relinquish certain extra-territorial privileges as well as some properties in Tibet. Military escorts at Yatung and Gyantse were accordingly withdrawn and the Postal, Telegraph and Public Telephone Service, hitherto operated by the Government of India, together with their equipment were handed over at a reasonable price to the Government of China, in addition to 12 Rest Houses which the Government of India had been maintaining in Tibet. The official wireless communications set at the Indian Trade Agency, Yatung, however, had been covered under the terms of Item (4). The Chinese Government had been fully cognisant of the existence of this set which had been with the Agency for a long time. There was nothing unusual about it and the Chinese Government had never objected to it.

The other allegations in the Chinese note regarding the school and hospital attached to the Trade Agency at Yatung are merely repetitions of previous allegations that have been fully answered by the Indian Government in para 4 of their note dated 26th October, 1959. As regards the final allegation that the Indian Trade Agent at Yatung showed to local inhabitants pictures of the “rebel clique’s flight into India”, this is nothing short of distortion of facts. Film shows held in the premises of the Trade Agencies are purely private ones. It is erroneous to suggest that there has been any violation of accepted conventions in this connection.
In sharp contrast to the exemplary behaviour of the Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet, the activities of the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong have been a record of interference in the internal affairs of India and of repeated violations of local regulations. Kalimpong is on the border and special security measures are necessary for border areas. Even there, the restrictions placed on the movements of personnel of the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong were the absolute minimum required and considerably less than those placed on the personnel of Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet. Far from the Chinese Trade Agency being 'surrounded' by 'armed men maintaining a constant watch', the Chinese Trade Agency personnel in Kalimpong have been guilty of various illegal actions including the discharging of air-rires indiscriminately from the Trade Agency premises, in the course of which an innocent passer-by was wounded. The Indian Government's protest dated 21st May, 1962 in this connection has not so far been answered. The Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong had also been responsible for arbitrarily seizing the premises of the Chung Hwa school in total disregard of local regulations and due process of law. This matter is now before the Court.

4. Conclusion:

From the above detailed facts it will be seen there is no basis for the charges of the Chinese Government. Their claim that they have adhered to the 1954 Agreement cannot be sustained on the basis of the experience of the Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet, nor by the systematic aggression that has been mounted by China on the Sino-Indian frontier. By their actions, the Chinese Government have amply shown their complete disregard both of the letter and the spirit of the Agreement as well as for the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence enunciated in the preamble to the Agreement.

The Ministry of External Affairs renews to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
In the course of discussions on the withdrawal of Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet, the Chinese Embassy was informed of the Government of India's intention to retain their property and buildings in Yatung under the charge of the Indian Consul-General at Lhasa. In this Ministry's Aide Memoire, dated the 1st June 1962 it was further stated that the Indian Consul-General at Lhasa would maintain a small staff for the upkeep of the property and buildings which would be used as a resting place for Indian officials and diplomatic couriers proceeding to and returning from Lhasa.

2. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese People's Republic informed the Indian Embassy in Peking on the 2nd June 1962 that they were agreeable to the retention of the buildings of the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung by the Government of India under the charge of their Consul-General in Lhasa. The request that Indian staff might remain in Yatung to look after the property was, however, not acceded to. The Indian Trade Agent at Yatung accordingly appointed Tibetan staff consisting of 5 persons to maintain the buildings left behind by him.

3. The Government of India are extremely surprised that, despite the understanding reached earlier, the Chinese authorities have persistently refused to permit Indian officials and couriers to make use of the former Agency building in Yatung as a resting place on their way to or from Lhasa. It has been further reported that some members of the staff deputed to look after the buildings have since been asked to leave the Agency by the local authorities.

4. The buildings of the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung have belonged to the Government of India for several years and continue to be their property, to be used by them in accordance with their local requirements. The Government of India regret the arbitrary action taken by the Chinese local authorities and wish to emphasise that the fact of legal ownership which is undisputed carries with it the legal right to utilise the building as and when required.

5. The Government of India emphatically protest against the action of the local Chinese authorities in removing forcibly the staff employed to maintain the buildings. The Government of India would request the Chinese Embassy to move the Government of China to take immediate steps to ensure that the legitimate rights of Indian officials to maintain and use their property in Yatung are restored with immediate effect.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 November 1961

With regard to the case in which the No. 8/61 issue of the India News published by the Indian Embassy in China carried a resolution slandering China adopted by the All-India Congress Committee, an Indian political party, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has learnt of the verbal note handed over in person on July 5, 1961 by Mr. S. Sinha, Director of the China Division of the Indian Ministry for External Affairs, to Mr. Fu Hao, Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy in India. It must be pointed out that the attempt made in that Indian verbal note to justify the appearance of the said material in the bulletin of the Indian Embassy in China is futile. The resolution of the Indian National Congress, which slanderously charged China with “maintaining her violations” of Indian territory, constitutes an obvious, malicious attack on the Chinese Government. Whatever explanation the verbal note may give, the publishing of such material in the bulletin of the Indian Embassy in China can only be regarded as improper. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has no intention of making any comment on the account given in the verbal note of the relations between the Indian National Congress and the existing Indian regime. Party politics of a country is purely the internal affairs of that country. Its diplomatic missions abroad, however, are diplomatic agencies representing only the government; they do not represent any political party, whether in power or not. Therefore, the fact that the Indian Embassy in China published a resolution of a political party slandering China can only be regarded as abuse of the hospitality and courtesy extended by the Chinese Government. In attempting to explain away the appearance of the above-mentioned resolution in the bulletin of the Indian Embassy in China, the verbal note asserts that the bulletin only reproduces speeches by the Prime Minister and other Ministers of the Indian Government and statements made by non-officials in India and press comments from Indian papers on China are never reproduced in the bulletin. Actually it has thus landed in a self-contradictory position and cannot make its argument hold water. In passing, it may be further pointed out that the Indian Embassy in China omitted the words “Indian National Congress” in publishing the above-mentioned resolution in Chinese edition of the said issue of the bulletin, and vaguely called it a “committee” resolution. This is evidently not due to accidental negligence. However, ambiguity in wording cannot make this material official in nature. While the Indian Government prohibits the Chinese Embassy in India to publish in its bulletin unofficial materials critical of the Indian Government, the Indian Embassy in China has published an unofficial resolution slandering China and the verbal note tries hard to defend this action; this is most unseemly.

As for the distribution condition of the bulletin of the Indian Embassy in China as referred to in the verbal note, it must be pointed out that no complaint should be made against China. The Chinese Government has always rendered facilities for the normal propaganda activities of the foreign embassies in China and never...
interfered with them. It has never placed any restrictions on the distribution list of the bulletin of the Indian Embassy in China. Moreover, the verbal note made groundless malicious attacks on the Chinese Embassy in India and China's news agency, and attempted to interfere with the freedom of the press in China. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs categorically rejects these charges and expresses its deep regret at the unreasonable attitude of the Indian Government.
Reference Note Verbale handed over to the Press Attache of the Indian Embassy in Peking on November 2, 1961, by the Information Department of the Chinese Foreign Ministry, regarding the publication in “India News” of the AICC Resolution on National integrity.

2. The above note of the Chinese Government by resort to a system of logic unknown in international intercourse has bypassed the facts of the case regarding the publication of the AICC Resolution on National Integrity in “India News” of 1st June, 1961.

3. The facts will, therefore, bear reiteration. The AICC Resolution on National Integrity was released by Hsin Hua News Agency on May 31, 1961, in a form which had no resemblance to the original. This garbled and disfigured version was featured in the “People’s Daily” and other Chinese papers of June 1, 1961, under the banner headline “NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS PARTY TURNS BLACK INTO WHITE”. Thus, this so-called slanderous attack on China was given wide publicity in the Chinese press although after it had been duly subjected to the most grievous distortion which from the over-exercised logic of the Chinese Government would seem to be the sole prerogative of the Chinese press. In view of this indecent misrepresentation, the Indian Embassy issued without any comment on the last page of its bulletin of 1st June, 1961, the unadulterated version of the resolution. It is part of the functions of the Embassy to protect its national interests from such misrepresentation without resort to unfair means. This is precisely what the Indian Embassy did, but in so doing it exposed itself to the charge of “abusing the hospitality and courtesy” of the Chinese Government. The latter, apart from being an unfair charge, is a meaningless exercise in semantics. Instances of discourtesy and unhostlike deportment in respect of the Embassy and its personnel have already been brought to the notice of the Chinese Government. It would be purposeless to repeat them inasmuch as they are well-known.

4. As to the charge that the Indian Embassy omitted the words “Indian National Congress” in publishing the resolution in the Chinese edition of its bulletin, this, if true, is ascribable to the lack of competent Chinese translators in the Embassy.

5. The Chinese note significantly does not deny the very limited circulation of “India News” although the Chinese Government absolves itself of all responsibility for this. It establishes, the fact that circumstances in China are inimical to the circulation of “India News”. “India News”, as the present exchange of notes will show, cannot even put out facts as a corrective to malicious anti-Indian propaganda without attracting the wrath of the Chinese Government.
6. As to the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi, its propaganda activities have shown over a long period that it resorts to criticism of the Government of India and its policies amounting to interference in the internal affairs of India.
The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China has received a memorandum dated October 7, 1961 from the Ministry of External Affairs of India in reply to the protest lodged by the Embassy against the various unwarranted restrictions imposed by the Government of India on the personnel of the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong. The Embassy has to say with regret that the reply given by the Ministry is unsatisfactory and that the reasons stated in its memorandum are obviously untenable.

The Embassy has on many occasions made representations regarding the unwarranted restriction imposed by the local authorities of India on the normal activities of the personnel of the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong. The Ministry of External Affairs, however, asserted that “this is purely a question of conforming to the laws and regulations of the local Government”. Such assertion is extraordinary and is a forced argument which is aimed at covering up its unwarranted restrictions on an official organ from a foreign country. It must be pointed out that there does not exist at all any question of the personnel of the Trade Agency not conforming to the laws and regulations, while these regulations only serve to discriminate against and deliberately restrict the personnel of the Trade Agency, thus making it impossible for the Agency to carry out its normal functions, and in this connection the Embassy naturally has the right to express its views. It is utterly unjustifiable that the Ministry should repeat, in its memorandum, the allegation that a particular official of the Chinese Government deliberately directed an Indian driver to act against the law and public security, to which the Embassy has long ago given a clear and definite reply.

The Ministry should be aware that all the Indian official organs in China have all along enjoyed the same treatment as all the other foreign official organs in China, and have never been subjected to any discrimination. His Excellency Indian Prime Minister Nehru also admitted this in answering questions in the Lok Sabha on November 20, this year. He said, “I do not know that any special restriction applies to us”. It is stipulated in the 1954 Agreement between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India on Trade and Intercourse between the Tibet Region of China and India that the Trade Agencies of both Parties shall be accorded the same status and same treatment. It is in violation of the spirit of the Agreement for the Government of India to impose various unwarranted restrictions on the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong.

The Embassy demands that the Government of India remove the various unwarranted restrictions against the personnel of the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong and accord due and normal treatment to the Chinese official organs in India.
Note given by the Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs
Kalimpong, to the Trade Agency of China at Kalimpong,

The Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India at Kalimpong presents his compliments to the Trade Agency of the People's Republic of China at Kalimpong and has the honour to state with regret that the staff of the Trade Agency are in the habit of shooting birds in their premises with Air Rifles having no regard to the safety of the police personnel on duty, stationed near the area. On several occasions in the past slugs fired from the Air Rifles by the staff of the Chinese Trade Agency have fallen upon the tents or upon the ground near Indian policemen on duty causing their apprehension or danger, inconvenience and annoyance. On the 22nd March, 1962 at about 09:30 hours the Chinese Trade Agency staff caused an accident when an Indian policeman Dilbahadur Rai, was hit at his right thigh by a pellet discharged from an Air Rifle from inside the Chinese Trade Agency, which accident occurred just outside Gate No. 1 (Main Gate). The policeman picked up the pellet and had to be treated in the hospital for minor injury. The Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India at Kalimpong cannot but has to take a serious view of this, albeit happened during the absence of Mr. Hsu Jen, Acting Trade Agent, in New Delhi, and accordingly urges upon the Trade Agency of the People's Republic of China at Kalimpong not to indulge in such indiscriminate shooting, having no regard to the safety of the Indian personnel on duty near the area. To shoot human beings with Air Rifles surreptitiously is not a praiseworthy act judged by any code and can only but create complications in our cordial friendly relations and the Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India at Kalimpong accordingly requests upon the Trade Agency of the People's Republic of China at Kalimpong to desist from such dangerous practice.

2. The Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India at Kalimpong takes this opportunity to renew to the Trade Agency of the People's Republic of China at Kalimpong the assurances of his highest consideration.
Note given by the Trade Agency of China at Kalimpong, to the Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs, Kalimpong, 2 May 1962

The Trade Agency of the People's Republic of China at Kalimpong presents its compliments to the Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, at Kalimpong, and with reference to the Agent's note No. 153C, dated, 30th March, 1962, has the honour to reply as follows:

With regard to the alleged accident of 22nd March, 1962, it has been found on enquiry that none of the staff of the Trade Agency used any air gun to shoot at any birds that day. It has to be pointed out with regret that the allegations such as "shoot human beings surreptitiously" made in the aforesaid note are baseless slanders.

The Trade Agency avails itself of this opportunity to express to the Agent the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note by the Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs, Kalimpong to the Trade Agency of China at Kalimpong, 15 May 1962.

The Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India at Kalimpong presents his compliments to the Trade Agency of the People's Republic of China at Kalimpong and with reference to the Trade Agency's note No. (62)5-051 dated the 2nd May 1962 has the honour to state as follows:

2. The incident of shooting by air rifle on the 22nd March, 1962 from inside the Trade Agency premises and injuring an Indian policeman Dil Bahadur Rai on duty, pointed out in note No. 153 C, dated 30-3-1962 of the Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India at Kalimpong, has simply been denied by the Trade Agency of the People's Republic of China at Kalimpong in their note on 2nd May after over a month. But the undisputable facts remain that the Indian Policeman on duty was injured, that the pellets came from the direction of the premises of the Chinese Trade Agency and that on previous occasion also, pellets discharged from the air rifles fired from the Chinese Trade Agency premises fell upon the tents or upon the ground near Indian policemen on duty. The Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India at Kalimpong feels, therefore, bound for the cogent reasons stated above, to treat the plea of denial of knowledge and responsibility by the Chinese Trade Agency as entirely unsatisfactory and untenable. The Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India at Kalimpong also takes this opportunity to warn that if there be any further shooting from the Trade Agency premises to the direction of the Police quarters, the entire responsibility will devolve upon the Trade Agent and he will be held personally responsible.

3. The Agent of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India at Kalimpong takes this opportunity to renew to the Trade Agency of the People's Republic of China at Kalimpong the assurances of his highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 May 1962


Answers to the Embassy's arguments will be found in the Ministry of External Affairs' note dated 7th October 1961. It is a matter of regret that the Embassy has again referred to in disrespectful terms to the laws and regulations of India using objectionable expressions. If the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong show proper regard for the laws and regulations of India there would be no impediment to its normal functioning although it cannot function, as it has been doing, in an abnormal way. In addition to the numerous earlier violations of local laws and regulations, members of the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong have sometime been found discharging air rifles from the Trade Agency premises with intent to cause injury, in the direction of the police lines located below the Agency. On the 22nd March 1962 about 09:30 hours a slug from an air rifle discharged from the Trade Agency premises hit an Indian police man, Dil Bahadur Rai, injuring him on the right thigh for which he had to be treated in hospital. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Kalimpong, protested about this to the Chinese Trade Agent vide note No. 153-C dated 30th March 1962. Instead of expressing regret and promptly stopping this dangerous and unlawful activity, the Chinese Agent in his reply of May 2, 1962, merely denied that any of his staff had used an air gun to "shoot at birds on that day". The Trade Agent is making a habit of these facile denials which do not absolve him of his personal responsibility for these wilful infringements of the law.

The Embassy's Memorandum has sought to make a comparison between the restrictions placed on Indian Missions in China, and more particularly in the Tibet Region of China, and those in force at Kalimpong. Whereas Indian Mission in China, and more particularly in the Tibet Region have for a long time been placed under numerous restrictive orders which have severely curtailed their movements and contacts, the regulations in the Indian frontier district of Kalimpong are of recent origin and have instituted on grounds of national security. It is absurd for the Chinese Embassy to refer to the Indian regulations in question as 'unwarranted restrictions' and even compare these regulations with those obtaining the People's Republic of China where is very little freedom for Indian Missions. If the restrictive orders in force in China were to be introduced in India, the Chinese Embassy would be in relatively better position to appreciate the freedom they are not enjoying in this country. The Embassy has observed that 'Indian Missions in China have all along enjoyed the same treatment as all other foreign official organs in China' which is a questionable statement and has no relation to facts. On the contrary, there is open discrimination against the Indian Missions, more particularly in the Tibet Region of China.
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The Government of India are glad that the Embassy has invoked the provision under Article 1(2) of the Agreement between India and China on Trade and Intercourse between India and the Tibet Region of China which reads as follows:—

"The Trade Agencies of both Parties shall be accorded the same status and same treatment".

The meaning of this provision is that Chinese Trade Agencies in India should be given the same treatment as is accorded to Indian Trade Agencies in the Tibet Region. There is still an appreciable lack of parity in treatment as between the Trade Agencies in the two countries and the Chinese Trade Agencies in India continue to enjoy more privileges and greater freedom than their opposite numbers in the Tibet Region. If the Embassy has any concern for the provision made in the Agreement of 1954 which they have cited, they should ensure forthwith parity in treatment for the Indian Trade Agencies in the Tibet Region. There is some misapprehension in the Chinese Embassy's Memorandum that the regulations enforced in Kalimpong are meant only for the Chinese Trade Agency located there. But this is an entirely unwarranted presumption.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and have the honour to state that two Indian pilgrims, Shri Ram Prakash and Shri Narain Gir, holders of Pilgrims Certificate No. 27 and 28, dated June 29, 1961 and July 7, 1961, respectively, issued at Dharohula, entered Western Tibet through Lipulekh Pass in the first half of July 1961. They reached Taklakot on the main pilgrim route without any mishap. At Taklakot, they were put through a course of interrogation by the Chinese authorities about the presence of Indian civil and military dispositions along the route they had traversed. From Taklakot, they were misdirected by the Chinese to a place called Batherai. At a point where they had to cross the Tsangpo river, one of the pilgrims Shri Narain Gir lost his belongings. He was being carried away by the river and was saved by his companion Shri Ram Prakash. While they were still within proximity of Kailash and Manasarover, they were arrested by the Chinese and taken to Shigatse in an army truck under armed escort. At Shigatse, they were subjected to continuous interrogation about Indian army dispositions on the border. Their interrogators also suggested to them that they (the pilgrims) had gone to Tibet to collect intelligence. It was not until September 25, 1961, that they were brought to the border (near Nathula) and asked to cross into Indian territory. Thus, they were kept under illegal detention for a period of almost two months.

2. It is clear that the two innocent pilgrims holding valid pilgrim's permits and proceeding along the pilgrim route were deliberately imposed upon, arrested and taken away to various places where they were kept secretly under detention and made to undergo rigorous interrogation. Apart from the entirely unjustifiable harassment and detention which they were made to suffer, they were also prevented from completing their pilgrimage for which they had undertaken a long and arduous journey through difficult country.

3. The conduct and action of the Chinese authorities in Tibet in respect of these two pilgrims from India are in breach of the terms of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 on Trade and Intercourse between India and the Tibet Region of China.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Indian Trade Agency, Yatung, to the Tibetan Bureau of Foreign Affairs, 20 January 1962

The Indian Trade Agency, Yatung presents its compliments to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs, Yatung, Tibet Region of China and has the honour to bring to its notice the orders of the local authorities to fell trees for timber in the forest at the rear of the Agency area with a sense of impending danger which may result if this operation is carried through. It is also pointed out there that in pursuance of this order preliminary clearing of forests has started and local people unwittingly intruded into the Agency compound and started clearing branches of trees and small bushes on the hill side. With the indiscriminate deforestation of this forest there will be a constant danger from erosion of the hill side and falling of boulders thus causing damage to Government of India property and danger to the lives of the persons and cattle in the Agency premises.

In order therefore to stop further intrusion within Agency compound, this Agency brought this matter to the notice of Yatung Bureau of Foreign Affairs on 4th December, 1961 verbally. Although this operation appear to have been stopped temporarily, the Bureau of Foreign Affairs will appreciate the apprehension of Indian Agency and will please consider the matter in this aspect and stop further destruction of this forest or else responsibility of loss of property and life resulting on account of this deforestation will lie with the Government of the People’s Republic of China.

The Indian Trade Agency take this opportunity to renew to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs the assurance of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 March 1962

The Chinese Government has read the Indian Ministry of External Affairs' memorandum to the Chinese Embassy in India dated September 6, 1961. It has been established through investigation that the charges made by the Indian Government in the memorandum against the Chinese Government are inconsistent with the facts and are, therefore, unacceptable.

It is alleged in the memorandum that five Chinese workers were under "pressure" from the Chinese local authorities to stop working for the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse. This is entirely groundless. Of the five workers, the two seasonal gardeners and the two domestic helpers are up to now still working at the Indian Trade Agency. As for the watchman who stopped working for the Trade Agency in July 1961, he was hired by the Trade Agency on a temporary basis from the very beginning. What must be pointed out is that the Indian Trade Agency, in hiring these workers, did not in every case follow the local provisions governing the employment of local Chinese workers by foreign institutions in Tibet. Such provisions were brought to the notice of the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa by the Foreign Bureau in Tibet, China, far back in August, 1960.

Regarding the question of medical aid to Shri N. R. Sharma, a staff member of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse, the Indian charges are also groundless. It is alleged in the Indian memorandum that the Indian Trade Agency is not entitled to approach the local doctor directly. The fact, however, is that the Sub-office of the Foreign Bureau at Gyantse, China, had twice informed the Indian Trade Agency, in December 1960 and in February 1961, that the latter could directly approach the local hospital. In spite of this, when the Sub-office of the Foreign Bureau was requested by the Indian Trade Agency in the afternoon of July 28, 1961, to assist in obtaining medical aid for Shri Sharma, it immediately gave active assistance and informed the local hospital. Within twenty minutes after the notice of the Indian Trade Agency, two doctors arrived at the scene. The patient died before the doctors had time to diagnose the case. According to local hospital regulations, in the event that a patient dies before the case is diagnosed, the hospital cannot issue a certificate of diagnosis, and it is entirely unjustified for India to lodge a complaint in its memorandum against this. On August 3, when the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse asked on behalf of one of its officials for an exit and re-entry visa valid for three months, it merely stated that the personal belongings of the late Shri Sharma would be taken out of the country, without indicating in any way that his ashes would have to be rushed to India, etc. Nevertheless, the Sub-office of the Foreign Bureau speedily issued the visa. The local authorities in Tibet have offered every possible assistance with regard to the case of Shri Sharma, for which the Indian Trade Agent Mr. Pandit personally
expressed his thanks to the Sub-office of the Foreign Bureau on August 16.

It can thus be seen that the Chinese local authorities in Tibet have, in accordance with the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement, all along accorded necessary and possible assistance and facilities to the Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet.
Note given by the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Yatung, to the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung, 14 March 1962

The Yatung office of the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet presents its compliments to the Indian Trade Agency, Yatung and has the honour to reply to Agency's letter of the 19th January 1962 as follows:

The Yatung office of the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet notes with surprise the letter of the Indian Trade Agency, Yatung, dated the 19th January 1962. After investigation it shows that the assertion of the so-called "impending danger" to the Indian Trade Agency allegedly resulting from the "orders" of the Local Authorities to fell trees is utterly groundless. The local authorities has never issued any instructions regarding the felling of trees on the hill at the rear of the Agency area, to say nothing about causing any danger to the persons and property of the Agency. Moreover, the issue of such instruction or not is purely a matter for the consideration of the local authorities, which the Indian Trade Agency has no right to interfere in. Now, the Indian Trade Agency, proceeding from fictitious fact, has taken it up and used shocking terms in its letter. The Yatung office cannot but feel regret at this.

The Yatung office of the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet avails itself of the opportunity to renew to the Indian Trade Agency the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 March 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note delivered by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India on January 5, 1962, has the honour to state as follows:

With regard to the case of the two Indian pilgrims mentioned in the note, the facts are found after investigation to be as follows: On August 5, 1961, a motor convoy in the Tibet region of China met with two foreigners asking for help in the vicinity of Saka, over three hundred kilometres east of Mavam Tso. Owing to language difficulties, they got to Shigatse together with the convoy. According to their declaration, one was called Ram Prakash, the other Narain Gir, both were Indians and had arrived at that place, having gone astray on pilgrimage. They had lost their pilgrim's permits issued by the Chinese frontier checkpoint, and had gone without food for two days when they met the motor convoy. In the light of their account, the local authorities took friendly care of them and arranged conveyance for them so that they could easily return to India. Upon leaving China, they time and again expressed thanks for the friendly treatment they had received and put that down in writing. When they left China, the Tibet Bureau of Foreign Affairs notified the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa of this matter.

In the spirit of Sino-Indian friendship, the local authorities in Tibet, China, not only abstained from inquiring into the case of the above-mentioned two Indian pilgrims going far from Kang Rimpoche and Mavam Tso and deep into non-pilgrimage areas, but gave them help and facilities in respect of means of life and transport. The Indian Ministry of External Affairs, however, in its note gave a story inconsistent with the facts and made unwarranted charges against the Chinese local authorities. The Chinese Government expresses its deep regret at this.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 March 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the notes of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated July 15 and November 10, 1961 regarding Indian checkpoints harassment of Chinese border inhabitants and the question of Indian pilgrims coming to the Tibet region of China on pilgrimage, has the honour to state the following. With regard to the other questions referred to in the notes, reply will be given separately.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has noted with extreme regret the lack of seriousness of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs in its attitude on the question of unreasonable harassment of Chinese border inhabitants and traders by Indian checkpoints and outposts. This can only be regarded as forced argument for the violations of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement by the Indian check-posts and outposts.

The facts are entirely contrary to what has been said by the Indian side. Chinese border inhabitants and traders proceeding to India have been continuously subjected to harassment by the Indian side. According to incomplete statistics compiled by the local authorities in Tibet, China, in the case of Rudok County in the Ari District alone, within 1960 more than sixty persons, including Tsujen and Wangcha, were unwarrantedly detained by Indian check-posts and outposts, and quite a few of them were unlawfully interrogated and beaten. The detention generally lasted from ten to twenty days, with the longest lasting as long as five months. In addition to the cases raised by the Tibet Bureau of Foreign Affairs, China, with the Indian Consulate General in Lhasa in 1961, the following cases can be cited by way of example. (1) Tutengtawa, Losangkungpao and Chiangpasangteng of Rudok County set out on August 21, 1960 for trade in Ladak. When they arrived at Mordo, they were unwarrantedly detained by the Indian outpost and were not released and allowed to return until January 1961. (2) From July 15, 1960, Tsaijentochieh of Jechio, Rudok County, was detained for 48 days by armed Indian personnel at Dingroze. During the interrogation, the Indian personnel asked him for military information about China's Tibet region. When he answered that he did not know, he was brutally beaten up by the Indian personnel; altogether he was beaten three times. (3) Tsujen, Wangcha, Jenching and Parmajentseng of Rudok County, who went to India in October 1960 for trade, were detained for 16 days by the Indian side when they reached Chusul. Among them, Tsujen was confined solitarily in a room and was unwarrantedly slapped in the face four times. Indian checkpoints and outposts required certificates of Chinese border inhabitants proceeding to India, for whom, as provided in the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement, no passports, visas or permits are needed. On the other hand, they confiscated the certificates held by Chinese traders, porters and muleteam drivers, issued by the Chinese local authorities in accordance with the provisions of the Agreement. These unjustifiable-
acts of the Indian checkpoints and outposts constitute an open disre-
gard for and violation of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement. In its note
of July 15 the Indian Ministry of External Affairs attempted to prove
that Chinese border inhabitants and traders were not harassed and
detained by arguing that those Chinese border inhabitants and trad-
ers who had been harassed and unreasonably detained by the Indian
local authorities at Chusul had not lodged any complaint with those
authorities themselves. This is a most shabby argument and can
only show the lack of tenable reason on the part of the Indian Ministry
of External Affairs.

The local authorities in Tibet, China, have consistently rendered
protection and facilities to Indian pilgrims in accordance with the
1954 Sino-Indian Agreement. In 1959 and 1960, in view of the raids
by remnant rebels in certain parts of the Ari District, Tibet region,
and in regard for the safety of the life and property of the Indian
pilgrims, the Chinese local authorities suggested that for the time
being they should not come to Kang Rimpoché (Kailas) and Mamam
Tso (Manasarovar) on pilgrimage. This was clearly notified to the
Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa by the Tibet Bureau of Foreign
Affairs. When conditions had changed for the better in 1961, the
Tibet local authorities notified the Indian side that pilgrims might
now come. In order to safeguard the safety of the pilgrims, the Tibet
local authorities suggested that they would better travel by Lipu
Lekh Pass. The Indian side is clearly aware of the fact that Lipu
Lekh Pass is specified in the Sino-Indian Agreement as one of the
passes for pilgrims as well as of the above-mentioned situation, yet
it repeatedly falsely accused the suggestions of the Chinese local
authorities as being not in conformity with the Agreement. This
is what the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs definitely cannot
accept.

Furthermore, the local authorities in Tibet, China, have arranged
lodgings for pilgrims in more than ten places near the sacred spots
so far as the local facilities allow. These lodgings have been arranged
specially for pilgrims by the Chinese local authorities after the signing
of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement, and have always been taken care
of by appointed persons. The Indian Ministry of External Affairs' assertion in its note of November 10 to the effect that the lodgings
"have little to recommend" etc. is totally inconsistent with the facts.

The facts show indisputably that violations of the 1954 Sino-Indian
Agreement have come from the Indian side which has subjected
Chinese border inhabitants and traders proceeding to India for border
trade to all sorts of harassment and restrictions. No forced argument
and counter-charge of the Indian side can negate these facts. On the
other hand, the Chinese Government has always treasured the friend-
ship between the Chinese and Indian peoples and, in safeguarding this
friendship, has rendered all possible facilities to the Indian pilgrims.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in
China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 April 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the note of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China dated 20th March, 1962 have the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government have, in their note admitted the fact that the two Indian pilgrims Shri Ram Prakash and Shri Narain Gir, were first taken charge of by Chinese officials on 5th August 1961. It is also established that it was only on September 25, 1961, that the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Lhasa chose to telephone the Consulate-General of India to inform them of the fate of these two pilgrims. Even then no details were given except that the pilgrims had been returned to India by way of Nathula. No reasons were also given for the long delay in communicating the facts to the Indian authorities.

While it is true that the two pilgrims had been reasonably clothed and fed by the Chinese, freedom of movement had been denied to them and they had been physically prevented from contacting any of the Indian representatives at Lhasa, Gartok, Gyantse or Yatung. These actions of the Chinese authorities militate against fundamental principles of international law and constitute at the same time a violation of the letter as well as the spirit of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954.

This delay in communicating the facts taken together with the statements made by the pilgrims, following their return to India, that they had been virtually under arrest at Shigatse and had been subjected to constant interrogation by the Chinese authorities, contradict the version of the incident given in the Chinese Government's note under reply. The Government of India are surprised that, in the face of these facts, the Chinese Government continue to deny their responsibility in this matter and to allege that unwarranted charges are being made against them.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of the opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 May 1962

Reference Memorandum dated 28th February, 1962, from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese People's Republic to the Indian Embassy, Peking. The Chinese Memorandum contains certain inaccuracies which the Government of India are bound to point out.

It is an undeniable fact that the two seasonal gardeners stopped working for the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse on the 1st August, 1961. The Trade Agent had written to the Local Foreign Bureau intimating this on the 11th August, 1961. In response to a communication received from the Local Foreign Bureau on the 12th August, 1961, the addresses of these persons were forwarded to them by the Trade Agent on the 14th August, 1961. The gardeners resumed duty on the 18th September, 1961. The Chinese Memorandum significantly fails to mention this period of absence or to furnish reasons for the same.

Though it is a fact that the local employees working as domestic servants for officials of the Trade Agency continue to do so, there can be no doubt that they were under pressure not to continue in employment at the time this matter was represented to the Chinese Embassy. The case of a servant named Nyima who was asked to stop working for an official of the Indian Trade Agency was reported to the Local Foreign Bureau on the 3rd March, 1962. It was only after this action had been taken that Nyima returned to work.

The failure of the watchman to return to work cannot be ascribed either to his being a temporary employee or to the Trade Agency not having complied with regulations for the employment of local staff.

In the case of the late Shri N. R. Sharma, the position is that though the Indian Trade Agent had been advised by the Foreign Bureau that members of the Indian Mission could go to the hospital directly without fixing on appointment through the Local Foreign Bureau, the doctors had not been prepared to entertain patients without a letter of introduction from the Foreign Bureau. Moreover, the procedure in this regard had not been clearly specified. Prompt action might have helped to save Shri Sharma's life but in spite of the Foreign Bureau having been approached and informed of the urgency of the situation, the doctor came only after a delay of one whole hour. It is incorrect to state that the doctor arrived after 20 minutes. It is not correct also to state that the Indian Trade Agent thanked the Local Foreign Bureau for their assistance, since on the contrary he had every reason to be dissatisfied with their unhelpful attitude.

The Government of India regret that these cases of genuine difficulty experienced by their Missions in Tibet have not been thoroughly investigated, and that the Chinese Government have furnished no assurance of such co-operation and consideration as would be normally expected of them both under the terms of 1954 Agreement on Trade and Intercourse, and according to accepted international practice.
The Indian Trade Agency, Yatung, presents its compliments to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs, Yatung, Tibet Region of China and has the honour to acknowledge the latter's note dated 14th March 1962.

The Indian Trade Agency is reassured to note that the local authorities had never issued any instructions regarding the felling of trees in the forest at the rear of the Trade Agency. However, it was only because preliminary clearing of the forest had started and local people had intruded into the Agency compound for clearing branches of trees and bushes on the hill side that the matter had been brought to the attention of the Bureau of Foreign Affairs. The Trade Agency is aware that such felling of trees at the rear of the Agency area would be technically an internal matter for the consideration of the local authorities but at there was serious likelihood that such destruction of the forest could cause erosion of the hill side and thereby endanger the lives of the persons residing in the Trade Agency premises, that the matter had been brought to the notice of the appropriate authorities.

The Indian Trade Agency, Yatung, avails itself of the opportunity to renew to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs, the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the
Embassy of India in China, 28 May 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with
reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to
the Chinese Embassy in India, dated April 21, 1962, has the honour
to state as follows:

Regarding the two Indian pilgrims going deep into non-pilgrimage
areas more than three hundred kilometres from Kang Rimpoche and
Mavam Tso, China already clearly stated in its note of March 20,
1962, that the local authorities in Tibet, China in the spirit of Sino-
Indian friendship, did not press the matter with them and gave them
help and facilities in respect of means of life and transport. Upon
leaving China, they time and again expressed thanks for the friendly
treatment they had received and put that down in writing. And
when they left China, the Tibet Bureau of Foreign Affairs notified
the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa of this matter.

It must be pointed out that to deal with foreigners who have
illegally entered Chinese territory without any permits is a matter
entirely within China's sovereignty in which no foreign government
has any right whatsoever to interfere. Ignoring the fact that the
Chinese local authorities have friendly treatment to the two Indian
pilgrims who had gone deep into non-pilgrimage areas, the Indian
Government time and again made slanders against the Chinese side.
Such an attitude of repaying good with censures is indeed regrettable.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in
China the assurances of the highest consideration.
Reference the memorandum dated May 16, 1962, from the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India.

With regard to employment of local Chinese workers by official Indian missions in the Tibet region of China, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs already pointed out in its note of December 12, 1960, to the Indian Embassy in China that whether the local people working for the Indian missions would continue their service was entirely their own business and they all along enjoyed complete freedom in this regard. While admitting the fact that the four Chinese workers did continue to work for the Indian Trade Agency, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, in its memorandum, repeated the charge that the Chinese workers were allegedly under “pressure” from the Chinese local authorities to stop working for the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse, and complained that the Chinese Government had failed to furnish “reasons” for the period of absence of two of the Chinese workers. This charge and complaint become all the more unreasonable. When considering the fact that those Chinese workers were employed directly by the Indian Trade Agency which had not informed the office of the Foreign Bureau of the matter at all.

As regards medical treatment for the late Shri N. R. Sharma of the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs cited facts in its memorandum dated February 28, 1962, to show that the local authorities had done their best to render assistance. The allegation made in the memorandum of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs that the doctors arrived as late as one hour after being notified by the Indian Trade Agency is incorrect. Two doctors rushed to the scene within twenty minutes after being notified by the Indian Trade Agency at 6:50 P.M. that afternoon, but Shri Sharma died at 7:30 P.M. before the doctors had time to diagnose his case. The death of Shri Sharma is regrettable, but it is entirely unjustifiable to charge, on account of his death, the local authorities with not rendering assistance.

The Indian Government has repeatedly made unreasonable charges against China in disregard of the facts; the Chinese Government cannot but express its deep regret at this.
Shri Kalu Singh, an India-based member of the staff of the Indian Trade Agency, Gyantse, had joined the Consulate-General of India, Lhasa, on official transfer on May 17, 1962. As the Chinese Embassy will note, this transfer had taken place well before the termination of the Sino-Indian Agreement on trade and inter-course on June 2, 1962.

On the 17th June 1962, a full month after the transfer, the Foreign Bureau in Gyantse had informed the Indian Trade Agent that Shri Kalu Singh should leave Tibet within the same period as the withdrawal of the Indian Trade Agencies. This information has now been conveyed by the Foreign Bureau in Lhasa to the Indian Consulate-General also.

The attitude of the Chinese authorities in Tibet in this matter is not at all clear to the Government of India. The Government of India would, therefore, appreciate a clarification from the Government of China.
As the Embassy of the People's Republic of China are aware the Government of India decided to withdraw their Trade Agency at Gyantse on 10th June 1962 and their Trade Agency at Yatung on 15th June 1962, and had requested the Government of China to make available necessary facilities to effect the withdrawal in accordance with this schedule. The Government of India had also requested that their Trade Agencies at Gyantse and Yatung should continue to have privileged communication with the Government of India as well as courier facilities until the actual date of their withdrawal as this was necessary to facilitate administrative arrangements in connection with their withdrawal. However, the Government of China have denied these facilities to the Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet with effect from 3rd June 1962 and have made it almost impossible for the Trade Agencies to communicate with the Government of India.

Despite the lack of normal facilities the Indian Trade Agents had taken steps to leave Yatung and Gyantse on the scheduled dates. It is a matter of regret, however, that the local authorities in Yatung and Gyantse have not only held back the cooperation expected of them but have used unfair means to harass and delay the departure of the Indian Trade Agencies. Both at Gyantse and Yatung, the Chinese authorities; have raised a number of vexatious issues and have demanded that these be settled to their satisfaction before the departure of the Indian Trade Agencies from Tibet.

The Indian Trade Agent at Gyantse has been ordered by the local Foreign Bureau to settle the following issues before his withdrawal:

(i) He should pay 8928.02 Yuans as arrears of rent for the Agency buildings for the period prior to the signing of the lease-deed on the 28th November 1961 and 9276.00 Yuans as arrears of rent for the land of the Agency site. There is no reason why such issues should have been raised after the expiry of the 1954 Agreement and on the eve of the departure of the Indian Trade Agent. Nor have the Chinese authorities given sufficient details regarding the basis of those claims. The claims are arbitrary as they are not supported by any lease-deed, agreement or understanding between the two Governments. However, if the Chinese Government certify that these claims are legitimate and render proper account for them, Government of India will have the claims settled through their Consulate-General in Lhasa or their Embassy in Peking.

(ii) He should demolish spurs constructed by the Indian Trade Agency for the protection of its property. As the Chinese Embassy are aware these were constructed in consultation with the Chinese authorities at Gyantse, Lhasa and Peking. Construction of the spurs was actually undertaken after the
verbal consent of the Chinese authorities had been obtained. The Government of India had informed the local authorities through their Trade Agent at Gyantse in September 1961 that they may destroy these spurs if they were endangering the bridge and other public work in Gyantse but that they should accept the responsibility for the protection of Agency property once this had been done. In the circumstances, the insistence of the local authorities that they be shown documentary evidence to show that their approval had been obtained for the construction of these spurs is a most unreasonable and arbitrary demand at a time when the Trade Agent is engaged in winding up his mission.

(iii) He should physically transport all property belonging to the Government of India out of Gyantse. The Chinese Government are fully aware of the circumstances in which building material which was acquired by the Indian Trade Agency in Gyantse could not be utilised and of the reasons for their inability to complete partly-built structures. These questions have formed the subject of correspondence between the Governments of China and India. The Indian Trade Agent cannot be compelled to demolish these structures or to remove accumulated building material from Gyantse. The disposal of these items of property belonging to the Government of India is a matter on which assistance should have been forthcoming from the Government of the People's Republic of China, and there are procedures prescribed by international law and practice in such matters. It is extraordinary that the Chinese authorities in Tibet instead of helping in this matter are exercising arbitrary pressure on the Indian Trade Agent to dispose of the building material etc. even if there is no means of doing so.

The Indian Trade Agent at Yatung has been ordered by the local authorities to accept responsibility for the suicide of a local employee and for the disappearance of other local employees of his Trade Agency. Such facts as are known to the Indian Trade Agent on these matters have been communicated verbally and in writing to the local Foreign Bureau. Reports available with the Government of India indicate that the case of suicide on 2nd June 1962 was caused by the entry of Chinese troops into the Agency premises. About the flight of some local employees from Yatung on 28th May, the Trade Agent had no prior knowledge of this. As soon as he came to know about it, he reported the matter to the local Foreign Bureau. In fact, he was embarrassed by the flight of these local employees as he needed their help in his own winding up operations. A later attempt by some local employees of the Trade Agency to run away led to their arrest by the Chinese authorities on 4th June. The Indian Trade Agent has been so severely restricted in his activities in Yatung that he could not, even if he had wanted to, assist any local employees in running away from Yatung. There can be no doubt that local employees of the Indian Trade Agency have been running away out of fear of the local authorities.
Another matter which has been causing concern to our Trade Agents in Tibet is the insistence on the part of the local authorities that the Tibetan wives of Indian officials employed by the Agencies cannot accompany their husbands unless they observe all the formalities prescribed by Chinese Immigration Laws for this purpose. The uncertainty as to whether this decision of the Chinese authorities will mean the needless separation of families has created a sense of great uneasiness and despondency among the staff of the Trade Agencies.

The Government of India reiterate their request for facilities to enable the Indian Trade Agents at Gyantse and Yatung to withdraw without further delay. They cannot but take a most serious view of the attempts so far made to harass their Trade Agents and to deny them courtesies due to their official position. Considering the gravity of the situation created by the Chinese authorities at Gyantse and Yatung, the Government of India must issue a clear warning that if there is any further attempt to hold up and harass the Indian Trade Agents in Tibet, there may be grave repercussions.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 22 June 1962:

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Chinese Government’s note No. 11/69, dated the 28th May, 1962.

The Chinese note once again overlooks the fact that the two Indian pilgrims Shri Ram Prakash and Shri Narain Gir had lost their way in Tibet due to their having been misdirected by Chinese officials, whose duty it was to help and guide the wayfarers. No reason has been adduced in the Chinese note to explain the time which elapsed between the arrest of the pilgrims and the telephonic intimation of this fact to the Indian Consul General at Lhasa. For as long as fifty days these innocent pilgrims were held in detention without facilities for consultation with their Consular Officer and tirelessly interrogated.

It has been claimed in the Chinese note that “to deal with foreigners who have illegally entered Chinese territory without any permits is a matter entirely within Chinese sovereignty”. The validity of this assertion is questionable on two grounds. First on the ground of the fact, viz., that the pilgrims were in possession of valid pilgrim passes. By a series of misadventures which had befallen them, they had lost all their possessions and very nearly their lives, when they were carried away by a strong current while crossing a flooded stream. Second, on the ground of law, viz., internal jurisdiction does not confer any right on the Government of China to arrest, detain and persecute the nationals of another State (in this case, India) who are in Chinese territory for a legitimate purpose recognised in the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 on Trade and Intercourse between India and the Tibet Region of China.

The Government of India regret that in the face of facts, the Chinese Government should continue to justify their high-handed action.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 3 July 1962


The Government of India's Memorandum, dated 16th May 1962 gave facts about the difficulties experienced by the Indian missions in Tibet in respect of their local employees. Pressure had been exercised on these local employees not to serve the Indian missions. Specific instances of such occurrence were brought to the notice of the Chinese Government.

The Chinese Memorandum under reference, however, takes the position that continuance in service with Indian missions is entirely a matter for the local employees themselves and that they enjoy complete freedom in this regard. The facts do not sustain this liberal view of life in China. Under regulations in force in China all local employees are to be recruited by foreign missions through the official agencies of the Government of China, and such employees of foreign missions continue to be responsible to the Government of China.

In their note dated 24th August 1960, the Foreign Bureau in Lhasa had advised the Indian Consulate-General that Indian missions in Tibet should intimate their requirements of local staff as also all changes in such appointments to the local Foreign Bureaus. The Indian Consulate-General accepted this position in their note dated 7th January 1961 to the Foreign Bureau in Lhasa. There were instances where the Foreign Bureau did not agree to permit certain persons selected by the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa to accept appointments offered to them.

Although Indian missions in Tibet scrupulously complied with all the local regulations they continued to experience serious hardship in obtaining the services of the local employees and in retaining the services of those already employed by them. From time to time such local employees have been withdrawn from the services of Indian missions on unspecified grounds. Since all such local employees are compulsorily registered with the local Foreign Bureau, there is no substance in the charge that the Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse failed to notify the local Foreign Bureau about the local employees serving with the Trade Agency.

In the case of the death of Shri N. R. Sharma at Gyantse, the facts have already been cited in the Ministry's Memoranda dated 6th September 1961 and 16th May 1962 and do not require any reiteration. It is obvious that had timely medical assistance been available Shri Sharma's life might have been saved. In this case, the uncooperative attitude of the local authorities at Gyantse was carried too far.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to refer to note No. 11/48, dated the 21st March 1962 from the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

2. The allegation made in the Chinese note have been thoroughly investigated and found to be baseless. There have not been any cases of unwarranted detention of Chinese traders or confiscation of their traders’ certificates. Chinese border inhabitants who were not required under the 1954 Agreement to hold travel documents to visit neighbouring areas in India for trading purposes have always been permitted to do so.

3. The allegation of undue detention and physical maltreatment of more than 60 Chinese traders from the Rudok area of Tibet has not been supported by any particulars and it has therefore not been possible to make any enquiries or investigations. The facts regarding the three specific instances mentioned in the Chinese note are as follows:

(i) The first case relates to 3 Tibetan traders who came to Chusul in August 1960 with 30 maunds of rock salt for sale. Though they claimed to be customary traders, they were unwilling to dispose of their merchandise at Chusul, even though offers to purchase it were made to them. Instead they insisted on visiting places at which no trade could be transacted. They were not detained by the Indian authorities at Chusul but were told that they were free to visit regular trade centres or to return to Tibet at any time.

(ii) As the Chinese Embassy were informed in the Ministry’s note dated the 15th July 1961, the Government of India do not maintain a checkpost at Dingroze. The question of detention of Chinese nationals at this place cannot therefore arise and the specific allegation in respect of Tsaijeutschich is thus baseless.

(iii) The third case relates to certain traders who visited Chusul between October 24 and October 28, 1960. They were required to remain at the Indian border checkpost for a very brief period for completion of normal formalities. The allegation that they were held up for 16 days and that they were harassed is baseless. It is also not true that Tsujen, a member of the group, was confined or beaten.

4. The claim that adequate facilities have been provided by the Chinese authorities to Indian pilgrims visiting Kailash and Mansarovar is not borne out by facts. The arrangements for accommodation made for Indian pilgrims have remained unsatisfactory. Apart from the rest-house at Rakshahtal, which itself is in a deplorable condition, other places provided for the use of the Indian pilgrims are abandoned buildings unfit for human occupation. The Chinese authorities did nothing over the entire period of operation of the 1954 Agreement to implement their undertaking given in the Notes.
exchanged between the two Governments to provide reasonable accommodation for Indian pilgrims wherever possible.

5. Indian pilgrims have also encountered numerous other difficulties e.g. they have not been permitted to purchase foodgrains or other consumer goods from the Chinese shops. Not only were no steps taken to afford protection to the lives and property of the Indian pilgrims but there were several cases of actual harassment. The case of Shri Ram Prakash and Shri Naraingir, who were needlessly detained by the Chinese authorities, subjected to severe humiliation and harassment and who were not permitted to complete their pilgrimage, forms the subject of the Ministry's notes dated the 5th January, 1961, the 21st April, 1962 and the 2nd June, 1962.

6. The record shows that the Chinese authorities have consistently acted against the letter and spirit of the 1954 Agreement on Trade and Intercourse between India and the Tibet Region of China which was intended to develop further the special relations already existing between the peoples of these areas from time immemorial. The various restrictive measures adopted by the Chinese authorities were clearly aimed at strangling the free intercourse between the Indian and Tibet peoples. No attempt to shift the responsibility for these actions by making groundless allegations against the Indian authorities or by denying legitimate representations, made by the Indian Government on behalf of their nationals will alter the deplorable fact of Chinese failure to implement the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 22 January 1962

On the 23rd March, 1961, Mr. Chen Lu-Chih, formerly Second Secretary in the Chinese Embassy, made a complaint to Shri V. V. Paranjpe, Under Secretary in the Ministry of External Affairs, to the effect that five postal packages containing copies of the magazine “China Reconstructs” were received by the Chinese Embassy on the 27th and 28th February, 1961, with the following special supplements removed, a notice to this effect signed by the Calcutta Customs authorities having been attached to each package:

(i) The text of Premier Chou’s interview with Mr. Felix Greene, a British correspondent.

(ii) Key to Chinese Phonetic Symbols.

The matter was further discussed by Mr. Ma Mu-Ming, First Secretary of the Embassy, with Shri B. C. Mishra, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs, on the 5th May and Mr. Ying Shang Chih, First Secretary of the Embassy, handed over a Memorandum to Shri B. C. Mishra on the 6th June, 1961.

2. At the discussions referred to in the preceding paragraph, the Embassy was informed of the breach of law which had led to the seizure of the offensive literature by the Customs Service.

3. The Embassy’s Memorandum has been given fair and careful consideration both in the light of facts and customary international law, and the conclusions are as stated below—

(i) The postal packages in question were addressed to the Information Service of the Embassy and not to the Embassy as has been erroneously stated in the Embassy’s Memorandum. They were not only despatched by ordinary mail but carried insufficient visible external marks to enable them to be classified as diplomatic mail. As such no immunity attached to these packages in international law.

(ii) The literature confiscated by the Calcutta Customs authorities contained prescribed propaganda in the English Language. It follows, therefore, that the bulk importation of this material could not have been intended strictly for the official cover for dissemination among the Indian public. The Customs and Postal Services of the Government of India would have failed in their duty had they not opened this ordinary mail when they had serious grounds for suspecting that it contained material other than diplomatic documents or articles intended for official use. The Embassy should be aware of the provisions under Section 19 of the Indian Sea Customs Act, 1878, which prohibits “the bringing into India of any book.
periodical, pamphlet, leaflet or other documents containing any words, signs, or visible representation which directly or indirectly questions the frontiers of India as declared by the Government of India or the territorial integrity of the country."

The supplement containing the text of Premier Chou's interview with Mr. Felix Greene is not only a manifesto on Chinese expansionism but an offensive attack on India's territorial integrity. The fact that the literature in question was despatched in violation of Indian law and that it was to be utilised by the Chinese Embassy for harmful propaganda within the territory of India constitute a serious dual breach of diplomatic privilege to which the Government of India take grave exception.

4. For the above reasons it is clear that the Government of India were well within their rights to open the five postal packages addressed to the Information Service of the Chinese Embassy and to confiscate the objectionable material contained in them. There was no contravention of the Embassy's diplomatic privilege but on exposure of a serious breach of diplomatic privilege on the part of the Information Office of the Embassy. The Government of India would draw the attention of the Chinese Embassy to the need to observe the laws of India and the limits, as established by international law, within which diplomatic privilege in the matter of the despatch of official mail can be availed of. The Government of India express their surprise that a protest should have been made on an issue on which the Chinese authorities have themselves committed a violation of Indian law and a breach of diplomatic privilege.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 2 February 1962

On the evening of January 14, 1962, a camp fire gathering was organised by the Hostel of the Kirori Mal College, University of Delhi, in celebration of the Lodi Festival. It was attended by the Principal and students of the College. The Chinese scholars in that College were also notified to be present. At the gathering, an item on the programme entitled "Mr. Chou En Lai" was performed, the contents of which were slanderous against Chinese Premier Chou En Lai. The Chinese Embassy expresses deep regret at this act of slandering a Chinese state leader and hereby draws the attention of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the matter.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 12 March 1962

The incident mentioned in the Memorandum dated the 2nd February, 1962 received from the Embassy of the People's Republic of China has been investigated. On the 14th January, 1962, the students of the hostel of Kirori Mal College, a non-governmental and privately-run educational institution in New Delhi, arranged a campfire to celebrate the Lohri festival. Attendance at this function was voluntary. It is not correct that the Chinese students residing in the Kirori Mal College Hostel were notified to be present. The programme for the occasion included recitation of a poem in Punjabi which said that Premier Chou En-lai's professions of Sino-Indian friendship did not square with the forcible occupation of Indian territory by Chinese forces. These sentiments are national and entirely legitimate.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 3 April 1962

On the morning of March 10, 1962, several hundred Tibetan rebel bandits in Kalimpong held a meeting at the Tharpa Choling Monastery there to "observe" the third anniversary of the rebellion in Tibet, at which some Indians were present. After the meeting, they went in procession in the streets of Kalimpong. They carried the national flag of India side by side with the flag of lion and snow-covered mountains, shouting slogans of "China quit Tibet" etc. Such activity is one of political nature, which constitutes an interference in China's internal affairs.

It must be pointed out that, in disregard of the repeated representations made by the Chinese side, the Indian Government has, in contravention of its earlier assurances, time and again permitted the Tibetan rebel bandits in India to carry out political activities against the People's Republic of China. The Chinese Embassy expresses deep regret at this.
Letter given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 5 April 1962

I have pleasure in forwarding herewith a letter dated March 23, 1962 from the All China Federation of Trade Unions addressed to His Excellency the Minister of External Affairs, Government of India. I shall be obliged if you will kindly acknowledge receipt of the same.
Enclosure to the letter dated 5 April 1962, of the Embassy of China in India

We have the pleasure to invite two delegates from the All India Trade Union Congress to visit China in late April this year for a period of three weeks and pass May Day—the International Workers' Day—together with the Chinese workers. We would be very grateful if your excellency would kindly convey this invitation to the All India Trade Union Congress.
Enclosure to the letter dated 5 April 1962 of the Embassy of China in India

With a view to promoting the friendly relations between the trade unions and workers of our two countries, we cordially invite two delegates from the All India Trade Union Congress to visit China in late April this year for a period of three weeks and pass May Day—the International Workers Day—together with the Chinese working people. It is hoped that the delegates can arrive in Peking before April 25th, 1962.
Letter given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 7 April 1962

With reference to your letter No. M/530/62 dated the 5th April, 1962, forwarding a letter dated 23rd March, 1962 from the All China Federation of Trade Unions to the Minister of External Affairs, Government of India, I have been directed to say that the Government of India regret that in the context of the occupation of Indian territory by Chinese forces and the consequent violation of India's territorial integrity by China, it is not possible to grant facilities to any delegate from India to visit China to participate in the May Day Celebrations.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 30 April 1962

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of the Republic of India, and has the honour to state in the following:

An airplane, Fengshou No. 2, which Chairman Liu Shao-chi of the People's Republic of China presents to His Majesty King Mahendra Bir Bikram Shah Deva of Nepal, will in the middle of May 1962 fly to Kathmandu from Kunming via Chittagong, Calcutta and Patna. The Government of the People's Republic of China would request the Government of the Republic of India to agree to the passing of the plane through the territory of India and kindly render assistance.

Enclosed herewith is the information concerning the flight of the plane and the items regarding which assistance is requested from the authorities concerned of the Government of the Republic of India during the flight.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Enclosure to the note dated 30 April 1962 of the Embassy of China in India

APPENDIX

I. Route and plan of flight:

On May 14, the plane will take off from Kunming, land at Mandalay for refuelling and stay there overnight.

On May 15, the plane will take off from Mandalay and, flying over Chittagong, land at Calcutta for refuelling and stay there overnight.

On May 16, the plane will take off from Calcutta, land at Patna for refuelling and then fly to Kathmandu.

Concrete timings of the flight will be given in advance from the take-off airport one day before the flight. Timings of flight will be postponed to a latter time in the scheduled order if the flight is made impossible owing to weather conditions or other reasons.

II. Information concerning the plane:

Type of plane: Fengshou No. 2 (single-engined biplane), holding a registration certificate issued by the China Civil Aviation Administration (registration number of the plane: 98001) and a certificate of airworthiness.

Telephone call sign: NINE NOVEMBER KILO ALFA ZULU (communication in English language):

Telegraph call sign: 9 NKAZ (communication in Q code).

Identification markings of the plane: The plane is in silver colour. On both sides of the pilot’s cabin are painted flags of His Majesty King of Nepal. On both sides of the stern of the plane are painted the national flags of the Kingdom of Nepal.

Cruising speed: 180 Kilometres per hour.

Maximum gross take-off weight: 5,250 kilograms.

Service ceiling: 4,000 metres

Fuel for use: Soviet aviation fuel—5-91/115 or 5-95/130, or Octane No. 100 aviation fuel.

Crew of the plane: Captain Yuan Tio-yuan and five others. Besides them, an official of the Consulate General of the People’s Republic of China at Calcutta will go with the plane from Calcutta to Patna.
III. Data and assistance requested from the authorities concerned of the Government of the Republic of India:

(1) Data concerning the airfields at Calcutta and Patna and other alternate airfields including location, coordinates, elevation, length and width of runways, magnetic course, let-down procedure and weather minimum.

(2) Data concerning communication and navigational aids of the airfields at Calcutta and Patna, and the alternate airfields, as well as those along the air route: The frequencies and call signs (including VHF and HF) of grounds to air radio stations (telegraph and telephone), control towers, approach controls and their working hours; the frequencies, call signs and locations of the radio beacons and direction-finding stations; the frequencies, call signs, working hours and types of wireless weather reports, as well as air traffic control regulations concerning flight along the above-mentioned air route.

(3) Timely weather forecasts and actual weather conditions along the route and at the airfields.

(4) The flight control centre of Calcutta is requested to transmit telegrams concerning flight conditions, take-offs and landings, and weather conditions.

(5) Starting equipment is requested to be provided by the Calcutta and Patna airfields and other possible alternate airfields: A 2-kilowatt direct current electric generator with 24—28 volts pressure, and a 30 ampere/hour battery or a battery group of 100 ampere/hour and 24 volts.

(6) Kindly arrange 600—800 kilogram refuelling for the plane at every landing airfield.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 5 May 1962

In spite of the fact that in its Memorandum No. C/103(5) CH/62, dated March 12, 1962, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs could not deny that on the occasion of a camp-fire at the hostel of the Kirori Mal College on January 14, 1962, an item on the programme slandering Chinese Premier Chou En-lai was performed, the Ministry tried to justify this act of slandering a Chinese state leader by describing it as "national" and "legitimate" sentiments. The Chinese Embassy feels deep regret at this.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 8 May 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

Over a month ago, the All-China Federation of Trade Unions addressed a letter to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs inviting the All-India Trade Union Congress to send delegates to take part in the celebrations of the "May 1 International Labour Day" in China. It was wholly out of the good desire of upholding and promoting the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples that the All China Federation of Trade Unions extended this invitation. Unexpectedly, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs in its note to the Chinese Embassy dated April 7, 1962 not only rejected this friendly invitation but wantonly slandered China. The Indian Ministry of External Affairs says in its note that "in the context of the occupation of Indian territory by Chinese forces and the consequent violation of India's territorial integrity by China, it is not possible to grant facilities to any delegate from India to visit China to participate in the May Day celebrations." Needless to say, the above attack on China is completely contrary to the fact and has long been refuted by the Chinese Government. The fact shows that it is precisely India itself and not China that has occupied the territory of the other party and thus violated the latter's territorial integrity. Now the Indian Government has repaid the friendly invitation of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions with the above malicious attack; the Chinese Government is greatly surprised at such rude and impolite behaviour and expressed its deep regret at it. This attitude of the Indian Government can only be considered as deliberately intended to utilise the boundary question to obstruct normal friendly intercourse between the two peoples and impair their friendship.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 9 May 1962

Reference Chinese Embassy Memorandum dated the 3rd April, 1962, regarding a meeting held by certain members of the Tibetan community in Kalimpong on the 10th March, 1962. The facts are as follows:

A meeting was held at the Tharpa Choling Monastery by a section of the Tibetan population of Kalimpong on the 10th March, 1962, to pay their annual homage to His Holiness the Dalai Lama. The participants of the meeting were all Tibetan refugees. There was no Indian present, and the statement to this effect in the Chinese Embassy Memorandum is incorrect. After the meeting, a procession was taken out. The processionists were peaceful. At no stage was there any threat to the peace.

The Chinese Embassy must be aware that such peaceful demonstration form part of the normal and accepted political life in India and that the authorities are not empowered to take any action to disperse them unless a threat to the law and order situation develops.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 9 May 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Embassy's publication "China Today" which in its issue of 5th May 1962 has published what it calls "A Brief Account of the Contents of the Chinese and Indian Officials' Report on the Boundary Question" and also the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs note dated April 30, 1962.

The "Brief Account and the Contents of the Report of the Chinese and Indian Officials' presents a propagandist onesided view of the Chinese case on the border question. It ignores the wealth of consistent and conclusive evidence produced by the Indian team at the officials' talks, while inflating beyond all proportion the sketchy and contradictory evidence presented by the Chinese officials."

As the Embassy is aware, there are established conventions about the right of foreign missions to carry on propaganda in the receiving State. The Government of India, by and large, endeavour to take a liberal view of such publications even when these are critical of them. But the 'Brief Account of the Contents of the Chinese and Indian Officials' Report as published in the Embassy's bulletin "China Today", questioning as it does the territorial integrity of India, flagrantly violates the law of the land and in more particularly, the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1961 of the Government of India.

The Ministry of External Affairs lodged an emphatic protest with the Embassy for acting in defiance of the law of the land and abusing the hospitality of India, and express the hope that there will be no repetition of such defiance of Indian laws and abuse of privilege.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the latter's note dated 30th April 1962, have the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India are pleased to accord the clearance requested for the flight of the Chinese aircraft, Fengshou No. 2, in transit through India to Kathmandu. However, the clearance of the flight through Indian territory is subject to the condition that the aircraft will carry an experienced Indian navigator who will be in charge of navigation during its flight from Calcutta to Kathmandu via Patna. The Indian navigator will be provided by the Government of India for this purpose free of cost.

The technical details required in connection with the landing of the aircraft in Calcutta are enclosed. Refuelling and other necessary ground facilities and services for the aircraft both at Calcutta and Patna will be made available as required on payment. Starting equipment for the aircraft will be available in Calcutta but not at Patna. Octane No. 100 fuel will be supplied by the authorised oil company at the respective airports and arrangements may be made by the Embassy in advance thereof.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails themselves of the opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 May 1962

Reference the Chinese Embassy Memorandum dated 5th May, 1962. The facts about the camp-fire meeting of students of the Kirori Mal College Hostel on the 14th January, 1962, have been communicated to the Chinese Embassy in the Ministry of External Affairs Memorandum No. C/106 (5) CH/62, dated the 12th March, 1962. There was no misrepresentation of facts or slander of a Chinese leader but a spontaneous expression of the students' views on the existing stage of Sino-Indian relations which the Government of India themselves have every reason to deplore.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 May 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs note No. 362, dated 8th May 1962.

In the note, the Government of China have assumed an air of injured innocence and taken exception to the fact that the Government of India, had for good and obvious reasons, declined an invitation to despatch delegates from the All-India Trade Union Congress to take part in the Chinese May Day celebrations. The contents of the note, and the subsequent action taken by the Government of China to release it to the world press, reveal that the note was written purely with a view to serve the ends of Chinese propaganda against India.

The Government of India in their reply dated 7th April 1962 merely stated the circumstances in which they were obliged to decline the invitation. These circumstances are only too well known to the Government of China.

The Government of China are fully aware that public opinion in India is greatly exercised over the continuing Chinese violations of India's territorial sovereignty and integrity. A traditionally tranquil and friendly border has become tense and uneasy.

As the Government of China are aware the Government of India have earnestly worked for close and friendly relations between the two countries. But, despite all that the Government of India have done, these relations have deteriorated in recent years because of the aggressive policies pursued by the Government of China in the border areas since 1957.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 29 May 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India dated May 9, 1962 and its note verbale of December 9, 1961 and the Memorandum of January 22, 1962, has the honour to state as follows:

1. The Indian Government, on the pretext of the Chinese Embassy in India “acting in defiance of the law of the land and abusing the hospitality of India”, recently ordered the confiscation of the news bulletin published by the Embassy which carried a Brief Account of the Contents of the Report of the Chinese and Indian Officials on the Boundary Question and the note of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China to the Indian Embassy in China dated April 30, 1962, and lodged a protest on May 9, 1962 with the Chinese Embassy in India. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs expresses its regret at such unreasonable behaviour of the Indian Government.

It is in conformity with international practice for an Embassy to carry in its news bulletins official documents and statements of its own Government. The Indian Embassy in China has always done this, and so has the Chinese Embassy in India. Hence this right is reciprocal for both sides, and the question of “defiance of the law of the land and abusing the hospitality” does not arise at all. In its note to the Chinese Embassy in India dated September 24, 1959, the Ministry of External Affairs of India declared that “The Government of India would ask once again that the Embassy should refrain from publishing in its bulletin any material of whatsoever kind critical of India’s policies unless they are official statements by the Government of China”. The Indian Government, however, has now gone to the length of ignoring its own declaration and confiscated the Embassy’s news bulletin carrying two official documents, that is, the note of the Chinese Government and a Brief Account of the Contents of the Report of the Chinese and Indian officials. This fact shows that it is totally lacking in good faith and has flagrantly violated the principles of international practice.

The news bulletin published by the Indian Embassy in China has all along carried documents of the Indian Government and speeches of its officials which attacked the Chinese Government, including the one-sided and distorted so-called “summary” of the Report of the Chinese and Indian Officials made by the Indian side. The Government even distributed widely in China the publication carrying the so-called “Summary”. The Indian Government has never considered this practice unjustified. But the Indian Government came out to interfere rudely when the Chinese Embassy carried in its news bulletin a brief Account of the Contents of the Report of the Chinese and Indian Officials which is of the same official nature.
as the so-called “Summary” of the Officials' Report published by India. The Chinese Government cannot understand why the Indian Government should think that its Embassy in China can do this while the Chinese Embassy in India cannot. Is it Indian laws and rules of conduct that it is free to attack others and others are not allowed to defend themselves? That is bigotry. One who adopts such an attitude towards China is certain to run his head against the wall.

The Indian Government's attempt of trying to use the allegation that the Brief Account of the Contents of the Report of the Chinese and Indian Officials questions India's territorial integrity as a pretext for the rude attitude it has adopted is wholly untenable. As is well-known to the whole world, the Sino-Indian boundary question is a dispute between the two countries, and it was precisely because each side questions the views of the other on this question that the two sides have held meetings of officials to check the facts and explain their respective stands. The Brief Account of the Contents of the Report of the Chinese and Indian Officials carried in the news bulletin of the Chinese Embassy is a correct representation of the facts of the Sino-Indian boundary question and the points of difference between the two sides. This is not to be compared with the “Summary” of the Officials' Report published by India, which distorts the facts. If the Indian Government were not aware of its own lack of justification, there would have been no need for it to fear the readers of the news bulletin to know the truth of the facts and the position of the Chinese Government. The suppression on the news bulletin of the Chinese Embassy by the Indian Government precisely exposes a weakness of the Indian Government, and that is, the position of the Indian Government on the Sino-Indian boundary question is based on fabrications and arbitrary and does not stand up to a cross-checking with the facts and refutations.

The Indian Government's confiscation of the news bulletin of the Chinese Embassy which carried the Brief Account of the Contents of the Report of the Chinese and Indian Officials on the Boundary Question and the note of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs dated April 30, 1962, is a breach of good faith and international practice. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs hereby lodges a protest with the Indian Government against this and categorically rejects the protest of the Indian Government regarding the publication of the two aforesaid documents in the news bulletin of the Chinese Embassy in India. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs hopes that the Indian Government will extend its co-operation to prevent the recurrence in the future of the above-mentioned unreasonable acts against the news bulletin of the Chinese Embassy. The Indian Government must be aware that if it ignores the good-intentioned advice of the Chinese Government and continues incessantly to resort to such acts against China on the question of the news bulletin, it will be impossible not to arouse strong reactions in China.

2. The Indian Government has repeatedly stressed that a principle followed by the Indian Embassy in China in publishing its news bulletin is to refrain from reprinting any comments or quotations from newspapers or other unofficial sources which are critical
of the Chinese Government. Basing itself on this understanding, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs has all along taken an attitude of accommodation towards the news bulletin of the Indian Embassy in China. However, going back on the above promise, the No. 8/61 issue of the India News, the news bulletin of the Indian Embassy in China, carried a resolution of the All-India Congress Committee slandering the Chinese Government. It was quite natural for the Chinese Government to lodge a protest against it. It was not thought that the Indian Ministry of External Affairs in its note verbale to the Chinese Embassy in India dated December 9, 1961, should have made the vain attempt to explain away the improper behaviour of the Indian Embassy and dodge the crux of the issue by casting malicious slanders on the Chinese Government and the Chinese press. This unreasonable attitude taken by the Indian Government in trying to whitewash itself only shows that it is at the end of its tether in advancing its arguments and is not worthy of refutation.

3. The unjustifiable confiscation by the Indian Customs at Calcutta of the mail sent to the Chinese Embassy in India from Peking, as the Chinese Embassy in India has repeatedly pointed out to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, likewise runs counter to international practice. The confiscation by the Indian Customs at Calcutta of the mail sent to the Chinese Embassy in Afghanistan from Peking via Calcutta on February 28, 1961, against which the Chinese Foreign Ministry already made representations to the Indian Embassy in China on April 28, 1961, is all the more a violation of universally recognized international practice according to which mails in transit are exempted from examination. With regard to the former case, even Mr. B. C. Mishra, Deputy Director of the northern division of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs admitted in his talk with Ying Shang-chih, First Secretary of the Chinese Embassy, held on June 5, 1961, that the action of the Indian Customs was wrong. However, in its memorandum delivered to the Chinese Embassy on January 22, 1962, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, in disregard of the facts, tried to explain away its action by distorted accounts in an attempt to evade the responsibility of India, and even went so far as to cast wanton slanders on Premier Chou En-lai and the Chinese Embassy in India. The Chinese Government expresses its deep indignation at this.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 11 June 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

On the afternoon of May 29, 1962, the Office of the Tibet Foreign Bureau at Yatung, Tibet, China, received from the then Indian Trade Agency at Yatung a written message to the effect that a number of employees of the Indian Trade Agency residing in the premises of the Agency and their families, totalling 23 persons (including 12 children), most of whom being Chinese nationals and a few being Nepalese, were found "missing" on the morning of the same day. On June 4, 1962, Mr. L. S. Jangpang, the then Indian Trade Agent at Yatung, verbally informed the Yatung Office of the Tibet Foreign Bureau of the "missing" of more employees of the Agency and their families, but the number of persons "missing" and other details were not given. According to foreign press reports, however, quite a number of the allegedly "missing" persons have already arrived at Gangtok, Sikkim.

As is known to all, it was on May 30, 1962, that the Indian Government notified the Chinese Government of its decision to withdraw the Indian trade agencies from Tibet. The Chinese Government is most surprised and finds it very strange that a sudden "missing" of large numbers of employees of the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung and their families should have occurred one day before that notification was made and another such case should have followed six days later. Since the total number of persons "missing" involved in the two cases reaches as many as several scores, including not only adults but also many children, it is hardly conceivable that they could have left the Indian Trade Agency without its knowledge as it so alleged. The fact that the Indian Trade Agency did not inform the Yatung Office of the Tibet Foreign Bureau till half a day after the "missing" of the first batch of persons made the local authorities unable to take necessary measures in time. Despite the fact that they are neither merchants engaged in traditional trade, nor pilgrims, still less border inhabitants, and did not hold any exit permits of the local authorities in Tibet, China, these people were admitted into the territory of Sikkim by the Indian frontier guards. All this obviously shows that the employees of the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung and their families fled Tibet under no other circumstances than the planned and calculated instigation and direction of the Indian Trade Agency. That India has gone so far as to resort to such unscrupulous means to achieve its ulterior aims constitutes a downright conspiracy. The Indian Government can by no means shirk its responsibility in these cases. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government and urges it to give a prompt account of those persons who have fled to Sikkim.
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Apart from the aforesaid, the Office of the Tibet Foreign Bureau at Yatung, Tibet, China, was informed at 20:00 hours, June 2, 1962, by the then Indian Trade Agency at Yatung that a Chinese employee of the Agency by the name of Mingmapingtso had “killed himself with a knife” in the premises of the Agency at 15:30 hours on the same day. It is strange that this employee who had worked 15 years for the Indian Trade Agency should have suddenly met an unaccounted-for death. The way in which the Indian Trade Agency handled this matter is also unusual. The Agency did not officially inform the local authorities till more than four hours after Mingmapingtso’s death; the scene where the deceased was left had been violated before investigation was undertaken by the Chinese local authorities; and the Indian Trade Agent refused to sign on the inspection record of the scene made by the local authorities. The Chinese Government holds that the Indian side cannot shirk its responsibility in this case too.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Chinese Government’s note, dated 29th May 1962.

The attention of the Government of China is drawn again to the Government of India’s note, dated the 9th May 1962 which gives a full and clear account of the reasons which led to the issue of an order under the relevant provisions of the law for the confiscation of all the copies of the 5th May issue of ‘China Today’. That issue contained “A Brief Account of the Chinese and Indian Officials’ Report” which presented a one-sided propagandist view of the untenable Chinese case and ignored or mutilated beyond recognition the well established case of India. The so-called “Brief Account of the Chinese and Indian Officials’ Report”, of unknown authorship, questioned India’s territorial integrity and flagrantly violated the Criminal Law Amendment Act of India. Nothing that the Government of China have said in their note extenuates the offence committed by the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi. Under International Law, diplomatic missions are not authorised to offend against the laws of the receiving State.

As to the facts about the Sino-Indian border problem, the Government of China should be aware that the Report of the Chinese and Indian officials was printed and published in full and released to the public in India as early as 14th February 1961. Thus, the Chinese case as presented by the Chinese officials has been available to the public in India for more than a year now. Obviously, this does not show that the Government of India are afraid to let the people of India know about the Chinese case, the validity of which they can judge for themselves. This is in contrast to the virtual suppression of the Indian case in the People’s Republic of China. As to the other matters raised in the Chinese note, these have been adequately dealt with in the earlier notes of the Government of India. It is a matter of regret that these baseless allegations, already refuted, are being repeated by the Government of China merely to serve the ends of their anti-Indian propaganda.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 12 July 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and have the honour to request the Embassy to arrange for the repatriation to China, on humanitarian grounds, of Mr. Li Luk Seng, a Chinese national.

Mr. Li Luk Seng worked for some time as a shoe-maker but suffered financial losses. He is now virtually a destitute. He has also been showing signs of being mentally unbalanced. At present, he is supporting himself on local charity. He is lodging in the Khak Shok Association at 314, Grant Road, Bombay.

Mr. Li Luk Seng, has lately become violent and has taken to annoying residents in the area at odd hours of the night. It is necessary that he receives proper care and treatment to help him back to normalcy. As Mr. Li Luk Seng has a wife and son who are living in China, it would be best if he could be repatriated to his homeland to rejoin his family. In the circumstances it is hoped that the Embassy will arrange for Mr. Li Luk Seng’s urgent repatriation to China.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 July 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the Chinese People's Republic and with reference to note No. 592, dated the 11th June 1962 from the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs has the honour to state as follows:—

The Indian Trade Agent at Yatung communicated detailed facts regarding the incidents of suicide by a member of the Agency on the 2nd June 1962 and the disappearance of certain other members of the Agency staff on the 28th May and 3rd June 1962 to the local Foreign Bureau immediately after he had learnt about them. The case of 23 persons who disappeared on the night of the 28th May was reported to the Trade Agent on the 29th May. He furnished the facts of this case to the Foreign Bureau in writing immediately thereafter. Information regarding the second batch of persons who disappeared on the 3rd June was communicated to the Foreign Bureau verbally on the 4th June. It is incorrect to state that details regarding persons missing were not furnished. These facts were, at the request of the Foreign Bureau, repeated in writing on the 11th, 15th and 16th June.

In the case of suicide on the 3rd June, the Vice Director of Foreign Bureau, a Chinese Security Officer, two secretaries of the Foreign Bureau and two interpreters were present at that time within the compound of the Agency. They were immediately informed that Mr. Mingma Phintso had stabbed himself. He died at 1530 hours when the Trade Agent was with the Foreign Bureau. On his return at 1800 hours an urgent communication was immediately sent to the Foreign Bureau. The charge contained in the Chinese note that reports on these incidents were incomplete or unduly delayed is clearly baseless.

The Indian Trade Agent gave the local authorities all facilities to investigate these cases and he and his staff assisted them in every way. As mentioned earlier, the Vice Director of the Foreign Bureau, a Chinese Security Officer and other members of his staff remained at the Agency from 9.00 A.M. to 12.30 P.M. on 2nd June to investigate the disappearance of 23 members of the local staff. The Trade Agent met the Vice Director once more on the same afternoon. Discussion took place again on the 4th, 10th, 15th, 16th and 18th between officials of the Trade Agency and the Foreign Bureau. He addressed two letters to the Foreign Bureau—on the 15th June and on the 16th June—in which he confirmed details furnished earlier to them and pointed out that he had no knowledge whatever of the intentions of these members of his staff who committed suicide or disappeared and indicated his inability, in these circumstances, to accept any responsibility for these actions. Despite his having taken prompt action to report their cases and having extended full co-operation to the local authorities, he was harassed and coerced for several days and the Foreign Bureau officials insisted that he should accept the responsibility for the suicide and disappearance of members of his staff. The Indian Trade Agent refused to sign an investigation
report on the suicide of Mingma Phinntsö as he was not informed before that joint investigation was contemplated and the report itself was in Chinese.

In its Aide Memoire dated the 20th June 1962 the Ministry of External Affairs had drawn the attention of the Chinese Embassy to the fact that the demand being made on the Indian Trade Agent to accept responsibility for actions of his local staff of which he could not possibly have had any previous knowledge was unreasonable. It was also pointed out that their attempt to run away could only have been due to fear of the local authorities.

The Government of India have permitted such of these persons as came to India to remain in the country. Certain others who left the Indian Trade Agency were apprehended by the Chinese authorities.

It is a fact that the Indian Government intimated their decision to withdraw their Trade Agencies from Tibet to the Chinese Government on the 30th May 1962. Members of the Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet were aware of this decision and the Tibetan staff who served the Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet for several years were also aware of this decision. The flight of some members of the Tibetan staff of the Indian Trade Agency can only have resulted from uncertainty about their future after the withdrawal of the Trade Agency. The Government of India reject the baseless allegations contained in the Chinese note that the Indian Trade Agent had planned and directed the escape of members of the staff of the Agency and protest against the undue harassment caused to the Indian Trade Agent by the Chinese authorities.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
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Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 21 July 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

According to reports from Chinese frontier guards in Sinkiang Indian troops which have intruded into Chip Chap valley in Sinkiang suddenly launched an armed attack on the Chinese frontier post at approximately 25° 20' N, 78° 05' E at about 19.00 hours on July 21, 1962. The said Indian troops began to advance on the Chinese post at 18.35 hours on the same day. From 19.00 hours they began to attack the Chinese post by continuous firing in disregard of the Chinese frontier guards' repeated advice by waving arms and shouting. As their lives were under direct threat the Chinese frontier guards were compelled to resort to self defence. According to the latest information the aforesaid Chinese post is still under the Indian troops' attack. The Chinese Government hereby lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government against this.

The Chinese Government has repeatedly stated that China is not willing to fight with India and the Sino-Indian boundary question can be settled only through routine negotiations. It has all along exercised the greatest forbearance and self-restraint towards Indian armed intrusions and provocations on many occasions. However the Chinese Government can by no means sit idle while its frontier guards are being encircled and annihilated by aggressors. At this critical moment the Chinese Government demands that the Indian Government immediately order the Indian troops to stop attacking the aforesaid Chinese post and withdraw from the area lest the situation be further aggravated. If the Indian Government should ignore the warning of the Chinese Government and continue to persist in its own way India must bear full responsibility for all the consequences that may arise therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 23 July 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

According to reports from frontier guards in Sinkiang, China, there occurred recently another two serious cases of Indian troops intruding into Chinese territory and firing provocatively at Chinese frontier guards:

(1) A detachment of Indian troops crossed the boundary and approached the Chinese frontier post located at 35° 30' N, 78° 07' E at about 13.30 hours on July 16, 1962 and suddenly fired two shots at the said post around 14.00 hours on the same day. The Chinese guards did not return the fire.

(2) Several dozens of Indian troops intruded recently into Chinese territory south of the Galwan River and reached a place at approximately 34° 34.5' N, 78° 35.5' E where they attempted to entrench themselves permanently. At 17.35 hours on July 19, 1962, the said Indian troops unwarrantedly fired provocatively at a Chinese patrol nearby. The Chinese patrol took no action against the provocation.

If the Chinese frontier guards had not remained cool and exercised self-restraint, the above two new cases of provocation would most probably have led to armed clashes. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against the two cases.

It must be pointed out that in the past two months and more Indian troops who had intruded into Chinese territory along the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary had on a number of occasions made provocations against Chinese frontier guards by firing at them. Although the Chinese Government has repeatedly made representations and served warnings, the number of provocative firings by Indian troops has still increased, as described above. Things went further till July 21 when Indian troops made an armed attack on the Chinese post at approximately 35° 20' N, 78° 05' E, and openly provoked an armed clash (reference the Chinese Government's note of July 22, 1962), thus pushing the situation to a new danger point. In order that further aggravation of the situation may be avoided, it is imperative that the Indian Government immediately order all the intruding Indian troops to stop advancing on Chinese frontier guards and refrain from firing provocatively at them and to withdraw at once from Chinese territory.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 July 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the note presented to the Charge d’Affaires of India at Peking on July 21st in regard to the incident that took place in the Chip Chap Valley on July 20th.

2. The Chinese Government appear to have been misinformed about the facts of the incidents which occurred on 20th July. Their note of 21st July is based on inaccurate reports from their local forces. Full and accurate details of the two incidents that occurred on July 20th have been given by the Government of India in their note of 22nd July, 1962, presented to the Chinese Charge d’Affaires in New Delhi. The Government of India have nothing to add to the facts given in this note.

3. Tension has been increasing in the past few months on the north-western frontier of India as a result of the recent establishment of a number of Chinese military posts and the increasing aggressive activities of the Chinese forces in that area. Details of Chinese posts recently established in Indian territory in the Ladakh region and instances of intensive and aggressive patrolling in this area have been given in the notes presented by this Government on 14th May, 6th June, 16th June, 6th, 10th, 12th and 14th July, 1962. These notes had also drawn the attention of the Chinese Government to the dangers of these aggressive activities.

4. The Government of India have in their various notes stressed the importance of avoiding clashes and of creating the appropriate climate for settlement of the differences regarding the alignment of the Sino-Indian border by peaceful negotiations. Not only has there been no positive response from the Government of China to these suggestions but the local Chinese authorities have, during the last few months, established several new military posts in Indian territory and stepped up their aggressive patrolling activity in this region.

5. The Chinese Government have, in their note of 21st July, stated that China is not willing to fight with India and the Sino-Indian border question can be settled only through negotiations. The Government of India fully reciprocate this desire for settlement by peaceful negotiations.

6. The factual history of the activities of the local Chinese forces in the Ladakh region is, however, not consistent with this desire for settlement by negotiations expressed by the Chinese Government. The local Chinese forces have even in the last few months established several new posts and resorted to aggressive patrolling in Indian areas which lie west of even the 1956 Chinese map claim line which Prime Minister Chou En-lai told Prime Minister of India “correctly shows the traditional boundary between the two countries in this sector”.

3
7. The details of the correct international boundary in the Ladakh region have been given with full supporting documentation by the Indian side in the meetings of the officials of the two sides whose report is now before the two Governments. Even if the Government of China are inclined to contest this boundary, the Government of India fail to understand why the Government of China do not restrain their forces from going beyond even their 1956 Chinese map claim line which is capable of easy and quick verification. It is true that the Government of India contest the validity of the 1956 Chinese map claim line but the Chinese local forces should not go beyond their own claim line confirmed by Prime Minister Chou En-lai.

8. The Government of India are prepared, as soon as the current tensions have eased and the appropriate climate is created, to enter into further discussions on the India-China boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials as contemplated during the meeting of Prime Minister Chou En-lai with the Prime Minister of India in 1960. The Government of India hope that the Government of China will give a positive response on the concrete suggestions made by the Government of India for relaxation of the current tensions and for creation of the right climate for negotiations.

9. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

The Chinese Government protested on July 16, 1962, against the establishment of three strongpoints for aggressive purposes by Indian troops in the Pangong Lake area of Tibet, China. According to further reports, three more new aggressive strongpoints have been recently set up by Indian troops in the same area. One is situated on the northern bank of the Pangong Lake, about two kilometres north of the strongpoint set up by Indian troops near Sirijap not long ago, and only about 200 metres from a Chinese border post (approximately 33° 45·5' N, 78° 50·5' E). Another is situated on the southern bank of the Lake, at approximately 33° 40·5' N, 78° 47' E, as deep as about 4 kilometres inside Chinese territory. The third is situated at approximately 34° 03' N, 78° 44' E, only about one and a half kilometres from a Chinese border post. At the same time, Indian motor-boats have been more and more frequently intruding into the Chinese part of the Pangong Lake.

What is particularly serious is that the Indian troops intruding into the Pangong Lake area have even engaged in provocative activities against the Chinese border post at approximately 33° 45·5' N, 78° 50·5' E. On July 21, 37 fully-armed Indian soldiers setting out from the aforesaid aggressive strongpoint newly set up on the northern bank of the Pangong Lake pressed forward all the way to a point only about 100 metres from the Chinese post. The Indian troops stopped advancing only after the Chinese border guards had repeatedly given out warnings. The Chinese border guards displayed the greatest self-restraint all through in spite of the serious threats they faced. The Chinese Government, however, is surprised to learn from the Indian Ministry of External Affairs' note of July 22, which it has just received, that the Indian Government not only evaded the fact that the Indian troops had pressed on the Chinese post, but also slandered without any ground whatsoever that the Chinese border guards had fired at the Indian troops. This allegation can only be regarded as an attempt to cover up the Indian troops' unwarranted provocative activities. The same Indian note also referred to the armed conflict which occurred in the Chip Chap River area on July 21, but the account given is completely contrary to the facts, of which the Chinese Government already made a correct narration in its note of July 22.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest against the new intrusions and provocations of Indian troops and categorically rejects the protest made in the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated July 22. The Chinese Government demands that the Indian Government immediately withdraw all its aggressive strongpoints and troops from the Pangong Lake area.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 28 July 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to state that on 27th July, 1962 at 10.00 hours a Chinese patrol opened fire on an Indian patrol from a distance of 300 yards at a position approximately E 78° 46’ 30”, N 33° 57’. The Chinese patrol then withdrew immediately. In spite of grave provocation the Indian patrol did not return fire. The Government of India lodge a strong and emphatic protest against this grave provocation on the part of Chinese forces.

The Indian Government has already in its Note of July 22nd called the attention of the Chinese Government to two earlier incidents of a similar nature and warned them of the dangers implicit in the presence of Chinese forces in this area. But for the extreme self-restraint shown by the Indian patrol this incident might have resulted in an unfortunate clash. The Indian Government demands that immediate steps should be taken to end continuing Chinese military activity in this area.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 July 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state that a further case of unprovoked firing by Chinese troops occurred at 14.15 hours on 29th July when a group of 20 Chinese soldiers opened fire on an Indian party in the vicinity of Yula in the Pangong lake area. The Indian party, although provoked, did not return the fire.

The Government of India have in the recent past drawn the attention of the Chinese Government to the mounting tension in this area caused by the aggressive military activity and irresponsible behaviour of the Chinese local forces in the Ladakh region. If the Chinese Government do not restrain their local forces, they will have to bear full responsibility for any untoward incident that might occur.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 30 July 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

The Chinese Government has learnt from reports from local authorities that the Indian side, while intensifying its encroachment on Chinese territory on the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, successively sent out two groups of soldiers with radio sets to intrude into China's Wuje area on the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border at the end of May and in the second week of June, 1962, and that these soldiers, having stationed themselves there, have built fortifications and illegally set up military strongpoints. At the same time, Indian aircraft have repeatedly intruded into the air space over that area to drop supplies for the intruding Indian troops.

As is well-known, the Wuje area has always been Chinese territory and under the effective jurisdiction of China. As a result of the intrusion of Indian troops in 1955, a situation of armed confrontation between China and India was once created in this area. Then, on the initiative of the Chinese side, the two sides reached an agreement in 1956 that both sides should refrain from sending troops into the Wuje area so as to ease the tension and prevent border clashes. In the summer of 1961, however, the Indian side, flagrantly violating the agreement, sent troops into the Wuje area and stationed them there. Against this the Chinese Government lodged a protest with the Indian Government in its note dated November 2, 1961. Now the Indian troops have again intruded into the Wuje area and aggravated the border tension. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against India's violation of the agreement and intrusion into Chinese territory, and demands that the Indian Government immediately withdraw the intruding Indian troops from the Wuje area.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 1 August 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

1. Following the armed attack on the Chinese border post in the Chip Chap River valley area in Sinkiang, China, on July 21, 1962, the Indian troops which have intruded into this area have set up a new strongpoint for aggressive purposes at approximately 35°20'N, 78° 3.5' E, only about 2.5 kilometres southwest of the Chinese post. At 14:00 hours on July 27, 14 Indian soldiers from the said strongpoint pressed forward to a place about 700 metres west of the Chinese post and fired two shots at it provocatively. The Chinese troops did not return fire.

2. Two more aggressive strongpoints have been established by Indian troops, one in the area south of the Chip Chap valley and the other near the source of the Karakash River both, in Sinkiang, China. The former is located at approximately 35°07'N, 78°21'E, as deep as about 20 kilometres inside Chinese territory and the latter at approximately 34° 57.5' N, 78° 26' E, as deep as about 19 kilometres inside Chinese territory.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this new series of intrusions and provocative firing by the Indian side.

It must be pointed out that the above-mentioned activities of Indian troops show that the Indian side continues to make every effort to nibble away and move forward on Chinese territory in a deliberate attempt to assert its unlawful territorial claims on China by armed encroachment and threat of force. Moreover, these intrusions further demonstrate that the armed attack launched by Indian troops on the Chinese side in the Chip Chap valley area on July 21 was by no means accidental. It is a serious consequence arising solely from India's premeditated effort to expand its occupation of Chinese territory. To prevent further deterioration of the current situation along the Sino-Indian border, the Indian Government must immediately withdraw all its aggressive strongpoints newly established on Chinese territory and desist from all provocations against China.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 1 August 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

A detachment of Indian troops crossed the boundary and intruded into the Nyagzu area north of the Pangong Lake in Tibet, China, at about 12.30 hours on July 27, 1962. Having made a reconnaissance on a nearby Chinese border post for about half an hour from a place at approximately 33°57'N, 78°44'5'E, they suddenly fired 16 rounds at the Chinese post. It was only because the Chinese side did its best to maintain an attitude of self-restraint that an untoward incident was averted. The Indian troops did not withdraw from Chinese territory till about 13.40 hours. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this new deliberate provocation by the Indian side against Chinese border guards.

The aforesaid incident is the fifth in 12 days since July 16, 1962, in which provocative firing was made by the Indian side against Chinese border guards on the western sector of the Sino-Indian border. Indian troops have recently set up 6 new strongpoints for aggressive purposes in Chinese territory in the area around the Pangong Lake and Nyagzu (vide the Chinese Government's Notes of July 16 and July 28). The intruding Indian troops moreover made reconnaissance and harassment on the Chinese posts there from time to time. The Chinese Government once again draws the attention of the Indian Government to the danger of the repeated intrusions and provocations. In order to avoid grave incidents, the intruding Indian troops must immediately stop making provocations to the Chinese side and withdraw completely from Chinese territory.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 3 August 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to

The Chinese Note under reference has made three allegations, namely:—

(i) that a detachment of Indian troops crossed the boundary
and approached the Chinese frontier post at 35° 30' N,
78° 07' E at about 13.30 hours on 16th July 1962, and fired
two shots at the said post;

(ii) that several dozens of Indian troops intruded into Chinese
territory south of the Galwan River at 34° 34:5' N, 78°
35:5' E on 19th July 1962, at 17.35 hours and fired at a
Chinese patrol; and

(iii) that Indian troops made an armed attack on a Chinese
post at 35° 20' N, 78° 05' E on July 21, 1962.

The Government of India have carefully investigated all the three
allegations and have found them to be without any basis whatso-
ever. As regards the first two allegations, it is significant that
although they are said to have occurred on the 16th and 19th July
respectively, neither of them finds any place in an earlier Chinese
Note dated 21st July. The third allegation that Indian troops
attacked a Chinese post at 35° 20' N, 78° 05' E is a repetition of the
charge made in the Chinese note of 21st July 1962, which has been
shown to be baseless in the Indian Government's reply dated 26th

The Government of India note in this connection that all the
three areas referred to by the Chinese Government lie well within
Indian territory. It is clear from this that such intrusions as have
occurred, have in fact been committed by Chinese forces and not
by Indian troops. The Indian border defence forces have, despite
provocation by Chinese forces throughout shown considerable patience
and self-restraint.

While rejecting the Chinese Note, the Government of India would
once again press upon the Chinese Government the urgent necessity
of issuing immediate instructions to all Chinese forces to desist from
provocative action of any kind and to withdraw from Indian
territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity
to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the
assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the
Embassy of India in China, 4 August 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has
the honour to state the following:

In disregard of the repeated protests of the Chinese Government,
the Indian side has not only refused to withdraw its troops which
have intruded into the Galwan River valley in Sinkiang, China, and
menacingly surrounded the Chinese frontier guards there, but set
up another military stronghold on Chinese territory south of the
Galwan River at approximately 34°34'5" N, 78°35'5" E. What is
particularly grave is that the intruding Indian troops, after firing at
nearby Chinese frontier guards on July 19, 1962 (vide Chinese
Government's note of July 23, 1962) recently again fired provocatively
at Chinese frontier guards on two successive occasions. The first
occasion took place around 12.10 hours on July 31, 1962, at which
time one shot was fired. The second occasion took place around 20.10
hours on August 1, at which time seven shots were fired. The bullets
all struck the site where the Chinese frontier guards were located.
It was only because the Chinese frontier guards exercised the utmost
restraint and did not fire back that a clash was avoided. Such actions
of the Indian troops in continuing their provocative firings against
Chinese frontier guards demonstrate that the Indian side has no
intention of relaxing but is wilfully aggravating the tension in the
Galwan River valley. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a
strong protest against such intrusion and provocative acts of the
Indian troops and once again demands that the Indian troops stop
immediately their provocations against Chinese frontier guards and
withdraw from Chinese territory.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in
China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the
Embassy of India in China, 4 August 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the
honour to state the following:

It has been established by the Chinese Government on the basis
of carefully verified reports from its frontier forces that since the
middle of May 1962, there have occurred on the eastern sector of the
Sino-Indian border new instances of Indian troops crossing the
so-called McMahon Line and intruding into the Migyitun area in
China's Tibet.

(1) On the morning of May 18, five fully-armed Indian military-
men intruded into Longju in the Migyitun area to conduct
reconnaissance.

(2) On the morning of May 30, four Indian militarymen carrying
weapons intruded into Ruyu in the Migyitun area and conducted
reconnaissance for a long time on the Chinese frontier forces stationed
in the northern part of the Migyitun area. They again gave out word
that Indian troops intended to come and stay in Longju.

(3) On the evening of June 4, five Indian militarymen carrying
arms intruded into Ruyu.

(4) On the evening of June 11, six fully-armed Indian militarymen
intruded into a place on the western bank of the Lo River northwest
of Longju.

(5) On the morning of June 13, six Indian militarymen intruded
into Longju and Ruyu.

(6) On the morning of June 18, three Indian militarymen sneaked
surreptitiously to the mountain-sides north of Longju to make a
reconnaissance.

(7) On the morning of June 22, five Indian militarymen carrying
arms intruded into a place on the western bank of the Lo River northwest of Longju.

The above-cited facts of the repeated intrusions by Indian troops
into Longju and other places have further exploded the falsehood of
the assertion made in the Indian Government's note of May 28, 1962,
that "Indian forces have not re-entered Longju since 26th August
1959." The Chinese Government hereby lodges another serious
protest with the Indian Government against the repeated intrusions
into Chinese territory by Indian troops.

The Chinese Government notes with regret that in the note of
May 28, 1962 referred to above, the Indian Government not only
refused to admit the fact that the Indian troops had intruded into
Longju on April 28, 1962, but made a counter-charge against the
Chinese Government, alleging that the fact of the Chinese Government protesting against the Indian Government is in itself a demonstration that “the Chinese troops again trespassed into Longju”, and on this basis it even went so far as to lodge a counter-protest with the Chinese side. Such a counter-charge is nothing but an unreasonable absurdity and does not worth refuting at all. The Chinese Government categorically rejects this counter-protest of India. The Chinese Government has also received the Indian Government’s note of June 6, 1962, in which it repeated the allegation that Chinese personnel had entered Ruyu in the second week of January 1962. As pointed out in the Chinese Government’s note of May 15, 1962, such allegation is completely baseless; the Chinese Government once again firmly refutes it.

Both Longju and Ruyu are part of the Migyitun area in Tibet, have always been under the jurisdiction of the Tibet region, China, and, moreover, lie to the north of the “McMahon Line”. After the peaceful liberation of Tibet, there were units of the Chinese People’s Liberation Army stationed in the Migyitun area and various administrative measures were adopted there by the Chinese authorities. It was only during the 1959 rebellion in Tibet that the Indian Government, taking advantage of the transferring of Chinese troops, sent its army into Longju and occupied it. Later, the Indian side launched an attack on Chinese frontier guards, which resulted in the first bloody clash between the Chinese and the Indian sides. All these are undeniable facts.

In an attempt to justify its deliberate violation of the status quo of the boundary and expansion of its encroachment on Chinese territory, the Indian Government has racked its brains to cook up a story about the geographical location of Longju and Ruyu and their relation to Migyitun. The Indian Government arbitrarily asserts that Migyitun is not an area, but merely a small village, and that the so-called McMahon Line just touches its southern edge. It is further asserted that Longju has no relation at all with Migyitun, that it lies south of the so-called McMahon Line, and 2 miles from both Migyitun and the so-called McMahon Line. However, a fabrication is after all a fabrication and does not hold water at all. In the first instance, this Indian story is inconsistent with the original map showing the “McMahon Line” attached to the secret notes illegally exchanged between the representatives of Britain and the local Government of Tibet during the 1914 Simla Conference. As shown on that map, the “McMahon Line” does not touch Migyitun, but lies south of it at quite a distance. In the second instance, the present Indian story contradicts its past assertions. As stated in Prime Minister Nehru’s letter to Premier Chou En-lai dated September 26, 1959, the alleged distance between Longju and Migyitun is not 2 miles but 1½ miles. In his speech at the Indian Lok Sabha on April 3, 1961, Prime Minister Nehru again had something different to say about the location of Longju, stating: “A little part of the village (Longju) this side (of the “McMahon Line”) and a part of it on that side.” All these contradictions fully reveal the fact that the Indian Government, in an attempt to usurp Longju, has tried hard to push the so-called McMahon Line further north, arbitrarily separated Longju from the
Migiyitun area and fabricated a non-existent distance which can be prolonged or shortened at will. But the truth cannot be covered up by such clumsy tactics.

In its note, the Indian Government again harped on its hackneyed false counter-charge against China with regard to the armed clash in the Migiyitun area in August 1959. This is also a painstaking but futile effort. Regarding the cause and the full factual details of that unfortunate incident, the Chinese Government already gave a complete picture in its notes of August 27 and September 1, 1959. That incident, like the Kongka Pass incident which occurred two months later, took place solely because the Indian troops launched an unwarranted attack on the Chinese frontier guards, who were compelled to defend themselves in the circumstances. Immediately following the two incidents, the Chinese Government proposed on its own initiative that armed forces of the two sides each withdraw along the entire border 20 kilometres from the line up to which each side exercises actual control and stop patrolling. But these reasonable proposals aimed at ensuring tranquillity along the border and easing the border situation were all rejected by India. Every fact shows that China, seeking a peaceful settlement of the boundary question, has all along stood for the maintenance of the status quo of the boundary and worked for the preservation of tranquillity along the border while India's attitude is the very opposite.

It is an indisputable fact that Longju and Ruyu, as a part of the Migiyitun area, are Chinese territory and located north of the "McMahon Line". There is no doubt about it. This area had always been tranquil and peaceful and there had been no dispute between the two sides over it till the armed clash provoked by the Indian side in 1959. If the Indian Government is really sincere about a peaceful settlement of the boundary question, it should change its line of action, maintain the status quo of the boundary and tranquillity along the border, and, in deeds and not merely in words, stop sending out armed personnel to intrude into any part of the Migiyitun area.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the note handed over to the Chinese Embassy in India by the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government on July 26, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

The incident which occurred in the Chip Chap valley on July 21, 1962 was unfortunate and regrettable. The Chinese Government has given in its note dated July 22, 1962 a correct account of the incident and pointed out in its note of July 28 that the presentation given in the Indian Government's note of July 22 was inconsistent with the facts. The Chinese Government does not propose to reiterate the relevant facts.

The Chinese Government cannot agree to the allegation in the Indian note that the present tension in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border was caused by the Chinese side. This allegation is extremely unjust. The fact is that the Chinese side has never crossed its national border which has always been under China's control, and that the tension was created solely by the Indian side advancing into Chinese territory, establishing new posts, and making provocations. After the officials' meetings of the two countries, Indian troops first stepped up their encroachment on the Demchok area in Tibet, and then, since last spring, they have successively intruded into such areas as the Chip Chap valley, the source of the Karakash River, and the Galwan River Valley in Sinkiang, and the Pangong and Spanggur Lakes in Tibet. They have successively set up 27 military strong-points on Chinese territory and more and more frequently resorted to armed threats against Chinese frontier guards by unwarranted firings which have occurred on 12 occasions up to now. At the same time, Indian aircraft have repeatedly intruded into China's air space over Sinkiang and Tibet for reconnaissance, airdropping and harassment purposes, making more than 300 sorties in the period from 1961 to the end of June 1962.

In the face of Indian intrusions and provocations, China has all along maintained an attitude of self-restraint. In its notes delivered during this period, the Chinese Government, while demanding that the Indian troops stop their intrusions and provocations and withdraw from Chinese territory, has all along maintained that the boundary question should be settled peacefully through negotiations, and that the status quo of the boundary should not be altered by force. The Indian Government's suggestion of May 14, 1962 is in fact requiring China to make an one-sided withdrawal from large tracts of its own territory. The Chinese Government of course cannot give consideration to it, neither in the past nor in the future.

Mention was made in the note under reference of the question regarding the Chinese map of 1956. During the officials' meetings of
the two countries, the Chinese side officially provided the Indian side with a map showing the Sino-Indian boundary. The delineation of the boundary in the western sector on the 1956 Chinese map affirmed by Premier Chou En-lai is the same as the delineation on that map. It is groundless to insist that there are discrepancies in the delineation of the boundary in the western sector in these two maps and to blame China for crossing the boundary line affirmed by Premier Chou En-lai. The basic way to ease the tension is not for the Chinese side to withdraw whatever distance within its own territory, but for the Indian side to withdraw its troops and strongpoints from Chinese territory, and in the first place, to stop further encroaching on Chinese territory and desist from any armed provocations.

The Chinese Government approves of the suggestion put forth by the Indian Government in its note for further discussions on the Sino-Indian boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials of the two countries. There need not and should not be any pre-conditions for such discussions. As a matter of fact, if only the Indian side stop advancing into Chinese territory, a relaxation of the border situation will be effected at once. Since neither the Chinese nor the Indian Government wants war, and since both governments wish to settle the boundary question peacefully through negotiations, further discussions on the Sino-Indian boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials of the two countries should not be put off any longer. The Chinese Government proposes that such discussions be held as soon as possible, and that the level, date, place and other procedural matters for these discussions be immediately decided upon by consultations through diplomatic channels. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will give positive consideration to this proposal and kindly reply at an early date.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 August 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to refer to two Notes presented by the Chinese Government to the Indian Charge d’ Affaires at Peking on August 1, 1962.

The Government of India in their note of 28th July lodged a protest that a Chinese patrol had opened fire at 10.00 hrs. on 27th July against an Indian patrol in the Chip Chap valley area approximately in the region referred to in the Chinese Note. The Chinese note presumably refers to the same incident. The allegation by Chinese authorities that an Indian patrol resorted to firing at a Chinese post is not only baseless but appears to be an attempt to confuse issues and escape responsibility for the aggressive activity of the Chinese local forces against which a protest has been lodged in the Indian note of the 28th July.

The Government of India have satisfied themselves that no Indian military post has been established in any part of Chinese territory. It is the Chinese local forces who have established Chinese military posts in Indian territory and caused serious tension by their continuing aggressive activities in the Ladakh region of India. The Government of India emphatically reject the Chinese allegation that Indian posts have been set up in areas that are 19 and 20 kilometres respectively inside Chinese territory.

The Chinese allegation that on 27th July a detachment of Indian troops fired at a Chinese post in Nyagzu north of Pangong lake is absolutely without any foundation. No Indian party was in that area on that date. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

Indian troops have recently established a new strongpoint for aggressive purposes in Tsamageje about two kilometres southeast of the village of Demchok in western Tibet, China, and have built pillboxes, dugouts, trenches and other defence works there. The intruding Indian troops even gave out word that they would advance further inside Chinese territory. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest against this serious new encroachment by the Indian side on Chinese territory.

The Chinese Government has pointed out in its note of March 20, 1962, the various facts of Indian troops intruding into the Demchok area and setting up strongpoints there in the latter half of last year. The Chinese Government notes with regret that the Indian Government in its note of May 21, 1962, while completely evading the facts, merely repeated the assertions made in past Indian notes which had long been refuted by the Chinese Government, arbitrarily insisting that Demchok was within Indian territory. But the Demchok area has always been a part of Chinese territory, and this was established by the strong evidence submitted by the Chinese side during the meeting of the officials of the two countries in 1960. Even the handbook "Tibet" compiled by the British Foreign Office in 1920 clearly recognized this fact. There is no need to cite others. It is extremely unjustifiable that the Indian Government has now again set up a new aggressive strongpoint in China's Demchok area in disregard of the Chinese Government's repeated protests and arbitrarily described what has always been Chinese territory as Indian. The Chinese Government hereby demands that the Indian Government immediately withdraw all its aggressive strongpoints and intruding Indian troops from the Demchok area.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 August 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's Note dated August 3, 1962.

The facts in regard to the Indian border defence post at 78° 38' E 34° 39' 45" N in the Galwan Valley have already been stated in the Indian Government's note of 10th July 1962. This post is purely for defence purposes and is located on Indian territory. It does not pose any threat to anyone. On the other hand, it is the Chinese forces who have intruded into Indian territory in this area in large numbers who continue to threaten the Indian post and who are sitting astride the lines of communication and supplies of the post. The Government of India emphatically protest against these aggressive questions of the Chinese forces who have intruded into Indian territory. The Government of India hopes that the Chinese Government will impress on their local forces the importance of avoiding provocative action of any kind and ask them to withdraw from their present positions back into Chinese territory.

In regard to the Chinese allegation about an Indian post at 78° 35·5' E, 34° 34·5' N an Indian ration party is located at present near 78° 38·5' E, 34° 34·5' N. This area like the area where the Indian post at 78° 38' E, 34° 39' 45" N is situated, also falls well inside Indian territory. The disposition of Indian border defence forces in these areas is an internal matter within the sole competence of the Government of India.

The Chinese note under reference also makes two baseless allegations, namely, that on July 31, 1962 and on August 1, 1962, Indian troops had fired one shot and seven shots respectively at Chinese frontier guards. There is no truth whatsoever in these allegations. On the contrary, whenever an instance of this nature has arisen it has invariably been due to Chinese forces intruding into Indian territory and shooting at Indian border defence forces. The Government of India have protested about two such incidents in their notes dated 28th July 1962 and 30th July 1962, addressed to the Chinese Government. On both occasions the Indian forces exercised great self-restraint and did not return the Chinese fire.

In the light of the above facts, the Government of India reject the Chinese note of 3rd August, 1962.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 8 August 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to
refer to the Chinese Government's note of 3rd August, 1962.

The facts in regard to the villages of Longju and Roi have been
fully stated in the Government of India notes dated 26th May 1962
and 6th June, 1962 respectively. It will be apparent from these notes
that there is no substance in the Chinese assertion that Longju and
Roi are situated north of the McMahon line. Both these villages
are well inside the international boundary in this region and have
always formed part of Indian territory. Longju is about 2 miles
south of the international border and Roi a further half a mile
south of Longju.

There is absolutely no truth in the Chinese allegation that Indian
military personnel have entered Longju on six separate occasions
between 18th May, 1962 and 22nd June, 1962. After the forcible occu-
pation of Longju in August 1959 by Chinese forces, the Indian
Government had, in the interests of a peaceful settlement, expressed
their willingness vide their note dated 10th September 1959, not to
send their personnel back to the area, provided the Chinese personnel
also withdrew. The Chinese personnel had withdrawn from Longju
some time in 1961 but the Indian side has made no attempt to re-enter
Longju.

As regards the village of Roi, it too forms an indisputable part
of Indian territory. This has been made clear in the Indian Govern-
ment's note of 6th June, 1962. Such intrusions as have taken place
there have, indeed, been committed by the Chinese.

In an attempt to confuse the issue, the Chinese note has made
an out of context reference to a speech by the Prime Minister before
the Indian Parliament and also quoted the Indian Prime Minister's
letter to the Premier Chou En-lai, dated 26th September, 1959, which
stated that the distance between Longju and the Tibetan village of
Migyitin is one and a half miles and pointed out that in the Indian
Government's note dated 28th May, 1962 this distance has been
shown as "about 2 miles". The relevant portion of the annexure
to the Prime Minister's letter, however, reads as follows:—

"The international boundary here runs just south of the village
of Migyitin. Longju which is entirely distinct from
Migyitin lies 1½ miles further south of the border. It
cannot be a part of Migyitin which was a decaying village
of 12 huts in 1913 and had further deteriorated to 6 huts
and a monastic inn in 1935. The lands attached to
Migyitin village were few and extended to a very short
distance from the village."

It follows from this that the Chinese contention of Longju
forming part of the Tibetan village of Migyitin is completely
untenable.
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To suggest in this connection that the incident at Longju in August 1959 was due to Indian troops launching "an unwarranted attack on the Chinese frontier guards" is a complete travesty of facts. In every instance of a clash on the Sino-Indian border it has always been Indian border defence guards who have been attacked, without warning and on Indian territory, by Chinese troops who intruded into Indian territory. There is no doubt that the Chinese Government has been responsible, by its aggressive policy, for converting a peaceful border into a border of tension. In order, therefore, to restore tranquillity once again on the border it is imperative that the Chinese forces withdraw from Indian territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 August 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

At about 19.30 hours on 14th August 1962 a party of Chinese troops took up position opposite an Indian post at Yula in the Pangong Lake region and commenced firing. The Indian post was compelled to return fire in self-defence. The Chinese party withdrew shortly thereafter.

This is another instance of continuing Chinese aggressive activity in the Ladakh region of India. The Government of India will hold the Chinese Government responsible for any untoward incident that might occur as a result of this intensified military activity.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 August 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Government’s note dated 28th July 1962, has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese note under reference merely repeats the baseless charges made in the earlier note of 16th July 1962. These have already been shown to be without any foundation in the Indian Government’s reply dated the 24th July 1962.

In regard to the Indian posts said to have been established at 33° 45.5’ N, 78° 50.5’ E, 33° 40.5’ N, 78° 47’ E and at 34° 03’ N, 78° 44’ E, although the co-ordinates given are not all correct, it is a fact that there are some Indian defence posts in this area. All these posts are located well inside Indian territory. As the Government of China are aware, the international boundary in this sector of the border cuts across the eastern part of Spanggur Lake and follows the northern and eastern watershed of the Indus. The Government of India cannot entertain any representation from the Chinese Government regarding the disposition of Indian security forces inside Indian territory. Such attempts of interference in the internal affairs of India must cease.

The Chinese Government have also repeated the allegations contained in their note dated 22nd July 1962, that Indian soldiers “engaged in provocative activities against the Chinese border at approximately 33° 45.5’ N, 78° 50.5’ E”. The facts in regard to this incident have already been conveyed to the Chinese Government in the Indian Government’s note of 22nd July 1962. An Indian party in this region was fired upon by Chinese intruding troops on 21st July. In spite of grave provocation the Indian forces exercised great self-restraint and did not return the fire.


The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

At about 16.30 hours on August 13, 1962 the Indian troops unlawfully entrenched at approximately 34°34'5"N, 78°35'5"E south of the Galwan River in Sinkiang, China, once again fired unwarrantedly at the Chinese frontier guards in the vicinity. They fired four separate shots, which all fell on the position of the Chinese frontier guards. After firing each shot, the provocative Indian soldiers made observation and pried on the position of the Chinese frontier guards. In the face of the Indian troops' provocations the Chinese frontier guards throughout maintained self-restraint and did not return fire.

The above-mentioned incident is the Indian troops' fourth provocative firing at Chinese frontier guards since they intruded into the Galwan River valley last July. It has indisputably overthrown the Indian denial of the previous provocative firings at Chinese frontier guards (reference the Chinese Government's notes of July 23 and August 3, 1962). Regarding this incident, the Chinese Government hereby lodges another strong protest with the Indian Government and urges the Indian Government to give serious thought to the danger involved in India's ceaseless military provocations as well as its responsibilities and to withdraw at once all the Indian troops which have invaded the Galwan River valley.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 August 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the Indian Government's note of June 30, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

The Chinese Government has noted that the Indian Government admits in the above-mentioned note that on May 29, 1962 Indian border guards pursued and fired at the Roma family, Tibetan inhabitants who were on their way home, and that Roma himself was shot dead by the Indian soldiers and Roma's sister-in-law Yekhu and two children she carried on her back were taken back to Taksing by the Indian side. To evade responsibility, however, the Indian Government in its note had turned the facts upside down and fabricated a false story, which the Chinese Government hereby categorically refutes.

The facts are most clear. The Roma family used to be peaceable inhabitants of the Lung Village in Luntzu County, Tibet, China. In May 1959 they were taken to the Taksing area south of the "McMahon Line" under the compulsion of Tibetan rebels. Six members of the family, who made a narrow escape from the Indian soldiers' shooting, have now returned to their original abode in the Lung Village and reunited with their relatives and friends. The assertion in the Indian note that Roma and his family were "Indian tribesmen" or "fugitives" from India is wholly untenable. The Roma family were returning to the Lung Village of their own free will. But they met with obstructions and were pursued by Indian troops who crossed the so-called McMahon Line, fired at them and killed and wounded four of them, including a woman and her children. Such atrocity committed by Indian soldiers against peaceable Chinese inhabitants has shown up the falsity of the assertion in the Indian note that the Indian side has "never stood in the way" of any Tibetan inhabitants returning to their motherland. The Indian note furthermore attempts to describe the whole incident as taking place south of the so-called McMahon Line. This is entirely contrary to the fact. The place of the incident created by the Indian soldiers is definitely Natienmula, which is north of the "McMahon Line." This can be testified by all the survivors of the Roma family. It is all the more absurd for the Indian side to say that the incident started because someone had "stolen a rifle" and "fired at" Indian soldiers. It is utterly unbelievable that a rifle of the Indian army or police should have been stolen so easily or that the Roma family, burdened with old people and small children, should be able to "fire at" six fully-armed Indian soldiers with one "stolen rifle" and "exchange fire" with them.

In view of the above, the Indian Government cannot escape the serious responsibility it should bear for this incident in which Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory and shot dead a
peaceable Chinese inhabitant. The Chinese Government reiterates its demands made in its note of June 18, 1962, and urges that the Indian Government immediately return the body of Roma and the kidnapped Yekhu and her children.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 August 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the Indian Government's note of August 15, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

In its note the Indian Government alleged that at about 19.30 hours on August 14, 1962 a detachment of Chinese troops fired on an Indian post at Yula in the Pangong Lake area, and the Indian post fired back. Careful investigation conducted by the Chinese Government shows that the armed clash described in the Indian note is a sheer fabrication. On August 14 no Chinese frontier guards ever fired on the aggressive strongpoint set up by Indian troops in Yula, nor were they fired on in return by any Indian troops. The Chinese Government expresses great surprise and regret at this trumped-up charge made by India. At a time when the Governments of the two countries are exchanging views for holding discussions as soon as possible on the Sino-Indian boundary question, the Indian Government has invented an exchange of fire between the troops of the two sides in the Pangong Lake area in China. This cannot but be deemed as done with ulterior motives. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the trumped-up charge made by the Indian Government.

It must be pointed out that the current tension in the Pangong Lake area, including Yula, is created solely because Indian troops have intruded into Chinese territory in this area, unlawfully set up strongpoints and made provocations there. In order to ease the situation, the intruding Indian troops must immediately withdraw from Chinese territory.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 18 August 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note of 7th August, 1962.

It is unfortunate that the Chinese Government should continue to repeat their unwarranted territorial claims in respect of the Demchok area in Ladakh, ignoring the wealth of consistent and conclusive evidence brought out by the Indian side at the meetings of the officials of the two Governments. The traditional boundary alignment between the two countries in this sector has always been east of Demchok. This has been confirmed by impartial observers and travellers from the early eighteenth century onwards. They include Ippolito Desideri (1715-1716) and James Baille Frazer (1820). There is also an unbroken administrative record showing the exercise of Indian jurisdiction over this area for many centuries. There can, therefore, be no doubt that the international frontier in this area runs five miles south-east of Demchok, which is well inside Indian territory.

In an effort to bolster up a non-existent case, the Chinese note has made an irrelevant reference to a Handbook entitled "Tibet". The only document quoted by the Chinese side at the officials' talks, which contained a reference to a border point, clearly specified that the traditional alignment lay along the LHARI. This is very close to the traditional Indian alignment and far removed from the line now claimed by China.

In such a context, for the Chinese Government to raise question about the disposition of Indian border defence posts in the Demchok area is an entirely unjustified interference in an internal matter which is within the sole competence of the Government of India. Indian border posts within Indian territory are intended purely for purposes of defence and stand in sharp contrast to the numerous unlawful Chinese posts set up in recent years on Indian soil.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 August 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated the 18th August, 1962.

The Government of India have already given the full facts about the incident concerning the Roma family in their note dated the 30th June 1962, and have nothing to add to them. The incident took place inside Indian territory and full details of the incident were reported by the local administration to the Government of India in the first week of June long before the Chinese note of 18th June. Though this was a purely internal matter within the sole jurisdiction of the Indian Government, the Ministry, in its note of 30th June, communicated these facts in order to remove the possibility of any misunderstanding on the Chinese side. It is most surprising that the facts given by the Government of India should be questioned by the Chinese Government who could not possibly have any knowledge of what actually transpired inside Indian territory. The Government of India regret that the Chinese Government should attempt to exploit the misfortune of the Roma family, which they alone had brought upon themselves, for making false and propagandist allegations against India.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 22 August 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows:

While the Chinese Government have been levelling baseless charges against the Government of India, Chinese forces have systematically continued to violate India's territorial integrity. In recent weeks Chinese forces have set up no less than 18 new aggressive military posts deep inside Indian territory. These posts, particulars of which are given below, have been set up even subsequent to the establishment of the 9 previous posts which formed the subject matter of the Indian Government's note of protest dated the 12th July 1962:—

(a) Chip Chap region

1. Post at 78° 05' E, 35° 20' N—ten miles east of Daulet Beg Oldi.
2. Post at 78° 04' E, 35° 23' N—Seven miles east of Daulet Beg Oldi.
3. Post at 78° 05' E, 35° 23' N—near Daulet Beg Oldi.
4. Post at 78° 07' 30" E, 35° 17' N.
5. Post at 78° 17' E, 35° 18' N.
6. Post at 78° 15' 30" E, 35° 10' N.
7. Post at 78° 12' 30" E, 35° 22' 30" N.
8. Post at 78° 10' E, 35° 22' N.
9. Post at 78° 07' 30" E, 35° 27' 30" N.
10. Post at 78° 13' E, 35° 19' N.

(b) Galwan Valley region

11. Post at 78° 38' 51' E, 34° 34.5' N.
12. Post at 78° 33' 5' E, 34° 40' N.

(c) Pangong-Spanggur region

13. Post at 78° 44' 45" E, 34° 03' 30" N about a 1000 yards east of the Indian defence post near Kongma.
14. Post at 78° 54' 45" E, 33° 42' N.
15. Post at 78° 52' E, 33° 44' 30" N about a 1000 yards north east of the Indian defence post at Sirijap.
16. Post at 78° 47' E, 33° 38' 30" N.
(d) Qara Qash region

17. Post at 78° 26' 15" E 35° 03' N.
18. Post at 78° 25' 45" E 35° 02' N.

Besides the above posts four camps have been established and five additional strong points set up by Chinese forces around the Indian post at 78° 38' E 34° 39' 45" N on the Galwan river thereby greatly aggravating the tension in the area.

The Ministry lodges an emphatic protest against the establishment of these new Chinese posts, camps and strong points deep inside Indian territory. These constitute further serious violations of India's territorial integrity. Not only are Chinese forces now located in menacing proximity to existing Indian defence posts in the area but their provocative activities are increasing the tension in the area and, if not restrained, might well result in untoward incidents. The Government of India will hold the Chinese Government responsible for any such incidents.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the note of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs dated 4th August, 1962. The Chinese Note refers to two points:

(i) the incident that occurred in the Chip Chap Valley on 21st July and other matters connected with the India-China boundary in the Ladakh region of India; and

(ii) the suggestions for further discussion on the India-China boundary question with a view to resolving the differences between the two governments.

This Note deals with point (i). A Separate note is being presented in connection with the second point.

2. It is surprising that the Chinese note, while referring to the incident that occurred in the Chip Chap Valley on 21st July, as "unfortunate and regrettable" continues, without giving any reasons, to dispute the carefully verified factual details of the incident given in the Government of India's note of 22nd July. There is no doubt whatever that the Chinese local forces wantonly and without any provocation fired upon the Indian patrol and that the latter had after some time to return the fire in self-defence.

3. Allegations have been made in the Chinese note about Indian intrusions into Chinese territory by establishing military strong points and by over 300 sorties by Indian aircraft into Chinese air space. Demchok, Chip Chap Valley, the source of the Qara Qash river, the Galwan River valley and the Pangong and Spanggur lakes have been referred to in this connection. The Ministry of External Affairs must categorically state that these allegations are completely groundless. The areas referred to are well within Indian territory as stated in detail in the following paragraph. Indian posts established in these areas and routine flights of Indian aircraft in connection with maintenance of supplies and services to the Indian posts in these areas are purely internal matters to be decided by the Government of India in accordance with the requirements of security.

4. Mention has been made in previous correspondence of the boundary claims in the Ladakh region advanced by China in 1956 and in 1960. The Chinese note of 4th August also refers to earlier Indian notes in which the discrepancy between these varying claims was pointed out to the Government of China and attempts to explain away the differences between these claims. These varying Chinese claims were mentioned in the earlier Indian notes simply to illustrate the continuing aggressive activities of the Chinese authorities in making wider boundary claims from time to time.
and getting the Chinese forces to follow these up by further intrusions into Indian territory. These varying claims have no relevance other than the fact that they illustrate Chinese expansionist aims in the area and the confusion prevailing in the minds of the Chinese Government as to the international frontier in the Ladakh region. So far as the Government of India's position on this matter is concerned, the Indian officials have, during the discussions between the Indian and the Chinese officials, established the discrepancies between the various Chinese claims as regards this border and produced a mass of evidence in support of the well established and recognised international boundary in this region. This international boundary runs from the Karakoram Pass along the watershed between the Shyok (belonging to the Indus system) and the Yarkand, and runs through the Qara Tagh Pass (Lon. 78° 20' East and Lat. 35° 43' North) to cross the eastern bend of the Qara Qash river (north west of Haji Langer) and to ascend the main Kuen Lun mountains. Thereafter the boundary runs through the Yangi Pass (Long. 79° 25' East and Lat. 35° 55' North) along the crest of the mountains separating the Yurungkash basin from those of the lakes in Aksai Chin. It leaves the main crest of the Kuen Lun mountains at a point approximately Long. 80° 21' East and descends in a South-westerly direction, separating the basins of the Amtogor and Sarigh Jilganang lakes in India from those of Leighten and Tsoggar lakes in Tibet, down to Lanak Pass (Lon. 79° 34' East and Lat. 34° 24' North).

5. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the concluding paragraph of the note of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs dated 4th August 1962 which deals with the suggestions for further discussions on the Sino-Indian boundary question.

The Chinese note states that "there need not and should not be any pre-conditions for such discussions" and yet the Chinese Foreign Minister in a broadcast on the Italian-Swiss Radio TV Network on 3rd August proclaimed on a publicity media that has wide coverage that "to wish that Chinese troops would withdraw from their own territory is impossible. That would be against the will of 650 million Chinese. No force in the world could oblige us to do something of this kind". The Chinese note itself states that the Chinese Government cannot give consideration to the suggestion made in Government of India’s note of 14th May 1962 regarding mutual withdrawals in this region "neither in the past nor in the future". These are pre-conditions which contradict the repeated Chinese statements that they want to settle the boundary question peacefully through further discussions. It is obvious that it is the Chinese who are laying down impossible pre-conditions and asking for acceptance of the Chinese claim regarding the boundary in this region before further discussions start.

The statement in the Chinese note "that the Chinese side has never crossed its national border which has always been under Chinese control" is at complete variance with the facts of today and the history of Chinese aggressive activities in the Aksai Chin and Ladakh region since 1957. There was no Chinese presence of any sort in the Aksai Chin and the Ladakh region of India till 1957. The Chinese entered the uninhabited areas of Aksai Chin and its neighbourhood clandestinely some time about 1957 and began to improve the Sinkiang-Tibet caravan route across Aksai Chin. Thereafter they started a series of aggressive moves into the Ladakh area of India, stationing garrisons of troops and indulging in aggressive forward patrolling which led to clashes between the Chinese forces and the Indian patrols in this area. This aggressive activity has been intensified since 1959. The series of notes sent by the Government of India since 1957 onwards on various Chinese intrusions into Indian territory in this region conclusively show that the presence of the Chinese forces and the present acute tension in this region of India are the result of the concerted and deliberate aggressive activities of the Chinese forces in altering the status quo of the boundary in this region by use of force during the last five years. To allege in the context of this factual history of the last five years that what the Chinese claim to be their national border has, in fact, all along been the national border
between China and India in this region is not only factually incorrect but definitely misconceived because it pre-judges the very issue on which further discussions have been suggested.

The Indian authorities all along showed considerable patience and restraint in the face of these aggressive Chinese activities. They were compelled, however, in the face of continuing Chinese intrusions, to take necessary preventive action and had to establish some military posts in this area.

The above paragraphs fully confirm the statement made in the Ministry's note dated 26th July that the factual history of the activities of the local Chinese forces in the Ladakh region is not consistent with the desire for settlement by negotiations expressed by the Chinese Government. If the Government of China are genuinely desirous of resolving the differences between the two Governments on the boundary question by further discussions and negotiations, they must realise that these discussions cannot start unless the status quo of the boundary in this region which has been altered by force since 1957 is restored and the current tensions are removed. There can be no pre-judging or acceptance of the Chinese claim before discussions start.

It will be clear from the factual position and the history of the last five years given above that an essential preliminary to the holding of further discussions on the basis of the report of the officials of the two sides with a view to resolving differences between the two governments on the boundary question is a definition of measures that should be taken to restore the status quo of the boundary in this region which has been altered by force during the last five years and to remove the current tensions in this area so as to create the appropriate climate for purposeful discussions. The Government of India would be glad to receive a representative of the Government of China to discuss these essential preliminary measures.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 23 August 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note of 18th August, 1962.

The Government of India protested against the firing by Chinese troops at an Indian post in the Pangong region to record a factual incident and to bring to the notice of the Chinese authorities that such irresponsible shooting might have had dangerous consequences and was in sharp contrast to the Chinese Government's own stand that they are desirous of peaceful negotiations to settle the Sino-Indian boundary issue. The Government of India categorically reject the allegation that this was a "trumped-up charge" and trust that the Chinese Government, motivated both by a desire to respect the truth and to remove tension in the area would restrain their troops from irresponsible shootings and withdraw them to the east of international frontier, into Chinese territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 August 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following about cases in which armed Indian personnel crossed the China-Sikkim boundary and intruded into Chinese territory:

1. On June 4, 1962 four armed Indian personnel crossed the Nathu La on the China-Sikkim boundary and intruded into the vicinity of Chumbitan in Tibet.

2. On June 15, 1962 three armed Indian personnel crossed the China-Sikkim boundary at Tzelung La and intruded into Chinese territory.

3. In the fourth week of June 1962 five Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory north of Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary. They erected three cairns more than two kilometres north of the Tagi La and declared them to mark the points dividing China and Sikkim.

The above-mentioned activities of armed Indian personnel beyond the China-Sikkim boundary constitute a serious violation of Chinese territory, against which the Chinese Government hereby lodges a protest with the Indian Government. The China-Sikkim boundary has long since been formally delimited and tranquillity has always prevailed along it. It is deeply regrettable that the Indian side should have used the territory of Sikkim to carry out encroaching activities against Chinese territory and sovereignty. The Chinese Government solemnly calls the attention of the Indian Government to such activities and urges that India immediately stop similar activities.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24 August 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state that since the protest lodged on 22nd August by the Ministry of External Affairs on the establishment of 18 new aggressive military posts, deep inside Indian territory, the Ministry has just learnt about a further post having been established by intruding Chinese forces on the 23rd August at a point 78° 45' 00" E, 33° 39' 20" N.

This post, apart from being well within Indian territory, is provocatively located in close proximity of the supply line to Indian posts in this area. The Chinese Government should ensure that this new intrusion is immediately removed. The Government of India will hold the Chinese authorities responsible for any untoward incident that might develop in the area as a result of the continuance of this post in close proximity to the line of supply of the Indian posts in the area.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to
refer to the Chinese Government's note dated 17th August 1962.

The Government of India have enquired fully into the allegation
contained in the Chinese note that, on the 13th August 1962, at
about 16.30 hours, Indian defence forces had fired on Chinese troops
near a point at approximately $34^\circ 34.5'\ N\ 78^\circ 35.5'\ E$ and have found
that the allegation is entirely baseless. Moreover, the area referred
to is located deep inside Indian territory where Chinese forces
could have no justification to be present.

It is a matter of regret that the Chinese Government should
repeat such baseless allegations which are obviously intended for
purposes of anti-Indian propaganda. Similar charges made in the
past have also invariably been proved to be without any founda-
tion.

In recent weeks, it is the Chinese intruders who have on no
less than five occasions opened fire on Indian defence forces sta-
tioned on Indian territory. Except on two occasions, on the 21st
July 1962 and 14th August 1962, when Indian defence forces were
forced in self-defence to return the Chinese fire, on all the other
occasions they exercised great self-restraint and refrained from
returning the fire. The Chinese Government have been informed
about these incidents in the Government of India notes, dated 22nd
July 1962, 28th July 1962, 30th July 1962 and 15th August 1962 and
cannot disown their responsibility in regard to the same. If, there-
fore, the Chinese Government are earnest in their desire to reduce
tension in the area, they should immediately put a stop to their
aggressive activities on the border and peacefully withdraw their
forces from Indian territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity
to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the
assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 27 August 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following with regard to the serious new cases, which happened in the last few days, of successive provocative firing at and armed encirclement of Chinese frontier guards by Indian troops which have intruded into Chinese territory on the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary.

The Indian troops which have intruded into the Galwan River area in Sinkiang have encircled the Chinese frontier guards and cut off the rear route of a Chinese post there for more than a month. They not only refuse to withdraw, but again fired repeatedly at the Chinese frontier guards of late after the four incidents of firing against which the Chinese Government has protested with the Indian Government (vide Chinese Foreign Ministry's note of August 17, 1962). At about 10.30 hours on August 21, 1962, the intruding Indian troops fired two shots at the Chinese frontier guards. At about 20.10 hours on August 22, four Indian soldiers pressed forward to a place as close as about 200 metres from the positions of the Chinese frontier guards and fired another two shots. At about 18.00 hours on August 25, the intruding Indian troops fired four more shots at the Chinese frontier guards. The latter exercised forbearance and self-restraint throughout and did not return fire.

Serious cases of intruding Indian troops closing in on Chinese posts have also occurred in the Pangong Lake area in Tibet. At about 14.00 hours on August 23, 1962, a batch of Indian soldiers in two motor-boats intruded into Chinese territorial waters in the Pangong Lake, where they sailed back and forth and fired nine shots at the southern bank of the Lake for reconnaissance purposes. At about 9.40 hours on August 24, a group of intruding Indian soldiers, numbering about 30, moved towards the Chinese post at approximately 33° 39' N 78° 44' E on the southern bank of the Lake. At about 12.50 hours, the same group of Indian soldiers came as close as about 300 metres of the Chinese post, where they threw themselves down, facing the Chinese post and posing to shoot. Then several more groups of Indian soldiers closed in on the Chinese post from the west and the south. Having come to places as close as about 400 metres of the Chinese post, they constructed defence works and pitched more than 30 tents. These intruding Indian troops, together with those which had earlier pushed to the eastern side of the Chinese post, now form an encirclement of the Chinese post on three sides, and cut off its communication and supply line to the rear.

The above-said provocations by Indian troops repeatedly firing at Chinese frontier guards and closing in on Chinese posts have seriously aggravated the tension on the border and endangering the safety of the Chinese frontier guards. The Chinese Government
hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this and demands that the Indian troops immediately stop such dangerous acts and withdraw from Chinese territory.

In the past two months, Indian troops have intruded into the Galwan River area in Sinkiang and encircled Chinese frontier guards there, and provoked an armed clash in the Chip Chap River area in Sinkiang; after all this they have now encircled a Chinese post in the Pangong Lake area in Tibet and cut off its rear route. These facts indisputably show that India, besides lacking the desire to ease the tension on the border, is doing its utmost to extend its aggression on Chinese territory and intensify its provocations against China, thereby creating more obstacles to a settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary dispute through negotiations.

The Chinese Government reiterates that the Sino-Indian boundary question must be settled through negotiations and the Indian Government's attempt to realise its ambitious territorial claims by force and to coerce China into submission is bound to fail. If the Indian side should overdo it, the Chinese side will have to resort to self-defence, and the Indian side must bear responsibility for all the consequences arising therefrom.

The Chinese Government has just received the Indian Government's note of August 24, in which the above-said Chinese post encircled by Indian troops on three sides in the Pangong Lake area in Tibet was described as "located in close proximity of the supply line to Indian posts." The tactics of the Indian Government of turning the truth upside down and making false counter-charges can in no way cover up India's military provocations related above, nor can it absolve the Indian Government of its responsibility for aggravating the tension on the border. The Chinese Government categorically rejects this totally baseless and malicious charge made by the Indian Government.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated the 30th July, 1962.

The Government of India have carried out detailed investigations into the allegations made in the Chinese note under reference and have found that they are without any basis whatsoever. Bara Hoti forms an integral part of Indian territory. However, no Indian troops are present in the Bara Hoti plateau; the Indian border defence forces are stationed some distance away.

The correct position in respect of Bara Hoti has been conveyed to the Chinese Government on a number of occasions. It will be recollected that in 1955, the then Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy in India had indicated that the location of Bara Hoti, which they claim to be Wuje, was 12 kilometres north of Tunjun La. The Chinese Government later resiled from that position.

In April—May 1958, at the conference on Bara Hoti held at Delhi between Indian and Chinese officials it was again apparent that the Chinese officials did not even know the precise location of Bara Hoti. When pressed for details, the Chinese side could only state vaguely that Wuje was an area south of Tunjun La, covered 15 kilometres north to south and 10 kilometres east to west but no coordinates were made available even with reference to this area. On the Indian side it was made clear that by Bara Hoti they meant a small pasture ground, covering 2 miles in length and ¾ mile in breadth, south of Tunjun La and the relevant coordinates had also been supplied by them. At the Officials’ talks in 1960 Chinese claims had developed even further and the area was stated to be approximately 300 sq. miles.

At the 1958 Delhi conference the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India had proposed that, pending settlement of the dispute, both sides should refrain from sending armed personnel and neither side should exercise civil jurisdiction over this territory or send its civilian personnel. The Chinese delegation, while agreeable to the suggestion of not sending armed parties to the disputed area, had refused to agree to the proposal that neither side should exercise civil jurisdiction over this area. In the absence of such an agreement, the Government of India had informed the Chinese delegation that they would continue to send their civil administrative personnel to the territory. However, they expressly refrained from sending any armed personnel there.

Bara Hoti lies between the main watershed of the Sutlej and Alakhnanda, which is the boundary in this sector and the range of the Himalayas further south. Revenue records and other official documents of the 19th century establish that the watershed is the
traditional frontier between India and Tibet in the region. It has been shown in Indian maps since 1850 when maps of this region based on surveys were first drawn. Even Chinese maps upto 1958 have shown the watershed as the frontier. Bara Hoti, which is south of the watershed, has always been part of India. A large amount of evidence to substantiate this has also been produced by the Indian side at the talks held between the Indian and Chinese officials. It is therefore legitimate for the Government of India to establish checkpoints and despatch civilian personnel required for the administration of the area. To describe the continuation of this administration as "intrusion" is a distortion of facts.

In the light of the facts cited above, the Government of India reject the Chinese Government's note of 30th July 1962.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows:

On 26th August 1962 at about midday, a party of Chinese troops attempted to ambush an Indian patrol on routine duties at a point approximately 33 miles south east of Daulat Beg Oldhi. The intruding Chinese troops were responsible for unprovoked firing which led to the Indian patrol being forced to return the fire in self-defence.

This is yet another instance of the aggressiveness of Chinese local forces who are unlawfully in Indian territory and their interference with the supply line of Indian posts in the area. The Government of India lodge an emphatic protest against this unlawful provocative behaviour of Chinese local forces which may, unless they are immediately restrained, lead to untoward developments.

The Government of India hopes that such unlawful intrusions by Chinese forces will be stopped immediately and they will be withdrawn from Indian territory in order to eliminate the recurrence of such dangerous incidents which are not in keeping with the professions of the Chinese Government that they desire a peaceful solution of the boundary question.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 28 August 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Ministry's notes dated the 22nd August and 24th August 1962 wherein the Government of India have lodged protests regarding the setting up of new military posts by the Chinese forces on Indian territory in Ladakh.

Subsequent to the above notes 4 more Chinese military posts have been established as follows:

**Pangong-Spanggur region**

(1) Post at 78° 45' 45" E, 33° 57' 15" N.
(2) Post at 78° 45' 30" E, 33° 57' 45" N.

**Qara Qash region**

(3) Post at 78° 24' 30" E, 35° 06' 15" N.
(4) Post at 78° 28' 15" E, 35° 07' 45" N.

The Government of India lodge an emphatic protest against the setting up of these military posts deep inside Indian territory and demand that they should be withdrawn along with the other Chinese posts from Indian territory.

The new Chinese military posts have been established in the past few days and are located extremely close to the existing Indian defence posts in the area. Apart from constituting further serious violations of India's territorial integrity they add substantially to the tension in the area and the possibility of fresh incidents.

It is particularly regrettable that Chinese forces should persist in their aggressive actions at a time when the Chinese Government are repeatedly professing their desire to have negotiations for a peaceful settlement of the question.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 29 August 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated July 28 and 30 and August 3 and 5, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

Of late, Indian troops which have intruded into Chinese territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary have repeatedly fired provocatively at Chinese frontier guards, against which the Chinese Government has lodged a number of protests. In its notes of August 3 and 5, 1962, the Indian Government resorted to its usual practice of denying the indisputable facts cited by the Chinese Government, but this is entirely futile. The Indian Government even doubted the truth of the two incidents of firing by Indian troops of July 16 and 19, 1962, to which the Chinese side referred, on the ground that it was not until July 23 that the Chinese side lodged the protest. This is even less worthy of refutation. It is common-sense whether a protest is lodged a few days earlier or later does not at all affect the truth of the matter concerned in the protest. In advancing a sophisticated argument on that ground the Indian side is in no way taking an attitude of dealing with things earnestly and seriously.

It is particularly regrettable that the Indian Government, in its notes, further falsely counter-charged the Chinese side. Now the Chinese Government will confine itself to refuting the three specific charges made by the Indian side:

1. In its note of July 28, 1962, the Indian Government charged that on July 27 a Chinese patrol opened fire at an Indian patrol at approximately 33° 57' N, 78° 46-5' E. This place mentioned by the Indian side is in the Nyagzu area in Tibet, China. It is strange, however, that eight days later, in another note dated August 5, 1962, the Indian Government stated that “no Indian party was in that area (Nyagzu)” on July 27. This inconsistency clearly shows that the charge the Indian side made in its former note is not in conformity with the fact. The fact is that on July 27 an intruding Indian force fired 16 shots in the Nyagzu area at a Chinese post there (vide the Chinese Government’s note No. 796, dated August 1, 1962). It seems that, after failing to abuse the Chinese side, the Indian side tried to resort to quibbling, but in so doing unwittingly disproved its former charge. As paper cannot wrap up fire, a lie is bound to show up.

2. In its note of July 30, 1962, the Indian side charged that on July 29 Chinese troops opened fire at Indian troops in the vicinity of Yula in the Pangong Lake area. The Chinese Government has satisfied itself by careful checking that the Indian charge is a downright fabrication. It can be mentioned here that the Indian Government further trumped up the story of a clash at Yula between the
Chinese and Indian sides in its note of August 15, 1962, which the Chinese Government, basing itself on the facts, has already refuted by its note of August 18, 1962. The purpose of the Indian side in repeatedly preferring such framed-up charges is clearly to cover up its activities of unlawfully setting up a strongpoint and expanding its military intrusions in Yula, Tibet, and to further aggravate deliberately the tension in that area.

3. In its note of August 5, 1962, the Indian Government not only tried hard to deny the fact that Indian troops which had intruded into the Chip Chap River valley in Sinkiang, China, fired on a Chinese post there on July 27 (vide the Chinese Government's note No. 795, dated August 1, 1962), but falsely counter-charged the Chinese side with firing at the Indian troops on the same day, and asserted that India had already made this charge in its note of July 28, 1962. But in fact the Indian note of July 28 does not touch on the Chip Chap valley area at all. It seems that the Indian side has landed itself in a jumble in cooking up charges.

It can be seen from the above that it is no one but India itself which has distorted the facts and reversed the right and wrong. As for the Indian side's usual practice of describing Chinese territory as Indian territory in an attempt to explain away the Indian troops' intrusions and provocations, and of even falsely counter-charging China with aggravating the border tension, the Chinese Government has refuted all these absurdities again and again and does not intend to repeat itself here. To ensure tranquillity along the border and ease the tension, the Chinese Government urges the Indian Government to desist from making statements which reverse right and wrong, strictly restrain the Indian troops so that they stop all provocations against the Chinese side and order them to withdraw immediately from Chinese territory.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 31 August 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government to the Chinese Embassy in India dated June 16, June 28, July 12 and August 22, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

The places where the Chinese side has set up posts and built a road as mentioned in the Indian Government's notes are all indisputably inside Chinese territory on the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, that is, on the Chinese side east of the western sector of the traditional Sino-Indian boundary affirmed by Premier Chou En-lai. The areas where those places are located have always been under the administration of the Chinese Government. That the Chinese side has set up posts and built roads on its own territory is purely China's internal affairs in which the Indian side has no right to meddle at all. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the Indian Government's unwarranted charges and protests.

As is well-known, the Chinese Government, always standing for the maintenance of the status quo of the boundary, has given strict instructions to its troops to refrain from going beyond the traditional and customary boundary line. In order to maintain tranquillity on the border and avoid clashes, the Chinese side, starting from 1959, even one-sidedly stopped patrolling within 20 kilometres on its side of the boundary. But the Indian side, instead of making an appropriate response, took advantage of that to alter the status quo of the boundary by force again and again. Since last spring it has even intensified its intrusion into and nibble at Chinese territory. It was under these circumstances that the Chinese side had to declare in its note of April 30, 1962 the resumption of border patrolling first on the sector where the Indian side had been making repeated intrusions and harassment and to adopt certain necessary defence measures. Those were the movements that, in Prime Minister Nehru's words, "the Chinese had also to make" "due to movements on our (the Indian) side." It was completely legitimate and necessary for the Chinese side to do so.

The Indian side tried to cover up its aggressive activities by slanderously accusing the Chinese troops of encroaching on Indian territory. This clumsy tactics has long been seen through and will not work at all. The Indian Government is advised to get down to the right path of easing the tension on the border in earnest, that is, to stop all intrusions and provocations of the Indian troops and withdraw them from Chinese territory.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 September 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state that an Indian patrol proceeding in the area south of the Chip Chap river region on routine task was surprised at 08:00 hours this morning the 2nd September and attacked by a large Chinese military force. Our patrol was compelled to return the fire in self-defence. At 14:15 hours on the same day yet another Indian patrol was attacked at approximately the same location forcing it to return the fire.

The Ministry lodges an emphatic protest against this further intrusion of Chinese forces into Indian territory and their wanton and unprovoked attacks on small Indian patrols going about on their routine duties.

The Ministry has already brought several instances of such aggressive activities of Chinese forces inside Indian territorial limits and these further instances make it obvious that these aggressive activities of the Chinese forces belie the professions of the Chinese authorities to settle the differences between the Governments of India and China on the border question by peaceful talks and discussions.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 3 September 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Ministry's note dated 2nd September, 1962, protesting against the intrusion of Chinese forces into Indian territory and attacking Indian patrols on two separate occasions. Both these incidents took place at approximately the same location, i.e., at 78° 17' 15" E, 35° 08' 15" N—about 15 miles west even of the claim line shown in the Chinese map of 1956 about which Premier Chou En-lai wrote to the Prime Minister of India in his letter dated the 17th December, 1959 that "it correctly shows the traditional border between the two countries in this sector".

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

On July 18, 1962, fully armed Indian military men, four in number, again intruded into Ruyu and Longju of the Migyitun area in Tibet, China. They sneaked to the hillsides east of Longju and pried about the camping ground of the Chinese border defence forces in the Migyitun area for as long as three hours. These Indian troops did not leave the Longju area till after two days' illegal stay there. This is the 9th illegal intrusion by Indian troops into the Longju area since last April. It gives the lie once again to the Indian Government's statement about its "willingness not to send their personnel back to the area." The Chinese Government hereby protests against the aforesaid serious violations of Chinese territory by the Indian side.

Longju and Ruyu have always been part of Chinese territory, and both lie north of the so-called McMahon Line. This is an indisputable fact, which the Chinese Government has, in its note of August 3, 1962, established with conclusive arguments. The Indian Government, in its note of August 8, 1962, while still insisting that Longju and Ruyu lie south of the "McMahon Line", fails to explain the inconsistencies which were pointed out in the Chinese note of August 3 as existing in its various descriptions of the geographical location of Longju and Ruyu. The Indian note lays a pretentious charge against the Chinese side as if the Chinese side misrepresented Prime Minister Nehru's statements by "making an out of context reference" to them. But Prime Minister Nehru stated in his letter of September 26, 1959, as cited in the Indian note, that Longuju lies 1¼ miles south of the "McMahon Line". Later, when speaking before the Indian Parliament on April 3, 1961, he further stated that Longju sits astride the "McMahon Line", and most of it lies north of the Line. And now the Indian side asserts that Longju is about two miles south of the "McMahon Line". It is entirely futile for the Indian side, being unable to explain these obvious inconsistencies, to charge baselessly the Chinese side with "making an out of context reference."

In addition to its illegal occupation of large tracts of Chinese territory south of the "McMahon Line", the Indian side has repeatedly sent out troops to intrude into Longju and Ruyu north of the Line. This obviously represents a deliberate attempt to create new troubles and tensions. To maintain tranquillity on the border, the Indian Government should, not merely in words but in deeds, stop sending out troops to intrude into Longju and the adjacent areas.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

At about 12-30 hours on August 26, 1962, seven Indian soldiers, five of them mounted, who had intruded into the vicinity of the source of the Qara Qash River in Sinkiang, China, pressed forward from north to south up to a place in front of the positions of the Chinese post located at approximately 35° 3' 5" N, 78° 22' E. Ignoring the warnings of the Chinese frontier guards who waved their arms and shouted, the Indian soldiers unscrupulously opened fire. Then another batch of Indian troops, ten in number, approached from the south and seized the high ground southwest of the Chinese post. At about 6:50 hours on the morning of August 29, the intruding Indian troops again pressed forward to the vicinity of the Chinese post and fired 17 shots at the Chinese frontier guards. During these two incidents, the Chinese frontier guards maintained self-restraint throughout and did not return fire. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned provocations of the Indian troops.

After the closing in on a Chinese post in the Pangong Lake area in Tibet on August 24, the Indian intruders have now advanced on and fired at another Chinese post, this time in the vicinity of the source of the Qara Qash River in Sinkiang. This shows once again that India is intensifying its intrusions into and provocations against China in a planned way, thereby aggravating further the border situation, and is not, as it has professed, willing to relax the border situation and peacefully settle the boundary question through negotiations.

It is regrettable that the Indian Government has again adopted the method of a thief crying "stop thief" and distorted this incident in its note of August 27, 1962, alleging that the Chinese frontier guards "attempted to ambush" an Indian patrol on routine duties and conducted "unprovoked firing", whereas the Indian troops were "forced to return the fire," and so on and so forth. All these allegations were sheer fabrications. One cannot help asking why the Indian troops should have proceeded to and patrolled at a place deep inside Chinese territory and "33 miles" away from its border post. Could it be the "routine duties" of the Indian patrol to invade the territory of others and press forward in a menacing manner to the border posts of others? This is absolutely impermissible. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the Indian Government's aforesaid false charge which turns the facts upside down and shifts the blame on others.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 5 September 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

At about 12:10 hours on September 2, 1962, a transport team comprising 6 rear service personnel of the Chinese border defence forces, when proceeding on a mission to approximately 35° 8.5' N, 78° 14.5' E, south of the Chip Chap River area in Sinkiang was ambushed by a large number of intruding Indian soldiers. The intruders unwarrantedly opened up fierce fire at the Chinese non-combatants with machine-guns and rifles. The transport team of the Chinese border defence forces was compelled to stop advancing and make retreat under the cover of the terrain features. The Indian soldiers continued to chase it with gunfire, shooting a total of nearly 200 rounds. The Chinese rear service personnel did not return fire throughout.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest against the aforesaid grave incident in which Indian troops penetrated deep into Chinese territory and even came to a supply route in the rear of Chinese border defence forces to ambush their rear service personnel. It seriously urges the Indian Government to give careful consideration to the grave consequences that may arise from such acts of playing with fire by the Indian side. One should be aware that whoever plays with fire will burn himself.

It must be pointed out that the above-mentioned Indian action of ambushing and attacking Chinese rear service personnel with fierce fire marked a new peak in the Indian troops' recent series of intruding and provocative activities, including the continuous setting up of aggressive strongpoints, the firing of provocative shots and the encirclement of Chinese posts and patrols on Chinese territory. This incident once again revealed that what India is after is not to relax tension and settle the boundary question through negotiations, as it claims, but deliberately to provoke new armed clashes, further aggravate the situation on the border and worsen the Sino-Indian relations.

The note handed over in the midnight of September 2 to the Charge d'Affaires of the Chinese Embassy in India by the Director of China Division of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, turning the truth upside down, has described the incident as one in which Indian patrols were twice "surprised and attacked by a large Chinese military force" on the same day at a certain place south of the Chip Chap River region and were "compelled to return the fire." While pretentiously lodging a protest in the note, the Indian side was unable to give the specific location where the incident occurred. Under the questioning of the Chinese Charge d'Affaires, the Director of the China Division of the India Ministry of External Affairs could only reply that he was not yet clear about it. Making a hasty accusation
without ascertaining the most rudimentary facts, the Indian Government was resorting to too naked a method of fabrication and false counter-charge. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the Indian protest which has no factual basis. The Indian attempt of using that protest to cover up its deliberate scheme of creating an armed clash and shift on to China the responsibility for obstructing peaceful negotiations is bound to fail.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government’s note, dated 27th August, 1962.

The allegations made in the Chinese note are not only baseless but also indicate the lack of a proper understanding on the part of the Chinese Government of the Indo-Chinese boundary in that area.

Indian forces have never established any strong points in Chinese territory. On the contrary, it is Chinese intruders who have, in recent years, unlawfully established numerous military posts deep inside Indian territory. This will also be evident from the fact that even the areas referred to in the present Chinese note are located well within Indian territory where Chinese forces could have no justification to be present.

The Government of India have carefully investigated the allegations in respect of each of the two areas mentioned in the Chinese note under reference and the facts, as verified are stated below:

(i) There is absolutely no truth in the allegation that Indian troops have “encircled the Chinese frontier guards and cut off the rear route of a Chinese post” in the Galwan Valley region. The fact is that Chinese forces had intruded into this sector of Indian territory in Ladakh, for the first time in July 1962. They had thereafter set up no less than 5 strong points around the Indian defence post at 78° 38' E 34° 39' 45" N and had begun to consolidate themselves in the area. In this process Chinese forces had established a post at 78° 33' 5" E 34° 40' N. They had also set up another post at 78° 38' 5" E 34° 34' 5" N, about 800 yards north of an Indian Ration Party in the vicinity so as to obstruct supplies from reaching the main Indian defence post at 78° 38' E, 34° 39' 45" N. In their notes dated 10th July 1962, 22nd August and 25th August, 1962 the Government of India have already drawn the attention of the Chinese Government to these aggressive Chinese actions.

As regards the allegations of shooting by Indian defence forces in this area on the 21st, 22nd and 25th August, 1962, these are entirely without foundation. There has been no shooting in this area by either side on the specified dates.

(ii) The correct position relating to the Pangong Lake area has been given in the Indian Government’s note, dated 24th August, 1962, in which a protest was lodged about a new Chinese post set up at 78° 46' E 33° 39' 20" N on the southern bank of the Pangong Lake. Here again it is the Chinese who are attempting by a series of provocative moves to isolate an Indian defence post in the area. The Chinese post at 78° 45' E 33° 39' 20" N which has been established only in the last few days has obviously been set up to interfere with the main supply line leading to the above-mentioned Indian defence post near...
Yula. There is no question in such a context of any "communication and supply lines to the rear" of a Chinese post being cut off. The Chinese allegation stands exposed as a palpable attempt to conceal the aggressive activities carried on by Chinese intruders and will convince no one.

The Government of India have been repeatedly drawing the attention of the Chinese Government to the provocations carried out by Chinese forces intruding into Indian territory. They have so far themselves refrained from taking any steps which could further aggravate the situation. However, if Chinese forces should persist in their illegal encroachments on Indian territory and continue to interfere with the supply lines of Indian defence posts, the responsibility for any consequences that might arise therefrom will rest solely on the Chinese Government.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 7 September 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Ministry’s notes, dated 22nd August, 24th August and 28th August 1962 wherein the Government of India had lodged protests about the setting up of new military posts, deep inside Indian territory, by Chinese forces in Ladakh.

It is most regrettable that even subsequent to the above protests, two more Chinese military posts should have been set up on Indian territory, as follows:

Changchanmo valley region:
(i) Post at 78° 46' E 34° 03' 30'' N.

Pangong-Spanggur region:
(i) Post at 78° 54' E 33° 40' 45'' N.

These new Chinese posts not only constitute further serious violations of India's territorial integrity but also add to the possibility of fresh incidents arising in the area.

The Government of India lodge an emphatic protest against the setting up of the above-mentioned Chinese military posts and demand that they be withdrawn immediately, along with other Chinese posts, from Indian territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 September 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's Note, dated the 4th September, 1962 and to state as follows:

The Government of India had, in their protest note of the 27th August, given clear and detailed facts of the incident that occurred on the 26th August. That the intruding Chinese troops opened fire against an Indian patrol engaged on routine tasks in Indian territory has been fully and clearly established.

The location at which the incident took place is 78° 23' 15" E 35° 05' 15" N and not 35° 3:5' N 78° 22' E as stated in the Chinese note. The Government of India categorically reject the absurd claim in the belated Chinese note of the 4th September that the Indian patrol was inside Chinese territory. The Chinese Government are fully aware that the point at which the incident took place is not only well inside Indian territory but is about 100 miles west of the international frontier between India and China in this region. There can be no doubt of any sort on this point as the question of the location of the boundary in this region has been gone into in great detail by the officials of the two sides.

Apart from the location, even on the facts of the incident, the details alleged in the Chinese note are inconsistent and illogical. No sensible person would believe that an Indian patrol of seven pressed forward in a menacing manner against a large Chinese force which had intruded in Indian territory. The version of the incident given in the Chinese note must, therefore, be rejected as factually incorrect and baseless.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese note of 5th September refers to the incident regarding which the Ministry had handed over a protest note to the Chinese Embassy on the 2nd September. The facts given in the Indian note are clear.

The note handed over to the Chinese Charge d’Affaires on 2nd September clearly stated that the incident took place in an area south of the Chip Chap region. When the Chinese Charge d’Affaires asked for the exact location where the incident occurred, he was told that the exact co-ordinates of the point would be communicated to him the next day. These were supplied in the note of 3rd September after careful verification.

It was the Chinese Charge d’Affaires who stated in the talk with the Indian Director on 2nd September that the incident must have been caused by Indian troops moving forward into Chinese territory. The Director of China Division expressed surprise that the Charge d’Affaires should make such an allegation without full verification of the site where the incident had occurred. This would show that the Charge d’Affaires repeated the usual baseless allegation made in all Chinese notes that any incident taking place in the Ladakh region is in Chinese territory.

The Government of India cannot understand why the Chinese authorities should, even after the exact coordinates of the site of the incident has been supplied in the Ministry's note of the 3rd September, reiterate the usual baseless allegation that the incident was caused by Indian troops penetrating deep into Chinese territory. Verification of the site on the basis of the coordinates given will show conclusively that the point at which the incident took place is deep within Indian territory. It is the Chinese forces who continue to penetrate deep into Indian territory and are causing tension in the area by their aggressive activities in Indian territory. In fact even on 5th September a group of Chinese soldiers provocatively advanced towards Indian troops at the above-mentioned location resulting in an exchange of fire. The presence of Chinese forces deep inside Indian territory, their aggressive forward patrolling and their repeated unprovoked firing against Indian posts and patrol in the area is fraught with danger and the Chinese authorities will themselves be solely responsible for any untoward incident that may take place.

The Chinese report of the incident states that the transport team of the Chinese forces was compelled to stop advancing. Where was it advancing and why so far from the Chinese border? Not only...
were the Chinese forces intruding into Indian territory but they opened fire on the Indian patrol who had to reply in self-defence. The facts are clear and straightforward and the Ministry must therefore reject the allegations in the belated Chinese note of 5th September.

Indian forces have no desire to “play with fire” or to cause any provocations but they are determined not to permit any aggression into Indian territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs take's this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 September 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated 24th August 1962.

The Government of India have found after careful investigation that the allegation in the Chinese note about Indian armed personnel having crossed the Nathu La border on 4th June 1962, is completely baseless.

The Indian Government are not aware of any places called Tzelung La and Tagi La on the Sikkim-Tibet border and have not been able to go into the details of the other allegations due to the absence of proper map coordinates of the places referred to.

The Ministry would reiterate, for the information of the Chinese Government, that Indian defence personnel, unlike the Chinese forces on the border, are well aware of the limits of the International Boundary. They are under strict instructions not to cross the boundary and invariably follow these instructions.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 10 September 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

The Indian side, persisting in its policy of realizing its territorial claims by armed force, has recently established on Chinese territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border six more aggressive strongpoints, the locations of which are as follows:

The first one is located at approximately 35° 10’ N, 78° 13’ E, which is as deep as around 13 kilometres inside Sinkiang.

The second one is located at approximately 35° 9.5’ N, 78° 14’ E, which is as deep as around 13 kilometres inside Sinkiang.

The third one is located at approximately 35° 24’ N, 78° 04’ E, which is north of the Chip Chap River is Sinkiang.

The fourth one is located at approximately 34° 23’ N, 78° 53.5’ E, which is northwest of the Kongka Pass and inside Sinkiang.

The fifth one is located at approximately 33° 39 5’ N, 78° 44’ E on the southern bank of the Pangong Lake in Tibet. It is only about 300 metres away from Chinese post in the area.

The sixth one is located at approximately 33° 26.5’ N, 78° 50’ E south of the Spanggur Lake, lying across the boundary line between the Ari district of Tibet, China, and Ladakh, India.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest against the above new violations of China's territorial integrity and sovereignty by the Indian side.

Since last spring, Indian troops have continually nibbled at and pressed forward in the border areas of China's Sinkiang and Tibet. The aggressive strongpoints established by India on Chinese territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border have now totalled up to 34 in number. From these strongpoints, Indian military personnel have further incessantly carried out threats and provocations against Chinese frontier defence forces. The Chinese Government has lodged a number of protests with the Indian Government against this. In its reply notes of June 22, June 28, July 6 and July 14, 1962, the Indian Government did not deny that India had indeed established these strongpoints on Chinese territory, but it repeatedly engaged in prevarication, asserting that India was taking defensive measures the objectives of which were “peaceful,” and falsely counter-charged China with continuously committing “agression” since 1957. And in its note of July 6, it again repeated its absurd proposal which actually meant that China should unilaterally withdraw from large
tracts of China's own territory. All this was refuted again and again by the Chinese Government in its previous notes. Facts are very clear. It was India which, having occupied much Chinese territory in the eastern and middle sectors of the Sino-Indian border, turned to press forward into Chinese territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, establishing more aggressive strongpoints and nibbling at Chinese territory. The Indian press has boasted that this was a "unique triumph for an audacious Napoleonic planning"; and Prime Minister Nehru himself openly admitted in the Indian parliament that "our movements sometimes go behind the Chinese positions," and that "India had opened some new patrol posts endangering the Chinese posts." One must ask: How can this be called defensive measures? Can this be the "peaceful objectives" flaunted by the Indian Government? If the Indian Government really has any sincerity for peace, it should, in deeds, immediately stop its intrusions into and withdraw its aggressive strongpoints from Chinese territory.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurance of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 12 September 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated 31st August, 1962.

The Indian team of officials at the talks of the officials of the two Governments clearly established that there is no basis for the claim advanced then and again in the Chinese note under reply that the place where the Chinese side has set up posts and built a road are on the Chinese side of the international boundary in the Ladakh region nor for the claim that any part of Ladakh has, except since the Chinese aggression in recent years, been under the administration of the Chinese Government.

Full details of the Chinese aggression in the Ladakh region since 1957 have been conveyed to the Government of China in numerous Indian notes on the subject. It is a matter of regret that the Chinese Government should persist in their attempts to justify their aggression into and forcible seizure of Indian territory in the Ladakh region since 1957 by unwarranted territorial claims.

The Chinese note has referred to the status quo on the border. But it is the Chinese Government themselves who have unilaterally sought since 1957 to change the long existing status quo on the border by the use of force.

Chinese forces have not only intruded deep inside Indian territory but there has been no halt in their incessant aggressive forward patrolling and setting up of new posts on Indian territory. It is in the context of these aggressive Chinese activities that Government of India had to take action to prevent further violations of India's territory. This is a purely defensive measure. It is the Chinese forces who continue their aggressive activities and who have in recent months deliberately manoeuvred to encircle Indian defence posts, to interfere with their line of supply and communications and to resort to unprovoked firing causing clashes and tension in the area. The various notes presented by the Ministry to the Embassy give full factual details of these irresponsible and aggressive activities of the Chinese forces.

Government of India must, in view of the reasons given in the above paragraphs, reject the fallacious and untenable contentions in the Chinese note under reference.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 September 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, in regard to India's recent establishments of additional strong points for aggressive purposes within Chinese territory on the western sector of the Sino-Indian border and the numerous serious incidents of firing provocative shots at Chinese frontier guards, has the honour to state the following:

1. The intruding Indian troops have established four additional aggressive strong points in Chinese territory.

The first one is located at approximately 35° 09' N, 78° 16' E, which is to the south of the Chip Chap River area in Sinkiang and as deep as about 17 kilometres inside Chinese territory.

The second one is located at approximately 35° 06' N, 78° 13' E, which is also south of the Chip Chap River area in Sinkiang, to the southwest of the aforesaid aggressive strong point and as deep as about 9 kilometres inside Chinese territory.

The third one is located at approximately 34° 59' N, 78° 24·5' E, which is to the west of the source of the Karakash River in Sinkiang and as deep as about 18 kilometres inside Chinese territory.

The fourth one is located at approximately 33° 39' N, 33° 44' 50" E, which is on the southern bank of the Pangong Lake in Tibet and behind a Chinese post in that area.

2. Intruding Indian troops provocatively fired on six more occasions at Chinese frontier guards.

In the area south of the Chip Chap River valley:

At about 7·00 hours on the morning of August 29, a group of Indian soldiers sneaked to the vicinity of the Chinese post at approximately 35° 10' N, 78° 14' E and fired five shots in succession. The bullets flew over the heads of the Chinese guards.

At about 1·20 hours on September 5, intruding Indian soldiers fired another shot at the above-mentioned Chinese post.

At about 17·00 hours on September 5, a batch of Indian soldiers fired 19 rounds with rifles and machineguns at four Chinese frontier guards from a place approximately 35° 07' N, 78° 13' E.

At 17·10 hours on September 5, a batch of Indian soldiers fired two shots at a small group of Chinese frontier guards from approximately 35° 8·5' N, 78° 17·5' E.
In the area north of the Chip Chap River:

At about 11:30 hours on September 2, a group of Indian soldiers fired two shots at the Chinese post located at approximately 35° 30' N, 78° 07' E on the eastern bank of the Lungnak Lungspa River. Following that, they even fired a mortar shell, which exploded in front of the Chinese post.

In the small hours of September 5, a group of intruding Indian soldiers sneaked to the vicinity of the Chinese post at approximately 35° 25' N, 78° 07' E, firing two shots at 1:55 hours and then one shot each at 3 and 3:05 hours respectively.

During all the aforesaid six incidents of provocative firings by Indian troops, the Chinese frontier guards exercised great restraint and fired not a single shot in return.

The Chinese Government hereby strongly protests against the above-mentioned series of fresh intrusions and provocative activities by the Indian side. These facts demonstrate that the Indian side is intensifying more and more its aggressive activities on Chinese territory. Taking only the cases of provocative firings at Chinese frontier guards, apart from the daily increase of shooting incidents, (as many as four such incidents occurred on September 5 alone), even the use of artillery shelling has been started. The Indian Government should be aware that shooting and shelling are no child's play; and he who plays with fire will eventually be consumed by fire. If the Indian side should insist on threatening by armed force the Chinese border defence forces who are duty-bound to defend their territory and thereby arouse their resistance, it must bear the responsibility for all the consequences arising therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 September 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China, and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government’s note dated 29th August, 1962.

2. The Indian Government’s note dated 3rd August 1962 had refuted Chinese allegations of firing on the 16th and 19th July, 1962. This was done after detailed verification. The note also pointed out that although a protest had been lodged by the Chinese Government about an incident near the Chip Chap river region on the 21st July, 1962 in their note dated 22nd July, 1962, these incidents which were alleged to have taken place even earlier had curiously enough found no mention therein. This additional feature of the case was mentioned as it also supported the results of the detailed verification undertaken by the Indian authorities. This is, therefore, not a “sophisticated” argument but an additional argument which establishes that the Chinese allegations are baseless. It may also be mentioned that the Chinese note dated 22nd July, 1962, had been fully answered in the Ministry’s note dated 26th July, 1962.

3. The Chinese note has further referred to the Indian Government’s notes dated 28th July, 1962 and 5th August, 1962 and claimed an imaginary contradiction in the information conveyed therein. The actual area where the Chinese patrol opened fire at an Indian patrol and about which the Indian Government had protested in their note, dated 28th July, 1962, was approximately 78°46’5” E 33°57’ N whereas the Chinese note dated 1st August, 1962, referred to an area at 78°44’5” E 33°57’ N. These two points are separated by nearly 3 miles and the Indian Government’s note dated 5th August, 1962 correctly stated that “No Indian party was in that area on 27th July, 1962”.

4. Referring to the Indian Government’s note of 28th July, 1962, the Chinese Government have further tried to draw unwarranted conclusions from a typographical error in the place reference in the Indian Government’s note dated 5th August, 1962. The map coordinates given in the Indian note dated 28th July, 1962, namely, 78°46’5” E 33°57’ N, however, clearly indicated the actual place referred to and it is surprising that the Chinese note deliberately overlooks this detailed place reference and merely makes a play with words.

5. The Chinese Government have referred to the Indian note, dated 30th July, 1962, protesting against unprovoked firing by Chinese troops, and have denied that Chinese troops fired at Indian troops near Yula in the Pangong lake area. The Chinese note has further denied that any clash took place on 14th August, 1962 near Yula between the two sides. The Ministry would stress in this connection that the facts conveyed in the Indian Government’s notes are carefully verified before being communicated to the Chinese Government. The Ministry cannot, therefore, accept the Chinese
Government's routine denials made without serious and earnest consideration of duly verified facts given in the Indian posts. It is undeniable that whenever there have been incidents on the border, they have been invariably caused by Chinese forces intruding into Indian territory and opening fire on Indian defence personnel.

6. The Government of India regret in particular the tone of the Chinese note which can only aggravate the situation which the Chinese have themselves created in Ladakh.

7. The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 September 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the Indian Government's two notes of August 22 in reply to the Chinese Government's note of August 4, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

1. The Chinese Government regrets that the Indian Government in its notes under reference refuses to hold further discussions on the boundary question as soon as possible on the basis of the report of the officials of the two countries.

2. In its notes, the Indian Government wilfully slandered China with alleged aggressive activities in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border. In order to seek a pretext for refusing to discuss the boundary question with the Chinese Government, the Indian Government insisted in its note that "discussions cannot start unless the status quo of the boundary in this region which has been altered by force since 1957 is restored and the current tensions are removed." The Chinese Government has always held that pending a settlement of the boundary question through negotiations both sides should maintain the status quo of the boundary and should not change it by unilateral action. The Chinese Government has strictly adhered to this stand. It has never crossed the line of actual control in any of the sections of the Sino-Indian boundary, let alone carrying out any aggressive activities. This fact can in no way be altered by any slander. It is exactly the Indian Government itself that has carried out aggressive activities in the Sino-Indian border areas and changed the status quo of the boundary by armed force. Such aggressive activities of the Indian Government not only took place in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, but extended also to its middle and eastern sectors. If the status quo of the boundary, which has been altered by force, must be restored before discussions on the boundary question can start, then it is the Indian troops that should withdraw from the Chinese territories which they have occupied along all the sectors of the Sino-Indian boundary. The Chinese Government has on numerous occasions protested against the Indian Government's aggressive activities and repeatedly asked it to withdraw its troops from Chinese territory. Yet the Chinese Government is always willing to resolve through negotiations all the disputes between the Chinese and Indian Governments on the boundary question, and has never put forth any pre-conditions for the negotiations. Now the Indian Government, while carrying out aggressive activities in the Sino-Indian border areas, has turned to put before the Chinese Government a pre-condition for negotiations. It can be said definitely that it is utterly futile for the Indian Government to use this inapt method to disguise the fact that it lacks sincerity for negotiations.

3. The Indian Government pretends to take interest in easing the tension along the border, but actually at the very moment when it is
repeatedly expressing the hope of easing the border situation it is stepping up its intrusions and provocative activities within Chinese territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary. Since August 4, Indian troops have established eleven more military strong-points on Chinese territory in the western sector, opened fire at Chinese frontier guards on 14 more occasions and even ambushed a transport team of the Chinese border defence forces, firing as many as 200 rounds at it. These daily growing aggressive activities of the Indian side have brought the border tension to a new danger point. The above facts completely belie the Indian Government's professed desire to ease the border tension.

4. The border tension ought to be eased. The Chinese Government has pointed out in its note of August 4 that if only the Indian side stop advancing into Chinese territory a relaxation of the border situation will be effected at once. But the Indian Government, while persisting in advancing into Chinese territory, changing the status quo by force and aggravating the border tension, asserts that “an essential preliminary” to the holding of discussions on the boundary question is a “definition of measures that should be taken to restore the status quo of the boundary in this region which has been altered by force during the last five years and to remove the current tensions in this area.” This assertion is utterly absurd. It is necessary to remind the Indian Government again that, if India should continue to nibble Chinese territory, it will certainly meet with China's resistance, and it must bear responsibility for all the consequences arising therefrom.

5. In the face of the above-stated facts one can hardly avoid the conclusion that the Indian Government has no desire to solve the boundary question peacefully through negotiations but is using peaceful negotiation as a cover for its plans of nibbling Chinese territory and altering the status quo of the boundary. In his speech at the Rajya Sabha on August 22, 1962 Prime Minister Nehru stated outright that on the Sino-Indian boundary question the Indian Government is following a “dual policy” and intends to gain from China what it seeks to gain “by political pressure, military pressure or other pressures.” To adopt one policy or another is India's own business. But the Chinese Government wishes to point out that China will welcome negotiations, if seriously intended, but will resist, whenever attacked, and that it will bring India no good to pursue a policy of “sham negotiations and real fighting.”

6. In its two notes the Indian Government tried at length to prove that Indian intrusions into Chinese territory are “purely internal matters to be decided by the Government of India in accordance with the requirements of security.” The Chinese Government has in its previous notes refuted this absurd assertion in detail, and so does not intend to repeat itself here. What needs to be noted is that, in an attempt to find an excuse for rejecting discussions on the boundary question, the Indian Government interpreted China's position on the boundary question, as explained by the Chinese Foreign Minister in his August 3 television interview and in the August 4 note of the Chinese Government, as putting forth a pre-condition for negotiations. Every State has the freedom and right to set forth its own position.
The Chinese Government has never said that discussions cannot start unless India accepts China's position on the boundary question. On the contrary, it has time and again stressed that "there need not and should not be any pre-conditions for such discussions." How can it be said that once the Chinese Government states its own position it is putting forth a pre-condition? To be quite open, if the Indian Government has no desire to negotiate, why not say so plainly? There is no need to rack its brains to fish out a reason where there is none.

7. In China's opinion it is, after all, not good to maintain prolonged border tension between two big Asian countries, China and India. With a view to easing the border tension the Chinese Government once again proposes that the armed forces of each side withdraw 20 kilometres along the entire border. It believes that the implementation of this measure will not only immediately ease the border tension but also in a way stabilize the Sino-Indian boundary pending a peaceful settlement through negotiations.

8. The Chinese Government still considers that the Chinese and Indian Governments should quickly hold further discussions on the Sino-Indian boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials of the two countries without setting any pre-conditions. The Chinese Government is convinced that this will be in conformity with the desire of the Chinese and Indian peoples as well as peace-loving countries and people all over the world. It formally proposes that the two Governments appoint representatives to start these discussions from October 15 first in Peking and then in Delhi, alternately. The details can be discussed and decided upon through diplomatic channels.

The Chinese Government awaits the reply of the Indian Government.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 16 September 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

Indian troops recently again crossed the so-called "McMahon Line", intruded into Che Dong of the Le village (approximately 27° 49' N, 91° 48' E) in China and constructed barracks and defence works there in preparation for prolonged entrenchment. At the same time, Indian aircraft repeatedly intruded into the air space over the Le village and circled over there for reconnaissance purposes on August 29, September 9 and September 10. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest against the above-mentioned fresh intrusions by the Indian side.

After swallowing up by force large tracts of Chinese territory south of the "McMahon Line" on the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, the Indian side went further to intrude into Khinze-mane north of the Line in 1959 and has since hung on there. And now it has further intruded into Che Dong. These systematic nibbling activities fully reveal how ambitious the Indian side's aggressive designs are. They also show that the Indian side is actively extending the tension to the entire Sino-Indian border. The Indian Government must be held responsible for all the consequences arising therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 17 September 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the note sent by the Chinese Foreign Office to the Indian Charge d’Affaires in Peking on the 16th September, 1962.

At the meeting of the officials of the two sides in 1960, the boundary between the North-East Frontier Agency and the Tibet Region of China was described in full detail by the Indian side. The Chinese Government are fully aware that the boundary in this sector, commencing from the point approximately 91° 40’ E and 27° 48’ N, runs in an easterly direction along the crest of the Tang La (Thagla) ridge, separating the North-East Frontier Agency of India from the Tibet Region of China.

Neither the Indian border forces nor Indian aircraft have at any time crossed this international boundary at any point, much less constructed barracks and defence works on the Chinese side. Such defence arrangements as exist are entirely on the Indian side of the boundary.

It is not the Indian side that is creating tension in this border area which has been peaceful all along. Reports received by the Government of India from their local authorities indicate that it is the Chinese who have been attempting, since the beginning of September, to cross the international boundary, intrude into Indian territory and to create tension in this border region. Khinzemane, to which the Chinese note refers, is indisputably Indian territory.

The Government of India categorically reject the baseless allegations made in the Chinese note of the 16th September. The Government of India will hold the Chinese Government responsible for any untoward incident that may occur due to the failure of the Chinese authorities to restrain their forces from crossing the border and attempting to intrude into the Indian territory in this region.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with regard to the intensified intruding activities of Indian troops in the Pangong Lake area, Tibet, has the honour to further state as follows:

In its previous notes of protest, the Chinese Government has recorded in detail the facts about the wilful intrusions by Indian troops and aircraft into Chinese territory and air space in the Pangong Lake area for threats and provocations, and there is no need to repeat them here. Apart from that, the Indian side, taking advantage of the fact that the western part of the Pangong lies astride of the Sino-Indian boundary, has continually dispatched military motor-boats to intrude into Chinese territorial waters in the Pangong Lake for all sorts of provocative activities. Within the two months from July 5 to September 5, Indian military motor-boats made intrusions in at least 90 sorties. Recently these intrusions have become even more frequent. Within a matter of 10 days and more from August 20 to September 5, there were intrusions in approximately 50 sorties, with an average of about 3 sorties a day.

Apart from frequently sending men and military material to the various aggressive strongpoints established by the Indian side on the banks of the Chinese part of the Pangong Lake, the motor-boats of the intruding Indian troops often fired harassing shots and even pressed forward menacingly and provocatively against the Chinese posts along the banks. On August 23, two Indian military motor-boats fired 9 shots at the southern bank of the Lake for reconnaissance purposes, against which the Chinese Government already protested on August 27. And on August 25, another group of intruding Indian troops, in two motor-boats, steered up to only about 100 metres from a Chinese post (approximately 33° 39' N, 78° 44' E) on the southern bank where they loudly reviled and threatened the Chinese frontier guards. Incidents of Indian Military motor-boats firing harassing shots again took place on September 2 and 5 successively.

The Chinese Government strongly protests against the Indian intruding and provocative activities in the Chinese territorial waters in western part of the Pangong Lake and has to point out that the Indian side would be definitely mistaken if it thinks that China could allow the Indian intruders to run riot on Chinese waters.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 19 September 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to
refer to the Chinese Government's note dated 13th September 1962.

The Government of India are disappointed both at the contents
and the tone of the Chinese Government's note of 13th September.
It is a matter of regret that there has not been the slightest effort
on the part of the Chinese Government to understand and appreciate
the constructive suggestions put forth by the Government of India
in their note of 22nd August. The Chinese Government, on the
contrary, have resorted to undiplomatic language and even held out
threats of force.

In the context of the tone and content of the Chinese note and
the concurrent attempts at creating tension in the Eastern Sector
of the India-China border which has till now been peaceful, it would
appear that the Government of China, while repeating their profes-
sions for a peaceful settlement, are determined to do all they can to
continue their aggressive activities and to alter by force the status
quo of the boundary unilaterally, using talks and discussions between
the two Governments only as a cloak to further their aggressive and
expansionist aims.

In paragraph 2 of the Chinese note it has been claimed that the
Chinese Government have maintained the status quo of the boundary.
Paragraph 3 of the Indian note dated 22nd August briefly sets out the
factual position in this regard. The Government of India do not have
the slightest doubt that the status quo along the Sino-Indian boundary
has been strictly observed by India and it is the Chinese side that
has, by unilateral action and aggressive activities, altered the status
quo which it now fallaciously calls "the line of actual control". The
hard facts of the situation cannot be altered merely by brushing them
aside as "slander" or "utterly absurd".

In paragraph 6 of the Chinese note it has been stated that "Every
State has the freedom and right to set forth its own position. The
Chinese Government have never said that discussions cannot start
unless India accepts China's position on the boundary question." Despite
this unobjectionable statement of principle, the Chinese note
throughout argues that "the line of actual control" established by
aggressive Chinese activities during the last few years should be
accepted and suggests that Indian forces should stop their defensive
activities on Indian territory and withdraw from areas claimed by
China. How is this contention of the Government of China consistent
with their profession that they are not imposing any pre-conditions
about the acceptance of the Chinese position on the boundary
question?

The Government of India agree that every State has the freedom
and right to set forth its own position. This is in fact what has been
done by the officials of both sides in their discussions in 1960. Having done this, however, further discussions to resolve the differences between the two Governments can only start after measures have been taken to restore the confidence between the two Governments, disturbed by unilateral alteration of the status quo, and after the border tension has been eased. The proposal in this regard made in paragraph 7 of the Chinese note about withdrawal of the armed forces of each side by 20 kilometres, suffers from the serious defect that it leaves the aggressor who altered the status quo by unilateral action over the last few years, in possession of the fruits of his aggression. This could hardly create that climate of confidence and goodwill between the two Governments which is an essential prerequisite for fruitful discussions to resolve the differences between the two Governments on the boundary question.

The Government of India hope that the Government of China will earnestly and in a constructive spirit, consider the suggestions made by the Government of India in their note of 22nd August and not try to confuse the issues either by use of undiplomatic language or by holding out threats of force, or by putting forth the fallacious argument about the "line of actual control" which has, as everyone can see, been established by unilateral aggressive action and alteration of the status quo of the long existing traditional boundary. The Government of India repudiate the unwarranted assertion in the Chinese note that India refuses to hold further discussions on the boundary question. The Government of India are sincere in their desire to resolve their differences with the Government of China by peaceful means and to do their utmost to promote peaceful, neighbourly relations between the Government and people of India and the Government and people of China, but no amount of casuistry or threats of force will deter them from their resolve to maintain inviolate the territorial integrity of India.

The Government of India are prepared to hold further discussions at the appropriate level to define measures to restore the status quo in the Western Sector which has been altered by force in the last few years and to remove the current tensions in that area. The implementation of such measures will create a climate of confidence between the two Governments which alone can make possible constructive discussions to resolve the differences between the two Governments on the boundary question on the basis of the report of the Officials.

The Government of India are agreeable to these discussions starting from 15th October, first in Peking and then in Delhi. The Government of India will take further action to discuss and settle the details of these discussions through appropriate diplomatic channels after the Government of China indicate their acceptance of the proposals in the preceding paragraph.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 September 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to draw the attention of the Chinese Government to yet another incident that has taken place at a point approximately 78° 80' 15'' E 35° 07' 45'' N as a result of intruding Chinese troops opening fire on an Indian defence post at approximately 9.00 A.M. on 15th September 1962. This area is over one hundred miles west of the International Boundary in this region.

The Chinese troops advanced menacingly close to the Indian post in the area and attempted to interfere with its normal supply line. They wantonly disregarded the repeated warnings of the Indian side and continued to advance towards the post resulting in an exchange of fire.

Latest reports indicate that the Chinese troops have been spread out in dangerous proximity to the Indian post as indicated below—

(a) about 50 Chinese at a distance of 800 to 1000 yards north-west of the Indian post;

(b) about 40 Chinese at a distance of 600 yards north-east of the Indian post; and

(c) about 50 Chinese at a distance of 1500 yards south-east of the Indian post.

The Government of India lodge an emphatic protest against these new provocations by Chinese forces on Indian territory and demand that these provocative activities be halted forthwith and the Chinese forces withdrawn immediately from Indian soil. If the Chinese forces do not cease their aggressive activities, the responsibility for any untoward incident that might occur will rest solely with the Chinese Government.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
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The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with regard to the grave tension caused by the intensified provocations on the part of intruding Indian troops against Chinese frontier guards at Che Dong, has the honour to state as follows:

On September 16, 1962, the Chinese Government already lodged a strong protest with the Indian Government against the Indian troops' crossing the so-called McMahon Line and establishing an aggressive strongpoint at Che Dong, Le village in Tibet. The Indian side not only turned a deaf ear to the protest, but has actively built up additional barracks and defence works around the aforesaid aggressive strongpoint, and has kept sending reinforcements there. What is particularly serious, a detachment of Indian troops made a harassing raid to the Che-jao bridge, which is about one and a half kilometres east of Che Dong, and made threats and provocations against the Chinese frontier guards there. Around 09:00 hours on September 17, more than ten Indian soldiers, in combat formation, pressed towards a Chinese sentry post near the Che-jao bridge. Some of them came as near as about three metres from the Chinese sentry on duty there. At 11:40 hours, two intruding Indian soldiers even aimed their guns at the Chinese sentry, posing to shot. At 16:20 hours, the Indian troops made unscrupulous threats and intimidations by placing machine-guns each on the eastern, southern and western sides of the Chinese sentry post. In the morning of the same day, an Indian air-plane again intruded into the air space over the area of Le village, and made reconnaissance and provocative circlings there. Nevertheless, the Chinese sentry maintained the greatest calm and self-restraint and issued repeated warnings to the Indian troops. But the Indian troops, instead of giving any heed to the warnings, built defence works on the spot and have thus far refused to withdraw therefrom.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned expanded aggression and intensified armed provocation by Indian troops.

In order to ease the tension and avoid clashes on the Sino-Indian border, the Chinese Government once unilaterally stopped sending its patrols to the area within 20 kilometres on its own side of the entire boundary. However, the Indian side took advantage of this situation and steadily pressed forward into Chinese territory. The Chinese Government, bearing the sacred duty of defending China's territory and maintaining tranquillity on its border, cannot remain indifferent to the intensified aggressive activities of the Indian side. In order to prevent Indian troops from further nibbling Chinese territory and carrying out armed provocations, the Chinese frontier guards were ordered to resume border patrolling and set up additional post in the western sector. Now the Indian side, instead of
ceasing its aggressive activities in the western sector, has extended
them to the eastern and middle sectors. In view of this, the Chinese
frontier guards have been ordered to take the same defensive
measures in the eastern and middle sectors as in the western sector.
The position of the Chinese Government for a peaceful settlement of
the Sino-Indian boundary question through negotiations is consistent
and remains unchanged. However, should the Indian side continue
its intrusion into Chinese territory and carry on its provocations in
disregard of the protests and warnings of the Chinese Government,
the Indian Government must be held fully responsible for the conse-
quences arising therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity
to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consi-
deration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 September 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Ministry's note dated 22nd August, 24th August, 28th August and 7th September 1962, wherein the Government of India have lodged protests regarding the setting up of new military posts by intruding Chinese forces on Indian territory in Ladakh.

The Government of India note with regret that, even subsequent to these protests, six more aggressive military posts have been set up by Chinese forces, deep inside Indian territory, as follows:

**Chip Chap region**

(i) Post at 78° 18' 30" E 35° 07' 45" N.
(ii) Post at 78° 18' 30" E 35° 09' 45" N.
(iii) Post at 78° 15' E 35° 13' 30" N.
(iv) Post at 78° 09' 30" E 35° 17' 30" N.

**Qara Qash region**

(v) Post at 78° 22' 45" E 35° 05' 15" N.

**Pangong-Spanggur region**

(vi) Post at 78° 45' 45" E 33° 35' 30" N.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest against the setting up of the above mentioned new Chinese military posts which constitute further evidence of China's expansionist aims.

The aggressive activities pursued by Chinese forces on Indian territory also belie the oft-repeated claims of the Chinese Government that they have not disturbed the status quo and that they are anxious to ease the tension prevailing in the area and to avoid clashes.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
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Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 September 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows:

On 20th September at about 21:30 hours two Chinese soldiers crept up to an Indian patrol post approximately one mile east of the Dhola Indian post (approx. 91° 42’ E 27° 46·5’ N) and threw two head-grenades injuring three Indian soldiers. The Indian post fired verey lights and saw a substantial number of Chinese soldiers massed some distance away. The Chinese soldiers thereupon opened fire on the Indian patrol post which was compelled to return the fire in self-defence. Intermittent firing continued for approximately two hours.

The Chinese soldiers again opened fire at 03:30 hours on the 21st September and this exchange of fire continued till 05:30 hours the same day. The Chinese once again fired at the Indian patrol post at 07:00 hours on 21st September.

The Chinese Government are fully aware that the boundary in this Sector commences from a point at approximately 91° 40’ E 27° 48’ N and runs in an easterly direction along the crest of the Tang La (thagla) ridge separating the North-East Frontier Agency of India from the Tibet Region of China. The location of the main Dhola Indian post, to which the Chinese refer as Tse Dong is about 2½ miles south of the Tang La (Thagla) ridge.

The Government of India lodge an emphatic protest against the unprovoked aggression and wanton attack on the Indian patrol post by Chinese forces in this area which has resulted in three Indian casualties and demand that the intruding Chinese troops should stop their provocative activities and withdraw immediately into Chinese territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 21 September 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

On September 20, 1962, at 24:00 hours, Indian troops in the Che Dong area of Tibet, China, north of the so-called McMahon Line, into which they had intruded, made a sudden armed attack on Chinese frontier sentries standing on guard west of the Che-jao bridge. From 24:00 hours on September 20 to 07:00 hours on September 21, the Indian troops on four successive occasions fired rifles and machine-guns, totalling more than 60 rounds, and hurled seven hand grenades. An officer of the Chinese frontier guards was hit and killed and a soldier was seriously wounded. Up to 08:30 hours on September 21, the Indian troops had not yet stopped firing. The Chinese frontier guards exercised the utmost self-restraint and fired four rounds back only after they had suffered casualties. These Chinese frontier guards west of the bridge are now still encircled by the Indian troops, and their contact with the rear has been cut off. The situation in the Che Dong area is extremely dangerous, and flames of war may break out there.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges the most serious and the strongest protest against the above-mentioned frantic attack by the intruding Indian troops and their crime of killing and wounding Chinese frontier guards. The Chinese Government demands that the Indian side immediately stop its attack and withdraw at once from the area of Che Dong and the Che-jao bridge. The Chinese Government reserves the right to ask for an apology and compensation from the Indian Government. If the Indian Government does not immediately accept the Chinese Government's demand, then, in order to protect the Chinese frontier guards west of the Che-jao bridge and restore their contact with the rear, the Chinese side will be compelled to take the necessary defensive measures. Should the Indian troops again open fire at the Chinese troops during the latter's defensive action, the Chinese troops will necessarily defend themselves resolutely, and the responsibility for any casualties of the Indian side under Chinese defensive fire must be borne completely by the Indian side itself.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state as follows:

Recently the Indian side again set up on Chinese territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border three additional strong-points for aggressive purposes. Two of them are located respectively at approximately 30° 34' 30" N, 78° 45' 05" E and approximately 33° 33' N, 78° 46' E, both lying astride the Sino-Indian boundary west of the Spanggur Lake in the Ari district, Tibet. The third one is located at approximately 35° 10' N, 78° 12' E south of the Chip Chap River area in Sinkiang.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest against this insatiable nibbling of Chinese territory by the Indian side, and once again demands that the Indian Government immediately withdraw all its aggressive strong points.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 25 September 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the two protest notes handed over to the Charge d’Affaires of India on 22nd September 1962.

2. The Government of China are either completely mis-informed about the location of the area referred to in their Note of 16th September or are deliberately confusing the precise location where the Chinese troops are carrying on their aggressive activities in Indian territory.

3. The Chinese note of 16th September alleged that Indian troops crossed the McMahon line and intruded into Che Dong of the Le village in Tibet and gave the co-ordinates of the location as 27° 49’ N and 91° 48’ E. A reference to the map would show that according to the co-ordinates given, the area referred to lies to the north of the Thagla Ridge and is obviously in Tibet. There is a village called Le at this location in Tibet. The Government of India have categorically stated in their note of 17th September that no Indian forces or defence works of any kind exist to the North of the Thagla Ridge which is the McMahon line boundary in this region and pointed out that the Chinese forces have intruded to the south of the line into Indian territory.

4. The Indian note of September 21st has given full factual details to show that the Chinese troops have not only provocatively crossed the McMahon line i.e. the Thagla ridge which forms the Indo-Tibetan boundary in this region, but have wantonly attacked Indian troops and inflicted casualties on them. Indian forces in the vicinity of the main Indian Dhola Post are only exercising their legitimate right of defence of Indian territory in resisting the aggressive attacks of Chinese forces on Indian soil.

5. In the light of the factual details given in the above paragraphs, the Chinese Government’s statement that “they reserve the right to ask for an apology or compensation”, is either misconceived because it is based on incorrect and misleading information, or is deliberately confusing and patently aggressive with the sole idea of supporting the provocative activities of the Chinese forces in Indian territory. The Government of India must in either case firmly reject it.

6. The Indian defence forces have firm instructions to remain within Indian frontiers. They are unmistakably clear as to where the frontier lies in this region. No amount of confused allegations or aggressive threats, as indicated in the Chinese notes, will deter them from resisting with firmness any violation of the Indian border by Chinese forces whether here or elsewhere.
7. The Government of India hope that the Chinese Government will even now pause and consider the factual position of the boundary in the area where their forces are carrying on their aggressive activities in Indian territory, stop making unwarranted threats, and issue immediate instructions to their intruding forces to cease their aggressive activities on Indian territory and direct them to return to Chinese territory across the frontier to the North of Thagla Ridge, that is, to the region indicated by the co-ordinates given in the Chinese note of 16th September, 27° 49' N and 91° 48' E. The Government of India will hold the Chinese Government responsible for all the consequences that flow from this deliberate aggression and unwarranted attacks by Chinese forces on Indian forces in Indian territory.

8. The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with regard to the Indian troops' grave crime of successively creating incidents of bloodshed in Che Dong by killing and wounding Chinese frontier guards, has the honour to state as follows:

The Indian troops which intruded into Che Dong, China, north of the so-called McMahon Line, have in the past few days kept shooting, day and night, at Chinese frontier sentries standing on guard to the west of the Che-jao bridge, in disregard of the repeated protests and warnings by the Chinese Government. Within the one and half hours from 21:30 to 23:00 hours on September 21, 1962 alone, the intruding Indian troops fired more than 400 gun shots and two artillery rounds and threw two hand grenades. In the period from 07:50 hours on September 22 to 02:12 hours on September 23, the Indian troops opened fire five times, firing more than 200 gun shots and five artillery rounds and throwing 11 hand grenades, wounding a Chinese sentry. What is more serious, from 13:00 to 13:50 hours on September 24 the aggressive Indian troops again opened fierce fire, threw a large number of hand grenades and blew up part of the defensive works of the sentries' post of the Chinese frontier guards to the west of the Che-jao bridge, causing four casualties among the Chinese sentries.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges once again the most serious and strongest protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned grave crime committed by the aggressive Indian troops, and reserves the right to ask for an apology and compensation from the Indian Government. In its note dated September 21, 1962 the Chinese Government demanded that the Indian side immediately stop its attack on the Chinese frontier guards and withdraw at once from the area of Che Dong and the Che-jao bridge. The Indian Government, while failing to give an answer so far, has successively created new incidents of bloodshed. In the face of the increasingly frantic armed attacks by the aggressive Indian troops, the Chinese frontier guards cannot but take resolute measures of self-defence. The Indian Government must be held fully responsible for all the consequences arising from this.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated 18th September 1962.

The detailed facts in regard to recent developments in the Pangong Lake area have already been given in the Ministry's notes dated 22nd July, 24th July, 28th July, 30th July, 15th August, 6 September, 7th September and 13th September 1962. These notes show that there has not only been an increase in the aggressive and provocative activities carried on by Chinese forces on Indian territory in this area but also that Chinese forces have been continuously setting up additional aggressive military posts.

The western half of the Pangong Lake is an integral part of Indian territory and there can be no justification whatever for the presence of any Chinese forces in that area. It is clear that such intrusions and incidents that have occurred in the area have been caused by Chinese intruders and not by Indian troops. As far as the deployment of Indian defence forces inside Indian territory is concerned, this is a matter purely for the Government of India to decide. The Indian Government cannot countenance any interference from the Chinese Government in this regard.

The allegation in the Chinese note that on 23rd August 1962, Indian military motor-boats on the Pangong Lake had fired 9 shots for reconnaissance purposes at an illegal Chinese post is a repetition of the baseless allegation made once before in the Chinese note of 27th August 1962. This allegation has been fully refuted in the Indian Government's reply dated 6th September 1962. Similar allegations of firing on the 2nd September and 5th September 1962 are equally baseless.

In the light of the facts cited above, the Government of India reject the Chinese note under reference.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 26 September 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

On the morning of September 19, 1962, a patrol team consisting of six Chinese frontier guards was on routine duty near a Chinese post on the northern bank of the Chinese part of the Pangong Lake in Tibet. At about 11:30 when the patrol team came to a place at about 33° 44.5' N, 78° 51' E, it suddenly met with serious provocation from two batches of intruding Indian troops, totalling over 30 in number. The Indian troops, relying on their superior strength, closed in on the Chinese patrol team. One batch of these Indian troops even pressed to within thirty metres or so from the Chinese patrol team. The Chinese patrols repeatedly gesticulated and shouted out warnings. The intruding Indian troops, however, not only did not stop their provocations, but continued to press forward, and then crouched down and made preparations for firing. It was only owing to the utmost self-restraint on the part of the Chinese side that a serious incident was avoided.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest against the above armed provocations by Indian troops. It must be pointed out that intruding Indian troops have more than once made similar provocations in the Pangong Lake area (reference the Chinese Government’s notes of July 28 and August 27, 1962); and what is more, this incident took place immediately after the Chinese Government lodged on September 18, 1962 a protest against the Indian side’s intrusions and provocations on the waters of the Pangong Lake in Tibet. These facts show that the Indian side is stepping up and expanding its aggressive activities in the Pangong Lake area. Under such circumstances, the Chinese side will have to adopt necessary defensive measures to protect its own territory.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note of 25th September 1962.

A detailed account of the recent intrusions by Chinese forces in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary has already been communicated in the Indian Government's notes dated 17th September, 21st September and 25th September 1962. The Government of India's note of 21st September 1962 gives the correct account of the attack by Chinese troops at 21:30 hours on the 20th September 1962 against an Indian patrol party approximately 1 mile east of the Dhola Indian post (91° 42' E 27° 46.5' N).

It is significant that in the Chinese note dated 16th September 1962 the coordinates for "Che Dong of the Le village", where the incident is alleged to have occurred, are given as 91° 48' E 27° 49' N. As has been pointed out in the Indian Government's note of 25th September 1962, this area is in Tibetan territory and there are no Indian troops present in that location. The actual scene of the clash is south of the Thagla ridge which is the India-China border and is one mile east of the location 91° 42' E 27° 46.5' N. This area is indisputably Indian territory into which Chinese forces have intruded.

In the light of the above facts the Government of India reject the Chinese note under reference and call upon the Chinese Government to withdraw their forces immediately from Indian territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 29 September 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

From 16:40 to 17:05 hours on September 25, 1962, the Indian troops which had intruded into China's Che Dong area again opened fire fiercely at the Chinese sentry post west of the Che-jao bridge, firing more than 700 gun shots and throwing four hand grenades. A Chinese frontier guard was killed and another wounded. The Chinese frontier guards were compelled to return fire in self-defence. Concerning the armed attack launched by Indian troops from 13.00 to 13.50 hours on September 24 on the same Chinese sentry post, the Chinese Government has received a further report from the Chinese frontier guards, which gives the verified casualties of the Chinese side in that incident as three soldiers killed and two officers wounded.

The Chinese Government hereby again lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government against the Indian side's grave crime of continuing to provoke armed clashes and create incidents of bloodshed. The Chinese Government once again warns the Indian side that it must immediately stop its attack on the Chinese frontier guards and withdraw its intruding troops at once from the area of Che Dong, otherwise, the Indian side must bear full responsibility for all the consequences arising therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 29 September 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state as follows:

At 00:45 hours on September 29, 1962, the Indian troops who had intruded into China's Che Dong area again attacked the Chinese sentry post west of the Che-jao bridge firing fiercely with machine-guns, submachine-guns and rifles. At the same time, they shelled more than ten rounds at the Chinese frontier guards east of the bridge. A total of four Chinese soldiers were wounded. The Chinese frontier guards were compelled to act in self-defence. The Chinese Government hereby lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government against the serious crime of the aggressive Indian troops in making provocative attack on and wounding Chinese soldiers. The Indian Government must bear full responsibility for the crime and all the consequences arising therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurance of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 29 September 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note of 4th September 1962.

The facts in regard to the villages of Longju and Roi have been fully stated in the Government of India's notes dated 28th May, 6th June and 8th August 1962. It is most regrettable that the Chinese Government should choose to ignore these unassailable facts and persist in repeating baseless allegations.

There is not the least doubt that the village of Longju, like the village of Roi, is south of the McMahon line and forms an integral part of Indian territory. No amount of prevarication by the Chinese side can alter this position.

No Indian troops visited Longju or Roi on the 18th July 1962, as has been alleged in the Chinese note under reference. Although after their forcible occupation of Longju in August 1959, Chinese forces had withdrawn from Longju sometime in 1961, the Indian side has made no attempt to re-enter it, in the interests of a peaceful settlement.

Chinese forces on the other hand have shown no such restraint. As recently as the 15th September 1962, 11 armed Chinese and 6 civilians intruded into Longju and then returned the same day to the Tibet region from where they had come. The Government of India strongly protest against this latest instance of intrusion into Longju by Chinese forces.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated 18th September 1962.

Detailed facts in regard to the incident have already been communicated in the Indian Government's note dated 20th September 1962. The Government of India categorically reject the untenable claim made in the Chinese note under reference that Indian troops had intruded into Chinese territory and "pressed close to the defence positions" of a Chinese post. On the contrary, the incident had occurred as a result of Chinese troops advancing menacingly on an Indian post in the area and unscrupulously opening fire on it.

The location at which the incident took place is 78° 08' 15" E 35° 07' 45" N. This area is over one hundred miles west of the International Boundary in this region where Chinese troops could have no justification to be present.

In the light of the above facts, the Government of India, while rejecting the Chinese note under reference, stress once more the urgent need for putting a stop to the aggressive forward patrolling by Chinese forces in Indian territory and for their immediate withdrawal.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the Indian Government's note of September 19, 1962, has the honour to state as follows:

1. The Chinese Government regrets that the Indian Government has once again refused its proposal for speedily and unconditionally holding discussions on the Sino-Indian boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials of the two countries.

2. The Indian Government has also refused the Chinese Government's reiterated proposal that the armed forces of each side withdraw 20 kilometres along the entire border. The aim of the Indian Government in doing so is quite clear. Taking advantage of the cessation of border patrols by the Chinese frontier guards, the Indian side again crossed the so-called McMahon Line last June and intruded into the Che Dong area to its north in China's Tibet region and has since then set up four aggressive strongpoints at Che Dong, Jungputiu, Chekuopu and Kalung. The proposal for each side to withdraw 20 kilometres would obviously hinder the Indian side from carrying out its aggressive activities in the eastern as well as the western and middle sectors. While sending China a note on September 19 refusing the Chinese proposal for a peaceful settlement of has since September 20 launched continuous attacks on the Chinese frontier guards in the Che Dong area and, as of September 30, killed 5 and wounded 9 Chinese frontier guards. Such unbridled provocation and attacks have not stopped up to now. It is clear that the Indian Government is determined to answer the Chinese Government's peace proposal with rifles and guns. The Chinese Government cannot but express deep indignation at this.

3. The Indian Government pretentiously repeated in its note that discussions on the boundary question can only be held after the border tension has been eased. This is downright hypocrisy. Can it be that the Indian troops' crossing the so-called McMahon Line and firing at Chinese frontier guards are an Indian effort to ease the border tension? Whenever India attacks, China is sure to strike back. The Indian Government must bear responsibility for all the serious consequences arising from this. The Indian side on the one hand says that discussions on the boundary question can be held only after the border tension has been eased, on the other hand ceaselessly creates tension on the border, thus increasingly complicating the boundary question. Hollow words can deceive no one and calculated deeds of continuously altering the status quo of the boundary unilaterally and by force will certainly bring India no good.

4. It was out of the sincere desire to ease the border tension that the Chinese Government reiterated the proposal for each side to withdraw 20 kilometres. Yet the Indian Government asserted in its note that this proposal "suffers from the serious defect that it leaves
the aggressor, who altered the status quo by unilateral action over the last few years, in possession of the fruits of his aggression." As a matter of fact, it is India itself that altered the status quo of the boundary unilaterally and by force, not only over the last few years, but for more than ten years. Regarding the western and middle sectors, the Chinese Government has already given detailed accounts in its previous notes. Now, for the eastern sector. China once again points out emphatically that the so-called McMahon Line is utterly illegal and is what the Chinese Government absolutely does not recognize. Actually, before the peaceful liberation of Tibet by China in 1950, it was merely a line which a Briton drew on a map at will and without any basis; a line without any legal or practical value. It was only after China had liberated Tibet that the Indian side unilaterally altered by force the traditional customary line in the eastern sector and pushed its frontier forces up to the so-called McMahon Line. Not satisfied with this, the Indian Government in 1959 occupied Khinzemane, which is north of the so-called McMahon Line, and has now further occupied the Che Dong area. All these are iron-clad facts of unilateral and forcible alteration of the status quo of the boundary by the Indian side.

5. While repeatedly protesting against the Indian actions of altering unilaterally and by force the status quo of the boundary in the western, middle and eastern sectors, the Chinese Government, proceeding from the fundamental interests of the peoples of China and India, has never made restoration of the original state of the boundary a pre-condition for the holding of boundary negotiations between China and India. The Chinese Government holds that no pre-condition should be set for the negotiations on the boundary question. This has been, and still remains, the attitude of the Chinese Government. It is not difficult for the Asian countries and all peace-loving countries to see from this that the Chinese Government is sincerely working for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. The Indian Government, however, insists in its note on a pre-condition for the discussions on the boundary question, namely, the so-called status quo of the Sino-Indian boundary in the western sector as conceived by India must first be restored, which means that China must withdraw from vast tracts of its own territory before discussions on the Sino-Indian boundary question can start. This is absolutely unacceptable to the Chinese Government. It is clear that the Indian Government has raised the question in such a way because it wants to make the two sides bog down in endless procedural debates in a continuous exchange of notes, thus making it utterly impossible to start discussions on the boundary question.

6. The Chinese Government is against setting any pre-conditions for the discussions on the Sino-Indian boundary question. But it does not object to discussing any question the Indian side may raise during the discussions on the Sino-Indian boundary question. The Indian note says that only certain questions concerning the western sector of the boundary will be discussed. Why only discuss the western sector? The eastern sector being the most pressing question at present, what reason is there for not discussing it? The Chinese Government now once again proposes that discussions on the Sino-Indian boundary question be started at once between the two Governments.
on the basis of the report of the officials of the two sides; that during
the discussions questions concerning the middle and eastern sectors
of the boundary must be discussed as well as those concerning the
western sector, in a word, that neither side should refuse to discuss
any question concerning the Sino-Indian boundary that may be raised
by the other side.

7. As regards the concrete arrangement, the Chinese Government
has noted that the Indian Government has agreed to the proposal for
holding discussions from October 15 first in Peking and then in
Delhi, alternately. The Chinese Government is prepared to receive
on October 15 the representative to be sent by the Indian side. It
suggests that other relevant details be promptly discussed and
decided upon through diplomatic channels.

The Chinese Government awaits the reply of the Indian Govern-
ment.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity
to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest
consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 4 October 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

The intruding Indian troops have recently set up two more strongpoints on Chinese territory for aggressive purposes. One is located at approximately 35° 08.5' N, 78° 14' E, at a place south of the Chip Chap valley inside Sinkiang. The other is located at approximately 33° 39.5' N, 78° 45' E, on the southern bank of the Pangong Lake inside Tibet. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest against these aggressive Indian acts of setting up more and more strongpoints and nibbling more and more Chinese territory. The Chinese Government once again demands that the Indian Government withdraw all its aggressive strongpoints illegally set up in Chinese territory.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 October 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the note presented to the Charge d’Affaires of India at Peking on 3rd October, 1962.

The Government of India regret that the Chinese Government have not only turned down the proposal to hold further discussions regarding measures to remove the current tensions in the Western sector, the implementation of which is a necessary preliminary to the creation of a climate of confidence between the two Governments for constructive discussions to resolve the differences over the border question, but categorically have stated that any consideration of measures for restoration of the status quo of the boundary unilaterally altered by force is absolutely unacceptable to the Chinese Government. How can any talks take place in the context of this precondition?

The Government of India have repeatedly stated their desire to enter into talks and discussions, first to devise measures to reduce tensions and to create a climate of confidence, and then to undertake purposeful and constructive discussions in the improved climate to resolve the differences between the two Governments over the border question. The Government of India’s approach in this matter of talks and discussions has been clear and straightforward—preliminary talks to ease tensions and to create the appropriate climate of confidence to be followed by further purposeful talks, after implementation of measures to ease tensions and restore confidence have been taken, to resolve differences between the two Governments on the boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials. If there has been any doubledealing or hypocrisy, it is entirely on the Chinese side as can be seen in the succeeding four paragraphs below.

The Government of China have repeatedly stated in their communications sent to the Government of India that they have all along refrained from disturbing the status quo of the eastern sector of the boundary along the McMahon line, though they did not recognise it, as they were respecting the actualities of the situation. This boundary, running along the highest Himalayan watershed ridges, has been the traditional and customary boundary between India and Tibet for centuries and Indian administration had been established right up to it. This was conclusively proved by the Indian officials at the talks of 1960. The Agreement of 1914—The McMahon Line Agreement—merely formalised the traditional boundary and gave it the added sanction of confirmation by treaty. The Government of China have recently accepted the eastern section of the McMahon line as the traditional watershed boundary between China and Burma. They have also in their recent publication, “Selected Documents on Sino-Indian Relations”, issued in 1962, attached a map showing the
McMahon line as the alignment along “the Himalayan mountains”. This makes clear that even according to the Chinese, it was not just “a line which a Briton drew on a map at will without any basis” but the highest watershed ridge in this area.

Despite this clear knowledge of the boundary, the Chinese forces have, during the last month, while notes were being exchanged for holding talks and discussions, intruded into Indian territory in the eastern sector and have been attacking Indian forces since 20th September. The Government of India have in their notes of 17th, 21st, 25th and 28th September given full details of this unwarranted and deliberate Chinese violation of the status quo of the border. The Government of India in their note of 25th September requested the Government of China, in the light of the full details given by them regarding this latest intrusion of Chinese forces into Indian territory, to issue immediate instructions to their forces to cease their aggressive activities on Indian territory and to return to Chinese territory across the frontier to the north of the Thagla Ridge, i.e., to the region indicated by the co-ordinates given by the Chinese authorities themselves in their note of 16th September, viz., 27° 49’ N and 91° 48’ E. The Government of China have not only not taken any action in this regard, continued their aggressive activities in Indian territory and created further tensions in the Eastern sector, which has so far been quiet and peaceful, but are now arguing, on the basis of tensions created by their deliberate aggression, that the eastern sector being the most pressing question at present, should also be discussed. The Government of India will not enter into any talks and discussions under duress or continuing threat of force. The latest Chinese intrusion must be terminated first.

The Government of India in their note of 19th September commented on the suggestion of the Chinese Government regarding withdrawal of forces on both sides by 20 kilometres that this suggestion “suffers from the serious defect that it leaves the aggressor who altered the status quo by unilateral action over the last few years in possession of the fruits of his aggression”. This comment of the Government of India is fully justified. While India has never altered the traditional status quo of the boundary, it is obviously the Chinese practice to alter the status quo unilaterally whenever they can. This has been further confirmed by the latest action of the Chinese forces during the last month in the eastern sector. Quite apart from the claims of either side, it is clearly established that Chinese forces have, during the last month, crossed the Thagla Ridge and entered into the area on the Indian side. This cannot be denied. And further, they are continually strengthening their position on the Indian side of the Ridge. The Chinese forces have thus advanced into and occupied Indian territory. These facts are clear and no one can be deceived by suggestions for talks and discussions and professions of peaceful settlement when force is actually being employed to grab Indian territory even while these notes for talks and discussions are being exchanged.

Nor can anyone be deceived by the false allegation that one Government of India have raised the question in such a way as to bog
down the two sides in endless procedural debate and make it utterly impossible to start discussions on the boundary question. The position of the Government of India in this matter is clear as stated in the third paragraph above. It is the Government of China, on the other hand, that want to bog down the talks in endless debates and wrangles by proposing that neither side should refuse to discuss any questions concerning the Sino-Indian boundary that may be raised by the other side. No useful talks and discussions can take place in the absence of a precise agenda and it appears that the Chinese are specifically aiming at creating confusion regarding the proposal for starting talks and discussions merely as a cover for their aggressive and expansionist activities along the India-China border.

The Government of India are prepared to make necessary arrangements for starting discussions in Peking or in Delhi from a mutually convenient date as soon as the latest intrusion by Chinese forces in Indian territory south of the McMahon line has been terminated as requested in Government of India's note of 25th September 1962, and the Chinese Government indicate their acceptance of the proposal made in that note, which is reproduced below for ready reference:

"The Government of India are prepared to hold further discussions at the appropriate level to define measures to restore the status quo in the Western sector which has been altered by force in the last few years and to remove the current tensions in that area. The implementation of such measures will create a climate of confidence between the two Governments which alone can make possible constructive discussions to resolve the differences between the two Governments on the boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials."

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government, dated September 17, 21 and 25, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

In its notes to the Indian Government dated September 16, 20, 21 and 25, 1962, the Chinese Government has given clear and detailed accounts of how Indian troops intruded into Che Dong, north of the so-called McMahon Line, established an aggressive strongpoint, attacked Chinese frontier guards and created incidents of bloodshed there. In the past few days, the Indian troops have again expanded the scope of their encroachment and set up three more aggressive strongpoints in the Che Dong area, one at Chekuopu, east of Che Dong and west of the Che-jao bridge, another at Jungputiu, south-west of Che Dong, and the third at Kalung, west by north of Che Dong. What is even more serious, the Indian troops have become increasingly unbridled in their armed provocations. Against this, the Chinese Government has repeatedly lodged the most serious protests with the Indian Government. The Chinese Government now demands once again that the Indian side immediately stop its armed attacks on the Chinese frontier guards and withdraw from China's Che Dong area.

The Indian Government in its notes not only tried hard to deny having engaged in aggressive activities, but went so far as to misrepresent the armed attack launched by the Indian troops at midnight on September 20, in which they killed an officer of the Chinese Frontier Guards and wounded a Chinese soldier, as an incident in which two Chinese soldiers came "up to an Indian patrol post" and "threw two hand-grenades injuring three Indian soldiers," so that the Indian side was "compelled to return the fire in self-defence." In concocting this lie in its notes, the Indian Government had probably forgotten another version of this incident given by a spokesman of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs on September 21. He then pretentiously said that the Chinese opened fire at an Indian post from some hundreds of yards away, injuring three Indian soldiers. This evident inconsistency in itself suffices to explode the Indian side's clumsy lies. It must also be pointed out that, in reply to correspondents on September 22, 1962, Prime Minister Nehru described the bloody clash created by Indian troops as "minor incidents". This irresponsible statement shows that the Indian side is going to continue to "play with fire" on the border. But he who plays with fire well burn himself, and the Indian side is advised to consider carefully the consequences.

The Indian Government asserts that Che Dong is to the south of the illegal McMahon Line and is Indian territory. This is wholly incompatible with the actual situation. The so-called McMahon Line was treacherously concocted in 1914 by Britain for the purpose of
aggression against China's Tibet. It is illegal and null and void and has never been recognized by any Chinese Government. But according to the original 1914 map of the "McMahon Line", this line extends eastward from approximately 27° 44' 6" N, 91° 39' 7" E, while Che Dong is situated at 27° 46' 5" N, 91° 42' E, and so obviously north of the Line. In the map "India and Adjacent Countries" published by the Survey of India in 1959, the so-called McMahon Line has already been shifted further north, yet the Che Dong area is still north of the Line as delineated in this map. During the meeting of the officials of the two countries, the Indian side said in describing its claim line on June 27, 1960 that the western extremity of the so-called McMahon Line was about 13 miles south of the Mela Pass (27° 57' N, 91° 40' E). Calculated by this distance, the Che Dong area is still north of the Line. All this shows that whether according to the 1914 original map, the 1959 Indian official map or the Indian officials' own account, the Che Dong area is undoubtedly to the north of the so-called McMahon Line. The Indian Government states in its September 17 note that the Indian side said in the officials' meeting that the so-called McMahon Line starts eastward from 27° 48' N, 91° 40' E. It is true that the Indian official said to that effect on July 13, 1960 in reply to a question put by the Chinese side. But his statement was not only at variance with the fact, but also inconsistent with the Indian official's own statement of June 27, 1960. It is utterly untenable for the Indian side now to use that statement as a ground for encroaching on the Che Dong area. The Indian side, after occupying large tracts of Chinese territory south of the so-called McMahon Line, has again and again changed its delineation of this illegal Line and encroached on Chinese territory north of the Line. According to such practice of the Indian side, what boundary could there be between China and India?

The fact is very clear. It is precisely the Indian side that has intruded to the north of the illegal McMahon Line and created incidents of bloodshed in the Che Dong area. The Chinese Government expresses its extreme regret and indignation over the Indian Government's practice of wilfully distorting facts and calling black white in its notes. It is absolutely futile for the Indian Government to try in this way to absolve itself of the guilt of expanding its aggression and killing and wounding Chinese frontier guards.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
On 9th October 1962 a batch of the Indian troops which had intruded into the Che Dong area north of the "McMahon Line" crossed the upper reach of the Kechilang river to establish an aggressive strongpoint at Chihtung (more than 4 kilometres north west of Che Dong). At 09.20 hours on 10th October the aggressive Indian troops launched from Chihtung a fierce attack on the Chinese frontier guards stationed near Chihtung, killing and wounding 11 Chinese frontier guards. The Chinese frontier guards were compelled to act in self-defence; by the afternoon of the 10th, the fighting was still on. At 09-40 hours on the same day, the Indian troops which had intruded into and stationed in Che Dong fired provocative shots at the Chinese frontier guards stationed at Paitsai, which is opposite to Che Dong across the river. The Chinese Government hereby lodges the strongest and most serious protest with the Indian Government against the aggressive Indian troops above mentioned grave crimes of setting up an additional aggressive strong-point, launching armed attacks and once again killing and wounding Chinese soldiers, it reserves the right to ask for admission of guilt by, and compensation from, the Indian side.

It must be pointed out that the fact that the Indian Government sent its aggressive troops across the upper reach of the Kechilang river to launch new attacks on the Chinese frontier guards and spread the war flame over the Che Dong area immediately after it again it refused to negotiate the boundary question with the Chinese Government shows that it is determined to realise by armed attack its ambition of continuously biting off Chinese territory and fully reveals the real policy of the Indian Government invasion under the cover of a false willingness to negotiate and provocation under the false desire to ease tension. The Chinese Government warns the Indian Government; if the Indian side does not immediately stop its armed attacks and withdraw from the Che Dong area but keeps on creating new incidents of bloodshed the Chinese side will surely act resolutely in self-defence and the Indian Government must bear full responsibility for all the consequences.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 10 October 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to
refer to the Chinese Government's note dated 6th October 1962.

The Chinese note of 6th October once again bears out the Indian
Government's assertion that the Government of China are either
completely misinformed about the location of the area, or are deli-
berately confusing the precise location where the Chinese troops are
carrying on aggressive activities on Indian territory.

The Chinese note of 16th September had originally stated that
Indian forces had stationed themselves in Che Dong of the Le village
(approximately 91° 48' E, 27° 49' N). The Government of India in
their note of 25th September had very clearly indicated that there is
a village called Le at the location given by the Chinese Government
but that is in Chinese territory and no Indian forces were present
there much less Indian military installations. The earlier Indian
note of 21st September had also mentioned that the location at which
Chinese intruding forces had entered Indian territory was in the
vicinity of an Indian post at 91° 42' E, 27° 46 5' N. It is indeed sur-
prising to see that the Chinese Government have now abandoned
the co-ordinates that they had originally given as the location of "Che
Dong" and, without any compunction or embarrassment, have switch-
ed over to the co-ordinates given by the Government of India.

The Chinese Government have also seen fit to refer disparagingly
between the account of the incident of the 20th September in the
Indian note of the 21st September and the Indian spokesman's state-
ment of the same date is wholly baseless. The statement of the
official Indian spokesman was identical with para 2 of the Indian note
of September 21st.

The Chinese Government have also seen fit to refer disparagingly
to the Prime Minister's description on 22nd September of the inci-
dents in the north-western sector of the eastern boundary of India
as of a minor nature. The Government of India hoped that the
Chinese Government would see the dangers inherent in their fresh
intrusion into Indian territory and would, after verification of the
location of their forces, get them to withdraw before the situation
deteriorated further. That hope has so far been belied. It is not
the Government of India but the Chinese Government who are play-
ing with fire by their continuous armed attacks on Indian personnel
in Indian territory. The Government of India hope that the Chinese
authorities will even now see the error of their ways and correct the
situation by withdrawing their forces on their side, i.e., the northern
side of the Thagla Ridge.

The boundary between India and Tibet in this sector is the tradi-
tional alignment along the highest watershed ridge which is the
Thagla Ridge. Commencing from a point approximately 91° 40' E, 27° 48' N, this boundary runs in an east-south-east direction along the crest of this ridge. There can be no room for doubt in regard to this traditional alignment which was described in great detail by the Indian side at the talks of the officials in 1960. The Agreement of 1914—the McMahon Line Agreement—merely formalised this boundary and gave it the added sanction of confirmation by treaty. The McMahon line was delineated on maps which were signed by the Chinese and Tibetan representatives. The maps were of the small scale of 1"=8 miles; but even so it was clear that the boundary in this sector lay along the watershed. The map "India and Adjoining Countries" published by the Survey of India 1959 and cited in the Chinese note also shows the boundary running along the watershed ridge; this alignment is identical with that on the map of 1914.

The Chinese note has falsely claimed a contradiction in the description of the boundary given by the Indian officials on 27th June, 1960 and that provided by them on 13th July, 1960 and sought to draw from this the unwarranted conclusion that Tse Dong (21° 42' E, 27° 46 5' N) lies north of the international boundary in this area. There is no basis whatsoever for this presumption. The western extremity of the McMahon line does lie about 13 miles from Mela Pass as measured along the international boundary. This is also the point approximately 91° 40' E, 27° 48' N.

At the talks of the officials on 27th June, 1960, to which reference has been made in the Chinese note, the Indian officials had repeatedly urged the exchange of maps on every large scale so that the fullest and most precise information about the alignments would be available. It was the Chinese side which rejected this suggestion and provided a map on the diminutive scale of about 1"=80 miles. The reluctance to provide a map on a larger scale, and the statement of the Chinese official on 27th June, 1960 that "there is no need for such an exchange" indicate that the Chinese were satisfied that the boundary ran along the high ridges and no further details were necessary or they were not only ignorant of the topography of the area but also harboured aggressive designs on the Indian border and sought to conceal this beneath the cloak of imprecision.

The Government of India once again draw the attention of the Chinese Government to the fact that the presence of Chinese troops on Indian soil either as a result of misconception of the correct alignment of the boundary or as an act of wilful aggression constitutes a grave danger and the Chinese Government will be entirely responsible for whatever consequences may follow from their failure to withdraw to their side of the boundary north of the Thagla Ridge.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Indian troops which had intruded into Che Dong area after crossing the Kechilang river occupying Chihtung and launching an attack in the morning of 10th October killing and wounding 11 Chinese frontier guards (reference Chinese Government Note of protest dated 10th October 1962), continued their frenzied attack and killed and wounded 22 more Chinese frontier guards. The Chinese frontier guards having suffered heavy casualties were compelled to strike back in self-defence. The aggressive Indian troops fled to the southern bank of the Kechilang river when their attack was thwarted and left behind them 6 corpses and some arms and ammunition. The corpses of the Indian military men have been properly buried on the spot by the Chinese frontier guards. The Chinese Government hereby again lodges the strongest and most serious protest with the Indian Government against the aggressive Indian troops mentioned crime of launching continued frenzied attacks and killing and wounding Chinese frontier guards. It reserves the right to ask for admission of guilt and compensation by the Indian side.

According to reports from the Chinese frontier guards, the aggressive Indian troops entrenched in the Che Dong area are continuing to get reinforcements and preparing for new attacks. The Chinese Government hereby issues another stern warning: should the Indian side still not rein in before the precipice but continue to spread the flames of war, the Indian Government must bear full responsibility for the resulting casualties on both sides and all other consequences that may ensue.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 October 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note, dated 26th September 1962.

In their note, dated 25th September, 1962, the Government of India have drawn the attention of the Chinese Government to the increase in the aggressive and provocative activities of Chinese forces on Indian territory in the Pangong Lake region and also to the setting up of additional military posts. The Chinese note of 26th September, 1962 makes the untenable claim that these posts are all within Chinese territory. Such an assertion is completely inconsistent with facts.

On 19th September 1962, Chinese forces, with a view to cutting off the normal supply lines of Indian posts in the vicinity of the location 78° 51' 15" E, 33° 44' 50" N, encircled two Indian patrols proceeding on normal routine duties and obstructed their line of access to their posts. Chinese forces subsequently set up a post at the same location (78° 51' 15" E, 33° 44' 50" N) with the deliberate aim of obstructing the lines of supply of the Indian posts and harassing them. The new Chinese post is ten miles west of the Indian border and well within Indian territory. There can be no justification whatsoever for the presence of Chinese troops in this area.

It is a matter of deep regret to the Government of India that Chinese troops continue to persist in their systematic and deliberate encroachments of Indian territory without any regard to the grave consequences that they may entail. While, therefore, categorically rejecting the Chinese note, dated 26th September 1962, the Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against the setting up of this latest Chinese post on Indian territory at 78° 51' 15" E, and 33° 44' 50" N and demand its immediate withdrawal.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 12 October 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and with regard to the new provocative activities of the Indian side in the Galwan Valley area in Sinkiang China has the honour to state the following:

At about 2250 hours on September 28th, 1962 intruding Indian troops fired a shot at the Chinese post located approximately at 34° 37' 20" N, 78° 36' E.

At about 1610 hours on October 3rd, 1962 two intruding Indian soldiers pressed forward to the front position of the Chinese post located approximately at 34° 35' 40" N, 78° 35' 30" E and fired five shots at the Chinese frontier guards.

At about 14.00 hours on October 4th, 1962 an Indian helicopter carrying more than 20 Indian soldiers illegally landed at a place at approximately 34° 36' 30" N, 78° 35' 30" E in the vicinity of a Chinese post in the Galwan Valley area. Only after the Chinese frontier guards issued repeated warnings did the helicopter fly away at about 1700 hours of the same day. But it did not leave China at once, and merely flew to an aggressive Indian firing point on the southern bank of the Galwan River.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest against the Indian side's above-mentioned aggressive activities of wanton intrusion into Chinese territory and airspace and firing of more provocative shots.

The Chinese Government deem it necessary to point out that since the intrusion into the Galwan Valley area by Indian troops in July this year Indian air planes have frequently intruded into the airspace over this area, incessantly circled over Chinese posts for reconnaissance purposes and made threats and provocations. Furthermore the landing of the Indian helicopter carrying intruding Indian troops in the vicinity of the Chinese post constitutes a most grave provocation. In order to prevent the situation from aggravating the Chinese side maintained utmost self restraint and allowed the Indian helicopter to fly away. Should the Indian side stubbornly continue its intrusions and provocations from the air the Chinese side will have to take military measures to stop these repeated intrusions into China's air strips by Indian aircraft and the Indian side must bear the full responsibility for all the consequences arising therefrom.

In its notes dated 13th July, 3rd August and 27th August 1962 the Chinese Government lodged protests and served warnings against the intrusions by more and more Indian troops and aircraft into Galwan Valley area and their increasingly rampant provocations since July this year. The Indian Government has however refused to stop its aggressive activities and engaged in prevarications and
denial in its notes of 24th July, 8th August and 6th September 1962. The new provocations by Indian troops in the Galwan Valley area as cited in the present note have thoroughly belied all prevaricating arguments of Indian side. Furthermore the above-mentioned incidents took place precisely after the aggressive Indian troops made armed attacks in the Che Dong area in Tibet and killed and wounded Chinese officers and men there. These facts once again show that the Indian side is aiming at extending its aggressive activities and creating armed clashes along the entire Sino-Indian boundary. They also show that the Indian side is persisting in its "dual policy" towards China of paying lip-service to holding talks while actually preparing to fight. But this will certainly bring no good to India.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 October 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated September 28, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

In its note of September 25, 1962, the Chinese Government lodged the most serious and strongest protest with the Indian Government against the grave crimes of repeatedly attacking Chinese frontier guards and killing and wounding them on September 21, 22 and 24, committed by intruding Indian troops in China's Che Dong area. In its reply dated September 28, the Indian Government not only refused to give an account of the Indian crimes of aggression, but also deliberately distorted the Chinese Government's note of September 16, 1962, asserting that it gave the co-ordinates of Che Dong as 27° 49' N, 91° 48' E. Such wilful trouble-making can only show how devoid of reason India is. It was explicitly pointed out in the very beginning of the Chinese note of September 16 that "Indian troops recently again crossed the so-called McMahon Line, and intruded into Che Dong of China's Leh Village (approximately 27° 49' N, 91° 48' E)." The co-ordinates given in the note come right after Leh Village and not after Che Dong. Everybody can see that the co-ordinates given there are clearly for Leh Village, not for Che Dong. As the Indian side itself knows, Che Dong which it has occupied is located at approximately 27° 46-5' N, 91° 42' E. Nevertheless, it deliberately tries to mislead the public in an attempt to divert attention.

As is well known, Che Dong is one of the pastures in the Kechilang grassland and has always been under the administration of Leh Village. The inhabitants of Leh Village have for generations grazed cattle at Che Dong and handed in their payment for the pasturage to Leh Village authorities. Even the Indian Government has had to acknowledge the fact explicitly that Leh Village has always belonged to China. None of India's pretexts for its aggression are tenable.

Following its occupation of Che Dong and its vicinity, India has now made further advances and expanded the flames of war it started in the Che Dong area. The Chinese Government hereby serves another warning: The Indian Government must bear the full responsibility for all the consequences that may arise from India's playing with fire.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

The Indian troops that had crossed the illegal McMahon Line to intrude into the Che Dong area in Tibet, after launching a frantic attack on October 10 against the Chinese frontier guards in the vicinity of Chihtung along the upper reaches of the Kechilang River, on October 11 intruded into the area of Niangpa, Tang, Jihtingpu and Keningnai, which are to the east and north of the lower reaches of the river. The aggressive Indian troops concerned advanced on the local Chinese frontier posts, with some of them coming as close as 30 metres of the positions of the Chinese frontier guards, and attempted to make an attack. Meanwhile, aggressive Indian troops have been continually airdropped in the Changto area north of the illegal McMahon Line in preparation for war. Against these actions the Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government.

These new aggressive actions of the Indian troops show conclusively that, after their frantic attack at Chihtung was defeated, the Indian aggressors are attempting to make a renewed trial in the lower reaches of the Kechilang River. Should the Indian side disregard the repeated protests and warnings by the Chinese Government and persist stubbornly in expanding its scope of aggression and continuing its attacks on the Chinese frontier guards, the latter will surely continue to strike back resolutely. The Indian aggressors must bear full responsibility for the consequences of their crimes.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's notes dated 28th and 29th September 1962.

The detailed facts regarding the Chinese intrusion in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary south of the Thagla Ridge have already been given in the Government of India's notes dated 17th, 21st, 25th and 28th September 1962. It is clear that the Chinese Government alone are responsible for the serious situation that has been created by the Chinese forces crossing the international boundary and launching an attack on Indian defence forces at a point approximately one mile east of 91° 42' E 27° 46.5' N. No amount of prevarication by the Chinese side can conceal this latest instance of Chinese aggression across the Indian border.

The Government of India accordingly reject the Chinese note under reference, and once again call upon the Chinese Government to withdraw their intruding forces back into Chinese territory. At the same time, the Government of India reserve the right to demand from the Chinese Government full compensation for the wanton damage to Indian life and property caused by the above aggressive activities of Chinese forces on Indian territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurance of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 October 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's notes dated 9th September, 13th September, 24th September and 4th October 1962.

Although the co-ordinates given in the Chinese notes are not correct, it is a fact that the Government of India have some posts in these general locations. All the locations mentioned are, without exception, well inside Indian territory, some of them as much as a hundred miles west of the international boundary in this region. These posts have been necessitated by the threat posed is recent years to the security and territorial integrity of India by Chinese forces advancing and illegally occupying Indian territory. It is needless to reiterate that the deployment of Indian defence forces in these areas is a matter solely within the competence of the Government of India and no outside party has any right to interfere in it.

Chinese forces have not only intruded deep inside Indian territory in this region but there has been no halt to their aggressive forward patrolling and setting up of new posts in Indian territory. Detailed facts in regard to such Chinese activity in Ladakh in recent months have been given in the Indian Government's notes dated 22nd August, 24th August, 28th August, 7th September and 21st September 1962.

As regards the allegations made in the Chinese note dated 13th September, 1962 of an incident that took place on 2nd September, 1962, the facts have already been communicated in detail to the Chinese Government in the Government of India's notes dated 2nd and 3rd September 1962. This incident was sparked off by a large Chinese military force intruding into Indian territory and attacking an Indian patrol proceeding on a routine task in the area south of the Chip Chap river region (78° 17' 15" E 35° 08' 15" N). The incident that took place on the 5th September 1962 was also similarly due to Chinese soldiers provocatively advancing on Indian defence forces at a point approximately 78° 17' 30" E 35° 08' 30" N as has been conveyed in the Indian Government's note dated 10th September 1962. There is absolutely no basis for the allegation of a shooting incident on 29th August.

It will be clear that it is the Chinese forces who have been constantly pushing forward and encroaching on Indian territory. They have, by their aggressive and provocative activities over the past few years, been solely responsible for mounting tension in this area.

In the light of the above facts, the Government of India reject the four Chinese notes under reference.
The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the notes presented to the Indian Charge d'Affaires in Peking by the Chinese Government on the 10th, 11th and 13th October regarding the clashes between Indian defence posts and the intruding Chinese forces in Indian territory to the south of the Thagla Ridge on 20th September and 10th October, has the honour to state that the Chinese authorities still continue to confuse the location where these clashes occurred and to misrepresent the factual details of these clashes.

This Ministry had, in its note of the 21st September, given full and accurate details of the clash that occurred on the 20th September. It was the Chinese intruding forces who mounted an attack on an Indian defence post and the latter had to return the fire in self-defence. This clash occurred approximately a mile to the east of the Dhola Indian post in the area. The clash on the 10th of October occurred in an area approximately 2 miles to the north-west of the Dhola Indian post. The Chinese threw a grenade at the Indian defence post at 20:30 hours on the 9th October. Next morning they followed this up with a severe attack using 2-inch mortar guns, automatic weapons and grenades. The Indian defence forces had to return the Chinese fire in self-defence. In the fighting that ensued, the Indian forces suffered 17 casualties.

These are the incontrovertible facts regarding the two clashes.

The sites of these clashes are also conclusively established by the details given in the Chinese and Indian notes exchanged since 16th September. The area in which these clashes occurred is south of the Thagla Ridge, which is the boundary between India and the Tibet region of China in this sector.

Despite the attempts at confusion made by the Chinese authorities, certain facts stand out clearly. The Himalayan water-shed range in the region has all along been the traditional and customary boundary. This boundary was further confirmed by the Agreement of 1914.
There has never been any doubt in the minds of the local authorities and inhabitants of the areas on both sides of the frontier as to where the international boundary in this sector lies. The Chinese authorities must be aware that it is the common practice of the villagers on both sides of the frontier to take their cattle for grazing on either side of the frontier, but in each case they pay grazing fees to the local authorities of the area concerned. This was so even after the People’s Government of China had established their control in Tibet. The villagers of Le in Tibet were permitted to use the pastures in the Namkha Chu river valley, which lies immediately to the south of the Thagla Ridge and where the intruding Chinese forces have been mounting attacks on the Indian defence forces, on payment of grazing fees in accordance with the request in writing—“Tsarin should be collected and deposited with the Government of India”—made by the Chinese official at Tsona in August 1953. There had been similar cases of villagers on the Indian side of the frontier grazing their animals on the northern slopes of the Thagla Ridge on paying grazing fees to Le village. This mutual accommodation so far as the graziers on the two sides are concerned does not alter but in fact confirms the international frontier, which lies along the crest of the Thagla Ridge.

In August 1959 a Chinese party led by a Chinese Army Officer and a civilian official met the Indian Assistant Political Officer of the area, at Khinzemane. The latter told the Chinese officials that the correct frontier lay along the Thagla Ridge up to Khinzemane and the Chinese party went back.

In the talks between the officials of the two Governments in 1960 the same position was reiterated by the Indian side, viz., that the international frontier in this area lay along the Thagla Ridge, which is the highest water-shed ridge in that area.

Le village, of which the co-ordinates were given in the Chinese note of the 16th September, lies to the north of the Thagla Ridge and is in the Tibet Region of China. The intruding Chinese forces have crossed the Thagla Ridge and are now to the south of it. During the last few weeks these intruding Chinese forces have been re-inforced, have been aggressive and provocative and have attacked Indian defence forces in Indian territory, major attacks having been
launched on the 20th of September and the 10th of October. In each case it was the Chinese intruding forces which attacked the Indian forces and the latter had to return the fire in self-defence.

These facts speak for themselves. It is beyond doubt, as shown in the preceding paragraphs, that the international boundary in this sector lies along the crest of the Thagla Ridge and that the Chinese authorities are fully aware of this position. The intrusion of the Chinese forces and their attacks on Indian defence forces in the area to the south of the Thagla Ridge during the last few weeks are deliberate acts of aggression in pursuance of the threat that the Chinese authorities held out as early as 30th November 1961 when they stated in a note: "the Chinese Government would have every reason to send troops to cross the so-called 'McMahon Line' and enter the vast area between the crest of the Himalayas and their southern foot".

It is clear that the tension and conflict in this sector of the Eastern boundary is the result of deliberate aggression by Chinese forces; and the responsibility for the consequences of these aggressive acts must therefore rest solely on the Government of China. It is the Chinese forces who have to accept the guilt for intruding into Indian territory, continuing to secure reinforcements and mounting concerted attacks on Indian defence posts on Indian soil. It is the Government of China who are not only refusing to undertake talks and discussions for easing of tension and for creating the appropriate climate for purposeful talks and discussions to resolve the differences between the Governments of India and China on the boundary question, but are creating further tension and conflict in another section of the boundary viz., in the Eastern sector, by pushing their forces across the frontier into Indian territory and mounting concerted attacks on Indian defence forces. The responsibility for these new incidents and the loss of Indian lives rests squarely on the shoulders of the Chinese authorities, who must bear full responsibility for the consequences. If the repeated Chinese professions of resolving the differences peacefully by discussions have any meaning it is still open to the Government of China to direct their forces south of the Thagla Ridge to return to their side of the boundary, i.e. on the northern side of the ridge. The Government of India cannot and will not permit intrusions into, and aggressive activities against Indian defence forces in, Indian territory to go unchallenged.
The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 October 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated 12th October, 1962.

The allegations in the Chinese note of firing by Indian defence forces on 28th September and 3rd October, 1962, are absolutely baseless. There has been no firing on the specified dates, in the areas mentioned. On the other hand, the Government of India must once again draw the attention of the Chinese Government to the fact that both the areas referred to namely, 78° 36' E 34° 37' 20'' N and 78° 35' 30'' E 34° 35' 40'' N are located well inside Indian territory. The Chinese forces have no business to be in these areas in Indian territory. Their presence there is continuing act of aggression by China on the territory of India.

The Chinese note has further referred to the landing by an Indian helicopter at a place approximately 78° 35' 30'' E 34° 36' 30'' N. As stated in the preceding paragraph, this location is also well inside Indian territory being over 70 miles to the west of the international boundary in this region.

The Government of India have already indicated that intruding Chinese forces have established four camps and five strongpoints around the Indian defence post on the Galwan river. The present Chinese allegation of aggressive Indian activity in the Galwan area is not likely to mislead anybody. The Chinese Government should be aware that these baseless allegations are being made merely as a cloak for their aggressive and hostile activities in this region.

It is not the Indian but the Chinese side that is adopting the "dual policy" of professing a desire for peaceful settlement of the border question while pursuing at the same time the path of flagrant aggression. This is clearly established by the fact that it is China which not only committed aggression on Indian territory in the Western sector of the frontier but also started last month another aggression in the north-western area of the Eastern sector of the boundary. No threats of force or use of force by the Chinese will deter the Government of India from their firm determination to defend the territorial integrity of India.
In the light of the above facts, the Government of India categorically reject the Chinese note under reference.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 October 1962

The Chinese Government received successive urgent reports from the Chinese frontier guards on October 20th to the effect that Indian troops had launched massive general attacks against Chinese frontier guards in both Eastern and Western sectors of the Sino-Indian border simultaneously. The Chinese Government hereby lodges the most urgent, the most serious and the strongest protest with the Indian Government.

In the Eastern sector, the Indian forces of aggression had in the three days since 17th October repeatedly directed vehement artillery bombardments against the Chinese frontier guards in the area between Kalung and the Sechang lake in the upper reaches of the Kechilang river, and in the Che-jao bridge area in the middle reaches of the river in the Chedong area in China's Tibet region. At the same time great number of Indian troops had moved continuously to concentrate at Pangkanting south of the Chedong bridge. At 7 O'clock (Peking time) in the morning of 20th October the aggressive Indian forces, under the cover of fierce artillery fire launched massive attacks against the Chinese frontier guards all along the Kechilang river and in the Khinzemane area.

In the Western sector the Indian forces of aggression entrenched in the Chip Chap Valley and the Galwan Valley in Sinkiang also launched general attack early in the morning of the 20th against Chinese frontier guards under the cover of fierce gun fire. Two days before that is on 18th October the Indian forces occupying the Chip Chap Valley had already begun closing in on the Chinese frontier posts in preparation for these attacks.

The above mentioned frenzied attacks by the aggressive Indian forces on Chinese territory in both Eastern and Western sectors of the Sinkiang Indian boundary have caused heavy casualties to the Chinese frontier guards. Pressed beyond the limits of forbearance and forced to where no further retreat was possible the Chinese frontier guards were compelled to strike back in self-defence.

It must be seriously pointed out that the present massive general attacks by the Indian forces were prepared over a long time by India. On 6th October the Indian Government for the third time flatly rejected China's proposal for holding discussions on the basis of 22nd March report of the Officials of the two countries. On 12th October Indian Prime Minister NEHRU declared that he has issued instructions to "free" China's territory of Chinese troops. On 14th October Indian Defence Minister MENON stated that they would fight China to the last man and the last gun. On 16th October immediately after his return to New Delhi from abroad Prime Minister NEHRU summoned a meeting of high ranking military officers to step up war dispositions. And on October 20th the Indian forces brazenly unleashed their massive general attacks on Chinese territory in the Sino-Indian border.
The Chinese Government has always stood for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. The Indian Government after flatly refusing to negotiate has launched massive general attacks against the Chinese frontier guards on Chinese territory. China has no choice but to rebuff these frenzied attacks resolutely. The fight is still going on. The Indian Government must bear full responsibility for all the serious consequences arising therefrom.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 October 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated 20th October, 1962, on the recent grave developments in the Eastern and Western sectors of India's northern border.

The Government of India take the strongest objection to the deliberate distortion of facts that is contained in the Chinese Government's note. The falsity of Chinese claims is only matched by the reckless cynicism with which they have begun large scale hostilities in which Indian posts in Indian territory have been attacked and aircraft evacuating casualties have been shot down.

At 0500 hours on 20th October Chinese intruding forces mounted a fierce offensive with machine gun and heavy mortar fire against Indian defence positions along the Namkha Chu river and also at Khinzemane. The Indian post at Khinzemane was surrounded and wireless contact was lost with the post at 0700 hours the same day. Subsequently the Indian posts at Dhola and Tsangdhar were overrun by Chinese troops in major battle offensives. Not only were Indian defence positions on the ground subjected to Chinese attack but Chinese forces also unscrupulously shot down two Indian helicopters which were engaged in evacuating casualties from the area.

It will be seen from the above facts that it is Chinese forces and not Indian forces that have "brazenly unleashed their massive general attacks". Even as recently as in their note dated 13th October the Chinese Government had been protesting against the existence of Indian defence positions at Tse Dong (91° 42' E 27° 46.5' N). The fact that the fighting today is taking place far south of Tse Dong is clear evidence that Chinese forces are aggressively pressing forward into Indian territory. No prevarication by the Chinese Government can conceal this basic truth.

In the Western sector also, Chinese intruding forces similarly launched a series of planned attacks from the evening of 19th October. Fighting in this area has continued unabated from the 19th October and Chinese forces have to date over-run several legitimate Indian defence posts in the area. That Chinese attacking forces have
been supported by heavy mortar and mountain artillery fire and by tanks indicates beyond doubt that these attacks too form part of a premeditated and large scale Chinese offensive into Indian territory.

The Chinese Government are aware that in spite of the initiative taken by the Government of India since July this year for talks and discussions on measures to reduce tensions prior to substantive discussions on the India-China boundary in the Western sector, the Chinese Government, both in their notes and by their aggressive military policies, had indicated their lack of interest in any civilised solution to differences between the two countries. On 3rd August 1962 the Chinese Foreign Minister, Marshal Chen Yi, unequivocally stated that no force in the world could oblige Chinese troops to withdraw from their own territory either in the past or in the future. On the next day, in their note of August 4th, the Chinese Government had the effrontery to write that “it approves of the suggestion put forth by the Indian Government in its note for further discussions on the Sino-Indian boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials of the two countries.” In plain words, they were ready to discuss on the clear understanding that they hold what they have taken by force over a period of years.

The hollowness of Chinese professions was soon patent once again when on 6th September, Chinese military forces committed fresh aggression in an area which had been comparatively quiet for some years. They marched across the Indian frontier—the Thagla Ridge in the north-western sector of the Eastern boundary—into undisputable Indian territory. This was followed by unscrupulous attacks on Indian posts in the NEFA on 20th September and 10th October. While notes were being exchanged to correct the situation created by this further Chinese aggression, the Chinese satisfied with their assessment of the military situation from the result of their probing attacks on 20th September and 10th October, launched an all-out military offensive on the 20th October along the entire India-China boundary. This offensive still continues and Chinese forces are continuing to mount heavy attacks on Indian defence positions and are advancing into Indian territory.

The hypocrisy of the Chinese allegations in their note that the Indian Government for the third time flatly rejected the Chinese proposal for holding discussions, is clearly established from the facts in the preceding paragraphs. The repeated professions of the Chinese Government reiterated even in the present note, that “the Chinese
Government have always stood for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question" are sheer hypocrisy and were only intended to deceive while massive preparations for invasion of India were being made by the Chinese. Obviously this hurling of Chinese military might against India’s limited border defence forces had only one objective viz. to force India to accept a settlement on Chinese terms. The Government of India can never agree to talk or discuss under threat of force. They stand by their earlier position that before any talks can be considered there must be a restoration of the position that existed in early September 1962.

While rejecting the Chinese note under reference, the Government of India protest most categorically against this blatant aggression by China which will be resisted at all cost.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 7 August 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

In disregard of the recent repeated protests of the Chinese Government, the Indian Government is still with great frequency sending out its aircraft and helicopters to intrude into China's air space. It has been established through repeated verifications that in the month of June 1962, intrusions by Indian aircraft into Chinese air space totalled as many as 54 sorties (for details see annex), 6 of which were even conducted beyond the boundary alignment unilaterally claimed by the Indian side itself, and one helicopter even openly landed on Chinese soil. Against this, the Chinese Government once again lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government.

As was pointed out by the Chinese Government, the frequent intrusions of Indian aircraft are designed to coordinate with the activities of the Indian ground forces in intruding into and carrying out provocations in Chinese territory. Such aircraft circled for reconnaissance again and again over Chinese frontier areas, especially over Chinese border posts, and at the same time transported personnel and large quantities of supplies to the military strongpoints which recently Indian troops set up illegally inside Chinese territory. The aforesaid activities of Indian aircraft have further aggravated the tense situation on the Sino-Indian border. The Chinese Government solemnly demands that the Indian Government immediately stop such intrusions.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Enclosure to the note dated 7 August 1962 of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking

List of Indian Aircraft’s Instructions into Chinese Territorial Air in June 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Intruded into</th>
<th>Sorties</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area in the vicinity of the Karakoram Pass, Sinkiang, China.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0900 hours, June 21</td>
<td>Flying over the boundary alignment claimed by the Indian side itself; circled and reconnoitered at a low altitude of 200-300m above ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0800 hours, June 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0800 hours, June 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1025 hours, June 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chip Chap valley area, Sinkiang, China.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0850 hours, June 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0920 hours, June 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0838 hours, June 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0953 hours, June 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1235 hours, June 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0905 hours, June 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1021 hours, June 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1217 hours, June 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0957 hours, June 12</td>
<td>(2 craft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0820 hours, June 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0855 hours, June 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0923 hours, June 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1050 hours, June 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1113 hours, June 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1041 hours, June 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1045 hours, June 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1120 hours, June 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1120 hours, June 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0945 hours, June 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1020 hours, June 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0840 hours, June 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0840 hours, June 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1226 hours, June 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hongshantou, Sinkiang, China (approximately 35°18'N 78°05'30&quot;E)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0905 hours, June 16</td>
<td>300 odd packs of supplies airdropped to the Military strong point set up there illegally by Indian troops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1255 hours, June 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0912 hours, June 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0905 hours, June 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1105 hours, June 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1325 hours, June 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1007 hours, June 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

104 E.A.—10.
Areas Intruded into Sor-
ties Time Remarks

Area of the source of the Karakash River, Sinkiang, China. 9 0918 hours, June 16 1130 hours, June 21 1350 hours, June 21 0845 hours, June 22 1040 hours, June 24 0945 hours, June 26 (2 craft) 0850 hours, June 28 0850 hours, June 29 The one which intruded at 1130 hours June 21, circled for as long as 2 hours; one of the two intruding helicopters on June 26 even landed at the military strong point illegally set up by Indian troops in the vicinity of the River source.

Area in the vicinity of the source of the Karakash River, Sinkiang, China, at approximately 34°58' 30°N, 78°22'30'E. 6 1200 hours, June 5 1000 hours, June 7 0980 hours, June 12 0950 hours, June 16 1312 hours, June 16 0840 hours, June 22 6 horses, 200 odd packs of supplies and 20 and more Indian soldiers air-dropped to the military strong-point illegally set up there by Indian troops.

Nyagu area in Tibet, China. 2 0830 hours, June 21 0900 hours, June 27 Flying over the so-called McMahon Line.

Sama and the area in its vicinity in Tibet, China. 2 1203 hours, June 15 0945 hours, June 18
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 August 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated 7th August 1962.

In their notes dated the 30th June 1962 and the 25th July 1962, in reply to the Chinese Government's notes dated 31st May 1962 and 28th June 1962 respectively, the Government of India had clearly established the total lack of substance in complaints of violations of Chinese air space by Indian aircraft alleged in the Chinese notes. The Chinese Government's note of 7th August is of the same type and makes baseless allegations. No map references have been given for as many as 41 out of 54 alleged air violations. The alleged violations where references are given relate to areas which form an integral part of Indian territory.

Enquiries conducted by the Indian Government have confirmed beyond any doubt that no Indian aircraft ever crossed the traditional and well-recognised boundary of India.

While rejecting the Chinese note under reference, the Government of India express their regret at the repetition of these baseless allegations which seem to be intended only for anti-Indian propaganda.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 22 August 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note handed over by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India on July 25, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

With regard to the allegation made in the Indian note that on July 7, 1962, a Chinese aircraft flew over Chushul, India, the Chinese Government has conducted a careful investigation, the result of which shows that such an allegation is a sheer fabrication. The Chinese Government has never permitted its aircraft to fly beyond China's boundary. Chushul is located on the Indian side of the Sino-Indian boundary, and no Chinese aircraft has ever been over there. The Chinese Government hereby sternly rejects the unreasonable protest of the Indian Government.

It must be pointed out that over the past few months it is Indian aircraft that have stepped up their violation of Chinese territorial air in coordination with the encroachment on Chinese territory by Indian ground forces. The above-mentioned utterly groundless charge made in the note of the Indian Government can only be regarded as an attempt to cover up the illegal activities of the Indian side itself.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 28 August 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

1. In continued disregard of the Chinese Government's protests, the Indian Government has increased the dispatch of its aircraft to intrude into China's air space. In July 1962, the number of verified cases of intruding sorties ran as high as 124 (See appendix for details), which is twice as many as in May or June, reaching the serious extent of 4 sorties a day on the average. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this, and once again urges the latter to stop at once sending aircraft to intrude into China's space.

2. From the facts listed in the appendix it can be seen that Indian air intrusions into China were particularly frequent over those areas where ground intrusions and provocations by Indian troops were most rampant. For instance, Indian air intrusions over the Chip Chap and the Galwan valley areas in Sinkiang, China, totalled 81 sorties in July. The intruding Indian aircraft circled again and again over Chinese frontier posts for reconnaissance purposes, sometimes over an hour. They airdropped to military strong points illegally set up by Indian troops on Chinese territory more than 40 Indian soldiers and more than 850 packs of arms, petroleum and other supplies.

3. It is entirely futile for the Indian Government, in its notes of June 30 and July 25, 1962 respectively, to deny the facts of Indian air intrusions into China in March-April and May this year listed by the Chinese Government. Even Prime Minister Nehru himself in his speeches made in India's Lok Sabha on August 13 and 14 this year, when dealing with China's protests, openly admitted: "Our aircraft have been visiting our posts and giving them supplies." He also stated boastfully: "They have mentioned the figure, over 300 sorties by us," and "We go as we like." These statements by the Indian Prime Minister further corroborate the fact of Indian air intrusions into China. The Indian notes as usual repeated the allegation that the areas the air space over which was intruded into by Indian aircraft are inside Indian territory, and falsely counter-charged China with "aggression". But these hackneyed words can in no way help the Indian side escape the responsibility for intrusion into China's air space. The large amounts of evidence produced by the Chinese Government during the meeting of the officials in 1960 have indisputably proved that the areas the air space over which was intruded into by Indian aircraft have always been China's territory. In order to defend its position, the Indian Government even asserted in its note of June 30 that the Chinese Government had in its own note admitted that "as many as 55 out of 67 sorties about which they have protested relate to the air space over areas which are inside India".
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This is indeed absurd to the extreme. The Chinese Government's note did not, and could not possibly, make such a statement. That the Indian side should have gone to such length in distorting the fact only shows how devoid of reason it is.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
List of Indian Air Intrusions into China in July 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intruded Areas</th>
<th>Sorties</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area near the Karakoram Pass, Sinkiang, China.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10:00 hours, July 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chip Chap valley area in Sinkiang, China.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9:38 hours, July 6</td>
<td>The Indian aircraft which intruded at 10:00 hours on July 23 and 14:30 hours July 27 circled as many as five or six rounds over the area surrounding the Chinese posts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around Hongshan-tou (Approximately 35°18'N, 78°05'5'E) in the Chip Chap valley area in Sinkiang, China.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9:31 hours, July 6</td>
<td>650 odd packs of supplies were air-dropped to the military strongpoint illegally set up there by Indian troops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:44 hours, July 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:41 hours, July 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:37 hours, July 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:24 hours, July 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:23 hours, July 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:07 hours, July 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:43 hours, July 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:31 hours, July 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:20 hours, July 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:10 hours, July 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:21 hours, July 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:44 hours, July 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:53 hours, July 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:00 hours, July 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:50 hours, July 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:45 hours, July 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:12 hours, July 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:39 hours, July 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:40 hours, July 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intruded areas</td>
<td>Sorties</td>
<td>Date and Time</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of the Source of the Karakash River, Sinkiang, China.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12:35 hours, July 27; 13:51 hours, July 27</td>
<td>The Indian aircraft which intruded at 13:51 hours on July 27 circled as many as 18 rounds over the area around the Chinese post. More than 40 Indian soldiers and 70 odd packs of supplies were airdropped to the military strongpoint illegally set up there by Indian troops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area near the source of the Karakash River, Sinkiang, China, around the point at approximately 34°58'.5&quot;N, 78°22'.5&quot;E.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10:05 hours, July 6; 14:00 hours, July 7; 9:00 hours, July 14; 14:20 hours, July 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Galwan valley area in Sinkiang, China.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9:37 hours, July 11; 15:00 hours, July 11; (2 aircraft) 8:40 hours, July 13; 9:25 hours, July 13; 13:25 hours, July 13; 8:52 hours, July 14; 9:00 hours, July 14; 9:05 hours, July 14; 9:40 hours, July 14; 12:41 hours, July 15; 9:45 hours, July 21; 10:55 hours, July 21; 13:55 hours, July 21; (2 aircraft) 14:20 hours, July 21; 11:02 hours, July 22; 14:10 hours, July 22; 14:25 hours, July 22; 14:30 hours, July 22; 9:10 hours, July 23; 10:35 hours, July 24; 10:50 hours, July 24; 11:50 hours, July 24; 14:35 hours, July 24; 15:00 hours, July 24; 9:50 hours, July 25; 9:50 hours, July 26; 10:53 hours, July 26; 11:30 hours, July 26; 14:16 hours, July 26; 10:20 hours, July 27; 12:55 hours, July 27; 13:27 hours, July 27</td>
<td>The Indian aircraft which intruded respectively at 9:37 hours, July 11; 14:10 hours, July 22; 14:35 hours, July 24; and 15:00 hours, July 24, repeatedly circled over the area around the Chinese posts for over one hour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intruded areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area around a place (Approximately 34°37′5N,78°35′5′E) in the Galwan valley, Sinkiang, China.</th>
<th>10 Sorties</th>
<th>14:10 hours, July 17</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2 aircraft)</td>
<td>130 odd packs of supplies were air-dropped to the military strongpoint illegally set up there by Indian troops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Changlung River area in Sinkiang, China.</td>
<td>6 Sorties</td>
<td>9:43 hours, July 11</td>
<td>The Indian aircraft which intruded at 8:55 hours on July 14 circled six rounds over Chinese territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:55 hours, July 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:55 hours, July 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:25 hours, July 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:20 hours, July 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:02 hours, July 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area near the Kongka Pass, Tibet, China.</td>
<td>6 Sorties</td>
<td>9:55 hours, July 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:20 hours, July 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:55 hours, July 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:11 hours, July 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:35 hours, July 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:45 hours, July 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nyagzu area in Tibet, China.</td>
<td>8 Sorties</td>
<td>9:00 hours, July 15</td>
<td>The Indian aircraft which intruded at 13:05 hours on July 31 penetrated into the air space over the area as deep as about 30 kilometres inside Chinese territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:55 hours, July 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15:15 hours, July 17</td>
<td>(2 aircraft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:20 hours, July 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:50 hours, July 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:07 hours, July 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:05 hours, July 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pangong Lake and Spanggur Lake areas in Tibet, China.</td>
<td>14 Sorties</td>
<td>8:40 hours, July 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:00 hours, July 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:21 hours, July 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:10 hours, July 16</td>
<td>(5 aircraft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:50 hours, July 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:10 hours, July 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15:12 hours, July 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:30 hours, July 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:40 hours, July 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:00 hours, July 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sama area in Tibet, China.</td>
<td>2 Sorties</td>
<td>10:40 hours, July 10</td>
<td>Flying beyond the so-called McMahon Line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:10 hours, July 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 September 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with regard to the serious incident of Indian troops again firing at and shelling Chinese frontier guards, has the honour to state as follows:

At about 10:00 hours on September 15, 1962, an Indian airplane intruded into the air space over the area west of the source of the Karakash River in Sinkiang, China, and made illegal air-drops. Some of the things air-dropped fell near the defence positions of the Chinese post located approximately at 35°06.5'N, 78°20'E. Following that, a batch of intruding Indian troops pressed close to the defence positions of the Chinese post, firing more than fifty rounds and two mortar shells at the Chinese frontier guards. With their lives under serious threat, the Chinese frontier guards were compelled to defend themselves and fired 8 shots back. But they still exercised the greatest restraint and remained throughout in their own defence positions without sallying out. The Chinese Government hereby lodges the strongest protest against the Indian side's firing at and shelling Chinese frontier guards and serious violation of China's air space as mentioned above.

Since last spring, intruding Indian troops have been steadily pushing forward in Chinese territory on the western sector of the Sino-Indian border and repeatedly closed in on Chinese posts and fired provocatively at them. The Chinese side has all along maintained the greatest forbearance and self-restraint, trying its best to avoid armed clashes. But the Indian side, taking this attitude of China to be a sign that China is weak and could be bullied, has become ever more unbridled in stepping up its aggressive activities and did not scruple to provoke another incident of exchange of fire. The facts have proved that the situation on the Sino-Indian border cannot be relaxed so long as India does not cease its intrusions and provocations. The Chinese Government once again urges the Indian side to stop immediately its dangerous playing with fire and withdraw its aggressive troops from Chinese territory.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government’s note dated 22nd August 1962.

The facts in regard to the violation of Indian air-space over Chu-shul (33° 35’ N 78° 40’ E) were communicated to the Chinese Government only after careful verification. There is no doubt whatsoever that the Chinese aircraft after committing the violation, flew back to the Tibet region of China from whence it had come. The Chinese Government’s denials cannot alter these established facts.

The Government of India, however, welcome the assurance contained in the Chinese note that “the Chinese Government has never permitted its aircraft to fly beyond China’s boundary” and hope that violations of Indian air space by Chinese aircraft will not recur in future.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 October 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government’s note of 28th August 1962.

In their notes dated the 30th June, 25th July and 16th August 1962 the Government of India have clearly established the total lack of substance in Chinese allegations of violations of Chinese air space by Indian aircraft. It is regretted that the present Chinese note has again made similar baseless allegations.

The details given in the appendix to the Chinese note clearly show that all the places over which the alleged violations of air space are stated to have occurred are well inside Indian territory. Indian aircraft have never on any occasion crossed the traditional international boundary.

The Chinese Government have mischievously alleged that the Indian Prime Minister in speeches in the Lok Sabha on 13th and 14th August 1962 had by indicating “Our aircraft have been visiting our posts and giving them supplies,” “openly admitted” violations of Chinese air space. This allegation is not only completely unwarranted but definitely false. The Prime Minister's statement referred to posts on Indian territory which had to be set up to stem the tide of Chinese aggressive intrusions in the area which have in recent years resulted in the forcible and unlawful occupation of a large area of Indian territory by Chinese forces. It is futile for the Chinese authorities to go on repeating such baseless allegations which can only create further tensions in the area.

The Government of India reject the allegations made in the Chinese note.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 11 October 1962

In the night of 10th October 1962 an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over the suburbs of Lhasa at 20:15 hours for reconnaissance and then flew northward along the Chinghai-Tibet highway to Damshune where it made reconnaissance circlings over a Chinese airfield and then flew away in the direction of India.

The deep intrusion of Indian aircraft into China for flagrant reconnaissance over the capital city of, and an airfield in, Tibet was obviously an action coordinated with the current military attacks by the aggressive Indian troops in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against this action and warns the Indian side that it must give serious thought to the grave consequences of such increasingly frantic activities of aggression.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 13 October 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to
refer to the note dated 11th October 1962, sent by the Chinese
Foreign Office to the Indian Charge d’Affaires in Peking on the
morning of 12th October, alleging that an Indian aircraft intruded
into Chinese air space over the suburbs of Lhasa at 20:15 hours on
10th October 1962.

This allegation is not only completely groundless but definitely
mischievous and deliberately designed to confuse the people of
China, more particularly of the Tibet Region of China, with a view
to seeking their support for the irresponsible and wanton aggression
into Indian territory by Chinese forces across the Thagla ridge and
their unprovoked cold-blooded attack on an Indian post in Indian
territory on the morning of the 10th October 1962.

All Indian aircraft have strict instructions to keep within the in-
ternational frontiers of India and these are fully observed. The fan-
tastic and absurd allegation of an Indian aircraft having intruded
into the air space over the suburbs of Lhasa is a deliberate and mis-
chievous invention of the Chinese authorities who seem determined
to resort to all sorts of unscrupulous devices to mislead the Chinese
public and to whip up anti-Indian feelings amongst the people of
China.

The Government of India categorically reject the Chinese note
containing this baseless and mischievous allegation.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew
to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of
its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

The Indian Government, disregarding the repeated protests lodged by the Chinese Government, continues to dispatch its airplanes to intrude into China's air space. In the two months of August and September, 1962, there were another 140 verified cases of air intrusions, totalling 161 sorties (59 cases totalling 64 sorties in August, and 81 cases totalling 97 sorties in September, for details see Appendix). The intruding Indian planes wilfully circled low over Chinese territory for reconnaissance purposes, some even repeatedly circled 13 times and for as long as an hour and 40 minutes. Furthermore, they airdropped to the aggressive strongpoints illegally set up by India on Chinese territory military personnel and more than 1,400 packs of various military materials. Indian helicopters even openly landed on Chinese territory for a number of times and transported military personnel for the aggressive Indian strongpoints. In September, Indian planes further made large-scale intrusions into the area of Le Village in Tibet, China, this was obviously for the purpose of co-ordinating with the military action taken by the aggressive Indian troops in the Che Dong area of Le Village.

The Chinese Government hereby again lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against its above-mentioned activities of frequently dispatching Indian planes to intrude into China's air space and deliberately aggravating tension on the Sino-Indian border. It is absolutely impermissible for Indian planes to intrude endlessly into China's sacred air space. The Chinese Government demands that the Indian side stop such intrusions into China's air space at once, and reserves the right to raise further demands in the future.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Enclosure to note dated 17 October 1962 from the Chinese Government

List of Indian Air Intrusions into Chinese Air Space in August and September, 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intruded Areas</th>
<th>Sorties</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Chip Chap valley area in Sinkiang, China.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9:07 hours, August 1 (2 planes)</td>
<td>As deep as about 24 kilometres within China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:35 hours, August 1</td>
<td>As deep as about 24 kilometres within China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:25 hours, August 3</td>
<td>As deep as about 21 kilometres within China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:56 hours, August 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:05 hours, August 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:10 hours, August 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:20 hours, August 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:12 hours, August 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:58 hours, August 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:25 hours, September 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:30 hours, September 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:50 hours, September 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:30 hours, September 7 (3 planes)</td>
<td>26 packs of supplies were dropped in the vicinity of a place at 35° 06' N, 78° 14.5'E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:50 hours, September 10 (2 helicopters)</td>
<td>One landed at a place 35° 08' N, 78° 20'E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:57 hours, September 15 (2 planes)</td>
<td>20 odd packs of supplies and 17 parachutes were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:20 hours, September 15</td>
<td>24 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:25 hours, September 15</td>
<td>24 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:15 hours, September 15</td>
<td>20 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:50 hours, September 15</td>
<td>18 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:15 hours, September 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:15 hours, September 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:00 hours, September 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date/Time</td>
<td>Location/Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:08 hours,</td>
<td>Around Hongshantou (approximately 35° 18'N, 78° 05' E) in the Chip Chap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16</td>
<td>valley area in Sinkiang, China.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:25 hours,</td>
<td>33 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:50 hours,</td>
<td>15 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10 hours,</td>
<td>As deep as about 24 kilometres within China.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18</td>
<td>As deep as about 24 kilometres within China.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:20 hours,</td>
<td>23 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 hours,</td>
<td>44 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 hours,</td>
<td>22 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 19</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40 hours,</td>
<td>22 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 19</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:45 hours,</td>
<td>22 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40 hours,</td>
<td>23 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 26</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:50 hours,</td>
<td>37 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 28</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:55 hours,</td>
<td>34 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 29</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:35 hours,</td>
<td>52 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 29</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45 hours,</td>
<td>29 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 6</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 hours,</td>
<td>21 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 6</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 hours,</td>
<td>23 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 7</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:05 hours,</td>
<td>36 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 11</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:10 hours,</td>
<td>22 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 11</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 hours,</td>
<td>22 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 23</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:37 hours,</td>
<td>23 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 24</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:25 hours,</td>
<td>36 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 24</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 hours,</td>
<td>22 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 25</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 hours,</td>
<td>23 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 29</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 hours,</td>
<td>15 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 hours,</td>
<td>15 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:50 hours,</td>
<td>44 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 5</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 hours,</td>
<td>22 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:31 hours,</td>
<td>25 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 23</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:31 hours,</td>
<td>17 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 23</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 hours,</td>
<td>25 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 28</td>
<td>Made airdrops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intruded Areas</td>
<td>Sorties</td>
<td>Date and Time</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of the source of the Karakash River, Sinkiang, China.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11:25 hours, August 23</td>
<td>18 packs of supplies were dropped. As deep as about 22 kilometres within China. It landed on Chinese soil. Five Indian soldiers got down from it and four packs of supplies were unloaded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:10 hours, August 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:30 hours, August 26 (1 helicopter)</td>
<td>10 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:50 hours, August 30</td>
<td>Personnel and supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:30 hours, September 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:40 hours, September 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:33 hours, September 15</td>
<td>38 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:45 hours, September 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:55 hours, September 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 hours, September 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Galwan valley area in Sinkiang, China.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9:05 hours, August 5</td>
<td>2 parachutes and 41 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:15 hours, August 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:15 hours, August 6</td>
<td>One of them landed on Chinese soil. 15 packs of supplies were unloaded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:35 hours, August 6 (2 helicopters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:40 hours, August 7 (1 helicopter)</td>
<td>It landed on Chinese soil. Two Indian soldiers got down from it and 6 packs of supplies were unloaded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:30 hours, August 7</td>
<td>30 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:30 hours, August 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:10 hours, August 14</td>
<td>30 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:00 hours, August 16</td>
<td>It circled 13 times and remained there for one hour and 40 minutes and dropped 12 packs of supplies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**11:15 hours, August 22**

It circled 8 times and remained there for one hour and dropped 42 packs of supplies.

**11:10 hours, August 23 (2 helicopters)**

One of them landed and 18 packs of supplies were unloaded. The other one dropped 7 packs of supplies.

**9:15 hours, August 24**

More than 50 packs of supplies were dropped.

**9:10 hours, August 25**

It circled for almost one hour and dropped 21 packs of supplies.

**10:55 hours, August 25 (2 helicopters)**

One of them landed and 5 packs of supplies were unloaded.

---

**11:00 hours, August 25**

18 packs of supplies were dropped.

**9:10 hours, August 26**

It circled for over one hour.

**9:05 hours, August 29**

One of them landed on Chinese soil and 3 packs of supplies were unloaded.

**9:45 hours, August 29**

18 packs of supplies were dropped (among which there were 5 wooden boxes and in each of them there was one Indian soldier).

**10:05 hours, August 29**

32 packs of supplies were dropped.

**13:00 hours, August 30**

The Indian planes circled for about one hour and dropped 17 packs of supplies.

**10:05 hours, September 3**

36 packs of supplies were dropped.

**9:43 hours, September 7**

**11:27 hours, September 8 (2 helicopters)**

**9:35 hours, September 15**

---

**9:50 hours, September 16**

**9:30 hours, September 18 (2 planes)**

**10:30 hours, September 23**

**9:30 hours, September 24 (3 planes)**

**11:00 hours, September 28**

**9:30 hours, September 29**

**10:30 hours, September 30**

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrude Areas</th>
<th>Sorties</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area south of the Kongka Pass in Tibet, China.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9:40 hours, August 2</td>
<td>A plane with PT 533 markings intruded into the air space over Nyagzu from the north, then flew westwards across the boundary and at 12:27 hours again intruded into Chinese air space from the direction where it had flown away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:35 hours, August 7</td>
<td>21 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>About 20 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:40 hours, August 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vicinity of Nyagzu in Tibet, China.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10:16 hours, August 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:25 hours, August 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:22 hours, August 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 sorties by one plane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 hours, August 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:50 hours, September 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:41 hours, September 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:30 hours, September 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:00 hours, September 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16:30 hours, September 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:40 hours, September 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:42 hours, September 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pangong Lake and Spanggur Lake areas in Tibet, China.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12:00 hours, August 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:30 hours, August 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:37 hours, August 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 hours, August 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:20 hours, August 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:40 hours, August 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13:45 hours, August 14
9:50 hours, August 17
9:28 hours, August 20
12:30 hours, September 8

The Le Village area in Tibet, China.

14:00 hours, August 29
15:10 hours, September 9

15:25 hours, September 9

9:10 hours, September 10
9:47 hours, September 17
11:03 hours, September 21
11:13 hours, September 21 (2 planes)
11:15 hours, September 21 (2 planes)
11:30 hours, September 21 (2 planes)
13:50 hours, September 21
14:13 hours, September 21
7:20 hours, September 23 (2 planes)
9:27 hours, September 23 (2 planes)
8:24 hours, September 24

11:20 hours, September 24
8:30 hours, September 25

8:31 hours, September 28

14:20 hours, September 28
8:50 hours, September 30 (3 planes)

It circled six times and a half over Che Dong, Le Village and other places.
It circled three times over Paitsai, Checkuopu and other places.

It circled as many as 17 times over Che-jao and dropped more than 40 packs of supplies while flying over Changto.

The planes circled for about 50 minutes.

The planes circled ten times over Che-jao.

It circled 12 times over Che-jao.

It dropped more than 40 packs of supplies while flying over Changto.

It dropped 36 packs of supplies while fling over Changto.

The planes circled for over two hours and dropped 127 packs of supplies while flying over Changto.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intruded Areas</th>
<th>Sorties</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Sama area in Tibet, China.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9:40 hours, September 6</td>
<td>10:50 hours, September 19 (2 planes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:58 hours, September 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:30 hours, September 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 17 October 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated October 13, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

The Indian Government flatly denied in its note the iron-clad fact that on October 10, 1962, an Indian airplane penetrated deep into the air space over the suburbs of Lhasa, capital city of China's Tibet, Damshune and other places and circled for reconnaissance purposes. In its note, India wilfully slandered the Chinese Government, absurdly alleging that the Chinese protests were mischievous invention and designed to mislead the public. The Chinese Government is indignant at this. It must be pointed out that, at the time when the Indian Government was sending out its note to deny the facts, Indian aircraft again, successively on October 11 and 13, intruded into China's air space over the area west of Rudok, over the Damshune, Migyitun and Meto areas, in Tibet. These aggressive activities of Indian aircraft can in no way be covered up.

The Indian Government has not only always prevaricated and denied the Indian air intrusion into China, but in its note of September 22 again employed the old practice of "thief calling 'Stop thief!'" and falsely charged China with air intrusions into India. But what is the truth?

Firstly, Indian air intrusions into China have become increasingly rampant. In the six months from last April to September alone, such intrusions numbered as many as 431 sorties. The intruding Indian aircraft often airdropped military supplies and military personnel on Chinese territory, sometimes even airdropped military supplies on the positions of Chinese posts, and on many occasions of late, flagrantly landed on Chinese territory.

Secondly, Chinese aircraft has never entered Indian air space. In an endeavour to ease the border tension, the Chinese side has never sent aircraft even over its own territory along the Sino-Indian border which has always been under China's control.

Thirdly, during the talks between the Prime Ministers of China and India held in Delhi in April 1960, Premier Chou En-lai pointed out to Prime Minister Nehru that, regarding the Indian Government's notification to the Chinese Government about unidentified aircraft detected over the Sino-Indian border area, it had been found through investigations by the Chinese Government that these were U.S. aircraft. Premier Chou En-lai further said that the Chinese Government in a note to the Burmese Government had stated that should Burma discover any unidentified aircraft in its air space, it was fully entitled to deal with them on its own, either forcing them to land or shooting them down. Premier Chou En-lai expressed his
belief that India would do likewise. Thereafter, the same point has been reiterated many times by the Chinese Government in its notes to India. The Burmese side believed in the Chinese Premier, and did shoot down a U.S.-made aircraft of the Chiang Kai-shek clique within the Burmese border. This fact was referred to by Prime Minister Nehru in the Indian Parliament on December 11, 1961. However, the Indian Government disregarded the Chinese Premier's statement and spoke for the United States and the Chiang Kai-shek clique (See the Indian note of April 23, 1962).

The above facts conclusively show that, while Chinese aircraft has never entered India's air space, India has continuously been sending out its aircraft to intrude into China's air space and at the same time kept prevaricating and making false charges against China. In order to make the truth known to the whole world, the Chinese Government hereby formally declares that, henceforth the Indian side, upon discovering any intruding alien aircraft in India's air space, may immediately force them to land or shoot them down; likewise, the Chinese side, upon discovering any intruding alien aircraft in China's air space, will immediately force them to land or shoot them down. Let's down them and find out whose aircraft after all are making frequent illegal flights above the Sino-Indian border, who after all is engaged in mischievous invention while sending out aircraft to violate the air space of the other party and who is trying to mislead the public. The Chinese Government presumes that the Indian Government will surely support this declaration of the Chinese Government and take self-defence measures similar to those of the Chinese Government if the statement made in the Indian note that “All Indian aircraft have strict instructions to keep within the international frontiers of India” is true to the fact.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 28 October 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the two notes dated the 17th October, 1962 of the Chinese Government.

The Government of India have repeatedly stated in their notes sent to the Chinese Government that all Indian aircraft have very strict instructions to keep within Indian air space. Nevertheless, on each occasion when the Chinese Government have made a complaint, very carefully enquiries are made. At no time has any Indian aircraft entered Chinese territory. Indian aircraft are, however, at liberty to fly in Indian air space over those areas where China has intruded illegally and forcibly, into the ground below.

Very careful investigations have been made and it is categorically confirmed that no Indian aircraft flew over Chinese air space in the vicinity of Rudok or Damshune which the Chinese note of the 10th October states is to the north of Lhasa. No verification has been possible in regard to the Tiryitun and Meto areas in the absence of more precise information on the location of these areas.

The Chinese Government are aware that they are forcibly occupying, by unilateral action, substantial areas of Indian territory. They have wilfully shot down two Indian aircraft engaged in the evacuation of wounded soldiers.

While, therefore, rejecting the Chinese notes the Government of India would like to state that if the sphere of the present conflict is further extended to the air, the Government of China alone will be responsible for any such extension.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 4 August 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China, and has the honour to state the following with reference to the notes of June 15 and July 10, 1962 of the Ministry of External Affairs of India.

Some Indians who are hostile towards China repeatedly go to the front of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates to carry on provocations and disturbances and openly insult Chinese leaders of the State; this can only be considered as sabotaging Sino-Indian friendship and worsening the relations between the two countries. However, the Indian Government not only defends them with "the fundamental rights of Indian citizens", "demonstrations are peaceful", etc., but in its note condemns the Chinese Government's protest against this as "ignoring the law and constitution of India." The Chinese Government resolutely opposes such unreasonable and counter-attack sayings of the Indian Government. The above-mentioned acts of sabotaging Sino-Indian friendship definitely cannot be defended with the pretext of the existence of border dispute between China and India nor so-called "normal exercise of the fundamental rights of a citizen." The attitude adopted by the Indian Government proves that it openly connives at and deliberately shelters these incidents, and disregards Sino-Indian friendship.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 7 August 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note delivered to the Chinese Embassy in India by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs on June 26, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

In its memorandum of December 12, 1961 and its note of June 2, 1962, the Chinese side cited undeniable facts to show that the Chung Hua School in Kalimpong was compelled to close down as a result of the Indian local authorities' premeditated persecution and their connivance at the disruptive activities conducted by Chiang Kai-shek elements. As the Head and Deputy Heads of the Board of Directors of the Chung Hwa School were compelled to leave India by the Indian authorities and were unable to take personal charge of the school property, they requested the Chinese Consulate-General in Calcutta to take charge of the school property on their behalf. In order to protect the legitimate rights and interests of its nationals the Chinese Consulate-General complied with the request. This was an exercise of the normal functions and powers of the Chinese Consulate-General, and was fully in accord with international practice. Moreover, the Chinese Consulate-General was fully entitled to entrust the former Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong, which was in the locality, to assist it in looking after purely technical matters.

In its note, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, again disregarding the facts and reversing right and wrong, perversely described the aforesaid proper and reasonable action as "arbitrary" and "highly improper" etc. It further slandered the former Chinese Trade Agency by alleging that the latter "arbitrarily seized" the school property, and even accused the former Chinese Trade Agent of committing an "offence". This is not only an expression of contempt for the well-recognised and customary principles of international law, but also a trumping up of charges to heap malicious calumnies on the Chinese Consulate-General and the former Chinese Trade Agency. The Chinese Government categorically rejects these fabricated charges and expresses its deepest regret.

The Indian side unreasonably expelled the responsible personages of the Chung Hwa School, and then connived at the Chiang Kai-shek elements' scheme to seize the school property and unreasonably demanded that the Chinese side hand over the school property. It has now gone a step further and is making it difficult for the Chinese Consulate-General to exercise the latter's legitimate right of taking charge of the property at the request of the Head and Deputy Heads of the School Board of Directors. All these actions precisely demonstrate that it is the Indian Government which is unscrupulously attempting to deprive the Chinese nationals of their legal property and pave the way for the seizure of the property of the Chung Hwa School by Chiang Kai-shek elements. The Chinese Government hereby solemnly declared that any attempt of the Indian side, under
whatever pretext, to use the Indian court to deprive the Chinese Consulate-General of its proper right to protect the legal properties of its nationals is impermissible under international law and is therefore null and void. The Chinese Government expresses its strong opposition to this action of the Indian side and once again demands that the Indian Government respect the legitimate rights of the Chinese Consulate-General.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 9 August 1962

Reference Memorandum dated 10th July, 1962 from the Ministry of External Affairs of India.

Regarding the incident of an attempt to set fire to the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay, the Chinese Embassy has already given a detailed account of the facts of what happened at that time. The Government of India, however, not only failed to account for the cause of fire, but even termed such a serious incident of attempting to set fire to a Chinese official organ in India as a small fire and made groundless charges against the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay whose security had been endangered. The Chinese Embassy expresses surprise and regret at this.

Following the above-said incident cases, in which window-panes of the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay were broken through, have repeatedly taken place. The Indian Government's allegation that these were caused by little boys throwing stones at the fruit of a mango tree is inconsistent with the facts. It must be pointed out that the first time the window-pane of the Consulate-General was broken through was on January 16, 1962, when there were no mangoes on the tree. The time of the breaking through of the window-panes of the Consulate-General in all the cases was at about 8 or 9 o'clock in the evening when mangoes on the tree were not visible at all. Moreover, the window-panes are at quite a distance from the mango-tree and do not face it. Even if little boys were throwing stones at the mangoes, it would not have been possible for them to break through the window-panes by mistakes. It is obviously an attempt on the part of the Indian Government to evade its responsibility for these serious incidents that it should have described this series of sabotages and disturbances, which the Chinese Consulate-General has for a long time been subjected to, as little boys' fun. In this connection, the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay has made a verbal reply to the Maharashtra State Government.
At the beginning of July, 1962 the Chinese Embassy received from Peking about a dozen mails of Chinese and English newspapers and journals addressed to the Embassy. It is found that the above-said mails had all been opened and examined by the Indian Customs-office. The covers of these examined mails are still in the keeping of the Embassy. Besides, it has also been found that the delivery of these mails was delayed for almost one month.

It must be pointed out that it is an extremely unfriendly act against the Chinese Embassy for the Indian Customs-office to have unwarrantedly examined the Embassy's official mails and delayed without any justification their delivery for almost one month, thus causing difficulties in the Embassy's work. The Embassy hereby draws the attention of the Indian Government to the above-mentioned occurrence and hopes that it will ensure against recurrence of similar incident in the future.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 22 August 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs note dated 6th August 1962.

The facts in regard to the arbitrary seizure of the Chung Hwa School premises by the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong have already been conveyed in the Ministry of External Affairs notes dated 23rd May 1962 and 26th June 1962. This unwarranted action of the Chinese Trade Agency can in no way be described as “an exercise of the normal functions and powers of the Chinese Consulate-General”. It is certainly not permissible for a Consulate to take over property arbitrarily without obtaining authorisation from the competent authorities, particularly as the local laws specifically require it. The Government of India maintain that the jurisdiction of an Indian court cannot be called into question and any attempt to do so is a contravention of all accepted norms of international laws and practice.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated July 4, 1962, to the Chinese Embassy in India, has the honour to state the following:

As is well-known, the "China Review" is a newspaper which is founded and run by Chinese nationals in India and which has always been devoted to the promotion of friendly relations between the Chinese and Indian peoples. The Indian Government was obviously deliberate in trying to shield the offending ruffians, otherwise it would not have repeated in its note time and again the absurd slander, which had already been refuted, that Chinese missions in India allegedly used the "China Review" as a mouthpiece of their official propaganda and fomented "internecine feud" among Chinese nationals. The unfair attitude taken by the Indian Government on this case and its continuous crude persecution against the editors and publishers of the "China Review" precisely reveal where the crux of the question lies. It is impossible for the Indian Government to evade the responsibility.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
At about 10 o'clock in the morning of August 15, 1962, the Chinese Embassy discovered that a portion of the southern wall of the compound of its chancery, Jind House, Lytton Road, New Delhi, had been broken through, resulting in a breach 8.5 feet in length and 4.5 in height. The Embassy informed the Delhi police authorities of the incident on the same morning. The wall is built of brick and has always been very solid. Obviously this is a violation and sabotage against the Embassy. This incident of sabotage is serious. The Chinese Embassy hereby brings this to the attention of the Government of India and requests it to ensure against recurrence of similar incident in the future.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 September 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to note No. 811 dated the 4th August 1962 from the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

As the Chinese Embassy is aware, the Government of India have persistently endeavoured to strengthen friendly relations between India and China and any suggestion that they are responsible for the worsening of relations between the two countries is completely unrelated to the facts. On the contrary, the wanton aggression of Chinese forces on Indian territory has been the principal cause of serious deterioration in the relations of the two countries.

The Indian people on occasions have reacted spontaneously but with dignity and restraint and undertake protest demonstrations against the aggressive activities of Chinese forces. The fundamental rights are guaranteed by the Constitution of India and the Government of India cannot interfere with such demonstrations conducted in a peaceful and non-violent manner.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 28 September 1962

An investigation was conducted on the complaint made in the Memorandum of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, dated 16th August 1962.

The newspaper packets in question were received in Delhi on the 8th June 1962 and, according to the prescribed procedure, demand calls for exemption certificates were issued to the Embassy by the postal authorities on 11th June 1962. These certificates were received back from the Embassy only on the 4th July 1962, and the packets were released on the 5th July 1962. It will be seen from this that the delay in the release of the packets by 22 days was purely due to the Embassy's negligence in not completing the formalities in time.

The Government of India have also carefully investigated the allegation made in the Chinese note that these mail packets had been opened by the Indian customs and they have found this allegation too to be absolutely without any basis.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 30 September 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

The following has been reported by the local authorities of the Ari district of Tibet, China:

1. On July 20, 1962, when Chinese border inhabitants Cago holding exit permit No. 003407, and Tsaipei holding exit permit No. 003408, both from the Certse County in the Ari district, went to India for petty trade as usual, they were illegally detained by the Indian check-post at Mordo for one day before they were released, but their exit permits were confiscated. On August 2, on their way home after the business was done, they took back their exit permits from the Mordo check-post and started on their way back. But after having gone a stretch, they were caught up by an Indian soldier with gun in hand who wrested from them their exit permits.

2. On July 26, 1962, when Chinese border inhabitant Kunggachienchan of Bragdhung hsiang of the Ari district went to India for petty trade as usual, he was also illegally detained by the Indian check-post at Mordo and questioned about military matters in Rudok Dzong in the Ari district of Tibet, China. The Indian soldiers subjected him to maltreatment and personal insults, slapping him several times and stripping him naked to make a thorough search of his person. The Indian soldiers even forcibly took away a fat sheep from Kunggachienchan without giving him any compensation. Kunggachienchan was illegally detained from 11:30 in the morning to 8 o’clock in the evening on that day.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a protest against such unwarranted acts of violence committed by the Indian soldiers and demands that the Indian Government speedily return the Chinese citizen exit permits which were forcibly taken away by the Indian check-post and compensate the Chinese citizens for the losses they suffered in the above-mentioned incidents, and that the Indian Government adopt measures to prevent the recurrence of similar incidents.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the note dated the 23rd August 1962 from the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The allegations made in the Chinese notes of January 23rd and May 28th have been fully and exhaustively dealt with in the Ministry's notes of March 2nd and July 4th. The Government of India are surprised that the Chinese note under reference should claim that "China Review" has "always been devoted to the promotion of friendly relations between the Chinese and Indian people". The facts are that it has persistently indulged in anti-Indian propaganda and several members of its staff have been found to be guilty of flagrant anti-social activities. Nevertheless, those found guilty of infringement of the law in the incident of 17th January 1962 were tried by a court of law and were sentenced. In the circumstances, the Government of India emphatically reject the allegation that they have adopted an "unfair attitude in this case".

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 17 October 1962


The full facts about the fire in the Consulate premises on the 5th December 1961 have been given in the Ministry of External Affairs Memoranda dated 18th January and 10th July 1962. In these Memoranda the attention of the Embassy had been already drawn to the fact that the members of the Chinese Consulate-General had not only refused to co-operate but also obstructed the full investigation of the cause of the fire.

Regarding the broken window panes mentioned in para 2 of the Memorandum, full details of the investigation conducted by the local police have already been communicated in this Ministry's note of 10th July. It was also stated that the local police were taking further measures in the form of additional patrolling of the vicinity of the Consulate-General to prevent a repetition of such incidents.
In its Notes of 2nd June and 5th August, 62 the Chinese Government has refuted the Indian Government's slander that the former Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong allegedly "arbitrarily seized" the property of the Chung Hwa School. It was entirely legitimate and proper for the former Chinese Trade Agency under the authorisation of the Chinese Consulate-General in Calcutta to look after the property of that school which is in the same locality. Yet the Indian Government in its Note arbitrarily mixed up the former Chinese Trade Agency's purely technical job of looking after the property of the school with the Chinese Consulate-General's exercising of its normal functions and powers and so distorted the case; this is completely unjustifiable. This practice of the Indian Government is obviously designed to pave the way for the underhand seizure of the property of the school by elements of the CHANG KAI SHEK gang. The Chinese Government cannot but pay serious attention to this.

In accepting the trust of the Board of Directors of a school of Chinese nationals to take charge of the school property, the Chinese Consulate-General was performing its normal functions of protecting the proper rights and interests of its nationals. Moreover the thing was notified to the Indian authorities concerned when trusteeship was accepted and the Indian side did not raise any objection. Now the Indian Government states in its Note, "It is certainly not permissible for a Consulate to take over property arbitrarily without obtaining authorisation from the competent authorities". This is an attitude of creating side-issues and making trouble which is wholly unreasonable. According to this argument it seems as if the Consulate of a sovereign State had to obtain authorisation from the authorities of a foreign country before it could exercise normal Consular functions within its competence. This is indeed unheard of an international practice. The Chinese Government firmly rejects the mischievous suggestion.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 23 October 1962

Reference Chinese Embassy Memorandum dated the 28th August, 1962 regarding the southern wall of the compound of its chancery.

The matter has been investigated and it has been found that the wall was in a bad state of repairs and so collapsed during the rains. The allegation that the wall had been broken through as an act of "sabotage" is utterly baseless. The Government of India regret that such an unwarranted insinuation should have been made by the Embassy.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 31 October 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's Note dated 22nd October, 1962.

The full facts in regard to the arbitrary seizure of the Chung Hwa School at Kalimpong by the Chinese Trade Agent have already been given in the Ministry's earlier notes. The illegal measures adopted by the Chinese Trade Agent at Kalimpong, even if under instructions from the Chinese Consul-General at Calcutta, cannot be explained away by the specious plea that the Trade Agent acted under the privileges and immunities shown under Article I of the 1954 Agreement. The Chinese Trade Agent clearly exceeded his functions as he did not follow the prescribed legal procedures for taking custody of the property.

In the performance of their normal functions Consular Officers, too, are bound to respect the sovereign jurisdiction of the Government of the host country. The arbitrary actions of the Chinese Consul-General and Trade Agent were obviously a violation of the accepted norms of diplomatic behaviour and amounted to defiance of the law of the land.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 12 September 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Ministry's note dated the 17th July 1962. It was pointed out in that note that, due to various arbitrary regulations introduced by the Chinese authorities in Tibet, the terms of Indo-Tibetan trade had been radically altered so as to make it difficult for Indian traders to dispose of large quantities of goods already imported into Tibet. Indian nationals also own some immoveable property in Tibet and large sums of money are owed to them by Tibetans. The Government of India desire that equitable compensation should be paid by the Chinese authorities for all property, moveable and immoveable left behind by Indian nationals in Tibet due to causes beyond their control and propose that talks to determine the quantum of compensation to be paid to the affected Indian nationals should be started urgently.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
In the course of discussions on the withdrawal of Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet, the Chinese Embassy was informed of the Government of India's intention to retain their property and buildings in Yatung under the charge of the Indian Consul-General at Lhasa. In this Ministry's Aide Memoire dated the 1st June 1962 it was further stated that the Indian Consul-General would maintain a small staff for the upkeep of the property and buildings which would be used as a resting place for Indian officials and diplomatic couriers proceeding to and returning from Lhasa.

2. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese People's Republic informed the Indian Embassy in Peking on the 2nd June 1962 that they were agreeable to the retention of the buildings of the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung by the Government of India under the charge of their Consul-General in Lhasa. The request that Indian staff might remain in Yatung to look after the property was, however, not acceded to. The Indian Trade Agent at Yatung accordingly appointed Tibetan staff consisting of 5 persons to maintain the buildings left behind by him.

3. The Government of India are extremely surprised that, despite the understanding reached earlier, the Chinese authorities have persistently refused to permit Indian officials and couriers to make use of the former Agency building in Yatung as a resting place on their way to or from Lhasa. It has been further reported that some members of the staff deputed to look after the buildings have since been asked to leave the Agency premises by the local authorities.

4. The buildings of the Indian Trade Agency in Yatung have belonged to the Government of India for several years and continue to be their property, to be used by them in accordance with their local requirements. The Government of India regret the arbitrary action taken by the Chinese local authorities and wish to emphasise that the fact of legal ownership which is undisputed carries with it the legal right to utilise the building as and when required.

5. The Government of India emphatically protest against the action of the local Chinese authorities in removing forcibly the staff employed to maintain the buildings. The Government of India would request the Chinese Embassy to move the Government of China to take immediate steps to ensure that the legitimate rights of Indian officials to maintain and use their property in Yatung are restored with immediate effect.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
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Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 8 October 1962

Reference the memorandum of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, dated July 25, 1962 to the Chinese Embassy in India.

As Deputy Director Chang Tung of the First Department of Asian Affairs of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs clearly pointed out on June 2, 1962, to Mr. P. K. Banerjee, Charge d’Affaires a.i. of the Indian Embassy in China, the Chinese side agrees that the buildings of the former Indian Trade Agency at Yatung may be put under the charge of the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa. But the Chinese Government cannot accede to the Indian request that a small staff be allowed to remain to look after the buildings and that Indian officials and couriers be permitted to use these buildings as a resting place on their way to or from Lhasa, as this would be tantamount to the setting up of another official establishment on Chinese soil, which is both inconceivable and unacceptable.

It turned out, however, that the Indian side, in withdrawing its trade agency from Yatung, unilaterally kept in the buildings quite a number of the personnel of its former Trade Agency at Yatung. The Chinese Government greatly regrets this.

It must be pointed out that the buildings of the former Indian Trade Agency at Yatung were maintained by the Indian Government under the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement on Trade and Intercourse between the Tibet Region of China and India and the Notes exchanged by the two countries in its regard, and that the land on which the buildings stand was leased by the Indian Government under the same Agreement and Notes. It can thus be seen that these buildings can only be used for specific purposes. Now the Agreement is no longer in force and the Indian Trade Agency has been abolished, yet the Indian side is trying to take advantage of its ownership of the buildings to set up another official establishment in actuality in Chinese territory. The Chinese Government naturally cannot agree to it. Therefore, it is entirely unjustifiable for the Indian Government to lodge the protest with the Chinese side. The Chinese Government categorically rejects this protest.

The building of the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung has been the property of the Government of India for several decades. When the Trade Agency was withdrawn in 1962, the Chinese Embassy had been clearly informed of the Government of India's intention to retain their property and buildings at Yatung under the charge of the Indian Consul-General at Lhasa. It was also stated by the Government of India that the building would be used as a resting place for Indian officials proceeding to and returning from Lhasa in the course of the performance of their official duties. The Indian Government's request was fully in keeping with international custom and practice.

The Chinese Government had informed the Indian Embassy in Peking on the 2nd June 1962 that they were agreeable to the retention of the buildings by the Government of India under the charge of the Consulate-General in Lhasa. However, by later on denying permission to use the building, the Chinese Government has effectively gone back on its earlier assurance as the right to the use of property is an essential and fundamental right that arises from ownership.

In accordance with the stipulation of the Government of the People's Republic of China, the Government of India even did not keep any Indian nationals as maintenance staff but instead retained 5 Tibetan ex-employees of the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung. The Government of India were, therefore, naturally surprised when these employees, too, were turned out of the building later on by the local authorities. The Agency premises and the buildings are now not being looked after by anyone. It is understood that the locks of some of the quarters have been removed and some window panes have also been broken.

The Agency building has belonged to the Government of India for several decades and in paragraph (4) of the notes exchanged between the two Governments on 29th April 1954, it has been clearly stated that all buildings within the compound wall of the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung may be retained by the Government of India. It has also been stated that the Government of India may continue to lease the land within the agency building from the Chinese side. This clearly shows that the land within the compound wall on which the building stands was already on lease with the Government of India several years prior to the conclusion of the 1954 Agreement.

It was only at the unreasonable and arbitrary insistence of the Chinese Government that a fresh lease-deed for the land was signed between the two Governments on the 18th of January 1958, for a period of 10 years, although such a procedure was uncalled for in terms of the Agreement.
The Chinese Government’s unwarranted denial of facilities to the Government of India for taking care of their property and building at Yatung and their plea that if Indian officials and couriers are permitted to use these buildings as a resting place it would be tantamount to the setting up of another official establishment on the Chinese soil constitute further testimony of the unco-operative and obstructive attitude that has all along characterised the actions of the Chinese Government in Tibet.

The Government of India hold the Government of the People's Republic of China responsible for any loss or damage that has already been caused, or may be caused in future, to the Agency building as a result of these unwarranted actions of the Chinese Government.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to state that in its Aide Memoire of 20th June 1962 and Note of 26th July 1962 the Ministry of External Affairs drew the attention of the Chinese Embassy to the harassment that the Indian Trade Agents at Yatung and Gyantse were subjected to by local authorities resulting in vexatious delay in the withdrawal of the Trade Agencies. The Foreign Bureau raised a number of issues with the Indian Trade Agent at Gyantse and made the unreasonable demand that they should be settled to their satisfaction before his departure. The specific questions raised by the local authorities are as follows:

1. **Payment of arrears of rent at Gyantse**

   Reference has already been made in the Aide Memoire of 20th June to the unreasonable claims made by local authorities for arrears of rent unsupported by any lease-deed, written understanding or agreement.

   The rental claimed for the period between the departure of the former landlord and the signing of the new lease-deed on the 28th November 1961 was arbitrarily fixed by the Chinese authorities on the basis of the rental agreed to in the new lease-deed. Even though the monthly rental paid to the former landlord was lower than that claimed by the Chinese authorities, there is no legal basis for this enhanced claim.

   The claim for rental of Changlo Linka is also completely arbitrary as no lease-deed has been signed by the Government of India and China for this land. The responsibility for failure to sign the lease-deed lay entirely with the Chinese local authorities as the Indian Consul-General at Lhasa and the Indian Trade Agent in Gyantse had carried out protracted negotiations with the Chinese authorities for the settlement of outstanding questions. The claim made for rental of Changlo Linka was vaguely fixed on the basis that the land belonged to the former landlord till January 1961 and that for the “convenience of accounting” it had been decided that rent would be charged from the 16th January 1961. The arbitrary character of this claim and the absence of any legal basis to support it render it untenable.

   The Government of India, however, did not like to prolong this correspondence as it is clear that the local Chinese authorities with their past attitude could not but consistently continue to be petty-minded and difficult in this matter. The Indian Trade Agent was, therefore, authorised to make payment in full in respect of the Agency buildings before his departure from Gyantse. Arrangements to settle the claim regarding the land of the Agency site are being made through the Indian Consulate-General at Lhasa.
2. Demolition of Spurs

The Indian Trade Agent was also called upon to take action before his departure to demolish spurs which had been constructed earlier to save Agency property from erosion. The Chinese authorities had been clearly informed by the Indian Trade Agent in September 1961 that they may demolish the spurs if they were endangering public works but that they would have to accept responsibility for protection of the Agency land from the river. The Chinese authorities were also informed that the stones salvaged as a result of demolition of spurs would continue to be the property of the Trade Agency. It is surprising that this action which had been suggested to the local authorities in September 1961 was postponed indefinitely and was made the subject of unnecessary harassment to the Indian Trade Agent.

3. Removal of Building Material etc.

The Chinese authorities in Gyantse also called upon the Indian Trade Agent to remove all building material and partly constructed structures belonging to the Government of India from Gyantse before his departure. The Trade Agent made arrangements to dispose of such building material as could be conveniently and economically transported out of Gyantse. Following the withdrawal of the Indian Trade Agency from Gyantse, building material acquired and partly constructed structures put up in good faith by the Agency during the operation of the 1954 Agreement on Trade and Intercourse between India and the Tibetan region of China and in anticipation of its renewal have had to be left behind. Its disposal will have to be determined in accordance with established principles of international law and compensation on an equitable basis will have to be paid by the Chinese Government to the Indian Government for all property acquired by the Agency in connection with the performance of its official functions at Gyantse which has now been left behind and is under the care and control of the local Chinese authorities. Government of India desire that negotiations with Indian Consulate-General, Lhasa should be started by the local Chinese authorities at an early date to settle this outstanding matter. It is a matter of regret that the local authorities in Gyantse did not agree to watchmen being deputed by the Indian Trade Agent to look after property belonging to the Government of India. In the circumstances the Chinese authorities must accept complete responsibility for any loss of or damage that may be caused to this property pending its final disposal.

4. Other difficulties experienced by the Indian Trade Agents

Apart from the major problems listed above the Indian Trade Agent at Gyantse was faced with a number of additional administrative difficulties all of which further delayed his departure from Gyantse. He was denied the assistance of members of the local staff for purposes of packing, etc. after June 3, 1962 on the specious ground that there was no obligation on the part of the local authorities to provide staff to the Indian Trade Agency after it had ceased to operate on the 2nd June 1962.
Similarly, questions of transport and loading arrangements, storage facilities for baggage, travel permits for Tibetan wives of Indian and Nepalese employees of the Trade Agency were not settled until detailed and laborious discussions had been held with the local Foreign Bureau.

The Government of India regret that the Chinese authorities in Tibet should have, despite the specific request made for the cooperation of the Chinese authorities in facilitating smooth withdrawal, denied normal facilities to the Indian Trade Agents at Yatung and Gyantse as a result of which their departure was considerably delayed. They would also call upon the Chinese Government to give urgent consideration to the specific proposals made regarding the disposal of the Government of India's property in Gyantse and elsewhere in Tibet.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 September 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to para. 3 of the Ministry's note dated the 14th August 1962, relating to building material and partially constructed structures of the former Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse for which an equitable compensation will have to be paid by the Chinese Government. It was suggested that the matter should be settled by the Consul-General of India at Lhasa and local Chinese authorities. The Government of India have also left behind building material in Gartok which was acquired in good faith with the intention of constructing buildings for the Indian Trade Agency there. The Government of India desire that disposal of this property should also be considered between the Indian Consul-General at Lhasa and local Chinese authorities who may be informed accordingly.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 22 September 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the memorandum and the note delivered by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India on June 20 and July 26, 1962 respectively, has the honour to state as follows:

1. In view of the fact that the Indian Government again and again rejected the Chinese Government's proposal for the two sides to conduct negotiations to conclude a new agreement on trade and intercourse, the trade agencies established by each side in accordance with the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement on Trade and Intercourse between the Tibet Region of China and India should naturally be withdrawn upon expiration of the Agreement on June 3, 1962. The Chinese Government withdrew its Trade Agencies at Calcutta and Kalimpong even before the expiration of the Agreement. The Indian Government did not inform the Chinese Government till May 30, 1962 that it proposed to withdraw its Trade Agencies at Yatung and Gyantse, China, on June 10 and 11 respectively, and the actual withdrawals were then delayed till June 18 and 23, respectively. The Chinese Government, showing an attitude of goodwill and considerateness throughout, not only gave them plenty of time for the above-mentioned withdrawal of the Indian Trade Agencies, but also gave special permission to the former Indian Trade Agent Mr. A. K. Bakshi to visit Gartok more than one month after the expiration of the Agreement.

2. The local authorities in China's Tibet gave every possible assistance and facility to the Indian Trade Agencies in the course of their withdrawal. The Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet, China, conceded to the request of the Indian Consul-General and Vice-Consul at Lhasa for a special visit to Gyantse and Yatung to assist the Indian Trade Agencies in their withdrawal. In order to meet the transportation requirements of the Indian side, the Chinese local authorities provided trucks on 23 runs, 291 beasts of burden, and civilian labour totalling 81 persons/times. The large amount of articles of the former Indian Trade Agencies and the luggage of the former Indian Trade Agents were all granted exemption from customs examination on exit. Special allowance was also made so that employees of the former Indian Trade Agencies were able to take out with them articles the exportation of which was prohibited by China's customs regulations. Upon departure, both Mr. L. S. Jangapangi, the former Indian Trade Agent at Yatung and Mr. K. L. S. Pandit, the former Indian Trade Agent at Gyantse, expressed their thanks for the assistance and facilities given by the Chinese local authorities in the withdrawal.

3. In its memorandum, however, the Indian Government unwarrantedly charged the Chinese local authorities with not giving the former Indian Trade Agencies, due co-operation, and alleged that the local authorities "used unfair means to harass and delay the departure of the Indian trade agencies". This does not at all conform
to the facts, and the Chinese Government categorically rejects this charge and allegation. The Indian Government requested that the privileges of using couriers and code communication be accorded as before to the former Indian Trade Agencies after the expiration of the Sino-Indian Agreement. This is obviously an improper request and the Chinese Government naturally cannot agree to it. But as a special allowance, the Chinese side agreed that couriers sent by the Indian Government to its Consulate-General at Lhasa might stop over at the former Indian Trade Agencies on their way back to India. As to the premises and the site occupied by the former Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse, they belong to the Chinese Government; and since the Trade Agency did not pay the rent over a long period of time, it goes without saying that it should clear and settle its accounts before its withdrawal. Before his departure from Gyantse, the former Indian Trade Agent himself wrote to the Gyantse Office of the Tibet Foreign Bureau, pledging that the Indian Consulate-General at Lhasa would pay the overdue rent to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet, China. It is crystal clear that the handling of this question by the Chinese local authorities was entirely correct and unimpeachable. It was equally proper for the Chinese local authorities to state that the former Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse should handle on its own the Indian property left over. It is regrettable that the Indian Government repeatedly slandered the Chinese local authorities as "most unreasonable" and "arbitrary". What is particularly surprising is that the Indian Government should have raised objection to a matter which is entirely within China's internal jurisdiction, that is, the Chinese wives of employees of the former Indian Trade Agencies, in leaving China together with their husbands, should go through the necessary procedures in accordance with Chinese law. Could it be that by marrying employees of the former Indian Trade Agencies they could be exempted from undergoing the necessary procedures which Chinese citizens must undergo before going abroad? As a matter of fact, the Chinese local authorities adopted special procedures so that they could leave the country as quickly as possible. The unwarranted charge of the Indian Government can only expose its unjustified position in interfering in China's internal affairs.

4. It must be particularly mentioned that about the time when the Indian Government announced the withdrawal of the Indian Trade Agency, one incident occurred after another in which Chinese employees of the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung and their families fled the country in groups under the threats and instigation of the Trade Agency and a Chinese employee, named Mingmapingtso, met a sudden and unaccounted-for death at the premises of that Agency. Regarding this the Chinese Government already lodged a strong protest with the Indian Government in its note of June 11, 1962, in which the Indian side was urged to give an account of those incidents. In its memorandum and note, the Indian Government not only tried to help the former Indian Trade Agency at Yatung shirk its responsibility, but made false counter-charges against China, alleging that the local employees had run away "only due to fear of the local authorities", and that Mingmapingtso had committed "suicide" because of "the entry of Chinese troops into the Agency premises". It even
described the proper investigation conducted by the Chinese local authorities into these incidents as “undue harassment” against the Indian Trade Agent and therefore lodged a counter-protest. The Chinese Government firmly refutes such nonsense and categorically rejects this unreasonable protest.

5. In its note the Indian Government admitted that the large numbers of Chinese employees who had run away had been aware of the decision of the Indian Government to withdraw its Trade Agencies long before it intimated this decision to the Chinese Government on May 30. In both cases, however, the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung did not inform the Chinese local authorities until long after the incidents took place (this was obviously intended to make it easy for these escapees to sneak out of Chinese territory). The Indian frontier guards, disregarding entry procedures, allowed these persons to enter Sikkim, and now the Indian Government has given them permission to stay in India. These iron-clad facts indisputably show that the escape of the above-mentioned persons was purposely instigated and arranged by the Indian Trade Agency and the Indian Government in a planned way. The Indian side can only expose itself further by its quibblings and making false counter-charges.

6. Mingmapingtso’s sudden death at the Indian Trade Agency’s premises was all the more mysterious. The spot where Mingmapingtso lay seriously wounded had been disturbed before examination was undertaken by Chinese officials so that it was hard to make out the real cause of the death. It has been established that when Mingmapingtso was carried to the hospital of the Indian Trade Agency at about 16:00 hours, he was still conscious and asked for a talk with local Chinese officials. But the Chinese local authorities had never been informed of this request of his, and was informed by the Indian Trade Agency only at 20:00 hours of the death of Mingmapingtso. From the time of entry of the wounded into the hospital to his death, Sonam Dorjie, the doctor of the Indian Trade Agency, not only did not make the necessary diagnosis and try to save the man’s life, but also did not make any report or record. (These facts are established by Sonam Dorjie’s written evidence which bears his personal signature). All this was extraordinary. In disregard of these facts, the Indian Government in its memorandum of June 20 lightly explained the sudden death of Mingmapingtso as “suicide” and fabricated a fictitious “entry of Chinese troops into the Agency premises” so as to explain the cause of the “suicide”. That will not do at all.

7. From the above paragraphs it can be seen clearly that, in withdrawing its Trade Agencies, the Indian side conducted a series of premeditated acts of disruption to undermine the relations between the two countries. The Indian Government can in no way shake off its responsibilities under whatever pretext.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 29 September 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs delivered to the Chinese Embassy in India on June 22, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

Regarding the illegal entry of the two Indians, Ram Prakash and Narain Gir, into a non-pilgrimage area in Tibet, China, the Chinese Government has already given a correct account of the case in its previous notes and there is no need to repeat it here. Even the Indian Government did not venture in all its previous notes to deny directly the fact that the two Indians had illegally entered a non-pilgrimage area in Tibet, China, and did not hold any valid documents issued by the Chinese side. The Chinese local authorities could have dealt with the above-mentioned illegal acts of the two Indians according to law. Nevertheless, the Chinese side, in the spirit of Sino-Indian friendship, instead of pressing the matter with them, gave them friendly help. It is surprising that the Indian note should have slandered the Chinese side as misdirecting and persecuting them. This only shows that the Indian side is engaged in wilful trouble-making.

The Chinese Government deeply regrets that the Indian side should have time and again rudely interfered in China's exercise of sovereign power.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurance of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 October 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and with reference to the Note, dated 29th September, 1962 from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China has the honour to state as follows:—

Detailed facts have already been communicated in the previous notes of the Indian Government on the subject.

Two Indians, Shri Ram Prakash and Shri Narain Gir entered Tibet on pilgrimage. They were deliberately mis-guided by the Chinese and lost their way. They were thereafter taken into custody and moved from place to place for interrogation, while being kept by the Chinese authorities under illegal detention for almost two months. They were not only prevented from contacting Indian officials in Tibet while under illegal detention but local authorities also did not inform Indian officials in Tibet until they had been made to cross the border into Indian territory. Such harassment was unwarranted and unjustifiable.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to Embassy of India in China, 18 May 1962

The Government of the People's Republic of China has received the verbal note given to the Chinese Embassy in India on November 10, 1961, by the Ministry of External Affairs of India. In its comment on Vice-Foreign Minister Keng Piao's talk with the Indian Charge d'Affaires a.i., in Peking on October 24, 1961, the Indian Government went so far as to make various groundless charges against the Chinese Government and launch personal attacks on Vice-Foreign Minister Keng Piao. Besides, the note contains not a few obvious distortions of Vice-Foreign Minister Keng Piao's statements. The Chinese Government cannot but be greatly surprised at and deeply regret such an attitude of the Indian Government.

As the Indian Government is aware, it was because the Indian Government had made a series of attacks and charges against China that Vice-Foreign Minister Keng Piao gave that talk. In their talks with Mr. R. K. Nehru, Secretary-General of the Ministry of External Affairs of India, during his visit to China in July 1961, Chinese leaders expounded fully China's friendly stand. It is regrettable that the reasonable attitude of the Chinese Government and its desire to improve the relations between the two countries have failed to obtain the correct understanding of the Indian Government. After the Secretary-General returned to India, Indian Government leaders ceaselessly launched open attacks on China. The Indian Government even interfered with China's freedom of the press through diplomatic channels. Under these circumstances, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs could not but make an appropriate reply.

Vice-Foreign Minister Keng Piao's talk was made out of the desire to uphold the friendship between China and India, and the points he covered were based on facts; this may in no way be distorted. In view of the misrepresentation of the talk of Vice-Foreign Minister Keng Piao made in the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and the wanton charges made on the basis of such misrepresentation, the Chinese Government deems it appropriate to enclose herewith a copy of the statement Vice-Foreign Minister Keng Piao made to the Indian Charge d'Affaires a.i., on October 24, 1961. The statement itself will sufficiently clarify the facts and refute all the groundless charges made by India.

The Indian Government repeated in the note its charges of alleged Chinese aggression on India that do not merit serious treatment. The Chinese Government has already conclusively proved with ample facts in its successive notes that it is India, not China, that has occupied the other's territory and therefore violated the other's territorial integrity. The note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs declared that "the forcible occupation of Indian territory by Chinese forces, so long as it continues, cannot lead to friendly relations." Such an allegation, which disregards the facts, can only be taken to mean that the Indian Government is determined to make use of the boundary question to impair the relations between the two countries. The various recent practices of the Indian Government have further proved that the Indian side is deliberately aggravating the tension on the border so as to further worsen the relations between the two countries.
We have read the contents of Mr. Charge d'Affaires talk with Mr. Cheng Chih-ping, Deputy Director of the First Asian Department, held on September 14, 1961, and of the talk of Mr. Desai, Foreign Secretary of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, with Ambassador Pan Tzu-li held on the same day.

We are surprised at the charges made by the Indian Government against the Chinese press, charges which are completely groundless and totally unreasonable, and have aroused the indignation of the Chinese press. We categorically reject the unreasonable demand of the Embassy which constitutes an interference in the freedom of the press in China.

Concerning the question of mutual criticism in the public opinion and the press of the two countries, Mr. Charge d'Affaires must have been aware that Premier Chou En-lai clearly explained the stand and views of China in his talk with Mr. R. K. Nehru, Secretary-General of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, during the latter's visit to China last July. It may be pointed out that Indian criticisms against China are much greater in quantity and much more serious in nature. Leaders of the Indian Government have regularly and openly attacked China, while the fabrications and slanders carried in Indian newspapers against China have been all the more profuse. The Chinese side has all along maintained self-restraint; leaders of our Government have always attached importance to the friendship between China and India, and the Chinese newspapers have mainly carried objective reports with little comment. There is a sharp contrast between the attitudes and practices of the Chinese and Indian sides. Of course, we do not deny that there is a difference of views between the two sides on a series of questions. We hold that it is not improper for the newspapers of one country to express their views and criticisms in regard to the attitude of another country, and that it would not do to forbid others to express different views or force them to accept one's own opinions. We do hold different opinions with regard to India's attitude of laying stress on blaming the Soviet Union in connection with the question of nuclear tests, of praising and defending the United States on the Congo question, with regard to India's attitude at the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, etc. It is natural that Chinese newspapers carried related reports and expressed different opinions. But this is completely different in nature from the Indian newspapers' unreasonable attacks and slanderous reports on China.

Chinese press reports on the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries were in accord with the facts. About the role of India at the Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries, there have been a large
amount of reports and comments in the newspapers of various countries, including those of India. Why can't Chinese newspapers carry objective reports about it? It is their right to express their views in commentaries and reports. It should be further pointed out that similar views have been expressed in newspapers of India and many other countries. To mention just a few examples: The Times of India reporting from Belgrade on September 4 said there was a whispering campaign that India was playing the Western game; the Indian Statesman reported on September 6 that India was alleged to be the main stumbling-block; the Indian Express reported on September 6 that the African countries were disappointed and even angry at Prime Minister Nehru's speech; the London Times in its September 7 editorial said that Prime Minister Nehru had conspicuously failed to persuade the majority that anti-colonialism was a dead issue. Why don't you blame the Indian newspapers and those of other countries, but blame the Chinese press alone? Moreover, Chinese correspondents were present at the Conference and the Chinese newspapers, in reporting the statements of Prime Minister Nehru, have almost entirely quoted his original words in accordance with his original meaning. It can by no means be said that these reports are distorted, malign, and mischievous and do not conform to the facts. In their commentaries, surely they may express their own views. If the Indian Government considers that there is freedom of the press in its land according to its Constitution, why does it not respect the freedom of the press as provided in the Chinese Constitution but arbitrarily hold that the Chinese newspapers must not have the freedom of the press which permits them to make objective reports and express their own views? This in incomprehensible. Does India want to hold China responsible for the comments on India's attitude at the Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries which have appeared in Indian newspapers and the public opinion of various countries? Does India want the Chinese newspapers to act in conformity with the views and instructions of the Indian Government? Does India want the Chinese Government to violate the Chinese Constitution and undermine the freedom of the press in China? This will never do. The Indian Government's unreasonable charges against the demands on the Chinese newspapers cannot but be regarded as a crude interference in the freedom of the press in China. We express our deep regret at this.

After the Secretary-General of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs returned home, the Indian Government has acted contrary to the statements made in China by the Secretary-General and the Indian Ambassador concerning the desire to improve the relations between the two countries. First of all, the Secretary-General himself told the press upon his return to India that he had indicated to the Chinese leaders that so long as a part of Indian territory was still occupied, there would be no friendly relations between China and India. This was not only a slander against China, but also a sheer fabrication. He described his visit to China as one for lodging a protest with China which China had accepted. This cannot be regarded as a friendly and just attitude. The series of words and deeds of the Indian Government have also shown that the Indian side, far from desiring to improve the relations, wants to create new
strains in our relations. After the Secretary-General's visit to China, Prime Minister Nehru even asserted that China, like British imperialism, was enforcing an expansionist policy and that China must withdraw from what he called "Indian territory". On September 12, Mr. Menon again attacked China, asserting that before China's "withdrawal", no truck could be had with China, no understanding could be reached and no negotiations could be held. In its note of September 19, the Indian Government even unscrupulously slandered China as "showing aggressive designs and imperialist ambitions". Even as late as October 8, Prime Minister Nehru again charged China with "illegally occupying Indian territory", acting in a "very wrong," "very unfair" and "very improper" way, and so on. And this was carried in the news bulletin of the Indian Embassy in China.

At present, activities of interference in China's internal affairs are being carried out openly in India. The Indian Government permitted the anti-Chinese elements of India and some other countries to hold a meeting of what they call the Asian-African Council in Delhi from August 26 to 28 at which slanders were wantonly cast on China in regard to Tibet. The Tibetan rebel clique is still allowed to engage in anti-Chinese political activities on Indian territory. On October 6 and 10, in the name of the Dalai Lama they published one after the other a "report" slandering China and a declaration on the so-called "draft outline of the Constitution" of Tibet, operating in the virtual capacity of an "exile government" of the Tibetan rebels. All this runs counter to the promise previously given by the Indian Government that the Dalai Lama would be allowed only to take refuge, and not to engage in political activities. Indian troops, personnel and aircraft have repeatedly violated Chinese territory and air space on the Chinese-Indian borders. In recent months, such activities have become more frequent, and even reached the extent of firing provocative gun-shots. More Chinese nationals in India have been persecuted and deported in large numbers. The Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong has been put under unreasonable restrictions. Endless slanders and distortion about China have kept appearing in Indian newspapers which have lately defamed the respected and beloved leader of the Chinese people and the Chairman of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party Mao Tse-tung as a "dictator", and accused China of "vicious expansionism and new colonialism", and so on. Some Indian newspapers, for example, the Hindustan Times of September 16, spread the allegations that Indian missions in China had been subjected to "extraordinary restrictions", that China had completely isolated the Indian Embassy and Consulates from the outside world, that every visitor had been subjected to prolonged interrogation and harassment, that invitations sent out by the Embassy had to be routed through the Chinese Foreign Office which decided who among the invitees should accept the invitation, that the circulation of the Embassy bulletin was controlled by the Chinese Foreign Office, that the Chinese side had attempted to open Indian diplomatic bags, that as a result the Indian missions in China could not discharge their routine responsibilities and so on. All these allegations are utterly groundless being in China, Mr. Charge d'Affaires, you cannot be unaware that these are all untrue. It should be pointed out that rumours and
groundless charges have often been put forth in your newspapers and the Indian official quarters have failed to deny them; it is not difficult to see that many things have been deliberately disclosed to the newspapers by the Indian official quarters.

Now you have again made unwarranted charges and demands on us in regard to Chinese press reports, and have disclosed to the public that you had lodged a strong protest with us. You have spread circulars, behind the back of the Chinese Government, to attack the Chinese press and deliberately injure its reputation. Can it be that you want once again to provoke disputes, create an anti-Chinese atmosphere and whip up a new anti-Chinese campaign? We cannot but take a serious view about this. With a view to preventing Chinese-Indian relations from deteriorating further, we hereby call your attention and hope that you will put an end to such words and deeds which are detrimental to the relations between the two countries.

We stand for and insist on friendship between China and India. In the interest of the two peoples and for the sake of helping the world situation develop in a direction favourable to peace, we hope that the two sides would value the friendship between China and India, make efforts to break the stalemate and settle the boundary question. In the event that the boundary question cannot be settled for the time being, it is our hope that the friendship between our two countries should none the less be treasured, and not hindered or jeopardized. We have always considered that every effort should be made to safeguard the friendly relations between the two big countries, China and India. We assure you that your Embassy will be treated in the same manner as before, and we will not treat you in the incorrect manner which you have taken. We believe that the unpleasant state of affairs between the two countries are temporary, and that it is mainly the imperialists who need now to take advantage of a dispute between China and India. We do not wish to argue with you, but since you have brought up these charges and made to the outside world a lot of propaganda which do not conform to the fact, we have been compelled to make the above clarifications. We have confidence in the future of Sino-Indian relations. We stand for friendship between China and India, and this stand has not changed and will not change. However, friendship between two countries can become a reality only when both sides desire it. We hope that the two sides will make joint efforts to this end.

That is all that I have to say in reply to the question you raised last time.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 28 June 1962


The next of the statement made by Vice-Foreign Minister Keng Piao on 24th October 1961 to the Charge d'Affaires of India in Peking, now furnished with the Chinese Memorandum under reference, contains a few minor variations from the original report of the statement. By and large, the original report adheres faithfully to the substance and pattern of the 'text' now furnished to the Government of India.

The various matters raised in the 'statement' were fully dealt with in the Government of India's Note Verbale of 10th November 1961. It is hardly necessary to reiterate them.

The Government of India have never raised any objection to comments and criticisms of their policies which have appeared in Chinese newspapers. Their objection has been solely to some deliberate mis-reporting in the Chinese press of statements and speeches made by responsible Ministers of the Indian Government. As pointed out in the Indian Note Verbale of 10th November 1961, "It is inconceivable that they (Chinese) who were not represented at the Conference should put out a version of the Prime Minister's speech at Belgrade holding it to be more authentic than the official version".

The Government of India are earnest in their desire to improve the relations between India and China and it is because of this desire that they do not like to allow any misunderstandings or misinterpretations to go uncorrected.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 August 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to inform that the Government of India will be placing on the table of the Lok Sabha and publishing on August 6, 1962 White Paper No. VI containing all correspondence between the Governments of India and the People's Republic of China up till 25th July 1962. It is also intended to place the Note presented by the Foreign Secretary to the Chinese Charge d'Affaires on July 26, 1962, on the table of the House on the same day.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 August 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India dated June 27, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

As already pointed out in the Ministry's note of May 29, 1962, to the Indian Embassy in China, it is fully conformable to international practice for the Chinese Embassy in India to publish documents and statements of its own Government in its bulletins and the Indian Government's unwarranted confiscation of the May 5 issue of the Bulletin of the Chinese Embassy in India "China Today" this year constitutes a flagrant violation of the principles of international conduct. The Indian note under reference, while mentioning nothing about the fact that the news bulletin of the Indian Embassy in China carried the one-sided and distorted so-called "Summary" of the Report of the Chinese and Indian Officials made by the Indian side, repeats the unwarranted allegation made by the Indian Government against the Brief Account of the content of the officials' Report carried in the bulletin of the Chinese Embassy in India, which is of the same official nature as the so-called "Summary" published by India but correctly presents the facts of the Sino-Indian boundary question and the points of differences between the two sides. This is a fresh demonstration that the Indian Government is at the end of its tether in advancing its arguments. The Ministry in its note of May 29, 1962 already thoroughly refuted the Indian Government's pretext for its rude action and no repetition is needed here. The allegation made in the Indian note without any factual basis that the views of the Indian side have been suppressed in China is all the more unworthy of refutation.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to
the Embassy of India in China, 8 August 1962.

Reference Memorandum of the Indian Ministry of External

The Indian Government, in order to cover up its rude interference
in China's internal freedom of the press, continues to allege that the
Chinese press misreported speeches made by Indian Government
leaders. But it cannot produce any evidence to support such an
allegation.

The Indian Government asserts that since the Chinese side was
not represented at the conference of non-aligned countries, it could
not correctly report Prime Minister Nehru's speech at the conference.
This assertion is completely wrong. As is well known, Chinese
correspondents were present at the conference, and their reports
were based on first-hand information obtained on the spot. Why
should the Indian Government disregard the fact with open eyes?

As regards whether the Chinese press correctly reported Prime
Minister Nehru's speech or not, a convincing answer was given by
the Hsinhua News Agency in its letter of protest to the Indian
Embassy in China, dated October 18, 1961, against the Embassy's
circular slandering the Chinese press. The Embassy's attention is
drawn to the following passage of the letter of protest:

"Mr. Nehru was then delivering an extempore speech without a
prepared manuscript, and the full text of this speech touched up and
circulated later, on which the circular distributed by the Indian
Embassy in China is based, does not tally completely with the word-
ing in the extempore speech. For instance, when quoting his sen-
tence about imperialism, colonialism and racialism being oversha-
dowed by the world crisis, the Hsinhua report used the phrase "the
present world crisis". Summarising the same speech in its report
of September 3, the Indian Information Service used the same phrase
'present world crisis' in the same passage. But in the version circu-
culated later, only the phrase 'this crisis,' and not 'the present world
crisis,' is found. It is unfair as well as unseemly for the Indian
Embassy, in its attempt to accuse the Hsinhua News Agency of 'dis-
tortion,' to use very minor discrepancies in some non-essential sub-
ordinate clauses or phrases between the Hsinhua correspondent's
report based on Mr. Nehru's extempore speech and the version circu-
culated later." In the letter of protest, the Hsinhua News Agency made
a word-for-word comparison between its report on Prime Minister
Nehru's speech and the version circulated by the Indian Embassy,
which showed no substantive differences between them.

The malicious attacks on the Chinese press indulged in by the
Indian Government in disregard of the facts can only be regarded as
a calculated anti-Chinese propaganda campaign.
The Chinese Government, in welcoming the statement made in the Memorandum of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs that the Indian Government is earnest in its desire to improve the relations between China and India, hopes this will be borne out by actions. At the same time, the Chinese Government wishes to point out frankly that the Indian Government's persistence in interfering in news reporting in China runs counter to the desire to improve the relations between the two countries.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 17 August 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government’s note, dated 2nd August, 1962.

The full facts in this connection have already been made available in the Indian Government’s notes of May 9, 1962 and 27 June 1962, as also in the Memorandum, dated January 22nd, 1962 and it is not necessary to detail them again.

The Government of India have always permitted a wide latitude in such matters and have continued to date to allow the publication of any Chinese Government communications addressed to the Indian Government and statements made by members of the Chinese Government even where these have been couched in offensive language. However, the particular issue of “China Today” which has been confiscated, not only transgressed established conventions in this regard but also flagrantly violated the law of the land. In the circumstances, the Government of India had been constrained to issue an order under the relevant provisions of the law for its confiscation.

The Government of India do not agree with the contention of the Chinese Government that this is a “flagrant violation of the principles of international conduct”. Under international law diplomatic Missions are not authorised to offend against the laws of the receiving State. It is the Chinese Officials who failed to conform to the principles of international law and practice in this case.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 27 August 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state that the Government of India intend to place their note of 2nd August, 1962 in reply to the Chinese Government's note of 4th August, on the Table of the House early in September, probably on the 3rd of September.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 28 August 1962


The detailed factual position in the matter has been communicated in the Government of India's note, dated the 10th November 1961 and the Memorandum dated the 28th June 1962. It is most regrettable that instead of meeting the legitimate objection taken by the Indian Government to the distorted reporting in the Chinese press of the Indian Prime Minister's statement at the conference of non-aligned countries in Belgrade, the Memorandum under reference should merely put forward a baseless charge of "rude interference in China's internal freedom of the press".

As emphasised in the Indian Memorandum dated the 28th June 1962, the Government of India have never raised any objection to comments and criticisms of their policy which have appeared in the Chinese press. The Indian Government's objection has been directed solely to the deliberate and wilful mis-reporting in the Chinese press of statements and speeches made by responsible Ministers of the Indian Government.
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Letter from Premier Chou En-lai to Prime Minister of India,  
24 October 1962

Your Excellency Respected Prime Minister,

It is most distressing that border clashes as serious as the present ones should have occurred between our two countries. Fierce fighting is still going on. At this critical moment, I do not propose to trace the origin of this conflict. I think we should look ahead, we should take measures to turn the tide. In order to seek a way to stop the border clashes, reopen peaceful negotiations and settle the Sino-Indian boundary question, the Chinese Government has already issued a statement, proposing the following:

(1) Both parties affirm that the Sino-Indian boundary question must be settled peacefully through negotiations. Pending a peaceful settlement, the Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government agree that both parties respect the line of actual control between the two sides along the entire Sino-Indian border, and the armed forces of each side withdraw 20 kilometres from this line and disengage.

(2) Provided that the Indian Government agrees to the above proposal, the Chinese Government is willing, though consultation between the two parties, to withdraw its frontier guards in the eastern sector of the border to the north of the line of actual control; at the same time, both China and India undertake not to cross the line of actual control, i.e., the traditional customary line, in the middle and western sectors of the border.

Matters relating to the disengagement of the armed forces of the two parties and the cessation of armed conflict shall be negotiated by officials designated by the Chinese and Indian Governments respectively.

(3) In order to seek a friendly settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, talks should be held once again by the Prime Ministers of China and India. At a time considered to be appropriate by both parties, the Chinese Government would welcome the Indian Prime Minister to Peking; if this should be inconvenient to the Indian Government, the Chinese Premier would be ready to go to Delhi for talks.

For thousands of years, the peoples of China and India have been friendly to each other, and they should remain so from generation to generation. Our two countries jointly initiated the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and took part in the Bandung Conference of historic significance. Our two peoples' common interests in their struggle against imperialism outweigh by far all the differences between our two countries. We have a major responsibility for Sino-Indian friendship, Asian-African solidarity and Asian peace. Driven by a deep sense of this responsibility I sincerely appeal to you that you may respond positively to the above three proposals.

Please accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Sd.) CHOU EN-LAI,  
Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China.
Statement of the Chinese Government, 24 October 1962

Serious armed clashes have recently taken place on the Sino-Indian border. This occurrence is most unfortunate. The Chinese and Indian people have always been friendly to each other and should remain so from generation to generation. That China and India should cross words on account of the boundary question is something the Chinese Government and people are unwilling to see, it is also what the peace-loving countries and people of the whole world are unwilling to see.

The Sino-Indian boundary question is a question left over by history. There is a traditional customary boundary between the two countries, but the boundary between the two countries has never been formally delimited. The so-called McMahon Line in the eastern sector is a line which the British imperialists attempted to force upon China by taking advantage of the powerlessness of the Chinese and the Indian peoples. It is illegal and has never been recognized by the Chinese Government. After the independence of India, and especially around the time of the peaceful liberation of the Tibet region of China, the Indian side gradually extended its scope of actual control in the eastern sector northward from the traditional customary line to the vicinity of the so-called McMahon Line. In the middle and western sectors, up to 1959 the extent of actual control by China and India in the main conformed to the traditional customary line, except at individual places. Although India occupied more than 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory in the eastern sector, provoked two border clashes in 1959 and made claim to large tracts of Chinese territory, the Chinese Government has always stood for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question through negotiations and held that, pending, a peaceful settlement, the extent of actual control by each side should be respected and neither side should alter the state of the boundary by unilateral action.

Seeking a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, Premier Chou En-lai went to New Delhi in April, 1960 to hold talks with Prime Minister Nehru, and tried hard to reach a preliminary agreement conducive to a settlement of the boundary question. Regrettably, the sincere effort of the Chinese side did not evoke a response from the Indian side. Following that, the meeting of the officials of China and India likewise failed to yield results as it should.

The Chinese Government has always held that, even though China and India cannot for a time reach agreed opinions on the boundary question, this should not lead to border clashes. As early as 1959, the Chinese Government repeatedly proposed that the armed forces of each side withdraw 20 kilometres all along the border and stop frontier patrols so as to disengage the armed forces of the two sides and avoid conflict. After the Indian side rejected these proposals, China unilaterally stopped patrols on its side of the boundary in the hope that this might help ease the border situation. Contrary to our expectations, the Indian side, taking advantage of these circumstances, pressed forward steadily and penetrated deep
into Chinese territory, first in the middle and western, and then in the eastern sectors of the Sino-Indian boundary, set up scores of military strongpoints and continually caused armed clashes, thus making the border situation increasingly tense.

In the past year and more, the Chinese Government has again and again asked India to stop changing the status quo of the boundary by force and return to the table of negotiations. In the last three months, the Chinese Government three times proposed negotiating the Sino-Indian boundary question without any preconditions but all three times met with the refusal of the Indian Government. The Indian Government insisted that negotiations cannot start until China has withdrawn from vast tracts of China’s own territory.

Especially shocking to China is the fact that the Indian Government, after rejecting China’s peaceful proposal, on October 12 ordered the Indian forces to “free” Chinese frontiers of Chinese troops. Then, on October 20, Indian forces started a massive general offensive in both the eastern and western sectors of the Sino-Indian border. In these serious circumstances, the Chinese frontier guards had no choice but to strike back in self-defence.

Fierce fighting is now going on. The occurrence of this grave situation pains the Chinese Government and people and disturbs the Asian and African countries and people. After all, what issue is there between China and India that cannot be settled peacefully? What reason is there for bloody clashes to occur between China and India? China does not want a single inch of India’s territory. In no circumstances is it conceivable for the Sino-Indian boundary question to be settled by force. China and India are both big countries of Asia having a major responsibility for peace in Asia and the world. They are initiators of the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and participants of the Bandung Conference. Although the relations between China and India are presently very tense, there is no reason to abandon the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and the spirit of the Bandung Conference. The Chinese Government holds that both the Chinese and Indian Governments should take to heart the fundamental interests of the 1,100 million people of China and India, the common interests of the people of the two countries in their struggle against imperialism and the interests of Asian peace and Asian-African solidarity, and try their best to seek a way to stop the border conflict, reopen peaceful negotiations and settle the Sino-Indian boundary question.

In line with its consistent stand for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, the Chinese Government now solemnly puts forward the following three proposals:

(1) Both parties affirm that the Sino-Indian boundary question must be settled peacefully through negotiations. Pending a peaceful settlement, the Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will agree that both parties respect the line of actual control between the two sides along the entire Sino-Indian border, and the armed forces of each side withdraw 20 kilometres from this line and disengage.
(2) Provided that the Indian Government agrees to the above proposal, the Chinese Government is willing, through consultations between the two parties, to withdraw its frontier guards in the eastern sector of the border to the north of the line of actual control; at the same time, both China and India undertake not to cross the line of actual control, i.e., the traditional customary line, in the middle and western sectors of the border.

Matters relating to the disengagement of the armed forces of the two parties and the cessation of armed conflict shall be negotiated by officials designated by the Chinese and Indian Governments respectively.

(3) The Chinese Government considers that, in order to seek a friendly settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, talks should be held once again by the Prime Ministers of China and India. At a time considered to be appropriate by both parties, the Chinese Government would welcome the Indian Prime Minister to Peking; if this should be inconvenient to the Indian Government, the Chinese Premier would be ready to go to Delhi for talks.

The Chinese Government appeals to the Indian Government for a positive response to the above three proposals. The Chinese Government appeals to the governments of Asian and African countries for an effort to bring about the materialization of these three proposals. The Chinese Government appeals to all the peace-loving countries and people to do their part in promoting Sino-Indian friendship, Asian-African solidarity and world peace.

Letter from the Prime Minister of India, to Premier Chou En-lai, 27 October 1962

Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

Thank you for the copy of your message of 24th October which was delivered to the Ministry of External Affairs by your Charge d'Affaires in Delhi on the evening of 24th October along with a copy of the statement issued by the Government of the People's Republic of China on the morning of the 24th.

Nothing in my long political career has hurt and grieved me more than the fact that the hopes and aspirations for peaceful and friendly neighbourly relations which we entertained, and to promote which my colleagues in the Government of India and myself worked so hard, ever since the establishment of the People's Republic of China, should have been shattered by the hostile and unfriendly twist given in India-China relations during the past few years. The current clashes on the India-China border arising out of what is in effect a Chinese invasion of India, which you have described as "most distressing", are the final culmination of the deterioration in relations between India and China.
I would not, in this letter, go into the long history of this deterioration in India-China relations or argue as to where the fault lies because you are quite familiar with our views on this subject. All I would say is that the long preamble to the statement of the Government of the People's Republic of China of 24th October, enclosed with your letter, gives a distorted picture of the history of India-China relations. I agree with you, however, that we should look ahead and consider what can be done not merely to turn the tide as you suggest, but to reverse it and make a serious attempt to restore the relations between India and China to the warm and friendly pattern of earlier days and even to improve on that pattern.

As regards the three points mentioned in your letter which were put out in the statement of 24th October, the Government of India have already indicated their official reactions to the proposals in these three points. I enclose a copy of this official reaction for ready reference.

My colleagues and I have carefully considered the appeal made in your letter. We are not able to understand the niceties of the Chinese three-point proposals which talk about "lines of actual control", etc. I believe several other Governments interested in peaceful settlement of our differences have also not been able to understand or appreciate what these proposals actually mean.

We are of the considered view that a clear straightforward way of reversing the deteriorating trend in India-China relations would be for Your Excellency to accept the suggestion made in point (V) of the official reaction of the Government of India and to revert to the position as it prevailed all along the India-China boundary prior to 8th September, 1962. If this is agreed to, it can be implemented by both sides. We will, thereafter, be glad to welcome you or a delegation from your country at any level that is mutually acceptable to discuss and arrive at further agreed measures which can facilitate a peaceful settlement of our differences on this border question, in one stage or in more than one stage as may be necessary.

There have been repeated declarations by the Government of the People's Republic of China that they want to settle the differences on the border question with India by peaceful means, though what is happening today is in violent contradiction with these declarations. I would, however, presume that your letter is a reaffirmation of the earlier declarations and indicates a desire to revert to the paths of peace and peaceful settlement. On this common basis of eschewing war and violence in the settlement of border differences, our proposal to revert to the status quo along the entire boundary as it prevailed before 8th September, 1962, should be acceptable to you. We could, after this is implemented, discuss our differences and see whether we can arrive at agreed measures and settle the differences either in one stage or in several stages. If we fail, we can consider what other agreed peaceful method of settling our differences should be adopted.

Please accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) JAWAHARLAL NEHRU.
Annexure to letter from the Prime Minister of India to Premier Chou En-lai, 27 October 1962

The Government of India have seen Press Agency reports of the three-point statement issued by the People's Republic of China which the New China News Agency has put out this morning. There has been no official communication from the Chinese Government on this matter so far.

The Government of India have in previous notes and in statements made by the Prime Minister clearly indicated their attitude in this matter. Government of India's position is:

(i) The Government of India wedded to peace and peaceful methods have always sought to resolve differences by talks and discussions in this case of border differences with the Government of China.

(ii) On the 16th October, 1962, in a note sent to the Government of China they proposed the restoration of the status quo of the boundary as it prevailed before the Chinese aggression in the eastern sector on 8th September, 1962, prior to talks and discussions for easing of tension and for creating the appropriate climate for purposeful talks and discussions to resolve the differences between the Governments of India and China on the boundary question.

(iii) Since then, it is the Government of China which on the morning of the 20th October, 1962, hurled its vast armies at various points on all sectors of the India-China boundary and enlarged the conflict. These Chinese forces have advanced in all sectors into Indian territory and are still advancing. India cannot and will not accept a position under which Chinese forces continue to commit aggression into Indian territory, occupy substantial Indian territories and use these as a bargaining counter to force a settlement on their terms.

(iv) There is no sense or meaning in the Chinese offer to withdraw 20 kilometres from what they call 'line of actual control'. What is this 'line of actual control'? Is this the line they have created by aggression since the beginning of September? Advancing 40 or 60 kilometres by blatant military aggression and offering to withdraw 20 kilometres provided both sides do this is a deceptive device which can fool nobody.

(v) If the Chinese professions of peace and peaceful settlement of differences are really genuine, let them go back at least to the position where they were all along the boundary prior to 8th September, 1962. India will then be prepared to undertake talks and discussions, at any level mutually agreed, to arrive at agreed measures which should be taken for the easing of tension and correction of the situation created by unilateral forcible alteration of the status quo along the India-China boundary.

(vi) India is always prepared to resolve differences by talks and discussions but only on the basis of decency, dignity and
self-respect and not under threat of military might of any country however strong it may be.

(vii) India would be prepared to welcome the Chinese Prime Minister or any suitable representative of the Chinese Government on a mutually agreed date if China is sincere in its professions of peaceful settlement and accepts the constructive proposal made in point (v) above which is fully consistent with dignity and self-respect both of India and China.

Letter from Premier Chou En-lai, to the Prime Minister of India, 4 November 1962

Respected Mr. Prime Minister,

I thank you for your letter dated October 27. I have also received the enclosed copy of the Indian Government's statement dated October 24.

It is indeed most painful to the Chinese Government and people that the current unfortunate border clashes should have eventually broken out and should have not yet ceased. The major enemy of China, as well as of the other Asian and African countries, is imperialism. The Chinese Government and people are by no means willing to see the two largest Asian countries crossing swords on account of differences between them, while they are confronted with the major enemy.

Though we interpret the cause of the current grave situation between China and India differently, I am glad that Your Excellency agrees that we should look ahead and should not merely turn the present tide but restore Sino-Indian relations to the warm and friendly pattern of earlier days and even improve on that pattern. I believe that if we really cherish such a common desire we shall certainly be able, through our joint efforts, to find a way to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question peacefully that is acceptable to both sides.

The three proposals of the Chinese Government of October 24 were advanced exactly in the spirit of resuming the friendly relations between the two countries prior to 1959. Your Excellency said that you and your colleagues were not so clear about the precise meaning of the Chinese Government's proposals. Although the Chinese Government already pointed out in its statement the origin and meaning of its proposals, I am still willing here to make some further explanations.

As pointed out in the October 24 statement of the Chinese Government, the proposals for the armed forces of China and India to withdraw 20 kilometres each from the line of actual control and to disengage was first put forward by the Chinese Government.
back in 1959; to put it more specifically, in my letter to you dated November 7, 1959. Now, the Chinese Government has reiterated this proposal. The "line of actual control" mentioned in the proposal is basically still the line of actual control as existed between the Chinese and Indian sides on November 7, 1959. To put it concretely, in the eastern sector it coincides in the main with the so-called McMahon Line, and in the western and middle sectors it coincides in the main with the traditional customary line which has consistently been pointed out by China. The reason why the Chinese Government put forward this proposal again emphatically is that we have deeply realised from the bitter experience of the past three years that it is very hard to avoid clashes in border areas under dispute if the armed forces of the two sides are not disengaged. The fact that the Chinese Government's proposal has taken as its basis the 1959 line of actual control and not the present line of actual contact between the armed forces of the two sides is full proof that the Chinese side has not tried to force any unilateral demand on the Indian side on account of the advances gained in the recent counter-attack in self-defence. According to this proposal of the Chinese Government, the undertakings of both sides are equal. Moreover, as Your Excellency is surely aware, in concretely implementing this proposal the Chinese armed forces will have to withdraw much more than 20 kilometres from their present position in the eastern sector. The Chinese Government greatly regrets that the Indian Government in its statement of October 24 should describe this fair proposal of the Chinese Government as a deceptive device to fool anybody. As Your Excellency is clearly aware, implementation of this proposal of the Chinese Government is not tantamount to the settlement of the boundary question, and so it will in no way prejudice the position of either side in maintaining its claims with regard to the boundary. No matter how differently our two sides view the Sino-Indian boundary question, the question has in fact been in existence for a long time. Yet this situation did not prevent our two countries from living together on friendly terms before 1959, then how is it that they can no longer do so after 1959? Of course, we both wish to see the boundary question settled speedily in a friendly way, yet why is it that our two countries must resort to arms before the boundary question is settled? The proposal of the Chinese Government for the armed forces of the two sides to withdraw 20 kilometres each from the line of actual control along the entire boundary and to disengage is precisely designed to create an atmosphere for the peaceful settlement of the boundary question; and even if the boundary question cannot be settled for the time being, avoidance of clashes along the border can be ensured.

The Indian Government said in its statement that India can enter into talks "only on the basis of decency, dignity and self-respect." I deem that the three proposals of the Chinese Government have precisely provided such a basis. Should the Indian Government agree to the Chinese Government's proposals, China and India can quickly designate officials to negotiate matters relating to the disengagement of the armed forces of the two sides and...
the cessation of their armed conflict. When these negotiations have yielded results and the results have been put into effect, the Prime Ministers of the two countries can then hold talks to proceed further to seek a friendly settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question.

You have said in your letter that "a clear straight-forward way of reversing the deteriorating trend in India-China relations" is for the Chinese side to accept the suggestion made in point V of the Indian Government's statement, that is, to "revert to the position as it prevailed all along the India-China boundary prior to September 8, 1962." I cannot but state with regret, however, that this Indian suggestion is contrary to the aim of turning the present tide and resuming Sino-Indian friendly relations.

I do not wish to reopen the old argument. But since the state of the Sino-Indian boundary prior to September 8, 1962 has been referred to, I cannot but point out that that state was unfair and pregnant with the danger of border conflict and hence should not be restored. So far as the eastern sector is concerned, I believe the Indian Government must be in possession of the 1914 original map of the so-called McMahon Line. According to the original map, the western end of the so-called McMahon Line clearly starts from 27°44.6'N. Yet the Indian Government arbitrarily said that it started from 27°48'N. and, on this pretext, it not only refused to withdraw the Indian troops from the Kechilang River area north of the Line, but made active dispositions for a massive military attack, attempting to clear the area of Chinese frontier guards defending it. Such was the position in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary prior to September 8, 1962. How can the Chinese Government agree to revert to such a position? As for the western sector, the Aksai Chin area has always been under China's jurisdiction. It was through this area that back in 1950 the Chinese People's Liberation Army entered the Ari district of Tibet from Sinkiang. Again, it was through this area that, from 1956 to 1957, the Chinese Government constructed the Sinkiang-Tibet Highway involving gigantic engineering work. Yet the Indian Government arbitrarily said that it was not until 1957 that the Chinese side came to this area and, on this pretext, unilaterally altered the state of the boundary in the western sector by force from 1961 onwards, occupied large tracts of Chinese territory east of the 1959 line of actual control and set up over 40 military strong-points. Such was the position in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary prior to September 8, 1962. How can the Chinese Government agree to revert to such a position?

The Chinese Government holds that the present border clashes should not have occurred at all and that, in order quickly to stop the border clashes, reopen peaceful negotiations and settle the Sino-Indian boundary question, neither side should assume the attitude of a victor, no matter how the clashes may develop. It was precisely in this spirit that the Chinese Government put forward its three proposals of October 24. The three proposals are reciprocal and not one-sided, they are equitable and not asking submission of one side, they are based on mutual accommodation and not imposed on others, they are based on mutual respect and
not bullying one side, and they are in the spirit of friendly negotiation and not arbitrary or dogmatic. However, the Indian Government has put to the Chinese Government humiliating conditions such as forced on a vanquished party. Your Excellency, Mr. Prime Minister, both our countries are sovereign states and neither can force its unilateral demands on the other. India has its self-respect, so has China. It was for the upholding of the self-respect, of both China and India that the Chinese Government put forward its three proposals of October 24. I sincerely appeal to Your Excellency once again to consider these three proposals and make a positive response.

Respected Mr. Prime Minister, since the unfortunate Sino-Indian border clashes began, many Asian and African countries have appealed to our two countries, expressing the hope that we may stop the clashes and resume negotiations. They say that imperialism and colonialism are the chief enemies of us newly-independent Asian and African countries, and that the Asian and African countries should settle their mutual disputes peacefully on the basis of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation. I am convinced that their intentions are good and their viewpoint is correct. We should not disappoint their eager expectations.

Please accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Sd.) CHOU EN-LAI,
Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China.

Letter from the Prime Minister of India, to Premier Chou En-lai, 14 November 1962

Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

Thank you for your letter of 4th November. Our Charge d'Affaires in Peking to whom it was handed over sent us a copy by telegram.

My colleagues and I have carefully considered the elaboration of the three proposals of the Chinese Government of October 24, given in your letter.

Apart from the Chinese claims regarding the territorial boundary in various sectors of the India-China boundary, one fact stands out quite clearly. This is the basic fact that till the 8th September, 1962, no Chinese forces had crossed the frontier between India and China in the Eastern sector as defined by India, that is, along the highest watershed in the region, in accordance with the Agreement of 1914. It was on 8th September, 1962, that your forces crossed
this frontier and threatened the Dhola frontier post of India. We took limited defensive measures to reinforce this post and at the same time made repeated approaches to the Chinese Government to withdraw their forces beyond the Thag La ridge which is the frontier in this region. Your forces not only did not withdraw to the position they occupied before 8th September, 1962, but, after some probing attacks, mounted a massive attack and are now in occupation of large areas of Indian territory in this region and also in various other frontier areas of NEFA. That the attack was premeditated and carefully planned is clear from the fact that this attack at the Thag La ridge frontier which commenced on the morning of the 20th October, 1962, was not an isolated move; similar attacks against Indian defence posts started simultaneously along other parts not only of the eastern sector of the frontier, but also of the western sector of the frontier.

As I said in my letter of 27th October, I do not want to go into the history of the last five years and the forcible, unilateral alteration of the status quo of the boundary by the Chinese forces in the western sector, on which a mass of notes and memoranda have been exchanged between our two Governments. The events since 8th September, 1962, however, have completely shattered any hope that that any one could have entertained about settling India-China differences peacefully in accordance with normal international principles observed by all civilized governments. This invasion, coming after 12 years of constant and consistent endeavour on our part to maintain and develop friendly relations with China, can only point to one and only one conclusion, namely, that the Government of China have taken a deliberate cold-blooded decision, in total disregard of all principles, which govern normal neighbourly relations between sovereign governments, to enforce their alleged boundary claims by military invasion of India. It is this crisis of confidence which has to be dealt with. I must state frankly, that we find no attempt, either in the three proposals as elaborated now or in the other parts of your letter, to deal with this main problem created by the massive Chinese aggression on India which began on 8th September, 1962, namely, the complete loss of confidence in the bona fides of the professions for a peaceful settlement repeatedly made in public statements of the Government of China. On the other hand, your letter proceeds on the unilateral assumption that the line of actual control created by the latest Chinese invasion of India should be accepted as a part of the cease-fire arrangements and implemented on the ground, the boundary differences being negotiated thereafter between the two Prime Ministers. In brief, China will keep what it has secured by this further invasion and is prepared to negotiate on the rest. India can never agree to this position.

The three proposals of the Chinese Government of October 24, 1962, have been examined carefully and in detail. The result of the examination is given in the memorandum that I am attaching to this letter. The memorandum speaks for itself.

You have mentioned in your letter that according to the Chinese proposals, the Chinese armed forces will have to withdraw by more than 20 kilometres from their present positions and that the fact
that the Chinese Government have taken as its basis the 1959 "line of actual control" and not the present "line of actual control" between the armed forces of the two sides, is full proof that the Chinese side has not tried to force any unilateral demand on the Indian side on account of the advances gained in what you still choose to call "recent counter-attacks in self-defence". What you call the 1959 "line of actual control" was no line but a series of positions of Chinese forces on Indian territory in Ladakh progressively established since 1957, which forcibly and unilaterally altered the status quo of the boundary. This was done even while assuring us since 1954 that China had no territorial claims against India. So far as the Central sector is concerned, the Chinese forces were always to the north of the Himalayan watershed ridge which is the traditional and customary boundary in this area.

The analysis given in the attached note will, however, show that even this 7th November, 1959, line of actual control is projected three years ahead to be identical with the line of actual control established by your forces since the massive attack on 20th October, 1962. Surely this must be clear to all concerned. To advance a few hundred kilometres and then offer to withdraw 20 kilometres is, as anybody can see, hardly a constructive proposal based on mutual accommodation. Your present proposal in brief amounts in broad terms to this: because India had been pressing China to remedy the forcible alteration of the status quo since 1957 in the Western sector, China has undertaken since 8th September, deliberately and in cold blood, a further massive aggression and occupied larger areas of Indian territory and is now making the magnanimous offer of retaining the gains of the earlier aggression plus such other gains as it can secure by negotiations from the latest aggression on the basis of the Chinese three point proposals. If this is not the assumption of the attitude of a victor, I do not know what else it can be. This is a demand to which India will never submit whatever the consequences and however long and hard the struggle may be. We cannot do less than this if we are going to maintain the principles we cherish, namely, peace, good neighbourliness and peaceful co-existence with all our neighbours including China. To do otherwise would mean mere existence at the mercy of an aggressive, arrogant and expansionist neighbour.

Despite the crisis of confidence created by the earlier Chinese aggression, we are, as I said in my letter of 27th October, prepared to consider entering into talks and discussions to deal with our differences and to re-establish good neighbourly relations on the basis of peaceful co-existence between our two countries, each following its own way of life, provided it was agreed that the status quo along the entire boundary as it prevailed before 8th September, 1962, should be restored. This is the minimum corrective action necessary. The damage to the very principles of good neighbourliness and peaceful co-existence done by the further aggression since 8th September, 1962, must be corrected before any other constructive step can be taken.

You have referred to the peaceful friendly relations between our two countries till 1959 despite the differences on the boundary question and asked why we could not have these relations after 1959,
despite the differences on the boundary question. The reason I feel
should be clear to you. It was in January, 1959, that you put
forward a claim for 50,000 square miles of Indian territory under
the guise of a boundary dispute. This was not a small adjustment
of the boundary here or there involving a few hundred square miles
but a demand for surrender of large areas of Indian territory. You
did not stop at this preposterous demand. Though we agreed to
talks and discussions at various levels to examine the relevant his-
torical, cartographic and other data on the subject, your forces con-
tinued to forcibly occupy substantial areas of Indian territory even
while these talks and discussions were going on. This process con-
tinued throughout the subsequent years and, on 8th September, 1962,
your forces started the further aggression in the Eastern sector which
had been quiet and peaceful all these twelve years except for the
minor differences over Longju.

In your letter as well as in the official note of your Government,
there are references to the line of actual control as on 7th Novem-
ber, 1959, as the basis of the three-point proposals. If the Chinese
Government really mean what they say regarding the restoration
of 7th November, 1959, positions of their forces in all sectors of the
boundary, their withdrawal to those positions and the restoration of
the positions of the Indian forces as they were prior to 8th Septem-
ber 1962, would, by and large, meet the problem of disengagement
as there will be enough distances between the position of the forces
of the two sides to prevent any risk of a clash. To put it concretely,
in the Eastern sector the Chinese forces will go back to the positions
they held on 7th November, 1959, that is, they will be on the other
side of the boundary along the Himalayan watershed which they
first crossed on 8th September, 1962. In the Central sector the
position will be the same, that is, they will be to the north of the
highest watershed ridge. In the Western sector the Chinese forces
will go back to the positions they held on 7th November, 1959, as
given in the attached note, that is, along the line connecting their
Spanggur post, Khurnak Fort and Kongka La and then northwards
to join the main Aksai Chin Road. The Indian forces will go back
to the various defence posts they occupied in all the three sectors
prior to 8th September, 1962. This arrangement will secure not only
adequate disengagement of forces of both sides but will not in any
way prejudge either the alignment of the customary and traditional
boundary in the Western and the Central sectors as claimed by the
two sides or the alignment of the McMahon Line boundary in the
Eastern sector.

You have, Mr. Prime Minister, referred in your letter to the
appeal made by Asian-African countries. I agree that this appeal
should evoke a constructive response. You must have seen in this
connection the four-point suggestion made by the President of the
U.A.R. mentioned in the U.A.R. Presidential communique of 31st
October and my message to the President of the U.A.R. dated 27th
October.

Please accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest
consideration.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) JAWAHARLAL NEHRU.
Annexure to letter dated 14 November 1962, from the Prime Minister of India

The implications of the three-point proposal of the Chinese Government presented on the 24th of October and further elaborated upon in Prime Minister Chou En-lai's letter, dated 4th November 1962, are given below:

Western Sector.

The line of actual control in November 1959 was no line but a series of positions of Chinese forces on Indian territory. These positions had been progressively established since 1957 by forcibly and unilaterally altering the traditional status quo of the boundary, even while the Government of China were assuring the Government of India that they had no territorial claims against India. In November 1959, Chinese posts in the Western sector were at Spanggur, Khurnak Fort, Kongka La and along the main Aksai Chin Road. Within three years, i.e., by September 1962, the Chinese had constructed a large network of military roads and posts, beginning with posts opposite Daulat Beg Oldi in the north, along the Chip Chap river valley and across the Galwan river to the Pangong and Spanggur lake areas. At certain points the network of military posts was more than one hundred miles to the west of Chinese positions in 1959.

The Chinese three-point proposal, taken with its clarifications, is that, in the Western sector, both parties agree to respect the "line of actual control" between the two sides. In his clarificatory letter Premier Chou En-lai states that "the line of actual control" "is basically still the line of actual control as existed between the Chinese and the Indian sides in November 1959". The normal deduction would be that this line of control would, therefore, be a line connecting Spanggur, Khurnak Fort, Kongka La and proceeding northwards to join the main Aksai Chin Road. However, Premier Chou En-lai's letter states that "in the Western and Middle Sectors it (the line of actual control) coincides in the main with the traditional customary line". In short, while referring to the line of control as it existed in 1959, the Chinese actually project it to the line they claimed in the meeting between the officials of the two sides in 1960 and the line they physically hold now since their massive attack which commenced in this region on 20th October 1962. This line not only includes all the Chinese posts established in the three years since 1959, but also includes all the Indian posts in the territory that existed till 20th October 1962, and extends even farther westwards, thus taking in an additional 5,000 to 6,000 square miles since their 7th November 1959 position.

According to the Chinese proposal, after this "line of actual control" is determined, India would have to further withdraw yet another 20 kilometres inside territory accepted by the Chinese as undoubtedly Indian, while the Chinese withdrawal of 20 kilometres would be only 20 kilometres inside Indian territory claimed by them leaving the Chinese forces well over a hundred kilometres deep into territory belonging to India. The total effect of this would be that the entire network of Chinese aggressive posts which
existed on 20th October 1962, and some more would remain intact poised for a further attack, while all Indian defence posts in Indian territory claimed by China will be eliminated and even posts in territory accepted as Indian including such key posts as Daulat Beg Oldi, Chushul and Hanle would be dismantled and eliminated.

**Middle Sector.**

In the middle sector, the suggestion that the "line of actual control", whether on 7th November 1959 or now, coincides only "in the main" with the traditional and customary boundary is absolutely without foundation. The Chinese Government have never had any authority south of the main Himalayan watershed ridge, which is the traditional boundary in this sector. Some Tibetan officials along with some Chinese troops did intrude into Barahoti on various occasions since 1954; and, in 1958, the two Governments agreed to withdraw their armed personnel from the locality. But Indian civilian personnel have throughout been functioning in the area. A conference held in 1958 to discuss the question made clear that the Chinese Government had not even precise knowledge of the area they were claiming.

**Eastern Sector.**

In the Eastern sector the Chinese Government are willing to withdraw their troops to the north of the "line of actual control". This "line of actual control" has been clarified in Premier Chou En-lai's letter as coinciding "in the main" with the McMahon Line. The Chinese Government by this ambiguous statement indicate that there are portions of the "line of actual control" as envisaged by them which do not coincide with the McMahon Line. These divergencies have not, however, been revealed. The fact remains, however, that Chinese positions have always remained to the north of the highest Himalayan ridge in the Eastern sector of the India-China border and the alignment of the McMahon Line has never been questioned by China. The Chinese were nowhere in the vicinity of this watershed boundary either in November 1959 or later till 8th September 1962, when they started their aggression into Indian territory in this region.

Premier Chou En-lai has in his letter referred to the 1914 original map of the McMahon Line and the coordinates given in this map. The Agreement of 1914 only formalised what was the traditional and customary boundary in the area which lies along the highest Himalayan watershed ridges. The maps attached to the Agreement were of small scale of 1 inch to 8 miles. They were sketch maps and intended to be only illustrative. All that they made clear was that the boundary ran along the main watershed ridges of the area. The parallels and meridians were shown only approximately in accordance with the progress achieved at that time in the sphere of scientific surveys. This is a common cartographic feature and the Chinese Government have themselves recognised this in Article 48 of their 1960 Treaty with Burma. If the maps and the coordinates given therein were taken literally it is impossible to explain the discrepancy between the existing distances and those given in the map between various villages in the area. Also Migyitun according
to the maps is at latitude 28° 38' north while its actual position as ascertained by the latest surveys is much further north. Tulung La has been shown on the 1914 maps at 27° 47' N while its position on the ground is further north of this point. Strict adherence to the co-ordinates shown on the McMahon Line maps would result in advancing the Indian boundary in both the areas of Migyitun and Tulung La further north thereby including both these places inside Indian territory. In the area east of Tsari Sarpa, strict adherence to the coordinates of Lola in the McMahon Line maps would result in advancing the boundary of India into this area by at least 7 miles to the north. This would mean including at least 70 square miles of Tibetan territory within India. The Government of India recognising the principle underlying the McMahon Line agreement that the boundaries lie along the highest watershed ridges actually confined their jurisdiction to the area south of this boundary and did not try to take over Tibetan territory beyond the highest watershed ridge on the basis of the inaccurate coordinates given in the 1914 maps. This must be known to the Chinese authorities and yet they ignore this and seek to use the inaccurate coordinates given in the maps where they are favourable to their fanciful claims made to support their latest aggression. The Chinese authorities cannot have it both ways. They cannot accept the highest watershed as the boundary in parts of the Eastern sector where it suits them though this is not consistent with the co-ordinates given in the 1914 maps and quote the coordinates in these very maps in their favour in other parts of the sector to make demands for territorial concessions from India.

The Chinese proposal envisages a further withdrawal of 20 kilometres on either side of the McMahon Line as understood by them. This would leave Chinese forces in command of the passes leading into India while Indian forces would be 20 kilometres to the south leaving the entire Indian frontier defenceless and at the mercy of any fresh invasion. The present Chinese invasion which commenced on 8th September, 1962, was known because there was a defence post near the border. If there are no border posts at or near the passes, Chinese aggression could recur without India knowing about it for quite some time.

The objective of the Chinese three-point proposal is to secure for the Chinese side guaranteed occupation of the Indian areas in the Western and Central sectors which they claim while they retain their right to negotiate, and negotiations failing, to enforce whatever territorial adjustments they want in the Eastern sector.

Western Sector.—India should not dispute on the ground, though it will be allowed to talk about its juridical claim, the Chinese occupation of 14,000 square miles of Indian territory including 2,000 squares miles forcibly occupied since 20th October 1962. India has to agree not only to respect this so-called line of actual control but must also dismantle and withdraw its defences in the region a further 20 kilometres into admittedly Indian territory involving withdrawal from points like Chushul, etc.

Middle Sector.—The Chinese claims must be fully satisfied so far as physical occupation is concerned.
**Eastern Sector.**—The principles of the highest watershed, which is the boundary and which had been respected till 8th September, 1962, should be given up in favour of whatever interpretation the Government of China decide to put on the McMahon Line. There should be a further withdrawal of 20 kilometres. Thus, India must give up control of the passes in the highest watershed ridges in the areas, with no guarantee that the Chinese side will not cross the actual line of control whichever it may be.

In short, the Chinese three-point proposal, despite the manner in which it is put forth, is a demand for surrender on terms which have to be accepted while the Chinese forces in great strength are occupying large areas of Indian territory which they have acquired since their further aggression which commenced on 8th September, 1962, and the massive attack which they started on 20th October, 1962.

---

**Statement given by the Chinese Government, 21 November 1962**

In the past two years, first in the western and then in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, Indian troops crossed the line of actual control between China and India, nibbled Chinese territory, set up strongpoints for aggression and provoked a number of border clashes. Relying on the advantageous military positions they had occupied and having made full preparations, the Indian troops eventually launched massive armed attacks all along the line on the Chinese frontier guards on October 20, 1962. This border conflict—deliberately provoked by India—has been going on for a month.

The Chinese Government served repeated warnings in regard to the increasingly serious Indian encroachments and provocations, and pointed out the gravity of their consequences. The Chinese frontier guards all along maintained maximum self-restraint and forbearance in order to avert any border conflict. However, all these efforts by China proved of no avail, and the Indian acts of aggression steadily increased. Pressed beyond the limits of endurance and left with no room for retreat, the Chinese frontier guards finally had no choice but to strike back resolutely in self-defence. After the present large-scale border conflict broke out, the Chinese Government quickly took initiative measures in an effort to extinguish the flames of conflict that had been kindled. On October 24, that is, four days after the outbreak of the current border clashes, the Chinese Government put forward three reasonable proposals for stopping the border clashes, reopening peaceful negotiations and settling the Sino-Indian boundary question. The three proposals are as follows:

1. Both parties affirm that the Sino-Indian boundary question must be settled peacefully through negotiations. Pending a peaceful
settlement, the Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will agree that both parties respect the line of actual control between the two sides along the entire Sino-Indian border, and the armed forces of each side withdraw 20 kilometres from this line and disengage.

(2) Provided that the Indian Government agrees to the above proposal, the Chinese Government is willing, through consultation between the two parties, to withdraw its frontier guards in the eastern sector of the border to the north of the line of actual control; at the same time, both China and India undertake not to cross the line of actual control, i.e., the traditional customary line, in the middle and western sectors of the border.

Matters relating to the disengagement of the armed forces of the two parties and the cessation of armed conflict shall be negotiated by officials designated by the Chinese and Indian Government respectively.

(3) The Chinese Government considers that, in order to seek a friendly settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, talks should be held once again by the Prime Ministers of China and India. At a time considered to be appropriate by both parties, the Chinese Government would welcome the Indian Prime Minister to Peking; if this should be inconvenient to the Indian Government, the Chinese Premier would be ready to go to Delhi for talks.

On the very day it received them, the Indian Government hastily rejected the Chinese Government’s three proposals and insisted that the Chinese Government should agree to restore the state of the boundary as it prevailed prior to September 8, 1962, that is to say, India wanted to reoccupy large tracts of Chinese territory so that the Indian troops might regain the position from which they could launch massive armed attacks on the Chinese frontier guards at any time. In his reply to Premier Chou En-lai dated November 14, Prime Minister Nehru put forward even more unreasonable demands, which, on the one hand, required the Chinese Government to agree to the Indian troops reverting to their positions prior to September 8, and, on the other hand, required the Chinese frontier guards not only to withdraw to their positions as on September 8, but to retreat farther in the western sector to the so-called positions of November 7, 1959, as defined for them by India unilaterally, that is, requiring China to cede five to six thousand square miles (thirteen to fifteen thousand square kilometres) more of Chinese territory. In the meantime, the Indian Government, relying on large amounts of U.S. military aid, again launched powerful attacks in the eastern and western sectors of the Sino-Indian border in an obstinate attempt to expand the border conflict.

It is by no means accidental that the Indian Government has taken such an extremely unreasonable attitude. To meet the needs of its internal and external politics, the Indian Government has long pursued the policy of deliberately keeping the Sino-Indian boundary question unsettled, keeping the armed forces of the two countries engaged and maintaining tension along the Sino-Indian border.
Whenever it considered the time favourable, the Indian Government made use of this situation to carry out armed invasion and provocation on the Sino-Indian border, and even went to the length of provoking an armed clash. Or else, it made use of the situation to conduct cold war against China. The experience of many years shows that the Indian Government has invariably tried by hook or by crook to block the path which was opened up by the Chinese Government for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. This policy of the Indian Government runs diametrically counter to the fundamental interests of the Chinese and Indian peoples and the common desires of all the peoples of the world, and serves only the interests of imperialism.

The Chinese Government's three proposals are most fair and reasonable; they are the only proposals capable of averting border clashes, ensuring border tranquillity and bringing about a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. The Chinese Government perseveres in these three proposals. However, the Indian Government has so far rejected these three proposals and continued to expand the border conflict, thus daily aggravating the Sino-Indian border situation. In order to reverse this trend, the Chinese Government has decided to take initiative measures in order to promote the realization of these three proposals.

The Chinese Government hereby declares the following:

(1) Beginning from the day following that of the issuance of the present statement, i.e., from 00:00 hours on November 22, 1962, the Chinese frontier guards will cease fire along the entire Sino-Indian border.

(2) Beginning from December 1, 1962, the Chinese frontier guards will withdraw to positions 20 kilometres behind the line of actual control which existed between China and India on November 7, 1959.

In the eastern sector, although the Chinese frontier guards have so far been fighting back in self-defence on Chinese territory north of the traditional customary line, they are prepared to withdraw from their present positions to the north of the line of actual control, that is, north of the illegal McMahon line, and to withdraw 20 kilometres farther back from that line.

In the middle and western sectors, the Chinese frontier guards will withdraw 20 kilometres from the line of actual control.

(3) In order to ensure the normal movement of the inhabitants in the Sino-Indian border area, forestall the activities of saboteurs and maintain order there, China will set up checkposts at a number of places on its side of the line of actual control with a certain number of civil police assigned to each checkpost. The Chinese Government will notify the Indian Government of the location of these checkposts through diplomatic channels.

These measures taken by the Chinese Government on its own initiative demonstrate its great sincerity for stopping the border conflict and settling the Sino-Indian boundary question peacefully. It should be pointed out, in particular, that, after withdrawing, the
Chinese frontier guards will be far behind their positions prior to September 8, 1962. The Chinese Government hopes that, as a result of the abovementioned initiative measures taken by China, the Indian Government will take into consideration the desires of the Indian people and peoples of the world, make a new start and give a positive response. Provided that the Indian Government agrees to take corresponding measures, the Chinese and Indian Government can immediately appoint officials to meet at places agreed upon by both parties in the various sectors of the Sino-Indian border to discuss matters relating to the 20 kilometres withdrawal of the armed forces of each party to fix a demilitarized zone, the establishment of checkpoints by each party on its side of the line of actual control as well as the return of captured personnel.

When the talks between the officials of the two parties have yielded results and the results have been put into effect, talks can be held by the Prime Ministers of the two countries for further seeking an amicable settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. The Chinese Government would welcome the Indian Prime Minister to Peking; if this should be inconvenient to the Indian Government, the Chinese Premier would be ready to go to Delhi for the talks.

The Chinese Government sincerely hopes that the Indian Government will make a positive response. Even if the Indian Government fails to make such a response in good time, the Chinese Government will take the initiative to carry out the above-mentioned measures as scheduled.

However, the Chinese Government cannot but take into account the following possible eventualities: (1) that the Indian troops should continue their attack after the Chinese frontier guards have ceased fire and when they are withdrawing; (2) that, after the Chinese frontier guards have withdrawn 20 kilometres from the entire line of actual control, the Indian troops should again advance to the line of actual control in the eastern sector, i.e., the illegal McMahon Line and/or refuse to withdraw but remain on the line of actual control in the middle and western sectors; and (3) that, after the Chinese frontier guards have withdrawn 20 kilometres from the entire line of actual control, the Indian troops should cross the line of actual control and recover their positions prior to September 8, that is to say, again cross the illegal McMahon line and reoccupy the Kechilang River area north of the line in the eastern sector, reoccupy Wuje in the Middle sector, and restore their 43 strongpoints for aggression in the Chip Chap River Valley, the Galwan River Valley, the Pangong Lake area, and the Demchok area or set up more strongpoints for aggression on Chinese territory in the western sector. The Chinese Government solemnly declares that, should the above eventualities occur, China reserves the right to strike back in self-defence, and the Indian Government will be held completely responsible for all the grave consequences arising therefrom. The people of the world will then see even more clearly who is peace-loving and who is bellicose, who upholds friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples and Asian-African solidarity and who is undermining them, who is protecting the common interests of the Asian and African peoples in their struggle against imperialism and colonialism and who is violating and damaging these common interests.
The Sino-Indian boundary question is an issue between two Asian countries. China and India should settle this issue peacefully; they should not cross swords on account of this issue and even less allow U.S. imperialism to poke in its hand and develop the present unfortunate border conflict into a war in which Asians are made to fight Asians. It is from its consistent stand of protecting fundamental interests of the Chinese and Indian peoples, strengthening Asian-African solidarity and preserving world peace that the Chinese Government has, after considering the matter over and over, decided to take these important measures. The Chinese Government calls upon all Asian and African countries and all peace-loving countries and people to exert efforts to urge the Indian Government to take corresponding measures so as to stop the border conflict, reopen peaceful negotiations and settle the Sino-Indian boundary question.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 26 November 1962

On November 23, 1962, the Indian Foreign Secretary met the Charge d’Affaires a.i. of the Chinese Embassy in India by appointment and orally asked for clarification on five points relating to the Chinese Government’s Statement of November 21. The Chinese Government gives its answers as follows:

Question: It is stated in point 2 of the Chinese Government’s Statement that Chinese troops will withdraw to positions 20 kilometres behind the line of actual control. Does this refer to the western sector only?

Answer: It is clearly stated in the Chinese Government’s Statement that Chinese frontier guards will withdraw along the entire Sino-Indian border to positions 20 kilometres behind the line of actual control which existed on November 7, 1959. In other words, this applies, without exception, to the western as well as the eastern and middle sectors of the Sino-Indian border.

Question: It is stated in point 2 of the Chinese Government’s Statement that Chinese troops will withdraw 20 kilometres north of the so-called McMahon Line. Where will that be? Will that be behind the positions of September 8, 1962, as suggested by the Indian Government?

Answer: It is clearly stated in the Chinese Government’s Statement that, after withdrawing, the Chinese frontier guards will be far behind their positions prior to September 8, 1962. In the eastern sector the Chinese frontier guards will withdraw to positions 20 kilometres north of the illegal McMahon Line, that is, they will withdraw not only from the Kechilang River and Che Dong area, but also from Le village, Migyitun and Tsayul. China will, of course, continue to exercise administrative jurisdiction in the above-mentioned areas.
Question: The Chinese Government's decision to cease fire and take these measures is China's unilateral action. Where, according to the interpretation of the Chinese side, should the Indian troops be in order not to go against the three measures and to evoke China's reaction?

Answer: It is clearly stated in the Chinese Government's Statement that it is out of its great sincerity for stopping the border conflict and settling the Sino-Indian boundary question peacefully that the Chinese Government is taking these three measures on its own initiative. The Chinese Government sincerely hopes that the Indian Government will give a positive response and take corresponding measures. In other words, it hopes that the Indian armed forces will similarly withdraw 20 kilometres on its side from the line of the actual control along the entire Sino-Indian border. When this is done, the armed forces of the two sides will disengage on an equitable basis, tranquillity along the border will be effectively ensured and recurrence of border clashes will be prevented. It goes without saying that respect by both China and India of the line of actual control up to which each side exercised administrative jurisdiction on November 7, 1959 and an equitable withdrawal of their respective armed forces from this line will in no way prejudice each side's adherence to its claims with regard to the boundary. However, as pointed out in the Chinese Government's Statement, China reserves the right to strike back in self-defence in case, after the Chinese frontier guards have ceased fire and withdrawn, Indian troops should continue to attack the Chinese frontier guards, or again advance to the line of actual control, or refuse to withdraw but remain on the line of actual control, or against cross it.

Question: Will China's checkposts be set up only in the areas within 20 kilometres of what China considers to be the boundary, or in other areas as well? In the middle and western sectors China will probably set up checkposts within 20 kilometres on its side of the customary line, but in the eastern sector will it set up checkposts within 20 kilometres north of the McMahon Line or, for a period of time, south of the line too?

Answer: It is clearly stated in the Chinese Government's Statement that China will set up checkposts at a number of places on its side of the entire line of actual control which existed on November 7, 1959. Therefore, the question of China setting up checkposts south of the line of actual control in the eastern sector does not arise at all. As for the concrete location of the line of actual control of November 7, 1959, reference is made to maps 3 and 5 attached to Premier Chou En-lai's letter of November 15, 1962 addressed to the leaders of Asian and African countries.

Question: The McMahon Line was mentioned in Premier Chou's letters of November 4. India has always held that this line should follow the highest ridge. The map of the McMahon Line is merely a sketch map. If, as China says, one should go by the co-ordinates on the map, 140 square miles of territory would be included into India, which territory, however, is now under the jurisdiction of Tibet. The Indian side hopes that China will clarify as to which delineation it supports.
**Answer:** The so-called McMahon Line is illegal and the Chinese Government has never recognized it. The reason why the Chinese Government pointed out the coordinates of the western extremity of the so-called McMahon Line was to show that Indian troops had crossed this line and intruded into the Kechilang River area. The Indian Government asserts that the so-called McMahon Line should follow the highest ridge. But this is an entirely groundless assertion. The Chinese Government considers that at present both sides should first adopt measures to disengage their armed forces, with the line of actual control of November 7, 1959 as the basic line, and prevent the recurrence of clashes so as to create an atmosphere conducive to boundary negotiations. Both sides should defer the differences on the boundary question for settlement by future negotiations, and refrain from haggling over them now endlessly.

---

**Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, 26 November 1962**

On November 21, 1962 Mr. A. P. Venkateswaran, Deputy Secretary of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, orally asked Mr. Yin Shang-chih, First Secretary of the Chinese Embassy, for clarification on three points relating to the Chinese Government's statement of November 21. The Chinese Embassy replies as follows:

**Question:** Beginning from December 1, the Chinese frontier guards will withdraw 20 kilometres from the line of actual control as on November 7, 1959. Is this line of actual control the one which was interpreted in the People's Daily of November 8?

**Answer:** Beginning from December 1, the Chinese frontier guards will withdraw 20 kilometres from the line of actual control as on November 7, 1959. This line of actual control is described in detail in the letter from Premier Chou En-lai to Prime Minister Nehru dated November 4, and in the letter and attached maps from Premier Chou En-lai to the leaders of Asian and African countries dated November 15; the People's Daily of November 8 can also serve as a reference.

**Question:** According to the Statement, the Chinese frontier guards, after withdrawing 20 kilometres from the line of actual control, will be far behind their positions prior to September 8. How would you define this? Because even according to the so-called line of actual control claimed by China, Chinese troops, after withdrawing 20 kilometres, would still have crossed the line of September 8 at certain places.

**Answer:** The Chinese frontier guards, after withdrawing 20 kilometres from the line of actual control, will be far behind their positions prior to September 8 (reference documents mentioned above). In the eastern sector, China will even have to withdraw its frontier guards in Tsayul and Le Village; in the western sector,
many Chinese posts in the Chip Chap River Valley, the Galwan River Valley, the Kongka Pass, the Pangong lake and the Spanggur lake areas will be withdrawn.

**Question:** Please clarify point (2) of the “possible eventualities” in the Statement.

**Answer:** It means that should the Indian side, taking advantage of the withdrawal by the Chinese side, again advance to the line of actual control or remain on it, this cannot but be regarded as the Indian side deliberately maintaining border tension, preparing for new intrusion at any moment and provoking clashes. The Chinese side hopes that such a situation will not arise.

---

**Letter from Premier Chou En-lai to the Prime Minister of India, 28 November, 1962**

Respected Mr. Prime Minister,

As a result of the cease-fire by the Chinese frontier guards on their own initiative along the entire Sino-Indian border from 00:00 hour November 22, 1962, the unfortunate border conflict between our two countries has come to a halt, and the situation has been eased somewhat. Beginning from December 1, 1962, the Chinese frontier guards, in pursuance of the Chinese Government’s decision, will withdraw on their own initiative all the way to positions on the Chinese side 20 kilometres behind the line of actual control as of November 7, 1959. The moment when the situation takes a turn, I consider it necessary to write to you in directly appealing to the Indian Government to take corresponding measures in good time so that our two sides may jointly move the present situation towards further relaxation.

Your Excellency must have taken note of the Chinese Government’s Statement of November 21. This Statement is very clear in itself. Earlier, on November 19 and 20, I had explained in detail the spirit and substance on this Statement to Mr. Banerjee, the Indian Charge d’Affaires in China. I believe he must have reported back to you. It is regrettable that so far I have failed to get a due response from Your Excellency.

Both our sides are well aware of the differences between us on the boundary question. It is not necessary to repeat them at present. The Chinese Government holds that the present task before our two sides is to terminate the border conflict, separate the armed forces of the two parties and create a proper atmosphere so as to settle confident that these differences can be settled in a friendly way through peaceful negotiations. We should not get these differences entangled with the present task, lest the border conflict could not our boundary differences through negotiations; and we should
be terminated and negotiations could not be started at all. *It was* precisely out of these considerations that the Chinese Government decided to take the lead in ceasing fire and withdrawing its frontier guards.

In taking its decision, the Chinese Government had given full consideration to the decency, dignity and self-respect of both sides. The initiative measures which the Chinese Government has decided to take are not conditional on simultaneous corresponding measures to be taken by the Indian side. According to the Chinese Government's decision, the Chinese frontier guards will withdraw 20 kilometres from the line of actual control of November 7, 1959. That is to say, they will not only evacuate the areas they reached in their recent fight in self-defence but will withdraw to positions far behind those they held on September 3 or October 20, 1962. The line of actual control of November 7, 1959 had taken shape on the basis of the extent of administration by each side at the time; it existed objectively and cannot be defined or interpreted according to the free will of either side. In withdrawing 20 kilometres from this line, the armed forces of each side would be evacuating areas under its own administration; hence the question of one side achieving gains and the other suffering losses does not arise. Moreover, this would not prevent either side from continuing to administer the area evacuated by its armed forces on its side of the line, nor will this prejudice either side's position in regard to the boundary alignment.

I would like to stress that withdrawal by China alone of its frontier guards beyond 20 kilometres on its side of the 1959 line of actual control cannot ensure the disengagement of the armed forces of the two sides, nor can it prevent the recurrence of border clashes. On the contrary, in case the Indian side should refuse to co-operate, even the cease-fire which has been effected is liable to be upset. Therefore, the Chinese Government sincerely hopes that the Indian Government will take corresponding measures. If the Indian Government agrees to do so, I specifically propose that the Governments of our two countries appoint officials to meet at places agreed upon by both parties in the various sectors of the Sino-Indian border to discuss matters relating to the 20-kilometres withdrawal of the armed forces of each party to form a demilitarised zone, the establishment of checkposts by each party on its own side of the line of actual control, and the return of captured personnel.

The meeting of the officials of the two countries will itself be of great positive significance because it will signify the return of our two sides from the battlefield to the conference table. If the meeting of the officials of the two countries achieves results and the results are put into effect, the Prime Ministers of our two countries can then hold talks and proceed further to seek a friendly settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question.

The border conflict in the past month has greatly strained the relations between our two countries. China's Embassy, Consulates, bank establishments and nationals in India have been subjected to treatment which is rarely seen even when war has been formally declared between two states. In my view, such an abnormal state
of affairs unnecessarily poisons the atmosphere between our two countries and obviously should not continue any longer.

Your Excellency Mr. Prime Minister, only a handful of ill-intentioned people in the world want our two countries to keep on fighting. The common friends of our two countries are all heartened by the realization of cease-fire between us. They ardently hope that we will make joint efforts to transform the cease-fire which has been effected into the starting point of a peaceful settlement of the boundary question. The Chinese Government has taken the first steps, i.e., cease-fire, and is going to take the second step, i.e., withdrawal. I hope the Indian Government will give a positive response and make efforts in the same direction. I am awaiting your reply.

Please accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Sd.) CHOU EN-LAI,
Premier of the State Council
of the People's Republic of China

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 November 1962

The clarifications of the Government of China, delivered on the 26th November 1962, are, in several respects, vague and would require further elaboration before the Chinese ceasefire proposals can be fully considered by the Government of India.

Maps 3 and 5 while correctly indicating Demchok area as within the line of actual control of India in the Western sector show large areas of Ladakh including Qiziljilga, Shinglung, Dehra, Samzungling and areas to the west of these locations as within the Chinese line of actual control as on 7th November 1959. A reference to the notes exchanged between the Governments of India and China during the last three years would establish clearly that none of these areas were under Chinese control in November 1959. Some of these areas were occupied by Chinese forces later in 1959 and in 1960 while exchange of notes and discussions at various levels were going on, some other areas were subsequently occupied in 1961 and 1962 upto the beginning of September but about 2,000 square miles more were taken by the Chinese after they mounted their massive attack on 20th October 1962 and after stiff fighting with numerous small Indian posts existing in this area. In view of this factual background the Government of India would be grateful for an objective and factual clarification of the Chinese line of actual control in the Western sector based on the position on the ground as on 7th November 1959 and not on the basis of any theoretical claims or surreptitious or forcible advances made by Chinese forces since then.
Maps 3 and 5 while correctly indicating Khinzemane as within the line of actual control of India have shown the Dhola area (Tse Dong), Longju and Bara Hoti as lying outside it. This is an evident violation of the line of actual control in regard to all these locations. There was a specific understanding with the Chinese Government that Indian police personnel would exercise control in Bara Hoti. In Longju both Governments agreed that neither Chinese nor Indian personnel should occupy the village. However, it is known that Longju lies within the Indian side of the line of control, whereas Migyitun is on the Chinese side. As regards the Dhola area (Tse Dong) this has always been under Indian control till the further Chinese aggression in this area on 8th September 1962. This has been indisputably established in the numerous notes sent by the Government of India to the Government of China since 8th September 1962.

Clarifications were sought on clause 3 of the Chinese ceasefire proposals which referred to the establishment of Chinese civilian checkposts. While vague reference has been made in the original proposal to the possibility of the establishment of checkposts by each party on its side of the line of actual control, no indication has been given in the clarifications on Indian civilian checkposts to be established on the line of actual control. It is presumed that the arrangements for the establishment of checkposts are reciprocal and that Indian civilian checkposts may be established up to the line of actual control.

No indication has been given in the clarifications of the manner in which Civilian checkposts would function to ensure normal movement of the inhabitants or forestall activities of the saboteurs or maintain order. For these purposes, it is presumed that personnel of these civilian checkposts would carry such small arms as are necessary and that there would be a parity both in the number of posts and the number of personnel between Indian and Chinese checkposts.

The memorandum handed over to the Director of the China Division at the Ministry of External Affairs and to the Indian Charge d'Affaires in Peking, stated that “China reserves the right to strike back in self-defence in case, after the Chinese frontier guards have ceased fire and withdrawn, Indian troops should continue to attack the Chinese frontier guards, or again advance to the line of actual control or refuse to withdraw but remain on the line of actual control, or again cross it”. This is in fact a reproduction of the relevant portion of the Chinese statement of 21st November on unilateral ceasefire and withdrawals. Yet, in a further Memorandum sent at 11:00 p.m. on the night of 26th November, a clarification to the same question has been given by the Chinese Embassy as follows: “It means that should the Indian side, taking advantage of the withdrawal by the Chinese side, again advance to the line of actual control or remain on it, this cannot but be regarded as the Indian side deliberately maintaining border tension, preparing for new intrusion at any moment and provoking clashes. The Chinese side hopes that such a situation will not arise”. As this is a substantial modification and not a mere clarification, it is imperative that
the attitude of the Chinese Government to a question that has considerable relevance to effective operation of the unilateral Chinese ceasefire proposals is clearly indicated.

The Memorandum of the Government of China has brushed aside as being mere haggling an extremely relevant query of the Government of India in regard to the alignment of the McMahon Line. It must be clearly understood that since the Chinese Government has defined "the line of actual control" as coinciding in the main with the McMahon Line, no clear interpretation of the ceasefire proposals is possible, when the very alignment of the line of control is vague and unclear. The Chinese clarifications state that the Chinese Government had never recognised the McMahon Line; but surely if the ceasefire proposals are to have any meaning at all, since they are based upon the McMahon Line as the line of actual control, a precise definition of the alignment of the McMahon Line is imperative. If both sides are, as the Chinese clarifications suggest, to defer the differences on the boundary question for settlement by further negotiations and to refrain from haggling over them now, surely the Chinese side should not haggle over Longju and the Kechilang River area which have always been within Indian control till displaced by force by the Chinese in August 1959 and on 8th September, 1962.

Letter from the Prime Minister of India to Premier Chou En-lai, 1 December, 1962

Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

Thank you for your message of 28th November, which was delivered by your Charge d' Affaires to our Foreign Office at midnight, on 28th/29th November, 1962.

In the letters that have been exchanged between us since the further aggression by your forces commenced on 8th September, 1962, the following principles, on the basis of which our differences can be resolved peacefully, have emerged:

(i) We should create a proper atmosphere for peaceful settlement of our differences. (This has also been mentioned in your message of 28th November).

(ii) We should settle our differences in a friendly way through peaceful talks and discussions. (This has also been reiterated in your message of 28th November). If we fail, we can consider what other agreed peaceful method of settling our differences should be adopted (my letter of 27th October, 1962).

(iii) There should be no attempt to force any unilateral demand on either side on account of the advances gained in the recent clashes. (Your letter of 4th November, 1962).
(iv) The necessary preliminaries for talks and discussions suggested should be consistent with the decency, dignity and self-respect of both sides. (Your message of 28th November).

(v) The implementation of these proposed arrangements will not in any way prejudice either side's position in regard to the correct boundary alignment. (Your message of 4th November and your message of 28th November, 1962).

The withdrawal arrangements, however, that you propose, behind what you refer to as “the line of actual control as of November 7, 1959”, are inconsistent with the principles mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

In spite of the clarifications given, I cannot understand how “the line of actual control as of November 7, 1959” can be as delineated in your maps 3 and 5 which were sent as accompaniments to your letter of 15th November to Heads of States/Governments of some Asian-African countries and to which reference was made in the clarifications given regarding “the line of actual control as of November 7, 1959”. I would in this connection refer you to the last but one paragraph of my letter of 14th November, 1962, which gives, what we regard, as the line of actual Chinese control as it existed on the ground on 7th November, 1959.

You have mentioned in your letter that this line cannot be defined or interpreted according to the free will of either side. This is exactly, however, what your Government have done in the clarification given to the Indian Government regarding “the line of actual control as of November 7, 1959”.

What you call “the line of actual control as on November 7, 1959” in the western sector was only a series of isolated military posts. You are aware that in November 1959 there were no Chinese posts of any kind either at Qiziljilga, Shinglung, Dehra, Samzangling or any areas to the west of these locations nor did the Chinese have any posts to the south or west of Spanggur. Despite this, “the line of actual control as on November 7, 1959”, as your Government now claim in Ladakh, is along the line of control established by your forces after the massive attacks mounted since 20th October, 1962. This is a definite attempt to retain under cover of preliminary cease-fire arrangements, physical possession over the area which China claims and to secure which the massive attack since 20th October, 1962, was mounted by your forces. This we cannot agree to. This also violates principles (i), (iii), (iv) and (v) mentioned in paragraph 2 above, which you have been reiterating in all your communications.

The same remarks apply to “the line of actual control as of November 7, 1959” defined by your Government in the central and the eastern sectors. Barahoti, which your Government call Wuje, had never been under Chinese control. As a matter of fact, if you will refer to the past communications on this subject, you would
find that there is an understanding that the administrative control of Barahoti will remain with the Indian side, only unarmed civil administrative personnel being in charge of the area. As regards the eastern sector, Longju was under Indian administrative control till August 1959 when Chinese forces attacked the Indian garrison there. Since then it has not been under the administrative control of either side. Again various communications exchanged between our two Governments would show clearly that Khinzemane and the Dhola region to the south of the Thagla ridge, which the Chinese clarification describe as the Kechilang river and Chedong area, have always been under Indian administrative control till Chinese forces started their further aggression on 8th September, 1962, in this region.

The three-point proposals of October 24, 1962 and the statement on cease-fire and withdrawals of 21st November, 1962, clearly aim at securing physical control of areas which were never under Chinese administrative control either on 7th November, 1959 or at any time prior to 8th September, 1962. These proposals not only violate principles (iii) and (iv) mentioned in para 2 above, but are a definite attempt to prejudice India's position in maintaining its stand as regards the boundary.

You have mentioned in your message of 28th November that "the initiative measures which the Chinese Government have decided to take are not conditional on simultaneous corresponding measures to be taken by the Indian side". And yet, later on in your message you state "that withdrawal by China alone of its frontier guards beyond 20 kilometres on its side of the 1959 line of actual control cannot ensure the disengagement of the armed forces of the two sides, nor can it prevent the recurrence of border clashes. On the contrary, in case the Indian side should refuse to co-operate, even the cease-fire which has been effected is liable to be upset." These observations appear to be contradictory. In any case, if the Government of India are to take any attitude to the so-called unilateral measures of cease-fire and withdrawals announced by the Chinese Government, they must clearly know what the "line of actual control as of November 7, 1959" is, nor can that line be unilaterally determined by the Chinese Government either on the basis of their alleged claims or on the basis of the position reached as a result of their further aggression.

In the light of the above, I would once again commend for your acceptance the clear and straightforward proposal made by us, namely, at least the status quo prior to 8th September, 1962, should be restored so that the necessary atmosphere for reverting to peaceful processes may be created. There is no danger of any clashes under this arrangement if both sides are genuinely sincere in their desire to revert to paths of peace. As you know, the earlier minor clashes occurred because your forces attacked the small Indian patrols of posts guarding against surreptitious aggressive intrusions in Indian territory which had been going on since 1957, and the major clashes started since 8th September, 1962, when your forces started an unprovoked wanton invasion of Indian territory.
Our Foreign Office has presented a written note to your Charge d’Affaires in Delhi on 30th November for further clarification of "the line of actual control as on November 7, 1959". I hope that the written memorandum presented by our Foreign Office and my present letter will result in positive clarifications on this rather confusing and complicated question of what you call "the line of actual control as of November 7, 1959".

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) JAWAHARLAL NEHRU.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 8 December 1962

1. In compliance with the request of the Indian Government, the Government of China has twice made clarifications concerning its statement of November 21, 1962, which is itself very clear. But the Indian Government alleged in its memorandum delivered on November 30 that the Chinese clarifications are "vague and would require further elaboration before the Chinese ceasefire proposals can be fully considered by the Government of India". While failing so far to make a positive response to the three measures taken by the Chinese Government on its own initiative, the Indian Government has created side issues and time and again raised meaningless and trouble-making questions, asking for clarifications from the Chinese Government. The Government of China cannot but express deep regret at this line of action taken by the Indian Government out of unrevealed motives.

2. In its memorandum, the Indian Government distorted the November 7, 1959 line of actual control in an attempt to deny the Chinese Government’s exercise of administrative jurisdiction over large tracts of Chinese territory. The Chinese Government resolutely refutes such a groundless argument.

A. The Chinese Government has already set forth in detail in its many previous documents facts about the Chinese Government’s exercise of administrative jurisdiction over the vast areas on the Chinese side of the traditional customary line in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border. Chinese administrative jurisdiction has extended right up to the traditional customary line, the areas including Qiziljilga, Shinglung, Dehra, Samzungling and places to the west of these locations have without exception been under the effective jurisdiction of China. By intentionally confusing the extent of
China's administrative jurisdiction and the location of China's frontier posts, the Indian Government attempts to prove that China's jurisdiction has not reached these areas. The very premise of this argument is wrong. But, even speaking of frontier posts, China had set up before November 7, 1959 seven posts close by the traditional customary line, with the northernmost one near the Karakoram Pass and the southernmost one near Spanggur Lake and with close ground contact maintained among these posts and between them and the rear. It is precisely because of the effective jurisdiction exercised by the Chinese Government that when armed Indian personnel on two occasions in September 1958 and July 1959 sneaked into these areas they were promptly detained by Chinese frontier guards, and that when armed Indian personnel intruded into Kongka Pass and provoked a border conflict in October 1959, they were immediately repulsed. Apart from these three occasions, not a single Indian personnel had entered these areas before 1961. What the Indian side had been able to do since then was confined to the establishment of 43 strongpoints of aggression within 20 kilometres on the Chinese side of the line of actual control, and the Indian side was able to do this surreptitiously only by taking advantage of China's unilateral cessation of border patrols. In order to resist Indian intrusions, beginning from May 1962 the Chinese side restored its patrols in these desolate border areas and set up a number of new frontier posts. Thus there had arisen prior to September 8, 1962 a situation of the posts of the two sides confronting each other in a manner of interlocked jigsaw puzzle within 20 kilometres on the Chinese side of the line of actual control in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border.

B. In the eastern and middle sectors of the Sino-Indian border, India tried to describe the Che Dong area, Longju and Wuje as situated on the Indian side of the line of actual control. This is wholly groundless.

Regarding the Che Dong area, China has in its previous notes and statements repeatedly given incontestable proof that this area is to the north of the illegal McMahon Line and under China's effective jurisdiction. There is no need to repeat it here.

Longju is a village in the Migyitun area, and India itself has admitted that Migyitun is situated to the north of the illegal McMahon Line. This village was invaded and occupied by Indian troops in June 1959, but was recovered by China after the armed conflict instigated by Indian troops in August 1959. Following that, China not only restored its administrative control over Longju, but also maintained a post there for a period of time. The Indian memorandum alleges that both sides agreed that neither Chinese nor Indian personnel should occupy the village. This is pure fabrication. It is appropriate to ask: When and in what manner did the two Governments agree to refrain from "occupying" Longju? It is impossible for the Indian Government to produce any definite evidence on this question.

As for Wuje, the Indian Government is clearly aware that, owing to the intrusion of Indian troops into this area after 1954, an agreement of non-stationing of either side's troops there was reached
between China and India on the initiative of China. However, there has never been any interruption in China's administrative control over the place. The Indian memorandum asserts that “there was a specific understanding with the Chinese Government that Indian police personnel would exercise control in Bara Hoti (Wuje)”. This is also pure fabrication. It is appropriate to ask: When and in what manner did the Chinese Government agree to the “control” of Wuje by Indian police personnel? On this question too, it is impossible for the Indian Government to produce any definite evidence.

The line of actual control of November 7, 1959 was a result of India's forcible violation of the traditional customary line and its seizure of large tracts of Chinese territory. China has already shown great forbearance and accommodation by renewing the proposal of taking this line as the base line for the withdrawal and separation of the armed forces of the two sides. It goes without saying that this line is not the final boundary line between China and India. Yet now India is not satisfied with this, but attempts to describe the Chinese territory which India has never occupied or has failed in its attempt to occupy as situated on the Indian side of the line of actual control of November 7, 1959. This is most unreasonable.

3. Regarding the question of checkposts, the Chinese Government's statement of November 21 made it quite clear that after the withdrawal of the Chinese frontier guards, China will establish checkposts on its own side of the line of actual control. Of course, China will have no objection to India's establishing checkposts on the Indian side of the line and manning them with an appropriate number of civil police equipped with weapons for self-defence. The memorandum, however, poses the so-called question of establishing checkposts on the line. If this is not deliberate trouble-making, it shows that India intends to edge into the Chinese side of the line of actual control on the pretext of establishing checkposts. This is absolutely impermissible. As for details relating to the establishment of checkposts, it has also been clearly explained in the Chinese Government's statement that they can be discussed and settled by the officials to be designated by the Governments of the two countries. While avoiding saying whether it is prepared to make a positive response to the three measures taken by China on China's own initiative, the Indian side unwarrantedly asked China to clarify the details. This was obviously deliberate haggling and evading an answer to the substantive question.

4. It is clearly stated in the Chinese Government's statement in what eventualities China reserves the right to strike back in self-defence after the cease-fire and withdrawal of the Chinese frontier guards. This stand of China's was further explained in the Chinese memorandum of November 25. The hope was expressed in the Chinese memorandum of November 26 that the possible eventualities mentioned in the statement of the Chinese Government might not occur. The stand of the Chinese Government is consistent. But the Indian Government asserted that China's clarification on November 26 was "a substantial modification and not a mere clarification". It may be asked: What is the substantial difference between China's reservation of the right to strike back in self-defence under certain circumstances and its simultaneously expressed hope that such
circumstances might not occur? The Indian Government has been either deliberately refusing to understand China's statement and clarifications, or intentionally making trouble. Should the Indian side further try to seek loopholes in China's clarification in order to make new provocations, the Chinese Government must point out here that this is dangerous and will never bring India any good.

5. By means of oral and written explanations and of maps, China has made it clear in detail the location of the line of actual control as of November 7, 1959 in the eastern sector and its relation with the illegal McMahon Line. Since the Indian side advanced to the illegal McMahon Line, both sides have been clearly aware of the extent of each other's administrative control. In other words, there objectively existed between the two sides a line of actual control formed by the extent of each side's administrative control. This was the line of actual control of November 7, 1959 as pointed out by China. Since November 7, 1959, the only dispute between the two sides has concerned the Che Dong area. This also proves that both sides are clear about and have no differences over the location of this line of actual control. There is nothing vague about the Chinese Government's proposal to take this perfectly clear line of actual control as the base line for separating the armed forces of the two sides, and no clarification whatsoever is needed.

The Che Dong area has always been under China's administrative jurisdiction. If India takes exception to this fact, the only thing it can go by is the original 1914 map, and cannot be any so-called geographical principle laid down by India unilaterally. While the so-called Thagla ridge on which India bases itself in unilaterally defining the alignment of the illegal McMahon Line in this area is not to be found on the original 1914 map, the coordinates which are clearly there indisputably show that the Che Dong area is to the north of the illegal McMahon Line. The Indian side has been haggling about this question and held that it has the right to define unilaterally the specific location of the illegal McMahon Line. This is clearly an attempt to create confusion about the 1959 line of actual control, which is very clear itself.

6. The November 21 statement of the Chinese Government is explicit and contains nothing vague. Many of the points raised by India for clarification were no questions at all, some of them were even deliberately raised to confuse right and wrong, and the object was nothing but putting off any response to the measures which China has taken on its own initiative.

It should be pointed out that what is really vague is the attitude of the Indian Government. The Indian Government faces a series of questions to which it cannot long avoid giving a frontal answer. These questions are:

(1) Does the Indian Government agree, or does it not agree, to a cease-fire? In the western and eastern sectors of the Sino-Indian border, Indian troops and aircraft have taken advantage of the fact that the Chinese frontier troops have ceased fire and begin to withdraw on China's own initiative, to make provocations against them. This is a grave
signal. It is now for the Indian Government to clarify whether the Indian troops intend to continue their provocations against the Chinese frontier troops.

(2) Does the Indian Government agree, or does it not agree, that the armed forces of the two sides should disengage and withdraw 20 kilometres each from the November 7, 1959 line of actual control? The Indian Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs Mrs. Menon openly declared in Colombo on December 4 that India would move its troops right up to the so-called McMahon Line and that India must gain control of the passes in the "Northeast frontier Agency". It must be stressed that the Chinese frontier guards are withdrawing from the nearly 20,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory north of the traditional customary line in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border in order to urge the Indian Government to make a positive response and seek a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. Now it is for the Indian Government to clarify whether the above statement made by the Indian Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs represents the official reply of the Indian Government to the fact that the Chinese frontier guards have ceased fire and begun to withdraw on China's own initiatives.

(3) Does the Indian Government agree, or does it not agree, that officials of the two sides should meet and discuss matters relating to the 20 kilometre withdrawal of the armed forces of each party from the line of actual control of November 7, 1959 to form a demilitarized zone, the establishment of checkpoints by each party on its side of the line of actual control as well as the return of captured personnel. The Chinese side is prepared, in the officials' meeting, to discuss with the Indian side any specific details relating to the above-mentioned matters.

It is hoped that the Indian Government will give a clear and definite reply.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 December, 1962

The Memorandum handed over to the Indian Embassy at Peking by the Chinese Foreign Office on 9th December, 1962, apart from containing three questions couched in a peremptory and dictatorial tone, is replete with factual distortions.

It is utterly fallacious to state that the Chinese Government have already set forth in detail in their many previous documents facts about their exercise of administrative jurisdiction over vast areas on the Chinese side of what they refer to as the traditional and customary line in the Western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary.
During the talks of the Officials of the two Governments in 1960 the Chinese side brought forward no evidence at all of having administered even the Aksai Chin area, let alone regions further west stretching up to their so-called line of actual control. The Indian side, on the other hand, produced considerable evidence of tax collection, revenue assessment, maintenance of law and order and construction of public works in this area. All that Chinese officials were able to show were unsubstantiated claims to have collected taxes in the Aksai Chin. The only document they could produce which they claimed referred to the Aksai Chin and Lingzi Tang areas was a petition from the Governor of Sinkiang in 1927 and an order passed the next year by the Chinese Government in that connection. A careful study of the document would indicate that it did not refer at all the Aksai Chin, but to an area north of the Kuen Lun range. Despite the Chinese claim that the Aksai Chin and Lingzi Tang areas since the 18th century had been extensively used for salt mining, pasturing and grazing, not a single document from either the archives of the Sinkiang Administration or from contemporary records or accounts was produced by them to establish the prevalence of this practice. To state brazenly that documents are available establishing the fact of Chinese administration up to their so-called traditional and customary line is patently fallacious when they are unable to produce evidence of administrative control even in the Aksai Chin region.

The Chinese Memorandum in referring to three incidents in 1958 and 1959 between Indian and Chinese forces states that “apart from these three occasions not a single Indian personnel had entered these areas before 1961”. The facts are that Indian official survey parties and patrols have constantly visited this area even after 1950, the year when the Chinese Government falsely claimed that they were present in the Aksai Chin area. In 1951, a group went from Leh to Lingzi Tang and Aksai Chin. In 1952, a party went up to Lanak La via Kongka Pass. In 1954 and 1956, patrols went to Lanak La. In September 1957, a party went to the Qara Tagh pass via Shamallungpa. In the summer of 1958, another party went to Sarigh-Jilganang and Amtoghar lake regions. The entire area was constantly being patrolled by Indian officials. These facts were very clearly brought to the notice of the Chinese side during the discussion of the officials in 1960, though the Chinese Government now choose to ignore all knowledge of these facts.

The Chinese Memorandum states that beginning from May 1962, in order to resist Indian intrusions, “the Chinese side restored its patrols in these desolate areas and set up a number of new frontier posts.” The patent falsehood of this assertion is established by the fact that, well before May 1962, the Indian Government had protested on numerous occasions on aggressive Chinese forward patrolling, on harassment of Indian personnel proceeding on normal duties and on establishment of military posts in the Western sector. The Government of India’s notes of 2nd July 1958, 8th November 1958, 30th July 1959, 4th November 1959, 31st October 1961 provide ample evidence of aggressive forward patrolling and establishment of military posts by Chinese forces throughout this earlier period.
While the Chinese Government has continued to make statements that the “Che Dong” area is north of the McMahon Line and within its effective jurisdiction, it has in no way substantiated it with what the Chinese Memorandum refers to as “incontestable proof that it was under China’s effective jurisdiction”. On the contrary, the Government of India have, time and again, given detailed facts to prove that this area has been under the direct administrative control of the Government apart from the substantive fact of its being south of the highest watershed ridge which forms the McMahon Line in this area. There is evidence in writing even as recently as August 1953 by the Chinese official at Tsona in Tibet to the effect that taxes collected should be deposited with the Government of India. The baseless character of the Chinese assertion has been very clearly indicated in the Indian Government note of 16th October, 1962.

Reference in this connection is invited to the comments under “Eastern Sector” in the Memorandum attached to the Prime Minister of India’s letter of 14th November to Prime Minister Chou En-lai. The Chinese authorities should state clearly whether they accept the highest watershed principle or want to follow strictly the coordinates given in the 1914 maps. If they follow the latter for the purpose of supporting their so-called claim to the “Che Dong area”, they should be prepared to accept on the same analogy that the areas of Migyitun and Tu Lung La should form part of Indian territory.

In referring to Longju, the Memorandum very boldly asserts: “The Indian Memorandum alleges that both sides agreed that neither Chinese nor Indian personnel should occupy the village. This is pure fabrication. It is appropriate to ask: When and in what manner did the two Governments agree to refrain from ‘occupying’ Longju? It is impossible for the Indian Government to produce any definite evidence on this question”. The Chinese Government is requested to refer to para 3 of the letter dated 17th December, 1959, of Premier Chou En-lai to the Prime Minister of India, in which it has been stated as follows:

“Pending the above-mentioned agreement, the Chinese Government, in a conciliatory spirit and out of the desire to move towards the withdrawal of armed forces along the entire border, is prepared to agree first to reach a partial solution by applying the proposal you have made in your letter for the non-stationing of the armed forces of both sides at Longju to the other disputed places on the border as well.”

In regard to Wuje, the Chinese Government will recollect that in their Note of 13th September, 1959, the Government of India had mentioned that: “if the Government of China are not agreeable to this suggestion the Government of India will continue as in previous years to send its civil personnel to exercise jurisdiction over an area which the Government of India have always considered as part of Indian territory. Such personnel, however, will not carry any arms”. No reply was received to this communication and the Government of India have been sending Indian police personnel to Bara Hoti during the summer season.
The attitude of the Government of India to the three questions posed by the Government of China has been indicated by the Prime Minister of India in his statement in the Indian Parliament on 10th December, 1962:

(1) The cease-fire and withdrawal declaration by the Government of China was a unilateral one. But in so far as the cease-fire is concerned, nothing has been done by the Indian side to impede the implementation of the cease-fire declaration.

(2) India is in favour of the dis-engagement of the forces of the two sides on the basis of a commonly agreed arrangement. Such an arrangement, however, can only be on the basis of undoing the further aggression committed by the Government of China on Indian territory on the 8th September, 1962. If the Government of China dispute that a particular area is Indian territory, this is a matter for juridical or the like decision. The fact, however, is that the areas in which aggression had been committed by China had long been in Indian occupation and this is something which cannot be disputed. The Government of India have given their understanding of the so-called line of actual control of November 7, 1959. They do not agree with the Chinese interpretation which is not in accordance with the facts. These facts can, as evidenced by the instances given in the earlier part of this Memorandum, be determined from the correspondence between the two Governments during the last five years. The Government of China cannot expect India to agree to the so-called line of actual control of November 7, 1959, which is manifestly not in accordance with facts.

(3) It is obvious that if the officials of the two sides are to meet, they must have clear and precise instructions as to the cease-fire and withdrawal arrangements which they are supposed to implement. Unless they receive these instructions, which must be the result of an agreement between the two Governments of India and China, they will be unable to function. Therefore, it has to be determined previously which line is to be implemented. Between the line of actual control immediately prior to the 8th September, 1962, and that on the 7th November, 1959, as defined by Chinese Government, there is a difference of about 2,500 square miles of Indian territory which China has occupied as a result of invasion and massive attacks during the last three months. The Government of India cannot agree to the Chinese authorities retaining the advantages secured by this latest invasion of Indian territory.

The Government of India regret that the Chinese authorities are deliberately confusing the line of actual control as on 7th November, 1959, with their so-called territorial claims, particularly in the Western sector, and holding out threats of counter-attack if this arbitrary line of actual control is not accepted by the Government of India. This is clearly inconsistent with the Chinese Government's professions of their desire for dis-engagement of the forces of the two sides based on line of actual control prior to the invasion and the clashes with a view to reverting to the processes of peaceful talks and discussions to resolve the differences between the two Governments on the question of the India-China boundary.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 27 December 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government, dated May 31, 1962, has the honour to state as follows:—

In a number of its previous notes the Chinese Government has repeatedly and patiently made it clear to the Indian Government that, in view of the fact that the Sino-Indian boundary has not yet been formally delimited, no specific provisions have been made in the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty regarding the tri-junction of China, Burma and India. However, the Indian Government has all along persisted in its subjective and one-sided assertion that this tri-junction has already been defined in the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty. Furthermore, it wants to impose such a distorted interpretation on the signatories. The Chinese Government cannot but express once again its deep regret at the Indian Government’s repeated and unreasonable haggling over the matter.

It is not difficult to see from the five Indian notes, and particularly from its note of May 31, that the Indian Government has been so endlessly harping on the subject simply because the conclusion of the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty has provided a powerful circumstantial evidence which once again refutes the Indian contention that the Sino-Indian boundary has long been delimited, thus leaving the Indian side with no tenable ground in the Sino-Indian boundary dispute. But that the Sino-Indian boundary has never been formally delimited is a fact which can by no means be altered. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will face up to this objective fact and not keep haggling over the question of the tri-junction of China, Burma and India. To continue the present Indian practice will be of no avail and deserve no further reply from the Chinese Government.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 29 December, 1962

The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs has received the memorandum of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated December 19, 1962. This memorandum once again shows that the Indian Government is deliberately creating side issues, reversing right and wrong, insisting on a reversion to the state of the boundary of September 8, 1962 and seeking pretexts for refusing to respond positively to China’s proposed measures of cease-fire, withdrawal and holding of
officials’ meeting. This unreasonable position of the Indian Government runs completely counter to the five principles for a peaceful settlement of the differences between China and India as summed up in Prime Minister Nehru’s letter to Premier Chou En-lai dated December, 1, 1962.

1. Concerning the western sector of the Sino-Indian border.

The whole vast area on the Chinese side of the traditional customary line in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border is part of Chinese territory; it has always been under China’s effective jurisdiction and has never been administered by India. This is an inmovable fact which the Indian Government can by no means overthrow by sheer fabrications. The Indian Government cannot deny that up till 1958 it had never disputed the fact of the Chinese Government’s exercise of effective jurisdiction over this area. But later it fished out some spurious historical evidence and tried in a farfetched way to describe this area as belonging to India. During the meeting of the officials of both countries in 1960, the Indian side argued in the following way. First, it groundlessly claimed that the area of 27,000 square kilometres including Aksai Chin and Linghithang was administered by a small village called Tanktse. Then it produced some evidence to show that Tanktse was under India’s jurisdiction. Accordingly, it concluded that Aksai Chin and Linghithang belonged to India. Such an absurd and ridiculous way of argument certainly cannot be regarded as serious. In contrast, the evidence cited by the Chinese side proved indisputably that the Chinese Government exercised effective jurisdiction over the whole area in the western sector, including the maintenance of administrative organs, patrolling, control of the passes, check on travellers, collection of taxes, extensive exploration and surveys, and the building of public works. The 1927 document referred to in the Indian memorandum is one of the many convincing documents cited by the Chinese side. This document proves clearly and unmistakably that the Aksai Chin and Linghithang area was under the jurisdiction of Hotien of Sinkiang. China had exercised effective jurisdiction over this area for hundreds of years. The Government of the People’s Republic of China took over this area from the Government of old China in 1950 and has continued to exercise effective jurisdiction there. The Indian side, on the other hand, had had no knowledge of the actual state of affairs in this area up till 1958. No wonder by September 10, 1959 Prime Minister Nehru still stated in the Indian Rajya Sabha that the said area in the western sector “has not been under any kind of administration.” That was of course true so far as the Indian Government was concerned. That statement of Prime Minister Nehru completely overthrows all the so-called evidence the Indian side has produced to prove past Indian administration in this area.

The Indian Government cannot deny the fact that Indian military personnel were detained or repulsed by the Chinese side on all the three occasions when they illegally intruded into this area in the western sector in September 1958, July 1959 and October 1959. Nevertheless, it tried to prove that Indian personnel had entered the area before 1961 on more occasions than those three. It pretentiously asserted that even after 1950, in 1951, 1952, 1954, 1956 and 1957 Indian
survey teams and patrol parties constantly reached this area. This assertion was entirely groundless. During the meeting of the officials of both countries, the Chinese side asked the Indian officials to their faces whether they could provide evidence to bear out their assertion, but the Indian side could not produce even a single evidence. Furthermore, anyone with common sense will ask: If indeed the Indian side had constantly patrolled this area before 1958, why should it have failed to discover that Chinese frontier guards frequented this area and that a highway involving gigantic engineering work was surveyed and built there?

The Indian memorandum has cited the Indian Government's notes dated July 2, 1958, November 8, 1958, July 30, 1959 and November 4, 1959 respectively in an attempt to prove that the Chinese side did not stop its patrols in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border. This is ludicrous to the extreme. The Chinese side had never said that it would stop its border patrols before the Kongka Pass incident took place on October 20-21, 1959. The citing of these notes in the Indian memorandum not only is pointless, but exactly proves that Chinese border patrols reached the traditional customary line. It was only after the Kongka Pass incident that the Chinese Government ordered the Chinese frontier guards to stop patrolling along the entire Sino-Indian boundary. When the Chinese Government's proposal of November 7, 1959 for the armed forces of each side to withdraw and stop patrolling was rejected, the Chinese frontier guards further stopped patrolling within twenty kilometres on China's side of the line of actual control. In his letter to Prime Minister Nehru dated December 17, 1959, Premier Chou En-lai notified the Indian Government of the decision of the Chinese Government. During a period of more than two years, the Chinese frontier guards strictly carried out this order. The allegation that China continued its patrols, which was made in the Indian note dated October 31, 1962 referred to in the Indian memorandum, was a total fabrication which was already thoroughly refuted by the Chinese Government in its previous notes. As a matter of fact, it was not until May 1962 that the Chinese frontier guards were ordered to resume patrolling in the western sector in order to resist the increasing intrusions and provocations of Indian troops. This decision was also notified to the Indian Government by the Chinese Government in its note of April 30, 1962. Chinese actions, whether stopping or resuming border patrols, have always been open and above-board, and no fault can be found with them by the Indian Government.

2. Concerning the Che Dong area.

Ever since the Indian side pushed up to the entire illegal McMahon Line, both sides have been clearly aware of the location of the line of actual control of November 7, 1959 in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border. The dispute over the Che Dong area was caused by the Indian side which, taking advantage of China's cessation of patrols, crossed the illegal McMahon Line in June 1962, and in September launched armed provocations. The Indian side alleged that the Che Dong area is south of the illegal McMahon Line. But the only so-called basis which India can rely upon is the original map of the illegal McMahon Line in the possession of both China and
According to the original map, the Che Dong area is clearly situated to the north of the illegal McMahon Line. And the Indian military sketch map captured by China in the recent border conflict also clearly shows the Che Dong area as north of the illegal McMahon Line. No matter how it haggles, the Indian Government cannot deny that its deliberate crossing of the illegal McMahon Line and occupation of the Che Dong area north of the Line were an undisguised act of aggression and provocation.

The question of the Che Dong area is a very simple one, and the merits of the case are quite clear. But now the Indian Government is creating side issues by entangling the specific dispute over the Che Dong area with the question of the delimitation of the entire boundary in the eastern sector. The Indian memorandum referred to the comments under “eastern sector” in the memorandum attached to the Indian Prime Minister's letter of November 14 to Premier Chou En-lai, and asked China to state whether it accepts the watershed principle or the coordinates principle. In its December 8 memorandum to the Indian Government and the text of the remarks made on the same day by the spokesman of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs which was handed over to the Indian Embassy in China on December 9, the Chinese Government has thoroughly refuted these comments and fully expounded its own viewpoint. The eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary has not yet been defined through negotiations, and so the question as to what principle China should accept in delimiting the boundary does not arise. The only line that exists in the eastern sector is the line of actual control marking each side's extent of administration. Both the Migyitun and Tulung Pass areas are on the Chinese side of the line, and no objections had ever been raised by the Indian Government. The Indian side now tries to create a fresh dispute over the Migyitun and Tulung Pass areas to cover up its aggression in the Che Dong area; this is completely futile.

The Indian memorandum referred to a so-called document of 1953. This document, far from substantiating India's case, is a protest to India's attempt to expand its aggression after occupying Tawang of Tibet in February 1951. It can be seen from the document that, although the Indian side tried to occupy the pasture of the inhabitants of the Le village and exacted grazing fees (i.e., taxes, as described in the Indian memorandum) from them, they still maintained that the pasture belonged to them. India's aggressive ambition did not succeed. In fact, the Che Dong area had been under China's effective jurisdiction through the whole period from 1951 to the recent Indian intrusion.

3. Concerning Longju.

In its memorandum, the Indian Government quoted a passage from Premier Chou En-lai's letter of December 17, 1959 as proof that both sides had agreed to refrain from occupying Longju. Premier Chou En-lai's proposal, however, was very clear, namely, both sides should refrain from stationing armed personnel in other disputed places on the border as well as in Longju. And those places were specifically mentioned in Premier Chou En-lai's letter, i.e., Khaszemane, Farligas,
Shipki Pass, Sang, Tsungsha, Puling-sumdo, Chuva, Chuje, Sangcha and Lapthal. That proposal was an integral whole and must not be taken apart. It was not accepted by the Indian Government. How then can it be held that both sides had agreed to refrain from stationing armed personnel in Longju? The Indian Government is indeed arbitrary to the extreme in so unscrupulously and wilfully distorting Premier Chou En-lai's letter in order to justify its own unreasonable stand.


A similar trick was played by the Indian Government in connection with the Wuje question. The Indian Government is well aware that China has always maintained that Wuje is Chinese territory. How could the Chinese Government, which rejected as unacceptable the Indian Government's proposals for both sides to refrain from sending civil personnel to Wuje, agree to the even more unreasonable demand for the Indian side alone to control the area by sending its civil personnel there? It is inconceivable that the Chinese Government would accept such an unreasonable demand. As a matter of fact, either before or after 1959, there has not been a single case where the Chinese Government failed to lodge a protest with India when it sent its so-called civil personnel to enter the Wuje area illegally.

5. Concerning the question of cease-fire.

The Chinese Government has taken note of the indication that "nothing has been done by the Indian side to impede the implementation of the cease-fire declaration." It must be pointed out, however, that non-impediment in China's unilateral cease-fire is not the same as India's formal agreement to a cease-fire. That is why the present state of cease-fire is still unstable. Since China unilaterally effected a cease-fire, Indian troops have, in the western sector, repeatedly intruded into the Spanggur Lake area; in the eastern sector, they frequently followed on the heels of and provoked the withdrawing Chinese troops. Indian aircraft also have repeatedly violated China's air space. The previous border clashes instigated by India were all the result of gradual development of such provocative activities. The fact that the Indian side now returns to its old ways while the Chinese frontier guards are withdrawing on China's own initiative cannot but arouse the serious attention of China and those Asian and African countries that take interest in a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question.

The first of the five principles for a peaceful settlement of the differences between China and India as enumerated by Prime Minister Nehru in his letter of December 1 to Premier Chou En-lai is: "We should create a proper atmosphere for peaceful settlement of our differences." There is no doubt that the measures of cease-fire, withdrawal and the repatriation of sick and wounded Indian military personnel taken by China on its own initiative conform to this principle. However, the Indian side has not only continued provocations along the border and stepped up its arms expansion and war preparations, but adopted a series of measures deliberately
aimed at poisoning the relations between the two countries. In unilateral violation of agreement, the Indian Government has closed down its consulates-general in China and has compelled China to do likewise. The Indian authorities have subjected Chinese nationals in India to ruthless persecution and threw more than 2,000 of them into concentration camps. The Indian Government has even decided to censor mail and telegrams between China and India. These acts taken by the Indian Government are in complete contravention of the above-mentioned principle.

6. Concerning the question of disengagement.

The Chinese Government has noted that the Indian Government is in favour of the disengagement of the armed forces of the two sides on the basis of a commonly agreed arrangement. The Indian Government, however, holds that "such an arrangement can only be on the basis of undoing the further aggression committed by the Government of China on Indian territory on the 8th September, 1962." The Chinese Government has repeatedly and exhaustively proved that the so-called state of the border of September 8 was the position in which India had further occupied large tracts of Chinese territory by armed force since November 7, 1959, and from which Indian troops launched massive armed attacks against the Chinese frontier guards. To restore that position would be against the principle that the boundary question should only be settled through negotiations and that it is impermissible to create a fait accompli by the use of force. Therefore, it is absolutely unacceptable to the Chinese Government. The Indian memorandum describes the state of the border prior to September 8, 1962 as a line. This is wholly untenable. The state of the border prior to September 8 was one in which the positions of the two sides were interlocked in a jigsaw puzzle fashion and which could by no means form a common base line for separating the armed forces of the two sides.

The Indian memorandum charges that the line of actual control of November 7, 1959 put forward by China is inconsistent with the fact. The sole ground for this charge advanced by the Indian Government is the allegation made in the memorandum attached to Prime Minister Nehru's letter to Premier Chou En-lai dated November 14, 1962 to the effect that the position of the line of actual control should be the locations of the Chinese frontier posts. This allegation has been thoroughly refuted in the remarks of the spokesman of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs on December 8, 1962 and in the memorandum of the Chinese Government to the Indian Government of the same date. It was pointed out that the extent of administration should not be confused with the location of frontier posts and that, so far as the frontier posts are concerned, long before November 7, 1959 China had set up a series of posts on the Chinese side close to the line of actual control of November 7, 1959. The difference was border. The Indian Government cannot deny these facts, no matter how it may prevaricate. It is true that there is a difference between the positions held by Indian troops prior to September 8, 1962 and the line of actual control in the western sector of the Sino-Indian estimated in the Indian memorandum is about 2,500 square miles. However, this difference was precisely created by India through perfidious armed encroachments on Chinese territory in the past three
years by taking advantage of the Chinese frontier guards' cessation of patrols. This difference created by India through armed aggression can neither negate nor change the line of actual control of November 7, 1959. On the contrary, it precisely proves that it is most fair and reasonable to take this 1959 line as the base line for the disengagement of the armed forces of the two sides.

The third of the five principles raised by Prime Minister Nehru is purportedly quoted from Premier Chou En-lai's letter of November 4 to Prime Minister Nehru. The following are the original words of Premier Chou En-lai: “The fact that the Chinese Government's proposal has taken as its basis the 1959 line of actual control and not the present line of actual contact between the armed forces of the two sides is full proof that the Chinese side has not tried to force any unilateral demand on the Indian side on account of the advances gained in the recent counter-attack in self-defence.” The principle contained in this sentence is perfectly clear, and that is, both sides should respect the 1959 line of actual control and neither side should alter this line by armed force and impose a fait accompli on the other side. It is precisely on this principle that the Chinese side proposed to take the 1959 line of actual control as the base line for separating the armed forces of the two sides and is withdrawing on its own initiative from the close to 20,000 square kilometres of territory south of this line in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border. In insisting on a reversion to the state of the border prior to September 8, 1962, the Indian side has precisely gone against this principle by demanding that China should accept India's encroachment on large tracts of Chinese territory through violating this line of actual control by armed force since 1959.

The fourth of the five principles raised by Prime Minister Nehru requires that the measures taken by both sides “should be consistent with the decency, dignity and self-respect of both sides.” According to the Chinese Government's proposal for the armed forces of each side to withdraw 20 kilometres from the November 7, 1959 line of actual control the Chinese frontier guards would have to withdraw not only from vast tracts of territory south of the 1959 line of actual control in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, but another 20 kilometres from the 1959 line of actual control along the entire border. Thus they will in fact withdraw to positions far behind those they held on September 8, 1962. This represents China's greatest regard for the decency, dignity and self-respect of India. India, however, insists on its unreasonable demand to restore the state of the border prior to September 8, 1962, which is by no means consistent with China's decency, dignity and self-respect.

The last of the five principles raised by Prime Minister Nehru specifies that measures proposed by both sides “will not in any way prejudice either side's position in regard to the correct boundary alignment.” This has been the consistent stand of the Chinese Government. But India has insisted on a reversion to the state of the border prior to September 8, 1962 as a precondition for holding negotiations. That is to say, India wants China to satisfy the greater part of India's territorial claims on China even before the negotiations start. It is impossible to hold that agreement to such an unreasonable demand would not prejudice China's position in regard to the boundary.
7. Concerning the question of the meeting of officials of the two sides.

The Chinese Government has noted that the Indian Government is not opposed to the holding of meetings of officials of the two sides, but maintains that there must first be a cease-fire and withdrawal arrangement commonly agreed by the two sides. If such an arrangement has been agreed upon by the two sides, the tasks of the officials of both sides would, of course, be much simpler. It is a pity, however, that such an agreement does not yet exist. It seems to the Chinese Government that this is no reason for putting off a meeting of officials of the two sides, but exactly points to the urgent need for holding such a meeting. Differences can only be solved through meetings and discussions; they would never be reduced, let alone removed, if no meeting is held. The second of the five principles raised by Prime Minister Nehru states: "We should settle our differences in a friendly way through peaceful talks and discussions." It was on this principle that the Chinese Government has repeatedly proposed negotiations between the two sides. The Chinese Government is awaiting actual deeds of the Indian Government to demonstrate that it is really willing to observe this principle.

Letter from Premier Chou En-lai to the Prime Minister of India, 30 December 1962

Respected Mr. Prime Minister,

I thank you for your letter dated December, 1, 1962. To the questions of substance raised in your letter the Chinese Government has given detailed answer in the remarks of the spokesman of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the text of which was handed over to the Indian Embassy in China on December 9, and in the memoranda to the Indian Government dated December 8 and December 29, with which Your Excellency must have been acquainted.

In your letter you have summed up, from our correspondence, five principles for a peaceful settlement of the differences between our two sides. I very much appreciate your spirit of seeking common ground. These principles are indeed what the Chinese Government has consistently advocated, and for their realization it has made unremitting efforts. However, I must point out that these principles must be equally observed by both sides, and that our differences cannot possibly be resolved if one side attempts to bind the other side with these principles while itself refuses to abide by them. Up to now it is India, and not China, that has persisted in a position which is inconsistent with these principles. It is hoped that from now on both sides will act in accordance with these principles in seeking a reasonable settlement of the Sino-India boundary question.

The Chinese Government has taken note of the fact that the Indian Government has stated that it will not impede the implementation of the cease-fire by China, that it is in favour of the
principles of disengagement of the armed forces of the two sides and that it is not opposed to the holding of meetings of the officials of both sides. However, as is well known, the state of cease-fire is not yet stable. In order to consolidate the cease-fire, the armed forces of the two sides must disengage; otherwise there is no assurance that clashes will not recur. The Chinese Government still holds that its three proposals of October 24 constitute the most effective way to stop the border conflict, reopen peaceful negotiations and settle the Sino-Indian boundary question, and that the core of these proposals, namely, that the armed forces of each side should withdraw 20 kilometres with the line of actual control of November 7, 1959 as the base line, is all the more a most fair and reasonable arrangement. It is regrettable that the Indian Government even now insists on a reversion to the state of the boundary prior to September 8, 1962. I would not like to repeat here our old arguments. What everybody anxiously hopes is that the unstable state of cease-fire will not again develop into a border conflict on account of the fact that our two sides continue to be at loggerheads with each other.

In order to stabilize the cease-fire and seek a rapprochement of the views of the two sides, the Chinese Government proposes that, in the course of the withdrawal of the Chinese frontier guards on China's own initiative according to set plans, the Indian troops should stay in their present positions along the entire Sino-Indian border, and that in the meantime officials of the two sides should meet immediately to discuss such matters as withdrawal arrangements for the disengagement of the armed forces of the two sides, establishment of checkpoints and return of captured personnel. The rank of the officials of both sides and the time and place of their meeting can be discussed and fixed through diplomatic channels. The Chinese Government tentatively considers that it may be appropriate for officials of the two sides to meet in January 1963 either in Peking, or in Delhi, or in the capital of a friendly Asian or African country.

I am awaiting your reply.

Please accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Sd.) CHOU EN-LAI
Premier of the State Council
of the People's Republic of China.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 31 December 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to
refer to the communique issued by the Chinese and Pakistan Governments on 26th December on their agreement in principle on the alignment of the border between China (Sinkiang) and the territory of Kashmir illegally occupied by Pakistan.

2. In their note of 30th June 1962, the Government of India had drawn attention to the attempts of the Chinese Government to exploit, for its own ends, the differences on Kashmir between the Indian and Pakistan Governments. Despite the assertion by the Chinese Government that it does not wish to get involved in the dispute, the calculated release of this communique at a time when delegations from India and Pakistan were attempting to resolve their differences on Kashmir and related matters is clear evidence of China's desire to exploit Indo-Pakistan differences for its own selfish and expansionist designs.

3. The joint communique is a brazen attempt at legitimisation of the gains of aggression in the hope that the Chinese Government will thereby secure Pakistan support to Chinese aggression on India and the gains of this aggression.

4. The Government of India protest strongly against this aggressive and expansionist move by the Government of China. They repudiate firmly the validity of any agreement involving Indian territory between parties who have no legal or constitutional locus standi whatever in respect of this territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Letter from the Prime Minister of India to the Prime Minister of China, 1 January 1963

Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

Thank you for your message of 30th December, 1962 which was delivered to our Foreign Office by your Charge d'Affaires in Delhi at 2015 hours on 30th December, along with a copy of the memorandum of your Ministry of Foreign Affairs, dated 29th December.

2. The main theme of the memorandum of your Foreign Office, dated 29th December which also runs through your message of 30th December, is that it is India and not China which is "reversing right and wrong" and persisting in a position inconsistent with the peaceful settlement of the India-China differences over the border question. This is a distorted version of the factual history of the last few years recorded in the exchange of notes between India and China on the boundary question. It is hardly necessary for me to go into the detailed background of this factual history as it must be well known to you both from our personal correspondence and from our talks and discussions right up to 1960, as well as from the official notes exchanged between India and China.
3. In the course of the past 7 or 8 years, I have personally visited various parts of Ladakh on several occasions. During my earlier visits, there was no sign of Chinese forces there, nor was there any report about their coming into Ladakh. On later occasions, there were reports of their having entered Ladakh in various places. Still later, they had advanced still further. I can speak of this from my personal knowledge. You will not expect me to accept vague allegations of Chinese occupation of a greater part of eastern Ladakh when this goes against the evidence of my own eyes.

4. Apart from the factual history of the developments since 1957, it is absolutely clear that so far as the Eastern sector of the border is concerned, this had been a peaceful border with no tension or clashes whatever except as regards Longju where an incident was created by your forces in 1959. That this sector should, beginning with 8th September 1962, and more particularly since 20th October, 1962, have been the scene of violent armed clashes between Chinese and Indian forces, is a development for which the Government of China are entirely responsible. There are frequent references in recent Chinese notes and memoranda to the Chinese armed forces having advanced more than 20,000 square kilometres in what is called “counter-attack in self-defence”. It would be obvious to any one who looks at the position objectively that this scale of military clashes and such large scale advance into Indian territory could not have occurred unless there was a pre-planned and carefully concerted aggressive move by the Chinese forces. Under the Chinese declaration of unilateral cease-fire and withdrawals, the Chinese forces propose to withdraw from the bulk of this area, but they stipulate a specific condition that the limited defensive measures against Chinese aggression taken by India both in the Eastern and Western sectors should not be restored. All sorts of fallacious arguments regarding the line of actual control as on November 7, 1959, the need for disengagement of forces etc. are advanced to enable the Chinese side to retain its gains of the latest aggression since 8th September 1962, in the Western sector and to retain a position of advantage for another armed aggression in the Eastern sector. No amount of wordy argument can hide this position of advantage that the Chinese Government seek to retain as the spoils of their latest aggression.

5. I requested you in my letter of 1st December 1962, for positive clarifications on what you call “the line of actual control as of 7th November 1959”. The only clarification given is that this line is the one unilaterally determined by China regardless of the factual history of the past few years. The only now suggestion in your present letter is that “the Indian troops should stay in their present positions along the entire Sino-Indian border and that in the meantime officials of the two sides should meet immediately to discuss such matters as withdrawal arrangements for the disengagement of the armed forces of the two sides, establishment of checkpoints and return of captured personnel.” This new proposal is worse than your three-point proposal in as much as it seeks to exclude the Indian armed forces from the entire area of Indian territory subjected to this latest aggression since 8th September, 1962, that is, from Indian territory of over 20,000 square kilometres in the Eastern sector and over 6,000 square kilometres in the western sector. Surely the officials of the two sides
can hardly discuss and reach agreements on such matters as withdrawal arrangements for the disengagement of the armed forces of the two sides if they have no clear direction from their Governments regarding the line with reference to which the disengagement of the armed forces of the two sides is to be arranged.

6. Many countries are devoted to peace. But I imagine that no country is more passionately devoted to peace and peaceful methods than India. To us war is hateful. That we should have to come into military conflict with our neighbour China, with whom we have sought to develop friendly relations, has caused us great pain. We would certainly like to find peaceful solutions of any differences that we might have about our frontiers or about anything else. When the British Government relinquished their rule in India in 1947, the frontiers of our country which then existed naturally became the frontiers of free and independent India. If there was any argument about any part of these frontiers, we were perfectly willing to discuss this matter peacefully and decide it by peaceful methods. But we were not prepared, and are not prepared to have any decisions thrust upon us by aggression and military means.

7. Because of our desire that any point in dispute between our two countries be decided peacefully, we repeatedly, for the last many years, drew your attention to the wrong maps issued on behalf of China and gave you our own maps where our frontiers are clearly marked. You said that your maps were old ones that you had inherited from the previous regime and you had had no time to revise them. You were thus clearly aware of our precise frontier. Yet, at no time during these years before September 1959, did you inform us of what in your opinion was your frontier, even though your forces had started committing aggression in various places in Ladakh. Surely, that was a curious method of approaching, and enforcing your claim on a friendly country.

8. In regard to the Eastern sector, we had fairly lengthy talks, and you gave me clearly to understand that while you did not accept the McMahon Line, yet, because of our friendly relations, you were perfectly prepared to accept the watershed as our frontier, as you had done in the case of Burma. At no time before the 9th September 1962 ever since India became independent, did the Chinese cross the border of the Eastern sector except at Longju. Before our independence, the Chinese People’s Republic had not been established, and there could have been no question of, therefore, of the Chinese coming there. Nor did the Tibetans enter our territory as there was no doubt that they certainly acknowledged the McMahon Line Agreement. Because of all this, it is a matter of amazement to me that, in spite of this past history and background, you should claim large areas of a Province of ours. It was a matter for still greater surprise that after the assurances given by you to us, you should carry out a massive attack on our country. I would beg you to consider not only the facts, but also whether this was in your opinion a proper way to treat a country which had repeatedly shown its friendship to you.
9. We firmly believe in peaceful methods and we shall always try to seek every avenue of peace to settle any problem or dispute. We want to do this despite the serious armed clashes that have occurred between India and China. But before a suitable atmosphere for any worthwhile talks between us is created, I think that at least the further aggression committed by the Chinese forces since the 8th of September 1962 should be removed and the positions as it existed then should be restored. After that, I shall gladly discuss the merits of these questions with you. I have even suggested to our Parliament that, if necessary, we would be prepared to refer these questions for decision on the merits to the International Court of Justice at The Hague, which is an impartial world tribunal.

10. I agree that there is no point in repeating our old arguments and that though our differences continue, we should, despite these differences, explore what other possibilities are available to avoid development of further conflict. I would, in this connection refer to the proposals made by the six non-aligned Afro-Asian countries who met at Colombo earlier last month. These have been conveyed to me and also to you and the Ceylon Prime Minister is now on a visit to Peking to explain these proposals and will be coming to Delhi about the 10th of January 1963. We are examining these proposals and will be discussing them with the Ceylon Prime Minister and her colleagues when she comes to Delhi.

11. Our Foreign Office is examining in detail the memorandum of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs dated 29th December and will be sending a full reply to that memorandum separately.

12. Please accept Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 January 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Foreign Ministry's note dated 27th December, 1962, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India have clearly stated their stand in their earlier notes on the subject and there is no need for reiterating the same.

It is, however, necessary to repudiate the suggestion contained in the present Chinese note that the conclusion of the Sino-Burmese Boundary Treaty "refutes the Indian contention that the Sino-Indian boundary has long been delimited". There had at no time been any
doubt that the traditional and customary India-China boundary alignment lies along the highest watershed ridges of the Himalayas. It is significant that the Boundary Treaty concluded by China with Burma has formally confirmed the Burmese frontier along the highest Himalayan watershed in this area. It is the western continuation of the same frontier, the McMahon line, which the Chinese Government perversely refuse to accept in the case of India.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurance of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 9 January 1963

There is no response in the memorandum of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, dated 29th December, 1962, to the peaceful sentiments expressed by the Indian Prime Minister in his letter of the 1st December, 1962, to the Prime Minister of China; nor does the memorandum indicate a helpful attitude towards the Indian Government's endeavour to achieve a peaceful solution of the Sino-Indian border problem, after the conditions prevailing before the massive invasion by Chinese forces on India are restored. The memorandum merely repeats false and mischievous allegations that have been refuted several times by the Government of India and is deliberately slanderous in tone because there is no logic or reason in support of its contentions.

Western Sector.

2. The Chinese Government have been constantly repeating that "the whole vast area on the Chinese side of the traditional customary line in the Western Sector of the Sino-Indian border is part of Chinese territory". Such repetition by itself cannot establish the validity of this claim. This has been a shifting claim which has kept pace with the forward movement of Chinese troops. In 1958, it covered the Aksai Chin road and was stated to be the same as shown in Chinese maps of 1959. In 1960, this was stretched still further west. And today, subsequent to the massive invasion by China, one does not know what the latest version of the claim is.

3. The Indian side had, in the discussions between the two Governments, given conclusive evidence that the Aksai Chin and the Chang Chengmo Valley were part of the ilaqa of Tanktse, and administrative sub-divisional headquarters in the Ladakh Tehsil. The Indian side had produced published revenue records that made it clear beyond any doubt that the areas of Aksai Chin, Lingzi Tang and Chang Chengmo were part of the Tanktse ilaqa. Indian officials also clarified that the extent of territory for which the revenue headquarters of a district would normally be responsible is directly dependent upon the extent of population and assessible revenue. The Chinese memorandum called all this spurious evidence simply because they themselves have not been able to produce any evidence whatever of revenue assessment over areas they claim to have been in possession for thousands of years.

4. The Chinese claim to have produced evidence of their jurisdiction in these areas is entirely baseless. They have, in their present memorandum, repeated the reference to the 1927 petition from the Governor of Sinkiang, because that is the only plausible thing they could trot out. This was also mentioned in the meeting of officials in 1960. The document itself refers to an area north of the Kuen Lun ranges and mentions the intention of establishing an administrative organisation at Shahidulla (in Sinkiang) covering an area which has, as its southern limits, the Karakoram Pass. Obviously, this has no
relevance to Aksai Chin or any other area of Ladakh. No other document of any kind from either the archives of the Sinkiang administration or from contemporary records has been produced to establish that Aksai Chin and Lingzi Tang were ever part of Sinkiang.

5. On the other hand, the Indian side had furnished evidence of administration of this area prior to 1950 and details of patrols which were sent even subsequent to 1950 and right up to 1958 and even in 1959, which demonstrated that India had continued to exercise rightful sovereignty and was fully discharging the responsibility of local administration that vested in India consistently with the requirements of the terrain. Indeed, it was only in 1959 that the Aksai Chin area was fully occupied by Chinese forces, disrupting thereby the Government of India's continued exercise of sovereignty. The fact that India, because, it put faith in Chinese professions of friendship and did not alter the traditional pattern of administration in the area by establishing a network of fixed administrative and defence posts all along the international border, can in no way prejudice its title or sovereignty over this Indian territory.

6. An instance of the type of baseless statement that the Chinese Government does not hesitate to make is the assertion that "the Government of the People's Republic of China took over this area (Ladakh) from the Government of old China in 1950". Such assertions as these are only indicative of the prevarications that are evident throughout the Chinese memorandum. It will be recalled that the former Government of China did not exercise any control at all in Tibet, much less in the Aksai Chin area during the years of the second World War and thereafter. In fact, in 1943, the British Government had to approach the Tibetan Government at Lhasa for permission for the transportation of armament through Tibet to assist the former Chinese Government.

Equally baseless is the Chinese Government's statement that Indian officials were unable to produce any evidence of patrolling in that area. The facts are exactly the other way round. It was the Indian officials who pointed out to the Chinese side that not only did Indian officials survey parties and patrols constantly visit these areas during the years 1911—1949, but Indian reconnaissance parties also visited this area in the years after 1950, when the Chinese Government falsely claim they were in the Aksai Chin area. In 1951, an expedition went to Leh, Lingzi Tang and Aksai Chin. In 1952, a party went to Lanak La via Tanktse, Tsogatsalu, Hot Springs and Kongka Pass. In August 1954 and August 1956, patrol parties went to Lanak La. The Indian flag planted at Lanak La in 1954 was still found there in 1956. In September 1957, an Indian reconnaissance party went up to Qara Tagh via Tanktse, Tsogatsalu, Hot Springs, Shimalungpa and Shing Lung. In the summer of 1958, an Indian patrol party went via Phobrung, Shimalungpa and Nischu to the Sarigh Jilganang and the Amlohar Lalak region. The party planted the Indian flag at a point 80° 12' M East 35° 03' M North. Another Indian reconnaissance party went at the same time via Phobrung, Shimalungpa and Shing Lung to Qizil Zilga. Other places near the Pangong lake and in the Chang Chongmo valley were also under constant patrol by Indian officials. These facts were clearly put before the Chinese side at the talks of the officials but the Chinese Government, apparently, seem to think
that all this evidence will disappear simply because they desire to ignore it.

7. The Chinese Government seek to disprove the fact of constant Indian patrolling in this area by stating that gigantic engineering work in the construction of the Aksai Chin road was not detected. This “gigantic engineering work” consisted of speedily and surreptitiously clearing a road over the comparatively smooth surface of a rocky plateau. Apart from the fact that the road follows an ancient caravan route, much of the area over which the road has been made merely required to be marked out and little actual road construction as such was necessary. It is because of this natural advantage that the Chinese had been able to lay out the road within a short time and to avoid detection in the process. In any event, the Chinese Government’s contention that an illegal construction of a road through another’s territory, even if described as a big engineering project, confers title to territory is just too absurd and fantastic to require detailed refutation.

Eastern Sector

8. In spite of the fact that the memorandum of the Government of India of December 19, 1962 had very clearly indicated that the Thagla ridge area lies south of the main Himalayan watershed and that administratively control over this area had long been exercised by India, the Chinese Government continue to assert that this region lies to the north of the McMahon Line. It is, however, significant that even the Chinese Government, in its memorandum, accept the fact that grazing fees have been as they choose to call “exacted” by India from inhabitants of Le village, which lies to the north of the McMahon Line, who came to graze their cattle in this region.

9. The Chinese memorandum claims to have captured an Indian military sketch map showing the Dhola area as north of the McMahon Line. There is no doubt that sketch maps were available with our forces to indicate the rendering of the McMahon Line, based on coordinates of the Simla map, just as they have maps indicating the highest watershed ridge which, in fact, is the correct alignment of the McMahon Line on the ground. In spite of all its protestations against the Indian presence south of the Thagla ridge, the Chinese Government has had, at no time, asserted that the Thagla ridge does not form the highest watershed ridge in that area. This is a matter of easy verification and would clearly determine that the areas to the south of the Thagla ridge were part of India.

10. The Chinese Government, beyond giving the coordinates of what they consider the eastern end of the McMahon Line, have never yet indicated their concept of the correct alignment. In addition to leaving this extremely vague, they have not indicated their acceptance of either the principle of the highest watershed dividing the territories between the two countries or of an alignment on the ground following a strict interpretation of the co-ordinates of the McMahon Line as appear in the Simla Treaty map. Whether in the Western sector in regard to their so called traditional and customary boundary or in the Eastern sector in regard to the McMahon Line, the Chinese Government are determined to keep their alignment vague and imprecise in spite of India’s constant requests to the Chinese to state their position clearly.
11. The Government of India have already refuted the Chinese Government claims to the Tawang region. Tawang has always been within Indian jurisdiction and ample factual evidence has been presented by the Government of India to prove India's sovereignty over that area. The Chinese Government base their claims on certain taxes that were once paid by the inhabitants of Tawang to the ecclesiastical authorities at Lhasa. It has been pointed out that these tributes were ecclesiastical tributes to the Dalai Lama and not a “tax” in the political sense of the term.

12. All administrative dues from the Tawang area were paid to the Government of India over the years. It has been incontrovertibly established that the Government of India have exercised jurisdiction over the entire boundary in this region upto the international boundary. If the Government of India had any aggressive intentions, they would not have voluntarily acknowledged China's jurisdiction over the Migyiton area and Tamadem on the basis of the highest watershed boundary. This acknowledgement of the correct position of Migyiton and Tamadem as north of the frontier is sufficient proof of the just and correct position adopted by the Government of India on the basis of the highest watershed ridge principle of the 1914 Agreement as translated on the ground. Facts prove without doubt that it is the Government of China who have, despite their assurances about the McMahon Line frontier which they also accepted in their boundary settlement with Burma, launched an unprovoked attack after the 8th September 1962 in this area in the pursuit of China's aggressive and expansionist ambitions in this region.

Longju

13. There is another instance of Chinese prevarication. Prime Minister Chou En-lai, in his letter of 17th December 1959 to the Indian Prime Minister, stated:

"Pending the above-mentioned agreement, the Chinese Government, in a conciliatory spirit and out of the desire to move towards the withdrawal of armed forces along the entire border, is prepared to agree first to reach a partial solution by applying the proposal you have made in your letter for the non-stationing of the armed forces of both sides at Longju to the other disputed places on the border as well."

The arrangement on Longju had been observed by both Governments since 1959. The Chinese Government have now amplified this understanding to be contingent upon the same arrangements being accepted in such areas as Khimzemane, Parigas, Shipki Pass, etc. Surely this was not so during the past three years and the suggestion that this arrangement should apply in all areas is a new demand that India cannot countenance.

Bara Hoti

14. On Bara Hoti as well, the Government of India had very clearly, in their Note of 13th September, 1959, stated:

"If the Government of China are not agreeable to this suggestion, the Government of India will continue as in previous years to send their civil personnel to exercise jurisdiction
over an area which the Government of India have always considered as part of Indian territory. Such personnel, however, will not carry any arms.”

The fact remains that the Chinese Government did not object then to this arrangement which had been continuing for several years.

15. The Government of India had categorically stated that no action would be taken to impede the implementation of China's unilateral declaration to cease-fire. The allegations that India had violated Chinese air-space during this period are completely unfounded. In fact, the Chinese forces have themselves been guilty of breach of the cease-fire as several instances have occurred of Chinese troops firing upon the Indian patrols since November 21, 1962. If an element of instability is being introduced in the cease-fire, it is the result of the actions of the Chinese Government, and not of the Government of India in spite of the unilateral decision by China to cease-fire, the objections raised in the Chinese memorandum to the legitimate steps being taken by India to ensure the security of the country is a cause of concern to this country. The treacherous massive attacks on India commencing on 20th October 1962 and the further military push forward on November 15 had also been preceded by a campaign of wild allegations of military measures being taken by India as well as by protestations of Chinese peaceful intentions. The efforts being made by India to strengthen itself and the removal of Chinese nationals from sensitive border areas of the country are all steps taken in the interests of the security of the country and have had to be undertaken because of the massive invasion mounted by Chinese forces.

Disengagement

16. The Government of India have, all along, maintained that a cardinal principle to be implemented, if India and China are to seek a peaceful settlement of their differences, is the restoration of at least the status quo that existed before the further Chinese aggression on September 8, 1962. The Government of India had already declared their agreement to a disengagement between the armed forces of the two countries on the basis of a commonly agreed arrangement as soon as the status quo before 8th September 1962 is restored.

17. The Government of India are, however, unwilling to accept a line which the Chinese Government have chosen to call the “November 7, 1959, line of actual control” and the alignment of which has been unilaterally decided upon by the Chinese Government in accordance with the advance of their forces following their latest massive aggression on India. It may be reiterated that the Chinese were nowhere in 1959 along the line at present referred to by them as “the 7th November 1959 line of actual control”. In fact, in a desperate attempt to prove this, the spokesman of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in a statement on December 8, 1962, gave four locations where Chinese forces were alleged to have been on November 7, 1959. The first post, Shenhsienwan, is north of the Karakoram Pass in Sinkiang, and not in an area which is traditionally and customarily Indian. Two other locations, Hot Springs and
Nyagzu, lie precisely in the vicinity of the line that Prime Minister Nehru referred to in his letter of 14th November 1962, as the line of actual control as on November 7, 1959. The fourth is an additional location in the Chip Chap River valley which the Government of India know did not exist till 1961. This would conclusively prove that the Chinese were, in 1959, nowhere west of the 1959 line of actual control as defined by India.

18. Apart from the fact that Chinese forces were never anywhere near their so called line of actual control of 7th November, 1959, the Chinese memorandum itself admits that there is a difference between the position held by the Indian troops prior to September 8, 1962, and the so called line of actual control of 7th November, 1959, as claimed by the Chinese. The fact is that the Indian Government took limited defensive measures in their own territory to prevent the continuing aggressive of Chinese troops. It is indeed, perverse thinking on the part of China to suggest that when a country puts up border defence posts within its own territory, it is guilty of aggression because it interferes with the aggressive designs of an expansionist power. To take the so called 1959 line as the base line for disengagement is, to quote the Chinese memorandum, not only not “fair and reasonable”, but is a definite attempt to retain the wrongful gains of its latest massive aggression.

19. The Chinese memorandum, in insisting upon India accepting the Chinese version of the 7th November 1959 line of actual control, is imposing a pre-condition which gives China the territorial gains of its latest aggression. India, on the other hand, is not placing any pre-conditions at all and is yet prepared to consider steps for further talks and discussions for a peaceful settlement of the differences. All that India ask for is that the aggression must be undone before reverting to peaceful talks and discussions for resolving the differences. This is on the basis of a principle that has been accepted internationally and is in consonance with the precepts of Panch Sheel.

20. The Government of India agree that differences can be solved through meetings and discussions, but these have to be on a just and equitable basis. No talks and discussions are possible in circumstances where India is compelled to accept an arbitrary line which: the Chinese call “the November 7, 1959 line of actual control” which has no legal, traditional or customary basis whatever and which is purely based on the latest Chinese military aggression on India. The crisis of confidence referred to in the Indian Prime Minister’s letter of November 14 can only be resolved when the Chinese Government give, by their performance, adequate proof of their professions to observe the normal standards of international behaviour between peaceful neighbours.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 8 September 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the Indian Government's note of June 6, 1962, has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government clearly pointed out in its note of April 27, 1962, that as the point 35°01' N, 78°34' E (six miles west of Sumdo) on the western sector of the Sino-Indian border is as deep as over thirty kilometres inside Chinese territory, whether the Chinese Government sets up a post or adopts any other measure there is China's internal affair in which the Indian Government has no right to meddle. Besides, the allegation that China has established a new post there is not true at all. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the unwarranted charge repeated by the Indian Government in its note under reference.

At the meetings between Chinese and Indian officials, the Chinese side already made a detailed description of the correct alignment of the traditional and customary Sino-Indian boundary in the western sector and conclusively established with a large amount of authoritative evidence that the entire border area east and north of this line was always under the jurisdiction and control of the Chinese side. As for the alignment described at great length by the Indian Government in its note, the Chinese side has long demonstrated that it is but an actually non-existent line drawn up underhandedly by British imperialism during the course of its aggression against China's Sinkiang, and the nature of this line will not be changed no matter how many times the Indian side may repeat its description of it. The Indian side has never exercised jurisdiction over the large area between this line and the traditional customary line. This was admitted by Prime Minister Nehru in the Rajya Sabha as early as September 10, 1959. He then clearly stated that this area "has not been under any kind of administration".

Chinese border defence forces have never over-stepped their own boundary, nor has the Chinese side ever had any post in Indian territory. Indian troops, on the contrary, have incessantly intruded into Chinese territory, occupied large tracts of Chinese territory, set up many aggressive strongpoints, and even not scrupled to start armed clashes. Therefore, in order to ease the tension along the border, the Indian side must withdraw all its illegal strongpoints and intruding personnel from Chinese territory.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 1 November 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated 8th September, 1962.

The Government of India had in their notes of 15th April and 6th June, 1962 indicated that a new Chinese military post had been established deep inside Indian territory at a point 78° 34'E 35° 01'N six miles west of Sumdo. These facts had been carefully verified and there can be no doubt about the existence of a Chinese post at the above location. It is unfortunate that the Chinese note under reference should not only deny the existence of the illegal Chinese post but also presume to question the traditional alignment of the Sino-Indian boundary in this area.

At the meeting of the Officials of the two Governments in 1960, the Indian side had produced a wealth of consistent and conclusive evidence to substantiate the alignment of the traditional boundary. The positive Indian evidence in contrast to the sketchy material produced by the Chinese side establishes beyond doubt that the traditional boundary between India and China is that defined in the description provided by the Indian side at the talks. It is therefore futile for the Chinese note to refer to the detailed alignment in the Western sector of the border given in the Indian note dated 6th June 1962 as a "non-existent line". This stand of the Chinese Government only indicates that they have not seriously considered the Report of the Officials and are merely reiterating without any evidence that the Indian territory in Ladakh, which is now under their forcible occupation, has been "always under the jurisdiction and control of the Chinese side".

The Chinese note has made the claim that the "Indian side has never exercised jurisdiction" in this area and quotes in this regard the statement of the Indian Prime Minister in the Rajya Sabha to the effect that this area "has not been under any kind of administration". The Indian Prime Minister's statement quoted in the Chinese note in no way contradicts the Indian Government's position that India had always exercised sovereignty over this area upto the time of the Chinese illegal occupation. All that the Indian Prime Minister meant to say in the statement quoted in the Chinese note was that this area being practically uninhabited and at a height of about 17000 feet, there was no 'administration' there similar to the administration in other inhabited territories. The Chinese Government's efforts to establish that India had not therefore exercised 'sovereign jurisdiction' over this area are not likely to delude anybody. In international law it is a well-established principle that the exercise of Sovereign jurisdiction by a state over any territory is to be judged firstly by its intention or will to act as Sovereign, and secondly, by some actual display of state authority over that territory appropriate to the nature of the territory and the conditions prevailing there. The exercise of state authority over an uninhabited region in proof of its Sovereignty cannot and need not be the same as over an inhabited region. Sovereign jurisdiction over this area appropriate to the nature of the terrain, the difficult climatic conditions prevailing there.
and its practically uninhabited character had always been exercised by the Indian Government up to the time of its Chinese illegal occupation. Regular patrols were sent to the limits of the Indian border. Two of these patrols at Haji Langar and Kongka La were involved in incidents with the Chinese troops. There is further evidence of continuous exercise of state authority over all this area in the form of detailed survey undertaken, the use of the area for trading, grazing and salt collecting, maintenance of police checkpoints by the Kashmir Government at appropriate places and a number of revenue and assessment reports.

In the light of the above facts, the Government of India categorically reject the contentions made in the Chinese note under reference and demand the immediate withdrawal of the illegal Chinese post at 78° 34' E 35° 01' N.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 6 November 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

According to reports from the Chinese frontier guards, Indian troops stationed in the area of Chushul and Tinruzhe in India in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border have since October 29, 1962 repeatedly shelled the Chinese frontier guards in China's Tibet with howitzers and heavy mortars. Up to November 3 they have altogether fired more than 170 shells. The specific cases were as follows:

(1) From 18:25 to 19:30 hours on October 29, the Indian troops stationed at Chushul fired more than 20 shells at the Chinese frontier post situated to the northwest of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet, China;

(2) From 18:00 to about 19:00 hours on October 30, the Indian troops stationed at Tinruzhe fired about 50 shells at the Chinese frontier posts situated to the west and southwest of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet, China;

(3) At 19:30 hours on October 31, the Indian troops stationed near Chushul fired about 30 shells at the Chinese frontier post situated near Digra in Tibet, China;

(4) At about 19:00 hours on November 2, the Indian troops stationed to the southeast of Tinruzhe fired nearly 20 shells at the Chinese frontier post situated near Jechiung in Tibet, China;
(5) At about 18:00 hours on November 3, the Indian troops stationed at the above-mentioned area fired more than 50 shells at the Chinese frontier post situated near Digra in Tibet, China.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned serious cases of shelling of Chinese frontier guards by Indian troops. It must be pointed out that at present the Indian side is amassing a large number of troops in the Chushul area in preparation for a new attack on Chinese territory. The bombardment of Chinese frontier guards with heavy artillery by Indian troops in the past consecutive days in a prelude to such an attack. Should the Indian side continue to play with fire and insist on expanding the conflict, the Chinese side, pressed beyond the limits of forbearance, will be compelled to strike back in self-defence. The Indian Government must bear full responsibility for all the consequences arising therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 6 November 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government, dated October 26, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

The Indian Government's note under reference is in reply to the Chinese Government's note of October 20, 1962 which lodged the most urgent, the most serious and the strangest protest against the massive general attacks launched by the Indian forces of aggression against the Chinese frontier guards in the eastern and western sectors of the Sino-Indian border. The Indian Government in its reply note vainly attempted to absolve itself of the guilt of refusing peaceful negotiations and launching armed attacks by employing its usual practice of calling black white. But the facts are all there and cannot be denied.

Firstly, it is India which refuses to negotiate. Without going back too far, in the period from July 26 to October 6, 1962 alone seven notes were exchanged between China and India on the question of holding negotiations. The Chinese Government thrice put forward the proposal for holding discussions speedily and unconditionally on the boundary question between the two sides on the basis of the report of the meetings of the officials of the two countries. But the proposal was thrice turned down by the Indian Government. The Indian side even opposed the Chinese Government's proposition that
during the discussions neither side should refuse to discuss any ques-
tion concerning the boundary that may be raised by the other side. The Indian Government first advanced the pre-condition that China should withdraw from large tracts of China's own territory in the western sector, then it advanced another pre-condition, that China should withdraw from another tract of China's own territory in the eastern sector, and it has all along obstinately stated that no discussions can be held unless the Chinese side accepts its pre-
conditions. In this way, the Indian Government, in its note of October 6, finally categorically shut the door to negotiations.

Secondly, it is also India which first attacked. As is well known, from the midnight of September 20, 1962, continuous armed attacks were launched against the Chinese frontier guards by the Indian forces of aggression entrenched in China's Che Dong area north of the illegal McMahon Line. As of October 10, the Indian side had in its many attacks killed and wounded a total of 47 Chinese frontier guards. On this account the Chinese Government lodged seven times in succession the most serious protest with the Indian Government and demanded that the Indian side immediately stop attacking. Regrettably, the Indian side has always regarded China's self-restraint and forbearance as a sign that China is weak and can be bullied and, in disregard of China's repeated protests and warnings, wilfully expanded its scope of aggression and stepped up its attacks. Indian Prime Minister Nehru declared on October 12 that he had ordered to “free” Chinese territory of Chinese troops. On October 17 the Indian troops started vehement shelling of the Chinese frontier guards in both the eastern and western sectors simultaneously. On October 18 an official of the Indian Ministry of Defence declared smugly that the Chinese forces had been “driven back two miles.” Finally, in the small hours of October 20 the Indian troops, in pursuance of Prime Minister Nehru’s order, launched a massive general attack. Only when the Chinese frontier guards were repeatedly subjected to frenzied Indian attacks and suffered heavy casualties was the Chinese side compelled to act in resolute self-defence. How can it be said that the Chinese frontier guards’ counter-attack in self-defence was kindling the flames of war? Can it be that only India is entitled to launch attacks while China has no right to defend itself?

Thirdly, while still refusing to stop the clashes and reopen negotia-
tions on a fair and reasonable basis, the Indian Government is even now actively preparing for attacks on a larger scale. It is unfortunate that serious border clashes have occurred between China and India. On October 24, that is, four days after the clashes began, the Chinese Government issued a statement, putting forward three peaceable proposals. Anyone can see that these proposals, fair and reasonable as they are, constitute the only way to salvage the current dangerous situation. The Indian Government, however, stated in its note under reference that “before any talks can be considered there must be a restoration of the position that existed in early September 1962.” That is to say, the Indian side still wants to stage a comeback in order to “hold what they have taken by force over a period of years” and revert to the posture prior to October 20 in which it launched massive attacks on the Chinese side. This is absolutely unacceptable to the Chinese side.
At the same time, the Indian side is stepping up nation-wide anti-China mobilization. The Indian President proclaimed on October 26 a “state of emergency” throughout the country. The Indian Prime Minister declared that the fight with the Chinese will go on for a long time to come. The Indian Ministers of Defence and Home Affairs personally flew to the frontiers to make inspections and dispositions. The Indian side is organizing new army units and moving large numbers of troops and transporting huge quantities of arms and ammunition to the eastern and western sectors of the border. What is especially serious, the Indian side is relying on the United States for the supply of large quantities of arms. Indian troops have never ceased bombarding and attacking Chinese frontier guards. Indian airplanes are still continually intruding into China’s air space for the purposes of reconnaissance and harassment. Indian troops, declared a spokesman of the Indian Defence Ministry, have already made a series of “probing attacks.” In a word, the Indian side is using every means to create a war atmosphere, stir up anti-China waves, persecute Chinese nationals in India, preposterously close down the branches of the Bank of China in Calcutta and Bombay and step up military dispositions in preparation for fresh attacks on China on an even larger scale.

The above-mentioned facts prove that the allegations made in the Indian note of October 26 are all falsehood and prevarications. What is imperative is to put an immediate end to the military clashes now going on and seek a peaceful settlement of the boundary question, not to engage in endless debate. The Chinese Government once again asks the Indian Government to give serious consideration to the three proposals put forward in the Chinese Government's statement of October 24 and make a positive response. Should the Indian side obstinately resort to force and continue to expand the clashes, the Indian Government must bear full responsibility for all the consequences.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 7 November 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and has the honour to refer to the note dated 6th November, 1962 handed over to the Indian Charge d’ Affaires at Peking at 16:30 hours by Vice Director Chang Tung on 6th November, 1962, and to state that the allegations made in the note are completely false.

It is the Chinese forces who have systematically attacked the various Indian defence border posts in the Ladakh region and eliminated these posts completely by massive concentrated ruthless
attacks without any provocation whatsoever. The note of 6th November handed over by the Vice Director Chang Tung coupled with the earlier attacks mounted against Indian forces in Damchok and the surrounding region and the massive concentration of Chinese forces in the vicinity of Chushul area appear to be a preparation for further aggression on Indian territory. It is the Chinese authorities who started a new aggression on 8th September in the North-Western corner of the North East Frontier Agency of India and who, after probing attacks on limited Indian defensive posts in the region, commenced a massive offensive against the Indian defence forces all along the entire frontier region between India and China. It is the Chinese Government who now seem to be extending the aggression still further into Indian territory. The Chinese Government must bear full responsibility for all the consequences arising from their further aggression on Indian territory since 8th September and the preparations for still further aggression on Indian territory being made in the vicinity of Chushul.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 16 November 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

According to reports from Chinese frontier guards, large numbers of Indian troops are being amassed in both the eastern and western sectors of the Sino-Indian border; they have set up another strongpoint on Chinese territory and continuously opened heavy artillery fire at Chinese frontier guards, in preparation for new attacks. The Chinese Government once again lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government against this.

In the western sector, Indian troops recently again set up in Tibet, China a new strongpoint for aggression located at approximately 32° 57' N, 79° 16' E in the Demchok area.

Meanwhile, the Indian side, in defiance of the protest lodged by the Chinese Government on November 6, 1962, has continued to amass large numbers of troops in the Chushul area in India west of the Spanggur Lake and shelled the Chinese frontier guards in the Spanggur Lake area in China.

In the eastern sector, ever since October 25, the Indian troops entrenched south of the Tawang River and in the Walong area have repeatedly shelled with heavy artillery the positions of Chinese frontier guards. In the Tawang River area, Indian troops shelled more than 600 rounds in the week from October 30 to November 5.
alone. In the Walong area they shelled about 400 rounds in the four
days from November 2 to 5 alone, and more than 200 rounds on the
single day of November 12. Moreover, on November 6 and 12, the
Indian troops entrenched in the Walong area, under the cover of
violent artillery fire, twice attacked the Chinese frontier guards. The
Chinese frontier guards suffered heavy casualties under the repeated
bombardments by Indian troops.

At the same time, the Indian side is rushing large reinforcements
to the above-said two areas. Indian aircraft have incessantly intruded
into the air space over the Chinese frontier guards’ positions
north of the Tawang River and over Sama, Tsayul, Chuwaken and
other places, which are deep within Chinese territory circling for
reconnaissance purposes and making provocative harassment. There
were 12 sorties of these air intrusions in the four days from Novem-
ber 8 to 11 alone. At about 20:00 hours on November 5, an Indian
aircraft flew deep into the air space over the Chamdo and Chiangta
area in Tibet, China, for reconnaissance and provocation. Indian
aircraft also stepped up air-drops and transport of large quantities
of war material to the Walong area, with as many as 389 packs air-
dropped on November 10 alone.

The Chinese Government in its note of November 6, 1962, already
enumerated the conclusive facts that Indian troops in the Chushul
area were repeatedly shelling the Chinese frontier guards and pre-
paring for launching attacks. The Indian Government hastily de-
nied these facts in its reply note of November 7 and made groundless
counter-charges against the Chinese side. But the above-stated
series of new aggressive activities on the part of India have thorough-
ly exploded the lies of the Indian Government. Facts prove that
the Indian side is making active preparations for new attacks in the
western and eastern sectors of the Sino-Indian border. While keep-
ing a close watch on the movement of the Indian troops, the Chinese
Government once again advises the Indian side not to reject the
good-will and appeal of the Chinese side for a peaceful settlement
and for avoiding the expansion of the conflict, and also not to take
China’s forbearance and self-restraint as a sign that China is weak
and can be bullied. Should the Indian side still insist on expanding
the border conflict, it must bear full responsibility for the conse-
quences arising therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity
to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest con-
sideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India, 5 December 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to
refer to the Chinese Government’s note, dated 16th November 1962.
The factual details of the developments that occurred all along the China-India border since the 20th October 1962 when Chinese forces had simultaneously launched attacks on the Western and Eastern sectors of the Indian border are given below:

**Western Sector**

(i) Commencing from 05:00 hours on 20th October 1962 all 13 forward Indian defence posts from the Galwan Valley upto north of Daulat Beg Oldi were attacked by Chinese forces in overwhelming numbers and were overrun.

(ii) On 21st October 1962 two more Indian defence posts in the Sirijap area were similarly attacked and captured by Chinese troops.

(iii) From 22nd to 24th October 1962, 3 Indian defence posts, one in Kongma and two in the Hot Springs area, were also attacked and taken.

(iv) On 29th October 1962 Chinese forces launched further attacks on Indian defence posts at Changla, Jarala and Demchok and occupied fresh Indian territory upto Dumchole, east of Fukche.

(v) From 6th November 1962 Chinese forces started to build up in the Spanggur area, opposite Chushul. On the same day Chinese troops were observed digging in and bringing up additional gun reinforcements, 2 miles east north-east of Spanggur.

(vi) Commencing from the morning of 18th November 1962 Chinese forces shelled the following further areas:

(a) Rezangla.

(b) Position 6 miles east of Chushul.

(c) Position 6 miles south-east of Chushul.

(d) Position 10 miles south-east of Chushul.

(e) The Chushul airfield area.

(vii) At 07:50 hours on 18th November 1962 the Indian defence post at Rezangla was taken, after repeated heavy attacks, by Chinese troops numbering over a thousand, Chinese tanks were also observed coming up from the Spanggur gap to assist in the attack which was preceded by heavy bombardment.

(viii) On 18th November 1962 at 16:30 hours, Chushul airfield was shelled again and the Indian defence post 6 miles east of Chusul attacked repeatedly by 400 to 500 Chinese troops from higher ground.

Surely, the above mentioned activities of Chinese troops against Indian defence posts in the Western sector can by no means be denied or concealed. The fact that Chinese forces did not scruple to bombard Chushul airfield which is inside Indian territory and more than 16 miles due west of the international frontier and 8 to 10 miles west even of the Chinese claim line of 1960 is clear evidence of the Chinese Government's unbridled aggressive activities.
The Government of India have, in their earlier notes, pointed out repeatedly how Chinese troops, since 1957, systematically intruded into Indian territory, constructed new military bases, extended the military posts already set up and linked these by roads with bases at the rear. The extensive network of roads constructed by Chinese troops deep inside Indian territory in itself demonstrates the premeditated aggressive plans of the Chinese Government. It was by using these roads that the Chinese Government had been able to achieve in this area their formidable build-up of troops and artillery including armour with which they started their massive attacks on 20th October, 1962.

Eastern Sector

As already pointed out in the Indian Government’s note of 26th October, 1962, Chinese forces, having build up since 8th September, mounted a fierce offensive with machine gun and heavy mortar fire against Indian defence posts along the Namkha Chu and at Khinzhemane. Subsequently, Chinese forces continued their aggressive attacks and extended them over a wider area to include 4 out of the 5 Frontier Divisions of the North Eastern Frontier Agency of India, namely, the Kameng, Subansiri, Siang and Lohit Divisions.

(1) Kameng Frontier Division.

(i) On 20th October 1962 the Indian defence posts at Dhola and Tsengdhar were overrun by Chinese troops in major battle offensives. The same day the Indian defence post at Khinzhemane was surrounded and overrun.

(ii) On 23rd October 1962 the Indian defence post at Bumla was attacked and overrun.

(iii) The town of Tawang had to be vacated around 23rd October 1962 due to heavy Chinese pressure.

(iv) On 17th and 18th November 1962 the Indian defensive position at Sela was attacked by Chinese troops of more than a Division strength.

(v) On the evening of 17th November 1962 Chinese forces cut off the line of communication 7 miles north of Bomdila.

(vi) On 18th November 1962 the Indian town of Bomdila which is over 40 miles south of the international border was attacked and fell to Chinese forces.

(vii) On 21st November 1962 Chakoo was also taken by Chinese forces.

(2) Subansiri Frontier Division.

Over the period 20th October to 21st November 1962 the towns of Asafila, Taksing and Limeking in the Subansiri Division were overrun by Chinese forces.

(3) Siang Frontier Division.

Over the period 20th October to 21st November 1962 in the Siang Division the Indian defence posts at Lamang, Henkor, Tadadege, Manigong, Mechuka and Tuting had to be withdrawn in the face of massive Chinese attacks.
(4) Lohit Frontier Division.

(i) In the Lohit Division, the town of Kibitoo was shelled and overrun on 22nd October 1962.

(ii) The town of Walong was then subjected to constant heavy attacks from 26th/27th October by Chinese forces of over 2 Brigades strength, and eventually taken by them on 16th November 1962.

It will be obvious from this chronological sequence of events that Chinese forces, after consolidating the gains of their aggression in all sectors and regrouping, had continued with further aggressive attacks on Indian defence posts which had to fall back in the face of these premeditated and fully prepared massive Chinese thrusts. It is obvious that the Chinese note of 16th November 1962 which was received by the Indian Charge d'Affaires in Peking on the 17th November 1962 is not only factually inaccurate but also deliberately mischievous and designed to give a false impression to the people of China and the world outside regarding the deliberate and preplanned Chinese aggression on India. The Chinese note of 6th November 1962 was intended to provide an apologia for the massive aggression by China against India from 20th October onwards. This further Chinese note of 16th November 1962 has the same objective of misleading and confusing public opinion at home and abroad.

To talk about Chinese goodwill and the appeal of the Chinese Government for a peaceful settlement in the face of Chinese aggressive actions and massive attacks is absurd and only serves to expose the Chinese Government's deception and duplicity.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 December 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to Chinese Government Note, dated 6th November, 1962, has the honour to state as follows:

In their Note of 26th October, 1962, the Indian Government had shown in considerable detail the insincerity with which the Chinese Government advanced proposals for entering into talks and discussions with the Government of India on the border question. The record of China's negative response to the initiative taken by India over the past three months provides complete evidence of Chinese reluctance to embark upon peaceful talks and discussions. The massive invasion of India mounted since 8th September 1962 is clear confirmation of the fact that China had
no intentions to find a peaceful solution, but was bent on enforcing its untenable claims on Indian territory by military force. The factual sequence of events re-capitulated in the following paragraphs establishing this conclusively.

The Chinese reply of 4th August, 1962, to the Indian Government's offer that the two countries should enter into further discussions on the India-China boundary was sent one day after the Chinese Foreign Minister Marshal Chen Yi stated that "no force in the world could oblige Chinese troops to withdraw from their own territory either in the past or in the future", thus unequivocally elaborating a firm Government policy in regard to all territories militarily occupied by Chinese forces and laying down a pre-condition that made a mockery of any discussions on the border question.

The next communication received by the Government of India was on September 13, 1962, five days after Chinese forces intruded into a hitherto peaceful section of the India-China border in the NEFA area. After having committed this aggression it is impossible to believe that Chinese professions for peace and peaceful discussions between the two Governments expressed in their letter of 13th September could have been anything more than hypocritical.

In spite of the extremely serious character of China's fresh invasion into Indian territory, the Government of India yet again expressed their willingness to enter into discussion provided the latest aggression of the Chinese Government was vacated.

The Chinese Government's cynical response to this suggestion was a massive attack all along the Indian border. The Chinese note of 6th November, 1962 tries to establish that their offensive of 20th October 1962 took place only in the Eastern sector of the India-China boundary. The fact is that, after earlier probing attacks, Chinese troops, on 20th October, began hostilities along the entire border. False reports of Indian attacks in the Eastern sector were broadcast by the Peking Radio to provide an excuse for Chinese massive attacks which commenced at 5:00 A.M. Indian Standard Time on 20th October 1962. In the Western sector in Ladakh, attacks on Indian posts commenced from the very early hours of the morning of 20th October 1962 though the Peking Radio forgot to trump up any similar excuse for the massive Chinese attacks on Indian posts in the Western sector in Ladakh.

The hollowness of the Chinese claim that their troops were acting in self-defence is clear from the fact that within four days, Chinese forces, with the initial advantage of well planned and co-ordinated preparations available to an aggressor, were able to press forward deep into Indian territory.

China's massive invasion has destroyed completely any faith that may have earlier been placed in so called peaceful settlement proposals that the Chinese Government may put forward. It is perfectly clear that China's so called peaceful settlement proposals are only proposals for settlement on its own terms. If they are
not accepted, China would again use military pressure to enforce these terms. While India will never agree to military dictation, it has been and is willing to enter into talks and discussions with the Chinese Government for resolving the differences peacefully, provided the status quo prior to 8th September 1962, when the further Chinese aggression commenced, is restored along the entire India-China border.

The Chinese note has referred to the declaration of a state of emergency throughout this country and the visit of the Indian Ministers of Defence and Home Affairs to forward areas in NEFA as a scheme of nation-wide mobilization against China. Action on the part of the Government to meet the emergency created by the Chinese Government has, indeed, been taken with the full co-operation of the people of India. Surely the Government of China do not expect the Government and people of India to facilitate Chinese aggression.

The Government of India are prepared to seek a peaceful settlement of the boundary question, but only in a manner consistent with decency and dignity. If the Government of China genuinely desires a peaceful settlement of the differences, they should agree to the restoration of at least the status quo that existed prior to 8th September 1962. Only thereafter can the representatives of the two countries meet to discuss and resolve the differences in one stage or in several stages as may be required.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 31 December 1962

"1. In its Note the Indian Government reiterated its hackneyed words which had long been refuted, and wantonly cast calumny and aspersion on China. But no matter how the Indian side may prevaricate, it cannot shirk its criminal responsibilities for refusing to hold peaceful negotiations and for launching armed attacks.

2. In the Notes the Indian Government slanderously charges China with making "negative response" to the "initiative taken" by India on the question of negotiations over the past three months. This is a complete reversal of black and white. As is well known, although the Indian Government had continuously despatched troops to set up many strong points of aggression on Chinese territory in the Western sector of the Sino-Indian border, the Chinese Government nevertheless proposed on 4th August 1962 that the two sides should quickly hold discussions on the boundary question on the basis of the officials' Report without any pre-conditions. In circumstances in which Indian troops had invaded and occupied China's..."
Che Dong area North of the illegal McMahon Line, the Chinese Government reiterated its above mentioned proposal on 13th September. Even after Indian troops made repeated armed provocations against the Chinese side, killing and wounding many Chinese officers and men, the Chinese Government for the third time put forward on 3rd October the proposal for peaceful negotiations. In order to seek a rapprochement between the two sides, the Chinese Government further suggested that neither side should refuse to discuss any proposition in regard to the boundary that may be raised by the other side during the discussions. Even such a suggestion was completely ignored by India. One may ask, when has the Indian Government demonstrated the least sincerity for negotiation in the face of so many important efforts made by the Chinese Government on its own initiative? Besides refusing to hold negotiations and insisting on China's acceptance of the pre-conditions of unilateral withdrawing from large tracts of its own territory, where is the "initiative" taken by the Indian Government?

3. In its Note the Indian Government tried hard to describe China as the culprit who provoked massive armed conflict and decked itself as an innocent victim. But the Chinese Government has given a detailed account of the course of the Indian attacks in its Notes of 20th October, 6th November and 16th November 1962. No matter at how great a length the Indian Government might wilfully distort the facts or even unscrupulously fabricate such lies as that China allegedly despatched tanks and bombarded Chushul, it would be of no avail. One would ask, why did the Indian Notes maintain complete silence about Prime Minister Nehru's 12th October order "Free" China's territory of Chinese troops? Why did they not mention a single word about the 18th October remarks of the Indian Ministry of Defence official to the effect that Chinese forces had been "driven back two miles"? The Indian Government had probably forgotten too that on 15th November a spokesman of the Indian Ministry of Defence had publicly declared that India had launched another massive attack against the Chinese frontier guards. All these words are still ringing in our ears, how can they be denied? The Indian Government energetically played up China's establishment of defence posts and construction of roads on China's own territory, attempting thereby to prove a so called "pre-planned Chinese aggression". But Prime Minister Nehru himself said on 20th June 1962: "India had opened some new patrol posts endangering the Chinese posts, and it was largely due to movements on our side that the Chinese had also to make movements. It is well known in knowledgable circle in the world that the position in this area had been changing to our advantage and the Chinese are concerned about it". All the facts prove exactly that the recent massive armed conflict was pre-planned by the Indian Government for a long time. The Fiasco of the Indian plan for aggression was due to its misappraisal of China's repeated forbearance and accommodation as a sign that China was weak and could be bullied. However it can by no means turn India from the aggressor into the victim.

Both in the past and in the present the Chinese Government unswervingly stands for peaceful settling the Sino-Indian boundary question through negotiations. In order to reverse the trend and
promote peaceful negotiations. China has effected a ceasefire and withdrawn its troops on its own initiative, and released large number of Indian personnel. In order to terminate the ceasefire and seek a rapprochement of the view of the two sides, Premier Chou En-lai further made a new positive proposal in this letter to Prime Minister Nehru, dated 30th December 1962. All these facts have fully demonstrated China's sincerity for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. The Indian side, however, has up to now remained pat in its attitude of persisting in its unreasonable demand for a so-called restoration of the "status quo that existed prior to 8th September." Prime Minister Nehru and other leaders of the Indian Government are still talking about long-term fighting with China. Indian troops and aircraft are still making continuous harassment and provocations against the Chinese side. These words and deeds run diametrically counter to the avowal of the Indian Government in its Note that it is prepared to seek a peaceful settlement of the boundary question. The Chinese Government once again urges the Indian Government to show sincerity for peaceful negotiations and respond positively to China's important measures and reasonable proposals.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 January 1963

In its Note the Indian Government tried hard to deny the fact that the Indian side, in violation of the agreement between China and India, again sent troops into the Wuje area and stationed them there last summer. Also it tried, in disregard of the fact, to diminish at will the extent of the Wuje area in order to show that Indian troops were stationed not in that area, but "some distance away". But it is not difficult to explode the falsehood of this position. Back in 1958, at the talks held in Delhi by the Chinese and Indian sides, the same trick was played by the Indian side. At that time the Indian side first asserted that the extent of the Wuje area, which covers nearly 150 sq. km., was only 6 sq. miles; and later it even claimed that the area covered only 1.5 sq. miles. Then in its Note of 27th August, 1962, the Indian side persisted in the assertion that the area covered 1.5 sq. miles but on the very next day, that is 28th August, Prime Minister NEHRU stated at the Rajya Sabha that it covered 6 sq. miles. He stated: "6 sq. miles in the Bara Hoti plateau (i.e. the Wuje area) had been demilitarised by mutual agreement". This inconsistency only serves to show that, in attempting to change the size of Wuje, the Indian side has landed itself in utter confusion. The Indian Note, turning things up-side down, alleged that China had said the Wuje area was 300 square miles in size, charging China with inconsistency in describing the size and location of this area. Such an allegation is most absurd and has long been sternly repudiated by China. Facts are not to be altered. The Indian side absolutely cannot turn its unreasonable position into a reasonable one by using the tactics of making a false counter charge against China.
Further-more the Indian Government in its Note openly claimed that it was "legitimate" for it "to establish check posts (in) and despatch civil personnel" into China's Wuje area, which should not be regarded as intrusion. For this purpose it tried hard to describe the Wuje area as being Indian territory. But during the meetings of the officials of the two countries in 1960, the Chinese side already cited conclusive evidence showing that the Wuje area was always part of China under the jurisdiction of Daba Dzong of Tibet. This was clearly recorded in the land-conferring document issued by P'OLHA in 1729 and the one sanctioned by the 7th Dalai Lama in 1737. The local authorities in Tibet have all along exercised effective jurisdiction over this area, stationing guards there, checking traders and travellers, maintaining security and order, collecting taxes and setting up markets.

As pointed out in the Chinese Government's statement of 21st November 1962, the Wuje area is on the Chinese side of the line of actual control between the two sides as of 7th November 1959. It is completely unlawful for the Indian side to despatch personnel, military or civil, to this area. The Chinese Government once again sternly asks the Indian side to stop all intrusions into China's territory of the Wuje area.

(text by telegram)

---

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 January 1963**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the note, dated 31st December delivered by the Chinese Foreign Office to the Indian Charge d'Affaires in Peking on 1st January, 1963.

2. Apart from the complete distortion of the factual history of the developments on the India-China border in the last three months, which is the principal feature of the Chinese note, its intemperate and blatantly aggressive tone by itself indicates the complete fallowness of the Chinese professions regarding a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question through negotiations.

3. The Chinese note is based on the fallacious assumption that a country taking limited defensive action on its own territory to check the continuing aggression of an expansionist neighbour who, in violation of all accepted norms of international behaviour between friendly neighbouring countries, continues, while talking of peace and friendship, to occupy by force the territory of its neighbour, is establishing strong points of aggression. The Chinese note also proceeds on the perverse hypothesis that a country putting up a border defence post within its own territory, to guard against...
aggressive intentions of an expansionist neighbour, commits an invasion, simply because this interferes with the designs that the expansionist neighbour has towards occupying this territory.

4. The further Chinese aggression since 8th September 1962 and the massive Chinese invasion following later have fully confirmed Indian fears of the possibility of aggression by its expansionist neighbour. Such limited action as India took before and was compelled to take later to resist the latest Chinese aggression, which commenced on 8th September 1962, requires no apology or explanation. It is absurd to distort this as “armed provocations against the Chinese side”. Surely, an aggressor committing violation of a friendly neighbouring country’s territory does not expect to be welcomed by the victim of his aggression.

There is a reference in the Chinese note to the proposal of the Chinese Government for talks and discussions on India-China differences. The insincerity with which these proposals were advanced has already been reiterated by the Government of India. It was the Government of India that took the initiative on 26th July 1962 for talks and discussions in order to reduce the tensions then existing between the two countries. The Chinese reply of 4th August 1962 to this offer was sent one day after the Chinese Foreign Minister, Marshal Chen Yi, stated that “no force in the world could oblige Chinese troops to withdraw from their own territory either in the past or in the future”, thus unilaterally laying down the basis on which the Chinese Government wished to deal with all territories militarily occupied by their forces. This made a mockery of the proposal for talks and discussions on the border question.

6. The next communication received by the Government of India was on September 13, 1962, five days after Chinese forces intruded into a hitherto peaceful section of the India-China border in the NEFA area. All that India asked even then was that the invading Chinese troops should withdraw to their side of the frontier before talks and discussions could be undertaken. This is categorised as a pre-condition sought by India. Evidently the Chinese believe in the principle of taking what they can by force and asking for negotiations for the rest, and resent non-acceptance of this imperialist demand which is reminiscent of the old days of gun-boat diplomacy.

7. The following sequence of events since the beginning of September 1962, which has been detailed in previous notes of the Government of India, would make clear who is the aggressor and who is the victim:

Western Sector

(i) Commencing from 0500 hours on 20th October 1962 all 18 forward Indian defence posts from the Galwan Valley upto north of Daulat Beg Oldi were attacked by Chinese forces in overwhelming numbers and were overrun.
(ii) On 21st October 1962 two more Indian defence posts in the Srijiap area were similarly attacked and captured by Chinese troops.

(iii) From 22nd to 24th October 1962, 3 Indian defence posts, one in Kongma and two in the Hot Springs area, were also attacked and taken.

(iv) On 27th October 1962, Chinese forces launched further attacks on Indian defence posts at Changla, Jerala and Demchok and occupied fresh Indian territory upto Dumchele, east of Fukche.

(v) From 6th November 1962 Chinese forces started to build up in the Spanggur area, opposite Chushul. On the same day Chinese troops were observed digging in and bringing up additional gun reinforcements, 2 miles east north-east of Spanggur.

(vi) Commencing from the morning of 18th November 1962 Chinese forces shelled the following further areas:—

(a) Rezangla.

(b) Position 6 miles east of Chushul.

(c) Position 6 miles south-east of Chushul.

(d) Position 10 miles south-east of Chushul.

(e) The Chushul airfield area.

(vii) At 0750 hours on 18th November 1962, the Indian defence post at Rezangla was taken, after repeated heavy attacks, by Chinese troops numbering over a thousand. Chinese tanks were also observed coming up from the Spanggur gap to assist in the attack which was preceded by heavy bombardment.

(viii) On 18th November 1962 and 1630 hours, Chushul airfield was shelled again and the Indian defence post 6 miles east of Chushul attacked repeatedly by 400 to 500 Chinese troops from higher ground.

Eastern Sector

As already pointed out in the Indian Government’s note of 26th October 1962, Chinese forces, having built up since 8th September, mounted a fierce offensive with machine gun and heavy mortar fire against Indian defence posts along the Namka Chu and at Khinzhemane commencing from 20th October 1962. Subsequently, Chinese forces continued their aggressive attacks and extended them over a wider area to include 4 out of the 5 Frontier Divisions of the North Eastern Frontier Agency of India, namely, the Kameng, Subansiri, Siang and Lohit Divisions.

(1) Kameng Frontier Division

(i) On 8th September, Chinese forces crossed the Thagla Ridge and intruded into Indian territory.

(ii) On 20th September, at about 2130 hours, Chinese soldiers opened fire and again at 0330 hours on the 21st. This latter exchange of fire continued till 0530 hours the same day.
(iii) On 9th October at 2030 hours, Chinese intruding forces again opened fire and provoked another clash. Next morning this was followed up with an attack in which 2-inch mortar guns, automatic weapons and grenades were used. In the fighting that ensued Indian forces suffered 17 casualties.

(iv) On 20th October 1962, the Indian defence posts at Dhola and Tsangdhar were overrun by Chinese troops in major battle offensives. The same day the Indian defence post at Khinzemane was surrounded and overrun.

(v) On 23rd October 1962 the Indian defence post at Bumla was attacked and overrun.

(vi) The town of Tawang had to be vacated around 23rd October 1962 due to heavy Chinese pressure.

(vii) On 17 and 18th November 1962, the Indian defensive position at Sela was attacked by Chinese troops of more than a Division strength.

(viii) On the evening of 17th November 1962 Chinese forces cut off the line of communication 7 miles north of Bomdila.

(ix) On 18th November 1962 the Indian town of Bomdila which is over 40 miles south of the international border was attacked and fell to Chinese forces.

(x) On 21st November 1962, Chakoo was also taken by Chinese forces.

(2) **Subsansiri Frontier Division**

Over the period 20th October to 21st November 1962 the towns of Asafila, Taksing and Limeking in the Subsansiri Division were overrun by Chinese forces.

(3) **Siang Frontier Division**

Over the period 20th October to 21st November, 1962, in the Siang Division the Indian defence posts at Lamang, Henkar, Tadadege, Manigong, Mechuka and Tuting had to be withdrawn in the face of massive Chinese attacks.

(4) **Lohit Frontier Division**

(i) In the Lohit Division, the town of Kibitoo was shelled and overrun on 22nd October 1962.

(ii) The town of Walong was then subjected to constant heavy attacks from 26th/27th October by Chinese forces of over 2 Brigades strength, and eventually taken by them on 16th November 1962.

8. The Chinese note refers to certain statements made by Prime Minister Nehru and by officials of the Ministry of Defence in regard to the limited defensive action that the Government of India had to take after the Chinese had committed aggression on Indian territory
commencing on the 8th September, 1962. These statements referred to the clear violation of the Indian frontier by Chinese troops and the limited measures taken to prevent continuing Chinese intrusion in this area. The fact that the Government of India still put faith in the possibility of persuading the Government of China, towards whom they had consistently shown friendship and understanding, to restrain their aggressive "border forces" and to withdraw them to their own territory, and did not take more extensive defence measures, can hardly constitute a ground for a grievance by China.

9. It is China and not India that is making a wrong appraisal of the events of the last three months. The forbearance and tolerance shown by India were misconstrued as a sign of weakness and it is China that adopted bullying tactics by mounting massive attacks. When this plan of aggression began to be condemned by all peace-loving countries of the world, the Chinese Government hurriedly adopted a plan of unilateral cease-fire and withdrawals in the hope that they would be able to confuse world opinion under the guise of peaceful intentions and, at the same time, succeed in compelling India to come to terms in accordance with the military dictates of China. If China is really sincere about settling the India-China border differences by talks, discussions and peaceful means, why does it regard the Indian proposal to restore the status quo that existed prior to the further Chinese invasion of India on 8th September 1962 as unreasonable? Chinese forces have been progressively intruding into India and occupying Indian territory since 1957. Since 8th September 1962, they have invaded India, mounted massive attacks and occupied over 26,000 square kilometres of Indian territory and are now pressing India to accept terms dictated by them in the guise of peace and peaceful settlement of differences. If India, which has experienced this massive invasion, is distrustful of Chinese intentions and makes preparations for defence against the continuing Chinese aggressive threat, why should this be a cause of concern to China unless it still harbours further aggressive intentions?

10. The Prime Minister of India has, in his letter of 1st January 1963, reiterated India's desire for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question and has agreed to holding talks and discussion to this end when the latest Chinese aggression since 8th September 1962 is undone. The Prime Minister of India has also referred in his letter of 1st January 1963 to the suggestion he made in the Indian Parliament regarding reference of the differences between India and China for decision to the International Court of The Hague, which is an impartial body. It is hoped that the Government of China will respond positively to the proposals made by the Prime Minister of India and indicate that they are sincere in their professions for a peaceful solution of the differences between the two countries.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 10 January 1963

In disregard of the Chinese Government's protest the Indian Government has continued to make use of the territory of Sikkim for its aggressive activities against China. It has been satisfied through repeated investigations that Indian troops crossed the Natu La on the China-Sikkim border on 28th September 1962 and penetrated about 300 metres into Chinese territory where they started building fortified structures. In the past few months, the Indian troops have built a total of 39 pill boxes in Chinese territory, of which 11 are big and 28 small. The Indian troops have also set up barbed wire, dug communication trenches at the Natu La and blocked the pass to himself the normal movement of border inhabitants. Furthermore the Indian troops, who have been reinforced again and again, have repeatedly intruded into Chinese territory for reconnaissance and provocation. Meanwhile Indian aircraft have been sent out on many occasions to intrude, via Jelep La, the Natu La, the Thanka La, the Tagi La and the Kailu pass into China's air space over the Khamba Dzong, Yatung, Phari and other areas in Tibet, China, for reconnoitring and harassing purposes. As many as 12 verified cases of such intrusions took place from 19th October to 11th December 1962 above.

The above mentioned intrusions by Indian forces constituted serious violations of China's territory and air space, against which the Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government. It must be pointed out that the China-Sikkim boundary, which was formally delimited long ago, has always been tranquil, and that the Natu La is a pass through which Chinese and Sikkimese border inhabitants customarily moved to and fro. The utilisation of the territory of Sikkim by Indian troops for intrusions into China and for blocking the normal customary movement of border inhabitants can only be regarded as a deliberate act to upset the tranquility along China-Sikkim border.

The above mentioned intrusions by Indian troops once again powerfully corroborates the well-established fact that armed Indian personnel intruded into Chinese territory across China-Sikkim boundary, against which the Chinese Government has protested in its Note of 24th August 1962. It is complete futility for the Indian Government to deny flatly this fact in its reply Note of 10th September 1962. The Chinese Government once again urge that the Indian side immediately cease its various activities of intrusion into Chinese territory and air space across the China-Sikkim boundary. Moreover the Chinese Government declares solemnly that China has consistently respected the China-Sikkim boundary, which has long been delimited, and that the Indian scheme to create tension along the China-Sikkim border so as to impair the good-neighbourly relations between China and Sikkim will definitely fail.

(text by telegram)
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 January 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Government's note dated 10th January 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese note itself admits that "The China-Sikkim boundary, which was formally delimited long ago, has always been tranquil..." However, the same note makes various baseless charges against the Indian Government and has referred to "aggressive activities against China" which are of a completely imaginary nature.

The Government of India have, in their note of the 10th September 1962, clearly pointed out that Indian defence personnel, unlike the Chinese forces on the border, are well aware of the limits of the international boundary. They are under strict instructions not to cross this boundary and have again been asked to adhere strictly to these instructions.

The Chinese allegations that "Indian troops crossed the Nathula on the China-Sikkim border on the 28th September 1962 and penetrated about 300 meters into Chinese territory..." are completely groundless. Nor is there any basis for the other allegations regarding construction of "pill boxes" in Chinese territory and of air violations. There have, on the other hand, been a number of confirmed reports that Chinese forces have been steadily concentrating on the border of Sikkim over the past few months. These reports are causing concern to the residents of the border areas.

The Government of India are constrained to observe that the baseless charges contained in the Chinese note are reminiscent of similar groundless allegations made by the Chinese Government just before their massive attacks on the Indian border which commenced on 20th October 1962. The Government of India hope that these unfounded charges concerning the border of China and Sikkim are not a prelude to a new aggression.

The Government of India believe there is no need to remind the Chinese Government about the special treaty relationship between India and Sikkim as the Chinese Government are fully aware of these arrangements and of the fact that the defence of Sikkim is the responsibility of the Government of India.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 17 January 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the note handed over to the Indian Embassy in Peking on the 2nd January, 1963, by the Chinese Government, has the honour to state the following:
2. It has been clearly stated in the Indian Government's note dated the 27th August, 1962, that the Government of India have continually refrained from sending any armed personnel into the Bara Hoti area. The Government of India do not maintain any armed posts in Bara Hoti which the Chinese call Wuje. There are, however, some Indian posts well to the rear which would not fall within the purview of the agreement on the demilitarisation of Bara Hoti. The Government of India repudiate the right of the Chinese Government to question the propriety of these limited defensive measures taken by the Indian Government. It would appear that in a vain attempt to show that India has violated the agreement with regard to not sending armed parties into the Bara Hoti area, the Chinese Government have arbitrarily enlarged the area of Bara Hoti to suit themselves.

3. The Government of India have, on various occasions, given the precise location of Bara Hoti and have indicated that it lies indisputably within Indian territory. For the benefit of the Chinese Government, the Indian Government would once again like to identify the location of Bara Hoti. Bara Hoti is a small pasture ground covering two miles in length and three-quarter mile in breadth, south of Tunjun La. It lies in the Pargana of Malla Painkhanda in the district of Garhwal in Uttar Pradesh State. The India-China boundary in this sector runs along the water parting from Tunjun La, Shalshal Pass, Marhe La to Balchadura Pass. Bara Hoti, being south of Tunjun La, is entirely within Indian territory. This is further established by the fact that Bara Hoti is also south of the Niti Pass which is one of the six border passes mentioned in the Agreement of Trade and Intercourse between India and the Tibet region of China which was concluded in 1954.

4. The Chinese Government, in their note, allege that the Indian Government do not know the extent of the area of Bara Hoti. A reference to the Annexure to the letter dated 26th September 1959 from the Prime Minister of India to the Prime Minister of China and to other notes of the Indian Government on the subject will show that it is not the Indian Government that is unaware of the extent of the area of Bara Hoti which is within Indian territory. On the other hand, it is the Chinese Government which has repeatedly shown its lack of precise knowledge in regard to Bara Hoti and other areas falsely claimed by them. Originally, in 1955, the then Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy in India had indicated that the location of Bara Hoti was 12 kilometres north of Tunjun La. Changing this position later in April-May 1958 at the Conference on Bara Hoti held at Delhi between Indian and Chinese officials, the Chinese side said that Bara Hoti is south of Tunjun La and that it covered an area of 15 kilometres north to south and 10 kilometres east to west. But no co-ordinate had been made available with reference to this area. At the officials' talks in 1960, China's claims had expanded, basically what is a small area of 1½ square miles, into the sizeable figure of 300 square miles.

5. The Chinese Government, in their note of 2nd January, 1963, have once again wilfully distorted the facts regarding the civil patrolling of Bara Hoti. In their note of 27th August 1962, the Government of India had clearly pointed out the fact that, at the Delhi conference of 1958, it was the Chinese Government who had, while-
agreeing that both sides should refrain from sending armed patrols into Bara Hoti, refused to agree to the further proposal that civil patrols also should not go into the area. As such the Government of India were constrained as before to send their civil administrative personnel to the territory and the Chinese Government had been informed of this.

6. During the talks of the officials in 1960, it was established by the Indian side that the so called "land-conferring document" mentioned in the Chinese note, which was issued by the Seventh Delai Lama, referred to the areas merely as "an estate for raising funds for religious expenses" for the Tashigong monastery. It was a clear case of a religious endowment and cannot constitute any proof of political authority.

7. Nothing in the documents produced by the Chinese side showed that Bara Hoti ever belonged to Daba Dzong. As for the Tibetan sarjus "stationing guards" or "checking travellers" near Bara Hoti, it has been pointed out by the Indian officials at the time of the talks in 1960 that these Tibetan officials came down to Indian villages by convention to announce the opening of the trade season in Tibet and to assure themselves that pack animals used by the traders were free from disease. They also contacted Indian traders and executed agreements with them that they would abide by customary practices in their trade with Tibet.

8. It is clear that the Bara Hoti area has been continuously under Indian administration. During the officials' talks in 1960 also, it was pointed out how Bara Hoti has always been traditionally under Indian administrative jurisdiction. In fact, even Chinese maps upto 1958 have shown Bara Hoti as part of India.

9. It is evident from the Chinese note that the Chinese Government are not interested in going into the merits of the issue, but are only anxious to revive an issue in an area which has remained undisturbed so far. Such a provocative attitude at a time when friendly Afro-Asian countries are doing their best to find a solution to the grave situation created by the Chinese aggression cannot but attract serious attention.

10. The Chinese note refers to Bara Hoti (Wuje) having been shown on the Chinese side of the line of actual control of 7th November, 1959, as defined by China, according to the Chinese Government's statement of 21st November, 1962. This does not in any way constitute a proof that Bara Hoti is located in Tibet. It is a unilateral decision by the Government of China to which India is certainly not a party. The Indian Government have clearly shown the fictitious nature of this "line of actual control" which has no basis in fact. That the Chinese Government should keep raising this question only confirms the view that China may endeavour to alter the status quo unilaterally in this sector also as she has done in the other sectors of the India-China boundary.

11. In the light of the above, the Government of India categorically reject the note dated the 2nd January 1963 from the Chinese Foreign Office.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 15 November 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state
as follows:

On the 27th October 1962 about 1020 hours, a Chinese jet aircraft
circled over KUTHI (30° 19' N, 80° 46' E) for full eight minutes before
it flew away in a north-easterly direction re-entering Tibet. The
aircraft had been earlier seen approaching from the Tibetan side of
the international boundary. The Government of India lodge a strong
protest against this latest violation of Indian airspace by Chinese
aircraft and demand that the Chinese Government put a stop forth-
with to such provocative flights.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew
to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of
its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 29 November 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer
to this Ministry's note dated 15th November, 1962 regarding the
violation of Indian air space over Kuthi.

On 11th November 1962 at about 1900 hours a Chinese aircraft was
seen approaching Milam (30° 26' N 80° 09' E) from a northerly direc-
tion. The aircraft after circling over Milam flew back again in a
northerly direction entering Tibet. It is regretted that so shortly
after the air violation mentioned above another instance of violation
of Indian air space by Chinese aircraft should have taken place.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest against the con-
tinued violation of Indian air space by Chinese aircraft and demand
that these provocations are stopped forthwith.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew
to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of
its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 3 December 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour, on
behalf of the Government of Bhutan, to draw the Embassy’s attention to the following violation of Bhutanese air space by Chinese aircraft:

1. On 30th October 1962 Chinese helicopters flew over Wagya La into Bhutanese territory. They were thereafter sighted flying through Gasa Dzong, more than 16 miles south of the international border, and thereafter over Lingshi Dzong and back into Tibet through Pyimi La.

2. On 20th November 1962 at 1130 hours Chinese jet planes flew over Wangdi Phodrang nearly 60 miles south of the international border. The jet planes were seen approaching from the Luna area and disappeared in a southerly direction.

3. On 21st November 1962 Chinese helicopters crossed the Tibet-Bhutan boundary and came up to Kuna after which they went back into Tibet.

4. On 22nd November 1962 Chinese jet planes were once again seen, this time over Lingshi. The planes flew away in the direction of Paro.

The Government of India hereby lodge, on behalf of the Government of Bhutan, a most emphatic protest with the Government of the People’s Republic of China against these repeated violations of the air space of Bhutan by Chinese aircraft. This is being continued in spite of the Chinese Government’s protestation in their note of 14th October 1962 that the question of any violation or threat against the territory and air space of Sikkim and Bhutan is non-existent. The Chinese Government should take the necessary steps immediately to prevent the recurrence of such air violations in the future.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 11 December 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

During the one day of December 10, 1962 there occurred nine Indian air intrusions deep into China:

At 07.32 hours an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over the Walong area, repeatedly circling over the positions of the Chinese frontier forces there and making harassment and provocation;

At 12.05 hours another Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over the suburb of Lhasa, capital of Tibet, and then flew eastward along the Szechuan-Tibet road for extensive reconnaissance.
At 14:20 hours another Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over Towa Dzong, Gyantse and Shigatse in Tibet, and engaged in reconnaissance and harassment;

Furthermore, at 11:55 hours, 13:00 hours, 13:25 hours, 13:30 hours, 14:37 hours and 14:38 hours, Indian aircraft made six intrusions into the air space over Nalung (near Gyantse), Miku (near Tsayul), Ketang (near Meto), Tamaden, Chumitan, Changlun (near Khamba Dzong) and other places in Tibet of China.

The above-mentioned intrusions into China's territorial air by Indian aircraft are direct provocations against the Chinese frontier forces who have ceased fire and are withdrawing on China's own initiative; what is more, these aircraft penetrated deep into the air space over main cities of the Tibet region of China. These incidents are therefore extremely grave. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against these air intrusions.

Since the Chinese frontier forces ceased fire and began withdrawing on China's own initiative along the entire Sino-Indian border, violations of China's territorial air by Indian aircraft, pressing forward on the Chinese frontier forces' cease-fire line and crossing of the 1959 line of actual control by Indian troops have happened repeatedly. The Chinese Government cannot but take a serious view of this. Does it mean that the Indian side deliberately intends to disrupt the cease-fire and withdrawal by the Chinese side? The Chinese Government has clearly pointed in its statement of November 21, 1962 in what eventualities China reserves the right to strike back in self-defence. The Chinese Government urges the Indian side to stop all provocations immediately. Should the Indian side turn a deaf ear to the warning and request of the Chinese Government, responsibility for all the consequences that may arise therefrom must lie with the Indian Government.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 December 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated the 11th December, 1962, handed over to the Indian Charge d'Affaires in Peking.

There is a reference in the note of the 11th December to a so-called intrusion by Indian aircraft over the Walong area. The Government of India would like to affirm in unmistakable terms its rights to fly over any air space within the sovereign jurisdiction of India, of which Walong is an integral part.
The Government of India instituted a detailed investigation into the other allegations regarding violation of Chinese air space by Indian aircraft cited in the above-mentioned note. The investigation held has confirmed beyond any doubt that no Indian aircraft ever crossed into the areas in the Tibet region of China referred to in the Chinese Government's note.

While the allegations made in the Chinese note have been found to be groundless, the Government of India would like to bring to the attention of the Chinese Government that on the 10th December, at 17:30 hours, a twin-engined Chinese jet aircraft was noticed flying over Chabua in Indian territory. The aircraft was flying away from Chabua in a north-easterly direction (045°) towards Rima.

The Government of India strongly protest against this violation of India's air space by Chinese aircraft in contravention of normal international practice. It is, indeed, surprising that while it is a Chinese aircraft which crossed over the recognised international boundary between India and China and violated Indian air space, the Chinese Government chooses to make baseless allegations about Indian aircraft violating Chinese territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 December 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated December 3, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

The Indian Government's allegation made in its note that Chinese aircraft had violated the air space of Bhutan on four occasions is entirely fabricated. As the Indian Government clearly knows, the Chinese Government has repeatedly declared that China has never permitted its aircraft to violate or intrude into the territorial air of any foreign country. In fact, no Chinese aircraft has ever violated or intruded into the territorial air of any foreign country. The fact that the Indian Government has once again groundlessly invented the lie about so-called violations of the air space of Bhutan by Chinese aircraft can only be regarded as an attempt of the Indian side to cover up its own incessant violations of Chinese territorial air (vide Chinese Government's note of December 11, 1962) and to sow discord in the friendly relations between China and Bhutan. The Chinese Government hereby categorically rejects the protest lodged by the Indian Government.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 January 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated the 24th December, 1962.

The instances of air violations by Chinese aircraft over Bhutanese territory had been carefully verified before being communicated to the Chinese Government. There is not the least doubt that these violations had taken place. Neither vehement denials nor false allegations can wipe away these facts. It is, however, the hope of the Government of India that cases of such violation of Bhutan territory by Chinese aircraft will not recur in future.

The Government of India categorically repudiate the suggestion in the Chinese note under reference that the charges of Chinese air violations over Bhutan have been made to counter similar Chinese allegations against India in respect of Tibetan air space, contained in the Chinese Government's note of 11th December 1962. The Indian Government's note dated the 13th December 1962 has fully exposed the baseless nature of the allegations contained in the last mentioned note.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 10 October 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with regard to the serious incident in which the Indian Government connived at a bunch of ruffians in disrupting a National Day Reception given by the Chinese Embassy in India, lodges a protest as follows:

1. On October 1, 1962, the day on which the Charge d'Affaires a.i. of the Chinese Embassy was going to hold the reception to celebrate the 13th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China, there appeared in the main streets leading to the Embassy a lot of big-lettered placards in English and in Hindi aimed at coercing Indians into boycotting the Chinese Embassy's reception. About six o'clock in the afternoon on the same day, that is, about one hour before the Embassy's reception started, a group of about forty to fifty Indian ruffians shouted anti-Chinese slogans and distributed leaflets in the three streets leading to the Embassy. They obstructed the passage of pedestrians and vehicles and hindered the guests coming to the reception from entering the Embassy. Some of the ruffians took photos of the Indians attending the reception. Other ruffians threw leaflets into the courtyard of the Embassy. During the reception, the ruffians' disruptive activities still continued unbridled, and even developed to the grave extent of damaging an automobile of a diplomatic envoy attending the reception.

2. The Indian Government took an attitude of deliberate connivance at and shielding of the disruptive activities of those ruffians. Even several days before the Chinese National Day, Indian bourgeois newspapers already carried agitating reports on and clamours for these disruptive activities by the ruffians. On the morning of September 30, an official of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs took this matter up with Mr. Banerjee, Charge d'Affaires a.i. of the Indian Embassy in China, and asked the latter to draw in time the Indian Government's attention to this matter. Again, in the morning of the day of the incident, the Chinese Embassy sent an official to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs urging the Indian Government to pay heed to this matter. But the Indian authorities did not take the necessary measures, and the Indian policemen on the spot simply stood idly by and looked on with indifference at the disruptive activities of the ruffians. When Mr. Yeh Cheng-chang, Charge d'Affaires a.i. of the Embassy, was compelled by the gravity of the situation to make representations concerning this matter on the spot to Mr. R. K. Nehru, Secretary-General of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, who attended the reception, the latter went so far as flagrantly to defend the ruffians, uttering the nonsense that these acts of the ruffians reflected the sentiments of the Indians, that these acts were permitted by India's system and law, and so on and so forth.

3. It is well known that the Indian Government has been in the recent years making use of the Sino-Indian boundary question, which is created single-handedly by itself, to stir up anti-Chinese waves in
India. It was against this background that certain Indian reactionaries made disturbances time and again in front of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General in India; and now they have even gone so far as to disrupt the solemn National Day celebrations of the Chinese people. The Chinese Government and people are fully aware that the great Indian people cherish very friendly and respectful feelings for the great National Day of the Chinese people. The despicable acts of a handful of ruffians not only have aroused the indignation of the Chinese people, but are sure to be denounced by the Indian People.

4. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a stern protest against the Indian Government's attitude of conniving at and shielding the ruffians in the above mentioned incident. It must be pointed out in particular that the defence made by R. K. Nehru, a high ranking official of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, for the ruffians lays bare the fact that this disruption was a premediated, planned and organized action connived at and sheltered by the Indian Government. Of course, the Indian Government can, as before make prevarications and denials in regard to the anti-Chinese activities by the Indian reactionaries in one way or the other. But the facts are all there, and no matter how the Indian Government may prevaricate, it cannot shirk its responsibility, moral and political, for this serious provocation and cannot escape the just condemnation which is its due.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 3 November 1962

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of the Republic of India and has the honour to state as follows:

On the evening of November 1, 1962 three batches of Indian ruffians came to the gate of the Chinese Embassy at about 6·10, 7·10 and 7·45 respectively, making disturbances and shouting slogans like "Chinese dogs go back", "Death to Chou En-lai", etc. insulting the Chinese people and Chinese leader. Some of them burnt an effigy of Premier Chou En-lai. On the morning of November 2, several batches of ruffians came successively to the gate of the Embassy from 10·15 P.M. On October 24, more than 40 ruffians shouted similar insulting slogans and burnt portraits of Chairman Mao Tze-tung at the gate of the Embassy. They even hurled stones into the premises of the Embassy and threw some burning articles into the roof of the porter's lodge in an attempt to set fire. At about 12·35 and 2·45 P.M. on October 25 and about 12·35 P.M. on October 26, three batches of school-boys came respectively and clamoured in front of the Embassy. At about 3·30 P.M. on October 30, ruffians also came to the gate of the Embassy, made disturbances and burnt effigies.
On October 27, 30 and 31 Indian ruffians proceeded to the Chinese Consulate-General in Calcutta, shouting slogans insulting China and even hung an anti-Chinese poster on the gate of the Consulate-General.

In Bombay, there also occurred that ruffians came to the Chinese Consulate-General and made noises and disturbances on October 22 and on the evening of October 24.

It must be pointed out that at a time when Indian troops are launching massive attacks on the Chinese frontier guards, a small number of ruffians should have been permitted for the past consecutive days to demonstrate, make disturbances, insult Chinese leaders and even burn portraits of Chairman Mao Tze-tung, the respected and beloved leader of the Chinese people, in front of the gates of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General; they have also induced school-boys to shout slogans insulting China at the gate of the Embassy. All these are attempted to fan up anti-Chinese sentiments among the Indian people. Some ruffians even threw stones into the premises of the Embassy and tried to set fire to the porter's lodge. These provocations and disturbances have not only obstructed the normal functioning, but also threatened the security of the Embassy. The Indian authorities, however, shut their eyes to all such acts mentioned above without preventing them. Facts have shown that the Indian authorities are giving a free hand to the ruffians to indulge in outrages. For all this, the Indian Government cannot shirk its responsibility. The Chinese Government expresses its indignation at this. The Chinese Embassy hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government and demands the Indian Government immediately take effective measures to prevent recurrence of similar incidents.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of External Affairs the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 5 November 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

The Chinese Government received urgent reports to the effect that the Calcutta Branch and the Bombay Agency of the Bank of China are under grave and preposterous persecution by the Indian authorities. Following up their cancellation of the two establishments' foreign exchange licenses on December 27, 1961, the Indian authorities took sudden action on November 2 and 3 of this year to unwarrantedly shut down and forcibly take over these bank establishments in Calcutta and Bombay. In the meantime, the Indian authorities placed restrictions on the freedom of movement of the
personnel of the Bank. The Indian Reserve Bank has even notified all the banks in Calcutta not to allow the Bank of China to draw its deposits. The Chinese Government hereby expresses its resolute objection to, and lodges a strong protest against, this rude persecution by the Indian authorities in unwarrantedly closing down and forcibly taking over these branches of the Bank of China. It demands that the Indian Government take immediate steps to cancel the orders for the closing down and taking over of these bank establishments, stop infringement on the personal freedom of the bank personnel and truly ensure the safety of the personnel and property of the above-mentioned bank establishments.

As a result of the Indian authorities’ unwarranted measures of closing down and taking over, the Calcutta Branch and the Bombay Agency of the Bank of China have become totally unable to function, and the Indian authorities must bear full responsibility for all the legal and other consequences. The Chinese Government solemnly declares that the Indian Government must be held responsible for all the losses suffered by China as a result of the Indian authorities’ orders to stop the business of and forcibly take over these branches of the Bank of China, and the Chinese Government reserves the right to ask for compensation for these losses.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 7 November 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government’s Note dated the 10th October, 1962.

The Government of India had indications that certain organisations were planning a demonstration to dissuade Indian invitees from attending the National Day Celebrations held by the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China. Adequate police arrangements were made well in advance to ensure that if demonstrations were staged they would be conducted strictly in a peaceful manner and without any interference with the reception. Demonstrators should not be permitted to approach any closer than 100 yards from the entrance to the Chinese Embassy.

These arrangements were finally implemented by the police.

To state that these demonstrators hindered guests and vehicles from coming to the Reception is completely without foundation. The allegation that an automobile of a diplomatic envoy had been damaged is equally unwarranted as no such complaint had been lodged either with the Ministry of External Affairs or with the local police.

The precautions taken by the Government of India to see that the celebrations of the National day of the Chinese People’s Republic
were not interfered with by demonstrators were most elaborate as the Embassy itself would be able to testify. In fact, the function was attended by several officials of the Government of India including the Secretary-General, Foreign Secretary and other officials of the Ministry of External Affairs.

On a representation at the reception from the Chinese Charge d’Affaires, the Secretary-General stated that it was a matter of regret that such a demonstration took place at all and told the Chinese Charge d’Affaires that while local laws would not permit the stopping of such demonstrations all efforts have been made to see that they were peacefully conducted and no one was physically interfered with. For the Chinese Government to characterise these sentiments as nonsense is as unwarranted as the Chinese Government’s baseless allegation that this demonstration was a premeditated plan in which the Indian Government had participated. While rejecting the Chinese Government protest as completely without any foundation the Government of India regret that the Chinese Government should unscrupulously attempt to twist the facts for its own propagandist ends.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 8 November 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with regard to the recent intensified persecution of Chinese nationals by the Indian Government throughout India, has the honour to state the following:

Since October 20, 1962, when massive armed attacks were launched by Indian troops along the Sino-Indian border, the Indian Government has frantically persecuted Chinese nationals throughout India in a planned way. On October 31 the President of India promulgated the Foreigners’ Law (Application and Amendment) Ordinance, 1962, a law directed against Chinese nationals. As a matter of fact long before the promulgation of this Ordinance the Indian authorities had already taken a series of measures openly discriminating against and rudely persecuting Chinese nationals throughout the country. Chinese nationals were put under unwarranted control and deprived of the freedom of normal activities. Moreover, the Indian authorities have unjustifiably arrested Chinese nationals in various places, continued to compel Chinese nationals to leave India and even unscrupulously coerced them into opposing their motherland.
While the Indian Government is openly discriminating against and rudely persecuting Chinese nationals, Indian ruffians are wantonly bullying them. Chinese stores have been smashed and sacked, and Chinese nationals have been beaten and insulted. Instances of flagrant outrage by ruffians endangering the lives and property of Chinese nationals have occurred even in New Delhi, the capital of India. The fact that the Indian authorities have allowed these ruffians to run riot without stopping them proves that the Indian authorities have obviously connived with and supported them. The Indian Government cannot shirk its responsibility for these outrages.

The Chinese people have always been friendly to the Indian people and the Chinese Government has always protected law-abiding Indian nationals in China. Despite the fact that the Indian Government has in recent years persisted in a policy of persecuting Chinese nationals, the Chinese Government has continued to allow Indian nationals to lead a peaceful life in China as ever. Even when Indian troops have launched massive attacks against China, Indian nationals still enjoy all the rights which foreign nationals enjoy in China. Now the Indian Government has so rudely persecuted the Chinese nationals, connived at damage and assault on them by ruffians and violated openly the acknowledged principles of international law and practice. This policy of hostility to friendship between the peoples of China and India is obviously in contravention of the will of the Indian people. The Chinese Government firmly condemns and emphatically protests against such unlawful activities of the Indian Government of open discrimination against and rude persecution of Chinese nationals. The Chinese Government reserves the right to ask for compensation for all the losses incurred by the Chinese nationals.

At present the atrocious persecution of Chinese nationals in India is still going on. The proper rights and interests of the Chinese nationals are seriously encroached upon and the safety of their lives and property is not at all ensured. Moreover, the situation is growing daily more serious. The Chinese Government expresses its very deep concern about this state of affairs. In view of this, the Chinese Government solemnly urges the Indian Government to do the following:

(1) Immediately stop all discrimination against and persecution of Chinese nationals, and release all the Chinese nationals who have been unjustifiably arrested.

(2) Punish the ruffians who have committed outrages against Chinese nationals, truly ensure the safety of the lives and property of Chinese nationals, and protect their proper rights and interests.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 November 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

The Ministry of External Affairs of India delivered successively on November 7 and 8 two notes to the Chinese Embassy in India. The note of November 7 stated that starting from the day of notification no staff member (whether diplomatic or non-diplomatic) of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates or his wife or child shall leave India without obtaining beforehand a permit issued by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs. It added that no Chinese national shall leave India except from the four ports specified by the Indian Government. The note of November 8 stated that the Indian Government had promulgated orders to the effect that no Chinese national shall leave his place of residence or absent himself from his residence for a period exceeding twenty-four hours without obtaining the prior permission in writing of the so-called registration officer concerned. On November 8 staff members of the Chinese Consulate-General in Calcutta were stopped by an Indian police officer when going out by car. The police officer tried forcibly to ride in the car of the Chinese Consulate-General who were going out, stating that he was instructed to do so by Government orders. The Chinese Government considers that the two above-mentioned regulations and the intended forcible ride of the Indian police officer in the car of the Chinese Consulate-General are extremely unreasonable. It is well-known that the Chinese Government has always given treatment to all the Indian official missions to China which is completely equal to that given to the official missions of other countries in China, and no exclusive regulations or discriminative measures have ever been adopted. The Indian Government, particularly the Indian Embassy in China, should be fully aware of this. But the above-mentioned unreasonable regulations of the Indian Government are directed exclusively against the personnel of the Chinese missions and Chinese national in India. They are not only discriminative and special restrictions imposed on Chinese nationals, but violations of acknowledged international practice. The outrageous measure taken by the Indian police authorities not only obstructs the normal functioning of the Chinese Consulates-General, but directly infringes upon the personal freedom of the staff of the Chinese Consulate-General. The Chinese Government lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against the above mentioned discriminative regulations and outrageous measure, and urges that the Indian Government immediately cancel the above two unreasonable regulations and prevent such rude action by Indian police officers.

Since the Indian Government launched massive military attacks in the eastern and western sectors of the Sino-Indian border, the Indian authorities have stepped up their anti-Chinese measures and vigorously created among the Indian people an atmosphere of hostility to China. Following on the closing down and taking over of the two branch establishments of the Bank of China in India and more frantic persecution of Chinese nationals, the Indian Government promulgated those orders designed exclusively for restricting and
discriminating against Chinese nationals, including Chinese diplomatic officials, and even created the above-mentioned rude incident in which the Indian police officer forcible wanted to ride in the car of the Chinese Consulate-General. The Anti-Chinese activities of the Indian Government have developed to an astonishingly unscrupulous degree. The Chinese Government would like to advise the Indian Government: even though the Indian Government completely disregards the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples, it should respect the minimum code of international practice and diplomatic relations.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest considerations.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 13 November 1962

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of the Republic of India and has the honour to state as follows:

On the afternoon of November 3, 1962 a few hundred Indian ruffians carrying with them loud-speakers arrived successively at the gate of the Embassy from 4.50. They shouted slogan insulting Chairman Mao Tse-tung and kept on clamouring as long as one and a half hours. At about 11·45 A.M. on November 7 and 3·15 P.M. on November 10 respectively more than one hundred people shouted in front of the Embassy slogans insulting the Chinese people and their leaders and burnt an effigy of Premier Chou En-lai. At about 7·15 P.M. on November 9, about 150 people carrying torches and Congress flags shouted and made disturbances before the Embassy’s gate. Again, on November 11, about 200 ruffians carrying Congress flags came to the Embassy at about 11·50 A.M. burnt an effigy of Premier Chou En-lai and shouted insulting slogans like “Death to Mao and Chou”.

In Calcutta about 200 ruffians made clamours before the Chinese Consulate-General at 5·50 p.m. on November 3 and slandered the Chinese people as “bandits”. On the afternoon of November 4, two batches of ruffians made troubles and burnt portraits of Chinese leaders before the Consulate-General. On the afternoon of November 6, about 300 and on the afternoon of November 9 about 80 ruffians were clamouring before the Consulate-General. Before the Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay similar incident occurred on the afternoon of November 2.

It must be pointed out that after the Chinese Embassy lodged a protest with the Indian Government on November 3, 1962 against incidents of Indian ruffians making clamours and disturbances in front of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General, those ruffians
should have still been allowed to continue to make trouble and provocations, and insult the Chinese people and their leaders. That the Indian authorities do not stop the outrages by the ruffians shows that the Indian Government is conniving at them to fan up anti-Chinese sentiments. For this the Indian Government can in no way evade its due responsibility. The Chinese Embassy hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government and demands that the Indian Government immediately take effective measures to prevent recurrence of the above-said acts of slandering the People's Republic of China and her leaders, obstructing the normal functioning and threatening the security of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 20 November 1962

According to reports from the Chinese Consulates-General at Calcutta and Bombay, in recent period Indian police and some unidentified men openly questioned visitors at the gates of the two Consulates, registered their names, and even tried to prevent them from entering the Consulates. These policemen and unidentified men followed the Consulates' cars and subjected their personnel to various ways of surveillance. Even the driver of the Consulate-General at Bombay was closely watched when he was stepping downstairs and cleaning his car. Apart from these, the Chinese Embassy has recently been similarly subjected to restrictions and surveillance by the Indian police and unidentified men. They even threatened and searched visitors besides questioning them. Cars of the Embassy are also followed, including those of the Chinese Charge d'Affaires and Military Attache.

It must be pointed out that Indian policemen and the unidentified men have all along been putting the Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General under unwarranted restrictions and surveillance. Now, when the Indian troops are launching massive attacks on the Chinese Frontier Guards, these restrictions, obstruction and surveillance directed against the Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General by the Indian authorities have been stepped up to an unscrupulous and discourteous degree. As a result of the above-mentioned questioning of and threatening to visitors, and restrictions, obstruction and surveillance against the Embassy and the Consulates-General by the Indian police and the unidentified men, people have been unable to come to the Embassy and Consulates out of fear. It is obvious that the Indian authorities, in effect, want to completely isolate the Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General. All this not only seriously obstructs the normal functioning of the Embassy and Consulates-General, but also gravely violates the acknowledged international
practice. The Chinese Embassy lodges a protest with the Indian Government against this, and demands the Indian Government immediately take measures to stop the above-mentioned rude and discourteous action and ensure against recurrence of similar incidents.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 21 November 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

On November 5, 1962, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs lodged a protest with the Embassy of India in China against the unwarranted closing down and forcible taking over of the Calcutta Branch and the Bombay Agency of the Bank of China by the Indian authorities and demanded that the Indian Government take immediate steps to cancel the orders for the closing down and taking over of these bank establishments. The Indian Government, however, while refusing to respond to this proper and reasonable demand of the Chinese Government, has stepped up its taking over, forcibly seized all the assets and property of the said bank establishments, brought all their business under its control and dismissed their employees. The Chinese Government expresses its utmost indignation at the arbitrary and unreasonable attitude of the Indian Government.

The Ministry has been informed that the officials in charge of the Calcutta and Bombay branch establishments of the Bank of China have been denied all possibilities of carrying on their functions. Mr. Cheng Chien-feng, Manager of the Bombay Agency, has been called "former" manager by the Indian authorities. The Calcutta Branch has even been prevented from making an announcement of its closing down in Indian newspapers. Since the dismissal of the employees of the branch establishments of the Bank of China was announced, the Indian authorities have so far failed to give them severance pay, stripping them of their means of living.

Obviously, following their forcible taking over of the Bank property, the Indian authorities are creating various difficulties for the Bank personnel in an attempt to make it impossible for them to live on in the localities. At present, all functions of these bank establishments have come to a standstill.

In view of the above, the Chinese authorities concerned have decided to withdraw the responsible officials of the Calcutta and Bombay branch establishments of the Bank of China. As for the
other persons working in the establishments, the Indian authorities concerned should give them proper severance pay and give those of Chinese nationality and their families who desire to return to China the facilities to do so. In this connection, the Chinese Government urges the Indian Government to render the aforesaid responsible officials and other Chinese nationals working in these bank establishments and their families the necessary facilities for their departure. The Chinese Government reiterates that the Indian Government must be held fully responsible for all the losses suffered by China as a result of the Indian Government’s orders to stop the business of and forcibly take over the branch establishments of the Bank of China. The Chinese Government reserves the right to ask for compensation for these losses.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 23 November 1962

The Indian Ministry of External Affairs' Memorandum, dated September 28, 1962 in reply to the Embassy’s Memorandum, dated August 16, 1962, in regard to the unwarranted examination and delay of mails addressed to the Chinese Embassy, is entirely unsatisfactory. Facts are there that the Indian Customs House has examined Embassy’s mails and this can in no way be denied. The question of exemption of duties for newspapers and magazines sent to the Embassy from China does not arise at all, and it has never arisen for the past ten years or more. Obviously, in doing so, the Indian authorities concerned are making something out of nothing, deliberately making harassment and finding an excuse for the unwarranted examination and delaying of the Embassy’s mails. The Embassy demands that the Indian Government ensure against recurrence of similar incident in the future.

It must also be pointed out that in recent months the newspapers and magazines mailed to the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay have all along been held up or delayed by the Bombay Customs House. The Consulate has several times made inquiries at the Foreign Post and taken up the matter with the Bombay Customs House, but they are of no avail. To date, newspapers and magazines mailed to the Chinese Consulate at Bombay not only continue to be examined, but are generally delayed for as long as one or two months. All this is completely unjustified and has seriously obstructed the functioning of the Consulate. The Chinese Embassy demands that the Indian Government immediately take measures to ask the Bombay Customs House to release all the mails being held up, and ensure against recurrence of similar incident in the future.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 November 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:—

The Ministry has been informed that the Indian Government issued on November 20 an order to arrest and intern all the Chinese nationals and those of Chinese descent in Assam State and five districts of West Bengal. This unprecedently cruel persecution constitutes a serious violation of international law and the standard of international relations. Against this, the Chinese Government lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government.

In its note of November 8, 1962, the Chinese Government already lodged a serious protest with the Indian Government against the intensified persecution of Chinese nationals throughout India and demanded that the Indian Government put an immediate end to all discrimination against and persecution of Chinese nationals. At the same time, the Chinese Government declared that it would continue to protect law-abiding Indian nationals in China. However, while refusing to respond to China's reasonable demands, the Indian Government resorted to persecution of Chinese nationals on a larger scale and in a cruder manner. On the heels of the Indian Government's restrictions on the departure of Chinese from India and its decision to put Chinese in India under unwarranted discriminatory control, the Indian Parliament has adopted a bill which purports to put foreigners under stricter surveillance but is actually directed against Chinese nationals. There had been reports even earlier that the Indian Government was prepared to arrest Chinese nationals on mass and that concentration camps had been set up for them. Now the Indian Government does come out with its mass arrest of Chinese nationals. Under all these terrors and persecution of the Chinese nationals in India have not only suffered serious encroachment on their personal liberty but have been deprived of the minimum right to a normal living. Such arbitrary and unwarranted arrests and internment of large numbers of innocent foreigners by the Indian Government constitute outrages rarely seen in international relations.

At a time when the Chinese Government is repeatedly making great efforts to reverse the trend in the grave situation of the Sino-Indian border conflict, the Indian Government has arrested Chinese nationals en masse and further aggravated the tense anti-Chinese atmosphere. This makes it crystal clear to the people of the world who is trying its best to relax tension and who is deliberately creating tension, who is actively upholding the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples and who is doing its utmost to undermine it.

The Chinese Government resolutely demands that the Indian Government immediately release all the interned Chinese nationals, stop all its persecution of Chinese nationals and truly protect the life of Chinese nationals and the safety of their property. The Chinese Government reserve the right to claim compensation from the Indian
Government for the losses suffered by the persecuted Chinese nationals.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

———

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 26 November 1962

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of the Republic of India and has the honour to state as follows:—

At 3:30 P.M., November 23, 1962 about two hundred Indian ruffians came to the gate of the Chinese Embassy and shouted slogans slandering the Chinese people and their leaders. Later on some of them pasted some slanderous propaganda materials on the Embassy's gate. The Indian policemen who were then on the spot did not try to stop them from doing all the above. Prior to this, on November 12 and 18, three incidents of the same nature, in which ruffians made provocations and disturbances, occurred in front of the Chinese Consulate-General at Calcutta.

The continued occurrence of these incidents shows that the Indian Government, in disregard of the protests lodged by the Chinese Embassy on November 3 and 13, continued to connive at these anti-Chinese activities by the ruffians. The Indian Government cannot in any way evade its due responsibility for the above-mentioned incidents. The Chinese Embassy lodges once again a strong protest with the Indian Government to take immediate steps to prevent such acts of slandering the Chinese people and their leaders, obstructing the normal functioning and threatening the security of the Chinese Embassy and the Consulate-General.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

———

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 3 December 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Embassy's note, dated 13th November 1962.

On an earlier verbal representation by the Embassy, it had been made clear that certain regulations had been instituted in respect of
Chinese nationals in India on a basis of strict reciprocity. As the Embassy is aware, Indian nationals residing in China, including Diplomatic and Consular Officers of Indian Missions, are required to obtain exit visas from the Chinese Government. Similar regulations are applied to Chinese nationals residing in India. The Government of India categorically reject the Chinese charge that the regulations so enforced are "discriminative" or in any way a "violation of acknowledged international practice".

The note has referred to the stopping of the car of the Chinese Consulate General in Calcutta on November 8, 1962. Due to the tense atmosphere that had been created following the latest Chinese aggression, the local authorities concerned had been given instructions to afford protection to members of staff of all Chinese Missions in India. In this particular case an Indian police official had only politely offered to accompany the officials of the Chinese Consulate-General so as to afford them the necessary protection. This offer had obviously been misunderstood by the officials of the Consulate-General.

The Indian Government regret in this connection that, in the concluding paragraph of the Chinese note, an attempt should have been made to reverse the actual facts relating to the honour conflict and to suggest that it is the Indian Government and not the Chinese Government that had launched massive military attacks in the eastern and western sectors of the Sino-Indian border. Such aggression can deceive nobody. The unwarranted Chinese aggression on India constitute clear evidence that it is the Chinese Government that has continued to disregard the "friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples".

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 December 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Embassy's notes, dated November 3rd, 13th and 26th, 1962.

The accounts given, in the Chinese notes under reference, of the demonstrations are not consistent with facts. The Government of India, fully mindful of their obligations in regard to the protection of foreign Missions in India, have taken and are taking all necessary precautions to safeguard the security of the personnel and property of the Embassy.
However, it may be reiterated for the information of the Embassy that so long as such demonstrations are peaceful and are in the lawful exercise of the fundamental rights as guaranteed in the Indian Constitution, no action can be taken to interfere with them. The demonstrations mentioned in the notes quoted above were a spontaneous expression of the emotions that had been generated in the minds of the Indian people as a result of the massive attacks launched by China on Indian territory since the 20th October, 1962.

The Government of India have ensured that the Embassy has not, in any way, been prevented from carrying out its normal functions because of these demonstrations.

The allegations in the Chinese note of 3rd November, 1962, that stones were thrown into the premises of the Embassy and an attempt made to set fire to the porter's lodge have been carefully investigated and are entirely baseless. The Government of India also categorically repudiate the mischievous suggestion made in the Chinese notes that they had connived at the holding of these demonstrations.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum of the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 December 1962

With reference to the Memorandum of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China dated November 23, 1962 the Ministry of External Affairs would draw the attention of the Embassy to the factual position already given in Government of India Memorandum dated 28th September 1962. The allegation of the Embassy that the mail packets addressed to the Embassy had been opened by the Indian customs is absolutely without any foundation.

As regards the newspapers mailed to the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay, which have been seized, the Chinese Embassy is aware of the Ministry of Finance Notification dated 26th November 1959 which prohibits the entry into India of any book, periodical, pamphlet, leaflet or other document containing any words, signs or visible representation which directly or indirectly question the frontiers of India. A copy of this Notification was also handed over to the Embassy. The newspapers referred to in the Chinese Embassy's Memorandum had been held up on account of their violating the provisions of the above Notification of the Government of India. The Government of India find it difficult to accept the suggestion contained in the Memorandum that confiscation of these offending newspapers has in any way obstructed the functioning of the Consulate.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 December 1962


In order to ensure the security of the premises and personnel of the Embassy and of the Consulates-General, due to the tense atmosphere created as a result of the latest Chinese aggression local authorities had been instructed to afford additional protection to the Embassy premises and the premises of the Consulates-General at Bombay and Calcutta. The Chinese Embassy will appreciate that this is a necessary measure in order to prevent the possibility of any untoward incidents arising out of the spontaneous reaction of the Indian people to Chinese aggression on Indian soil. The Government of India find it difficult to accept the suggestion that these measures taken by the Government, which are in the interest of the Chinese Missions in India, in any way obstruct the normal functioning of the Embassy and the Consulates-General.

The Government of India also reject the suggestion in the Chinese Embassy's memorandum that the legitimate precautions taken by them in the interests of the Chinese Missions themselves are a violation of acknowledged international practice.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 8 December 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

On November 21, 1962 the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs addressed a note to the Indian Embassy in China regarding the unwarranted closing down and forcible taking over the Calcutta Branch and the Bombay Agency of the Bank of China by the Indian authorities, and asked the Indian Government to facilitate the departure of the responsible officials of the Calcutta Branch and the Bombay Agency of the Bank of China, who are now unable to carry on their functions, and the other Chinese employees and their families. The Indian Government has not yet given any reply so far.

It is reported that in applying to the local authorities concerned in India for leaving India, the personnel of the Calcutta and Bombay branch establishments of the Bank of China have encountered man-made difficulties and are thus hitherto unable to leave India. The Chinese Government cannot understand this attitude taken by the Indian authorities, and is very much concerned over the fact that those personnel are encountering difficulties. The Chinese Government once again requests the Indian Government to take immediate measures to give due facility to the departure of the responsible officials and other Chinese employees of the Calcutta and Bombay branch establishments of the Bank of China and their families.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 December 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's notes dated 8th November and 24th November, 1962.

The Chinese Government are aware that the established practices of international law require foreign nationals living in the territory of another State to respect the laws and regulations of that State. The maintenance of law and order and public security assumes greater significance when the country concerned has been subjected to external aggression. Several orders were promulgated by the Government of India under the Defence of India Regulations placing restrictions on Indian nationals in order to safeguard the security of the country endangered by massive Chinese invasion. The Foreigners Law (Application and Amendment) Ordinance, 1962, was also promulgated with the same end in view. The promulgation of this Ordinance is a matter solely within the sovereign jurisdiction of the Government of India.

The Chinese note of 24th November has referred to internment of Chinese nationals in Assam State and five districts of West Bengal. It became necessary for the Government of India to remove all Chinese nationals from that region along with others who were security risks when Chinese aggressors had been moving threateningly towards these areas. This was done in pursuance of the requirements of security and defence of the country against foreign aggression.

The Chinese note dated 8th November, 1962, has alleged that some Chinese stores had been damaged during recent demonstrations. It is a matter of regret to the Government of India that one or two incidents of this nature should have occurred. Such instances have, however, to be seen in the context of the intensity of public feeling against continuing Chinese aggression on Indian territory and the prompt action taken by the Government of India to restrain these feelings and to enforce law and order. The Prime Minister of India, speaking in the Indian Parliament on 14th November, 1962, stated:

"We have nothing against the Chinese people. We regret many things that their Government has done. We think that their Government has acted infamously towards us. We regret many things that their Government has done in their country. We cannot help them. Anyhow, we must always distinguish between the people of any country—much more so of a great country, great in size, great in history—and its government and not transfer somehow our anger and bitterness at what has been done by the Government to the people........"
We should always distinguish between Governmental action and the people as a whole. Therefore, I have not liked some poor Chinese shopkeepers, some restaurant-keepers being attacked in Delhi or elsewhere as if they were the symbols of the attack on us. Perhaps some people thought so. But, it was wrong for them to think so.

This will indicate that, despite continuing Chinese aggression and the havoc being wrought on our defence personnel and civilians by Chinese aggressors, careful attention is being paid by the Government of India at the highest level to the interests of the Chinese community residing in India.

These are the facts. The Government of India, therefore, reject the propagandist and factually inaccurate Chinese Government's notes under reference.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 December 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated December 13, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

The Chinese Government has twice sent notes to the Indian Government, on November 8 and 24, 1962, seriously protesting against the Indian authorities' wanton persecution of Chinese nationals. But in its note the Indian Government deliberately evaded matters of substance and made denials in hollow and vague terms in a futile attempt to absolve itself of the guilt of cruel persecution of Chinese nationals, and once again tried to turn black into white and cast groundless calumny on China. The Chinese Government hereby categorically refutes and rejects such denials and calumny contained in the Indian note.

The Indian Government was telling a big lie when it claimed in its note that "careful attention is being paid... to the interests of the Chinese community residing in India". As a matter of fact, the Indian Government not only has disregarded the serious protests lodged by the Chinese Government and the repeated representations made by the Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General, but has been stepping up its cruel persecution of Chinese nationals in the recent period. Since November 20 this year, the Indian Government has, in sudden raids, made wholesale indiscriminate arrests of law-abiding peaceable Chinese nationals, both man and woman, old and young, in such states as Assam and West Bengal. According to the public announcement made by the Indian Minister of Home Affairs Shastri on December 3 alone, the number of arrested Chinese nationals has
reached 1,736. The arrested Chinese nationals have been thrown into concentration camps, cut off from their families and deprived of their personal liberty and property. They have been subjected to all kinds of inhuman treatment, with the result that many of them have fallen ill or even died. Those Chinese nationals who have not been arrested are also in a precarious position; many have lost their jobs, have been rendered unable to carry on business in their shops, or have had their property frozen. Moreover, the Indian authorities have unjustifiably subpoenaed them and searched their houses at all times and connived at various kinds of atrocities committed by ruffians. Chinese nationals proceeding to the Chinese Consulates-General have been unwarrantedly harassed and even searched. Exercising the universally acknowledged right of protecting their own nationals, the Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General repeatedly asked the Indian Government for permission to visit the arrested Chinese nationals and for relevant information about them. But these completely proper requests were all rejected. These actions of the Indian Government, trampling on the code of conduct in international relations, wantonly persecuting Chinese nationals and obstructing the Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General from exercising their proper rights, have aroused the great indignation of the Chinese people. The Chinese Government hereby again lodges the most serious protest with the Indian Government.

In its note, the Indian Government again slanderously charged China with so-called aggression against India and described its large-scale barbarous persecution of Chinese nationals as action to meet "the requirements of security and defence". There is no need to recapitulate here the facts known to the whole world about India's rejection of peaceful negotiations and its aggression. But the fact that India is linking its persecution of Chinese nationals with the armed conflict it provoked on the Sino-Indian border does further demonstrate that the Indian Government's large-scale persecution of Chinese nationals has been carefully planned and is an integral part of its overall anti-Chinese conspiracy. As for the claim in the note to the effect that promulgation by India of the ordinance designed to discriminate against and persecute Chinese nationals is "a matter within the sovereign jurisdiction of the Government of India", it is completely untenable. The Indian Government should be aware that, according to international practice, the country of residence has the obligation to respect the human rights and fundamental freedoms of foreign residents and to protect the safety of their person and property. No matter what pretexts it may employ, the Indian Government cannot justify its actions against the Chinese nationals, which constitute a serious international delinquency.

What is more, in his conversation with the Chinese Charge d'Affaires a.i. on December 10, the Director of the China Division of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs raised the absurd proposition that the Indian Government was willing to exchange information concerning the internees only on a reciprocal basis and through the medium of the International Committee of the Red Cross. It must be pointed out that, while diplomatic relations are still maintained between China and India, it is the indisputable diplomatic privilege of the Chinese Embassy in protecting its nationals to request the Indian Government to provide information concerning the unwarrantedly
arrested Chinese nationals and to arrange visits. By dragging in the International Committee of the Red Cross, the Indian Government is attempting to deprive the Chinese Embassy of its legitimate right and cover up India's crime of persecuting Chinese nationals. The Chinese Government absolutely will not agree to this. It should also be pointed out that, in contrast to the Indian Government's unbridled persecution of Chinese nationals, the Chinese Government has always provided protection for law-abiding Indian nationals in China so that they may live in peace and engage in their normal pursuits, and not a single Indian national has been interned on account of the border conflict between the two countries. This fact can in no way be denied even by the Indian Government. Under these circumstances, the Indian Government's demand for so-called reciprocity obviously harbours ulterior motives. The Chinese Government would ask the Indian Government: Is India planning to blackmail the Chinese Government by holding large numbers of Chinese nationals as hostages?

At present, when the Chinese Government has on its own initiative adopted the measures of cease-fire and withdrawal and released successive batches of wounded and sick Indian troops captured in the border conflict and thus brought about some relaxation in the situation, the Indian Government, while failing so far to respond positively to the measures that China has taken on its own initiative, has gone to the length of unilaterally tearing up the agreement between the two countries on the mutual establishment of consulates-general and of stepping up its persecution of Chinese nationals. This can only demonstrate that the Indian Government is bent on obstructing a relaxation of the situation and further worsening the relations between the two countries. Furthermore, all signs suggest that the Indian Government, after compelling the termination of the Chinese Consulates-General, is preparing to arrest and persecute Chinese nationals on an even bigger scale and in an even more cruel way. All this cannot but attract the serious attention of the Chinese Government.

Owing to the stepped-up persecution by the Indian Government, the Chinese nationals in India are now in the direst straits. In order to succour the victimized Chinese nationals and rescue them from their bitter plight, the Chinese Government after careful consideration has decided to send ships to India to bring back those Chinese nationals who are either interned or unable to continue to earn their living in India as a result of other forms of persecution and who wish to return to their motherland. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will take to heart the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples and will not obstruct the return of these Chinese nationals to China or allow any forces inimical to the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples to sabotage the Chinese Government's work of bringing back its nationals.

In order to protect the proper rights and interests of the Chinese nationals and ensure the smooth performance of the work of bringing back the victimized Chinese nationals, the Chinese Government asks the Indian Government to do the following:

1. Immediately stop persecuting Chinese nationals, release all the arrested and interned Chinese nationals, return to them their pro-
property and compensate for their losses, immediately supply the num-
ber, name list and places of detention of the arrested Chinese nationals
and afford facilities for the realization of visits and other reasonable
requests made by the Chinese Embassy,

2. Ensure the freedom of departure of Chinese nationals wishing
to return to their motherland and allow them to bring with them their
money and property, ensure the personal freedom of Chinese
nationals wishing to stay on in India and the safety of their person and
properly, without discriminating against them in any way.

3. Give due cooperation and the necessary facilities to the Chinese
Government's measure of bringing back its victimized nationals.

The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will
give it a speedy and explicit reply.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity
to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest
consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy
of India in China, 24 December 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with
regard to the Indian authorities unreasonable obstruction of the
departure of the responsible officials of the branch establishment of
the Bank of China in India, has the honour to state the following:

Since 20th November 1962 the Chinese Government, the Chinese
Embassy and the Chinese Consulates General have made repeated
representations with the Indian Government, asking the Indian
authorities to render facilities to the departure from India of the
responsible officials and other Chinese staff members of the branch
establishments of the Bank of China in India and their families.
However, the Indian local authorities said that this was a matter for
the Central Government to decide, while the Indian Ministry of
External Affairs, in turn, referred it back to the local authorities.
This is obviously a deliberate attempt on the part of India to obstruct
the departure of the responsible officials of Bank of China from India.
The Chinese Government expresses its utmost regret at the Indian
side's unreasonable attitude. The Indian authorities unjustifiably
declared on 10th December 1962 that officials had been formally
appointed to take over all the property and assets and affairs of the
branch establishments of the Bank of China in India. They have
even compelled the men in charge of the Bank establishments to
leave the living quarters of the Bank where they were residing. The
Indian authorities have, on the one hand, seized all the property of
the Bank establishments, taken over all their affairs, deprived the
responsible Bank officials of their functions and threatened them to
remove from their living quarters; on the other hand, they have
prevented the responsible Bank officials from leaving India. Furthermore the Indian authorities have recently unwarrantedly arrested Mr. HUANG CHIN-AN, a staff member of the Bank of China, and his whole family, all these facts show that the Indian Government; not contented with unwarrantedly closing down and forcibly taking over the branch establishments of the Bank of China, wants to go further and persecute the personnel of the Bank. The Chinese Government urges the Indian Government to change this unreasonable attitude, take immediate measures to enable the smooth departure of the responsible officials and other Chinese staff members of the Bank and their families who desire to leave India, and stop its threats against and persecution of the personnel of the Bank of China who are still residing in India at present.

The Chinese Government awaits a reply from the Indian Government.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 25 December 1962

According to recent reports in some Indian newspapers, the Government of India has, through U.S. imperialism, had contacts with the Chiang Kai-shek gang in regard to the Chinese nationals residing in India and the over two thousand Chinese nationals unjustifiably arrested by the Indian Government; the Chiang Kai-shek gang has even requested "repatriation" of these arrested Chinese nationals, and the Indian Government should have given so-called "assurance" to the Chiang Kai-shek gang. These reports cannot but arouse the most serious attention of the Chinese Embassy. The Embassy, therefore, requests that the Indian Government immediately make clarifications regarding the above-mentioned reports.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 25 December 1962

With regard to the wanton persecution of Chinese nationals by the Indian Government, the Chinese Embassy and former Chinese Consulates-General at Calcutta and Bombay have time and again taken up the matter with the Indian Government and the Indian local authorities, and have repeatedly asked them to supply the information concerning the unjustifiably arrested and interned Chinese nationals and make arrangements for the officials of the Embassy and the Consulates to visit them. In its note dated December 18, 1962 sent to the Indian Embassy in China, protesting against the Indian Government's prosecution of the arrested Chinese nationals and comply with the request for visiting them and other reasonable
requests put forward by the Chinese Embassy. The Indian Government, however, while unable to deny the fact of its large scale arrest of Chinese nationals, still failed so far to provide the relevant information concerning the arrested and interned Chinese nationals nor has it made any arrangement for the realization of visits. It must be pointed out that to supply the above-mentioned information and make arrangement for the visits is a responsibility of the Indian Government, which it can never shirk under whatever pretext. The Embassy hereby once again demands that the Indian Government immediately supply the number, name list, cause of arrest and places of detention of all the arrested Chinese nationals, and immediately make arrangement for officials of the Embassy to visit those already thrown into the concentration camp and others who have been arrested.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 28 December 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Government's Notes dated 5th and 21st November and 8th and 24th December, 1962, has the honour to state as follows:

Orders of liquidation had been served on the Bombay and Calcutta Branches of the Bank of China by the High Courts of Bombay and Calcutta respectively on an application made by the Reserve Bank of India under the Statutory Banking Regulations obtaining in India. Whatever action has been taken is as a result of normal legal processes and there can be no complaint of "persecution" in this regard. It is accepted practice that when a bank is under liquidation, its assets are frozen and the account books of the bank are taken into the safe custody of the Official Liquidator appointed specifically for this purpose. It is also the normal practice that until the books of accounts are scrutinised and liquidation proceedings are completed, the Agents of the Branches of the bank should be available for consultation. These requirements are in conformity with Indian laws and are purely within the sovereign jurisdiction of the Government of India.

As regards the Provident Fund and other Gratuities of the employees of the Bank the final settlement can only be made after the High Courts have passed their orders and given permission to the Official Liquidator to make the necessary payments. However, all the employees of the Bank have been paid up to 30th November, 1962, and will also be paid for the further period up to 10th December, 1962, which is the date from which they have been retrenched, as soon as the prescribed formalities are completed.

There is absolutely no basis for the allegation made by the Chinese Government that unnecessary restrictions are being placed on the personnel of the Bank. The Government of India reject the
baseless and mischievous propagandist charge contained in the Chinese Note of 21st November, 1962, that difficulties have been created for the personnel of the Bank of China in an "attempt to make it impossible for them to live on in the localities".

The Chinese Note of 8th December, 1962, has sought facilities for the Officials of the Bank of China and their families to leave for China. Necessary facilities are being extended for them to leave the country.

In the light of the above facts, the Government of India categorically reject the baseless charges made by the Chinese Government in their Notes dated 5th and 21st November and 8th and 24th December, 1962.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 31 December 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated the 18th December, 1962.

2. The detailed factual background in regard to the detention of Chinese nationals has already been furnished in the Ministry's note dated the 13th December, 1962. It was the carefully planned invasion of India by China, which led to the necessity of interning Chinese residents in the border areas. This action had been reluctantly taken by the Indian Government, in the larger interests of national security, only following the massive Chinese attacks since 20th October 1962 in the Eastern and Western sectors of the Indian border. This factual sequence of events clearly establishes the absurdity of the Chinese suggestion that "a large scale persecution of Chinese nationals has been carefully planned by the Government of India." In fact, so far as cold calculated planning and deliberate aggressive action are concerned, that has been completely on the Chinese side.

3. The bulk of the Chinese, who have been lawfully interned as a result of the Emergency arising out of the massive Chinese attack against India launched on 20th October 1962, are from the sensitive border areas of India from where they have had to be removed in the interest of national security. This action taken by the Government of India is fully within their sovereign competence and there has been no violation of international law in this regard. The Chinese note states that "Chinese nationals who have not been arrested... have lost their jobs, have been rendered unable to carry on business
in their shops or have had their property frozen." This is gross ex-
aggeration. But, in any case, any hardships that they may be
suffering, are clearly caused by the wanton and aggressive activities

4. India has no quarrel with the people of China and is opposed
only to the aggressive and imperialist activities of the Chinese
Government. As the Prime Minister of India recently stated:

"We have no bitter feelings against Chinese people as such. The
Chinese Government have done certain evil things and attacked our
country.... We must fight the aggressor but it would be wrong to go
against certain basic principles. We are looking forward to a time
when we shall again have friendly relations with the people of
China."

It is in appreciation of this basic attitude of the Government and
the people of India that the Overseas Chinese Association of India,
representing the overseas Chinese community, the bulk of whom are
in Calcutta, had spontaneously addressed the Prime Minister of India,
shortly after the Chinese massive attack of 20th October 1962, declar-
ing unequivocally their solidarity with the Indian people.

5. The Chinese nationals whom the Government of India have
been compelled to intern for security reasons, are being properly
looked after. The officially accredited representative of the Inter-
national Committee of the Red Cross in India has also visited the
camp and was fully satisfied with the arrangements made. It may
be stressed for the information of the Chinese Government that the
facilities accorded to these internees are in full conformity with the
scales prescribed under the Geneva Conventions of 1949 to which the
Chinese Government are also a signatory.

6. The cases of these Chinese internees are being reviewed from
time to time. Only those who constitute serious risk to national
security will continue under detention. The Government of India
are also prepared to give necessary facilities to Chinese nationals in
India, who wish to return to China of their own free will. These faci-
lities will, in the first instance, be limited to holders of passports
issued by the Government of the People's Republic of China who
have no criminal or civil complaints pending against them. These
Chinese nationals returning to China will be allowed to take back the
sale proceeds of any property that they may have in accordance with
the prevailing Indian regulations on the subject. The Government
of India presume that similar facilities for repatriation etc. will be
extended by the Chinese Government on a reciprocal basis to Indian
nationals in China who wish to return to India.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew
to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of
its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 31 December 1962

In its notes dated 18th June and 18th August 1962 the Chinese Government has given detailed account of the fact that Indian troops who had crossed the illegal McMahon Line fired at the Roma family, inhabitants of the Lung village in Tibet, and killed Roma and kidnapped his sister-in-law Yekhu and others, and it has asked the Indian Government to make thorough investigation into the incident. Indian Government in its two notes of 30th June and 21st August did not deny the facts in question. The Indian side however described in its 21st August Note the outrage of shooting and killing Chinese border inhabitants committed by Indian troops as a "misfortune of the Roma family, which they alone had brought upon themselves". The Chinese Government is shocked and regrets at this bigoted unreasonable attitude taken by the Indian side. The Note further arbitrarily asserted that "the incident took place inside Indian territory". This baseless allegation has already been sternly repudiated by the Chinese Government in its 18th August Note. The fact is that Natemula, where the incident took place, is located not only within Chinese territory, but definitely north of illegal McMahon Line.

It must be pointed out that according to reports from the Chinese local authorities, the Indian troops have carried the kidnapped Yekhu to the south of and far away from the Lung village forcibly separating her from her family. No prevarication or denial can cover up the outrage committed by Indian troops in unwarrantedly obstructing peacable Chinese inhabitants from returning to their native place; wantonly killing people and kidnapping women. The Indian Government can by no means evade its due responsibility.

(text by the telegram)

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to Embassy of India in China, 2 January 1963

The Chinese Embassy in India handed to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs on 25th December 1962 a Memorandum requesting clarifications from the Indian Government on the news reports that the CHIANG KAI SHEK clique had made representations with the Indian Government in respect of the arrest of Chinese nationals residing in India and that the Indian Government had given certain "assurances" to the CHIANG KAI SHEK clique through the United States Government. This request of the Chinese Embassy is entirely proper. It is surprising that the Indian Ministry of External Affairs should have, in contravention of universally acknowledged diplomatic practice, rejected the Memorandum of the Chinese Embassy and refused to make clarifications on the above mentioned news report. The Chinese Government deeply regrets this unreasonable act on the part of the Indian Government.
It was stated in the Note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India dated 5th December 1959 that it will not permit any activities designed to promote the idea of “two Chinas”. However the Indian Government has now refused to clarify whether it has had contacts with the CHIANG KAI SHEK clique on the persecution of Chinese nationals in India. This ambiguous position cannot but attract the serious attention of the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government once again asks the Indian Government to make speedy and unequivocal clarification on the above mentioned news report.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 January 1963

Reference the Chinese Embassy Memorandum dated the 25th December, 1962.

The Embassy has on vague newspaper reports levelled wild and irresponsible charges. The Government of India reject the Embassy’s allegation that “assurances” have been given to any party regarding Chinese nationals who have been interned under Indian laws.

The Government of India have already made it clear in their note of 31st December that it is for the overseas Chinese themselves to decide on their future plans and that the Indian Government would consider any legitimate requests made by them.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 January 1963

Reference the Chinese Embassy Memorandum, dated 25th December 1962.

The Government of India have already fully clarified the factual background regarding the detention of Chinese nationals in their notes, dated 13th and 31st December 1962. The action taken in respect of persons of Chinese origin is one that has been thrust on the Government of India on account of the unprovoked aggression launched by Chinese forces. The Prime Minister of India has stated several times in the past that India has no quarrel with the people of China, much less with people of Chinese origin resident in India. However, in the face of the massive Chinese invasion, the action taken by the Government of India is the minimum that any Government would take under similar circumstances.
It has already been pointed out to the Chinese Government that the Chinese nationals, whom the Government of India have been compelled to intern for reasons of security, are being well looked after. This fact has also found confirmation in the report of the officially accredited representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross in India. The facilities accorded to these internees are in full conformity with acknowledged international practice. All relevant information pertaining to the internment has been provided to the International Red Cross in keeping with the Geneva Convention of 1949 to which the Chinese Government are also a signatory. In the circumstances, there is no need to inform the Chinese Government specifically of actions which are within the sovereign jurisdiction of the Government of India.

Despite much of this information having been furnished even earlier to the Chinese Government, it is regretted that they should continue to persist in levelling wilful and unwarranted accusations against the Government of India.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 January 1963


The Memorandum of 25th December 1962, handed over by the Chinese Embassy to the Ministry of External Affairs, has been clearly replied to in the Ministry's Memorandum, dated 6th January 1963 and hence no further clarification is necessary.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 January 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the note, dated 31st December 1962 from the Chinese Foreign Ministry has the honour to state as follows:

A detailed factual account concerning the incident about the Loma family has already been furnished by the Government of India in their note, dated 30th June 1962. However, the Chinese Government who could not possibly have had any knowledge of what actually transpired inside Indian territory, have continued to make wild and irresponsible charges for their own propagandistic purposes.
Tibetan refugees in India have always been treated with the generosity and compassion that are due to a people who have been rendered homeless. As pointed out in the Indian Government's earlier note, the Government of India while helping to rehabilitate these Tibetan refugees to the best of their capacity have never stood in the way of any Tibetan refugee who wished to return to Tibet. In such a context, the allegation that a woman member of the tribal party, named Yaku, had been “kidnapped” and forcibly separated from her family is absurd in the extreme and is firmly repudiated.

In the light of the fact stated above the Government of India reject the Chinese note, dated 31st December 1962.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 November 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs had brought to the notice of the Chinese Charge d'Affaires in New Delhi that in flagrant violation of all established international practices the Indian Consulate-General, Lhasa, had been denied facilities of telegraphic and courier communication with the Indian Government from 9th October 1962. It was only on 25th October that telegraphic contact was eventually re-opened. Even then the Indian Consulate's telegrams to Delhi are delayed by 3 to 4 days and it is doubtful whether any of the telegrams sent by the Government of India are delivered at all to our Consulate-General.

The Indian Consulate-General staff are being subjected to most wilful harassment by local Chinese authorities in Lhasa. There is total prohibition to anyone entering the premises of the Consulate-General. Essential articles of food are denied to them and under pressure from local authorities the entire local staff have refused to serve from November 1st, 1962. Despite this wilful withdrawal of their services, they are, under instigation of local authorities illegally demanding gratuity for past services and planning strikes and demonstrations.

The Government of India strongly protest against this completely unwarranted harassment of the Indian Consulate-General staff which is contrary to all tenets of international law and international behaviour. Such local staff as required by the Consul-General should be permitted to work at the Consulate-General, supplies of food locally obtained should be made easily available and all other restrictions should be removed forthwith.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 17 November 1962

The Content of the Memorandum of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs delivered to the Chinese Embassy in India on November 4, 1962 is completely inconsistent with the facts.

The local authorities in Tibet, China, have always done their best to render assistance to official Indian missions in the latter's normal functions. The allegation made in the memorandum that the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa had been denied facilities of telegraphic communication with the Indian Government is a sheer distortion of the facts. Assistance has been rendered to the greatest possible extent to the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa in its communications even under very difficult natural conditions in the locality. In the middle of last October, owing to telegraphic circuit troubles, the Lhasa Post and Telegraph Office had to suspend all its telegraphic contact inside and outside the country, and informed all its clients of the same. Later, after great efforts were made by the Lhasa Post and
Telegram Office in repairing, telegraphic communication inside and outside the country was quickly restored. This is unimpeachable indeed. The Memorandum, in addition, alleged that the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa had been denied facilities of courier communication with the Indian Government. This is an unwarranted charge too. The Chinese side has always accorded Indian couriers all the privileges and facilities in strict accordance with international practice, providing them even with special cars. Under such natural and road conditions as in the Tibet region, mechanical troubles can hardly be avoided in car driving. However, the local authorities in Tibet China, have done their best to help maintain normal runs of courier cars and tried their utmost to do the repair work promptly whenever an occasional mechanical trouble developed. In fact, courier cars are on normal runs. The Chinese Government does not understand how this can become a pretext for the Indian Government to slanderously charge China with "flagrant violation of all established international practices."

Since the armed attacks by Indian forces have aroused indignation and anger among the Chinese people, the local authorities in Tibet China, taking into account the safety of the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa and out of the desire to give it protection, have adopted certain safeguards and security measures and informed it of the same. Food supplies needed by the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa have always been regularly provided. As for the allegation that employees of the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa have refused to serve under pressure from local authorities, it is all the more an out-and-out fabrication. The Indian Government must be fully aware that the employees of the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa were chosen and engaged by the Indian side itself. They have all served many years with Indian missions. Whether they would continue to serve with the Indian missions is solely their own business and can be decided by themselves of their free will. The Chinese Government wishes to point out here in passing that according to its principle of giving protection to the interests of the working people, any worker who wishes to resign is entitled to ask for severance pay from the establishment which he serves.

It can be seen from the above that the protest of the Indian Government is completely unwarranted and inconsistent with the facts. The Chinese Government firmly rejects this unwarranted protest. Evidently, these slanderous charges of the Indian Government are merely aimed at worsening Sino-Indian relations, aggravating tension and creating a pretext for the frenzied anti-China activities being carried on by India.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 12 December 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to Note No. 62, Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1002 dated 22nd September (In
White Paper No. VII), 1962 from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China, has the honour to state that full facts regarding the harassment of the Indian Trade Agents at Yatung and Gyantse and the consequential delay in the winding up of the Indian Trade Agencies at Yatung and Gyantse had been given in this Ministry’s previous notes. In order to create obstacles in the smooth withdrawal of our Trade Agencies in Yatung and Gyantse, the local authorities raised vexatious problems and insisted of their settlement on the eve of the departure of the Indian Trade Agents.

The issue of arrears of rent for the Indian Agency at Gyantse for which there had neither any documentary evidence nor any legal basis was raised arbitrarily without giving even sufficient details for the basis of the claims. The Indian Trade Agents was not in a position to settle those unjust claims on the spot and he was made to sign under duress a document to the effect that the over-due rents to the Bureau of Foreign Affairs in Tibet will be paid by the Indian Consulate-General at Lhasa. It may be mentioned that this unwarranted action taken by the local Chinese authorities was against all norms of International courtesy and practice.

Regarding the Indian property left over, the Indian Trade Agent was asked to transport them physically out of Gyantse knowing fully well that the material acquired by the Indian Trade Agency could not be utilised due to the unreasonable and transigent attitude of the local authorities to complete the partly built structures.

The local authorities also did not want the Tibetan wives of the Indian employees to accompany their husbands and to this end they created endless difficulties in the issue of proper travel documents to them. Some of them were even arrested on some pretext or the other. These actions not only created needless separation of families but also created a great sense of uneasiness and despondency among the employees of the Government of India.

At Yatung the activities of the Indian Trade Agent was restricted to such an extent that he was not able to know even the whereabouts of his own employees. Some of them had left Yatung for no reason other than sheer fear the local authorities had created in them.

The Chinese Note referred to the suicide of a Tibetan employee Mr. Ningmapingtso. On the 2nd of June, 1962, a Chinese Security Officer with 2 Secretaries of the Foreign Bureau and 2 interpreters were present within the compound walls of the Agency when the incident took place. No expired after a few hours and the local Foreign Bureau was immediately informed of the death. The Indian Agency Doctor gave all possible medical help to the patient and did his best to save his life. The representatives of the Foreign Bureau were present at the premises when Mr. Ningmapingtso committed suicide and contrary to the allegation made in the Chinese Note had an opportunity to talk to Mr. Mingmapingtso if they wished to. The local authorities were fully aware of all the above mentioned facts and, even in spite of it, they ordered the Indian Trade Agent to accept the responsibility for the suicide of Mr. Ningmapingtso just on the eve of his departure from Yatung. He was also asked to sign an arbitrary investigation report in the Chinese language.
It will, therefore, be seen from the foregoing that all the allegations
made by the Chinese authorities in their above mentioned note are
utterly baseless and are categorically rejected.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity
to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the
assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 28 December 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, and, with refer-
ence to their Note dated 17th November, 1962, has the honour to state
that full facts regarding the wilful harassment by local Chinese
authorities of the Indian Consulate General staff at Lhasa have
already been given in this Ministry's note, dated 4th November,
1962.

The local authorities had taken a number of steps in the part
calculated to restrict the freedom of movement of the staff of the
Indian Consulate in Tibet and to deny them free access even to their
own nationals. These restrictions were gradually intensified and,
during the last few months of their stay, members of the Consulate
staff were virtually denied any contact outside their office premises
and, for all practical purposes, were confined to their houses.

Telegraphic contact with Lhasa was completely cut off between
9th and 25th October, 1962. Even the telephone of the Consulate
General was cut and outsiders were forbidden to enter the premises.
Supplies of even such essential commodities such as milk, eggs, fire-
wood, etc. were stopped.

Following upon the massive Chinese attack on India which com-
menced on 20th October, 1962, the attitude of the local Foreign
Bureau was quite unco-operative and the local Tibetan staff were
even pressed to leave the services of the Consulate General. They
were, at the same time, instigated by the local authorities to resort
to strikes and demonstrations to strengthen illegal demands of
gratuity for the services they had rendered to the Indian Consulate
General in the past, although they were leaving without giving the
notice necessary in such cases. The provisions of the jeep contract
for carriage of diplomatic bags were contravened and jeeps for our
diplomatic couriers were refused.

The explanation given by the Chinese authorities that the wire-
less telegraph link between Darjeeling and Lhasa were cut off from
the 9th to 25th of October, 1962, due to certain technical defects, is
not satisfactory. The link was operated by wireless and although
radio contact with Lhasa was established, they refused to accept any
messages.
The Chinese Government's further contention that they have given adequate facilities to our officials for the performance of their normal functions is untenable. It is abundantly clear from the above that the local authorities have always been adopting restrictive measures and curbs to cause maximum harassment to Indian officials in their work against all accepted norms of international courtesy and practice.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 3 December 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state that the Government of India have decided to discontinue the Indian Consulates General at Lhasa and Shanghai from December 15, 1962 and to withdraw their personnel manning these Consulates General. The Government of the People's Republic of China are requested to take reciprocal action on the same date in regard to their Consulates-General in Calcutta and Bombay.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 7 December 1962

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India and, with reference to the conversation between Mr. Ma Mu-ming, First Secretary of the Embassy, and Mr. A. P. Venkateswaran, Deputy Secretary of the Ministry, on December 6, has the honour to state as follows:—

1. The personnel of the Chinese Consulate-General at Calcutta are scheduled to leave India for China in groups between 9th and 15th December, while those of the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay are scheduled to leave India for China in groups between 13th and 15th December. The Embassy requests the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to render them all necessary facilities in order to ensure their departure on schedule.

2. The Chinese Consulates-General at Calcutta and Bombay are scheduled to begin shipping their cars, refrigerators, projectors, films, typewriters, furniture and other articles from December 10, 1962. The Embassy hopes that the Ministry will expeditiously inform the authorities concerned including the Reserve Bank of India, the Customs and Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports both at Calcutta and Bombay so as to enable the Consulates to fulfil all the necessary formalities before December 9 and ship all the articles on schedule.

3. The Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay has plans to dispose of some of its articles locally. Because of the unreasonable prevention of all visitors from entering the Consulate by the Indian police officers, the Consulate, however, has been unable to do so. In spite of the fact that the Embassy has time and again taken up the matter with the Ministry, it has continued to happen. The Embassy can not but express its deep regret at this. The Embassy hopes that the
Indian Government will instruct the local authorities to put an immediate end to such unwarranted obstructions so as to enable the Consulate-General to dispose of the articles.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 8 December 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China acknowledges receipt of the note of December 3, 1962 handed over to the Chinese Embassy in India by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs. The note stated that the Indian Government has decided to terminate the Indian Consulates-General at Lhasa and Shanghai from December 15, 1962 and unreasonably requested China to terminate its Consulates-General at Calcutta and Bombay from the same date. The Indian Government is aware that the above-mentioned Consulates-General of the two countries were set up by agreement between the two governments. The action now taken by the Indian Government one-sidedly without prior consultation with the Chinese Government constitutes a unilateral tearing up of an agreement between the two governments. Such practice of the Indian Government can only be taken as a calculated move to worsen the relations between the two countries and impair the interests of the two peoples. For this the Chinese Government lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government.

In these past years, the Indian Government in line with its set anti-Chinese policy has subjected Chinese official organs and nationals in India to all sorts of restrictions and persecutions. Particularly since the Indian Government provoked a large-scale armed conflict on the Sino-Indian border, India's measures of opposition and discrimination against the Chinese have been redoubled. Thousands of Chinese nationals have been locked up in concentration camps; branch establishments of the Bank of China in India were unwarrantedly closed down and forcibly taken over; the Chinese Embassy and consulates have been subjected to restriction and discrimination in serious contravention of accepted international practice so that they have been unable to carry out their normal functions; and even the personal safety of the staff of the Chinese Embassy and consulates has been threatened. Especially, the Chinese Consulates-General in Calcutta and Bombay have long been surrounded and placed under close surveillance day and night by Indian armed police and have in actuality been cut off from the outside world. Such abnormal treatment meted out to the Chinese in India, including the staff of the Embassy and consulates, is rarely seen even when a war has been formally declared between two countries. Leaders of the Indian Government have moreover voiced threat on many occasions that India would sever diplomatic relations with China and would declare war on China at the opportune time.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 November 1962

Reference Ministry of External Affairs Note, dated 9th May 1962 and subsequent Note, dated 27th June 1962, regarding the prescription, under the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1961, of the issue No. 18, dated 5th May 1962 of "China Today". The Ministry of External Affairs regrets to note that this prescribed issue No. 18 of "China Today" was again sought to be circulated by the Embassy through postal channels on 27th October 1962. This action of the Chinese Embassy is in direct contravention of the law of the land and is a serious breach of diplomatic privilege. The Ministry of External Affairs would impress upon the Embassy the impropriety of their action and expresses the hope that similar lapses will not occur again in the future.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 3 December 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state that the allegations made in their Note No. (62) Pu Ling Erh Tzu No. B11/96, dated September 30, 1962, have been investigated and have been found to be baseless. The Protest note of the Chinese Government is, therefore, categorically rejected.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
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The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated December 31, 1962 has the honour to state the following:

In its notes of May 31 and September 12, 1962, the Chinese Government already sternly refuted the Indian Government's crude interference with and malicious attacks on the boundary negotiations held between the Government of China and Pakistan. Now that the Indian Government is once again vociferously slandering China after China and Pakistan have reached an agreement in principle with regard to the location and alignment of the boundary actually existing between the two countries, this can only show that the Indian side is deliberately seeking a pretext to continue poisoning the atmosphere between China and India and sabotage Sino-Pakistan relations.

The Indian note arbitrarily asserts that the issuance of the joint communique on the reaching of an agreement on the boundary between China and Pakistan manifests a desire to exploit the differences between India and Pakistan on the Kashmir question, and is therefore a so-called "aggressive and expansionist move". This is indeed preposterous to the extreme.

As is known to the whole world, the Chinese Government has never involved itself in the India-Pakistan dispute over Kashmir, the Sino-Pakistan boundary negotiations and the related agreement have not at all touched on the question of the ownership of Kashmir, and have even less to do with the India-Pakistan talks on this question. It is a good thing that China and Pakistan have held boundary negotiations and reached an agreement in principle through friendly consultations. It has not only promoted the friendship between the Chinese and Pakistan peoples, but is also in the interests of Asian and world peace. What is it if not a malicious reversion of right and wrong to term such a good thing an "aggressive and expansionist move"?

China has never committed aggression against India. It is India which has occupied large tracts of Chinese territory and launched massive armed attacks against China. If there is anyone who tries to exploit something to realize its ulterior aims, it is none other than India itself. After the defeat of its military adventure against China, India, encouraged by certain Western powers, has redoubled its efforts to entice Pakistan into a joint anti-China campaign. This is no secret at all, Pakistan has repeatedly exposed such an attempt by India. India has not only brushed aside the traditional Sino-Indian friendship of thousands of years standing, but is deliberately sowing discord and sabotaging the relations between China and her other neighbours. There is no need to cite any more facts to show to what lengths the Indian Government has gone in its opposition and hostility to China. The Indian Government's attitude is indeed that of downright big nation chauvinism and expansionism.
Proceeding from the sincere desire to strengthen Asian-African solidarity and safeguard world peace, China hopes as she has always hoped, that the two sister countries India and Pakistan will be able to solve their dispute peacefully. China wishes to be friendly to both Pakistan and India, and hopes that India and Pakistan will live together in amity. This frank and above-board stand of China's is not to be distorted by any Indian slanders or calumnies.

The Chinese Government resolutely refutes the Indian Government's slanders against China in its note and categorically rejects the totally unreasonable protest by India.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 March 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated the 21st February, 1963, regarding boundary negotiations between the Governments of China and Pakistan.

The Government of India reiterate their deep concern at the Chinese Government's persistence in continuing their arbitrary and illegal efforts to "locate and align the boundary" between China and the areas of Kashmir which have been illegally occupied by Pakistan. As has been stated, repeatedly, by the Government of India, any such illegal arrangements involving Indian territory between parties that have no legal or constitutional locus standi is invalid and unacceptable to the Government of India.

The Chinese note asserts that the Chinese Government "has never involved itself in the Indo-Pakistan dispute over Kashmir". This assertion is directly contradicted by the actions of the Chinese Government in entering into negotiations with Pakistan though there is no common border between Pakistan and China. Equally groundless and misleading is the further assertion that "the Sino-Pakistan boundary negotiations and the related agreement have not at all touched upon the ownership of Kashmir". If Pakistan has no common border with China, and China and Pakistan, nevertheless, agree to locate and align a boundary in Kashmir, no further proof is needed to show that the Chinese objective is to come to terms with Pakistan on the question of the ownership of Kashmir and to involve itself in its neighbours' dispute in the interests of its expansionist and chauvinistic policies. The absurd claim made in the Chinese note that the boundary negotiations between Pakistan and China has "promoted the friendship between the Chinese and Pakistani people and is in the interests of Asia and the world peace" is, therefore, nothing but an excuse—and a false excuse at that—for the pursuit of exactly the opposite objective, namely, China's insidious policy of poisoning the
mutual relations between the countries of Asia and creating tensions and conflict in this region.

In spite of these facts which show direct interference by the Peking Government with Indo-Pakistan relations, the note expresses the insincere hope that the "two sister countries, India and Pakistan, will be able to solve their disputes peacefully". This clearly confirms the fact mentioned in the earlier Indian note, that the boundary agreement manifests the Peking Government's desire to exploit the differences between India and Pakistan on the Kashmir question, to further its own expansionist interests.

It is thus clear that the responsibility for spoiling the relations between China and India and India and Pakistan is not that of India, but that of the Government of China, who are deliberately pursuing a policy intended to destroy the accord and amity which have been developing between India and Pakistan, as a result of the joint talks between the two countries on Kashmir and other related matters. The Chinese Government should certainly know that the statement in their note that "India, encouraged by certain Western Powers, has redoubled its efforts to entice Pakistan into a joint anti-Chinese campaign", is completely baseless, considering the widely known fact that Pakistan is a member of military pacts, including the SEATO which aims at the containment of Chinese expansionism in South East Asia.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Letter from Premier Chou En-lai to Prime Minister of India, 3 March 1963

Your Excellency respected Prime Minister,

The Chinese Government has in its note of March 2, 1963 officially informed the Indian Government that the Chinese frontier guards have completed their plan of withdrawing 20 kilometres from the line of actual control as of November 7, 1959 along the entire Sino-Indian border in accordance with the Chinese Government's statement of November 21, 1962. The Chinese Government has in the same note informed the Indian Government of the locations where it has established civilian check-posts within the 20-kilometre zone on its side of the line of actual control and that it has vacated the four areas where there is a dispute about the cease-fire arrangement. I am now writing to Your Excellency to propose once again that the two sides should speedily start direct negotiations on stabilization of the cease-fire, disengagement and a peaceful settlement of the boundary question.

In order to stop the border conflict, re-open peaceful negotiations and settle the boundary question, the Chinese Government has made unremitting efforts. Only four days after the outbreak of the border
conflict, it put forward three peaceable proposals which are fair and reasonable. On November 21, 1962 it announced the measures of cease-fire and withdrawal adopted on its own initiative. China has released sick and wounded captured Indian military personnel and returned large quantities of captured weapons and military supplies of the Indian troops. The Chinese Government has responded positively to the appeal of the Colombo Conference and accepted in principle the proposals of the Conference as a basis for direct negotiations between China and India. In order to promote direct Sino-Indian negotiations, the Chinese Government has done all that is possible for it to do.

The 20-kilometre withdrawal of the Chinese frontier guards from the line of actual control has put them far behind their positions as of September 8, 1962. Moreover, the Chinese Government has further decided to refrain from establishing civilian check-posts in the four areas where there is a dispute about the cease-fire arrangement. All these actions on the part of China have created for direct Sino-Indian negotiations the necessary conditions in conformity with the dignity and self-respect of both sides, and first of all with that of the Indian side.

Therefore, I do not think there should be any more reason to delay the holding of talks between Chinese and Indian officials. As for the fact that there is a difference between the two sides in the way they interpret the Colombo Conference proposals, it can well be discussed and resolved in the talks and should not constitute an obstacle to the opening of the talks. China reserves its two points of interpretation of the Colombo proposals, but does not make their acceptance a precondition for the opening of the talks. I believe that, no matter what differences there may be between the two sides, they can be settled reasonably in the talks provided both sides have the sincere desire to stabilize the cease-fire, disengage the troops and settle the boundary question peacefully.

The Chinese Government's stand for direct Sino-Indian negotiations will not change. But if the Indian Government, owing to the needs of its internal and external politics, is not yet prepared to hold such meetings, the Chinese Government is willing to wait with patience. Now, thanks to the initiative and efforts of the Chinese side, there exist a de facto cease-fire and a de facto disengagement along our border. Even if the officials' meeting between the two sides is not held for the time being, the already eased border situation will not become tense again provided the Indian side refrains from making provocations again and from re-entering the four areas where there is a dispute about the cease-fire arrangement.

The participating nations of the Colombo Conference and all other peace-loving countries hope to see direct Sino-Indian negotiations, and they hope even more ardently that the Sino-Indian border situation will remain relaxed. In 1959 the Chinese frontier guards stopped border patrols for the purpose of relaxing the border situation, but the consequences were contrary to China's expectations. Now, the Chinese Government has again made tremendous efforts. It hopes that history will not be repeated. If unfortunately it should be repeated, the Chinese Government believes that the whole world will
be able to see even more clearly than before who should be held responsible for the tension along the Sino-Indian border.

Respected Mr. Prime Minister, it is unfortunate that armed clashes should have broken out on the Sino-Indian border. Use of force can settle no question between us. And the Sino-Indian boundary question will have to be settled peacefully in the end. I sincerely hope that you will respond favourably to the Chinese Government's proposal.

Please accept, Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Sd.) Chou En-lai.
Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China.

Letter from the Prime Minister of India, to Premier Chou En-lai, 5 March 1963

Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

Thank you for your letter of 3rd March handed over to the Indian Charge d'Affaires in Peking. He has telegraphed the text of your letter as well as of the Chinese Government's note of March 2. Your Charge d'Affaires in Delhi also gave copies of these communications to our Foreign Office on the evening of the 3rd.

We have noted the action taken by the Government of China in implementation of their unilateral declaration regarding cease-fire and withdrawals of November 21, 1962. As you know, so far as this declaration is concerned, the Government of India's attitude was communicated to the Government of China in my letter of 1st December 1962 addressed to you and in the note handed over by the Ministry of External Affairs to your Charge d'Affaires in Delhi on 19th December, 1962.

Since then, as Your Excellency is aware, the six non-aligned Afro-Asian countries met at Colombo on December 10, 1962, to consider what recommendations, honourable to both sides, they might make to resolve the differences between India and China. The discussions of the Colombo Conference countries resulted in the unanimous adoption by the Conference of the Colombo Conference proposals which were communicated both to you and to me and later personally explained by the Hon'ble Sirimavo R. D. Bandaranaike, Prime Minister of Ceylon, during her visit to China from 1st to 9th January 1963 and her visit to Delhi from 10th to 14th January, 1963.

The Colombo Conference proposals as explained by the Hon'ble Sirimavo R. D. Bandaranaike, Prime Minister of Ceylon, during her visit to Delhi were placed before our Parliament and, after consideration of the proposals in Parliament, I informed the Ceylon Prime
Minister that the Government of India accept the Colombo Conference proposals and the clarifications given by the Ceylon Prime Minister during her visit to Delhi in toto. This was on 26th January. I mentioned in this communication that further action to implement the Colombo Conference proposals by direct discussions between India and China of the various points left over for settlement between the two parties concerned can only be taken up after the Government of China have similarly accepted the Colombo Conference proposals without any reservations. The Government of India have since then been waiting for a communication from the Ceylon Prime Minister about acceptance of the Colombo Conference proposals by the Government of China.

You have stated in your message that “the Chinese Government has responded positively to the appeal of the Colombo Conference and accepted in principle the proposals of the Conference as a basis for direct negotiations between China and India”. This does not constitute an acceptance of the Colombo Conference proposals by China without reservations as China still reserves its two points of interpretation of the Colombo Conference proposals.

I regret I cannot understand your claim that “in order to promote direct Sino-Indian negotiations, the Chinese Government has done all that is possible for it to do”. The obvious thing, if the Government of China are sincere in their professions regarding peaceful settlement, is to accept the Colombo Conference proposals without reservations just as the Government of India have done. We can go to the second stage of talks and discussions only thereafter.

It is because of the sincere desire of the Government of India to settle the boundary question peacefully that we accepted the Colombo Conference proposals without any reservations and did not insist on the position stated in my letter of 1st December to you. The Government of China, on the other hand, do not still accept the Colombo Conference proposals without reservations and insist on unilateral implementation of the Chinese Government’s statement of November 21, 1962. This is the only obstacle to the next step of talks and discussions to implement the Colombo Conference proposals with a view to the creation of the appropriate climate for resolving peacefully the differences between India and China on the boundary question.

As you are already aware, I stated in Parliament on 10th December, 1962 that “I am prepared, when the time comes, provided there is approval of Parliament, even to refer the basic dispute of the claims on the frontier to an international body like the International Court of Justice at The Hague”. There could be no fairer and more reasonable approach than this proposal for peaceful resolving of our differences, once the appropriate climate is created.

You have, in your letter, referred to four areas where there is a dispute about cease-fire arrangements. There is no dispute, so far as the Government of India are concerned, with the Colombo Conference proposals in respect of these four areas. The dispute if any is the one raised by the Government of China with the Colombo Conference countries by their reservations on the Colombo Conference proposals. Once these reservations are dropped, the Governments of
India and China can undertake direct talks and discussions to settle the cease-fire arrangements for the Thagla Ridge area and Longju in the Eastern sector, the maintenance of the status quo in the Middle sector and the question of establishment of civilian posts of both sides in the demilitarised zone of 20 kilometres in the Western sector as required under the Colombo Conference proposals.

I hope that the Government of China will, on fuller consideration, decide to comply with the unanimous recommendations of the Colombo Conference countries and accept the Colombo Conference proposals without any reservations. We can then, go on to the next stage of talks and discussions for implementation of these proposals and create the appropriate atmosphere of peace in the border areas to enable us to make a further attempt to resolve peacefully the differences between India and China on the boundary question.

Please accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) JAWAHARLAL NEHRU.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 9 March 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the note, dated 2nd March 1963 from the Chinese Government, has the honour to state as follows:—

The action taken by the Chinese Government for implementing their unilateral declaration of November 21st 1962, to cease fire and withdraw has been noted. The Government of India had themselves informed the Hon'ble Prime Minister of Ceylon about their acceptance of the Colombo proposals and clarifications in toto and that they were prepared to enter into talks and discussions to implement them as soon as the Government of China similarly accepted them without any reservation. It is, however, evident that the Chinese Government have not yet accepted the Colombo Conference proposals without reservation. The sincere endeavours of the Colombo Conference powers who have worked single-mindedly for stabilisation of the cease-fire arrangements on the basis of the Colombo proposals have still not succeeded because of this attitude adopted by the Government of China to go ahead with unilateral implementation of their own proposals in total disregard of the unanimous recommendations of the Colombo Conference.

The Chinese Government's note has referred to "four areas of dispute" but, as has been pointed out by the Prime Minister of India in his letter of the 5th March 1963 to Premier Chou En-lai, there is no dispute, so far as the Government of India are concerned, with the Colombo Conference proposals in respect of these areas. The dispute, if any, is one raised by the Government of China because of their reservations on the Colombo Conference proposals.
There would be no obstacles to direct talks between India and China to settle the cease-fire arrangements for the Thagla Ridge and Longju areas in the Eastern sector, the maintenance of the status quo in the Middle sector and the establishment of civilian posts of both sides in the demilitarised zone of the Western sector, once the Chinese Government make known their clear, unqualified and straight-forward acceptance of the Colombo Conference proposals. The final response of the Chinese Government to the Colombo Conference proposals will show how sincere the Chinese Government are in their professions of peaceful settlement of their differences regarding the boundary with India.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 25 March 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and replies to and refutes the Indian Government’s note of March 2, 1963 as follows:

1. China and Pakistan are both sovereign states. To the west of the Karakoram Pass the Sinkiang region of China is contiguous to areas the defence of which is under the actual control of Pakistan, and there is a boundary of about 480 kilometres between China and Pakistan. And of course China and Pakistan have the right to negotiate and delimit this boundary in order to develop friendly and good-neighbourly relations and maintain tranquillity on the border. It is absolutely impermissible for a third party to interfere.

2. The Boundary Agreement between China and Pakistan has already been published. Article Six of the Agreement explicitly stipulates that: “The two parties have agreed that after the settlement of the Kashmir dispute between Pakistan and India, the sovereign authority concerned will reopen negotiations with the Government of the People’s Republic of China on the boundary, as described in Article Two of the present Agreement, so as to sign a formal boundary treaty to replace the present Agreement”. It is crystal clear that the Agreement is of a provisional character and it has nothing to do with the ownership of Kashmir. The Indian Government’s arbitrary assertion that the Chinese Government wants to “come to terms with Pakistan on the question of the ownership of Kashmir” is a sheer fabrication and slander.

3. The note of the Indian Government slanderously charges the Chinese Government with the intention of using the boundary negotiations between China and Pakistan to undermine the India-Pakistan negotiations on the Kashmir dispute. This is absurd and ridiculous. Everybody knows that the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan is of long standing. And the India-Pakistan negotiations on the Kashmir question which had been shelved for many years were actually resumed after the Sino-Pakistan boundary negotiations began.
How can it then be said that the Sino-Pakistan boundary negotiations have undermined the negotiations between India and Pakistan? It is the consistent position of the Chinese Government that outstanding questions between Asian and African countries should be settled by the countries concerned through friendly negotiation. The dispute over Kashmir is solely the business of India and Pakistan themselves, which should be settled by India and Pakistan through negotiations and in which China will never interfere. Why is it that India on her part should insist on interfering with the boundary negotiations between China and Pakistan?

4. In its note the Indian Government attempts in vain to accuse China of "poisoning the mutual relations between the countries of Asia," "creating tensions," etc. As the Chinese Government has pointed out in its previous notes, the Indian Government's attempt is to oppose the settlement of the boundary question and the development of friendly relations between China and Pakistan. The Indian Government's policy formulated to suit its own needs in domestic and foreign affairs is that it not only refuses to settle its own boundary question with China, but also opposes the settlement of boundary questions between China and other neighbouring countries; and that it not only frenziedly carries on an anti-China campaign itself, but also tries to entice other countries to join in the anti-China campaign. Not long ago, the anti-Chinese propaganda materials distributed by Indian diplomatic missions abroad even went to the length of asserting slanderously that the settlement by China of her boundary questions with Burma and Nepal is an "example" of so-called Chinese expansionism. Facts are more eloquent than words. It is none other than the Indian Government itself that is "poisoning the mutual relations between the countries of Asia and creating tensions and conflict in this region".

5. In its note the Indian Government further raises the question of military pacts with ulterior motives. In this regard, unfortunately the Indian Government has again lifted a rock only to crush its own feet. It is known to all that the Chinese Government has always maintained that Asian and African countries should live together in peace and friendship, and has firmly opposed the schemes of U.S. imperialism to rig up military blocs in Asia and Africa under the pretext of coping with "communist threat" for the realization of its policies of aggression and war. It is a matter of course that the Chinese Government should have welcomed Pakistan's willingness to develop good-neighbourly relations and settle peacefully and amicably its boundary question with China. This is in the interests of Asian-African solidarity and world peace. However, the Indian Government has come out in support of U.S. imperialism, alleging in its note that SEATO aims at "the containment of Chinese expansionism in Southeast Asia". Here, the Indian Government has openly revealed itself to be the apologist and mouthpiece of U.S. imperialism.

6. The settlement of the boundary question between China and Pakistan is an excellent thing. What the Indian Government should do is not to repeat endlessly its slanders and threats against the Chinese Government, but to learn honestly from the spirit of friendship and good-neighbourliness, consultation on an equal footing, mutual understanding and mutual accommodation as displayed by
China and Pakistan in their negotiations and so to settle the Sino-
Indian boundary question.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to
renew to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest
consideration.

Letter from Premier Chou En-lai, to the Prime Minister of India,
20 April 1963.

Your Excellency respected Prime Minister,

I thank you for your letter of March 5, 1963. Much to my regret
after the Chinese Government made so many efforts towards reconcili-
ation, you have once again rejected the Chinese Government's pro-
posal for the two sides quickly to start direct negotiations on the
stabilization of the cease-fire, disengagement and the peaceful settle-
ment of the boundary question.

In your letter, you said that Sino-Indian talks can start only after
the Chinese Government has, like the Indian Government, accepted
in toto the Colombo proposals and the clarifications made by the
Ceylonese Prime Minister in New Delhi. I cannot see why you have
taken such an attitude which leaves no room for consultation.

Like me, you are aware that the main aim of the Colombo Con-
ference was to promote direct negotiations between China and India
for a peaceful settlement of the boundary question; that the task of
the conference was to mediate, not arbitrate; and that the conference
proposals are merely a recommendation for the consideration of China
and India, not a verdict or adjudication which China and India have
to accept in toto. The Indian Government is, of course, free to accept
the Colombo proposals, in part or in toto. But I cannot understand
why talks cannot start until the Chinese Government, like the Indian
Government, has accepted in toto the Colombo proposals.

The Colombo Conference did not adopt any document other than
the six-point proposals. The clarifications made by the Ceylonese
Prime Minister and her colleagues in Peking and New Delhi do not
constitute an official document of the Colombo Conference. There-
fore, the question of accepting these clarifications as a component of
the Colombo proposals does not arise. As it has now been established
that the clarifications produced in New Delhi are not even a document
prepared by participating nations of the Colombo Conference, it is, all
the more, out of the question that they must be accepted.

In your letter you said that it is because of the sincere desire of the
Government of India to settle the boundary question peacefully that
you accepted the Colombo proposals without any reservations, that
is, you accepted in toto the Colombo proposals and the so-called clarifi-
cations produced in New Delhi, and no longer insisted on the position
stated in your letter to me of December 1, 1962, which called for so-
called restoration of the state of the boundary that prevailed prior to
September 8, 1962. As far as the Chinese Government is concerned,
we would of course be glad if that were indeed the case. But unfor-
tunately it is not so. You said in the Indian Parliament on January 23,
1963 that: "On full consideration of these matters as contained in the
Colombo Conference resolutions and their clarifications, we came to the conclusion that these proposals fulfilled the essence of the demand made for the restoration of the status quo prior to 8th September. With regard to the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, you even said: "The Colombo Conference proposals have certain advantages over one which we had previously indicated, that is, the restoration of the 8th September position". At a meeting commemorating the 15th anniversary of the death of Gandhi on January 30, 1963, you said: "When India received the proposals of the Colombo powers we give them most careful consideration, but we did not react immediately because some of the clauses were not clear", and that "since the clarifications brought the proposals close to India's demand for the restoration of September 8 position, India accepted them in toto". Thus, how can it be said that what India calls its unreserved acceptance of the Colombo proposals means that it has ceased to insist on its original stand for the so-called restoration of the state of the boundary prior to September 8? Indeed, is it not because the Indian Government, by exploiting the ambiguities of the Colombo proposals, had interpreted the proposals as conforming with the Indian stand that it ostensibly proclaimed its unreserved acceptance of the Colombo proposals?

It is the Indian Government's persistent demand for so-called restoration of the state of the boundary prior to September 8, 1962 that gave rise to the dispute concerning certain areas in the cease-fire arrangement. But in your letter, you described this dispute between China and India concerning certain areas as one between the Chinese Government and the Colombo Conference nation. This attempt to cover up the fact of the Indian Government's holding to its unreasonable stand by means of such misrepresentations will not succeed. The Colombo proposals are a recommendation made by the six Asian and African countries to China and India to help our two countries settle our dispute through direct negotiations. China and India may each have its own view about the Colombo proposals. Taking an honest attitude, the Chinese Government accepted the Colombo proposals in principle as a basis for direct Sino-Indian negotiations, and at the same time presented its differing opinions as its own interpretation, but reserved them for discussion and resolution in the negotiations, without making acceptance of China's interpretation a pre-condition to the opening of direct Sino-Indian negotiations. The Colombo Conference nations deemed this to be the Chinese Government's positive response to the Colombo proposals. They did not hold that direct Sino-Indian negotiations can be started only when both China and India accept the Colombo proposals in toto. But the Indian Government, while trying to turn the Colombo proposals into an adjudication, attempts to present India's interpretation of them as clarifications by Colombo Conference participants, and to force it not only on the Colombo Conference nations, but also on China. This is a dishonest approach, which also shows that India has no intention whatever to hold negotiations.

You said in your letter that you were prepared, when time comes, to refer the Sino-Indian boundary dispute to an international body like the International Court of Justice at the Hague. You further said that there could be no fairer and more reasonable approach than this proposal. The Chinese Government is of the opinion that complicated
questions involving sovereignty, such as the Sino-Indian boundary question, can be settled only through direct negotiations between the two parties concerned, and absolutely not through any form of arbitration. The Chinese Government has never agreed to refer the Sino-Indian boundary dispute to international arbitration, nor will it ever do so. On August 7, 1961 you stated in the Indian Parliament that “Arbitration was not considered a suitable method for settlement of the dispute over 51,000 square mile of Himalayan border land facing Tibet”. After that you stated more than once that arbitration is not suitable for disputes over sovereignty. But now, when the Chinese Government has created conditions for direct negotiations between China and India and when all the countries and people concerned for Sino-Indian friendship are eager to see early negotiations between China and India, not only the Indian Government has prevented Sino-Indian negotiations by setting unreasonable preconditions but you have suddenly changed your attitude by describing arbitration as the most fair and reasonable approach. This sudden change of attitude is plainly an attempt to cover up the fact that the Indian Government refuses to negotiate.

The Chinese Government has made the most magnanimous efforts to promote a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. On its own initiative, China has taken the measures of cease-fire and withdrawal, repatriated the sick and wounded captured Indian personnel, returned the captured war material of the Indian troops, and vacated the areas where there is a dispute about the cease-fire arrangements and refrained from establishing civilian check-posts there. Of late, the Chinese Government on its own initiative has further decided, and begun, to release and repatriate all the three thousand and more captured Indian military personnel. I wish to remind Your Excellency once again that, as a result of the withdrawal of the Chinese frontier guards, they are now far behind their positions as of September 8, 1962. This is a great regard for India's dignity and self-respect. The Chinese Government has, of course, every right to set up civilian check-posts in the areas where there is a dispute about the cease-fire arrangement, however, in response to the Colombo proposals, it has decided to vacate these areas and refrain from establishing civilian check-posts there. This is another major effort made by the Chinese Government in regard for the dignity and self-respect of both sides, and above all of the Indian side. Anyone making a comparison between what the Chinese Government had done and the views set forth in its statement of October 24, 1962 will see what great concessions China has already made in order to promote a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. But what has the Indian Government done? Far from making any positive response to the efforts China made on its own initiative, the Indian Government has become even more frenzied in its anti-China clamours, in seeking U.S. military aid and in making war preparations after the border situation was eased. India has continued to violate China's territory and air space along the Sino-Indian border. It has persecuted the Chinese nationals in India and even gone so far as to throw more than two thousand of them into concentration camps—although part of them are being brought back by ships sent by the Chinese Government, many victimized Chinese nationals are still obstructed from returning to China. It has forced the termination of the Chinese consulates-general in India. It has
placed restrictions on the diplomatic activities of the Chinese Embassy in India. It has unjustifiably taken over the branch establishments of the Bank of China in India. It has applied censorship on mail and cables between China and India which is permissible only when there is a state of war. And it has more overtly instigated the fugitive Tibetan rebels in India to carry out criminal activities against their motherland. I believe that everyone who respects the facts will make a fair judgement as to who truly has the sincerity for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question.

At present, the situation on the Sino-Indian border has already eased owing to the efforts made by China on its own initiative. Even if negotiations cannot be held for the time being, the Sino-Indian border situation will not become tense again provided the Indian side does not resume provocations. If, after obtaining large quantities of military aid from the United States and placing itself in the position of an aligned country, India should again intrude into the areas vacated by the Chinese frontier guards’ twenty-kilometre withdrawal on the Chinese side from the line of actual control of November 7, 1959, including the areas where there is a dispute about the cease-fire arrangement, and rekindle flames of war on the Sino-Indian border, the people of the whole world will see the aggressive nature of such Indian activities even more clearly than before.

Your Excellency respected Prime Minister in asking that the Chinese Government, like the Indian Government, should accept in toto the Colombo proposals and the so-called clarifications produced in New Delhi as a pre-condition to negotiations, you are actually serving an ultimatum for China to accept the Indian Government’s interpretation of the Colombo proposals. This absolutely will not do. In the past you always advised other countries to settle disputes peacefully through negotiations without setting any pre-conditions, why has the Indian Government taken a diametrically opposite attitude towards the Sino-Indian boundary negotiations? Although the Indian Government has taken such an attitude, I urge you once again to consider the proposal that the two sides accept in principle the Colombo proposals as the basis for negotiations and start negotiations immediately on the stabilization of the cease-fire, disengagement and the peaceful settlement of the boundary question, reserving their different interpretations of the Colombo proposals for settlement in the negotiations. This is the hope of the Chinese Government as well as of the people of the whole world. If the Indian Government, owing to its internal and external political requirements, is not prepared to hold negotiations for the time being, the Chinese Government is willing to wait with patience. If, under outside influence, the Indian Government should put blind faith in force and provoke fresh conflicts on the Sino-Indian border, that will be something which the Chinese Government does not want to see, and which will not be excused by the Chinese and Indian peoples and the people of the whole world.

Please accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Sd.) CHOU EN-LAI.
Premier of the State Council of the People’s Republic of China.
Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

Thank you for your letter of 20th April.

2. The first two paragraphs of your letter clearly demonstrate the intrinsic contradictions in the Chinese Government's attitude to adoption of various processes for peaceful settlement of the differences between India and China and this feature dominates all the arguments advanced in your letter. You accuse India of rejecting the Chinese proposals to start direct negotiations. At the same time, you had to admit that India has taken the first step in this direction and accepted the Colombo proposals and the clarifications in toto and China has not done so.

3. The plain facts of the situation are:

(i) It is the Chinese authorities who resorted to force to settle the differences on the border question and mounted an invasion against India.

(ii) Following initial success of their massive attacks, it was the Chinese authorities who tried to dictate cease-fire terms to India. I refer to your three-point proposal of October 24, 1962.

(iii) India rejected the three-point proposal and asked for restoration of the status quo prior to 8th September 1962.

(iv) When India refused to submit to these military dictates, Chinese authorities, after re-grouping their forces, mounted another massive attack further penetrating nearly a hundred miles into Indian territory.

(v) Having failed to compel India by force to accept the three-point proposal dictated by them, the Chinese made what they called their unilateral cease-fire and withdrawal declaration which had the three-point proposal rejected by India as its essential basis. India maintained its earlier position that restoration of the status quo prior to 8th September 1962 and the un-doing of the latest aggression were necessary before direct talks and discussions on the border differences between India and China can start. India, at the same time stated that Indian forces will not interfere with the cease-fire or with the withdrawal of the Chinese forces.

(vi) Having failed in the attempt to force India to come to the conference table on Chinese terms and realising the effort of their ways in using force and committing aggression on Indian territory, the Chinese started what you call efforts towards reconciliation. All these efforts towards so-called reconciliation, however, have only one aim, namely, to compel India by alternate threats and cajolery to go to the conference table on Chinese terms without doing anything to resolve the crisis of confidence created by unprovoked...
Chinese aggression and massive attacks. China wants to force its own terms on India. China has no real intention of undertaking talks and discussions except on Chinese terms for resolving peacefully the differences between India and China on the border question. This is the dishonest approach and that explains the sad story of contradictory and inconsistent Chinese attitude to the Colombo proposals.

4. The Colombo Conference of the six non-aligned countries was held, on the initiative of Prime Minister Mrs. Bandaranaike, to resolve the stalemate in the India-China dispute created by Chinese rejection of the Indian demand for the restoration of the status quo prior to 8th September 1962 and Indian rejection of the Chinese three-point proposal. The Government of China began by welcoming this initiative. When, however, the Colombo proposals were put to the Government of China and explained by Prime Minister Mrs. Bandaranaike, the Government of China, while making a show of accepting the proposals in principle, handed over to Prime Minister Mrs. Bandaranaike a memorandum dated 6th January 1963 and a letter dated 8th January 1963 which made various reservations on the Colombo proposals. These reservations which have since been maintained by the Government of China, in one form or another, were made prior to any clarifications given by Prime Minister Mrs. Bandaranaike to the Government of India in Delhi. To bring in the clarifications given in Delhi, therefore, as the main ground for China's non-acceptance of the Colombo proposals is patently absurd. The Government of China having previously attempted to force its own terms on the Government of India has, since the emergence of the Colombo proposals, continued its attempts to force the Colombo Conference countries to modify the proposals to suit China's requirements. This alone can explain Chinese characterisation of the Colombo proposals as "not precise and inconsistent in certain respects" and Chinese allegations that different sets of clarifications were given in Peking and Delhi. I understand that Prime Minister Mrs. Bandaranaike has replied to you and refuted these criticisms and allegations.

5. In your anxiety to justify the Chinese attitude to the Colombo proposals, you have questioned the aims and purposes of these proposals by raising the bogey of arbitration and adjudication. That these queries are fanciful and far fetched is clear from the following observations made by the Ceylon Prime Minister during the Conference at Colombo:

In her words the purpose of the Conference was "to find a means by which India and the People's Republic of China could be brought together with a view to consolidating the cease-fire and negotiating a settlement of their border dispute".

Towards the end of the Conference she explained the purpose of the Colombo proposals and said: "It was the unanimous opinion of the countries which participated that these proposals provide such a basis and we earnestly hope that they will deserve your careful consideration and subsequently win your approval and acceptance".
You have stated, Mr. Prime Minister, that "the task of the Conference was to mediate and not to arbitrate; and that the Conference proposals are merely a recommendation for the consideration of China and India, not a verdict or adjudication which China and India had to accept in toto". The Colombo proposals only deal with the question of consolidation of the cease-fire arrangements and not with the merits of the border differences. There can, therefore, be no question of arbitration or adjudication. Paragraph 5 of the Colombo proposals defines their scope and purpose in clear terms:

"The Conference believes that these proposals, which could help in consolidating the cease-fire, once implemented, should pave the way for discussion between representatives of both parties".

The Colombo Conference countries have also categorically stated in para 6 of the proposals that acceptance of the proposals in response to their appeal "will not prejudice the position of either of the two Governments as regards its conception of the final alignment of the boundaries".

The aim, purpose and the scope of the proposals have been stated in a clear straightforward manner by the members of the Conference and do not call for any arguments or polemics.

I regret, Mr. Prime Minister that, on this, as on other matters, the issues are being deliberately confused to find some justification for Chinese intransigence with regard to the Colombo proposals.

6. India accepted the proposals in toto because it wanted to consolidate the cease-fire arrangements and proceed to the next step of implementing these proposals so that, in the improved atmosphere, after implementation of the cease-fire arrangements, India and China can undertake talks and discussions on the main issue, that is, their differences regarding the border and try to resolve these peacefully. China has not, so far, accepted the Colombo proposals though it glibly talks about acceptance in principle. Surely cease-fire arrangements have to be accepted and implemented as suggested in para 5 of the Colombo proposals. There can be no half-hearted or partial approach in this matter. People the world over can see for themselves which country is obstructing consolidation of the cease-fire arrangements and the return to paths of peace and peaceful talks and discussions.

7. You state in your letter that "it has now been established that the clarifications produced in New Delhi are not even a document prepared by participating nations of the Colombo Conference". Having failed to substantiate the baseless allegation that different clarifications were given at Peking and Delhi by the Prime Minister of Ceylon and her colleagues, you are now making yet another unwarranted and baseless statement intended to confuse the main issue that the Government of China has not accepted the Colombo proposals. That your allegation is baseless is clear from the fact that in the Joint Communique issued on the termination of the visit of the Prime Minister of Ceylon and her colleagues His Excellency Mr. Aly Sabri of the U.A.R. and His Excellency Mr. Kofi Asante Ofori-Atta of Ghana, it was clearly stated that "upon the request of the Government of India, the
leaders of the three visiting delegations gave detailed clarifications of the Colombo Conference proposals”. And again from the fact that the document in which the clarifications were given in detail begins: “Upon request of the Government of India, the following clarifications of paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the Colombo Conference proposals were given by the delegations of Ceylon, U.A.R. and Ghana”.

8. No amount of casuistry, Mr. Prime Minister, can conceal the fact that the Government of China, while claiming to accept the proposals in principle, has been consistently opposing these proposals by maintaining its so-called reservations. If your concern for a peaceful settlement of the border dispute and for the preservation of Afro-Asian solidarity is genuine, one cannot understand your refusal to accept the proposals made unanimously and in all sincerity by six non-aligned friendly Afro-Asian countries.

9. The Government of China is perfectly within its sovereign rights if it refuses to accept the Colombo proposals. It is, however, inconsistent with the dignity of a sovereign and independent country to find flimsy excuses or to resort to indiscriminate accusations against other governments in an attempt to confuse the issues involved and to cover up its intransigence. The Colombo proposals are neither Indian nor Chinese. As a matter of fact, they considerably fall short of the Indian demand that the status quo prior to 8th September 1962 should be restored. And yet, the Government of India accepted them in the interest of peace and Afro-Asian co-operation. It seems to be a strange form of logic for you to reject the Colombo Conference proposals just because the Government of India has accepted them. The obvious reason for the Government of China’s attitude in this matter is its desire to retain at least partially the gains of its latest aggression and no amount of camouflage can hide this particular design.

10. You have deliberately misquoted my letter of 5th March as stating that the dispute concerning certain areas was one between the Chinese Government and the Colombo Conference countries. All that my letter stated was that any reservations in regard to the Colombo Conference proposals that the Chinese Government may have are matters for the Colombo Conference countries and the Government of China to deal with. Apart from this misquotation, you are also misinterpreting the scope of the Colombo Conference proposals. The quotations in para 5 above will convince you that the Colombo Conference put forward these proposals for acceptance by both India and China because the participating countries believed that these proposals, if implemented, will pave the way for discussion between the representatives of India and China on their differences regarding the border.

11. What is being discussed in this correspondence between you, Mr. Prime Minister, and myself is neither the Chinese three-point proposal nor the Indian proposal regarding restoration of the status quo prior to 8th September 1962, but the proposals made by the Colombo Conference. It is high time that the Government of China took a clear and categorical attitude to these proposals. India has accepted them in toto and, if the Government of China states that they also accept the Colombo proposals without any reservations, we can go or to the next stage of discussing the points which the Colombo
proposals have left to the two countries to decide by common agreement and then implement the agreed cease-fire arrangements on the ground. We can then revert to the question of talks and discussions on the main question of our border differences.

12. You categorically state in your letter that "the Chinese Government is of the opinion that complicated questions involving sovereignty, such as the Sino-Indian boundary question, can be settled only through direct negotiations between the two parties concerned and absolutely not through any form of arbitration. The Chinese Government has never agreed to refer the Sino-Indian boundary dispute to international arbitration, nor will it ever do so." Having stated this categorical attitude of the Chinese Government you proceed to justify this attitude again by quoting me out of context. I agree that arbitration on the question of sovereignty is a concept that is unacceptable to my Government. The Sino-Indian border dispute, however, involves differences on interpretation of treaties, agreements, maps and the factual data relating to exercise of administration in the boundary areas under dispute. These differences are matters which are justiciable and capable of judicial interpretation either by the International Court of Justice at the Hague or by an arbitrator or arbitrators agreed to between our two governments. It is true that on August 7, 1961, I did not consider that arbitration on the Sino-Indian dispute was called for because we were hoping to resolve our differences by talks and discussions and evaluation of the material advanced in support of their claims by both sides. Since then, however, the Government of China has attempted to settle this dispute by force. In this context of force having been actually used, reversion to peaceful procedures requires that we must also agree, in case our differences cannot be settled by direct discussions, to some other peaceful method of resolving these differences so that neither India nor China need resort to force in future for settling this dispute.

13. There is no change in attitude, sudden or otherwise, on the part of the Government of India on the question of arbitration. There has been only one change and that is that the Government of China has sought to settle the differences by force of arms. It is in this context that the other peaceful methods suggested by me—reference to the International Court of Justice at the Hague or arbitration by an impartial individual or group of individuals agreed to by both the countries—has to be considered. I need not cite instances of such international arbitration resorted to by various countries in the past as these are well known.

14. In your letter, Mr. Prime Minister, you refer to actions of the Chinese Government, such as, your decision to cease-fire and withdraw and repatriation of Indian prisoners of war etc., which you characterise as magnanimous. But this overlooks the basic fact that there would not have been any need for such actions if the Government of China had not invaded India and undertaken large-scale massive attacks in the western and the eastern sectors of the Sino-Indian border. Your so-called "magnanimous actions" are not only mere palliatives of the serious wrong done to a friendly and peaceful neighbour but are calculated moves to compel India to accept the terms dictated by the Government of China. If this were not so, why
should the Government of China decline to accept impartial and objective proposals for consolidation of cease-fire made by the six independent non-aligned countries of Asia and Africa?

15. As aggression and massive attacks by China have occurred and the Government of China continues to be intransigent on the Colombo proposals though these only deal with consolidation of cease-fire, the Government of India has had to take necessary measures for the defence of its territorial integrity and independence against the recurrence of what happened in October-November, 1962. This is a purely defensive measure and the Government of China has no need to worry on this score unless it harbours aggressive designs against India.

16. In your letter you have thought fit to refer to a number of measures that the Government of India had to take in the interest of security when faced with Chinese aggression and made various baseless allegations against the Government of India. These have been dealt with in detail in the replies sent by the Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India. I would only say that all these measures are the direct result of Chinese aggression and massive attacks. The Government of India had to take, though reluctantly, these minimum measures to safeguard the independence and territorial integrity of India. At no time have Indian forces violated Chinese frontiers nor have any undue restrictions been placed on the activities of the Chinese Embassy in India. Even on the question of repatriation of Chinese detenues, the Government of India has wholeheartedly co-operated in facilitating the repatriation of those who wanted to go to China. The only point on which the Government of India could not co-operate with the Chinese Government was in respect of the Chinese demand that even those Chinese detenues who wanted to stay in India should be compulsorily repatriated to China.

17. You have, Mr. Prime Minister, made a mischievous insinuation in the concluding portion of your letter that the Chinese Government is willing to wait with patience if the Indian Government, owing to its internal or external political requirements, is not prepared to hold negotiations for the time being. This insinuation is entirely unwarranted and baseless. The Government of India has behind it the united support of the entire people in its attitude in support of the Colombo Conference proposals and the measures it had to take in the face of the aggressive and expansionist policies of the Government of China. Nor has the Government of India at any time since its independence been ever influenced in its decisions by external factors or outside influences.

18. Despite the crisis of confidence created by Chinese aggression and massive attacks, the Government of India is determined to seek all peaceful avenues of settlement of the Sino-Indian differences on the border question as indicated in Government of India’s note dated 3rd April, 1963. While taking necessary precautions against the repetition of the events of October-November 1962, it continues to follow the policy of non-alignment, peaceful co-existence and development in peace and freedom for the betterment of the conditions of the 450 million people of India who stand united in their support of the Government of India’s firm resolve to pursue these policies.
19. The Government of India does not make any pre-conditions nor does it serve any ultimatum. Equally clearly it will not accept any pre-conditions or be coerced by any ultimatum or threats aimed at modifying what are clearly straightforward and impartial proposals made by six friendly and independent non-aligned countries for consolidation of cease-fire arrangements between India and China as the first step in the series of processes to be undertaken to settle the India-China border differences by peaceful means as distinct from the attempt by China to settle these differences by the arbitrament of war.

Please accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Yours Sincerely,

(Sd.) JAWAHARLAL NEHRU.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 26 June 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the Indian Government's note of March 9, 1963, has the honour to state the following:—

The Chinese Government has withdrawn its frontier guards from the 20 kilometre zones on the Chinese side of the line of actual control along the Sino-Indian border and only established twenty-six civilian check-posts there. In those areas in the demilitarized zones where there is a dispute between the Chinese and Indian sides about the cease-fire arrangements, the Chinese Government has even refrained from establishing any civilian checkposts and left them completely vacated. This is another major effort made by the Chinese Government for the sake of stabilization of the cease-fire, disengagement and promotion of a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, and also in response to the peace appeal of the Colombo Conference. The Indian Government, however, asserted in its note that these conciliatory measures of China had been taken in total disregard of the Colombo proposals and that they were a cause for the failure of the endeavours of the Colombo Conference nations. On June 12, 1963, a spokesman of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs asserted that among the civilian checkposts set up by China in the western sector of the border, six were inside Ladakh; and that the Colombo proposals envisaged that the demilitarized area in the western sector should be administered by the civilian posts of both sides. The assertions made in the Indian note and by the Indian spokesman have totally reversed right and wrong, and their purpose is to borrow the name of the Colombo proposals to cover up India's unjustifiable refusal to settle the boundary question peacefully through negotiations.

All the twenty-six civilian checkposts set up by China are located inside Sinkiang and Tibet, China. Among them seven, and not six, are in the western sector. China had maintained border defence
posts at these seven posts as far back as before November 7, 1959, while the Indian had never been there. The assertion of the Indian spokesman that the civilian checkposts set up in the western sector by China are located in Ladakh is wholly groundless.

The Indian Government's assertion that the Colombo proposals envisaged that the area in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary should be administered by the civilian posts of both sides is nothing but its own unilateral interpretation of the Colombo proposals. Any attempt to impose this interpretation upon China will be futile. The Chinese Government's decision on the establishment of civilian checkposts on the Chinese side of the line of actual control has been made known not only to the Indian Government, but to the Colombo Conference nations and the whole world. The series of conciliatory steps taken by the Chinese Government have exerted ever greater influence, and the Colombo Conference nations earnestly hope that direct Sino-Indian negotiations will start quickly. It is understandable that the Indian Government is afraid of this influence, but it is rather unseemly to resort to distortion and smearing against China's conciliatory measures in an attempt to cover up its unwillingness to hold negotiations.

China has from the very beginning welcomed the efforts of the Colombo Conference nations to promote direct Sino-Indian negotiations for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. China has demonstrated not only by words but by deeds its acceptance of the Colombo proposals in principle. The Colombo Conference nations have all expressed their appreciation of the series of measures taken on China's own initiative, holding that they are helpful towards a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question and constitute a positive response to the Colombo proposals. India claims that it has accepted the Colombo proposals in toto, but what has it done? It has done nothing positive. Instead, it has stepped up its anti-China campaign, its arms expansion and war preparations and its activities to vitiate the relations between the two countries. As to who truly cherishes the sincere desire for a peaceful settlement of the boundary question and who has genuinely responded to the Colombo proposals, that is a fact evident to everybody and can in no way be distorted by the Indian Government.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 July 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office Note, dated 26th June, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:—

The traditional and customary boundary between India and China has been well-known from time immemorial and there has never
been any doubt about it. No previous Chinese Government had ever come in search of territory beyond the Kuen Lun. For full ten years after the formation of the Government of the People’s Republic of China, that Government too had raised no doubts in regard to this boundary. Even while maintaining a facade of friendship with India based on assurances of respect for India’s territorial integrity and sovereignty and the non-existence of any territorial dispute whatsoever, Chinese forces had commenced a process of illegal and stealthy encroachments into Indian territory in the Middle and Western Sectors. It is significant that in the correspondence exchanged in regard to these encroachments, which the Government of India sincerely believed then to be the result of misunderstandings on the part of Chinese local officials, the Chinese Government did not make known that it intended at an opportune moment to challenge the traditional and customary border between the two countries. It was only in his letter dated 23rd January, 1959, that Premier Chou En-lai, for the first time, advanced the astonishing proposition that “there are certain differences between the two sides over the border question”. These differences did not exist but were deliberately created by the Chinese Government in pursuit of its policy of aggressive expansionism. Even then the nature and extent of these so-called differences were not spelt out and it was only in Premier Chou En-lai’s letter dated 8th September, 1959, which was written 8 months later, that claims were made to large areas of Indian territory in all three sectors of the India-China border.

2. Between 1960—1962, the Chinese Government had engaged in blatant intrusions into Indian territory in the Western sector, and by 1962, had set up a number of military posts in the area in furtherance of its expansionist designs. To use a Chinese expression, descriptive of an analogous situation in China in the third decade of this century, Chinese forces in Ladakh were alternately “nibbling like silkworms and swallowing like whales”. In 1962, when the Government of India had adopted limited measures to stop the further erosion of India’s territorial integrity, realising that these encroachments threatened India’s security and independence, the Chinese Government resorted to the extreme step of open and flagrant aggression in October, 1962. There can be no doubt in the face of massive evidence that war and subversion are the main instruments of Chinese policy.

3. It was by war and subversion that the Chinese forces finally reached, in the winter of 1962, the so-called 1960 Chinese claim line, which by a twist of propaganda was then re-designated as the “7th November 1959 line of actual control”.

4. In its communications, the Government of India has clearly shown that the so-called “line of actual control” of November, 1959, is no line at all. By the end of 1959, Chinese forces had set up a series of illegal posts on Indian territory. These posts had been progressively established by a forcible and unilateral alteration of the traditional status quo of the boundary. In November, 1959, these illegal Chinese posts in the Western sector were at Spanggur, Khunak Fort, Konka La and near the main Aksai Chin Road. However, it was only since 1960 that Chinese forces made further deep encroachments into Indian territory at a time when both sides:
had agreed to keep to existing positions to facilitate the talks of their officials. Thereafter, in October, 1962 massive attacks were launched by the so-called frontier guards and these attacks brought the invaders for the first time to their so-called claim line of 1960.

5. While Chinese forces have withdrawn north of the border in the Eastern sector, they have not withdrawn from the areas they had overrun by invasion in the Western sector. In a number of notes and statements, since the massive aggression launched by Chinese forces against India in October-November, 1962, the Chinese Government has sought to create the impression that its aggressive forces have withdrawn 20 kilometres behind their fictitious “line of actual control”. In fact, the Chinese Government is not only keeping the so-called civil posts in the area but freely moving military patrols within and beyond the area. The area which should have been properly demilitarized has been illegally seized and incorporated by China while India is inhibited from entering the area by the threat which China has held of massive retaliation.

6. There is no doubt that the Colombo Conference had been guided by certain principles in the formulation of its proposals. It was the consensus of the Conference that there should be no gain from aggression and that a stable cease-fire should precede any attempt at negotiations between the two sides. In pursuance of these eminently equitable principles, para. 2(c) of the Colombo Proposals urged that pending a final solution of the border dispute the demilitarized zone of 20 kilometres in the Western sector should be “administered by civilian posts of both sides as mutually agreed upon, without prejudice to the previous presence of India or China in this area”. This is indubitably a substantive part of the Colombo Proposals and not, as held by the Chinese Government, an “unilateral interpretation” of the Government of India.

7. Under the guise of accepting the Colombo Proposals “in principle” the Chinese Government has acted in open and wilful contravention of the Proposals by establishing on its own admission 7 posts in the Western sector, 6 of which are located in the proposed demilitarized zone of Ladakh. It is entirely fatuous to argue that all these posts existed before 7th of November, 1959. In this connection, a reference is invited to the Annexure to the Prime Minister of India’s letter to Premier Chou En-lai of 14th November, 1952. These posts are largely the creations of later aggression. The additional post recently detected on Indian territory at Depsang La west of the so-called line of actual control is fresh evidence of Chinese proclivity for aggression.

8. Thus, the Chinese Government is seeking to impose a settlement by unilateral implementation of its own declarations of 24 October and 21 November, 1962 and by sidetracking the Colombo Proposals. To show its generosity, the Chinese Government has argued that it has taken control of the demilitarized zone except in “disputed areas” where India had posts prior to China’s massive invasion. This is another fiction created by Chinese propaganda. To abide by the Colombo Proposals, the entire 20 kilometres demilitarized zone must be administered by civilian posts of both sides to be set up by mutual agreement. Unilateral impositions of one side are impermissible.
9. The Chinese Government has asked rhetorically what India has done to facilitate peaceful negotiations. In a spirit of sacrifice, India has unconditionally accepted the Colombo Proposals as a basis for peaceful negotiations. At the same time, India has exercised the utmost restraint by not challenging the provocative acts as well as measures taken by the Chinese Government in the imposition of its unilateral settlement based on the Chinese declarations of 24 October and 21 November, 1962. Furthermore, although India is averse to submitting her sovereignty to external arbitration, she has, in the larger interests of peace, proposed that the dispute, in the last resort, should be settled by agreed arbitration or by an appeal to the International Court of Justice.

10. The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 July 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to Chinese Government's note dated the 25th March, 1963.

The Chinese Government has not provided any justification for its illegal action in concluding a boundary agreement and in taking further steps to demarcate the boundary between China and the areas of Kashmir which have been illegally occupied by Pakistan. It has repeated once again the absurd argument that “China and Pakistan have the right to negotiate and delimit” that portion of the boundary of the Sinkiang region of China which is “contiguous to areas the defence of which is under the control of Pakistan”. To argue that the agreement is only of a “provisional character” in no way confers additional legality on the illegal Chinese action which is in contravention of all accepted norms of international law and conduct.

The Government of China has consistently maintained that negotiations with any authorities in defacto control of territory without de jure title to it is not permissible. And yet it argues in this case that because Pakistan has de facto control over this territory of Jammu and Kashmir State of India, negotiations relating to that territory with Pakistan are permissible and justified.

The State of Jammu and Kashmir forms an integral part of India and the Chinese Government has neither right nor legality on its side in conducting its present negotiations with the Government of Pakistan. As has been stated repeatedly by the Government of India, any such illegal arrangement involving Indian territory between parties that have no legal or constitutional locus standi is invalid and unacceptable to the Government of India.

That the Chinese Government should have started these negotiations after a lapse of over a decade since the establishment of the People's Republic of China constitutes clear evidence that its intention is not “to develop friendly and good neighbourly relations
and maintain tranquility on the border” but in fact to add to the existing tensions in the region. The negotiations with Pakistan started only after continuing Chinese encroachments into Indian territory which finally culminated in the massive offensive launched by Chinese forces against India in October-November, 1962. In the context of these aggressive policies, and the timing of the negotiation it is absurd to contend that “it is the consistent position of the Chinese Government that outstanding questions between Asian and African countries should be settled by the countries concerned through friendly negotiations”. It is difficult to see with what justification the Government of China accuses the Indian Government of being “the apologist and mouthpiece of U.S. imperialism” when it illegally negotiates with Pakistan for surrender of Indian territory and further claims “to develop good neighbourly relations” with Pakistan which is a member of various military pacts including the SEATO and CENTO.

The Chinese note has asked what India has done to facilitate peaceful negotiations of the Sino-Indian boundary question. It has been clearly stated in the Indian Government’s note dated the 6th July, 1963 that “in a spirit of sacrifice, India has unconditionally accepted the Colombo Proposals as a basis of peaceful negotiations. At the same time, India has exercised the utmost restraint by not challenging the provocative acts as well as measures taken by the Chinese Government in the imposition of its unilateral settlement based on the Chinese declarations of 24th October and 21st November, 1962. Furthermore, although India is averse to submitting her sovereignty to external arbitration, she has, in the larger interests of peace, proposed that the dispute, in the last resort, should be settled by agreed arbitration or by an appeal to the International Court of Justice”.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 7 February 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:—

Since the Chinese frontier guards ceased fire and started withdrawing along the entire Sino-Indian border on China’s own initiative, Indian troops have continually intruded into the Spanggur Lake area in Tibet, China, for reconnaissance and provocation, the specific cases are as following:

(1) On December 4, 1962, at 1350 hours, Indian soldiers riding a jeep intruded into Chinese territory for about 500 metres in an area west of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet, China. Two Indian soldiers dismounted from the jeep and continued to move forward till one of them trod upon and exploded a
mine, which had been planted by Indian troops, and got wounded. The other then drove back to Indian territory.

(2) On December 4, 1962, at 1520 hours, Indian soldiers riding a jeep again intruded into the above-said area and carried away the wounded Indian soldier.

(3) On December 13, 1962, at 1730 hours, Indian soldiers riding a motor car intruded into an area west of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet, China, for reconnaissance and provocation.

(4) On December 13, 1962, at 1750 hours, twelve Indian soldiers again intruded into the above-said area.

(5) On December 29, 1962, at 1420 hours, four Indian soldiers intruded into the Spanggur Lake area in Tibet, China, and stayed there for thirty minutes before they returned to Indian territory.

(6) On December 30, 1962, at 0200 hours, Indian soldiers riding in two motor cars intruded into Chinese territory for about one kilometre in an area west of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet, China, and stayed there for twenty minutes before they returned to Indian territory.

(7) On January 4, 1963, at 1530 hours, an Indian soldier intruded into an area south-west of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet, China.

(8) On January 6, 1963, at 1410 hours, Indian soldiers riding in two jeeps intruded into an area west of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet, China where six of them dismounted for reconnaissance.

(9) On January 15, 1963, at 1610 hours, an Indian soldier intruded into an area west of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet, China, and carried out reconnaissance for as long as one hour and forty minutes.

(10) On January 17, 1963, at 1430 hours, nine Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory for about 600 metres in an area south of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet, China and did not leave Chinese territory until 1535 hours.

(11) On January 20, 1963, at 1140 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory for about 600 metres in an area south of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet, China, and did not leave Chinese territory until 1220 hours.

The above-mentioned intrusions by Indian troops constitute a serious violation of Chinese territory. It is particularly serious that India should have kept sending military personnel to cross the line of actual control and intrude into Chinese territory for reconnaissance and provocation after the Chinese Government effected a cease-fire long ago and while it was withdrawing its troops along the entire Sino-Indian border on its own initiative to bring about a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against such Indian activities which violate China's territory, sabotage the cease-fire and create border tension. The Chinese frontier guards have now withdrawn from the area twenty kilometres on the Chinese side of the Sino-Indian boundary in the western
sector, including the above-mentioned areas south and west of the Spanggur Lake into which Indian troops have repeatedly intruded. The Chinese Government calls upon the Indian Government to consider all the consequences that may result from the intrusions by Indian troops taking advantage of the measures for peace taken by China on its own initiative. It urges that such dangerous activities be stopped at once.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

___

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 February 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Government note dated 7th February 1963 has the honour to state that the area generally referred to as “West of the Spanggur lake” in the Chinese note is to the west of the International boundary and well within Indian territory. This apart, it is the Chinese forces who, following their latest aggression in the Eastern Sector of the India-China boundary, have committed serious violations of Indian territory and mounted massive attacks on Indian territory both in the Eastern and the Western sectors. Despite this, when the Government of China made their unilateral declaration of ceasefire and withdrawals, the Government of India instructed their forces not to do anything to impede implementation of the Chinese unilateral declaration and these instructions have been and are being carried out effectively. The Chinese Government not only do not appreciate this peaceful gesture made by the Government of India despite unprovoked and wanton Chinese aggression but seem determined to pursue their aggressive adventure. This alone can explain the entirely false and baseless allegations that the Chinese Government continue to make against the Government of India. The Government of India categorically reject the baseless protest contained in the note under reference as the allegations made in the protest have no basis whatever in fact.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

___

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 March 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

In line with its consistent stand for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question and in order to stop military conflict, disengage the armed forces of the two sides and create conditions for the re-opening of boundary negotiations between China and
India, the Chinese Government issued a statement on November 21, 1962, announcing the adoption of the measures of cease-fire and withdrawal taken on its own initiative and of establishing civilian check-posts. In accordance with the above-mentioned statement of the Chinese Governments, the Chinese frontier guards had by February 28, 1963 completed their plan of withdrawing along the entire border. In order to ensure the normal movement of the border inhabitants of China and India, prevent the activities of saboteurs and maintain public order along the border, the Chinese local authorities, acting upon instructions of the Chinese Government, have established civilian check-posts at several points within the 20 kilometre zone on the Chinese side of the line of actual control as of November 7, 1959 vacated by the Chinese frontier guards. The number and location of these civilian check-posts are as follows:

In the eastern sector: 16, located in Tibet at Le, Hsiao, Chuna, Gongna, Lung, Migyitun, Tamaden, Laiguo Bridge, Nanyi, Lusha, Titung, Dergong, Budzong, Hsiachiang, Tsayul and Sama.

In the middle sector: 3, located in Tibet at Shipki Poling and Silangta.

In the western sector: 7, located at Shenhsienwan, Tienwentian and Hot Springs in Sinkiang, and at Kongka Pass, Nyagzu, Khurnak Fort, and Spanggur in Tibet. These are the seven places where China had maintained frontier posts prior to November 7, 1959.

It must be stressed that none of the above-mentioned civilian check-posts is established in the four areas where there is a dispute between China and India about the cease-fire arrangement—namely, the Che Dong area and Longju in the eastern sector, Wuje in the middle sector and the area in the western sector where India once established 43 military strong points and where China had set up additional frontier posts in order to resist Indian invasion. In response to the peace appeal of the Colombo Conference of Six Asian and African countries, the Chinese Government has decided to vacate the four areas and to refrain from establishing civilian check-post thereafter the withdrawal of Chinese frontier guards. This is yet another important effort made by China along the road of conciliation following the measures of cease-fire and withdrawal taken on its own initiative, and also represents a great regard for the honour and self-respect of India.

So long as the Indian side refrains from making provocations and from entering the areas where there is a dispute about the cease-fire arrangement, the Sino-Indian border situation which has eased thanks to the efforts made by China on its own initiative will not become tense again. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will correctly understand China's effort for peace and respond to it favourably.

The Foreign Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China. 10 March 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the Indian Government's note dated February 10, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

In its note dated February 7, 1963, the Chinese Government lodged a serious protest with the Indian Government against eleven successive intrusions by Indian troops into the Spanggur Lake area in Tibet, China, for reconnaissance and provocation since the cease-fire and withdrawal effected by China on its own initiative. In its note of reply dated February 10, the Indian Government not only hastily denied the facts in this regard, but once again wantonly and slanderously accused China of having committed "aggression" against India. It even went so far as to allege that the Chinese Government in lodging its stern and just protest with India was "determined to pursue their aggressive adventure". Who can be fooled by such clumsy argumentation of calling black white which only serves to further reveal India's bigotry and unreasonableness? It is clear to everybody that China has effected the cease-fire and withdrawn its troops on its own initiative in order to settle the boundary question peacefully; and that the one which is "determined to pursue their aggressive adventure" is none other than India itself which is continuing its incessant incursions into Chinese territory by taking advantage of the withdrawal by the Chinese frontier guards.

The Indian Government stated in its note that it had instructed its forces not to impede the implementation of the Chinese declaration of cease-fire and withdrawals. It is much to be regretted that after the Indian Government sent out the above-mentioned note, there have again occurred the following cases of Indian troops crossing the boundary and intruding into the Spanggur Lake area in China.

1. On February 11, 1963, at round 1430 hours, more than 30 Indian soldiers intruded about 1.5 kilometres inside Chinese territory in an area northwest of the Spanggur Lake, and stayed there for three hours before they left.

2. On February 12, 1963, two batches of Indian soldiers, more than 50 in the first batch and more than 30 in the second, intruded into an area southwest of the Spanggur Lake at about 1350 and 1430 hours respectively, and they returned to Indian territory only after 1900 hours.

3. On February 13, 1963, at about 1240 and 1300 hours respectively, two batches of Indian soldiers, more than 20 each, again intruded into the area northwest of the Spanggur Lake where Indian soldiers intruded on February 11. They returned to Indian territory not until about 1540 hours.

4. On February 14, 1963 at about 1550 hours, one Indian soldier, disguised in Tibetan clothes and riding on horseback, sneaked into an area west of the Spanggur Lake for reconnaissance for about one hour and did not leave until about 1640 hours.
The Chinese Government hereby once again lodges a serious protest against such intrusions into Chinese territory by the Indian side. What calls for attention is the fact that the above-mentioned places where Indian troops made the intrusions are all in the areas where the Indian side intruded last year and set up aggressive strongpoints and which were vacated by the Chinese side on its own initiative after repulsing the attacks launched by the Indian side. The present reintrusions by Indians into these areas are obviously deliberate provocations. These facts prove that the statement of the Indian Government that it would not impede the cease-fire and withdrawals of the Chinese side is a sheer lie, let alone the talk about this statement "being carried out effectively." One may ask, if the Indian side has no intention to use force again to occupy Chinese territory and again create border tension, why has it not yet directly and explicitly announced its agreement to the cease-fire? And why has it openly declared that it would send its troops to the areas vacated by the Chinese side and that it had "actually moved up in some places" in the western sector (see Prime Minister Nehru's speech on February 25, 1963 at Indian Lok Sabha)? The Chinese Government would like to point out once again that, in order to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question peacefully, the Chinese side has done everything it can do. China has already completed its plan of withdrawal on its own initiative along the entire border, vacated the areas where there is a dispute about the cease-fire arrangement and even refrained from setting up civilian check-posts there. The Chinese Government sincerely hopes that these peaceable efforts on the part of China will win a favourable response from the Indian side. If the Indian side should miscalculate China's sincere desire for peace and continue to make intrusions into Chinese territory, it will be absolutely unable to escape its responsibility for renewing border tension and obstructing the peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 March 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated the 10th of March, 1963.

2. In their note dated the 10th of February, 1963 the Government of India had fully refuted the baseless Chinese allegations regarding "intrusions" into the Spanggur lake area. As has been repeatedly pointed out, this area is well to the west of the international boundary and within Indian territory. There can clearly be no question of Indian forces intruding into Indian territory.

3. However, consistent with their statement that they would not impede the implementation of the Chinese declaration of cease-fire
and withdrawal, Indian forces have not moved forward from their existing positions. The Chinese Government's allegations that Indian troops have been active in the Spanggur lake area are, therefore, entirely without foundation.

4. Indian civilian personnel had been engaged in the task of collecting and giving a proper funeral to the dead Indian soldiers who were unfortunate victims of the recent unprovoked attacks launched by Chinese forces in that area. The Chinese Government are wilfully mis-representing the removal of the dead bodies of the Indian soldiers, in the vicinity of Spanggur lake, by Indian civilian personnel, as military activity on the Indian side.

5. The Government of India regret that, while ostensibly professing a desire for peace, the Chinese Government have held out a naked threat in the concluding sentence of their note under reference. It is not the Indian Government who have an "intention to use force and again create border tension" but the Chinese Government who have, in total disregard of the Colombo proposals which required that the demilitarized area should be administered by civilian posts of both sides, set up posts on Indian territory in the area from which they have withdrawn, and are deliberately creating tension in this area.

6. In the light of the above facts the Government of India reject the Chinese note under reference.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 March 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

In disregard of the Chinese Government's protest, the Indian side has continued to encroach on Chinese territory along the China-Sikkim border and carried on provocative activities there. Since February 1963, the Indian troops which have crossed the Natu La have been intensifying the repairs and reinforcement of their pill-boxes and other defence works illegally set up in Chinese territory. They have been built additional defence works, including a pillbox, a shelter, communication trenches and a sentry post, and set up a telephone line in Chinese territory to the southeast, northeast and north of the Natu La, obviously preparing for long-term entrenchment. The Indian side has, furthermore, dispatched personnel to reconnoiter and chart clandestinely the terrain features around the Natu Lal in Chinese territory. On February 5, 1963, Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over Khamba, Traksing, Phari and other places in the Tibet region, China, for reconnaissance and provocation through the Kailu Pass and the Jelep La on the China-Sikkim border at 1330 and 1400 hours respectively. The Chinese Government hereby
lodges another serious protest with the Indian Government against such stepped-up violation of Chinese territory and air space on the part of India.

It must be pointed out that, since the Indian troops started their aggressive activities against China on the China-Sikkim border in the latter half of 1962, the Chinese side has more than once lodged protests with the Indian Government, asking the Indian side to stop such activities immediately so as to restore the China-Sikkim border to tranquillity which has now been upset. However, apart from flatly denying the conclusive facts that Indian troops and aircraft have repeatedly intruded into Chinese territory and air space, the Indian side has continued to make wanton provocations in disregard of the protests of the Chinese Government. What makes people particularly indignant is that the Indian Government, has, in its note of January 16, 1963, groundlessly alleged that Chinese forces have been "concentrating on the border of Sikkim", and that it has even described China's just protests against the aggressive activities of the Indian side as "a prelude to a new aggression." This practice of confounding black and white and making rumours and slanders can only all the more expose the Indian Government's ulterior aims of deliberately maintaining tension, upsetting the tranquillity on the China-Sikkim border and sowing discord in the relations between China and Sikkim, which have always lived together in friendship.

The Chinese Government wishes to tell the Indian Government in a straightforward way: The successive intrusions along the China-Sikkim border by the Indian forces are all facts that cannot be covered up by any lies. The Indian side must immediately stop all its aggressive activities on the China-Sikkim border, completely dismantle their defence works, big or small, which have been illegally set up on Chinese territory, and order the intruding Indian troops to withdrawing immediately from Chinese territory.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 29 March 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and, with reference to the Chinese Government's note dated 24th March 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The allegations made by the Chinese Government have been carefully investigated and it has been found that they are without any basis whatsoever. As already pointed out in the Indian Government's note dated 16th January 1963, Indian defence personnel are under strict instructions not to cross the international boundary and they have invariably adhered to these instructions.
The preposterous and baseless allegations made by the Chinese Government that Indian forces have “built additional defence works . . . in Chinese territory to the south-east, north-east and north of Nathu La” or that they have “despatched personnel to reconnoitre and chart clandestinely the terrain features around Nathu La in Chinese territory” or that they have carried out aerial reconnaissance over Chinese territory could have only one motive viz., to fabricate a fictitious justification for the continuing aggressive concentration of Chinese forces on the Indian border. No less a person than the Foreign Minister, Marshal Chen Yi, had indicated this line in his television interview to the Swedish Broadcasting Corporation wherein he stated that “judging from the present attitude of the Indian Government, provocative actions on the part of Indian troops will occur from time to time”; and this is now being followed up by trumped up and baseless allegations.

The Government of India categorically reject the false and baseless allegations made in the Chinese note under reference.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 April 1963.

On 10th March 1963 at about 2050 hours 3 Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory in Sinkiang Division within about 2 kms. of the Chinese civil checkpost at Hot Springs North West of the Kongka Pass for reconnaissance activities and did not withdraw until about 2110 hours. This fresh Indian intrusion and provocation can only be regarded as a deliberate attempt to disrupt China’s peace effort and to renew border tension. Against this the Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government. It must be pointed out that since last December the Indian side has taken advantage of the cease-fire and withdrawal effected on China’s own initiative by the Chinese frontier guards and has kept harassing and intruding into Chinese territory in the Western sector of the Sino-Indian border. The Chinese Government has more than once lodged protests with the Indian Government on this account. In its note dated 15th March 1963 the Indian Government in effect admitted part of the facts of Indian intrusions but at the same time quibbled by describing China’s Spanggur Lake area as “Indian territory”. The note alleged that the intruders into area were Indian “civil personnel” and that they were not engaged in military activities. Such equivocation is entirely futile. In fact since last December Indian troops have intruded into Chinese territory in the Western sector of the Sino-Indian border not once or twice but as many as 16 times in succession and now these military intrusions have even extended from the Spanggur Lake area in Tibet to the Hot Springs area in Sinkiang. Prime Minister Nehru himself openly declared that Indian troops had “moved up” in the Western sector. The
Chinese Government hereby draws the attention of the Indian Government to the grave consequences of these aggressive activities and sternly demands India immediately stop all its violations of Chinese territory.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 3 April 1963.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state that, despite the Chinese Government's announcement on March 1st of withdrawal of Chinese troops 20 kilometres beyond the so-called line of actual control and the latest announcement of their intention to release Indian military personnel taken during the massive Chinese attacks in October and November 1962, the Chinese Government have, contrary to the established international practices in this regard, been indulging in making propagandic and baseless allegations of Indian military preparations, forward patrolling and provocations and sending notes couched in provocative and scurrilous language. These notes are strongly reminiscent of similar baseless Chinese charges against India in 1962 immediately prior to China's massive invasion of Indian territory.

2. The Chinese Government have, at the same time, been stating from time to time that they desire a peaceful settlement of the boundary question. Foreign Minister Chen Yi, in a recent broadcast, has stated that "the Chinese Government has been consistently seeking direct negotiations between China and India". If the Chinese Government are really sincere in their desire for peaceful settlement of their differences with India regarding the boundary, there is no need for them to keep up this propaganda barrage of scurrilous and provocative notes or to decline to take various constructive steps indicated by the Government of India in the communications sent to the Government of China from time to time. These constructive steps are reiterated for the consideration of the Government of China:

(i) The Government of China should accept, without reservations, the Colombo proposals just as the Government of India have done.

(ii) The acceptance by both sides of the Colombo proposals can be followed up by a meeting of the officials to arrive at settlement of various matters left by the Colombo Powers for direct agreement between the parties and to decide the details regarding implementation of the Colombo proposals on the ground.

(iii) The officials of both sides concerned can then take action to implement these proposals on the ground so that agreed cease-fire arrangements are established on the ground.

(iv) Thereafter, in the improved atmosphere, India and China can take up the question of their differences on the boundary question and try to reach a mutually acceptable settlement in one or more than one stage. If a settlement
is reached, this can then be implemented in detail on the ground.

(v) If a settlement is not reached in these direct talks and discussions between the two parties, both sides can consider adoption of further measures to settle the differences peacefully in accordance with international practices followed in such cases. Both India and China can agree to make a reference, on the differences regarding the boundary, to the International Court of Justice at The Hague and agree to abide by the Court's decision. If this method of peaceful settlement is, for any reason, not acceptable to the Government of China, both parties can agree to some sort of international arbitration by a person or a group of persons, nominated in the manner agreed to by both Governments, who can go into the question objectively and impartially and give their award, the award being binding on both Governments.

3. That the Government of India are sincere in their desire to reach a peaceful settlement of the differences regarding the India-China boundary is clear from the fact that, in spite of the crisis of confidence caused by Chinese massive aggression and wanton attacks on Indian territory, the Government of India made the constructive suggestions for peaceful settlement detailed in the preceding paragraph. If the Government of China are really sincere in their professions of peaceful settlement of the differences both in connection with the cease-fire arrangements and in connection with the main question of differences regarding the boundary, they should, instead of indulging in scurrilous propaganda and baseless allegations which are not only not conducive to peaceful settlement of the differences but which further vitiate the atmosphere between the two countries, accept these constructive suggestions made by the Government of India. The Government of India hope that the Government of China will revert to the paths of peace and accept the constructive suggestions for peaceful settlement reiterated in paragraph 2 above.

4. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 3 April 1963

In its note the Indian Government dare not openly deny the facts that Indian troops had intruded into Wuje area in China but repeated the sophistical argument contained in its note of 27th August 1962 that Indian troops had merely set up some posts "well to the rear" of Wuje. This Indian assertion is obviously aimed at explaining away by diminishing the extent of the Wuje area its violation of the Sino Indian agreement on refraining from sending troops into Wuje area and its deliberate occupation of Chinese territory and creation of tension. But this attempt is utterly futile.
2. As pointed out by the Chinese Government the Wuje area is about 150 square kilometres in size. In its note the Indian side once again fabricated the story that Chinese officials had described the area of Wuje as being 300 square miles. However as is well known the Chinese Government in its documents and statement for foreign audience has always used the metric system and not the British system in referring to area. Therefore the term “300 square miles” could not have been used by Chinese Officials. It is not difficult to see that the Indian side has invented this story in disregard of the facts for provoking purpose and then cover up its attempt to diminish the extent of the Wuje area at will. Most interesting is the fact that Prime Minister NEHRU asserted before the Indian Lok Sabha on 16th March 1963 that the Chinese Government’s description of Wuje “varied from time to time”. He said that Wuje is only 1.5 square miles in size. However it can be clearly dismissed that Prime Minister NEHRU himself had said that the Wuje area covered 6 square miles when he spoke before the Indian Rajya Sabha on 28th August 1962 a year ago. Then whose statements “varied from time to time”?

3. During meeting of the officials of the two countries the Chinese side cited many convincing evidences showing that the Wuje area has always been part of China under the jurisdiction of Daba Dzong Tibet. Being unable to cross these evidences the Indian side has racked its brains in trying to minimise their value. The land out line documents of 1729 and 1737 for instance clearly stated that Wuje area was within the boundaries of the Daba Dzong. At the officials’ meeting the Indian side arbitrarily asserted that they merely stipulated the right to collect “transit dues” from the Indian traders. In the note under reference the Indian side further asserted that they only provided for “raising funds for religious expenses for the Tashigong monastery”. These assertions are not at all mentioned in the above mentioned documents. Any one with a little knowledge about the area knows that the Wuje area has nothing to do with the Tashigong monastery and their branches bundled together. Here is another instance. The Chinese side has been accustomed to station guards in the Wuje area. They have extensive rights of administrative jurisdiction including guarding the frontier checking traders and travellers maintaining security and order and collecting taxes. This fact is not only testified by documents in the possession of government of the Daba Dzong but also corroborated by the report of an Indian Officer dated 1890. In the past the Indian side grudgingly admitted that these people “came occasionally to this area to collect imports”. (see Prime Minister NEHRU’s letter to Premier CHOU-EN-LAI dated 26th September 1959). But now it flatly asserted that they were merely trade officials. Again who is it that “varied from time to time”?

As for the so called evidences cited by the Indian side in the officials’ meeting they cannot hold water. For instance it cited some so called material concerning tax and census but none of this material referred to Wuje area. The Indian note also alleged that the 1954 Sino Indian agreement specified Niti pass as “one of 6 border passes.” The Chinese Government long ago thoroughly refuted this allegation in its note of 26th December 1959. It is senseless for the Indian side to repeat its stale arguments.
4. It is beyond doubt that Wuje area has always been part of Chinese territory under Chinese jurisdiction and is on China's side of the line of actual control between two sides of 7th November 1959. However, for the sake of the peaceful settlement of the Sino Indian boundary question the Chinese Government when completed its plan withdrawing 20 kilometres from the entire line of actual control as of 7th November 1959 on its own initiative announced and notified to the Indian Government its decision to vacate the Wuje area as one of the 4 areas where there is a dispute about the cease fire arrangement and even to refrain from setting up civil check posts there. This again fully demonstrates the Chinese Government sincere desire for peace. The already eased border situation will not become tense again provided the Indian side too refrains from entering the above mentioned 4 disputed areas. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian side will respond favourably to China's other measures.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 9 April 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and, with reference to the Chinese Government's note dated the 3rd April, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:—

2. Detailed facts in regard to Bara Hoti have already been conveyed in previous notes of the Indian Government. This Ministry's notes of 27th August 1962 and 17th January 1963 have shown in considerable detail the ignorance of the Chinese Government on the extent of the Bara Hoti plain and the constantly shifting position that has been taken in this matter. The Ministry does not consider it necessary to go over the same ground again to refute various groundless contentions in the Chinese note.

3. In refuting the fact that the Chinese claims had varied from time to time, the Chinese Government has, in its note of 3rd April, 1963, even gone to the extent of wilfully misquoting the Prime Minister's statement in the Parliament on 28th August, 1962 where he stated that about 6 square miles in the Bara Hoti plateau has been demilitarised by mutual agreement. This statement about demilitarisation of the plateau is, in no way, a contradiction of his statement in the Indian Lok Sabha on 16th March 1963 that the Bara Hoti plain is 1.5 square miles in size.

4. In its note of 17th January 1963, the Government of India had clearly pointed out the fact that, "at the Delhi Conference of 1958, it was the Chinese Government, which had, while agreeing that both sides should refrain from sending armed patrols into the Bara Hoti plains, refused to agree to the further proposal that civil patrols also should not go into the area. As such, the Government of India were constrained as before to send their civil administrative personnel to the territory and the Chinese Government had been informed of this".
The Government of India observe that, in the note of April 3, the Chinese Government has notified "its decision to vacate the Wuje area". The Government of India are not aware of the Chinese Government having had any presence in the Bara Hoti plains excepting for the seasonal visit of a local Tibetan official. It is presumed therefore, that the Chinese Government will refrain from sending any Chinese civilian personnel to the Bara Hoti plain in future. The Government of India have taken note of the Chinese Government's decision and will reciprocate by suspending the practice of sending civilian personnel to the Bara Hoti plain which has been followed hitherto.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 April 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the note dated 2nd April, 1963 of the Chinese Government, has the honour to state that the allegation that three Indian soldiers had intruded into Chinese territory on 10th March 1963 between 20-50 hours and 21-10 hours for a 20 minute reconnaissance is not only baseless but patently absurd.

It is significant that long before the receipt of the Chinese note under reply, Radio Peking had, in a broadcast on the 14th March, 1963 made the same allegations of "intrusion" by three Indian soldiers into the Hot Springs area north-west of the Kongka Pass. The fact that a protest has, a fortnight or so later, been lodged by the Chinese Government, clearly indicates that it is a repetition of the earlier trumped up allegation for propaganda purpose and has no basis in fact.

The Chinese note has, as usual, again quoted the Prime Minister of India out of context in an attempt to prove that Indian troops have moved forward in the Western sector. The Indian Prime Minister has made it quite clear in various statements before Parliament that the Government of India have been strictly adhering to the Colombo Conference proposals in regard to the positioning of Indian forces in the Western sector.

The Indian Government would request the Government of China to desist from making trumped up baseless allegations for propaganda purposes and instead decide to accept the Colombo Conference proposals without any reservations.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 April 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note from the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated January 4, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The Indian Government's note, apart from directing unwarranted abuses and slanders against China, merely reproduces the contents of the two Indian notes dated December 5, 1962. This shows that the Indian Government is utterly devoid of case or arguments.

In its note of December 31, 1962 in reply to the two Indian notes dated December 5, 1962, the Chinese Government already proved in detail who refuses to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question peacefully through negotiations and who provoked the armed conflict on the border. No lies or prevarications on the part of the Indian Government can alter the history in recent years in which India nibbled into and encroached upon Chinese territory, carried out continuous armed provocations and went to the length of launching all-out massive attack on China, nor can they cover up the fact that today India is still trying hard to obstruct the holding of direct negotiations between the two parties, stepping up arms expansion and war preparations and attempting to restore tension on the border. It is entirely meaningless for Indian notes to repeat over and over the hackneyed phrases which were thoroughly refuted long ago. If in future India continues to make such unreasonable haggling, the Chinese Government will not reply any more.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 May 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows:

(i) At 0730 hours on 4th May 1963, seven Chinese soldiers drove up in a vehicle near Mugger hill in the Spanggur gap. The party went back at 1315 hours.

(ii) At 0900 hours on 5th May, 1963, two Chinese soldiers came in a vehicle to Pimple in the Spanggur gap. At 1230 hours on the same day, a further party of 20 men also came in a vehicle to Pimple, returning at 1500 hours the same day.

(iii) An even more serious instance of provocation by Chinese troops occurred at 1700 hours on 27th April, 1963. Three Chinese soldiers were observed in a vehicle in the area near the Spanggur gap, south of Pimple. They provocatively fired their weapons and returned in the direction from which they had come, at 1730 hours.
The areas referred to, apart from falling inside Indian territory, lie extremely close to the so-called 'line of actual control' unilaterally defined by the Chinese Government, thereby belying the Chinese Government's claim of withdrawal by their armed forces, 20 kilometres east of this line.

The above incidents clearly indicate that the Chinese Government are not trying to effect a reduction of tension in these areas but that they are even stepping up once again their military activity in these areas.

The Government of India hereby categorically protest against these provocative activities of the Chinese forces.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 11 May 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government has received successive reports from the Civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang to the effect that, within the week from April 20 to 26, 1963, Indian military personnel had made four intrusions in succession into China, in the area to the northwest of Kongka Pass in Sinkiang, and carried out reconnaissance in the vicinity of the Chinese civilian checkpost at Hot Springs. The specific time of the intrusions and the number of persons involved in them are as follows:

1. On April 20, from about 1800 hours to 1845 hours; three persons.
2. On April 25, from about 1550 hours to 1605 hours; one person.
3. On April 26, from about 1240 hours to 1350 hours; four persons.
4. On April 26, from about 1630 hours to 1900 hours; three persons.

The Chinese Government hereby once again lodges a serious protest against the repeated intrusions of Indian troops into Chinese territory, deliberately designed to renew the border tension.

These fresh intrusions by Indian troops pointedly refute the Indian Government's denial, in its note of April 11, 1963, of the Indian troop intrusion in the same area on March 10. The note alleged that the Chinese Government's protest against the Indian troop intrusion of March 10 was "for propaganda purposes," and the
reason given for the allegation was merely the lapse of a fortnight between China's release of the news concerned and its protest. The Indian Government's unreasonable charge is untenable. It is entirely for the Chinese Government to decide whether it lodges a protest against an Indian troop intrusion before or after the release of the news, and in either case it will have justice. This cannot be distorted or interfered with by the Indian Government. As for the fact that Indian troops "had actually moved up in some places" in the western sector, it was stated by Prime Minister Nehru himself in the Indian Lok Sabha on February 25, 1963. The Indian note dared not openly deny this, but, in order to prevaricate, it alleged that the Chinese side had quoted "out of context". This is obviously futile.

It must be pointed out unequivocally that so long as the Indian side continues to make intrusions into Chinese territory, the Chinese Government has the right to lodge protests and make the facts known to the whole world. If the Indian side is afraid that its true features of renewing tension on the border may be exposed before the world, it should immediately stop its intrusions into China.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 May 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Government's note dated the 11th May, 1963 has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India have investigated the allegations made in the Chinese note of four "intrusions" by Indian military personnel in the area to the North West of Kongka Pass on 20th, 25th and 26th April, 1963 and it has been established that there is no basis whatsoever for these allegations. In fact, these self-same allegations had been made earlier by Radio Peking and they had, even at that time, been categorically refuted by the Official Indian Government Spokesman on 4th May, 1963. The Indian Government Spokesman also observed: "We cannot understand why such unfounded allegations are made; the reason seems to be that Peking wants to maintain tension".

Although the area to the North West of Kongka Pass falls clearly inside Indian territory the Government of India, have, in consonance with their declared stand, refrained from doing anything that may interfere with the implementation of the unilateral declaration of cease-fire and withdrawal by China. Indian Defence personnel in Ladakh have accordingly continued to remain to the west of the so-called "line of actual control" as defined by the Chinese Government. It is, however, necessary to emphasise that this restraint on the part of the Indian Government can in no way be construed by the Chinese Government as conferring on them a title to those areas
of Indian territory in Ladakh which have been forcibly intruded into and occupied by Chinese forces.

The Government of India have in their note dated the 11th May, 1963 given a number of instances of Chinese military activity in the Spanggur area. The Chinese Government's note under reference is obviously intended to cover up the clandestine activities of Chinese forces in Ladakh by making a series of false counter-charges. The Government of India firmly reject these baseless charges.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 27 May, 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows:

On the morning of April 26, 1963, 20 Chinese in blue uniform came from Migyitun to Alubari, south of Longju. Ten members from the party came down to Saosi, about 3 miles south of Longju, and stayed there up to 4 P.M. The whole party thereafter returned to Migyitun.

The Government of India strongly protest against this unwarranted violation of Indian territory which clearly exposes the hollowness of the Chinese claims made in the statement of the Chinese Ministry of Defence on March 1st and in their note of March 2nd, 1963 that Chinese army personnel had completed their plan of withdrawals 20 kilometres away from the so-called "line of actual control" unilaterally fixed by the Chinese Government. Migyitun, has been clearly indicated by the Chinese Government in their note of March 2nd, 1963, as a location where a civilian checkpost has been established. It is, however, from Migyitun that the Chinese soldiers carried out this provocative intrusion into Indian territory. Furthermore, Longju where the present intrusion has taken place, is an area which the Chinese Government itself has declared to be "an area under dispute" where in response to the appeal of the Colombo Conference countries they would refrain from establishing a civilian checkpost. Despite the pretentious statements in the Chinese note of March 2nd, 1963, that "the eased border situation will not become tense again provided the Indian side refrains from making provocations again and from re-entering the four areas where there is a dispute about the cease-fire arrangements", Chinese military forces have provocatively entered into the very same area. The Government of India strongly protest against this intrusion which is patently contrary to China's professed arms of finding a peaceful solution to India-China differences and designed purely to foment tension between the two countries.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 June 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India dated May 11, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

In its note the Indian Government cited three alleged cases of Chinese soldiers entering the Spanggur Lake area. The Spanggur Lake area has always been China’s territory, and even India has admitted in its note that it is on the Chinese side of the 1959 line of actual control. The Indian Government therefore, has no right at all to raise any objection against Chinese activities in this area.

The Indian Government is not unaware of the fact that by the end of February, 1963 the Chinese frontier guards had already completely withdrawn from the twenty-kilometre areas on the Chinese side of the 1959 line of actual control. In the entire area in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border evacuated by the Chinese frontier guards, the Chinese side has maintained civilian checkpoints only at Spanggur and six other places. During the recent release and repatriation of captured Indian military personnel, the Chinese side, taking into account the convenience of the Indian side in taking back the captured personnel, decided to make Spanggur one of the repatriation points. In order to ensure the safety of the captured Indian military personnel to be repatriated and the personnel of the two sides responsible for the handing over operations, the Chinese side sent out some civil police to a place about five kilometres from the line of actual control within China to clear the obstacles and mines left there during the border clashes last year and repair the road. This was a matter fully within China’s sovereign rights. Nevertheless, officials concerned at the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs received Mr. Banerjee, Charge d’ Affaires a.i., and Mr. Row. First Secretary, of the Indian Embassy in China on April 29 and May 3, 1963 respectively and informed them that the Chinese side had decided to take the above-mentioned security measures so as to ensure smooth progress of the work of repatriating the captured Indian military personnel. After having taken such measures, the Chinese side released on May 17, 160 captured Indian military personnel at a place west of the Spanggur Lake and handed them over to the representatives of the Indian Red Cross who came to receive them. The Indian Government, however, is now returning evil for good, making groundless charges against the Chinese Government and even making the pure fabrication that the Chinese personnel “provocatively fired their weapons.” What is more, it has gone so far as to malign the withdrawal of the Chinese frontier guards taken on China’s initiative as a deceptive attempt. The Chinese Government cannot but express its great indignation at this.

As is well known, the Chinese side has done its best in making efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. It is the Indian side which, instead of making any positive response to this, has gone further, after China’s unilateral cease-fire and withdrawal, to intrude over a dozen times into the
Spanggur Lake area in China for reconnaissance and harassment (See Chinese Government’s notes dated February 7 and March 10, 1963). The Indian Government is now deliberately creating a sensation by distorting the security measures and preparations of the Chinese side for repatriating captured Indian Military personnel as “provocative activities.” This can only show even more clearly how the Indian Government stops at nothing to whip up anti-Chinese sentiments and create a belligerent atmosphere. The Indian attempt to weaken by such means the great impact created by the peaceful efforts of China and to cover up its wilful scheme to make the border situation tense again will only come to naught. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the unwarranted protest of the Indian Government.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 4 June 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

1. In its notes dated January 10 and March 24, 1963 the Chinese Government twice lodged serious protests with the Indian Government against the crossing of Natu La on the China-Sikkim boundary and intrusion into Chinese territory and the illegal erection of military structures there by Indian troops. In its reply note of March 29, 1963, the Indian Government made another flat denial, asserting that China had made “trumped up and baseless allegations” against the Indian side. In order thoroughly to expose such sophistical denials on the part of India, the Chinese Government hereby gives once again a detailed account of the facts of the Indian troops’ encroachment on Chinese territory.

2. Incidents of Indian troops crossing the Natu La and encroaching on Chinese territory already occurred repeatedly back in May and June of 1960 (see Chinese Government’s Note of July 2, 1960). In June 1962, when India set up a great number of military strong-points on Chinese territory where it had intruded in the eastern and western sectors of the Sino-Indian border, it also stepped up its intrusions into Chinese territory along the China-Sikkim border. In September 1962, that is, just before the large-scale attack launched by India on the Chinese frontier guards along the Sino-Indian border, Indian troops crossed the Natu La and then in succession illegally built several dozens of big and small pillboxes and other military structures on Chinese territory and blocked the customary pass of the Natu La, thus hindering the normal movement of border inhabitants of China and Sikkim. In February 1963, when the Sino-Indian border situation was already released as a result of China’s
continuous efforts, the Indian troops who had crossed the Natu La not only did not withdraw from Chinese territory, but even reinforced their military structures for aggressive purposes and built additional ones. Furthermore, Indian aircraft repeatedly crossed the China-Sikkim border into China's air space for reconnaissance and harassment.

3. As is well-known the China-Sikkim boundary has long been formally delimited. As provided in the related article of the Sino-British convention of 1890, the China-Sikkim boundary runs along the watershed between the waters flowing into the Mochu and northwards into other small rivers in Tibet, China and the waters flowing into the Sikkim Tessta and its affluents. During the 1960 meeting of the officials of China and India, the Indian officials, while unilaterally referring to the China-Sikkim boundary, explicitly admitted that the China-Sikkim boundary crosses the Natu La (see page 2 of the Indian report in the report of the officials of China and India on the boundary question). Official Indian Maps also show the China-Sikkim boundary as crossing this pass.

Over a long time now, the Natu La has served as a dividing point of the scope of administration by China and Sikkim. At the same time, it is one of the important routes for the movement of border inhabitants of the two sides. On January 10, 1956, in his talk with the Director of the Bureau of Foreign Affairs of Tibet, China and others, Sikkim's Maharajkumar explicitly expressed the hope that each side should build a road in its area on the Sino-Sikkim border which would connect with the road of the other side at Natu La.

The Natu La is marked by clear terrain features. It is located on the only watershed along this section of the boundary and can be identified at a glance, and there can be no misunderstanding about it. In September 1958, when Prime Minister Nehru passed through the Natu La during his visit to Bhutan, local Chinese officials went there to receive him. At that time the Chinese national flag was implanted at the Chinese side of the pass. And a cement tablet bearing the words "Sikkim-Tibet Border" was set up by the Indian side at the Sikkim side of the pass. This fact proves that the Indian side is well aware of the location of this section of the boundary.

But, in flagrant violation of the related provisions of the above-mentioned 1890 convention, India has now upset the state of the traditional boundary and of administration long respected by China and Sikkim, crossed the Natu La and set up military structures for aggressive purposes on the Chinese, side of the slope, and thereby gravely infringed on China's sovereignty and sabotaged the tranquility along the China-Sikkim border. All the facts are there and the evidence is conclusive, what use is there for any more denials on the part of India?

4. It must also be pointed out that on March 21, 1963, just as India was stepping up its intrusions on the China-Sikkim border, the U.S. Ambassador to India Galbraith, accompanied by high-ranking Indian Military officers, personally went to the Natu La for activities. Such a singular act was by no means fortuitous. What makes one indignant is that, while clearly it is India itself which, supported
by the United States, has been wantonly encroaching on Chinese territory, it once again in its note of March 29, 1963 created out of thin air the lie of “aggressive concentration” of the Chinese forces on the China-Sikkim border. This assertion of calling black white only further exposes the intentions of India at a time when the Sino-Indian border situation has already relaxed, which are to create tension along the China-Sikkim border, make anti-China propaganda and sow discord between China and Sikkim so as to attain its ulterior aims.

5. The Chinese Government hereby lodges another serious protest against the Indian acts of crossing the Natu La and encroaching on Chinese territory, and once again demands that India immediately order the intruding Indian troops to withdraw from Chinese territory and dismantle all their illegally built structures within Chinese territory. Should the Indian side refuse to withdraw the intruding Indian forces and dismantle the aggressive military structures, and conditions its prevarications and denials, then the Chinese Government would request India immediately to dispatch officials to conduct with Chinese Officials a joint investigation of the case of Indian troops crossing the Natu La and encroaching on Chinese territory.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 7 June 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state that a Chinese force of 200 men with eighty or more horses penetrated into Indian territory at Rezangla, in Ladakh on the 3rd June, 1963 at 14.00 hours and carried out a provocative demonstration. The point of intrusion at Rezangla is also beyond the so-called 1959 Chinese line of actual control which the Chinese Government have persistently sought to impose after their massive invasion of India last winter. It is evident that, under cover of their unilateral cease-fire terms, Chinese forces are continuing to make intrusions into areas even beyond their self-instituted 20 kilometres demilitarised zone. In doing so, they are not only contravening their own unilateral cease-fire declaration but also the Colombo Proposals, which they vociferously claim to have accepted ‘in principle’. All this shows that no principle is binding on the Chinese Government.

At Rezangla, as the Chinese Government should be aware, India had maintained a defence post until November, 1962, when it fell under massive Chinese attacks. Despite their declaration of unilateral cease-fire and withdrawal, it is the Chinese forces who have been not only trespassing into territory which is admittedly and indisputably Indian but also violating their own much advertised declaration on unilateral cease-fire and withdrawal.

In lodging a strong protest against the intrusion of a force of 200 Chinese into Rezangla on 3rd June, 1963, the Government of India
would again urge on the Chinese Government to discontinue their strategy of aggression and intimidation, realise the error of their ways and return to the path of peace.

The Ministry of External Affairs renews to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 June 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government’s note dated the 2nd June, 1963.

The protest of May 11, 1963 in regard to the intrusions and provocative firing by Chinese troops in the Spanggur area was lodged after careful verification of facts. Significantly the Chinese Government has not denied the intrusions, but has speciously argued that the intrusions in question were made by “civil police” while “clearing obstacles and mines” left during the border clashes of last year. No attempt has been made to explain how or why the Chinese Civil police had to resort to provocative firing as had occurred on April 27, 1963, south of Pimple. To cover up this act of provocation the Chinese Government has referred to the intimation given to the First Secretary of the Indian Embassy on April 29, and May 3, respectively about certain measures to be taken by the Chinese “to ensure smooth progress of the work of repatriation”. While the aforesaid information was given on April 29 and May 3, the intrusion and firing by the Chinese “Civil police” otherwise known as “frontier guards” occurred on April 27, 1963. There is no apparent relation between the act of provocation of April 27 and the subsequent task of clearing obstacles entrusted to the civil police.

In further extenuation of its unwarranted act of provocation, the Chinese Government has advanced two entirely untenable claims viz. that “the Spanggur lake area has always been China’s territory and that even India had admitted in its note that it is on the Chinese side of the line of actual control”. The Government of India firmly repudiates these aggressive views of the Chinese Government.

By constantly enlarging its claims beyond its illegal and unwarranted encroachments into Indian territory, the Chinese Government had sought to create a deceptive and mischievous basis for its massive invasion of India during the winter of 1962. Indian posts which were located to prevent further Chinese incursions into Indian territory were falsely accused of having invaded Chinese territory.

In 1959 Chinese intrusions of Indian territory were confined to the area of the Aksai Chin Road. In October 1959 a Chinese patrol ambushed an Indian police party at Kongka La. Kongka La marked the limit reached by the Chinese intruders in that year and Indian patrols were still moving up the Qara Qash Valley. It is only between 1960 and 1961, that is, during the talks between the officials of India and China, when at Chinese suggestion India had stopped sending
forward patrols, that the Chinese stealthily came forward to set up a post on the Chip Chap river and two posts at Dambuguru and Nyagzu. Yet even in 1961, although the Chinese had, by then, established a few posts outside the Aksai Chin road area, it could not be said that they had established a line of actual control, far less the so-called fictitious '1959 line of actual control', which was achieved only after last winter's massive invasion of India and the elimination by brutal attacks of Indian posts in Indian territory. Thus three indisputable facts emerge:

(1) that there was no Chinese line of actual control in Ladakh until 1962,

(2) that the so-called 1959 line of actual control was established as a result of the massive invasion of India in the winter of 1962, and

(3) that the Spanggur lake area had never been part of Chinese territory until it was forcibly seized in 1962 after massive Chinese attacks on the Indian posts in the area.

The foregoing is also consistent with the letter which Premier Chou En-lai sent to Prime Minister Nehru in December 1959 stating that “the Chinese map published in 1956...correctly shows the traditional boundary between the two countries in this sector”.

Premier Chou En-lai was doubtless putting forward China's extreme claim of the time (December 1959) to territory in Ladakh. However, the so-called 1959 line of actual control corresponds more nearly to the claim line shown on the Chinese 1960 map which was first produced at the officials' talks in June 1960. In disregard of the facts the Chinese Government has persistently sought to fool people by falsely asserting that there was in “November 1959 a Chinese line of actual control in Ladakh”. It is a peculiar Chinese ruse to assert that what was first claimed in 1960 and established by naked aggression in 1962, existed as early as 1959.

The Chinese Government’s claim that the Indian note of May 11, 1963, admits that the Spanggur lake area is on the Chinese side of the 1959 line of actual control is entirely unwarranted and deliberately mischievous.

In terms of the Colombo Proposals the question of the number and location of civil checkpoints to be established in the demilitarized zone was to be decided by mutual agreement between India and China. While India has deferred the setting up of its civil check posts in the area pending Chinese acceptance of the Colombo Proposals, China in complete disregard of the Colombo Proposals and in contravention of its professed “positive response” and acceptance “in principle” of the Colombo Proposals has unilaterally established its so-called civil posts. This act and the continued intrusions and provocative activities of Chinese forces in the Spanggur and Rezang La areas clearly show that under cover of mischievous Chinese propaganda that India is seeking to renew tension, China is consolidating the gains of its aggression and creating a basis for further aggression.
It was entirely pertinent for the Government of India to point out in its note of May 11, 1963 that recent incidents caused by provocative activities on the part of Chinese frontier guards belied the Chinese Government's own propagandistic claim that it had withdrawn its armed forces 20 kilometres east of the so-called '1959 line of actual control'.

In rejecting the Chinese note of June 2, 1963, the Government of India again urge the Chinese Government to take immediate steps to stop further encroachments and provocative activities by Chinese armed forces in Indian territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs renews to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 June 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated June 4, 1963.

The two earlier notes of the Chinese Government were replied to in the Indian notes of January 16, and March 29, 1963. Despite the refutation of the earlier Chinese allegations, the Chinese Government has repeated the same allegations without adducing any fresh undeniable evidence in support of its allegations. Perhaps the Chinese Government hopes, by mere repetition of the allegations, to confuse world public opinion and to whitewash its aggressive record of violence and bloodshed during October-November 1962 when it mounted unprovoked massive attacks along the Sino-Indian border.

The Chinese note has artfully suggested that the border violations in question across Nathu La occurred as early as May and June of 1960, that India had stepped up intrusions in this Sector of the Sino-Indian border when actually Chinese forces had made deep inroads into Indian territory and had started investing Indian defence posts in Ladakh in June, 1962. It was in September 1962 that Chinese invasion of Indian territory started and the allegation that Indian troops crossed the Nathu La and successively "built several dozens of big and small pill-boxes and other military structures" in September 1962 is obviously an attempt to cover up the further Chinese aggressive activities since 1962.

Stripped of euphemism, what the Chinese note seems to object to is not the so-called fictitious border violations across the Nathu La alleged in the Chinese note, but the protective defence works which India had necessarily to undertake on its own side of the border against China's avowed objective of taking over Indian territory by force. Admittedly, the setting up of such protective defence works
had led to the interruption of normal trade and traffic across the border between Sikkim and Tibet. But, for this eventuality, the responsibility rests squarely on China and its aggressive objectives and large-scale military preparations along the Sino-Indian border. To make the Chinese accusations against India seem credible, the Chinese note has taken recourse to the standard charge about alleged air violations committed by Indian aircraft. But there is no more substance in this allegation than in the others, which the Government of China refurbishes from time to time for the sake of keeping alive China's anti-India propaganda.

The Chinese note has referred to the convention of 1890 between Great Britain and China relating to Sikkim and Tibet. Relevant extracts from this historic convention binding on the present Governments of India and China are reproduced below:

1. "The boundary of Sikkim and Tibet shall be the crest of the mountain range separating the waters flowing into the Sikkim Teesta and its affluents from the waters flowing into the Tibetan Mochu and northwards into other rivers of Tibet."

2. "It is admitted that the British Government, whose protectorate over the Sikkim State is hereby recognized, has direct and exclusive control over the internal administration and foreign relations of that State, and, except through and with the permission of the British Government, neither the Ruler of the State nor any of its officers shall have official relations of any kind, formal or informal, with any country."

The Convention of 1890 and the subsequent physical demarcation of the boundary between Sikkim and Tibet leave no room for doubt that the boundary lies along the watershed dividing the waters of the Teesta and the Mochu river systems. The location of Nathu La is unambiguous.

Since the Government of China had raised doubts about the validity and the physical layout of the traditional alignment along the entire length of the Sino-Indian border, which had been sanctified by treaties and agreements for the most part, the Indian delegates at the officials' talks, while offering sector-wise clarifications of the Sino-Indian boundary had offered a precise definition of the boundary between Sikkim and Tibet. But the Chinese officials, in pursuance of the aggressive designs of their Government, declined to discuss the precise alignment of the Sikkim-Tibet boundary with the Indian officials in open contravention of the 1890 Convention. Indeed, there is unmistakable evidence in the present Chinese note to show that the Chinese Government has not abandoned acting in a manner which is both irresponsible and in direct contravention of the 1890 Convention.

The Chinese note has referred to the stone marker which commemorates the opening of the Gangtok-Nathu La Road by Prime Minister Nehru on September 18, 1958. The Stone marker (not cement tablet) was not placed on the boundary but some distance away from it and inside the territory of Sikkim State below the
It is futile for the Chinese Government to incessantly distort facts in order to trump up charges against the Government of India.

The Chinese note has, in desperation, seized on the United States Ambassador's visit to the border in support of its absurd charge of border violations by Indian troops across Nathu La. The United States Ambassador's visit could not obviously have been to the wrong side of the border. And his visit to Nathu La, to the Indian side of the border, need hardly be a matter of any interest or concern to China.

The Government of India entirely agree with the statement made in the Chinese note that "The Nathu La is marked by clear terrain features. It is located on the only watershed along this section of the boundary and can be identified at a glance and there can be no misunderstanding about it." Because of these clear terrain features, the Indian defence forces are absolutely in no doubt whatever as to the correct boundary and, while maintaining vigilance, scrupulously keep within the Indian side of the boundary along the China-Sikkim border. There is, therefore, not the slightest need for any joint investigation which appears to have been suggested by the Chinese Government for purely propagandist purposes to give the false impression that the Chinese Government desires to settle its differences with India peacefully by talks and discussions.

India is ever willing to settle its problems with China peacefully and to this end has unconditionally accepted the proposals made by the Colombo Powers. These efforts of friendly non-aligned Afro-Asian countries have, however, been rendered sterile by the attitude of the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government has not merely attacked the role of the Colombo Powers but has sought to bend the will of the Colombo countries to subserve its own expansionist designs. It is no fortuitous that, while destroying the Colombo Proposals, China has taken unilateral steps to consolidate the gains of its latest aggression and to lay the foundation for its further aggression on India. If the Government of China genuinely desires peaceful settlement of its differences with India, it should, as a first and necessary step, accept the Colombo Proposals unconditionally.

The Ministry of External Affairs renews the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 17 June 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state that a serious violation of Indian territory has been committed recently by the aggressive Chinese 'frontier guards' in the vicinity of Depsang La, south-south-east of Daulat Beg Oldi in northern Ladakh. They have constructed a building and established a post at a point approximately 77° 59' 30'' East Longitude and 35° 14' 30''
North Latitude which is about 1,200 yards north-east of Despang La on the traditional Indian route to the Karakoram Pass.

The location of the new post is not only far to the west of the boundary as shown in the Chinese map first produced at the officials' talks in June 1960, but also clearly to the west of the fictitious November 1959 line of actual control unilaterally instituted by the Chinese Government after its massive invasion of India in the winter of 1962.

At the same time, this latest encroachment on Indian territory goes beyond the demilitarized zone, self-instituted by the Chinese Government in Ladakh.

It is also significant that this post is in addition to the so-called seven civilian posts which the Chinese Government has in disregard of the Colombo Proposals, unilaterally set up in the Western Sector and announced in its note of 2nd March, 1963.

In setting up the post, the Chinese Government has purposefully infringed:

(a) the boundary alignment claimed by the Chinese Government in its 1960 map,
(b) the more recent so-called November 1959 line of actual control,
(c) its unilateral declaration of cease-fire and withdrawal of 21st November, 1962, and
(d) the Colombo Proposals, which the Chinese Government still professes to have accepted "in principle".

This fresh act of aggression, as well as the series of intrusions committed by the Chinese frontier guards in other parts of Ladakh, e.g., in Spanggur and Rezang La, expose the hollowness of Chinese propaganda that the unilateral measures taken by the Chinese Government have restored peace and created the necessary atmosphere for peaceful negotiations. On the contrary, by committing aggression under cover of its peace offensive, the Chinese Government is deliberately making a bid to renew tension and create a grave situation in the border areas of Ladakh.

The Government of India lodges a strong protest with the Chinese Government against this fresh act of aggression committed by Chinese frontier guards on territory admitted as Indian even by the Chinese Government, and urges the Chinese Government to take immediate steps for the withdrawal of the post from Indian territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs renews its assurances of highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 25 June 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

At 1205 hours on June 12, 1963 one Indian military jeep intruded into Chinese territory north-west of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet. Three Indian soldiers alighted from the jeep and spied on the Chinese civilian checkpoint at Spanggur for around half an hour, and then they drove away. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against the aforementioned intrusion and provocative activities of the Indian side.

This is the sixteenth intrusion of the Indian side into the Spanggur Lake area since China effected on its own initiative the measures of cease-fire and withdrawal, and is also another serious incident following the four intrusions into Chinese territory by Indian troops north-west of Kongka Pass in Sinkiang during the latter part of April, 1963. The Indian Government in its note of May 15, 1963 tried hard to deny the fact of Indian troops intruding four times into the area north-west of Kongka Pass, and arbitrarily asserted that the area, which has always belonged to China, was "inside Indian territory". The Chinese Government expresses its regret at this peremptory and unreasonable attitude of the Indian side. In its note, the Indian side further stated that it had "refrained from doing anything that may interfere with the implementation of the unilateral declaration of cease-fire and withdrawal by China". But this fresh intrusion by Indian troops into the area north-west of the Spanggur Lake has once again exposed this lie.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 26 June 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

In its note of June 7, 1963, the Indian Government alleged that a Chinese force of 200 men entered into "Rezangla" on June 3 and "carried out a provocative demonstration." This is absolutely groundless. The Indian Government did not mention in its note the specific location of "Rezangla", but it did admit that this place was where an Indian strongpoint of aggression had been eliminated in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border. It is obvious that this place is east of the line of actual control of November 7, 1959. As early as before March 1, 1963 the Chinese frontier guards on China's own initiative withdrew from the twenty-kilometre-wide zone on the Chinese side of the line of actual control. In active response to
the Colombo proposals and in order to promote a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, China further vacated the areas where forty-three strongpoints of aggression had been set up by Indian troops in the western sector east of the line of actual control and where additional posts had been established by the Chinese frontier guards in order to resist Indian troops' intrusions, and China did not even establish civilian checkposts there. The above-mentioned allegation by the Indian Government is a pure fabrication. As for the Indian assertion that the place where India had established the strongpoint of aggression inside Chinese territory in the western sector is inside Ladakh, it is sheer nonsense which has long been refuted by the Chinese Government with conclusive evidence.

In its note of June 17, 1963 the Indian Government further alleged that "Chinese frontier guards" had entered a place "approximately 77° 59' 30" east longitude and 35° 14' 30" north latitude" in the vicinity of "Depasang La" in Ladakh and established a post there. This is an even more strange and clumsy allegation. The place indicated by the above-mentioned coordinates is inside Ladakh. The Chinese frontier guards have never crossed the boundary even for one step and have even withdrawn from the twenty-kilometre-wide zone on China's side of the line of actual control, so how could have the Chinese frontier guards established any post at that place? The Indian Government in its note cannot even supply the date of the so-called "violation of Indian territory" by the Chinese side. This also shows that its allegation was purely fabricated out of thin air.

In view of the above-mentioned facts, the Chinese Government categorically rejects the protests of the Indian Government.

In order to free itself from the awkward position which it has fallen into owing to its refusal to settle the boundary question through negotiations and to maintain an unpopular anti-China atmosphere, the Indian Government has even gone so far as unscrupulously to fabricate absurd allegations time and again, and is clamouring that the Chinese side has crossed the line of actual control and the Sino-Indian boundary line and using at will words like "aggression," "intimidation," "hollowness" etc., in a vain attempt to place China in a bad light. The Chinese Government expresses its greatest indignation at this and would like to point out that such tactics of making lies and slanders can only further expose the unpresentable position of the liar.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 28 June 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:
On the morning of June 20, 1963 seven Indian soldiers carrying weapons and field glasses intruded into Tungmula Pass (some five kilometres to the south-east of the Chinese civilian checkpoint at Laiguo Bridge, Tibet) on the line of actual control of November 7, 1959 in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, and spied on the Chinese civilian checkpoint at Laiguo Bridge. Two of them even crossed the line of actual control for reconnaissance. Then they withdrew to the south of the line together with the other Indian soldiers. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this and demands a cessation of such intrusions.

Since China took the initiative measures of cease-fire and withdrawal, Indian troops have on more than twenty occasions crossed the line of actual control between the two sides in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border and intruded into Chinese territory for reconnaissance and harassment. And now, Indian troops are even starting to cross the line of actual control in the eastern sector for reconnaissance. This calls for close attention. Facts have demonstrated that India's assertion that it would not impede China's cease-fire and withdrawal and that it did not send troops into the areas evacuated by China in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border is sheer deception.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 July 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated the 25th June, 1963.

There is no basis in fact, for the allegation made in the Chinese note that an Indian military jeep had "intruded into Chinese territory North-west of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet". This area is well on the Indian side the traditional boundary and has been occupied by China only very recently following upon the massive attacks launched by Chinese forces in October-November, 1962. Consistent with her desire to find a peaceful solution to the boundary question and in deference to the Colombo Proposals, India has refrained from crossing the so-called "line of actual control" claimed by the Chinese Government. The statement that an Indian military jeep was in the area is patently false.

By making a number of fictitious allegations against India, the Chinese Government is obviously aiming at the keeping up of tensions along the India-China border. The Government of India firmly rejects these fabrications of the Chinese Government.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the
Embassy of China in India, 16 July 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated the 28th June, 1963.

The Government of India have confirmed after careful investigations that there has been no instance of Indian defence personnel having crossed the international boundary. There is no question, therefore, of any Indian defence personnel having crossed the boundary at a pass in the vicinity of the Chinese post at Laiguo Bridge. On the other hand, it has come to the knowledge of the Indian Government that a Chinese intrusion had taken place about two miles south of Dom La Pass on 20th June, 1963. Two Chinese intruders who were in plain clothes disappeared into the adjoining forest as soon as they noticed that they had been observed. The Chinese allegation of intrusion by Indian defence personnel is, therefore, obviously an attempt to cover up their intrusion into Indian territory.

The above facts show that Indian forces have been acting strictly in accordance with the Colombo Proposals and that it is the Chinese forces who are acting in violation both of the Chinese declaration of the so-called unilateral cease-fire and withdrawal and of the Colombo Proposals. The Government of India accordingly reject the Chinese note dated the 28th June, 1963.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 26 July 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the latter's note of the 26th June, 1963.

The Government of India had protested about the intrusion by Chinese forces west of Rezang La on 3rd June, 1963 after a careful verification of the facts. There is no doubt at all that this intrusion had taken place as stated. The location of Rezang La (E 78° 51' 10" N 33° 25' 30") is well known, and it is absurd for the Chinese Government to argue that because "the specific location of Rezang La" had not been given in the Indian Government's note, no such intrusion had taken place. It is even more absurd for the Chinese Government to assert, after claiming that they are not aware of the specific location of Rezang La, that "it is obvious that this place is east of the line of 'actual control' of 7th November, 1959".

As regards the Chinese post in the vicinity of Depsang La, against the establishment of which the Indian Government had protested in its note of 17th June, 1963, there is no doubt that this post had actually been set up. It had been detected on the 7th June, 1963 by an Indian civilian party which was proceeding to Daulat Beg Oldi along the Central Asian trade route. Following upon the denials by the
Chinese Government of the existence of this post, further investigations were carried out which confirm that the Chinese forces had set up a post in the area, that it has been subsequently demolished and that white patches on the spot still indicate where the post had originally been located. It is obvious from this that on receiving the Indian Government's protest, Chinese forces had been ordered to withdraw from this area and the post had been demolished. It would appear that because the facts were established and clear, the Chinese Government have resorted to use of offensive language unbecoming in diplomatic correspondence exchanged between Governments to bolster up their deliberate prevarication on the facts.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China. 8 January 1963

On 3rd January 1963 at 1309 hours an Indian Military aircraft intruded into the air space over Chinese Sinkiang and Tibet. It first flew over Samzungling, Tienwentian, Kendahwar and other places for reconnaissance, then reached as far as the area South East of Hotien, and then, turning Southwards, flew over Rudok, Tashigong and other places in the Ari district of Tibet. Finally it returned to India along a route to the South West of Pierh (approximately 31° 37.N 79° 06·5E) 1452 hours. This intruding Indian aircraft, which penetrated as deep as 360 K. metres inside China, flew over vast areas of China's Sinkiang and Tibet and engaged in wilful reconnaissance and harassment for as long as one hour and 45 minutes. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this frenzied provocation by Indian aircraft.

After the Chinese side ceased fire and started withdrawing on its own initiative, the Indian Government has still incessantly sent out its aircraft to intrude into China's air space. The Chinese side, exerting its utmost to maintain self-restraint, has not opened fire on them. After the Chinese Government lodged a strong protest with the Indian Government on 11th December 1962, intrusions by Indian aircraft far from ceasing have become even more rampant. This cannot but arouse the serious attention of the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government demand that the Indian side stop immediately its intrusions into China's air space. Otherwise the Indian Government shall bear the responsibility for all the consequences arising therefrom.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 14 January 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

During the months of October, November and December, 1962 the total number of verified Indian air intrusions into China's air
space reached 400 sorties (see Appendix for details). The intruding Indian planes, apart from wilfully circling over and harassing the positions of Chinese frontier guards, reached as far as such important cities as Lhasa, Damshune, Shigatse, Gyantse and Chamdo in Tibet for reconnaissance purposes. It can be seen from the facts listed in the Appendix that the Indian air intrusions into China's air space in October 1962 were unprecedently feverish and frequent. They undoubtedly constituted a component part of the whole operational plan for the massive Indian attacks on Chinese frontier defence forces started on October 20, 1962. It is especially serious that even after the Chinese frontier defence forces ceased fire and withdrew along the Sino-Indian border on China's own initiative, India has still kept sending out aircraft to intrude into China's air space for provocative purposes. The Chinese Government hereby lodges once again a serious protest with the Indian Government against this.

In its notes of August 16, October 5, and October 28, 1962, the Indian Government tried vainly to deny the facts that Indian planes continually intruded into China's air space from June to September 1962 and that Indian planes intruded into the air space over Damshune and other places in October 1962. The Indian Government even openly declared in its note of October 28, 1962, that Indian aircraft “are at liberty to fly” over that part of China's territory which India wishes to occupy but has not been able to do so. This is, indeed, a most peremptory and preposterous attitude. The Chinese Government seriously warns the Indian Government that if Indian aircraft continue to intrude wilfully into China's air space and provoke challenges China will reserve the right to self-defence and the Indian side must bear the responsibility for the consequences arising therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
**Enclosure to the Note dated 14 January 1963 of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking.**

*List of Indian Air Intrusions into China in October, November and December, 1962.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Intruded</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of Sorties</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Chip Chap valley area in Sinkiang, China</td>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53 packs of supplies were dropped to the military strongpoints then illegally set up by Indian troops in Chinese territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28 Packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>129 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Intruded</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number of Sorties</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of the source of the Karakash River, Sinkiang, China (16 sorties)</td>
<td>October 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37 packs of supplies and 7 horses were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Galvan valley area in Sinkiang, China (35 sorties)</td>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 helicopters landed on separate occasions on Chinese soil and 26 Indian military men got down from them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 helicopters landed on separate occasions on Chinese soil. 15 Indian military men got down from them and some supplies were unloaded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Helicopters landed on Chinese soil. 11 Indian military men got down from them and 41 wooden cases were unloaded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Helicopters</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Helicopters landed on Chinese soil. 6 Indian military men got down from them and more than 20 packs of supplies and 4 wooden cases were unloaded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>One of the Indian planes dropped 25 packs of supplies. The other two helicopters landed on Chinese soil and 2 Indian military men got down from them and 20 wooden cases were unloaded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>One of the Indian planes dropped 23 packs of supplies. Two helicopters landed on Chinese soil and 4 Indian military men got down from them and 5 cases of ammunition and some other materials were unloaded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Changlung valley area in Sinkiang, China. (8 sorties)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The vicinity of Nyagzu in Tibet, China. (9 sorties)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 packs of supplies were dropped.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Intruded</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number of sorties</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pangong Lake and Spanggur Lake areas in Tibet, China</td>
<td>November 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pangong Lake and Spanggur Lake areas in Tibet, China</td>
<td>October 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rudok Dzong area in Tibet, China.</td>
<td>November 27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 sortie)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vicinity of Demchok in Tibet, China</td>
<td>October 24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Sorties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pulan Dzong, Gyanima and their vicinity in Tibet, China**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sorties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Khamba, Phari and Yatung areas in Tibet, China**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sorties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Shigatse, Gyantse and Kangma areas in Tibet, China**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sorties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Intruded</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lhasa and Damshune areas in Tibet, China</td>
<td>October 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawang, Dirang Dzong and their vicinity in Tibet, China</td>
<td>November 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lungtsu area in Tibet, China</td>
<td>October 19, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migyitun, Tamaden and their vicinity</td>
<td>October 13, 19, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vicinity in Tibet, China (10 sorties)</td>
<td>November 6, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Meto area in Tibet, China</td>
<td>October 10, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5 sorties)</td>
<td>December 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tsayul area in Tibet, China</td>
<td>October 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18 sorties)</td>
<td>November 2, 3, 7, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 11, 12, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Walong area in Tibet, China</td>
<td>December 2, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 sorties)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamdo and its vicinity in Tibet, China</td>
<td>November 15, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4 sorties)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 23 January 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

On January 19, 1963, at 1309 hours, an Indian military aircraft intruded into China's air space across the China-Sikkim border, and flew over such important Chinese cities as Gyantse, Lhasa, Damshune, Shigatse and Lhatse in Tibet for reconnaissance and harassment for more than two hours, leaving for India only at 1550 hours back across the China-Sikkim border. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this serious Indian provocation.

As is known to all, with a view to reversing the border situation and promoting a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, the Chinese Government has taken series of important steps, including cease-fire and withdrawal of its troops on its own initiative. Now the whole world is waiting for the Indian side to make a positive response and return to the conference table at an early date. But at this very juncture, the Indian side, in disregard of the repeated protests recently lodged by the Chinese Government (see the Chinese Government's notes of January 8, 10 and 14, 1963), has continued to dispatch aircraft to intrude deep into Chinese air space for reconnaissance and provocation and once again made use of the air space of Sikkim for aggressive activities. This calls for serious vigilance. The Chinese Government once again solemnly asks the Indian side to stop immediately such activities calculated to perpetuate tension on the border.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24 January 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated 23rd January, 1963, regarding an alleged intrusion by an Indian military aircraft into China.

In their reply 13th December, to a Chinese Government note of 11th December 1962, the Government of India have already pointed out the baseless nature of such charges of violation of Chinese air space by Indian aircraft. However, the Chinese Government have continued to make unwarranted and provocative allegations in their notes dated 8th, 10th, 14th and 23rd January, 1963.

The Chinese Government should be aware that there are strict instructions against Indian aircraft entering Chinese air space and these instructions are scrupulously observed. No Indian aircraft
has ever crossed into China. There can, therefore, be no question of any Indian aircraft having flown over Gyantse, Lhasa, Damshune, Shigatse and Lhatse on 19th January 1963.

In the light of facts cited above, the Government of India reject the Chinese note under reference. The Government of India express their serious concern at the motives of the Government of China in making spurious allegations which have no basis at all in fact.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 25 February 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Government's note dated 8th January 1963 has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese note gives no precise map references for a number of places which have been given unfamiliar names and which are referred to in the note. However, the Government of India have conducted a careful enquiry and have confirmed that no Indian aircraft has ever crossed into Chinese territory.

In this connection it is observed that the Chinese note mention Samzungling as falling inside Tibet although it is clearly inside Indian territory and over 70 miles to the west of the international border in this region. There can be no basis for a Chinese protest in regard to a place which is indisputably inside Indian territory and the Government of India reiterate the right of Indian aircraft to fly over any place which lies within the sovereign jurisdiction of India.

In the light of the above facts, the Government of India reject the Chinese note under reference.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 February 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Government note dated 14th January 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese note has referred to alleged air violations during October, November and December 1962, by Indian aircraft over
two distinct areas: areas in the Tibet region of China and areas within Indian territory where China has intruded illegally and forcibly.

After careful investigations it has been definitely confirmed that no Indian aircraft has ever intruded into Chinese air space over areas within the Tibet region of China.

With respect to the other areas mentioned in the Appendix to the note of January 14, the Indian Government would like to point out that all these areas are within the territorial limits of the Indian Union. As such, Indian aircraft are at liberty to fly over places which are an integral part of India. As the Chinese Government are fully aware, these flights in some of these areas were flights of transport aircraft engaged in airdropping of supplies to Indian defence posts in these areas of Indian territory.

The Indian defence posts in Indian territory and the air supply arrangements for the maintenance of these defence posts posed no threat to anyone. On the other hand, it is the Government of China who had made a coordination and concerted plan for massive attacks on Indian territory while continuing to talk about peaceful talks and discussions.

The Government of India categorically reject the Chinese note of 14th January as the allegations made in the note are baseless and completely divorced from the facts of the situation.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 February 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to refer to the notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated November 15 and 29, and December 13, 1962.

The Chinese Government in its note dated December 11, 1962 lodged a strong protest with the Indian Government against the nine intrusions made by Indian aircraft for reconnaissance and harassment in a single day on December 10, 1962 over Lhasa and other important cities as well as positions of the Chinese frontier guards in the Walong area. In its note of December 13, 1962 the Indian side did not deny the fact of Indian aircraft's intrusion over the Walong area but brazenly declared that it had the right to do so. That is to say, the Indian Government openly claims that it can indulge in sending aircraft for provocation and disruption at will when the Chinese side has ceased fire and is withdrawing on its own initiative. The Chinese Government expresses its deep regret at this and sternly demands that the Indian side immediately
stop such calculated provocation and disruption against China’s initiative measures of cease-fire and withdrawal.

The Indian note of December 13, 1962 denied flatly as usual all the other eight serious Indian air intrusions into China on December 10. Moreover, it again made a false charge against the Chinese side, alleging that a Chinese plane intruded over India’s Chabua on the same day. This clumsy fabrication was obviously meant to deceive the public so as to cover up its own intrusions. Similarly, the charges made by the Indian Government in its notes dated November 15 and 29, 1962 about two alleged Chinese air intrusions into India were both trumped up. The Chinese Government categorically rejects these unwarranted charges and protests made by the Indian side.'

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 7 March 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and with reference to the note dated 19th February 1963 from the Chinese Government has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India had, after careful investigation of the facts, informed the Chinese Government vide their note dated 13th December 1962 that no Indian aircraft had ever violated Chinese air space on 10th December 1962, as alleged by the Chinese Government. It is regrettable that the Government of China should continue to repeat the same baseless allegations in their note under reference.

Not only have the Chinese Government made baseless allegations about Indian aircraft violating Chinese air space but they have also taken exception to Indian aircraft flying even over Indian territory. Such an objection on the part of the Chinese Government is quite unacceptable. The Government of India firmly reject the Chinese Government’s description of legitimate flights by Indian aircraft over Indian territory as “calculated provocations and disruption against Chinese initiative measures of cease-fire and withdrawal”.

The Chinese note has gone on to deny the fact of intrusions by Chinese aircraft into Indian air space about which the Government of India had protested in their notes dated 15th and 29th November 1962. These Chinese intrusions into Indian air space had been carefully verified and there can be no doubt they had taken place.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 30 March 1963

In its note of 24th December 1962 the Chinese Government has thoroughly refuted the slanderous charges made by the Indian Government against China with regard to alleged violation of the air space of Bhutan by Chinese aircraft. It is entirely futile for the Indian Government to repeat these slanderous charges in its note. The Government of China will pay no more attention to any further unreasonable haggling that the Indian Government may make in this regard in future.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 April 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Government's note of 30th March, 1963, has the honour to state the following:

Neither vehement denials on the part of the Chinese Government nor their refusal to discuss the issue any further can alter the fact that Chinese aircraft repeatedly violated the air-space over Bhutan as was detailed in the Government of India's note dated 3rd December, 1962. It was in view of these violations of Bhutanese air-space that the Government of India had lodged a protest on behalf of the Government of Bhutan. However, in the face of the denials of the Chinese Government, the Government of India have no desire to continue the correspondence.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 25 April 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to bring to the notice of the Embassy the following violation of Indian air space by a Chinese jet aircraft.

On the 15th March, 1963, at 0906 hours, a Chinese jet aircraft was seen flying over Chhaglon (28.15 North, 96.35 East) from a North-easterly direction towards a South-westerly direction. The Government of India strongly protest against this violation of Indian air space by Chinese aircraft and demand that the authorities concerned be asked to put a stop forthwith to such provocative flights.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 26 April 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

During the months of January, February and March, 1963, the total number of verified Indian air intrusions into China reached 27 sorties (see Appendix for details). Indian aircraft not only intruded into China's air space along the entire Sino-Indian border, but also penetrated 360 kilometres into Chinese territory to reach the vast area around Hotien, Sinkiang for wanton reconnaissance and harassment. What is especially serious, these intrusions all took place after the border situation had eased owing to the cease-fire and withdrawal by the Chinese frontier guards on China's own initiative. They can only be regarded as the Indian side's deliberate provocations and attempts to create tension once again. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against them.

In its notes of January 24, January 25, February 13, March 7, 1963, the Indian Government denied the intrusions by Indian aircraft into China's air space, asserting that "no Indian aircraft has ever crossed into China." However, the Indian side can never deny and quibble away the facts that Indian aircraft have intruded into China's air space for provocations. In its note of February 13, 1963, the Indian Government itself admitted the flight of Indian aircraft in some areas, but it preposterously asserted that these areas of Chinese territory were "within the territorial limits of the Indian Union", and that Indian aircraft "are at liberty to fly" over them. This once again proved that India would continue to alter the status quo of the Sino-Indian border by force. In this connection, the Chinese Government wishes again to warn the Indian Government: the Sino-Indian boundary question can only be settled through direct Sino-Indian negotiations, India's attempt to change the status quo of the boundary by force did not succeed before and will never succeed in the future. In order to enable the stabilization of the already eased border situation, the Indian side should immediately stop its intrusions into China's air space.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Enclosure to the note dated 26 April 1963 of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking

List of Indian Air Intrusions into China in January, February and March, 1963

I. Indian air intrusions into Sinkiang and Tibet regions in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border (8 sorties)—

(1) On January 3, 1963, at 13:09 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Sinkiang and Tibet,
carried out reconnaissance over Samzungling, Tienwentian, Kengshwar and other places, then penetrated into the south-east of Hotien and turned south passing over Rudok, Tashigong and other places in Tibet. It was not till 1452 hours that it returned to India from the southwest of Pierh (approximately 31° 37'N, 79° 06.5'E). This Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over vast regions of Sinkiang and Tibet, penetrated into China to the depth of 360 kilometres and spent one hour and forty-three minutes in China.

(2) On January 3, 1963, at 13:25 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the Chinese frontier post in the Spanggur Lake area in Tibet.

(3) On January 24, 1963, at 12:37 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Tashigong in Tibet.

(4) On January 27, 1963, at 21:45 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the Chip Chap Valley and the area to its south in Sinkiang.

(5) On February 8, 1963, at 10:55 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the Pangong Lake and Nyagzu areas in Tibet, and circled there for reconnaissance.

(6) On February 9, 1963, at 10:20 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the Chinese frontier post in the Spanggur Lake area in Tibet.

(7) On March 7, 1963 at 11:42 hours one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Tashigong and its vicinity in Tibet.

(8) On March 27, 1963, at 11:30 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Tashigong and its vicinity in Tibet.

II. Indian Air intrusions into Tibet region in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border (5 sorties)—

(1) On January 3, 1963 at 1200 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the Tokchen area and Mavam Tso in Tibet, and circled there again and again for reconnaissance.

(2) On February 6, 1963, at 15:08 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Tibet and carried out reconnaissance over Demchok, Tashigong, Gargunsa, Toling and other places.

(3) On February 23, 1963, at 12:55 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Pulan Dzong, Silang and other places in Tibet for reconnaissance.

(4) On February 23, 1963, at 13:30 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the vicinity of Parkha in Tibet and circled there for reconnaissance.
(5) On February 24, 1963, at 13:03 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over Pulan Dzong in Tibet.

III. Indian air intrusions into Tibet region to the north of the line of actual control in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border (9 sorties)—

(1) On January 19, 1963, at 13:09 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over Tibet and carried out reconnaissance and harassment over Gyantse, Lhasa, Damshune, Shigatse, Lhatse and other important cities for as long as above two hours, and flew away in the direction of India only at 15:50 hours.

(2) On January 22, 1963, at 13:30 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over Tibet and penetrated into Chamdo and other places for reconnaissance.

(3) On January 22, 1963, at 14:14 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over Ketang in the Meo area, Tibet.

(4) On February 1, 1963, at 20:50 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over the Tsayul area in Tibet.

(5) On February 5, 1963, at 14:02 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over Yueherhtung, Meo and other places in the Meo area, Tibet.

(6) On February 5, 1963, at 14:39 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over the Tsayul area in Tibet.

(7) On February 6, 1963, at 13:25 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over Tsayul, Chuwakan and other places in Tibet.

(8) On March 15, 1963, at 11:30 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over the Tsayul area in Tibet.

(9) On March 15, 1963, at 14:30 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over Tsayul and other places in Tibet.

IV. Indian air intrusions into Tibet region on the China-Sikkim and China-Bhutan borders (5 sorties)—

(1) On February 5, 1963, at 13:30 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space across the China-Sikkim border at Kailu Pass, and flew over Changlun, Khamba, Trakising, Tokela, Phari and other places in Tibet for reconnaissance.

(2) On February 5, 1963, at 13:39 hours one Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space across the China-Bhutan
border, and flew over Chumbitan and other places in Tibet.

(3) On February 5, 1963, at 14:00 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space across the China-Sikkim border at Jelep La, and flew over Chumbitan, Yatung and other places in Tibet.

(4) On February 9, 1963, at 13:07 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Yatung, Chumbitan and other places in Tibet.

(5) On March 4, 1963, at 14:14 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Chumbitan and other places in Tibet.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 9 May 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated April 25, 1963, has the honour to state the following:

In its note the Indian Government charged that on March 15, 1963 a Chinese aircraft flew over Chhaglon south of the so-called McMahon Line. This is completely groundless. Although China has never recognized the so-called McMahon Line, Chinese aircraft have refrained from crossing this illegal line. The Chinese Government categorically rejects this trumped up charge and protest by India.

When sending out this note, the Indian Government had probably forgotten that ten days ago, on April 15, 1963, the Indian Deputy Minister for Defence D. R. Chavan said during question and answer in the Indian Lok Sabha that since January 1 this year, there was no Chinese “air violation”. It is obvious that in fabricating by a stretch of imagination the charge about the flight of a Chinese aircraft over Chhaglon more than a month ago, India's purpose was none other than to create tension and cover up its own repeated intrusions into Chinese territory and air space. But this only serves to expose India itself and land it in self-contradiction.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 May 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the
Chinese Government note dated the 26th April, 1963 has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese note has alleged that “Indian aircraft not only intruded into China’s air space along the entire Sino-Indian border, but also penetrated 360 kilometres into Chinese territory...” However, the areas described in parts I and II of the Appendix relate not only to areas in the Tibet region of China, but also to areas clearly lying within Indian territory in the Western sector of the India-China border, where Chinese forces have illegally intruded in recent years.

The Government of India have confirmed after careful investigation that no Indian aircraft has ever intruded into Chinese air space over the Tibet region of China. The allegation that an Indian aircraft penetrated 360 kilometres into Chinese territory around Hotien in Sinkiang is too absurd to deserve any comment.

It is surprising that in their note under reference the Chinese Government should have made fictitious allegations about Indian aircraft violating Chinese air space. They have even taken exception to Indian aircraft flying over what is indisputably Indian territory. As already pointed out in the Indian Government’s note of 7th March 1963, this attitude on the part of the Chinese Government is totally unacceptable. The Government of India firmly repudiate the Chinese Government’s charge that the Government of India are attempting to “alter the status quo of the Sino-Indian border by force”. The record of Chinese aggression since 1957, initially by surreptitious means and then by naked aggression is sufficient proof that they alone have attempted to alter the India-China border by force.

In the light of the above facts, the Government of India categorically reject the Chinese Government’s note of 26th April, 1963.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 May 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows:

On 6th May, 1963, at 0657 hours a Chinese aircraft was observed flying over Chaam in the Tehri Garhwal area, Uttar Pradesh State. The aircraft which was flying at a high altitude, penetrated nearly 60 miles into Indian territory before it flew back in a North-easterly direction into Tibet.

This violation in the Middle sector is well to the south of the international border which has been recognised both by China and India. The attention of the Chinese Government is drawn to their
note of 20th March 1962 in which they stated “that the Indian Government is fully entitled to deal with any unidentified aircraft discovered in Indian air space without having to make any enquiries of the Chinese Government”. The Government of India strongly protest against this brazen transgression of Indian sovereign air space and would like to affirm that such violations will not be tolerated.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 June 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to refer to the notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated May 16 and 21, 1963.

“In its note of May 16, 1963, the Indian Government resorted to its usual practice of denying the conclusive facts put forward in the Chinese note of April 26, 1963 about Indian air intrusions into China’s air space which amounted to 27 sorties during the first quarter of 1963, and once again arbitrarily described the Chinese territory over which the Indian aircraft flew as “indisputably Indian territory”. Such a peremptory attitude exposes all the more clearly the Indian attempt to change the state of the Sino-Indian boundary by armed force. It is futile for India to deny this in its note.

In order to further cover by Indian intrusions, the Indian Government did not hesitate to make a charge in its note of May 21, 1963 about a Chinese aircraft flying over Chaam in Uttar Pradesh State of India on May 6, which was alleged to have penetrated nearly 60 miles into Indian air space. This is sheer venomous mudslinging. Chinese aircraft have never intruded into the air space of other countries, and such things can never happen. For the sake of easing the border situation, Chinese aircraft have always refrained from flying even over the Chinese areas close to the Sino-Indian border. The Indian note also mentioned that the Chinese Government had long made it clear “that the Indian Government is fully entitled to deal with any unidentified aircraft discovered in Indian air space without having to make any enquiries of the Chinese Government.” Since the Indian Government still clearly remembers this statement, why should it continue to trump up the story about Chinese aircraft flying over Indian territory? Is it not a clear case of mischief-making and deliberate creation of tension? The Chinese Government categorically rejects such a trumped-up charge and protest of the Indian side.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 11 June 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to
refer to the Chinese Government note dated 2nd June, 1963:

The Chinese note evades the issue raised in the Government of
India's note of May 21, 1963 wherein irrefutable proof had been
given of the clear violation of Indian airspace by a Chinese aircraft
on the 6th May, 1963. The aircraft penetrated 60 miles into Indian
airspace and returned taking a north-easterly course into Tibet.

It is obvious that the Chinese reply is not based on a careful en-
quiry into the Indian complaint. On the contrary the Chinese Gov-
ernment has sought to counter it by such untenable assertions as
"Chinese aircraft never intruded into the airspace of other countries
and such things can never happen. For the sake of easing the bord-
er situation, Chinese aircraft have always refrained from flying over
the Chinese area close to the Sino-Indian border". In the face of
the systematic encroachment and unlawful occupation of thousands
of square miles of Indian territory and the massive attack unleashed
on India in the winter of 1962, these assertions look utterly ludicrous.

The Government of India has time and again warned the Chinese
Government about these violations of Indian airspace which must
cease, if peace is to prevail.

Although of no direct relevance to the issue, the Chinese Gov-
ernment has mischievously repeated its old allegations about Indian
air intrusions into Chinese airspace. These false allegations have
already been repudiated in the Government of India's note of May
16, 1963. As to the exception taken by the Chinese to Indian air-
craft flying over Indian territory, this is utterly incomprehensible
and ridiculous.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew
to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of
its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 12 June 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to
refer to the Chinese Government's note dated the 5th May, 1963.

The Government of India's note dated the 25th April, 1963 gave
full details regarding the violation of Indian airspace over Chhaglon.
It is regretted that instead of investigating a legitimate complaint,
the Chinese Government has merely denied having made any aerial
intrusions whatsoever in this area.

Furthermore, the Chinese reply has sought to evade the issue by
referring to Chhaglon as "south of the so-called McMahon Line".
Had Chhaglon not been south of the McMahon Line, there would
have been no cause for the Government of India to lodge a protest. The McMahon Line which formalized the centuries old traditional boundary between India and Tibet had always been recognized as such both by China and Tibet, and merely because the present Chinese Government chooses to refer to that boundary line as the "so-called McMahon Line", it does not become less legal.

The Chinese note has taken shelter behind a statement made on 15th April, 1963 in the Indian Parliament by the Minister of Defence. When that statement was made, the detailed verifications that have necessarily to be undertaken in such matters of importance had not been completed and the Defence Minister's statement bore no reference to this particular aerial intrusion over Chhaglon. However, on the 23rd April, 1963, after verification had been completed, the Deputy Defence Minister referred to it in the Rajya Sabha. It is futile for the Chinese Government to defend itself by making baseless counter-charges that are not sustainable.

The Ministry of External Affairs renews to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China. 24 June 1963.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

On June 6, 1963, at 1242 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Tibet, China. It flew over Rudok, Shanho (about 25 kilometres to the north-east of Rudok), Toma (about 70 kilometres to the north-east of Rudok), the Pangong Lake and their vicinity for reconnaissance. It flew away via the area north of the Pangong Lake at 1312 hours. The Indian aircraft penetrated as deep as more than 130 kilometres inside China. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest against the unbridled violation of China's airspace and tension-creating activities of the Indian aircraft and urges India to stop its intrusions into China's airspace.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India. 26 June 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state that since the violations of Indian airspace over Chaam in Uttar Pradesh State and Chhaglon in the North East Frontier Agency by Chinese aircraft, reported in the Ministry's protest notes of 11th
and 12th June, 1963, the following further instances of violation of Indian airspace by Chinese aircraft have come to notice.

(i) On 27th May, 1963 at 0705 hours, a Chinese aircraft flew over Bameng (27° 33' North and 92° 56' East) in the Kameng Division of the North East Frontier Agency. The aircraft penetrated nearly 30 miles South of the International border;

(ii) On 5th June, 1963 at 0920 hours, two Chinese twin-engine aircraft flew over Koloriang (27° 58' North and 93° 18' East) in the Subansiri Division of the North East Frontier Agency. The aircraft penetrated 25 miles deep into Indian territory.

These renewed violations of Indian airspace by Chinese aircraft on illegal operations reveal the aggressive intentions of the Chinese Government and the threat which continues to be posed to India's security and territorial integrity.

In lodging a strong protest, the Government of India would again urge an immediate cessation of these unlawful operations of the Chinese Government.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi. to the Embassy of China in India, 2 July 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Ministry's note dated June 26, 1963 regarding violations of Indian air space by Chinese aircraft over Bameng and Koloriang in the North East Frontier Agency of India.

The Government of India are now in possession of verified facts on the following further violation of Indian airspace by Chinese aircraft:

On 19th June, 1963, between 0700 hours and 0750 hours, a Chinese four-engined aircraft flew over Gamsali, Pulam-sumda and Nelang in the Uttar Pradesh State and penetrated 20 miles inside Indian territory. The aircraft was observed over Gamsali at 0700 hours, over Pulamsumda at 0730 hours, and over Nelang at 0736 hours, flying over Gamsali again at 0750 hours while returning to Tibet.

The Government of India regret that despite the earlier protests the Chinese Government have not stopped sending aircraft over Indian territory to carry out illegal operations. This is further proof that the aggressive policies of the Chinese Government have in no way changed.
The Government of India lodge an emphatic protest against the afore-mentioned violation of Indian airspace and again urge that similar provocations be stopped forthwith.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 12 July 1963.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated the 24th June, 1963.

Despite the refutations by the Indian Government on similar baseless charges made in the past about intrusions by Indian aircraft into Chinese air space, the Chinese Government has continued to invent further allegations in a determined attempt to slander the Government of India. The Government of India has, after a careful enquiry, established that there is no basis whatsoever for the present allegation that an Indian aircraft flew over Rudok, Shanho, Toma and over the eastern half of Pangong Lake on the 6th June, 1963.

The Chinese note of 24th June is accordingly rejected.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 12 July 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

During the months of April, May and June, 1963, the total number of verified Indian air intrusions into China reached seventeen sorties (See appendix for details). These intrusions of Indian aircraft were most flagrant. They circled over Chinese civilian checkposts and the vast areas of Tibet and Sinkiang of China for reconnaissance. Some of them even penetrated over 130 kilometres into Chinese territory. This fully shows that the Indian side is unwilling to stabilize the eased border situation, but is deliberately creating new tension. Against this, the Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government, and demands that the Indian side stop its intrusions into China.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Enclosure to the note dated 12 July 1963 of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking

List of Indian Air Intrusions into China in April, May and June 1963.

I. Indian air intrusions into Sinkiang and Tibet regions of China in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border (11 sorties)

1. On April 1, 1963, at 1120 hours and 1245 hours respectively, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Tashigong in Tibet for reconnaissance and penetrated over thirty kilometres into Chinese territory.

2. On April 3, 1963, at 1240 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Yula and other places on the southern bank of the Pangong Lake in Tibet.

3. On April 12, 1963 at 1045 hours, and on June 2, 1963 at 0922 hours respectively, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the vicinity of the Chinese civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang, and circled over there for reconnaissance.

4. On April 20, 1963, at 1015 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the southern bank of the Pangong Lake in Tibet.

5. On May 15, 1963 at 1710 hours, on May 17, 1963 at 1200 hours and on May 19, 1963 at 1635 hours respectively, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet and its vicinity. The aircraft which intruded on May 17 circled over the civilian checkpost there for about twenty minutes, and the one which intruded on May 19 carried out activities over Chinese territory for about one hour.

6. On June 6, 1963, at 1242 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Rudok Dzong Shanho, Toma, the Pangong Lake and other places in Tibet for half-an-hour reconnaissance, penetrating over 130 kilometres into Chinese territory.

7. On June 29, 1963, at 1235 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the Chinese civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and the area to its north for reconnaissance.

II. Indian air intrusions into the Tibet region of China in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border (three sorties)

1. On April 28, 1963, at 1215 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Pulan Dzong, Gyanima and other places in Tibet, circled over there for reconnaissance and penetrated over forty kilometres into Chinese territory.

2. On April 28, 1963, at 1304 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the civilian checkpost at Poling and over Toling, Tsaparang and other places in Tibet for reconnaissance, penetrating over fifty kilometres into Chinese territory.

3. On May 21, 1963, at 1100 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Pulan Dzong in Tibet.
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III. Indian air intrusions into the Tibet region of China north of the line of actual control in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border (one sortie).

On May 12, 1963, at 1100 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Tsona Dzong and other places in Tibet.

IV. Indian air intrusions into the Tibet region of China on China-Sikkim border (two sorties).

1. On April 28, 1963, at 1145 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Changlun, Khamba Dzong, Traksing, Yatung and other places in Tibet.

2. On June 14, 1963, at 1345 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the Yatung area in Tibet and circled over Asang, Hsiasima, Upper Yatung and other places for reconnaissance.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24 July 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government note dated the 12th July, 1963.

The Government of India have carefully investigated the allegations made in the Chinese note under reference and it has been established that they are without any basis whatsoever. No Indian aircraft has ever flown over China or Tibet.

While some of the allegations of aerial intrusions mentioned in the Chinese note are repetitions of previous allegations already refuted by the Government of India, some also relate to places which are clearly located in Indian territory. It is deplorable that the Chinese Government should continue to make false charges in its effort to intensify its propaganda against India and generally to increase existing tensions between the two countries.


The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 25 July, 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows:

On 4th July, 1963 at 2040 hours a Chinese jet aircraft intruded into Indian air-space at Kalpani (80° 50'E and 30° 13'N) and Kuthi (80° 46' E and 30° 17' N) in Uttar Pradesh State. The Government of India takes a serious view of such continuing violations of Indian air-space by Chinese aircraft. It is surprising that while Chinese
aircraft are repeatedly violating Indian air-space, the Chinese Government should be indulging in baseless allegations about Indian aircraft violating Chinese air-space.

The Government of India hereby lodges a strong protest against this aggressive attitude of the Chinese Government.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 7 November 1962

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India and has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Embassy has learnt that on the afternoon of October 26, 1962 Indian police authorities sent their men to the Roxy Press to announce proscription of issue No. 43 of "China Today", a bulletin published by the Chinese Embassy, and forcibly took away all the copies of the issue which were temporarily left by the Embassy at the Roxy Press to be brought to its office. It must be pointed out that it is in conformity with international practice for the Chinese Embassy to publish its bulletin. The arbitrary confiscation by the Indian police authorities of the Embassy's bulletin left by the Embassy at the Press to be brought to its office constitutes a serious infringement on the rights of the Embassy as well as an open violation of international practice, thus hindering the normal functioning of the Embassy. The Embassy lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against this crude and unwarranted act, demands that the Indian Government immediately look into the matter, take measures to return all the copies of the bulletin to the Embassy, and guarantee that no similar incident will recur in the future.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of External Affairs the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 7 December 1962

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India and, with reference to the Ministry's note No. F. VII/408/20/62, dated June 25, 1962 and note No. 412-DII/62 (25/8), dated November 14, 1962, has the honour to state as follows:

The charges made in the two notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of India that the non-diplomatic staff of the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay have not got themselves registered nor have they fulfilled exit formalities are groundless. The Embassy must make it clear that in a note sent to the Indian Embassy in China on November 13 in reply to a note sent by the Ministry of External
Affairs to this Embassy on November 7, 1962 (according to which, diplomats and non-diplomats of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates, their wives and children cannot leave India without getting permit from Indian Ministry of External Affairs), the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs has seriously protested against measures of unscrupulous discrimination against the personnel of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates. If the allegations made in the Ministry's two notes under reference refer to the position of affairs before November 7, 1962, the Chinese Embassy would like to point out clearly that the non-diplomatic staff and their families had always registered themselves in compliance with the regulations of the Indian Government. As for the formalities for leaving India, the Embassy would like to remind the Ministry of the correspondence exchanged between Mr. P. N. Subramanian, Deputy Chief of Protocol of the Ministry of External Affairs, and Mr. Pei Monung, Second Secretary of the Chinese Embassy in May and June, 1955. In his letter of reply dated June 9, 1955, Mr. Subramanian confirmed that members of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates holding service passports "are not required to obtain leave permits from the police, while leaving India." Therefore for all the years since then the non-diplomatic staff of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates, in accordance with the correspondence exchanged, did not follow formalities for exit permit and the Indian authorities concerned too never had any objection.

However, since May 1962, the Maharashtra State Government has time and again requested that officials of the Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay holding service passports should fulfil exit formalities while leaving India. This is obviously in contravention of the promise made by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy. What is more surprising is that the Ministry of External Affairs not only did not try to rectify the unreasonable demand of the Maharashtra State Government, which is in contravention of the promise made by the Ministry itself, but, on the contrary, in its two notes dated June 25 and November 14, 1962, in disregard of its own promises, made groundless charges against the Chinese Embassy and Consulate. This can only show that the Government of India is trying by all means to create pretexts for stepping up discrimination against and restriction of the personnel of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates. The Chinese Embassy expresses its indignation over this and resolutely rejects the baseless charges.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 25 December 1962

The Chinese Government and the Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General in India have time and again made representations and protested to the Government of India against its wanton persecution and large scale arrest of Chinese nationals residing in India. The Indian Government, however, in disregard of China's repeated protests and representations, has continued its unscrupulous persecution
and unwarranted arrest of the innocent Chinese nationals. The Embassy has learnt that the Indian Government has recently again arrested a member of staff of the Bank of China in Calcutta, Mr. Huang Chi-an and his family, the Principal of the Chinese Primary School Mr. Tsui Ching-hsiang, Chinese national Mr. Chen Lin-tsu and his son, Chinese nationals in Delhi Mr. Wang Lu-chang, Mr. Chao Kuo and his wife as well as other Chinese nationals. The Chinese Embassy once again lodges a serious protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs against this violation of the code of conduct in international relations and the barbarous persecution of the Chinese nationals by the Indian Government. The Embassy requests that the Indian Government immediately release all the above-mentioned arrested Chinese nationals and immediately make arrangements for the officials of the Embassy to visit them.

It should meanwhile be mentioned that as a result of the arrest of Mr. and Mrs. Chao Kuo, the Chinese nationals in Delhi, their teenage daughter has been rendered homeless with no means of living. In discharging of its responsibility of protecting Chinese nationals and out of humanitarian considerations, the Embassy has taken temporary care of her before her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Chao Kuo, are released.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 30 December 1962

The Indian Ministry of External Affairs alleged as "irregular" the "procedure" adopted by the former Chinese Consulates General in Calcutta and Bombay in issuing service passports to Mr. LIU CHANG-CHING and Mr. YU HSIAO-HAI respectively and applying for exit permit for them to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs. The Indian Ministry of External Affairs however failed to give any ground at all in support of this complaint.

Mr. LIU CHANG-CHING and Mr. YU HSIAO-HAI, who had worked for a long time at the former Chinese Consulates General in Calcutta and Bombay respectively, were staff members of the Consulates General. Whether and when the Chinese Consulates General issued service passports to them was matter which the Chinese Government had full right to decide upon. After issuing service passports to them, the Chinese Consulates General immediately notified the Indian authorities concerned of the matter; and the Indian local authorities accordingly replaced Mr. YU HSIAO-HAI's foreigner's registration certificate. The procedure adopted by the former Chinese Consulates General in arranging for the departure of Mr. LIU and Mr. YU was also perfect.

It must be pointed out that the Indian Embassy in China and the former Indian Consulate General in Shanghai also employed local Indian residents and endorsed the alteration of their passports into service ones in October this year. Mrs. SHAKUNTALA CHANG of the Indian Embassy holding an ordinary passport for local Indian nationals applied to the Chinese authorities for permission to leave the country. While applying for an exit visa, the Indian Embassy
issued a service passport to her in lieu of the ordinary one. The Chinese authorities did not raise any objection in this case.

While endorsing alterations of ordinary Indian passports into service passports for local Indians working at the Indian Embassy and Consulates General in China, the Indian Government lodged a complaint against the former Chinese Consulates General which issued service passports to their staff members on a reciprocal basis, and called the "procedure" "irregular". The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs regrets this unreasonable attitude of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and categorically rejects the unwarranted complaint of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs against the former Chinese Consulates General.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 5 January 1963

According to news reports, the Government of India has of late issued a so-called "The Control of Internees' Property Order". In accordance with this order, the property of interned Chinese nationals will be taken over by the "Custodian of Enemy Property" for India. There are further reports that the Government of India has prohibited trade with China and disallowed any payments in transactions due to the Chinese side; that Chinese nationals in India are not permitted to make remittance to China for the maintenance of their families and for other purposes; and that the property of Chinese nationals in India has been frozen, they are not permitted to sell their property and any violation thereof will be subject to imprisonment. The Chinese Embassy is very much surprised at those reports; therefore it requests the Government of India to make immediate clarifications as to whether the above-mentioned reports are correct, whether the Government of India has taken over and frozen the property of Chinese nationals in India and by what right these measures have been taken.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 9 January 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Embassy's Note No. M/627/62 dated 7th December, 1962 has the honour to state as follows:

In this Ministry's Note No. F. VII/408/20/62, dated 25th June, 1962 and No. 412-DIII/62(25/8), dated 14th November, 1962, the non-compliance of the Non-Diplomatic staff and members of their families of the Chinese Missions in India of the Registration formalities under the registration of Foreigners Rules 1939 was brought to the notice of the Chinese Embassy. These rules had been communicated to the Chinese Embassy under this Ministry's letter No. 3(63)PT/50, dated 10th March, 1952.

In their Note under reply the Chinese Embassy has stated that the charges made in our notes dated 25th June and 14th November are
groundless. According to instructions issued under this Ministry's letter No. F.3 (63) PT II/50, dated 10th March, 1952 referred to above, Non-Diplomatic personnel of the Chinese Missions in India were not exempt from Registration. On their arrival in India they should have got themselves registered initially. They could be exempted from other Registration formalities during their stay in India only on a reciprocal basis. It may also be pointed out that individual declarations of exemption in their favour had also not been issued as requests for such exemption had not been made by the Chinese Diplomatic and Consular Missions in India. If the Chinese Embassy's contention that their Non-Diplomatic personnel had duly registered their names on their first arrival in India according to the Foreigners Registration Rules of 1939 is correct, they should have surrendered concerned at the time of their final departure from India. Evidently this had not been done by any of the Non-Diplomatic personnel of the Chinese Missions and Consular Posts in India who have left India prior to November 7, 1962.

This Ministry's letter No. D.3249-PT II/55, dated 9th June, 1955 from the Deputy Chief of Protocol, referred to by the Chinese Embassy in its above mentioned note had not exempted the Chinese Non-Diplomatic personnel in India of the Registration requirements. Even according to this letter, the Chinese Non-Diplomatic staff had to register their names with the local Registration Authorities at the time of their arrival, obtain registration certificates, apply for exemption from further registration and also finally surrender their registration cards at the time of their departure from India.

The Maharashtra Government time and again had brought to the notice of the Chinese Consulate General at Bombay of such lapses without any result. The State Government had also informed the Chinese Consulate General verbally on more than one occasion that they were contravening the Registration of Foreigners Rules and that, if the Chinese Consulate General so desired that members of their staff be exempted from the operation of the Registration of Foreigners Rules 1939, they should take appropriate steps for exemption from the operation of the relevant rule thereof. The Chinese Consulate General however remained adamant and continued to flout the local regulations.

It may be seen from the foregoing that the Government of India had not created any "pretext" for stepping up discrimination against and restriction of the Chinese Non-Diplomatic personnel in India. On the contrary the Chinese Missions in India for the last several years continued to show complete disregard for the local regulations.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 10 January 1963

When the Indian Government unwarrantedly closed down and forcibly took over the Calcutta branch and the Bombay agency of
the Bank of China on November 2nd and November 3rd, 1962 it also took over the funds which the Chinese Embassies in India and Nepal and the former Chinese Consulates General in Calcutta and Bombay had deposited in the Bank of China for diplomatic expenses. When the Chinese Embassy in India asked the Indian Government for the return of this sum of fund, the Indian Government went to the length of claiming that it could not interfere with court affairs and unreasonably stated that the Chinese Embassy should furnish a so-called "assignment" to the Indian Government in accordance with legal procedure before this sum of fund could be returned. This was a flagrant attempt to place the Chinese Embassies and Consulates General under India's judicial jurisdiction. It was an act in violation of International Law and rarely seen in diplomatic practice. The fund of any foreign Embassy or Consulate for diplomatic expenses should enjoy unqualified immunity. The Indian Government however forcibly took over the fund of the Chinese Embassies and Consulates General and kept them for as long as 50 days and more. Still more the many representations made by the Chinese Embassy in India, the Indian Government delayed the matter again and again, and it was not until December 22nd, 1962 that the sum of fund was returned. This seriously affected the normal functioning of the Chinese Embassies and Consulates General and caused great difficulties to the former Chinese Consulates General in Calcutta and Bombay in their winding up operations and in the withdrawal of their staff. The Indian Government bears the unshirkable responsibility for all this.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a protest with the Indian Government against its rude action in violation of the diplomatic and consular immunity of the Chinese Embassies and Consulates General and in contravention of International practice.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 January 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and, with reference to its note, dated 30th December, 1962, has the honour to state as follows:—

In its Note of 14th November, 1962 the Ministry of External Affairs had indicated that all possible co-operation had been extended to the Chinese Consulates General in Bombay and Calcutta and exit permits were issued to Mr. Liu Chang-ching and his family in Calcutta and Mr. Yu Hsiao-hai in Bombay, despite the fact that they were holders of ordinary passports and were registered with the local Foreigners' Registration Office as civilian nationals living in Calcutta and Bombay respectively and not as employees of the Chinese Government. Even though the Consulates-General issued them with official passports of the Chinese Government with the intention of circumventing local legislation, the Government of India, however, consistent with their desire to facilitate the winding up of the Consulates-General, issued exit permits to them.
In the case of Mr. Shakuntala Chang, it might be mentioned that subsequent to her being taken on the staff of the Embassy in Peking she was issued an official passport as far back as October, 1962. This passport was issued to her as it corresponded with her functions in the Embassy and was not with a view to contravening any local regulations.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 17 January 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and with regard to the fact that the Indian authorities handed over the property of the Chung Hwa School in Kalimpong to elements of the Chiang Kai Shek gang has the honour to state the following:

According to reports received by the Chinese Government, the local Indian authorities in Kalimpong have arbitrarily handed over the Chung Hwa School to the CHIANG KAI SHEK gang element there in flagrant disregard of the fact that the school property was entrusted to the charge of the former Chinese Consulate General in Calcutta by the Board of Directors of the school and of the repeated warnings of the Chinese Government. To celebrate this matter, the local CHIANG KAI SHEK gang elements have put big advertisements in a newspaper. The Chinese Government previously pointed out in its Notes that when Indian authorities subjected the Chung Hwa School to constant persecution forced the Head and Deputy Heads of the Board of Directors, the Principal and teachers of the school to leave India and deprived the Chinese Consulate General of its rights to take charge of the school property, their purpose was obviously to facilitate the activities of the CHIANG gang elements and help them seize the school. Facts have been now proved indubitably that there was long since collusion between the local Indian authorities and the CHIANG gang elements, and that the handing over of the school to the latter was a premeditated plot. They also show that when Indian Government repeatedly levelled against the former Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong the false charge of “arbitrarily seizing” the school, in its previous Note, including that of 31st October, 1962, it was merely trying to cover up the conspiratorial activities of the local Indian authorities and the CHIANG gang elements. Now, the truth is out. The Indian Government can by no means shirk its responsibility. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government and urges that it immediately corrects this error. It reserves every right to make representation on the Indian authorities’ illegal handing over of the Chung Hwa School in Kalimpong to the CHIANG KAI SHEK gang elements.

It should also be pointed out that the Indian authorities not only worked hand in glove with the CHIANG KAI SHEK gang elements in damaging the legitimate cultural and educational establishments
of the Chinese nationals and persecuting the Chinese nationals, but have recently brazenly connived at and supported the activities of the so-called Overseas Chinese Association of the CHIANG gang special agents on Indian soil, which are directed against the People's Republic of China, and compelled Chinese nationals to oppose their motherland. The fact that Indian authorities should so flagrantly collude with the CHIANG KAI SHEK gang elements while diplomatic relations are maintained between China and India and while the Indian Government has all along declared that it recognises the People's Republic of China alone cannot but arouse the utmost indignation of the Chinese people. The Chinese Government warns the Indian Government that, if the Indian Government continues its present practice, it must accept responsibility for all the consequences arising therefrom.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 January 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated December 31, 1962, has the honour to state the following:—

The Indian Government had to admit in its note the fact that it had thrown large numbers of Chinese nationals into concentration camps and that the masses of the Chinese nationals were suffering from persecution, but it did not say a word about or reply to an important point raised in the Chinese Government's note of December 18, 1962, namely, that the Indian Government was asked to give due co-operation and necessary facilities to the Chinese Government in sending ships to India to bring back its victimized nationals. This cannot but make one suspect the Indian Government of deliberately obstructing the Chinese Government from sending ships to bring back its victimized nationals.

The note once again used the lie about Chinese "invasion" to deny the Indian Government's guilt of persecuting Chinese nationals. It is known to the whole world that it was Indian troops which invaded and occupied large tracts of Chinese territory and made increasingly serious armed provocations, and it was after Prime Minister Nehru issued orders to "free" Chinese territory of the Chinese that they launched large-scale attacks on October 20, 1962. The Chinese frontier guards struck back in self-defence only when they were subjected to repeated frenzied Indian attacks and suffered heavy casualties and when they were pressed beyond forbearance and left with no room to retreat. The Indian Government has already done many unjustifiable things by falsely accusing China of aggression, and now it is using the same means to deny its cruel persecution of Chinese nationals. This is of no avail.

Regarding its internment of large numbers of Chinese nationals, apart from repeating the hackneyed phrases "for security reasons", "sovereign competence", "(the interned Chinese nationals) are being
properly looked after”, “in conformity with the Geneva Conventions of 1949” and “there has been no violation of international law”, which had already been refuted by the Chinese Government, the Indian Government in its note evaded to reply to such specific requests made by the Chinese Government in its note of December 18, 1962 as that the Indian Government should supply the number, name list and places of detention of the arrested Chinese nationals by personnel sent by the Chinese Embassy. The Chinese Government hereby points out to the Indian Government once again that, while normal diplomatic relations are maintained between China and India, it is an acknowledged practice in accordance with the principles of international law that the Chinese Embassy should exercise its right to protect its nationals. The Chinese Government absolutely will not allow the Indian Government to deprive it of this right on whatever pretext. The fact that the Indian Government has so far failed to give an account of the arrested Chinese nationals and to let the Embassy send people to visit them only shows that it is afraid to make known to the world the truth about its maltreatment of the interned Chinese nationals.

Lacking justification and tenable arguments, the Indian Government in its note tried to defend its persecution of Chinese nationals by using anti-Chinese statements issued in the name of “Overseas Chinese Association” by the Chiang Kai-shek gang special agents, who are shielded by the Indian Government and who usurped the name of Chinese nationals. In the past, the Indian Government repeatedly denied that it had connived at or supported activities against the People's Republic of China conducted by Chiang gang elements on Indian territory. Now the Indian Government has openly cited in its official note anti-Chinese statements issued by the “Overseas Chinese Association”, which is a bogus organisation of Chiang gang elements, in order to justify its persecution of Chinese nationals. This cannot but arouse the utmost indignation and serious attention of the Chinese Government and people.

While stating that it is prepared to give necessary facilities to the return of Chinese nationals, the Indian Government said in its note that it would “review” the arrested Chinese nationals and continue to detain those who “constitute serious risk to national security” and that the departure facilities would “be limited to holders of passports issued by the Government of the People’s Republic of China”. The Indian Government is obviously manufacturing pretexts for detaining Chinese nationals indefinitely. The Indian Government is clearly aware that the Chinese Government has neither made a registration of all the Chinese nationals in India nor issued all of them passports. Therefore, many Chinese nationals do not hold Chinese passports. However, this does not change their status as Chinese nationals. And the Indian Government has never raised any objection to this. Hence what was said by the Indian Government, as quoted above, once again reveals its intention to detain large numbers of Chinese nationals as hostages for blackmailing the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government is resolutely opposed to the Indian Government's attempt, by any pretext, to deprive Chinese nationals of their right to return to their motherland.
The Chinese Government takes note of the statement that the Indian Government will allow the Chinese nationals returning to China to take back the sale proceeds of any property. But in fact property of the Chinese nationals is to this day frozen and forbidden to be sold. Recently, the Maharashtra State Government openly ordered the requisition of property of Chinese nationals. If the Indian Government sincerely means what it stated, it should immediately stop such practice which is completely in violation of international law. In sharp contrast to the Indian Government's persecution of Chinese nationals, the Indian nationals in China always enjoy equal treatment with nationals of other countries in China. Their proper rights and interests and their property have always been protected, and they have always enjoyed, and now still enjoy, facilities to take away their property on leaving China.

The Chinese Government once again solemnly notifies the Indian Government that, in order to rescue the persecuted Chinese nationals, and particularly those who are detained in concentration camps and maltreated by the Indian Government, the Chinese Government has decided to send ships to India to bring them back. For this purpose, the Chinese Government has instructed the Chinese Embassy in India to discuss with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs concrete matters concerning the sending of ships to bring back the Chinese nationals (e.g., the supply of name lists of the Chinese nationals under detention, the arrangements for visits to them by personnel of the Chinese Embassy, the departure procedures and the procedures for the Chinese nationals to take back their property, and the concrete arrangements for Chinese ships to enter and leave Indian ports). The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will give a speedy explicit reply to this reasonable request.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 22 January 1963

As instructed by the Chinese Government, the Chinese Embassy is to discuss with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs matters of concrete arrangements concerning sending ships to India to bring back the victimized Chinese nationals. The Chinese Embassy now puts forward the following points:

1. The Indian Government is requested to speedily supply to the Embassy the number, name lists and places of detention of the Chinese nationals thrown into concentration camps and other arrested Chinese nationals and information about their health and deaths occurred, and to make arrangements for the Embassy to send its personnel to the concentration camps and other places of detention to visit the arrested Chinese nationals and undertake registration with regard to their return to China so as to bring them back to China in groups.
2. Simplification of departure procedures:—Owing to the pressure of time, the Chinese Embassy will secure a collective exit permit on behalf of the Chinese nationals returning to China by the ships sent for the purpose. The Indian Government should also facilitate the departure from India of those who have already obtained visas to return to China or other documents for the same purpose issued by the Chinese Embassy or Consulates.

3. The Indian Government is requested to make clear in concrete terms what facilities it is ready to give to the Chinese nationals to take back with them their property, and supply relevant existing regulations.

4. The Indian Government is requested to give facilities to the entry of and departure from Indian ports of the ships sent by the Chinese Government to bring back the Chinese nationals. The Indian Government is requested to make clarifications as to under what circumstance a foreign vessel may be stopped and examined according to the "Vessels (Control of Entry and Examination) Order, 1962" issued by the Indian Ministry of Defence.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24 January 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the note from the Chinese Foreign Office, dated January 10, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

2. In their Aide Memoire dated 24th November 1962 to the Chinese Embassy and subsequent note dated 28th December, 1962, the Ministry of External Affairs has clearly explained the circumstances under which the orders of liquidation had been served on the Bombay and Calcutta branches of the Bank of China, in full compliance with normal judicial processes. The Indian judiciary, like all judiciaries in sovereign democratic countries, is independent of the executive branch of Government. It appears the Chinese Government either cannot or do not want to understand this basic principle governing administration of justice in democratic countries.

3. It is the accepted practice that when a bank is under liquidation, the assets of the bank are frozen and the account-books are taken into the custody of an official liquidator, specifically appointed for the purpose, whose responsibility it is to deal with the assets and liabilities of the Bank. The Official Liquidator acts on the orders of the Court and the executive branch of Government has no say in the matter whatever.

4. However, in order to enable the Chinese Embassy and their Consulates-General to utilise the funds that were frozen in the branches of the Bank of China, the Ministry of External Affairs had, as a measure of goodwill, offered to place at the disposal of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, an amount equivalent to the amount held by them in deposit with the Bank of China on the
date that it was taken in liquidation. To implement this arrangement, the Embassy was requested to furnish the Ministry with an irrevocable deed of assignment of the claims on the Bank of China in India in favour of the President of India for submission to the Official Liquidator.

5. On 11th December 1962, the Charge d'Affaires of the Embassy stated that the Embassy could not, for technical reasons, furnish such a deed of assignment. As a further measure of concession, the Government of India willingly revised the procedure for payment to the Embassy, and asked the Embassy merely to furnish a note "making over" to the Ministry of External Affairs, the deposits which the Embassy, the Consulates General and the Embassy of China at Kathmandu held with the Bank of China. On December 18, the Embassy furnished the note "making over" to the Ministry of External Affairs the sum of their deposits with the Bank of China. On December 22, 1962, the full amount of the deposits of the Embassy, the two Consulates General and the Embassy of China at Kathmandu, was made over by a cheque to the Chinese Embassy.

6. This would show that, far from placing the Embassy "under India's judicial jurisdiction", or making them give up any of their diplomatic rights, the Government of India, moved solely by the desire to assist the Embassy, gave the Embassy special facilities. The Ministry of External Affairs did its utmost to facilitate the payment of funds to the Embassy. Delay in assisting the Embassy was due solely to procedural difficulties raised by the Embassy. The Government of India categorically reject the charge that there has been any violation of international law or a breach of diplomatic practice/privilege on their part.

7. The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 25 January 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Government's note, dated the 19th January 1963 and the Memorandum presented by the Chinese Embassy to the Ministry of External Affairs on 22nd January, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India firmly repudiate the allegations made in the Chinese Government's note and Memorandum that Chinese nationals have been placed in "concentration camps". This is a false and malicious insinuation, completely at variance with facts, and the Government of India categorically reject it. The Government of India have accorded generous and considerate treatment to Chinese detenus who had to be put under restraint in the interest of security because of the wanton unprovoked massive attacks mounted by China against India.
The Government of India in their note of December 31st had already made it clear that they are prepared to give necessary facilities to Chinese nationals who wish to return to China on their own free will. These facilities will, in the first instances, be limited to holders of passports issued by the Government of the People's Republic of China who have no criminal or civil complaints pending against them. They will be allowed to take back the sale proceeds of any property that they have in accordance with the prevailing Indian regulations on the subject.

The views of Chinese nationals detained under the Foreigner's Law (Application and Amendment) Ordinance 1962, on the offer of the Government of the People's Republic of China to arrange facilities for their repatriation to China are being ascertained. As soon as a list is compiled, discussions will be initiated with the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi for finalising their departure procedures.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 29 January 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Government's note dated 17th January 1963, has the honour to state as follows:—

The full facts in regard to the arbitrary seizure of the Chung Hwa school, Kalimpong, by the Chinese Trade Agent have already been communicated in the Ministry's earlier notes dated 23rd May, 26th June, 22nd August and 31st October 1962. It was also pointed out in these notes that the action taken by the Chinese Trade Agent had grossly exceeded his functions both under the 1954 Agreement and also under recognised principles of customary international law. As the particular offence had been committed by the Agency of a foreign Government, the Government of India had in their note dated 23rd May 1962, out of consideration, advised the Chinese Embassy that the premises and properties of the Chung Hwa school should be handed over to the Sub Divisional Officer of Kalimpong within ten days of the receipt of the notice. Since the premises were not surrendered within this stipulated time a case was filed in the court of the Sub Divisional Magistrate, Kalimpong and, pending court proceedings, an order for an interim attachment of the school premises was passed.

After taking into careful consideration all aspects of the case, the court passed orders resulting in a new Executive Committee, constituted from members of the Chinese Community in Kalimpong, taking over possession of the Chung Hwa school. The school has been functioning normally again since 10th October, 1962.

The Chinese Government's allegation that there has been "collusion" in this regard between local Indian authorities and so-called "Chiang Kai Shek elements" is entirely unwarranted and absurd. The
Government of India had made it clear in their earlier notes to the Chinese Government that the interference by the Chinese Consulate General at Calcutta and the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong in the affairs of the school was illegal and that the functioning of the school was entirely a matter for the Chinese community in Kalimpong to decide for themselves in accordance with the local regulations on the subject. The matter has now been finally settled by a judicial decision of the law court. The Government of India firmly maintain that the jurisdiction of the Indian court cannot be questioned in any way and any attempt to do so is in contravention of all accepted norms of international law and practice.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 31 January 1963**

The Ministry of External Affairs, presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Embassy's note dated 7th November 1962, has the honour to point out that the correct position on the subject has already been communicated to the Embassy on a number of occasions in the Ministry's notes dated 22nd January, 9th May, 27th June, 2nd August and 17th August 1962.

Issue No. 43 of "China Today" had been confiscated not only because it transgressed the established conventions in this regard, but also flagrantly violated the law of the land. In the circumstances, the Government of India had been compelled to issue an order under the relevant provisions of law for its seizure.

In the light of the above facts, the Government of India reject the Embassy's note dated 7th November 1962.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

**Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 February 1963**


In order to protect the business accounts and stock-in-trade of persons of Chinese origin interned for security reasons, the Ministry of Commerce and Industry of the Government of India has promulgated an order called "The Control of Internees' Property Order". A Custodian has been appointed whose duty it is to take over the business accounts and stock-in-trade of those interned. However, the personal assets of the internees have not been taken over by the Custodian. The internee has the option of executing a power of attorney in favour of the Custodian or any person of the internee's
choice to look after the personal assets of the internee. Hence, the statement of the Chinese Embassy that all property has been taken over by the Custodian is not correct.

There are no general orders prohibiting trade with China as such. After the lapse of the Trade Agreement pertaining to Tibet entered into with China, and the withdrawal of the Indian Consulate General at Tibet, there is naturally a limitation on trade with the Tibet region of China.

There is no truth in the allegation contained in the Memorandum that persons of Chinese origin are not permitted to sell their property or that they would be subject to imprisonment if they do. This allegation is completely baseless.

---

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 February 1963.


The persons referred to in the above-mentioned Memorandum of the Chinese Embassy had been arrested and interned under the Defence of India Rules because of their prejudicial and anti-Indian activities. There were very clear reasons for their arrest and there was no “wanton persecution” as mischievously alleged in the Chinese Memorandum. The Ministry of External Affairs repudiates the suggestion in the Chinese Embassy’s Memorandum that the action taken in regard to these Chinese nationals indulging in anti-Indian activities is a “violation of the code of conduct in international relations”. It is, on the other hand, an accepted code of conduct that foreign nationals should respect local laws and not act in a manner prejudicial to the security of the State wherein they reside.

When foreign nationals are interned under the Emergency regulations, option is given to them to take their families to the internment camp. Where family members remain outside, a subsistence allowance is paid to them in accordance with prescribed scales. There can, therefore, be no question of anyone being “rendered homeless with no means of living”. In the case of Mr. and Mrs. Chao Kuo, to which the Chinese Embassy’s Memorandum refers, this option was not exercised as they preferred to leave their daughter in the custody of the Chinese Embassy.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 21 February 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, dated January 14, 1963, to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India, has the honour to state the following:—
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In its note, dated December 30, 1962 to the Indian Embassy in China, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs sternly refuted with ample facts and reasons the charge made by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs against the former Chinese Consulates-General in Calcutta and Bombay for issuing service passports to their staff members, Mr. Liu Chang-ching and Mr. Yu Hsiao-hai. The Indian Government, aware of its own paucity of argument, did not scruple to distort the facts in its note by asserting that Mr. Liu Chang-ching and Mr. Yu Hsiao-hai were “not employees of the Chinese Government”, and slandered that the former Chinese Consulates-General issued service passports to them with the intention of “circumventing local legislation”. In point of fact, the Indian Government is fully aware that Mr. Liu and Mr. Yu have for a long time been staff members of the Chinese Consulates-General. The Chinese Consulates-General have all along given the Indian Ministry of External Affairs due notification of the names of the staff members of the Chinese Consulates-General, including these two gentlemen. The Chief Secretary of the Government of West Bengal also signed and issued an identity card to Mr. Liu Chang-ching as functionary of the Consulate. These facts can never be negated by the Indian Government’s prevarications.

One would like to ask, since the Indian Government’s official passports which “corresponded” with their “functions”, why cannot the Chinese Government issue service passports to staff members who for a long time worked in the Chinese Consulates-General? Since the Indian Government issued official passports to its employees “not with a view to contravening any local regulations”, why is it that the Chinese Government’s issuance of service passports to its staff members was done with the intention of “circumventing local legislation”? Can it be that in doing a thing of the very same nature, it is proper for India, but not proper for China? What extraordinary logic! According to such logic, is there still any equality or reciprocity left between nations? Let alone talk about commonly observed international practice! This is entirely an attitude of big nation chauvinism. The Chinese Government expresses its great indignation at the Indian Government’s truculent and unreasonable attitude and categorically rejects the unwarranted charge by the Indian Government against the former Chinese Consulates-General.

The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 23 February 1963

With regard to the unwarranted close down and forcible take over of the Calcutta branch and the Bombay agency of the Bank of China and the wanton persecution of the personnel of the bank by the Indian authorities, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs lodged a strong protest on November 5, 1962 and demanded that the Indian Government take immediate measures to cancel the order for the close down
and take over of the bank and stop the persecution of the bank personnel. Thereafter the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs reiterated this demand in its successive Notes of November 21, December 8 and December 24, 1962 to the Indian Embassy in China. But the Indian Government in its Note did not give consideration to the above mentioned proper and reasonable demand of the Chinese Government and furthermore engaged in sophistry to defend its unreasonable measures and outrageous behaviour. The Chinese Government categorically refute the “explanation” made by the Indian Government in its Note and reiterate its demand advanced in its previous Notes.

The Indian Government arbitrarily stated in its Note that the actions it took against the Bank of China were all the “result of normal legal processes” attempting thereby to escape its criminal responsibility for the forcible close down of the bank and the persecution of the Bank personnel. This is entirely futile. The Indian authorities have never given and simply cannot give any tenable reason for the close down and take over of the Bank of China and the persecution of the Bank personnel. It is evident that the aim of the Indian authorities was but to take over the property and assets of the Bank of China and worsen the relations between China and India. Furthermore fact prove that this plot which cannot see the light of day was carefully planned* long ago. Persecution against the personnel of the Bank of China began as early as 1960. In that year the Indian authorities unwarrantedly arrested and detained three times in succession Mr. CHIANG WEN-KUEI former Manager of the Calcutta Branch of the Bank of China and in early 1961 forced Mr. CHIANG to leave India. Following that, the Indian authorities again crudely forced in succession other leading personnel and staff of the Bank and their family members, 16 in all, to leave India. On December 27, 1961 the Indian authorities without offering any reason suddenly cancelled the Bank’s foreign exchange licences, attempted thereby to make it impossible for the Bank to continue its business. In order to further worsen the relations between the two countries and to attain its ultimate aim of seizing the property and assets of the Bank of China the Indian authorities flagrantly gave orders on 2nd November and 4th December* 1962 to close down and take over the establishments of Bank of China in Calcutta and Bombay and stepped up their persecution of the personnel of the Bank. The Indian authorities not only restricted the freedom of movement of the Bank personnel and time and again created difficulties in the Bank personnel’s applications for departure, but even unwarrantedly arrested the whole family of HUANG-CHI-AN a staff member of the Bank, in mid December 1962 and went to the barbarian extent of throwing Mr. HUANG’s baby of only a few months old into prison. All these facts can by no means be covered up by any kind of sophistry*.

The Indian Note further described such unwarranted measures and outrageous actions of India as being “in conformity with Indian law” and “within the sovereign jurisdiction” of India. This is also completely untenable. According to the accepted norms of International law, every country is obliged to grant full protection to peace and law abiding foreign nationals and foreign juridical persons, and it is
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not permitted to deny them their human rights and fundamental freedoms by recourse to its national laws, much less to infringe at will on their living, property and security. It is obvious that the above mentioned wanton persecution by the Indian authorities is in serious violation of the norms of International law.

The acts of forcibly closing down and taking over the Calcutta branch and the Bombay agency of the Bank of China by the Indian authorities are completely illegal and unjustified. And moreover since December 1962 the Indian authorities have gone from bad to worse and took a series of measures in freezing and seizing the deposits and all property and assets of the head office and the other establishments of the Bank of China lying with their correspondents in India, and further stepped up persecution of the staff members of the Bank of China in Calcutta and Bombay. The Chinese Government expresses its great indignation at and once again lodges a strong protest against such wanton practices and outrageous attitude of the Indian Government. The Chinese Government demand that the Indian Government immediately return the whole property and assets of the Bank of China which have been taken over, frozen or seized by the Indian Government and immediately stop its persecution against the Bank personnel. The Chinese Government reiterate that the Indian Government is held fully responsible for all the losses suffered by Chinese as a result of the close down and take over of the establishments of the Bank of China in India and the freezing and seizure of the property and assets of the Bank of China in India, and the Chinese Government reserve its full right to ask for compensation.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 7 March 1963

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of the Republic of India, and, with reference to the Ministry's memorandum dated November 2, 1962 and its note to the Chinese Embassy in India dated January 31, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

In its previous notes to the Indian Government, the Chinese Government has repeatedly pointed out that it is a right of reciprocity for the Embassies of China and India to carry in their bulletins official documents of their respective Governments. The Indian Embassy in China has always done this, and the Indian Government has also more than once stated that it does not object to the Chinese Embassy's doing this. Therefore, it has nothing to do at all with the law of the land. While evading all this in its note, the Indian Government continued to confiscate unjustifiably Chinese Embassy's bulletin carrying official documents of its own Government and tried to justify its crude act of sending policemen to confiscate copies of the Embassy's bulletin which were temporarily left by the Embassy at the press. This arbitrary and outrageous act constitutes an out-and-out violation of the code of conduct in international relations. The Chinese Embassy rejects the Indian Ministry of External Affairs' memorandum of November 2, 1962 and its note of January 31, 1963, and demands that
the Indian Government immediately put an end to the unwarranted confiscation of the Embassy's bulletin.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 7 March 1963

In its memorandum dated December 4, 1962 the Indian Ministry of External Affairs made an attempt to deny the fact that the Indian customs had opened and examined mails addressed to the Chinese Embassy, but it is of no avail. The Embassy is in possession of clear evidence that the Indian customs have opened and examined mails addressed to the Embassy. The denial made in the Indian memorandum can only prove that the Indian side was aware of its own unreasonableness and could find no words to justify itself in reply.

The Indian memorandum had to admit that the newspapers mailed to the former Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay had been examined and confiscated. It must be pointed out that all the newspapers were for the use of the Consulate-General. This unwarranted action of the Indian authorities obstructed the functioning of the Consulate-General. For this the Government of India can in no way shirk its responsibility.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 7 March 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to this Ministry's note dated the 25th January, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India had in the above mentioned note conveyed their willingness to permit internees of Chinese origin, to leave for the mainland of China, if they so desired. The wishes of the Chinese internees have since been ascertained. There are approximately 1450 Chinese internees who have expressed their desire to go to China. Besides this number, the internees have claimed that their dependents totalling about 900, who are outside the camp, will be willing to accompany them to China. The wishes of these dependents are being ascertained independently by the Indian local authorities. On this basis, the total number of persons of Chinese origin who are desirous of going to China would come to approximately 2400.

The Government of India are agreeable to permit ships sent by the Chinese Government for repatriating these Chinese to dock at Madras port. Exit permits will be issued to all the above mentioned Chinese to leave India and necessary arrangements for their transport to the port of embarkation will also be made as soon as a reply is received from the Chinese Government regarding the date on which they will
be sending the ships. The tonnage of the ships may please be furnished urgently for transmission to the port authorities. The health formalities with which the repatriates will have to comply may also be communicated at the same time.

The above information has already been conveyed to the Chargé d'Affaires of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China by the Director, China Division, Ministry of External Affairs on the 4th March, 1963.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 9 March 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs' note dated January 9, 1963 to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, has the honour to state the following:

Since June 1962, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs has sent out several notes which kept on glibly charging the non-diplomatic staff and their family members of the Chinese Missions in India with "non-compliance of the registration formalities under the Registration of Foreigners Rules 1939" and "disregard for the local rules and regulations". However, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs cannot cite any facts whatsoever in support of this charge. The Indian Ministry of External Affairs first made the charge that the non-diplomatic staff of the former Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay had not gone through the formalities for registration and for departure. The Chinese Embassy sternly refuted this by immediately citing to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs facts showing that the Chinese non-diplomatic staff had always gone through the registration formalities and by referring to the letters exchanged between Chinese and Indian officials on the exemption of formalities by the Chinese non-diplomatic staff on their departure. After this, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, aware of the hollowness of its position, again made the fabrication that the surrendering of the certificates of registration to the authorities concerned "had not been done by any of the non-diplomatic personnel of the Chinese missions and consular posts in India who have left India prior to November 7, 1962". This is completely a barefaced lie. As the Indian Ministry of External Affairs is fully aware, whether prior to or after November 7, 1962, the non-diplomatic staff and their family members of the Chinese Missions in India have always surrendered their certificates of registration to passport officers at the ports of embarkation on their departure from India in accordance with the regulations of Indian Government.

The purpose of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs in so unscrupulously concocting tales again and again, slandering the non-diplomatic personnel of the Chinese Missions in India and thereby
unwarrantedly haggling with the Chinese Government is obviously to cover up its own malicious practice of crude discrimination against and restriction of the personnel of the Chinese Missions in India. The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs resolutely opposes the Indian Ministry of External Affairs' wanton charges against the Chinese non-diplomatic staff and its continued unreasonable haggling on this subject.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 March 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Government note of February 23, 1963, has the honour to state the following:

2. In their notes dated 28th December, 1962 and 24th January, 1963, the Government of India have fully detailed the circumstances connected with the liquidation of the Bank of China branches at Calcutta and Bombay. It is obvious that the persistence of the Government of China in continuing to make wild accusations without any appreciation of the basic principle governing the administration of justice in India despite the detailed information on law and facts provided by the Government of India to the Chinese Government is solely due to their determination to carry on anti-Indian propaganda. The orders of liquidation passed on the Bank of China were fully justified by the law and the facts of the case and such action, as was taken, was in keeping with the provisions of the Banking Companies Act as it is in force in India.

3. The Chinese Government's allegations about "persecution against the Bank personnel" on the part of the local authorities in India are completely baseless. It may be recalled that full facilities were accorded for the China-based officials of the Bank of China and their families to leave for China after liquidation orders were served on the Bank. The Chinese note cites the case of the arrest of Mr. Chiang Wen Kuei. Mr. Chiang did not comply with orders to leave India when he was served with such orders and had therefore to be arrested. The local authorities at Calcutta withdrew the cases pending against him when he ultimately left India. As for Mr. Huang-Chi-An, mentioned in the Chinese note, there were again clear reasons for his internment on grounds of security. The Government of India categorically repudiate the right of the Chinese Government to question actions which are completely within the sovereign jurisdiction of India. Mr. Huang's wife and family have been permitted to remain with him during the period of his retirement.

4. The Government of India repudiate the suggestion that national laws in India deny human rights and fundamental freedoms to foreign nationals residing in India. It is clear that the Chinese Government,
have no understanding of the fundamental rights and freedoms secured under the Constitution within the framework of which the Government of India function.

5. When a bank is under liquidation, it is the normal practice to freeze all the assets of the bank, wherever they are, with a view to setting these off against the liabilities of the Bank. This action is necessary if the interests of the depositors are to be safeguarded. To suggest that there has been any violation of the norms of international law is patently absurd.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 March 1963

In their Memorandum dated March 7, 1963, the Chinese Embassy have ignored the factual background provided to them in the Ministry of External Affairs Memorandum dated 4th December, 1962, and again made baseless charges that mail packets addressed to the Embassy have been tampered with by the Indian Customs authorities.

2. The Chinese Embassy is surely aware of the existing regulations in India whereby the entry into India of any book, periodical, pamphlet, leaflet or other document containing any words, signs or visible representations which directly or indirectly question the frontiers of India, is prohibited. It was because the newspapers in question, sent by direct post, offended against this regulation that the local authorities had been compelled to confiscate them. The Government of India cannot accept the suggestion that by this action, the functioning of the Chinese Consulates-General had been obstructed.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 14 March 1963

The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and, with reference to the Indian Ministry’s notes dated January 25 and March 7, 1963 and memoranda dated January 8 and February 8, 1963, has the honour to reply as follows:

1. For more than three months now since the Indian Government threw large numbers of peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals into concentration camps in November 1962, several thousand Chinese nationals have been wilfully maltreated by the Indian Government and placed in the direst straits. The Chinese Government has repeatedly asked the Indian Government to release all the arrested Chinese nationals, supply their number and names and arrange visits by members of the Chinese Embassy. The Indian
Government, however, has tried hard to evade these reasonable requests of the Chinese Government and has up to now neither released the detained Chinese nationals nor allowed members of the Chinese Embassy to visit them. It has even refused to give a name list of the detained Chinese nationals or provide information about their health. In its notes and memoranda, the Indian Government repeats without end the stale arguments long thoroughly refuted by China and hypocritically declares that it “has no quarrel with the people of China.” Having thrown thousands of Chinese nationals into concentration camps, deprived them of personal freedom, seized their property and even caused some of them to die of maltreatment, the Indian Government has so far not given any account to the Chinese Government nor allowed visits by Chinese officials. One may ask: Can such acts in violation of the principles of international law be covered up by empty words like “no quarrel”?

2. It must also be pointed out that, following the repeated protests by the Chinese Government, the Indian Government, far from stopping its persecution of Chinese nationals, has further expanded the scope of persecution. Since January 1963, the Indian Government has further arrested Hsiung Hsing-hsiang, Publisher of the Calcutta “China Review”; Chen Yu-ju, Head of the Board of Directors of the Chinese Primary School; Tan Tun-ai, a Chinese national residing in Bombay, and others, continued to undermine the cultural and educational establishments of Chinese nationals and forcibly requisitioned houses of Chinese nationals. This series of facts can only show that the Indian Government is stubbornly persisting in its policy of cruel persecution of Chinese nationals and deliberate poisoning of the relations between the two countries. The Chinese Government hereby once again demands that the Indian Government immediately stop its persecution of Chinese nationals and release all the arrested Chinese nationals.

3. The Chinese Government has repeatedly proposed to send ships to India for bringing back victimized Chinese nationals. To this end, the Chinese Embassy has asked for permission for its staff members to visit the concentration camps and to register the Chinese nationals wishing to return to China, and also asked the Indian Government to return to victimized Chinese nationals their property, compensate for their losses, allow them to take all their property back to China, simplify their departure formalities, etc. The Indian Government, however, evaded replying to any of these proper and reasonable requests, instead, it only provided a figure which it unilaterally considered represented the number of Chinese nationals wishing to return to China and asked the Chinese Government to “repatriate them.” At the same time, Mr. Menon, Director of the China Division of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, declared that India would continue to intern those Chinese nationals who allegedly endangered the security of India. What the Indian Government is actually doing is, on the one hand, to compel large numbers of peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals to leave India after illegally interning and maltreating them and, on the other hand, to continue to detain other innocent Chinese nationals under the trumped up charge of “endangering the security of India” so as to use them as hostages to black-mail the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government absolutely will not agree to this.
4. While diplomatic relations are maintained between China and India, the Chinese Embassy's sending of persons to contact the victimized nationals and compile a list of Chinese nationals wishing to return to China is an indisputable power of the Embassy in carrying out its diplomatic function of affording protection to its nationals. Nobody has the right to obstruct the Embassy from exercising this power or fact in its stead. Moreover, being interned by the Indian Government, the Chinese nationals are in no position to express their wishes freely. Nevertheless, in order to save at the earliest possible date Chinese nationals who have suffered long in Indian concentration camps and prison, the Chinese Government agrees in principle first to ship back in different stages and by groups that number of victimized nationals as provided in the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated March 7, and the first ship for bringing back the nationals will be sent to India within March. This represents yet another major effort by China for a settlement of the question of Chinese nationals. If the Indian Government has the sincerity, it should give due cooperation and facilities. It should:

(1) Immediately provide a list of all the interned Chinese nationals and arrange for members of the Chinese Embassy to go to the concentration camps and prisons to register those Chinese nationals who wish to return to China so as to arrange for their transportation home by stages and groups;

(2) Immediately release all the victimized Chinese nationals arrested by the Indian Government, return to them their property, compensate for their losses, permit them to return to their original places of residence and make it convenient for them to sell their property and wind up their unfinished business;

(3) Allow the victimized Chinese nationals to bring back to China all their property;

(4) Simplify departure formalities, be responsible for transporting the returning victimized Chinese nationals to the port of embarkation, guarantee their safety while they are travelling in India and be responsible for their food and lodgings before they leave India;

(5) Provide due facilities for the port entry and exit of ships sent by China for transporting victimized Chinese nationals and for other relevant affairs of the ships;

(6) Give due protection and full cooperation to persons sent by the Chinese Embassy to the port for the purpose of assisting in the work of transporting back the Chinese nationals.

The Chinese Embassy asks the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to agree speedily to discuss the above-mentioned matters concretely with the Embassy.

The Chinese Embassy in India avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 18 March 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's Note dated the 21st February, 1963.

In their notes of 14th December, 1962 and 14th January 1963, the Government of India had indicated in great detail that the Chinese Consulates-General in Bombay and Calcutta had purely with a view to circumventing local legislation, issued official passports to certain Chinese nationals holding ordinary passports who were registered with the local Government's Foreigners' Registration Office. Nevertheless, the Government of India, consistent with their desire to facilitate the winding up of the Consulates General, issued exit permits for these personnel without any further question or delay. The intention of the Government of India was to show the extent of cooperation that had been extended to the Chinese Consulates-General. Instead of appreciating this cooperative attitude, the Chinese note makes baseless allegations in undiplomatic language for mischievous propagandic purposes. This is an indication not only of the absence of elementary understanding of international practices in this regard but a deliberate attempt to continue an aimless and empty harangue for propagandic purposes. The Government of India reject the Chinese note of February 21, 1963.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 March 1963.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated 9th March 1963.

Full facts regarding the repeated violations by the non-diplomatic staff of Chinese Missions in India of the registration formalities under the Registration of Foreigners' Rules 1939 have already been conveyed in the Government of India's notes dated 25th June, 1962, 14th November 1962 and 9th January, 1963. Some names of members of non-diplomatic staff of the Chinese Consulate General in Bombay who have not complied with these formalities, are given below:

1. Mr. Liu Kuo Chang Left for China on 26-4-1962 from Calcutta.
2. Mr. Chang Te Heng
3. Mr. Liu Hsi Shuang Left for China on 24th July, 1962 from Calcutta.
4. Mr. Chang Wen Hsiang

The above clearly reveals the inaccuracy of the Chinese statement that "whether prior or after 7th November 1962 the non-diplomatic
staff and their family members of the Chinese Missions in India have always surrendered their certificates of registration to passport offices at the ports of embarkation on their departure from India in accordance with the regulations of the Indian Government”. This is not confirmed by facts.

Despite these violations the Government of India have displayed great patience and restraint and local Indian authorities have extended full facilities to Chinese missions on the departure of their non-diplomatic staff. Angry denials couched in intemperate language cannot alter these facts. The Government of India reject the Chinese Government note of 9th March.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 March 1963.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and with reference to the Embassy’s note dated 7th March 1963, has the honour to state as follows:—

2. The Government of India have always taken a liberal attitude and never objected to the Chinese Embassy publishing in its bulletin “China Today” any of the official communications from the Chinese Government which have been transmitted to the Government of India. In fact, the Government of India themselves publish notes, memoranda and letters exchanged between the Governments of India and China in the form of White Papers which are released from time to time. In such a context the allegation contained in the Chinese note that the Indian Government have not been consistent in their stand is wholly without basis.

3. However, the issue of “China Today” under reference contained Chinese statements which not only violated the law of the land but also transgressed established conventions by maligning the Government of India. The Chinese Embassy should be aware that under international law, diplomatic Missions are not authorised to offend against the laws of the receiving State.

4. In view of the position clearly enunciated above, the Government of India reject the suggestion that they have acted arbitrarily in the matter of the confiscation of the offending journals published by the Chinese Embassy.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 26 March 1963.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to
refer to the Embassy's note dated 14th March, 1963.

2. In their notes dated 31st December 1962, 25th January 1963 and
7th March 1963, the Government of India had conveyed their will-
ingness to permit Chinese internees and their families, who desire to
be repatriated to China, to leave the country.

3. The reasons for the detention of these internees are well known
to the Chinese Embassy. They had been interned purely in the inter-
est of national security following the massive Chinese invasion of
India in October-November, 1962. It is particularly regrettable that
the Chinese Embassy should ignore these patent facts and continue
to make baseless allegations claiming that these internees are being
used "as hostages to blackmail the Chinese Government". On the
contrary, it will be clear to everyone that if there is any question of
anyone holding hostages, it is the Chinese Government who are still
holding as hostages over 3,000 Indians who had been unscrupulously
captured on Indian territory during the unwarranted massive attacks
by Chinese forces in October-November, 1962.

4. In their latest note dated 7th March 1963, the Government of
India had, after ascertaining the wishes of the internees of Chinese
origin, made known the approximate number of internees and their
dependants in respect of whom the Chinese side would have to make
arrangements for repatriation. In the same note the Government of
India had agreed to permit ships sent by the Chinese Government
to dock at Madras Port. They also agreed to provide the repatriates
with transportation to the port of embarkation as soon as the actual
date when the Chinese Government would send ships would be
known. The Indian note had requested for details in regard to the
ships for onward transmission to the port authorities and had also
called for information on the health formalities to be completed by
the repatriates. The requisite information on these lines has only
been supplied by the Chinese Embassy on March 26, 1963.

5. The Embassy, in its note dated 14th March 1963, had unilater-
ally laid down six points for discussion. Some of the points so raised
were completely irrelevant to the issue and had little to do with the
concrete formalities involved in the repatriation of Chinese nationals
referred to in the Ministry's note of 7th March, 1963, whose repatria-
tion in fact had been agreed to specifically in the Chinese note dated
14th March 1963.

6. However, consistent with their sincere desire to settle this
question, the Government of India convened a number of meetings
with the Charge d'Affaires of the Chinese Embassy on the
16th, 23rd, 24th, 25th and 26th March, 1963, to discuss finalisa-
tion of the departure procedure for those Chinese internees
and their families who had expressed their desire to leave for China.
At these meetings, the Chinese side had regretfully taken an obstruc-
tive attitude and kept insisting on raising matters quite outside the
purview of the discussions. For example, the Chinese side meaninglessly demanded the name-list of all the Chinese internees including the name-list of internees who had clearly expressed their desire to remain in India. Despite the fact that such a request exceeded the terms of reference of the meeting and amounted to a gross interference in the internal sovereign jurisdiction of the Indian Government, the Chinese side kept on repeating its unreasonable demands and refused to discuss concrete details concerning repatriation facilities for internees and their families who had expressed their desire to leave for China. After the Indian officials repeatedly pointed out that the discussion should concern itself only with departure arrangements for those internees and their dependants who had opted to go to China, the Embassy persisted in an equally unreasonable demand that, irrespective of the numbers whom they actually proposed to take back in the different groups/batches, they should be given an omnibus list of all internees and dependants who had expressed their desire to leave for China.

7. The Indian side had stated its willingness to provide lists in accordance with the groups and batches in which the Chinese Government had indicated its desire to repatriate internees and dependants. The Government of India reiterate that they will provide the Chinese side with lists of Chinese internees and their dependants in groups and batches as and when the numbers and their date of embarkation are communicated by the Chinese Government. This is necessary to secure that each group includes all the dependants of the internees who are sailing in that group. These lists would be made available about ten days before the date of embarkation of each batch/group.

8. The Government of India have already indicated to the Chinese side their willingness to extend various facilities for the repatriation of the Chinese internees and their dependants who have expressed a desire to leave for China. These are listed in the attached annexure.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Enclosure to the note dated 26 March 1963 of the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi.

1. Exit permits will be issued to all the Chinese internees as well as their dependants outside the internment camp to leave India in groups and batches in accordance with departure arrangements as finalised by the Chinese Embassy.

2. Arrangements will be made by the Government of India to transport the internees in the camp to the port of embarkation, namely Madras. In the case of dependants of internees, similar arrangements will be made by the local authorities.

3. Health formalities for the internees will be arranged in the internment camp.
4. Internees and dependants will be permitted to take with them all items of personal luggage in conformity with the rules as laid down by the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

5. Internees will be permitted foreign exchange facilities upto Rs. 650 per family for meeting their immediate needs.

6. All personal property left behind by the repatriated Chinese families may be handed over either to the Custodian appointed for the purpose by the Government of India or a power of attorney could be left behind by the families with a friend or a relative.

7. Necessary port facilities will be made available for the Chinese ships at Madras Port.

8. Facilities will be accorded for two or three Consular officials of the Chinese Embassy to be present at Madras Port at the time of embarkation of repatriates.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 26 March 1963.

(1) The Indian Government cruelly arrested, interned and maltreated several thousand peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals, subjecting them to great sufferings and miseries. While China and India are maintaining diplomatic relations, the Indian Government, in disregard of the reasonable requests repeatedly put forward by the Chinese Embassy, stubbornly refused to provide the Embassy with a list of all the interned Chinese nationals, refused to make arrangements for officials of the Chinese Embassy to visit the Chinese national in the concentration camps and prisons, and refused to release all the arrested Chinese nationals and return to them their property, etc. This is an act which seriously violates the principles of international law and an attempt of the Indian Government to deprive the Embassy of its legitimate power of protecting Chinese nationals. The Embassy is resolutely opposed to it.

(2) In order to save at the earliest possible dates the victimized Chinese nationals in India, the Chinese Government in a note sent as early as December 18, 1962, informed the Indian Government of its decision to send ships to bring back the victimized Chinese nationals. And, in its memorandum dated January 22, and its note dated March 14, 1963, the Chinese Embassy put forward concrete requests to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs regarding the arrangements for shipping back the victimized Chinese nationals. Upto now, the Indian Government has failed to give a full and clear reply to these requests; nor has it provided the Embassy with the list of all the interned Chinese nationals. On January 22, 1963, the Indian side promised to supply within a week or ten days a list, compiled by India, which it alleged to contain those interned Chinese nationals who wish to go back to China. Yet two months have passed, even such a list has not been supplied. Meanwhile, the Indian side has more than once changed the figure which it alleged to represent the number of those wishing to return to China, and evaded the question of disposal of property by the victimized Chinese nationals. In the
course of talks, the Indian side has been erratic and inconsistent, broken its own promises and created one obstacle after another. Moreover, the Indian Government has now even gone so far as to refuse to issue visas to the eleven persons sent by the Chinese Government along with the ships for bringing back the Chinese nationals, in an attempt to prevent the ships from sailing as scheduled. All these facts fully show that the Indian side has only agreed in words to the shipping back of the Chinese nationals by China but in deeds it has repeatedly rejected the reasonable requests of the Chinese side and deliberately obstructed the Chinese Government from shipping back the victimized Chinese nationals.

(3) The Embassy requests that the Indian Government immediately change its unreasonable attitude and immediately make full and explicit reply to the various points put forward by the Embassy in its memorandum dated January 22, and its note dated March 14, 1963. The Indian Government must immediately supply a name-list of all the interned Chinese nationals, arrange for members of the Chinese Embassy to go to the concentration camps and prisons to visit them and to register those who wish to return to China, realise all the interned Chinese nationals, return to them their property, compensate for their losses, permit them to return to their original places of residence, make it convenient for them to sell their property and wind up their unfinished business and allow those who wish to go back to China to bring back all their property. In order to speedily arrange the concrete matters of bringing back the victimized Chinese nationals, the Indian Government should immediately provide the Embassy with a complete list which it alleged to contain those interned Chinese nationals who wish to go back to China, give facilities for the Chinese Embassy to register the victimized Chinese nationals who wish to go back to China, and make concrete arrangements for them to bring back their property. The victimized Chinese nationals are to leave India by stages and by groups, with each group numbering from eight hundred to one thousand persons. Those who have families must be accompanied by members of their whole families on the same ship. The Indian side should be fully responsible for all the transportation, food and lodging and safety of the victimized Chinese nationals as well as medical care to the sick among them before they leave India and go on board the ships. The Indian Government should provide due cooperation and facilities to persons sent by the Chinese Embassy to Madras for the purpose of transporting back the Chinese nationals in their work, boarding and lodging, transportation, and communication with the Embassy, and properly ensure their safety. The Indian Government should ensure the safety at the port of the Chinese ships and all the members of their crew sent for bringing back the Chinese nationals and provide facilities in the formalities of port entry and exit and in the arrangement of anchorage of the Chinese ships as well as in the supply of water, fuel, food etc.

(4) The Chinese Embassy hereby informs the Indian Ministry of External Affairs that the ship M/S “Guang Hua” for bringing back Chinese nationals is leaving for India on March 27, 1963 as scheduled and as previously notified to the Ministry by the Embassy. She is expected to arrive at Madras by the middle of April.
Chinese ship sent for the same purpose, S/S “Xin Hua” is also scheduled to arrive at Madras by the middle of April. The total capacity of these two ships is eight hundred to one thousand persons.

(5) If the Indian Government has sincerity, it should change its unreasonable attitude and immediately give a clear and definite reply to the requests made successively by the Chinese side; otherwise, the Indian Government must be wholly responsible for the delay in shipping back the victimized Chinese nationals.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 26 March 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its complaints to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to refer to the note of the Indian Government dated January 11, 1963.

With regard to the case in which Indian troops crossed the illegal McMahon Line to pursue and fire at Loma and his family, all peaceable Chinese inhabitants, killed Loma himself and kidnapped Yehku, his sister-in-law, the facts have been very clear. Even the Indian side itself has in its previous notes admitted the basic facts in this case. Therefore, no prevarication can help the Indian side evade its responsibility which it should bear. The Chinese Government reserves all its rights to ask the Indian side to punish the criminals and compensate the family of the victims. The Chinese Government will give no more reply to the irrational prevarication made by the Indian side.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 27 March 1963


2. As a result of the massive invasion by China of Indian territory certain Chinese nationals had to be interned as a security measure. This action is fully within the sovereign competence of the Government of India and there is no violation of international law in this regard. The allegations in the Chinese Government’s Memorandum of March 26th of cruelty, maltreatment and subjection to sufferings and miseries of several thousand Chinese nationals by the Indian Government are rejected as an absurd and unacceptable insinuation completely at variance with the facts.

3. In its note of January 25th, the Ministry of External Affairs had informed the Chinese Embassy that the views of the Chinese nationals detained under the Foreigners Law Ordinance, 1962, are being ascertained and as soon as a list is compiled, discussion will be initiated with the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi for finalising
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their departure procedures. The suggestion that on January 22nd the Indian side promised to supply within a week or ten days a list compiled by India of those internees of Chinese origin who wish to go back to China is without any foundation whatsoever. In its note of 26th March, the Ministry of External Affairs had stated its willingness to provide the Chinese side with lists of internees and their dependants in groups and batches as and when the numbers and their date of embarkation are communicated by the Chinese Government. Every effort would be made to ensure that each group includes all the dependants of the internees who are sailing in that group.

4. The Indian Government will be responsible for the transportation of the internees and their dependants to the point of embarkation where they would be handed over to the officials of the Chinese Government. Necessary port facilities would be made available for the Chinese ships arriving at the Madras Port. It is noted that two ships s.s. “Guang Hua” and s.s. “Xin Hua” are scheduled to arrive at the Madras Port by the middle of April. The exact date of arrival of these ships may be communicated as early as possible in order that it may be coordinated with necessary arrangements for the transportation of internees to the Madras Port.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 1 April 1963

The Embassy of People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India and has the honour to state as follows:

According to the statement made by Mr. N. B. Menon, Director of China Division of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs on March 30, 1963 to Mr. Chen Chao-yuan, Charge d’Affaires of China, the Indian authorities have arrested in the concentration camps 80 victimized Chinese nationals who are prepared to go back to China, and will possibly prosecute them and prevent them from returning to China. This is a shocking incident of a very serious nature. The Chinese Embassy lodges a protest to the Indian Government against the ruthless oppression of the defenceless victimised Chinese nationals by the Indian Police authorities and the unwarranted means used to attempt to prevent them from going back to China and to continue to detain them and requests that the Indian Government immediately inform the Embassy of the details of this incident as well as the names and state of injury of the arrested persons.

At a time when the ships sent by China to bring back the Chinese nationals are to arrive in India, the sudden occurrence of this incident cannot but make one suspect that this is a plot intended to deprive a part of the victimized Chinese nationals of their right to go back to their motherland and threaten the other victimized Chinese nationals to prevent them from expressing their wishes to go back to China, thus creating new obstacles to the work of bringing back Chinese nationals by the Chinese Government so as to continue to hold the Chinese nationals as hostages to blackmail China. The Chinese Embassy solemnly declares that whatever pretext the Indian authorities may create to continue to detain the Chinese
nationals and prevent them from going back to China, it is absolutely impermissible. The Chinese Embassy reserves the right to further make demands in regard to this incident.

The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of External Affairs the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 April 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government’s note dated 26th March, 1963.

2. The detailed facts regarding the incident concerning the Loma family have been furnished in the Indian Government’s note dated 30th June, 1962. The Chinese Government have been unable to disprove any of these facts but have continued to make wild and irresponsible charges for their own propagandist purposes.

3. Now that the Chinese Government have intimated their desire to end the correspondence on the subject, the Government of India have no special interest in continuing this futile correspondence.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 8 April 1963

The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India and has the honour to state the following:

The Embassy has learnt that the Government of India has of late again arrested Mr. Chen Ke-chiang, Deputy Principal, and Mr. Chung Wan-jung, teacher, of the Hsing Hwa Middle School in Calcutta. It has also unjustifiably ordered Miss Yu Tsuan-chun, teacher at a Chinese primary school in Bombay, and her mother to leave India within a short period. The Chinese Embassy once again lodges a protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs against such unwarranted action of deliberately persecuting the Chinese nationals by the Indian Government.

It must be pointed out that this is an attempt of the Indian Government to continue to persecute peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals in a planned way, to step up its undermining of the cultural and educational undertakings of the Chinese nationals and deliberately to deteriorate the relations between the two countries. The Chinese Embassy demands that the Government of India immediately stop its persecution of the Chinese nationals and release all the arrested Chinese nationals.
The Embassy of the People's Republic of China takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of External Affairs the assurances of its highest consideration.

Letter given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 9 April 1963

In the course of the discussions recently held between the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and the Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India on matters concerning some concrete arrangements for the Chinese Government to send ships to bring back those Chinese nationals and members of their families interned by the Indian Government as well as other members of their families elsewhere in India, who desire to come back to China, the following points have been agreed upon by the two sides:

1. The Chinese Government will send ships to bring back the above-mentioned interned Chinese nationals and members of their families by stages and by groups, with each group numbering from 800 to 1,000 persons. All members of the family of an internee mentioned above shall come back to China together with the internee in the same ship.

2. The Indian Government will issue exit permits to the above-mentioned interned Chinese nationals and members of their families and give them necessary facilities while they are leaving India.

3. The Indian Government will make arrangements for all the above-mentioned interned Chinese nationals and members of their families to undergo necessary health formalities and issue them valid health certificates, as agreed upon between the two sides.

4. The Indian Government will be responsible for transporting each group of the above-mentioned interned Chinese nationals and members of their families to the port, namely, Madras. Before their arrival at Madras and embarkation on board the ships, the Indian Government will be responsible for providing and making proper arrangements for all their transportation, boarding and lodging as well as health facilities, etc. The safety of their persons and property shall be ensured.

5. The Indian Government will ensure the safety of the Chinese ships and all their crew members at the port, and give due facilities to them in carrying out their functions.

6. The Chinese and the Indian Governments will designate officials respectively to maintain contact with each other at the port in regard to the work of shipping back the above-mentioned interned Chinese nationals and members of their families, and to settle, at any time and through consultations, problems which may arise, so that the work may proceed smoothly in time.
I shall be glad if you will please confirm that the foregoing correctly sets out the points of agreement reached between the two sides.

Letter given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 9 April 1963

I write to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated the 9th April, 1963, which reads as follows:—

"In the course of the discussions recently held between the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and the Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India on matters concerning some concrete arrangements for the Chinese Government to send ships to bring back those Chinese nationals and members of their families interned by the Indian Government as well as other members of their families elsewhere in India, who desire to come back to China, the following points have been agreed upon by the two sides:

(1) The Chinese Government will send ships to bring back the above-mentioned interned Chinese nationals and members of their families by stages and by groups, with each group numbering from 800 to 1,000 persons. All members of the family of an internee mentioned above shall come back to China together with the internee in the same ship.

(2) The Indian Government will issue exit permits to the above-mentioned interned Chinese nationals and members of their families and give them necessary facilities while they are leaving India.

(3) The Indian Government will make arrangements for all the above-mentioned interned Chinese nationals and members of their families to undergo necessary health formalities and issue them valid health certificates, as agreed upon between the two sides.

(4) The Indian Government will be responsible for transporting each group of the above-mentioned interned Chinese nationals and members of their families to the port, namely Madras. Before their arrival at Madras and embarkation on board the ships, the Indian Government will be responsible for providing and making proper arrangements for all their transportation, boarding and lodging as well as health facilities etc. The safety of their person and property shall be ensured.

(5) The Indian Government will ensure the safety of the Chinese ships and all their crew members at the port, and give due facilities to them in carrying out their functions.

(6) The Chinese and the Indian Governments will designate officials respectively to maintain contact with each other
at the port in regard to the work of shipping back the above-mentioned interned Chinese nationals and members of their families, and to settle, at any time and through consultations, problems which may arise, so that the work may proceed smoothly in time.

I shall be glad if you will please confirm that the foregoing correctly sets out the points of agreement reached between the two sides."

I confirm that the foregoing correctly sets out the points of agreement reached between the two sides.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 23 April 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Embassy's note of April 1, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

On the afternoon of the 29th of March, a disturbance occurred in the Internment Camp set up after the massive invasion of India by Chinese forces. It was caused by a group of internees who had opted for repatriation to China. This group physically assaulted another group of internees who were not willing to go to China. On the intervention of officials present on the spot in the Internment Camp the disturbance was brought under control.

The Government of India in order to cooperate fully with the Chinese Government's offer to take to China all those internees who had exercised their option to be repatriated, decided not to take any action against these 80 persons and have included them in the first group of internees that have been repatriated.

The accusations made in the note of the Chinese Embassy that the incident in the Internment Camp was a "plot intended to deprive" a part of the Chinese nationals of their right to go to China and a so-called threat to the other Chinese nationals "to prevent them from expressing their wishes" to go to China is utterly baseless. The Government of India have extended full cooperation to the Chinese Embassy in carrying out the repatriation of such of those Chinese nationals who have exercised their option to go to China and even included the 80 miscreants who had caused disturbances in the Internment Camp in the very first group of internees.

In view of the facts stated above, the Government of India reject the untenable charges made in the Chinese Embassy note of 1st April, 1963.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 23 April 1963

"The Indian Ministry of External Affairs in its note did its best to make prevarications for the Indian authorities' illegal action of seizing the property of the Chung Hwa School in Kalimpong in collusion with CHIANG KAI SHEK gang elements. In order to deceive the general identity the Indian Government through the Indian Information Service issued on 2nd February a news item which distorted the facts; and on 3rd February a CHIANG KAI SHEK gang special agent in Kalimpong by the name of WANG LU-AN issued a "statement" in which he lodged a "strong protest" with the Chinese Government. This duet between the Indian Government and CHIANG KAI SHEK gang elements reveals of the truth of the close collusion of the Indian Government with the CHIANG KAI SHEK gang elements for joint anti-China activities.

The Head and Deputy Heads of the Board of Directors and other responsible personnel of the Chung Hwa School in Kalimpong were forced to leave India under unwarranted persecution by the Indian authorities. The former Chinese Consulate General in Calcutta in accepting their trust to take charge of the school property as exercising the universally recognised consular right of protecting one's own nationals. No slander levelled by the Indian Government against the former Chinese Consulate General in Calcutta and against the former Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong can cover up its illegal action of seizing property of Chinese nationals in collusion with CHIANG KAI SHEK gang elements and of infringing upon the right of the Chinese Consulate General to protect its nationals or absolve the Indian Government of a single particle of its responsibility for this action.

The Indian note said that after the seizure of the school property by the Indian authorities "a new Executive Committee taking over possession of the Chung Hwa School" was set up on orders of the Indian court. The Head of this organisation set up on order of the Indian authorities is none other than WANG-LU-AN the CHIANG KAI SHEK gangs special agent. In the past ten years and more this notorious CHIANG KAI SHEK special agent all along shielded by the Indian authorities has been actively engaged in activities against the People's Republic of China in Kalimpong. After the Tibetan rebels fled to India he became one of the persons directing the so called "Chinese refugee school" in Kalimpong. This school was "registered" with CHIANG KAI SHEK clique entrenched in Taiwan. The Indian authorities systematically persecuted the responsible personnel of the Chung Hwa School compelled this school to close down and then flagrantly handed over the school property for WANG LU-AN and his ILK to "take change". This series of facts fully prove that there was long since collusion between the Indian authorities and the CHIANG KAI SHEK gang elements and that the handing over the Chung Hwa School to the latter was a long-premeditated plot of the Indian authorities.

The Chinese Government solemnly state that the Chinese people absolutely will not tolerate the Indian Government persecution of peaceable, law-abiding Chinese nationals which is carried out in
collusion with CHIANG KAI SHEK gang elements and in determining hostility to the Chinese people. The Chinese Government reserve all its rights to further action in regard to the case of the illegal handing over of the Chung Hwa School to CHIANG KAI SHEK gang elements by the Indian authorities.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 25 April 1963

After the Indian Government's scheme of interning Chinese nationals as hostages was exposed it went to the length of slanderously counter charging the Chinese Government with "holding as hostages" the capture of Indian military personnel. This reveals once again the unreasonable position of the Indian Government reversing black and white and creating pretexts to vitiate Sino-Indian relations.

As everybody knows the Chinese Government always showed magnanimous solicitude for the capture of Indian military personnel and gave active consideration to their release so that they might rejoin their families at the earliest date. In the course of cease-fire and withdrawal on China's own initiative the Chinese frontier guards already on their own initiative released several batches of sick and wounded captured Indian military personnel. Recently the Chinese Government further decided and already began to release and repatriate all healthy captured Indian military personnel. In the face of these world known facts how can the Indian Government's slander about China's "holding as hostages" the capture of Indian military personnel deceive anybody? Obviously its purpose in making the slander is only to divert people's attention and cover up its attempt to blackmail the Chinese Government by interning Chinese nationals.

Everyone knows that the Chinese nationals persecuted in India and Indian military personnel captured on the battle-field belong to totally different categories. Yet out of ulterior motives the Indian Government insist on confusing the two and in December, 1962 proposed China and India on a so-called reciprocal basis exchange information about prisoners through the International Committee of the Red Cross. The Chinese Government of course absolutely could not accept such an unreasonable demand. However the Indian Government did not give up and continues after that to place the victimised Chinese nationals on a par with the captured Indian military personnel seeking continually to blackmail the Chinese Government. It may be asked what justification did the Indian Government have in linking the question of the unwarrantly victimised Chinese nationals and that of the captured Indian military personnel. Does not this exactly show that the Indian authorities interned large number of Chinese nationals for the purpose of holding them as hostages?

2. While delaying and obstructing the shipment of Chinese nationals by the Chinese Government the Indian Government has
countercharged that "at these meetings the Chinese side had taken an obstructive attitude". As a matter of fact as early as 18th December, 1962 the Chinese Government proposed that it would send ships to bring back the Chinese nationals. But the Indian Government all along prevented the Chinese Embassy from sending its staff to visit the victimised Chinese nationals and register those wishing to return to China. Repeatedly eating its own words it was not until 3rd April that the Indian Government furnished a list of the first batch of 995 returning Chinese. But when the ships by China to bring back its nationals arrived in India on 12th April the Indian side further created pretexts and detained over 80 victimised Chinese nationals whose names were already in the list. What is the Indian Government's line of action if not delaying and obstructing the shipping back of Chinese nationals?

It must be further pointed out that in asking the Indian Government to provide a list of the interned Chinese nationals arranging visits to them and registration of the victimised Chinese wishing to return to China by the Chinese Embassy, etc. the Chinese Embassy was exercising the internationally acknowledged right of protecting one's own nationals and requested the proper and normal facilities for the shipping back of its nationals. The facts of the inhuman maltreatment of the victimised Chinese nationals by the Indian authorities bear further proof that the above requests of the Chinese Embassy are totally proper and extremely necessary. The Indian Government's allegation that these requests "amount to a gross interference in the internal sovereign jurisdiction of the Indian Government" is solely designed to cover up its unjustified crude violation of the principles of international law and obstruction of the smooth transportation of Chinese nationals by the Chinese Government for fear that the facts about the infernal concentration camps in which its interned Chinese nationals might be sick. But all this is futile.

3. At a time when Chinese Government is releasing and repatriating all captured Indian military personnel and has adopted other initiative measures and thus brought about a further relaxation of the Sino-Indian border situation the Indian Government on the contrary has become more brutal in persecution of Chinese nationals obstructing the return of arrested Chinese nationals desiring to return and even preparing to intern some of them identifiably lest they would expose the truth of the Indian authorities maltreatment of Chinese nationals once they regain freedom. The Indian Government has brought all kinds of pressure to bear on Chinese nationals outside of the concentration camps seizing their property setting a time limit for them to leave India or render it impossible for them to continue to make a living and rendering them homeless. Moreover it has forcibly trampled upon the educational undertakings of Chinese nationals, continues to arrest and expel persons in charge of them compelling the closure of a school and a newspaper run by Chinese nationals. Many signs show that while some Chinese nationals are being brought back by ships sent by China the Indian Government is engineering a new plot of intensifying persecution of Chinese nationals. The Chinese Government lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against these acts of hostility to the friendship
between the Chinese and Indian peoples and urges that the Indian Government immediately stop all persecution of Chinese nationals and release all the victimised Chinese nationals who have been unwarrantedly interned.

(Text by telegram).

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 27 April 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and with regard to the inhuman persecution of Chinese nationals in India by the Indian Government has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government has lodged repeated protests with the Indian Government against its unwarranted persecution of Chinese nationals and particularly its wholesale arrests and internment of peaceful and law-abiding Chinese nationals. But the Indian Government has tried in every way to prevaricate and deny the fact describing the arrest of Chinese nationals as hostages as to "the requirements of security and defence" and the maltreatment of Chinese nationals as "the internees are well cared for" and so on and so forth. In order to cover up its brutality the Indian Government has long maintained a tight news blockade* and tried everything possible to distort the truth. But the first batch of victimised Chinese nationals now brought back to China by Chinese ship have during voyage indignantly denounced the Indian authorities' acts of persecution and maltreatment of peaceful and law-abiding Chinese nationals. They have with innumerable iron-clad facts exploded the Indian Government's false propaganda and exposed its inhuman atrocities. The Chinese Government and people are extremely indignant at such atrocities by the Indian Government.

The facts preliminarily disclosed by the returned victimised Chinese show that the large scale persecution of Chinese nationals by the Indian authorities is* by no means due to "the requirements of security and defence" but is solely a retaliatory action taken by them after they failed in their military attack along Sino-Indian border. Nor is it an isolated measure taken by a local authority but a scheme carefully planned by the Indian Government. It can be seen that the majority of the arrested Chinese are women and children. Among those interned in the concentration camps are babies less than one month old, expecting mothers approaching confinement, a blind man of over 70 years old and even aged men of more than 90 years old. They were unwarrantedly interned subjected to all sorts of maltreatment and robbed of their properties, homes and family members. What crime had they committed? The only reason is that they are Chinese nationals but one may ask the Indian Government can they constitute a threat to the "security and defence" of India merely because they are Chinese nationals? And can it be that even newborn babies, children under school age, expecting mothers, blind men

*By ch.
and aged men of more than 90 years old threaten India’s “Security and defence”? The Indian Government’s assertion that the wholesale arrests and brutal persecution of Chinese nationals are due to “the requirements of security and defence” is a big lie.

The Indian Government repeatedly boasted that the victimised Chinese nationals “are being well cared for” but the returned victimised Chinese nationals had shown with facts that the Indian concentration camps are a very hell on earth. The Indian Government has chosen desert areas where the weather makes sudden changes between hot and cold to intern the Chinese nationals. The concentration camps are most unhealthy being infested with mosquitoes and flies and stinking with a bad smell. The rooms are so crowded that the victimised Chinese nationals have to sleep in turns and it often happens that babies are crushed and injured. The internees are given very bad food often mouldy looking to eat and unwholesome unboiled water to drink. Hence the camps are rife with diseases and quite a number of people who are seriously ill are not given due care medical or otherwise. On top of all this there are attacks by special agents and maltreatment by Indian troops and police. As a result many Chinese nationals have been wasted to mere skeletons and on the point of dying; some have been beaten up and wounded all over and several dozens victimised Chinese nationals have died miserably in the concentration camps. Owing to inhuman treatment 70 years old woman HOU CHIN-HSIU was mentally affected and then died without any accounting for the cause after she was confined in a so-called “hospital” by the camp authorities. Afterwards wounds were found on her body. When CHANG SHIH-HSIN another victimised Chinese was sent to the “hospital” on account of a stomach trouble he was not only denied food but made to suffer. When he protested he was given two doses of medicine by the doctor and died of them suddenly. Another sick Chinese MA SHAO-HSIA was for several days denied food and drink while he was being taken to a camp. As a result he died miserably on the train before reaching the camp. The Chinese Government wish to ask the Indian Government: Is this what you meant when asserting that “careful attention is being paid by the Government of India to the interest of Chinese community residing in India”? Is this what you meant when asserting that the treatment given to victimised Chinese nationals was “in full conformity with the scales of the Geneva conventions of 1949”? It has been pointed out by the Chinese Government long ago that the reason why the Indian Government stubbornly refused to provide a list of the interned victimised Chinese nationals or allow the Chinese Embassy to send its staff to visit them was that the Indian Government feared that the appalling state of the concentration camp might be made known to the world. The facts preliminarily revealed by the victimised Chinese nationals have now borne out that the concentration camps where Chinese nationals are interned by India are a world of horror.

On March 29, 1963 when the ships sent by the Chinese Government to bring back its nationals were about to reach India the Indian authorities engineered a political incident in the concentration camps to persecute the helplessly victimised Chinese nationals. The Indian
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concentration camp authorities incited certain bad elements and
CHIANG KAI SHEK gang special agents under their control to make
provocation by writing a letter to the Indian Government in the
usurping names of all the victimised Chinese nationals which slan-
dered China and falsely claimed that *they* did not want to return
to China. This plot naturally met* the general opposition of the victim-
mised Chinese nationals. Using this as a pretext the Indian authori-
ties thereupon sent their pre-arranged hundreds of soldiers and police
into the concentration camps together with the special agents* already
in the camps madly beat up the victimised Chinese nationals. The
Indian authorities then slanderously counter charged the returning
Chinese nationals with trouble making and forcibly detained* a part
of them and forbade* their return to China. Despite a subsequent
protest by the Chinese Embassy many of them are detained up to the
present and unable to return to China. The above mentioned incident
shows that the Indian authorities have not only used all means to
obstruct and frustrate the shipping back of Chinese nationals by China
but also flagrantly detained and persecuted victimised Chinese
nationals who desired to return. This is what the Chinese Government
will never tolerate.

There are now many signs that the Indian Government not only
has no intentions to stop its unwarranted persecution of Chinese
nationals but is turned from bad to worse and resorting to even more
vicious measures. On the one hand the Indian authorities are creating
various pretexts alleging that victimised Chinese nationals have
changed their minds and are no longer willing to return to China or
use all kinds of intrigues to detain those Chinese who desire to return
or even unscrupulously kill them lest they reveal the facts of the
atrocious maltreatment of Chinese nationals. On the other hand the
Indian authorities are intensifying their persecution of those Chinese
nationals also who are not yet interned seizing their property ex-
pelling them from India or using all means to deprive them* of their
means of livelihood. The Indian Government is even acting in guerilla
warfare collusion with CHIANG* KAI SHEK gang* elements to
pressurize Chinese nationals into betraying their motherland. The
Chinese Government and people cannot but pay close attention to all
these treacherous schemes of the Indian Government.

The brutal maltreatments inflicted on the Chinese nationals in
India are too many to recount. The above mentioned facts are only
a few examples. But* even these few cases are sufficient to prove the
towering crimes committed by the Indian Government. All these
crimes not only cruelly trample upon the principles of international
law but completely disregard the minimum principle of humani-
tarianism. The way the Indian Government so brutally treats the
peaceful law-abiding Chinese nationals while diplomatic relations are
maintained between China and India is quite unprecedented in
international relations. The Chinese Government hereby lodges the
strongest protest with the Indian Government against its barbarous
atrocity of cruelly persecuting Chinese nationals in disregard of
international morals and firmly demands that the Indian Government:

*By ch.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 27 April 1963

The Chinese Embassy has to point out with regret that during the time when the Chinese Government sent ships at the middle of April, 1963, to bring back to China a group of Chinese nationals interned by the Indian Government, and members of their families, the Indian side should have violated the six point agreement reached between China and India concerning concrete arrangements of bringing back the Chinese nationals, created various difficulties, and unjustifiably placed obstacles and made harassment, thus causing numerous inconveniences and obstructions to the said work:

(1) The so-called name-list supplied by the Indian Government to the Chinese side of the first group of the interned Chinese nationals and their families who desire to return to China, consisted of 995 persons. But, at the time of the handing over at the port of Madras, the Indian side withheld more than eighty of them in the list and deprived them of the right to go back to their motherland. Besides, contrary to the agreement, some of the internees and members of their families were not transported to the port to sail for China.

(2) According to the agreement, members of the family of an internee shall come back to China together with the internee in the same ship. Some of the internees, however, were not accompanied by members of their families while returning to China.

(3) Under the agreement, the Indian side should be responsible for making proper arrangements for the transportation, boarding and lodging as well as health facilities for the victimized Chinese nationals on their way to the port, and it should also ensure the safety of their property. But, the Embassy has learnt that during the long journey of 3 to 4 days in the hot weather from the concentration camps to
the port, the victimized Chinese nationals were under armed escort like prisoners, and even subjected to restrictions and harassment when they got down the train for drinking water. The aged, the young and the sick were not given necessary care. A pregnant woman had begun to feel birth-pangs on the way, but received no due attendance. While the victimized Chinese nationals were going on board the ship, there were three old men, extremely weak and unable to walk, who had to be carried to the deck on stretchers. But this had not been intimated by the Indian side to the Chinese side in advance to enable the latter to make arrangement for special care. From the concentration camps to the port and before embarkation, the victimized Chinese nationals and their luggage were subjected to several searches. Even the only valuables were forcibly taken away from a number of them. Money was also taken away from many of them and their request for a receipt was rejected. All these are in violation of the agreement reached between the two sides.

(4) It had been verbally agreed between the two sides that the two Chinese ships for bringing back the Chinese nationals should berth at the wharf at the same time near to each other. But, at the port the Indian side persisted that only one ship was permitted to berth at one time. This has caused unnecessary difficulties and delay in the work of shipping back the Chinese nationals. Moreover, after the victimized Chinese nationals embarked on board the ships, the Indian side asked the ships to leave the wharf immediately, thus making it impossible for the officials of the Embassy to undertake necessary registration and other formalities among the Chinese nationals returning to China. Before the Charge d'Affaires and other officials of the Chinese Embassy got down from the ship, the ladder placed to the ship was being removed, in an attempt to render it difficult for them to come back to the wharf. On the evening of April 13, when a diplomatic official of the Embassy was leaving the harbour, Indian policemen even wanted to search his brief-case and prevented him from leaving the place for as long as over ten minutes. Such practice as mentioned above not only goes against the agreement that the Indian Government would give the Chinese officials facilities in their work, but also contravenes international practice and lacks minimum diplomatic courtesy.

(5) It should also be pointed out that the Indian authorities have taken away from many Chinese nationals passports and other papers issued to them by Chinese government organs, and did not return them to the Chinese nationals even when they embarked on board the ships for their motherland. Such an outrageous act of forcible seizure of passports issued by China is in grave violation of code of conduct in international relations.

The various facts listed above show that the Indian side lacks cooperation and sincerity in regard to the work of shipping back the Chinese nationals. The Indian side not only violated the agreement
reached between China and India concerning concrete arrangements of bringing back the Chinese nationals, but even broke the various promises it had made during the discussions as well as in the Annex to its note dated March 26, 1963. This has brought many difficulties and delay to the work of bringing back the Chinese nationals, and consequently it could not proceed smoothly and in time. To this, the Chinese Embassy hereby draws the serious attention of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs.

The Chinese Embassy now informs the Indian Ministry of External Affairs that Chinese ships for bringing back the second group of the victimized Chinese nationals will arrive in India by the middle of May, 1963. The Embassy hopes that, in the forthcoming work of bringing back the Chinese nationals, the Indian Government will strictly abide by the agreement reached for the purpose, and the promises it has made, fully cooperate with the Chinese officials and ensure due facilities to them. In order to ensure the smooth proceeding of the work of shipping back the second group of the victimized Chinese nationals, the Chinese Embassy requests that the Indian Government:

(1) supply within a week the name-list of the returning victimized Chinese nationals and members of their families, which includes, besides the original items, names in Chinese, age, and health conditions requiring special care;

(2) immediately release the returning victimized Chinese nationals to go back to their original places of residence to dispose of their property;

(3) immediately make known the contents of the six point agreement between China and India and the eight point promises contained in the Annex to the Indian note dated March 26, 1963 to the returning victimized Chinese nationals and members of their families.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 27 April 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated March 20, has the honour to state the following:

The Chinese Embassy in India and the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs have, in their notes of December 7, 1962 and March 9, 1963 respectively, completely and thoroughly refuted the unwarranted charge by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs that the non-diplomatic staff of the Chinese Missions in India had not gone through aliens registration formalities. Yet the Indian Ministry of External Affairs now again haggled over this matter and pretentiously alleged that the persons concerned had not gone through the formalities. In fact, the Indian Government is fully aware that the above-mentioned Chinese non-diplomatic personnel had not only gone through aliens registration formalities, but had already returned their aliens registration certificates to the Indian authorities upon their departure from
India. The conduct of the Indian Government in slanderously charging them with failure to go through registration formalities after taking back their registration certificates is in total disregard of diplomatic good faith. The Chinese Government is firmly opposed to this unreasonable attitude of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and to continued haggling on this subject.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 30 April 1963

The Chinese Embassy has learnt that the Indian Government has of late again successively ordered proscription of issue Nos. 9, 14 and 15 of "China Today", the bulletin of the Chinese Embassy. In these issues of the bulletin, the Chinese Embassy published Chinese Government leaders' speeches expressing hopes for early negotiations to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question, notes of the Chinese Government and reports making known to the Indian people the good treatment received by the captured Indian military personnel, which are conducive to the promotion of Sino-Indian friendship. This is entirely proper. There is no reason whatsoever for the Indian Government to proscribe these issues of the Embassy bulletin. The Embassy once again lodges a protest against Indian Government's practice of repeatedly disregarding the international practice and unjustifiably proscribing the bulletin of the Chinese Embassy, and demands that the Indian Government put an end to this unreasonable action.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 May 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Foreign Office note dated the 27th April, 1963, in reply to the Indian note of 20th March.

The Chinese note once again tries to deny the breach of protocol and violation of registration formalities committed by non-diplomatic staff of the Chinese Missions in India. But as the contents of the Indian note of the 20th March 1963 indicate, the Government of India have incontrovertible proof that a number of non-diplomatic staff members of the Chinese Missions in India did not fulfil the registration formalities required by the rules. Mere, violent language as in the Chinese Foreign Office note cannot deceive anybody as far as the facts are concerned. In these circumstances, the Government of India do not propose to entertain any further correspondence in the matter.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 4 May 1963

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India and has the honour to state the following:

The Embassy has learnt that the Government of India has of late again unjustifiably ordered Miss Chen Chin-ai, teacher of a Chinese primary school in Bombay, to leave India within a short period, thus compelling the closure of the Chinese primary school in Bombay. Besides, the Government of India has also unjustifiably ordered a Chinese national in Delhi Mr. Wang Deh-chien and his family to leave India within a short period. This is another act of persecution of Chinese nationals by the Indian Government.

It must be pointed out that the Indian Government, while creating various pretexts to detain the victimized Chinese nationals who request to return to China, is stepping up its persecution of the peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals, depriving them of their means to make a living and plunging them into a helpless plight. At the same time, the Government is continuing to arrest and expel those engaged in cultural and educational undertakings of the Chinese nationals, compelling the closure of their school and newspaper. The Chinese Embassy hereby lodge a protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs against such act of hostility to the friendship between the peoples of China and India, and demands that the Indian Government immediately stop its persecution of the Chinese nationals.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 May 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Foreign Office note, dated 27th April, 1963.

2. The malicious and false allegations made in the Chinese note, purely for purposes of propaganda and maligning the Government of India, do not merit any reply. The Chinese Government have deliberately and maliciously distorted the facts despite the Government of India having at every stage, extended the fullest co-operation to the Chinese Government in repatriating those persons who were desirous of going to China. The factual position is, however, reiterated in the following paragraphs for the information of those interested in this humanitarian problem which is being exploited for propaganda purposes by the Chinese Government.

3. The internment of persons of Chinese origin residing in border areas had to be reluctantly undertaken by the Government of India on grounds of national security because of the massive Chinese attacks and unprovoked invasion of India. The Government of India had agreed to the request of dependants such as wives, children, aged parents etc. of those arrested for security reasons and given them all
facilities to stay in the internment camp with their relations who were detained. Family members of internees had been given the clear choice of accompanying them to the internment camp or staying on in their original places of residence. Those who opted to stay on in the original places of residence were given subsistence allowances for their maintenance. The Government of China are aware of this factual position and yet distort it deliberately to carry on a malicious campaign against India. Surely these facilities given at the request of the families concerned on purely humanitarian grounds could not be called arrest and detention of women, old men and children.

4. The Government of India have scrupulously followed normal humanitarian standards in the treatment of internees. A representative of the International Committee of the Red Cross has also visited the internment camp. The report of the I.C.R.C. representative has confirmed that the internees are being well looked after and are being cared for properly.

5. The Government of India set up the camp in a healthy region where the weather is temperate and where adequate water and sanitation facilities were available. The scale of diet provided has been in accordance with the Geneva Convention and has a calorific value of 2655 calories. The list of the standard diet is attached. Additional rations of milk are given to children below 12 years of age. The camp has a 10 bedded hospital with two full-time doctors and several nurses apart from a number of nursing orderlies. Medical staff have been available on call throughout the day and night and serious medical cases are being taken care of in local civilian hospitals in the neighbourhood.

6. The factual details given above establish conclusively the absurdity and malicious nature of the allegations made in the Chinese note. The Government of India categorically reject these false, baseless and mischievous allegations.

7. The Chinese Government have repeated their false allegations regarding an incident that occurred in the camp on March 29th. These have been refuted in the Government of India's note of April 23rd.

8. It is probably embarrassing for the Chinese Government to learn that there are people of Chinese origin who are not desirous of returning to Mainland China and prefer to remain in India even though they had, because of the unprovoked Chinese aggression and massive attacks on India, to suffer the inconvenience of temporary displacement. This alone accounts for the hysterical, false and entirely baseless allegations made in deliberate distortion of the occurrence of a few natural deaths.

9. Over 900 Chinese internees, who desired to go to China, have already left the country for China with the co-operation of the Government of India. The Indian Government is giving further facilities to permit all others who are desirous of leaving in the next batch of repatriates. The Government of India are, however, not prepared to repatriate compulsorily those who are unwilling to go to China.

10. The demands mentioned in the Chinese note are only perverted propaganda points which have no relation to facts. The Government
of India treat the false baseless and malicious allegations of torture and killing with the disdain such mischievous allegations deserve. The factual position is that:

(i) Careful records have been maintained of the twelve natural deaths that occurred in a group of over 2,000 people interned during the last six months. Death certificates based on the findings of competent medical authorities are being forwarded to the International Committee of the Red Cross.

(ii) Lists of Chinese nationals who desire to be repatriated to China are being provided to the Chinese Embassy in Delhi as and when a group is due for repatriation.

(iii) The question of the release of such internees as are not prepared to go to China and who are therefore, not being repatriated is a matter solely within the competence of the Government of India and is being separately considered.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and assurances of its highest consideration.

Enclosure to the note dated 6 May 1963 of the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi

Calorific value of the diet given to Chinese internees at Deoli

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Quantity in oz</th>
<th>Calorific value per oz</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99 × 15 = 1,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10 (average)</td>
<td>10 × 6 = 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32 × 6 = 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100 × 4 = 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98 × 2 = 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14 × 2 = 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking oils.</td>
<td>¹/₄</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256 × ¼ = 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>¹/₂</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126 × ¼ = 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>¹/₂</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25 (average of cows’ and buffalos’)</td>
<td>25 × 1 = 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Chillies</td>
<td>¹/₄</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12 × ¼ = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curry</td>
<td>¹/₄</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44 × ¼ = 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 6 May 1963

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India and has the honour to state the following:

The Chinese Embassy has recently received several notes from the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, informing the Embassy of deaths of Chinese nationals in India. According to these notes more than twenty persons have died. The Embassy is very much concerned about it. It is especially necessary to point out that the cause, time and place of the deaths of six Chinese nationals were not accounted for in the above-mentioned notes. Among them the cause, time and place of the death of Mr. Tchen Wen Chin alias Chey Yun Chong [Indian Ministry of External Affairs' note No. VI/405/1(14)63, dated April 8, 1963], the cause and time of the death of Mr. Cheng Chaing Ming (note No. F-T/4360/1/63, dated February 5, 1963), the cause of the deaths of Leong Pin Kwong alias Liailg Ping Kuang [note No. 436 (II)/12/T/62, dated December 20, 1962] and Tham Wei Men Chang (note No. F. 4360/1/T/63, dated March 1963), the cause and place of the death of Tashi Pencho (note No. 4360/1/T/63, dated March 1963) and the place of the death of Tan Feng Ying (note No. F. 4360/1/T/63, dated March 1963) were not given. In exercise of its right of protecting Chinese nationals, the Chinese Embassy requests the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to immediately give explicit account for the cause, time and place in each case of the deaths of the above-mentioned Chinese nationals.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 11 May 1963

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and has the honour to state the following:

It is learnt that in the concentration camp where India detains victimized Chinese nationals there occurred recently an incident in which victimized Chinese desiring to return to China were violently beaten up or assaulted. It will be recalled that, when the first ships sent by China to bring back its nationals had sailed for India, there occurred on March 29 the incident in which the Indian authorities detained and persecuted victimized Chinese desiring to return to China, and that many victimized Chinese are still under detention. Now, when a Chinese ship, for the second time, is about to sail for India, the Indian authorities again created an incident of persecuting victimized Chinese desiring to return. The Chinese Embassy cannot but express its serious concern about the matter. It must be pointed out that the Indian Government has the unshirkable responsibility
for whatever incidents that may happen in the concentration camp which is under the tight control of the Indian authorities. The Chinese Embassy urges that the Indian Government:

(1) immediately clarify the aforesaid report and provide information about the wounded and dead victimized Chinese;

(2) immediately arrange visits by staff members of the Chinese Embassy;

(3) immediately provide a list of all the victimized Chinese now held in the concentration camp.

The Chinese Embassy reserves the right to make further demands as the circumstances may require.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 May 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to their note dated April 8, 1963 has the honour to state the following:

The persons mentioned in the Chinese Embassy note under reply had indulged in activities prejudicial to the national security, and as such, the Government of India were constrained to take action against them. In the circumstances, the Government of India reject the protest lodged by the Chinese Embassy.

2 The Government of India also refute the charge contained in the Chinese note that "peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals" have been persecuted. The further charge that the Government of India desire to "undermine" the cultural and educational undertakings of the Chinese nationals is entirely baseless. The educational and cultural institutions of the Chinese nationals in India are perfectly at liberty to function and given equal opportunities along with the non-Chinese institutions to carry on their activities so long as they respect the law of the land.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of India in China, 16 May 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the
latter's note No. M/140/63, dated the 11th May, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India have enquired into the allegation about a recent incident in the internment camp made in the Chinese note under reference and have found it to be entirely baseless. The Government of India are surprised that the Embassy should have, for its own propagandist purposes, alleged such an incident in the internment camp without any evidence whatsoever to support its allegation.

In this connection, it is relevant to draw the attention of the Embassy to the fact that when an incident had really occurred in the internment camp at Deoli earlier on the 29th March, 1963 as a result of some mischief makers trying to create a riot in the camp, the Director of the China Division in the Ministry of External Affairs had expressly sent for the Charge d'Affaires of the Chinese Embassy the very next day and communicated to him the full facts of the case. Despite this correct attitude taken in the matter by the Indian side, Chinese propaganda organs had made any number of unwarranted charges solely with the aim of poisoning the relations between the two countries, deliberately ignoring the fact that even the mischief makers who were responsible for the incident on March 29, 1963, had been allowed by the Indian Government to be repatriated with the very first batch that sailed on April 13, 1963, from Madras. This in itself would testify to the cooperative attitude all along adopted by the Government of India. However the Chinese Government obviously not only refuse to see the facts but also have now thought fit to invent an utterly fictitious incident that has no basis in fact.

In the light of the above, the Government of India categorically repudiate the allegations made by the Chinese Embassy in its note under reference and reject the unacceptable demands made therein.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 May 1963


It is regretted that in spite of the fullest co-operation rendered by the Government of India to the Chinese Embassy in the matter of repatriation of such of those persons of Chinese origin who were willing to go to China, the Chinese Embassy persists in levelling baseless charges alleging violation of the points of agreement reached between the Indian and Chinese Governments. The Government of India emphatically repudiate these allegations. Far from placing any difficulties or obstacles as alleged in the Chinese Embassy memorandum, the Government of India have at every stage fully co-operated with the Chinese Embassy in the matter of repatriation.

2. The Government of India had all along made it quite clear to the Chinese Embassy that they would ascertain the freely expressed
wishes of the persons in the internment camp and their dependants elsewhere as to whether they wished to be repatriated to China or remain in India as law abiding citizens, and then provide a name-list of persons who expressed their desire to go to China as and when they were due to be repatriated. This name list was furnished to the Chinese side on April 3, 1963, full 10 days before the scheduled departure of the Chinese ships from the port of Madras.

3. Between April 3rd and April 13th, a number of internees who had been included in the list changed their minds and desired to remain in India. The full particulars of these Chinese internees and their families were communicated to representatives of the Chinese Embassy at Madras on April 14, 1963. The statement in the Chinese Embassy memorandum that the Indian side deliberately withheld more than 80 persons of the original list and deprived them of the right to go to China has no basis in fact. The Government of India had observed, both in letter and in spirit, the agreement reached between the two sides. Consistent with their desire not to break up family units, the Government of India had carefully brought together the members of the families elsewhere in India with the persons coming from the internment camp so as to enable composite family units to embark on the same Chinese Ship.

4. The Government treated the repatriates with consideration and made comfortable arrangements for their transportation. The special train from the place of their internment to Madras was equipped with adequate medical facilities; kitchen cars with cooks were provided. The Government of India are completely satisfied that proper care and attention had been paid to the comfort of travel of the repatriates to the port of embarkation, namely, Madras.

5. In response to the specific requests made by the Chinese Embassy for additional security arrangements for the Chinese repatriates, the Government of India had provided them with armed escorts. The absurd charge contained in the Chinese Embassy’s memorandum that the repatriates were treated like prisoners and that they were subjected to harassment is firmly repudiated.

6. The Chinese memorandum refers to the case of a pregnant lady in the party. It need hardly be pointed out that the person in question had herself indicated her desire to leave. Adequate medical attendance was always at hand. A medical party consisting of two doctors and six nurses which included a mid-wife was in attendance on all Chinese repatriates.

7. The memorandum goes to the absurd length of alleging that valuables and money were confiscated from the repatriates. This is yet another instance of the wild propagandistic charges of the Chinese Government. The routine customs examination was speedily completed at the Madras port. Nine hundred passengers were cleared in a period of three hours and there has not been a single instance of confiscation of personal belongings.

8. It is surprising that the Chinese Embassy should complain that two Chinese ships were not berthed together when the Embassy officials were able to satisfy themselves that berthing facilities at Madras port were available only for one ship at a time at the wharf.
The memorandum refers to the fact that the ships had to leave the wharf immediately after the embarkation, and alleges that inconvenience was caused to the Charge d'Affaires and other officials of the Chinese Embassy getting down from the ships. This is absurd and baseless. Members of the Chinese Embassy used the regular gangway to disembark from the Chinese ships. Officials of the Embassy also had adequate time for "registration" of the Chinese nationals returning to China. When more time was requested for by the Chinese Embassy as in the case of passengers on the Xin Hua, a launch was made available for members of the Chinese Embassy to proceed to the ship to carry on their so-called work of registration. Members of the Chinese Embassy were again taken to the Chinese ship ss Xin Hua on the morning after it had left the wharf. The Chinese Embassy has chosen to suppress the fact that at the very last minute a demand was made that photographs had to be provided for all the repatriates embarking on the ss Xin Hua. At considerable inconvenience, the Government of India complied with this last-minute request of the Chinese Embassy and provided the photographs overnight.

9. The Government of India had accorded full facilities for the members of the Chinese Embassy to enter and leave the Madras harbour premises in keeping with the requirements of their work. Apart from a routine examination of passes, required in the interests of security, any allegation of personal belonging of the members of the Chinese Embassy being examined is palpably false.

10. No instance of the so-called confiscation of passports of the Chinese repatriates has come to the attention of the Government of India. It is evident that here, as in many other instances, the Chinese Embassy has made baseless and unsubstantiated statement purely for propagandistic purposes.

11. The whole tenor of the Chinese memorandum under reply is unfriendly and unco-operative. As far as the concrete arrangements for repatriation are concerned, the Government of India are fully satisfied that on their part at least the work of repatriation was smoothly carried out. No wild and unsubstantiated charges on the part of the Chinese Embassy can alter this fact.

12. In regard to the list of points mentioned in the annexure to the Government of India note dated March 26, 1963, the internees were fully aware of the conditions under which repatriation facilities were being offered to them. The list of facilities offered by the Government of India to the repatriates had already been made known to all Chinese repatriates.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 16 May 1963

In its memorandum dated May 14, 1962, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs continued to quibble over the program staged in the Hostel of the Kirori Mal College, which insulted Chinese Premier Chou En-lai. This once again showed that the Indian Government connived at and supported the activities poisoning the atmosphere
between China and India. Following the aforesaid incident, the Indian Government went further to instigate ruffians to abuse Chinese leaders, and even to burn portraits of Chinese leaders in front of the Chinese Embassy. Indian Government's intention of fanning up anti-Chinese feelings and undermining Sino-Indian relations has been exposed to the full and absolutely cannot be covered up. If the Indian Government tries further to haggle on by useless quibbling, the Chinese Embassy will not reply.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 17 May 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs has the honour to refer to the Chinese Embassy's memorandum, dated the 30th April, 1963, concerning the proscription of issues No. 9, 14 and 15 of “China Today”, the bulletin of the Chinese Embassy.

2. The Government of India have informed the Chinese Embassy time and again of the circumstances under which they have been compelled to take action to proscribe issues of the Embassy’s bulletin “China Today”. Whatever the interpretation that the Chinese Embassy may place on the contents of issues No. 9, 14 and 15 of “China Today”, the fact remains that all these issues grossly misrepresented the correct position regarding the India-China differences and further indulged in poisonous propaganda against the Government of India.

3. The Government of India do not understand how articles and speeches misrepresenting the facts about the India-China border question, and making false propaganda against the Government and people of India can be considered as “conducive to the promotion of Sino-Indian friendship”. Issues No. 9, 14 and 15 of “China Today” contained Chinese statements which not only transgressed established principles of courtesy by maligning the Government of India but which also violated specific provisions of the laws of the country.

4. While categorically rejecting the protest contained in memorandum of the Chinese, the Government of India would like to point out that such protests in fact constitute an unwarranted interference in the domestic jurisdiction of the Indian Government.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 17 May 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Foreign Office note of the 25th of April, 1963.

internees were given an option to go to China and remain in their country as law abiding citizens. In consonance with the decision of the Government of India, repatriation of overseas Chinese desirous of going to China is continuing and the first batch of internees have already reached China. If the Indian Government were desirous of holding hostages, as maliciously alleged in the note under reference, this repatriation would not have taken place.

2. The Chinese Government have stated that the Government of India have linked the question of “Chinese nationals” and that of the captured Indian military personnel. It may be pointed out that the Government of China’s decision to release Indian prisoners captured following the unwarranted Chinese attack on Indian territory was announced on 2nd April, 1963 whereas the Indian Government had indicated their agreement to the repatriation of Chinese internees who were desirous of going back to China as early as 31st December, 1962. This is an incontrovertible fact.

3. The Government of India have time and again stated that the internment of persons of Chinese origin residing in border areas had to be undertaken on grounds of national security because of the unwarranted and massive aggression launched by China on India. In marked contrast to the reasonable attitude of the Indian Government, the Chinese Government have refused for their own ulterior motives, to allow any representative of the Indian or the International Red Cross Committee to visit the camps where Indian military personnel are confined.

4. In response to the Chinese Government’s request of 18th December, 1962, that it desired to send ships to repatriate internees of Chinese origin, they were informed on 31st December that “the Government of India are also prepared to give necessary facilities to Chinese nationals in India who wish to return to China, of their own free will”. It was, however, only in its note sent on 19th January, 1963 that the Chinese Government indicated its desire to discuss the departure procedure of these internees. A name list of the first batch of internees was provided on April 3rd, 1963, full ten days before the scheduled departure of the Chinese ships from the port of Madras.

5. Over 900 Chinese internees and their dependants who desired to go to China, have already left the country for China with the co-operation of the Government of India. The Indian Government are giving further facilities to permit all others who are desirous of leaving to do so but they are not prepared to repatriate compulsorily those who are unwilling to go to China.

6. The Indian Government have abided by all their commitments connected with the repatriation of Chinese internees. The Chinese Government on the other hand, while releasing the Indian prisoners taken during their invasion of India, have indulged in cheap propaganda by forcing a number of Indian officers, while in captivity, to tour the cities of mainland China. This blatantly propagandistic action of the Chinese Government is in contravention of the Geneva Convention on treatment of prisoners and stands in marked variance to the Indian Government’s generous treatment of Chinese repatriates.
7. Despite the Chinese Government's repeated protestations of friendship between the Chinese and Indian people, it is the Chinese Government who are deliberately preventing the restoration of normal relations between India and China by continuously indulging in poisonous propaganda against India while at the same time refusing to accept the proposals of the Colombo Powers which offer an honourable basis for consolidating the cease-fire and for subsequently direct negotiations by both sides.

8. In the circumstances, the Government of India categorically reject the protest contained in the Chinese Foreign Office note under reference.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 18 May 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Foreign Office note of the 23rd April 1963 in reply to the Indian note of the 29th January, 1963.

The full facts regarding the Chung Hwa School in Kalimpong have already been stated in Government of India's notes dated 23rd May, 26th June, 22nd August, 31st December, 1962 and 29th January, 1963 and do not require any further repetition.

The Chung Hwa School, as is well-known, was established by the overseas Chinese in Kalimpong as early as in 1930 long before the People's Republic of China came into existence. The school has been managed by a Board of Directors, the members being elected from among the local Chinese community.

The Government of India had made it quite clear in several of their notes that interference by the Chinese Consulate General at Calcutta or the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong in the management of the school was unwarranted and that the functioning of the school was entirely a matter for the local Chinese community to decide. To represent their interference and even seizure of property of this school as an exercise of "the universally recognised consular right of protecting one's own nationals" is quite unacceptable and is firmly rejected. In fact, it is the interest displayed by the Chinese Government in the functioning of a school in India run by an executive committee of local residents, that is a violation of normal codes of international conduct. These professions of course have also been firmly rejected by the executive committee of the school composed of Chinese nationals belonging to the Chinese community in Kalimpong. Since the functioning of the school is entirely a matter for the Chinese community to decide themselves in accordance with the local regulations on the subject, it is absurd to suggest that there has been a close collusion between the Indian Government and the "so-called Chiang Kai-shek gang element".
The Government of India reiterate their just stand that the action taken by them in regard to the Chung Hwa school was correct and aimed at the welfare of the overseas Chinese community in Kalimpong. No vituperation by the Chinese Government in this matter can alter these facts.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 May 1963

The repatriation of the second group of internees of Chinese origin and their dependants took place on the 25th May, 1963 according to schedule. In keeping with the agreement arrived at with the Chinese Embassy that members of the families of internees resident elsewhere in India who desire to go to China would be allowed to do so in the same Chinese ships as the internees themselves, the Government of India had ensured that the internees were advised in good time whether their dependants were desirous of proceeding to China or not.

2. On 20th May Mr. Sang Tee Wung was advised by the Commandant of the Internment Camp, Deoli, that three sons of his whom he had declared as dependants had stated that they were unwilling to accompany him to China. Mr. Sang nevertheless proceeded to Madras.

3. At the time of his embarkation, since he was availing of repatriation facilities in the full knowledge that his sons had refused to accompany him, Mr. Sang was requested to make a declaration to that effect, which he refused. The Chinese Embassy officials present interceded on his behalf. While an altercation was in progress, three Chinese Embassy officials, in complete contravention of normal diplomatic practice and decorum, assaulted Indian officials who were with Mr. Sang. The Indian authorities present immediately protested against this unseemly act on the part of Chinese Embassy officials.

4. The local authorities extended maximum co-operation to permit all those willing to go to China to avail of the facilities for repatriation. Mr. Sang also left by the same ship.

The Ministry of External Affairs strongly protests against the action of the Chinese Embassy officials in assaulting the officials of the Government of India who were discharging their normal duties.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 27 May 1963

1. In order to deny its responsibility for conniving at and shielding the activities of Indian ruffians in disrupting the National Day
reception given by the Chinese Embassy in India, the Indian Government in its note went to the length of slandering the Chinese Government as attempting to "twist the facts for its own propagandist end". This practice of the Indian Government of confounding black and white and resorting to false counter charges is regrettable indeed.

2. In its note of 10th October, 1962 the Chinese Government already gave a detailed account of the truth about this serious incident. In the first place the Chinese side had repeatedly drawn in advance the attention of the Indian Government to the attempt to disrupt the National Day reception to be given by the Chinese Embassy. But the Indian Government failed to take prompt measures. Secondly, when the ruffians crowded in front of the Chinese Embassy and engaged in trouble making and disruptive activities, the Indian policemen on the spot simply stood by without taking any action to check them. Thirdly, and what is even more serious, when the Charge d'Affaires of the Chinese Embassy took up the matter on the spot with a high ranking official of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs the latter flagrantly defended the trouble making ruffians alleging that these acts of the ruffians were permitted by India's law that they reflected the sentiment of the Indians, etc. One may ask: are these series of facts yet insufficient to prove that the ruffians' activities of disrupting the National Day reception given by the Chinese Embassy were fully connived at and shielded by the Indian Government? This was moreover no isolated incident but part of the entire anti-China campaign conducted by the Indian Government.

3. In its note the Indian Government also attempted to brush aside the grave consequences of the incident and even claimed that the ruffians' acts were conducted "without any interference with the reception". But the facts furnished by the Chinese Foreign Ministry in its note of 10th October, 1962 including the ruffians' activities of distributing leaflets shouting slogans taking photos and damaging the automobile of a diplomatic envoy, were all undeniable and witnessed by all those present and they could not be distorted or obliterated by the Indian Government.

4. The Chinese Government would like to point out once again the disruptive activities of a handful of ruffians by no means represented the sentiments of the Indian people as alleged by certain high ranking officials of the Indian Government. On the contrary they were merely the Indian reactionaries' acts of antagonism and hatred against China. Many Indian personages who attended the Chinese Embassy's reception despite obstructions and intimidation by the ruffians expressed on the spot their dissatisfaction and indignation at the vicious acts of those reactionaries. It is precisely these fair and just expressions that truly reflected the Indian people's friendship for the Chinese people and their esteem for the great National Day of the Chinese people.

5. The Chinese Government has recapitulated the truth of the matter and reiterated its position and attitude on this serious incident. It will be futile for the Indian Government to resort to any more prevarications and denials and they will merit no further refutation".
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 28 May 1963


This matter has been fully dealt with in Ministry of External Affairs memoranda dated March 12, 1962 and May 14, 1962. The Government of India have nothing further to add.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 29 May 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to their note No. M/138/63, dated the 6th May, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India have always kept the Chinese Embassy informed of the demise of the Chinese nationals in various parts of India. As far as the demise of Messrs. Tchen Wen Chin alias Chey Yun Chong, Cheng Chang Ming, Leong Pin Kwong alias Liang Ping Kuang, Tham Wei Men Chang, Tashi Pencho and Tan Feng Ying is concerned, the Government of India are investigating the details regarding their death which would be furnished to the Chinese Embassy in due course.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity of renewing to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 31 May 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Embassy's note dated May 4, 1963.

The Government of India have satisfied themselves that the persons mentioned in the Chinese Embassy's note under reply had indulged in activities prejudicial to the national security and as such their continued presence in India would be harmful to the interests of the State. The Government of India are fully within their right in requiring persons who do not abide by local laws to leave the country and they reject as baseless the charge contained in the Chinese Embassy's note that this action amounts to persecution of Chinese nationals by the Indian Government.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurance of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 6 June 1963

1. The charges of ruthless persecution of Chinese nationals made by the Chinese Government in its previous notes against the Indian Government are based on iron clad facts which cannot be denied by the Indian Government with any amount of specious arguments. To begin with the Indian Government cannot deny the fact that most of the Chinese nationals it arrested and interned are women, children and the aged and sick. It is well known that the wholesale arrests of Chinese nationals by the Indian Government last year was an act of political persecution of Chinese nationals after it launched a military offensive against the Chinese frontier guards. At that time the Indian Government used the pretext of the "requirements of security and defence" suddenly rounded up and forcibly took away thousands of Chinese nationals irrespective of men and women, the old and the young and not spared even those laid up in hospitals. Now the Indian Government has changed its tone describing the wholesale arrests of women, children and the aged and sick as "facility given at the request of the families concerned on purely humanitarian grounds" and asserted that "they (the Indian Government) are not prepared to repatriate compulsorily those who are unwilling to go to China". People cannot help asking: could these Chinese women, children, old people and even sick people laid up in hospital "endanger the security of India"? Since the Indian Government long ago pretentiously declared the arrest of Chinese to be "endangering" India's security why does not the Indian Government now "repatriate" them but want them to continue to stay in India? What kind of reasoning is it to describe the detention of women, children and the aged and sick and even whole family as the granting of "facilities given at the request of the families concerned"? Such self-contradicting prevarication by the Indian Government only shows that its purpose in arresting and detaining Chinese nationals as well as preventing victimised Chinese to return to China is to realise its political aim to oppose China.

2. The Indian Government's claim in its note that it has "at every stage extended the full co-operation to the Chinese Government" in shipping back victimised Chinese nationals runs diametrically counter to the fact. It is not just now that the Indian Government begins to obstruct victimised Chinese from returning to China. As early as 15th February this year the Indian concentration camp authorities issued an "order" imposing various captions, conditions on the return of victimised Chinese nationals which must be accepted by the latter within the time limit of one day otherwise they would be regarded as unwilling to return to China. On March 29th the Indian authorities instigated bad elements and CHIANG KAI SHEK gang agents in the concentration camp to make provocations where upon large numbers of soldiers and policemen were called in who frantically beat up and persecuted victimised Chinese desiring to return to China. Dozens among the Chinese arrested in that incident were unable to return to China in the first batch of returning Chinese. Even after the Chinese Government announced the release and repatriation of all the captured Indian military personnel the Indian Government has repeatedly violated the agreement reached between the officials of
the two countries on the shipping back of victimised Chinese by the Chinese Government although it could not but hand over two batches of victimised Chinese whose names were already on the lists intended for the first and second batches to return to China alone, more than 260 have been held up by the Indian Government which arbitrarily asserted they had changed their minds and were no longer willing to return to China. Is this not flagrant detention of Chinese nationals? Not satisfied with breaking up the homes and families of over 2,000 peaceful law abiding Chinese who have lived in India for generations and reducing them to misery the Indian Government has set up obstacle after obstacle to prevent them from returning to China. Nevertheless it asserted that they were unwilling to return to China. The Chinese Government wants to ask the Indian Government: Is this the "full co-operation" it rendered to the Chinese Government in bringing back its nationals?

3. The Chinese Government further wishes to point out that the deaths of many victimised Chinese were due to maltreatment and by no means "natural death" and that there were not only 12 of them as alleged in the note of the Indian Government. The Chinese Government reserves its right to make further representations regarding this matter.

4. Furthermore the Chinese Government takes a serious view of the fact that in its note of 6th May the Indian Government out of ulterior motive used the expression that victimised Chinese are "not desirous of returning to mainland China". Everyone knows that "mainland China" is a name used by the U.S. imperialists in their design to create "two Chinas" and hostility to the People's Republic of China. Now it has been openly adopted in an official Indian document. No wonder there have been reports recently that encouraged and brought together by the United States Government "official" of the CHIANG KAI SHEK clique and the Indian Government have made contacts and discussed the question of Chinese nationals (in India). They further prove that it is by no means accidental that the Indian Government has used this name (one group corrupt—-which is?) inimical to the People's Republic of China. The Chinese Government expresses its great indignation at this and hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government.

5. In order to promote China-India reconciliation the Chinese Government has already made a series of major efforts on its own initiative. However the Indian Government is persisting in a rigid attitude continuing to vitiate the relations between the two countries and even now stepping up its persecution of Chinese nationals in India. Proceeding from a desire to safeguard the traditional friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples the Chinese Government urge that the Indian Government: (a) immediately stop all persecution of Chinese nationals, unconditionally release all the victimised Chinese nationals under detention and compensate for all their losses, (b) immediately supply a name list of all the victimised Chinese nationals under detention specifying those Chinese and their dependents who wish to return to China; strictly abide by the agreement reached between the officials of the two countries and refrain from creating difficulties on whatever pretexts for the
victimised Chinese nationals who wish to return to China, (c) clarify its intention in using in its note the expression of "Mainland China" and the reports about contacts made by the Indian Government with "official" of the CHIANG KAI SHEK clique.

The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will give a speedy and unequivocal reply to the above demands.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 7 June 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Foreign Office note dated the 27th May, 1963.

The Government of India had, in their note dated November 7, 1962, given the full detailed facts of the peaceful demonstrations held outside the Chinese Embassy on Chinese National Day, October 1, 1962. As the Embassy is itself aware, elaborate precautions were taken to see that the celebrations of the Embassy were not interfered with. In fact the function was attended by several officials of the Government of India including the Secretary-General, Foreign Secretary and other officials of the Ministry of External Affairs. The Secretary-General even informed the Charge d'Affaires of the Chinese Embassy that it was a matter of regret that such a demonstration took place at all and told the Charge d'Affaires that while local laws would not permit the stopping of such demonstrations, all efforts have been made to see that they were peacefully conducted and no one was physically interfered with.

The Chinese note continues to refer to the damaging of the automobile of a diplomatic envoy when it has been clearly affirmed that no such complaint had been lodged either with the Ministry of External Affairs or with the local police.

The Government of India rejects the absurd charge of the Chinese Embassy that it "connived" at and shielded the demonstrators. The belated revival of this topic after a lapse of over six months can only mean that the main interest of the Chinese Government is to keep alive a needless controversy to serve their own propagandist purposes.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 June 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office note of the 6th June 1963, has the honour to state that in a series of notes the Government of India, although
under no particular obligation, has already set out the salient facts concerning the arrest and internment of some persons of Chinese origin in a situation of grave peril to India. These facts were not, as has been erroneously assumed, submitted to the judgment of the Chinese Government but were given freely in order to enable the Chinese Government to gauge the mischief done by its unprovoked invasion and by its insidious endeavour to subvert the security and independence of India. It was the duty of the Government of India to take all measures in consonance with the security of the State to counter the machinations of a hostile foreign power.

2. Although the Chinese Government has persistently sought to drown the facts in a lot of noise, it is incontrovertible that since 1958 in pursuance of a ruthless policy of aggression, it had started a process of surreptitious aggression and occupation of Indian territory, and as the events of last winter have indisputably shown, had laid elaborate plans by heavy concentration of troops and by construction of a network of roads and supply dumps along India's borders, to launch a massive attack of India. Such preparations were not made in a day. Indeed, long before the 'liberation' of Tibet, some Chinese political journals had been proclaiming the objective of using the 'liberated' territory of Tibet as a base for operations against India. Alongside these military preparations, the Chinese authorities had striven to build up, in the days of Sino-Indian friendship, a network of espionage and agents-provocateurs, using mainly for this purpose, persons of Chinese origin in India. In their infamous article entitled 'More on Nehru's Philosophy', they had brazenly called upon their agents in India to assist their nefarious purpose and betray the country. It is the avowed objective of the Chinese Government to overthrow by war and violence the lawfully constituted Governments of the independent peoples of Asia and Africa. War is as surely its gospel as peace is its bugbear.

3. It is true that the Chinese Government has, from time to time, opportunistically given lip service to peace in order to exploit a universal urge but it has remained a firm and militant adherent of the cult of war. It denounces peaceful co-existence except where military parity requires it to be circumspect.

4. It is ironical that a Government, which daily practises oppression and shows no respect for human rights should pose as a liberal protector and accuse the Government of India of "ruthless persecution of Chinese nationals".

5. As to the Chinese internees in India, a vast majority of these have already been repatriated. It has been the policy of the Government of India to ship back people of Chinese origin who constitute by their covert and overt activities a threat to law and order and to the security of the State. There will be no change in this policy. But the Government of India will not coerce any person of Chinese origin to go back to the People's Republic of China against his or her own will. A fair opportunity will be given to all such persons to reach their own decisions.

6. As to women and children in the camp, they were allowed to join their male relations on their own volition. To have declined their request for permission to join their menfolk in the camp would
The incident in the camp on March 29, 1963, caused, according to the Chinese Government, by “Chiang Kai-shek gang agents”, those responsible were included in the first batch of repatriates. It is for the Chinese Government to determine their particular political affiliation. The Chinese Government apparently gives considerable importance to what it calls the “Chiang Kai-shek clique”. It even trades opportunistically Indian territory with Pakistan. All this is incomprehensible particularly when the Chinese Government ostensibly regards it as impermissible for other States to emulate its own principle, or lack of principle, in such matters.

The Government of India has taken note of the Chinese Government’s political interpretation of the expression ‘Mainland China’. The expression itself is used in common parlance as a geographical term. The Chinese internees in India have customarily used it in that sense. If it has any other connotation, it is unknown and unacceptable to most people. The Government of India must, in this context, reject the Chinese Government’s “strong protest”.

As for the twelve natural deaths, which occurred in the camp, the Government of India has given the facts in its note of May 6, 1963.

In conclusion, it must be stated, though the Chinese Government must be aware of it, that certain persons of Chinese origin to be taken into camp at the time of the Chinese invasion of India because of the following reasons:

(i) to prevent acts of subversion and sabotage;
(ii) to prevent fifth-column activities; and
(iii) to protect enemy agents from the wrath of the people.

If the Chinese Government is earnest in seeking Sino-Indian reconciliation, it can achieve this objective by respecting India’s territorial integrity and sovereignty and stopping hostile, provocative and baseless propaganda.

The Ministry of External Affairs renews to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 10 June 1963

The Chinese Embassy hereby informs the Indian Ministry of External Affairs that the Chinese Government agrees to send ship(s) to India for the third time to bring back the victimized Chinese nationals, interned by the Indian Government, and members of their families. The date of shipping back the Chinese nationals will be after June 15, 1963, as requested by the Indian Government.
For the sake of making arrangement for bringing back the Chinese nationals, the Embassy requests the Indian Government to clarify the following questions:

(1) The numbers of the victimized Chinese nationals brought back by the Chinese Government in the first and second batches were at variance with the numbers originally supplied by the Indian Side. In the first batch brought back there were more than eighty persons less than the original figure, and in the second batch, more than 170 persons less. Moreover, in the third batch which is to be brought back, the Indian Government first informed the Chinese side on May 18, 1963 that about 600 persons will be handed over to it, but, on May 26 the number was reduced to about 500, namely, a difference of one hundred persons. What is the reason for this change?

(2) What after all will be the number of the victimized Chinese nationals who are to be brought back in the third batch? Among them, how many are internees in the concentration camps and how many are members of their families outside the camps? Besides the third batch, how many will still remain interned in the concentration camps?

It must be pointed out that the repeated changes by the Indian side of the numbers in difference batches of the returning victimized Chinese nationals have caused difficulties to the Chinese side in despatching ships to bring back the Chinese nationals. The Chinese Government requests that the Indian Government immediately clarify the above-mentioned questions.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 June 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and with regard to the incident in which the Indian authorities abducted the victimised Chinese SHEN TIEN-FENG and Indian officials insulted Chinese diplomatic officials has the honour to state as follows:

On May 25, 1963 the victimised Chinese national SHEN TIEN-FENG was taken by the Indian authorities under escort from the Deoli concentration camp to Madras port and was handed over together with other victimised Chinese to the Chinese officials in charge of receiving the Chinese nationals. After going through the handing over formalities SHEN TIEN-FENG complained to the Chinese diplomatic officials that he could not find his three sons who used to live in West Bengal whose names were included in the list of the second batch of victimised Chinese to return to China which had been made public by the Indian concentration camp authorities and who according to the notice of the camp should have met him at Madras port for sailing to China on board same ship. He demanded that the Indian authorities should allow his three sons to return to China by the next ship sent by China. However when SHEN TIEN-FENG’s reasonable demand was conveyed to the Indian liaison officials the Indian officials not only categorically refused to give it consideration but intimidated SHEN
TIEN-FENG by saying that there were only two alternatives for him either being sent back to the concentration camp or declare in writing that he was willing to leave his sons in India. This was of course unacceptable to SHEN TIEN-FENG. Thereupon a number of plain-clothed Policemen were sent by the Indian authorities to abduct this 81 year old victimised Chinese by force threatening that he would be thrown back into concentration camp if he did not sign a prepared paper declaring his “unwillingness” to leave his sons in India. As the old man had no knowledge of foreign languages and was anxious to return to China he was compelled to put down his signature under the duress of the Indian authorities. The Chinese diplomatic officials handling the business of receiving Chinese nationals made a verbal protest on the spot with the Indian authorities against their unwarranted abduction of the victimised Chinese and declared that the signature secured against the volition of the person concerned was completely null and void. Surprisingly the Indian officials used insulting and abusive words against the Chinese diplomatic officials in total disregard of the minimum diplomatic courtesy. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this serious incident in which the Indian authorities brazenly abducted and threatened the victimised Chinese and insulted Chinese diplomatic officials.

According to agreement between the Chinese and Indian officials all members of the family of an interned Chinese shall come back to China together with him in the same ship. After gross violation of the agreement the Indian authorities went to the length of abduction and threatened SHEN TIEN-FENG by force and Indian officials openly insulted Chinese diplomatic officials. Such truculent behaviour shows how unscrupulous are the Indian authorities in obstructing the return of victimised Chinese. In order to cover up its unjustifiable action the Indian Government hastened to deliver a memorandum to the Chinese Embassy in India on 26th May falsely charging the Chinese officials with assaulting the Indian officials and pretentiously lodging a so-called “protest”. This clumsy trick only serves to expose all the more the ugly deeds of the Indian authorities. The Chinese Government firmly rejects the “protest” of the Indian Government.

The Indian authorities’ abduction of SHEN TIEN-FENG in their attempt to retain his sons was by no means accidental. It was only one instance of the Indian Government’s endeavour to obstruct the return of victimised Chinese nationals. The Indian Government has loudly claimed that certain victimised Chinese nationals “change their minds at the last minute” and “were unwilling to return to China” and yet it has a guilty conscience and does not permit Chinese diplomatic officials to visit victimised Chinese in the concentration camp. The Indian Government’s deliberate scheme of retaining a number of victimised Chinese is all too evident and can in no way be denied. The Chinese Government firmly opposes this plot of the Indian Government and demands that the Indian Government strictly observes the agreement on the shipping back of Chinese nationals reached between the two sides and ensures that all the interned Chinese nationals together with their families will return to China.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 June 1963

Reference the Chinese Embassy Memorandum dated the 10th June, 1963.

The Government of India has on numerous occasions made clear to the Chinese Embassy the policy followed by the Government of India in the matter of repatriation of persons of Chinese origin, who have been interned for security reasons. The repatriation of internees, their families and their dependents, is entirely governed by their own freely expressed wishes. This accounts for the variation in the numbers in the lists of the different batches of repatriates. As the Chinese Embassy is aware, after the embarkation of the 1st and 2nd batches of repatriates, complete tally sheets had been provided by the Indian authorities to clarify these variations. It is not the intention of the Government of India either to compel them to go to China or to stop them from going.

In regard to the third batch of Chinese internees due for repatriation, the position has been fully explained to the Chinese Embassy. It is now expected that approximately 750 to 800 persons consisting of internees and their families from the camp at Deoli and their dependents elsewhere will be embarking from Madras. A name-list of these persons will be provided to the Chinese side as usual 10 days before the scheduled embarkation date, which will now have to be during the last week of June.

It is hoped that the Chinese Embassy will now urgently confirm the date of the arrival of the Chinese ship at Madras.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 June 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office note dated June 13, 1963 has the honour to state the following:

The facts regarding the case of the repatriate Mr. Sang Tee Wung have been communicated to the Chinese Government in the Government of India memorandum dated May 26, 1963. If the Government of India had wanted to prevent the departure of the repatriate, he would not have been brought to the Madras harbour and then, as alleged in the Chinese note, 'abducted'. On the contrary, the facts show that on Mr. Sang's fulfilling the requirements, he was allowed to sail on the 25th May, 1963 by the same Chinese repatriation ship. Nevertheless if the Chinese Government resorts, as it has done time and again, to a gross distortion of the facts and trumps up mischievous allegations, it is obviously because of the needs of China's anti-India propaganda campaign, which continues unabated.

Mr. Sang Tee Wung's family consists of a wife and five children who are living in Kurseong in W. Bengal State. Mr. Sang was aware before he left the camp that his wife and sons had expressed their
preference to stay on in India and had refused to accompany him to China. After specifically ascertaining the wishes of the three sons, whom Mr. Sang Tee Wung wanted to take along with him, Mr. Sang was informed by the camp authorities on May 20, two days before the departure of the special train from Deoli camp, that they too desired to stay on with their mother and had no wish to go to China. Even though this information was furnished to him, Mr. Sang Tee Wung, of his own free will, had undertaken the journey to Madras en route to China. At Madras port, for the first time, he raised the issue with the Chinese Embassy officials that his three sons had not joined him. He declared untruthfully that he had come to Madras in the expectation that his sons would join him there, although in the written statement made by him to the camp authorities on February 3, 1963, conveying his personal option to go to China, he had stated: “I am unable to speak for my family .......”.

The correct position was immediately conveyed to the Chinese Embassy officials who were told that it would be necessary for Mr. Sang Tee Wung, if he wished to proceed alone, to sign a declaration to that effect. It was further clarified that signing the form would not in any way prevent the sons from leaving by the next ship if they so chose, and that it was not mandatory for Mr. Sang Tee Wung also to leave India by that ship if he preferred to stay on to persuade his children to go along with him by a subsequent ship.

Despite these clarifications, the Chinese Embassy officials objected to Mr. Sang signing the necessary declaration on the plea that this would in some way commit him to leave his children behind. This was not in consonance with the facts. On the contrary, the Chinese Embassy officials had been specifically told by the Indian authorities that Mr. Sang Tee Wung was free to correspond with the children to ascertain their true wishes in the matter.

The Chinese note has purposefully ignored the aforesaid facts, and more particularly the fact that Mr. Sang’s two other sons as well as his wife had from the beginning made it clear that they had no desire to go to China.

As to the allegation that Indian officials had used “insulting and abusive words against Chinese diplomatic officials”, this is wholly untrue. On the contrary, officials of the Chinese Embassy, in contravention of all diplomatic etiquette, made a display of force to obstruct Indian officials from carrying out their duty.

The Chinese Government’s allegation that the Indian Government is deliberately preventing the Chinese internees from going to China is completely baseless and mischievous and deliberately trumped up to bolster up anti-Indian propaganda. The fact that over 1,500 persons of Chinese origin have already been repatriated should give the lie to it.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 29 December 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

The "India News", the bulletin of the Indian Embassy in China, carried in its No. 22 and No. 24 special issues of 1962 three "resolutions" of the so-called "Overseas Chinese Association of India", which openly clamour against the Chinese and declare an alliance with India to fight China. These "resolutions" are contrived by Chiang Kai-shek gang special agents shielded by the Indian Government, who usurped the name of overseas Chinese. For instance, Chang Chi-hua of the Chinese Journal of India, the Mei Kuang High School and others that put their signatures to the so-called "resolution" of December 10, 1959 are either Chiang gang elements or schools under their control in Calcutta, India. Back in 1959 and 1960 the Chinese Embassy in India delivered notes to the Indian Government with regard to the Indian Government's connivance at the organization of activities against the People's Republic of China by Chang Chi-hua and other Chiang gang elements. The Indian Government has been aware of the political standing of these persons. China and India still maintain diplomatic relations, and the Indian Government has repeatedly avowed that it only recognizes the People's Republic of China. However, in order to push through its anti-Chinese policy, the Indian Government flagrantly allows those special agents of Chiang Kai-shek gang, who have been repudiated by the Chinese people, and the organizations under their control to carry out on Indian soil criminal activities against the People's Republic of China. Now the Indian Embassy in China has further unscrupulously published their anti-Chinese resolutions in its official bulletin issued in Peking. This is an action which is in complete disregard of diplomatic code and hostile to the Chinese Government and people. The Chinese Government and people cannot but express their great indignation at it. The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs hereby lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Embassy in China and seriously warns the Indian Embassy in China that recurrence of such incidents absolutely will not be tolerated by the Chinese Government.

It should also be pointed out that the publication of the above-mentioned "resolution" of the special agents of the Chiang Kai-shek gang by the Indian Embassy in China in its bulletin is a serious violation of the promise made by the Indian Government that it will refrain from publishing in its Embassy bulletin any material critical of the Government of the country of residence, which is not official government documents. The above-mentioned "resolutions" of the Chiang gang special agents are not Indian official material, and not even Indian material. On what ground has the Indian Embassy in China published them in its bulletin? Is the bulletin of the Indian Embassy in China propaganda medium of the Chiang gang special agents?

Besides publishing the above mentioned material, the news bulletin of the Indian Embassy in China recently carried a great deal of other material which is not Indian Government documents and which maliciously slanders the Chinese Government, such as the propaganda
material compiled and issued by the Indian Information Service, an article written by Chalapathi Rau, former chief editor of the National Herald, and the false and slanderous stories written by correspon- dents of All India Radio out on China's own initiative. In the meantime, the Indian Government has repeatedly ordered to confis- cate issues of the bulletin "China Today" of the Chinese Embassy in India, which carried official documents of the Chinese Government, and even sent police to intrude into the printing house which handled the printing of the bulletin of the Chinese Embassy, to carry away all the copies of the bulletin stored there by the Embassy, and to intimidate and threaten the printing house so that it no longer dared print the bulletin for the Chinese Embassy.

While violating international practice by unwarrantedly restricting the Chinese Embassy in India in publishing Chinese Government documents in its bulletin, the Indian Government has wilfully pub- lished in the bulletin of the Indian Embassy in China a great amount of unofficial material slandering China. Such peremptory and des-picable practice is absolutely impermissible. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs demands that the Indian Government stop this practice immediately.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consider- ation.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 February 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs note dated the 29th December, 1962.

The Chinese note under reference proceeds on the assumption that Overseas Chinese are incapable of identifying themselves with the countries of their adoption. It is, however, an undeniable fact that the recent unprovoked aggression by China against India has roused the righteous indignation of numerous overseas residents in India including those of Chinese origin. The resolution of the Overseas Chinese Association was only one such expression of the indignation felt by Chinese and other overseas residents in India who have identi- fied themselves with the country of their residence.

The Overseas Chinese Association of India represents a large body of people of Chinese origin who have been living in India for several decades. It is only natural that the premeditated and massive aggres- sion committed by China has caused pain and concern to these people of Chinese origin who are residing in India.
The Chinese Government in their note attempt to condemn all Chinese opposed to their aggressive designs against India as "special agents" and members of the "Chiang Kai-shek Gang". This is indeed strange logic. Is it the contention of the Chinese Government that all overseas Chinese should applaud the aggressive actions of the Government of the People's Republic of China?

The Ministry would once again remind the Government of China that India is a democratic secular Republic where people of different faiths and political persuasions are allowed to express their views freely as long as they function within the framework of law. The Overseas Chinese Association is one of several thousand associations of this type which is allowed to carry on their activities as long as they conform to the law of the land. In allowing these associations to carry on their peaceful activities, the Government of India do not in any way associate themselves with their activities. The Ministry hopes that the Chinese Government will show proper understanding of the political and social pattern of the Indian way of life and not indulge in making reckless, wild and baseless accusations.

The use of undiplomatic language and wild accusations against the Government of India only prove that the Chinese Government find the fact of overseas Chinese condemning Chinese aggression extremely unpalatable. The fact, however, remains that aggression has been committed and that there is a vast overseas Chinese population which has condemned this Chinese aggression in unmistakable terms. The Chinese Government have always been making a great show of sympathy for the overseas Chinese community. This attempt by them to interfere not only in the internal affairs of India but with the freedom of expression of the overseas Chinese community resident in India, only shows the Chinese Government's hostility not only to the people of India but to the overseas Chinese people resident in India.

The Chinese Government have objected to the publication in the "India News" of the resolution passed by the Overseas Chinese Association. The news sheet produced by the Indian Embassy in Peking entitled "Indian News" is a modest effort on the part of the Embassy to give objective news about happenings in India. As the Chinese Government are aware the distribution of this news sheet is very limited and is confined purely to diplomatic and consular Missions in China. On the other hand there are numerous instances of Chinese propaganda organs freely using non-Governmental documents in their attempts to malign India. The Indian Government have even been constrained to prohibit the circulation of some publications maligning India or questioning India's territorial integrity which specifically offended against Indian Laws.

In view of the factual position indicated in the above paragraphs, the Government of India reject the allegation that they violated any international practice by publishing material which embodied the free expression of views held by people in regard to the Chinese aggression against India. They also reject the suggestion that they have acted in a peremptory manner in proscribing certain issues of the "China Today" which had specifically violated Indian laws.
The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 12 March 1963

The Indian note arbitrarily describes the so-called Overseas Chinese Association of India organised by special agents of the CHIANG KAI SHEK gang usurping the name of Overseas Chinese as an organisation representing the Overseas Chinese, and openly argues for the criminal activities of these agents against the People's Republic of China. This shows that, in order to oppose China, the Indian Government does not scruple to collude with agents of the CHIANG KAI SHEK gang. K. C. YAP the "President" of the so-called Overseas Chinese Association of India is a special agent of the CHIANG KAI SHEK gang in Calcutta, India. He was once a member of the Standing Committee of the Kuomintang General Branch in India and attended a spurious meeting on Overseas Chinese affairs in Taiwan; and in February 1960 he went from India to Taiwan to take part in the ceremony celebrating CHIANG KAI SHEK's continued assumption of the bogus President. The Indian Government is fully aware of these facts which can be covered up by no one. In the so-called resolution contrived under the usurped name of Overseas Chinese with the Indian Government's connivance, K. C. YAP shamelessly asks the Indian Government to distinguish between what he termed Communist Chinese and anti-Communist Chinese and frantically raises a hue and cry against the People's Republic of China. The statement of K. C. YAP published on 15th January 1963 by the Indian Information Service, an Indian Government's information organ, went further in flagrantly demanding the overthrow of the Government of the People's Republic of China. The Indian note even went to the length of ascertaining that these people have identifies themselves with the Indian Government. Is it that the Indian Government does not confine itself to aggression on Chinese territory, but wants to go further to conspire with agents of the CHIANG KAI SHEK gang to overthrow the People's Republic of China? As the whole world knows, the Indian Government is wilfully persecuting peaceable and law abiding Chinese nationals en masse, and threw more than 2,000 Chinese nationals into concentration camps so that many of them have fallen ill or even died as a result of maltreatment. On the other hand however the Indian Government is shielding and conniving at this handful of special agents of the CHIANG KAI SHEK gang and protecting their "freedom of expression" to oppose and slander the People's Republic of China. This demonstrates that the "democracy" and "freedom" flaunted in the note of the Indian Government are only meant for conniving at and encouraging the special agents of the CHIANG KAI SHEK gang to conduct anti-Chinese activities.

The Indian note resorted to equivocation with regard to this serious incident in which the Indian Embassy in China published in its news bulletin the above mentioned anti-China resolution adopted by special
agents of the CHIANG KAI SHEK gang. However equivocation can in no way help the Indian Embassy in China shirk its responsibility for this serious incident. This is an act by the Indian Embassy of making propaganda direct on Chinese soil against the People's Republic of China for the special agents of the CHIANG KAI SHEK gang and of turning in actuality an official publication of the Indian Embassy into a propaganda medium for the special agents of the CHIANG KAI SHEK gang who have been repudiated by the Chinese people. This completely exceeds the scope of normal diplomatic activities and has nothing in common with reporting by a publication of a diplomatic mission on the situation of its own country in accordance with international practice.

The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs must once again bring the Indian Government’s attention to the fact that India and China still maintain diplomatic relations. The Indian Government’s shielding of and conniving at the special agent of the CHIANG KAI SHEK gang repudiated by the 600 million Chinese people in their activities against the People’s Republic of China and the publication by the Indian Embassy in China in its bulletin of the anti-China resolution of these special agents can only be regarded as deliberate acts of hostility against the Chinese people and interference in Chinese international affairs. This is absolutely intolerable to the Chinese Government and people and also impermissible according to the codes of international conduct. It is entirely necessary for the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs to lodge the strongest protest in its note of 29th December 1962 against the publication of the above resolution in the bulletin of the Indian Embassy in China. The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs reiterates the serious warning, contained in its previous note, to the Indian Embassy in China that recurrence of such incidents absolutely will not be tolerated by the Chinese Government.

It is futile for the Indian note to try to defend sophistically the Indian Government’s repeated unwarranted confiscations of the bulletins of the Chinese Embassy in India. The bulletins of the Chinese Embassy confiscated by the Indian Government carried only official documents of the Chinese Government concerning the Sino-Indian boundary question and not any non-Governmental documents as alleged in the note. Therefore the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs has turned to ask the Indian Government to stop such peremptory acts which, in violation of international practice, unwarrantedly place restrictions on Chinese Embassy’s bulletin.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 March 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the note of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs dated 12th March, 1963.
2. In their note dated 2nd February, 1963, the Government of India had clearly pointed out that the Overseas Chinese Association was only one amongst the hundreds of similar associations which had condemned the massive Chinese aggression against India. In exercising their right to express freely their views on a subject which concerned every resident of India, the Overseas Chinese Association was acting fully within the framework of the laws of the country which guarantees, amongst others, the right to free speech.

3. However, there is no question of the Indian Government associating themselves with the activities of private bodies such as the Overseas Chinese Association. It is absurd for the Chinese Government to continue to make baseless allegations that the Government of India “connives” at the activities of private associations such as the Overseas Chinese Association, even after the detailed factual background provided in the Indian Government’s note dated 2nd February, 1963. Obviously, the Chinese Government are unable to understand that people of different beliefs can live together freely in a democratic society where full freedom of expression is guaranteed under the laws of the land. The Government of India categorically reject the utterly baseless and absurd allegation made by the Chinese Government that the Government of India are conspiring with any party to overthrow the Government of the People’s Republic of China. The Chinese Government will, however, familiar they may be with such techniques, appreciate that these are alien to the basic philosophy and traditions of the social system prevailing in India.

4. The Government of India have already pointed out to the Chinese Government that wherever there has been any internment of people of Chinese origin, this had been most reluctantly undertaken in the interest of national security as a sequel to the massive aggression which the Chinese Government perpetrated against India. To suggest in this context that the Government of India have “shielded certain sections” is utterly baseless. That the Chinese Government persist in making these baseless charges only shows that the Government of the People’s Republic of China are bent upon carrying on their senseless anti-Indian propaganda and on further prejudicing and vitiating the relations between the people of China and the Indian people.

5. Circulation of the Indian Embassy bulletin has been so restricted by Chinese authorities that at present copies are only distributed to the members of Diplomatic Missions and the Chinese Foreign Office. This is in sharp contrast to the facilities available to the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi to distribute their bulletin on a very wide scale.

6. The allegations made in the Chinese note of March 12th are unjustified, unwarranted and baseless. While rejecting the Chinese Government’s note under reference, the Government of India would like to add that they will decline to take notice of repetitious notes of this kind couched in abusive language contrary to the standard international practices in this matter.
The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 29 March 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and has the honour to state as follows:

After the unwarranted aggression committed by the Chinese Government across Indian territory, they have according to their own admission taken over 3,000 Indian soldiers as prisoners.

In view of the fact that the Chinese Government ratified the Geneva Conventions on 28th December, 1956, these prisoners are entitled to be treated and given facilities in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Conventions. The Government of India had, therefore, approached the International Committee of the Red Cross to ensure that the treatment and facilities accorded to Indian prisoners in China conform to the provisions of the Conventions.

The International Committee of the Red Cross approached the Government of the People's Republic of China through their Consulate General in Geneva on this matter, vide their note verbale addressed to the Chinese Consulate General in Geneva, dated the 28th of December, 1962. They had also requested the Chinese Government to allow their delegate in the Far East, Mr. Andre Durand, to visit the Indian prisoners in China. The Chinese Government stated in reply that as normal contacts continue to exist between the Chinese and the Indian Governments and as the Chinese Red Cross Society is in direct liaison with the Indian Red Cross Society in this matter, there was no need for the representative of the International Committee of the Red Cross to visit China.

The Indian Red Cross Society also approached the Chinese Red Cross Society on the 2nd of December, 1962 requesting that arrangements be made for representatives of the Indian Red Cross Society to visit Indian prisoners in China. A reminder was sent by this organization to the Chinese Red Cross Society on the 11th December, 1962 and again on the 8th of January, 1963. None of these communications have so far been answered.

The Government of India are, in view of the facts stated above, constrained to observe that the Chinese Government seem determined to hold over 3,000 Indian prisoners captured by them as hostages and deny these prisoners the benefits of the Geneva Conventions to which the Chinese Government are a party. This continuing denial by the Chinese Government of facilities to a representative of the I.C.R.C. or of the Indian Red Cross to visit the Indian prisoners would lead the Government of India to suspect that the treatment accorded to the Indian prisoners is not in conformity with the Geneva
Conventions governing the treatment of prisoners of war to which the Chinese Government are a party.

The Government of India hope that the Chinese Government will reconsider their attitude in this matter and at an early date extend facilities either to a representative of the I.C.R.C. or of the Indian Red Cross to visit the Indian prisoners in Chinese custody in conformity with the Geneva Conventions.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 30 April 1963

Reference the Memorandum dated July 3, 1962 from the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, to the Chinese Embassy in India.

1. It was already a special waiver by the Chinese local authorities when they did not inquire into the employment of a Chinese worker by the former Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse on its own, in disregard of their regulations concerning the employment of local Chinese workers by foreign missions in Tibet. Yet the Indian Government repeatedly groundlessly attacked China with the charge that pressure had been exercised on Chinese local employees not to serve the Indian missions. This was completely unjustified. The Chinese Government resolutely rejects this unwarranted charge made by the Indian Government against the Chinese side.

2. The Chinese local authorities did their best to save Mr. N. R. Sharma's life. Chinese doctors rushed to the scene within twenty minutes of notice by the former Indian Trade Agency. But Mr. Sharma died before the doctors had time to diagnose his disorder. The Chinese Government expresses its regret at the fact that the good intentions of the Chinese local authorities should have been repeatedly subjected to the Indian Government's unwarranted attack.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 8 May 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India dated October 30, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

It cannot be denied by the Indian side that Ram Prakash and Narain Gir illegally came deep into a non-pilgrimage area in Tibet, China without valid documents issued by the Chinese side. Nevertheless, the local authorities of China, in the spirit of friendship
between the Chinese and Indian peoples, gave them lenient treatment and friendly assistance. They expressed their gratitude for this and put that down in writing for the Chinese authorities concerned. In its note, the Indian Government went so far as to trump up the story that they were “deliberately mis-guided by the Chinese” and repeatedly made unwarranted charges against China on that score. The Chinese Government can only express regret at these charges and categorically rejects them.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 May 1963

In its Note the Indian Government made slanderous allegations against China on the question of captured Indian military personnel to the effect that the Chinese side has denied “these prisoners the benefit of the Geneva Convention” that “China seem determined to hold over 3,000 Indian prisoners captured by them as hostages” and so on and so forth. The Chinese Government categorically rejects and sternly refutes these baseless charges.

The Chinese side has throughout given all Indian military personnel captured during their attack against the Chinese frontier guards in October and November 1962 a most lenient and amicable treatment which even exceeds the requirements of the Geneva Convention. The well-being of the captured Indian military personnel has been attended to and looked after in the best way possible in the local material conditions. Their religious beliefs and national customs have been properly respected. They have been given every facility to correspond by mail and cable with their families. The sick and wounded among them were given first aid and effective medical care in good time. The lenient and amicable treatment and facilities rendered to the captured Indian military personnel by the Chinese Government out of a sincere desire for Sino-Indian friendship are unprecedented in history. That is why both during their captivity and at the time of their release and repatriation the captured Indian military personnel time and again praised and thanked the Chinese frontier guards and the Chinese Government for the good treatment accorded them.

The Red Cross Society of China has all along maintained normal contacts with the Indian Red Cross Society and has successively provided it with name lists of the captured Indian military personnel and information about them. In order to meet the demands of the Indian Red Cross Society the Red Cross Society of China with the assistance of the Chinese authorities concerned has delivered all parcels and articles sent to the captured Indian military personnel overcoming great difficulties in transportation. It has also done its best to satisfy other demands raised by the Indian Red Cross Society.
Since diplomatic relations are still being maintained between China and India and the Red Cross Society of China has already made direct contacts and cooperated in concrete matters with the Indian Red Cross Society there is of course no need to introduce a third party into the matter. Therefore an unequivocal answer was long given by the Red Cross Society of China and the Chinese authorities concerned to the requests made by the International Committee of the Red Cross. The Red Cross Society of China also answered on 4th April 1963 the relevant requests raised by the Indian Red Cross Society. The Indian Government's conduct of injecting side issues on this question and unreasonable haggling over them only serves to reveal that it harbours ulterior motive.

If the Indian Government were truly concerned about captured Indian military personnel it should have given a speedy response to the Chinese proposal for holding discussions on the return of captured personnel. But facts turn out to be otherwise. Early in its statement of 21st November 1962 the Chinese Government already proposed that the Chinese and Indian Governments appoint officials meet on the border to discuss the return of captured personnel and since then waited with patience for more than 4 months. The Chinese Government assumed that even though the Indian Government did not respond to China's unilateral measures of cease-fire withdrawal and others because of its reluctance to see the relaxation of Sino-Indian relations it would nevertheless give a proper reply to a question involving the repatriation of several thousands of captured Indian military personnel. It was incomprehensible however that the Indian Government should have all along ignored such a friendly proposal on the part of the Chinese Government. Under these circumstances with a view to enabling the captured Indian military personnel to rejoin their families at an early date and further promote a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question the Chinese Government decided on its own initiative to release and repatriate all captured Indian military personnel and has put that decision into practice.

The Indian Government not only showed indifference to the Chinese Government's proposal for holding discussions on the release and repatriation of captured Indian personnel but falsely accused China of being "determined" to hold the captured Indian military personal as "hostages". One cannot help asking if the Chinese authorities were "determined" to hold to captured Indian military personnel as "hostages" why should they have actively proposed discussions on the latter's repatriation when they announced the measures of cease-fire taken on their own initiative? Why should the Chinese Government have decided on its own initiative to release and repatriate the captured Indian military personnel when Indian Government had all along failed to reply to the Chinese proposals? How in these circumstances the Indian Government answer these questions of common sense?

It must be pointed that one of the purposes of the Indian Government in slandering China as holding captured Indian military personnel as "hostages" is to cover up its own crime of crude persecution of Chinese nationals in India. Everyone knows that after its failure in launching armed attack on the Chinese frontier guards
the Indian Government became enraged by shame and intensified its anti-China activities adopted many frenzied measures in violation of the principles of international relations. One of its measures was the sudden arrest of more than 2,000 innocent law abiding Chinese nationals—one of whom many are women, children, old men and invalids. They were thrown into concentration camps and victimised and maltreated. When Chinese Government sent ships to bring back its nationals the Indian Government used all means of obstruction and even attempted to detain indefinitely part of the victimised Chinese nationals desiring to return to China. Owing to obstruction by the Indian Government many victimised Chinese nationals could not bring their families with them when they themselves eventually returned after breaking through the difficulties and thus they are in a tragic state of being separated from their family members.

In a word the varying forms of extremely brutal persecution inflicted by the Indian Government on the numerous law abiding Chinese nationals in India are too many to recount. Such atrocities are absolutely impermissible even when two countries are formally at war. Of course the unwarranted persecution of Chinese nationals in India and the captured Indian military personnel who attacked China are matters of totally different nature. But in fact a most vivid and sharp contrast is formed between the maltreatment suffered by innocent Chinese civilians in India and the good treatment received by the captured Indian military personnel in China. No matter what slanders the Indian Government may make it will be unable to escape just condemnation. Now the release and repatriation of the captured Indian personnel will soon be completed. If the Indian Government should continue to direct slanders and attacks of one kind or another against China on the question of captured Indian military personnel it would only serve to expose further its peremptory and untenable position.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 1 June 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, end with reference to its note dated the 18th May, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

Though the Chinese Government may resort to prevarications and propagandistic statements regarding captured Indian military personnel, nobody can be deceived about the facts of the matter. It is self-evident that it was the Chinese Government who launched a massive and unprovoked attack against Indian territory; that consequent to this aggression over 3900 Indian military personnel were captured by aggressive troops of the Chinese Government; that these personnel were kept in captivity in difficult climatic conditions of Tibet for over six months; and that in spite of the repeated requests made by the Indian Red Cross Society and the International Committee of the Red Cross, the Chinese Government refused an inspection of the conditions of captivity of these captured Indian military
personnel in Tibet by impartial observers from the International Committee of the Red Cross or the Indian Red Cross Society.

The fact that no "state of war" existed in the legal sense of the term and that normal diplomatic contacts continued do not negate the actual state of armed hostility which existed between India and China as a result of the unprovoked aggression by the Chinese troops against Indian territory. The Chinese Government is aware that the provisions of the Geneva Convention apply to such situations even if a state of war does not exist. The Chinese Government expressly violated the provisions of the Geneva Convention when it refused to allow a representative of the International Red Cross to visit the prisoners camp where Indian personnel were kept.

The Chinese Government makes much of its offer of releasing these personnel as early as the 21st November 1962, when it made the so-called declaration of unilateral cease-fire and withdrawal. This so-called cease-fire offer was nothing but a "dictat" sought to be imposed by the force of arms. The Chinese offer of discussing the release of the prisoners was tied up with the so-called three-point proposal of 24th October 1962 and the so-called declaration of unilateral cease-fire both of which sought to consolidate the results of Chinese aggression on Indian territory. The release of Indian prisoners was in fact made conditional on the Government of India's acceptance of the unilateral dictates of the Chinese Government after its wanton aggression against India.

As far as the treatment given to Indian military personnel is concerned, it may be recalled that the Chinese Government not only unsuccessfully attempted to indoctrinate Indian military personnel with a view to subverting them but also used them for highly objectionable and propagandistic purposes. It is well known that 27 officers of the Indian army were detached from their men and paraded in the cities of China before they were returned to India. The Government of China resorted to this barbaric practice reminiscent of the Middle Ages, in violation of international conventions to which it is a party.

It is regrettable that the Chinese Government has again repeated the false and hackneyed allegations about maltreatment of Chinese internees in India. The unprovoked massive Chinese aggression constrained the Government of India to intern a small number of the overseas Chinese residing in the border areas threatened by the Chinese attack. This fact and the satisfactory arrangement in the detention camp which were also verified by a representative of the International Red Cross has already been stated clearly in various notes sent to the Chinese Government. The Government of India does not see any reason to repeat these facts. While the Chinese Government's offer to release Indian prisoners was made conditional on the acceptance by the Government of India of the military dictates of the Government of China, the Indian Government had from the very beginning, expressed its willingness to repatriate those Chinese internees and their dependants who desired to go to China. In the internment camp, internees were given all facilities to lead a normal and comfortable life, and those who opted to go to China
were given necessary transportation facilities to Madras where repatriation in Chinese ships took place. In consonance with the decision of the Government of India two batches of internees have already left India and arrangements are being made to repatriate the third batch of overseas Chinese who want to go back to China, in the middle of June, 1963.

Instead of recognising the lenient treatment given by India to Chinese internees who were interned on security considerations and acknowledging the courtesy shown by the Government of India in allowing the Chinese ships to come to an Indian port to take the internees, the Government of China, in pursuance of its propagandic aims continues to indulge in slanderous allegations against the Government of India. The tone of the Chinese note under reference and the intemperate language used therein seem to be a deliberate attempt at heightening the existing tension between India and China.

It is obvious that the professions of peace and so called desire for a pacific settlement of the border question are just expressions to cover up the ulterior motives of the Chinese Government. The Indian Government has no interest in indulging in any propaganda against the Chinese Government but it is duty bound to expose the negative attitude of the Chinese Government on this whole issue.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 1 June 1963


Full facts about the difficulties experienced by Indian Missions in Tibet with regard to their local employees have been given in the Ministry’s previous notes and there is no need to repeat them. Specific instances where the Chinese authorities had put pressure on local employees not to serve the Indian Missions have also been given in the above notes. Yet the Chinese Government try to justify their unreasonable stand and maintain that it was the Indian Missions in Tibet which had disregarded the local regulations on the employment of local workers. Judging from the stringent regulations governing employment in Tibet the arguments extended by the Chinese Government can convince no one.

The sad demise of Mr. N. R. Sharma at Gyantse due to lack of timely medical help is undoubtedly attributable to the callous indifference of the Chinese local authorities. If the local authorities had any intention to save the life of a dying man, as professed in the Chinese Memorandum under reference, some attempt should have been made to rush a doctor to his side. In this case the facts were otherwise and Mr. Sharma lost his life as the doctor arrived only after a delay of one whole hour.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 1 June 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China No. (63) Pu Lin Erh Tzu No. 11/93, dated the 8th May, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

As stated in the Ministry's previous notes the fact remains that Ram Parkash and Narain Gir were in possession of valid pilgrim passes and they lost these passes and their other possessions due to circumstances beyond their control. Further, the local authorities were fully aware that these two pilgrims crossed into Tibet for the legitimate purpose of pilgrimage in terms of the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 on Trade and Intercourse between India and China. It was due to their being deliberately misguided by the local authorities that they lost their way in Tibet. The fact that they were prevented from contacting the Indian Consular officials in Lhasa and instead taken from place to place and repeatedly interrogated by the local authorities clearly shows that the only interest of the latter was to harass and persecute them on trumped up charges.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of the opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 3 June 1963

"The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has learnt that recently Indian Embassy in China circulated successive issues of "India Calling" which carried slanderous articles against China. The recently circulated April issue of the periodical carried the article "Chinese aggression and international law" written by G. S. Pathak a member of the Indian Parliament and the article "how the hundred flowers bloomed in Peking University" written by Meena Vohra. Confounding black and white the first article repeated the shopworn allegation about Chinese "aggression" against India and slandered China as "the first State which has defied all rules of International law and international behaviour after the Second World War". The second article wilfully distorted and attacked the internal policies of the Chinese Government. The Indian Embassy in China is crudely trampling on the principles of international relations in taking advantage of the courtesies accorded to it by the Chinese Government to circulate on Chinese territory such propaganda material which maligns the Chinese Government and interferes in China's domestic affairs. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs hereby lodges a protest against this.

The Indian Government has time and again stated that foreign diplomatic missions are not permitted to publish and circulate any material critical of the policies of the Government to which they are
accredited except for the official documents of their own Governments and statements by their Government leaders and that this is a matter of diplomatic usage and courtesy. But the Indian side has done quite different. The bulletin “Indian Information” published by the Indian Embassy in China carried not only large amounts of unofficial material which slandered China but even the anti-China resolutions made by Chiang Kai-Shek gang special agents which openly clamoured for the overthrow of the Chinese Government. Following the Chinese Government’s strongest protest on this matter to the Indian Embassy in China, the Indian Government still tried hard to prevaricate and resorted to denials even in its recent note of 15th March in reply to the Chinese note of 12th March. However prevarication and denials are of no avail. That the bulletin of the Indian Embassy carried the anti-China resolutions of Chiang Kai-Shek gang special agents is a fact for all to see and the Indian Embassy in China absolutely cannot absolve itself of its responsibility for the serious case of conducting anti-China propaganda by utilising Chiang Kai-Shek gang special agents. Can the Indian Government assert that the resolution of Chiang Kai-Shek gang special agents is an official document of the Indian Government? Before a satisfactory account for this serious case is made by the Indian Government the Indian Embassy in China now again circulated on Chinese territory issues of “India Calling” which carried anti-China articles which are evidently not official documents of the Indian Government.

The Indian Government while directing its diplomatic mission in Peking to carry out repeated anti-China propaganda has tried every possible means to restrict and sabotage the normal publicity work of the Chinese Embassy in India. The Indian Government repeatedly and unwarrantedly seized bulletins of the Chinese Embassy which carried documents of the Chinese Government and ordered the prohibition of “reprinting translations and extracts” of the bulletins and even forced the printing press to stop printing the bulletins for the Chinese Embassy. Despite the Chinese Government’s repeated protests on this matter in the period between February and April this year the Indian Government again seized three successive issues of above mentioned bulletins published by the Chinese Embassy on 22nd February, 29th March and 6th April respectively. In its reply note to the Chinese Embassy dated 26th March the Indian Government further maligned the bulletins of the Chinese Embassy as violating the so-called laws of the land. Carried in these bulletins of the Chinese Embassy are notes of the Chinese Government, speeches by Chinese Government leaders and information about the good treatment accorded to the captured Indian military personnel in China and their desire for Sino-Indian friendship. This is in full conformity with international practice and unimpeachable even according to the Indian Government’s own arguments and has nothing to do with the question of laws of the host State. What justification has the Indian Government for seizing these bulletins? Is it conceivable that while the Indian Embassy in China may stop at nothing and do whatever it pleases in China the Chinese Embassy in India should be forbidden to publish documents on Sino-Indian relations which explain the position of its own Government? The lenient treatment accorded to the captured Indian military personnel by the Chinese Government demonstrates its sincere desire to seek a peaceful settlement.
of the Sino-Indian boundary question through negotiation. This is an open and above board action. Why cannot the Chinese Embassy publish information about it in its bulletins?

The above mentioned facts clearly expose the true features of the Indian Government which is deliberately hostile towards China. For the purpose of opposing China it may go back on its own words. It talks glibly about International usage and diplomatic courtesy but totally ignores them in practice. What is there left of the principles of international relations? Plainly speaking the Indian Government simply wants to rail at others at will while forbids others to talk reasonably. However the Indian Government is making a miscalculation if it thinks that it can deal with China in a truculent manner. The Chinese Government must solemnly point out that it absolutely will not allow the Indian Government to persist in its wilful actions on the question of publicity work of the Embassies of the two countries. The Indian Embassy in China must immediately stop its anti-China propaganda activities. The Indian Government must immediately stop its unwarranted acts of restricting and sabotaging the normal publicity work of the Chinese Embassy."

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 10 June 1963.


2. It is astonishing that the Chinese Government has equated truth with slander. This is unnatural except when an exposure of truth leads to subjective discomfort.

3. The two articles published in "India Calling" carry the truth and nothing but the truth. It is evident from the tenor of the Chinese Memorandum that there is a strong aversion for truth in China. If so, it is for the Chinese Government to legislate against the publication of true information in China.

4. The laws in India are made known to all. They take their course when there is an infringement. The Chinese Embassy publications and propaganda material have systematically and purposefully infringed against the law. The Chinese Memorandum itself has cited many instances of such wilful infringement. It is surprising that despite numerous actionable misdemeanors of this nature in the past, the Chinese Embassy continues to transgress the law.

5. The Chinese Memorandum refers to what it calls the publication in the Chinese Embassy's bulletin of information relating to "good treatment" accorded to the Indian Prisoners of War. This is a somewhat ingenious way of adding insult to injury. First, an unprovoked surprise attack is unleashed on India, which resulted in the killing, maiming and capturing of many Indian defenders. Then there is sweet talk of "lenient treatment" having been accorded to
the "captured Indian personnel." If by this device the Chinese Gov-
ernment is, as it seems, hastily easing its conscience and making its
victims forget the original crime committed against India, this sub-
terfuge is too obvious to require any detailed exposure.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to
the Embassy of India in China, 29 December 1962.

According to reports from China's Tibet local authorities, when
the former Indian Consul-General in Lhasa A. R. Deo and his staff
withdrew from Lhasa and were passing through Yatung, they seri-
ously damaged property within the premises of the former Indian
Trade Agency in Yatung in the afternoon of December 15, 1962. For
instance, they demolished several motor-cars, broke up a diesel gene-
rator, cut open several dozen barrels of gasoline, diesel oil and
machine grease with hatchets. broke down doors and windows, etc.
On the eve of their withdrawal from Lhasa, the staff of the Indian
Consulate-General there also smashed the glass on the doors and
windows of the Consulate-General building in Lhasa.

It must be pointed out that the above-mentioned acts of the staff
of the Indian Consulate-General not only constituted a breach of the
local public order, but obviously harboured an ulterior motive, that
is, to shift the blame on the Chinese side. The Chinese Govern-
ment sternly condemns these despicable acts of the former Indian
Consulate-General and its staff and reserves the right to look into
this matter further.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the
Embassy of India in China, 2 January 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with
regard to the unwarranted harassment suffered by the former
Chinese Consulates-General in Calcutta and Bombay at the hands
of the Indian authorities in course of winding up their affairs and
withdrawing their staff members, has the honour to state as follows:

After the Indian Government unilaterally tore up the Sino-Indian
agreement on the mutual establishment of Consulates-General, the
Chinese authorities concerned rendered all kinds of assistance and
facilities in the termination of the two Indian Consulates General in
China, making it possible for them smoothly to wind up their affairs
and withdraw their staff members. The two Chinese Consulates
General in India, however, met with unwarranted harassment of
various kinds in their winding up and withdrawing. The follow-
ing are some of the instances.

After repeated procrastination, it was not until 13th December
1962 that is two days before the withdrawal of the Chinese Consu-
late-General in Calcutta, that the Indian authorities issued exit per-
mits to Mr. Tang Hsing-Po, the Consul and his staff members. Fur-
thermore the Indian authorities notified the Consulate-General on
7th December 1962 that Mr. Liu Chang-Ching, a member of the staff of the Consulate-General, would not be permitted to leave India. It was only after repeated representations by the Chinese side that the Indian authorities issued him an exit permit, but they refused to visa his service passport. When Mr. Chen Hsiang-Jen Consul Eleve of the Consulate-General expressed the desire of leaving India either by plane or by boat, the Indian authorities placed unreasonable restrictions on him, permitting him to leave only by plane.

When many overseas Chinese went to the Chinese Consulates General to apply for entry visas to China or do other business immediately before the withdrawal of the Consulates General they were subjected to intensive harassment by the Indian police who registered their names one by one, interrogated them meticulously and even searched their bodies. Tradesmen who went to purchase furniture from the Consulates General were also obstructed by the Indian authorities. In Bombay, permission was delayed and not given by the Indian authorities until 12th December 1962 i.e. three days before the close of the Consulate General, for tradesmen to enter the Consulate General. The two Consulates General also encountered many difficulties in obtaining permits for transporting articles out of the country.

Every movement of the personnel of the Chinese Consulates General was unwarrantedly interfered with by the Indian authorities. Even when they went on official mission to Indian local authorities, Indian armed police followed them into office rooms and sat by them for open surveillance. It must also be pointed out that diplomatic officials sent by the Chinese Embassy in India to Calcutta and Bombay to assist in the termination of the Consulates General were also subjected to unwarranted harassment by the Indian side. First Secretary Yin Shang-Chim was subjected to insulting interrogation by Indian police at the Bombay airport and detained as long as 40 minutes. When Consul Jen Yi-Pei stayed at a hotel in Calcutta the local police authorities placed persons outside his door for surveillance.

The above mentioned unreasonable acts of the Indian authorities crudely violated the acknowledged international practice and disregarded the minimum diplomatic courtesy. They not only created great difficulties for the Chinese Consulates General in winding up their affairs and withdrawing their staff, but impeded the normal functioning of diplomatic officials of the Chinese Embassy or even infringed upon their personal freedom. Regarding them the Chinese Government hereby expresses its deep regret and lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24 January 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs note handed over to
the Indian Embassy in Peking on 2nd January, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

2. The Ministry of External Affairs has, in its note of 15th December, 1962, clearly pointed out that facilities for the departure of the personnel of the two Chinese Consulates General at Bombay and Calcutta have been fully accorded. All local Indian authorities had cooperated to the maximum extent to enable the smooth winding up of the Chinese Consulates General. The Government of India reject the charge that “unwarranted harassment of various kinds” had been placed on them.

3. The Government of India have repeatedly pointed out that whatever measures had been taken on account of the unprovoked aggression against India to protect Chinese officials in this country were entirely in the interests of the Chinese Embassy and the Chinese Consulates General. To call these measures “unwarranted harassment” or as “unreasonable restrictions” is entirely unacceptable to the Government of India.

4. With regard to the issue of exit permits, it may be pointed out that this measure is in strict reciprocity with the prevailing practice in China.

5. The Government of India reject the charge made in the Chinese note that Indian police have harassed the overseas Chinese community who went to the Chinese Consulates General to transact business. On the contrary, the Indian police have always adopted a most cooperative attitude in keeping with the Indian laws. It is regretted that the Chinese Government, far from appreciating the measures which were adopted in the interests of the Consulates General themselves, have levelled irresponsible charges. The fact of the matter is that full facilities had been accorded to the Chinese Consulates General to enable them to keep to the schedule of departure and to dispose or re-export the property of the Consulates General and of its members.

6. The Government of India reject the allegation made in the note that they have violated acknowledged international practice or have disregarded any diplomatic courtesy. A reference to the past correspondence on the subject would show that it is the Chinese Government that have done this. In their notes dated 4th November 1962 and 28th December 1962, the Government of India have clearly pointed out how the local Chinese authorities at Lhasa had wilfully harassed the staff of the Indian Consulate General at Lhasa. Local Chinese authorities had, in every manner possible, restricted the freedom of movement of the staff of the Indian Consulate General in Lhasa. These restrictions had been stepped up gradually and intensified after 20th October 1962, when massive Chinese forces launched an invasion on Indian territory. After virtually denying the staff of the Indian Consulate General any contact outside the office premises and confining them to their houses, even telegraphic contact with the outside world was completely cut off between 9th and 25th October 1962. The contract for affording transport facilities to Indian diplomatic couriers was not honoured,
the telephone lines of the Consulate General were cut and supply of such essential commodities as milk, eggs and firewood were stopped. Just before the winding up of the Indian Consulate General at Lhasa, the Tibetan local employees of the Consulate General were also instigated by the local authorities to resort to strikes and demonstrations.

7. In respect of the Indian Consulate General at Shanghai also, it might be mentioned that during the last fortnight prior to closure, no visitor was allowed to enter the premises of the Consulate General except foreign nationals. Even some of the Indians were refused entry to the premises by the Chinese police.

8. It is evident from all this that it is the Chinese Government who have always adopted restrictive measures and curbs in a manner calculated to cause the maximum harassment to the Indian officials of the Consulates General.

9. It is a matter of deep regret that in spite of the fullest cooperation extended by the Government of India to enable the smooth winding up of the two Chinese Consulates General, the Chinese Government have not appreciated the arrangements made.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 February 1963


When the former Indian Consul General at Lhasa, Shri A. R. Deo and his staff visited the former Indian Trade Agency at Yatung on the 15th December, 1962, with the permission of the local authorities, they found that the premises and all the buildings had been forced open, glass panes on the doors and windows broken and all valuable properties in the buildings removed. Even on the day previous to the departure of the Indian Consul General and staff from Lhasa, some unknown persons stoned the house of one of the staff members and broke several panes of the doors and windows. This was done deliberately and, doubtless, the miscreants had done it with the connivance of the local authorities.

Before the closing down of the Indian Consulate General at Lhasa when the Consul General had received information about the damage done to the building at Yatung, he had taken up the matter with the local authorities who had denied any knowledge of this. The Vice Director of the Foreign Bureau himself had told the former Indian Consul General that the local authorities were neither responsible for the safety of the property left at Yatung nor were
they interested in what happened. The Chinese Government have now endeavoured to represent the damages to the property of the Government of India at Lhasa and Yatung as having been done by the former Consul General and his party. This is not likely to deceive any body. The local authorities at Lhasa and Yatung are held solely responsible for the unwarranted vandalism on the buildings of the Government of India.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 11 March 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated January 1, 1963, has the honour to state the following:

The Indian Government's unilateral tearing up of the Sino-Indian agreement on the mutual establishment of Consulates General in disregard of international good faith was a major diplomatic measure taken by the Indian Government against China after it was frustrated in its massive military attacks along the Sino-Indian border. In its note of December 3, 1962 the Indian Government gave no reason whatsoever for taking this unilateral action. It was only after the Chinese Government had lodged a strong protest and exposed the Indian Government's motives that India argued in its subsequent note that it had adopted this anti-China measure because the two Indian Consulates General in China allegedly had been subjected to restrictions. This allegation is completely devoid of factual basis, and the making of this groundless pretext is an additional proof that this unilateral action by India is completely unjustified.

It is clear that India has torn up the agreement on the establishment of Consulates-General for no other purpose than to meet the political requirements of its anti-China and hate-China campaign. China has consistently given the Indian official missions in China normal treatment, and it is futile for the Indian Government to try to find any fault in this respect which could serve as a pretext for its anti-China moves. The Indian charges of alleged restrictions and harassment against the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa were either serious distortions of the facts or out-and-out fabrications, which were all resolutely refuted by China long ago. The allegation that the Indian Consulate-General in Shanghai was subject to restrictions is even more nonsensical. Before withdrawing, responsible official of the said Consulate-General even thanked the local department in charge of foreign affairs for the assistance he had received during his term of service.

What is absolutely true and unmistakable are the truculent and unwarranted restrictions from which the Chinese official missions in India have suffered. Take the two Chinese Consulates-General in Calcutta and Bombay alone. The various restrictions contrary to international practice imposed by the Indian authorities on the Chinese Consulates-General were aimed at making it impossible for
them to continue their existence. The Chinese Government has cited relevant iron-clad facts and lodged repeated protests with the Indian Government. In its note, the Indian Government again tried to deny the facts as was its custom by confounding right and wrong and slandering China, and even described all its outrageous actions of obstructing the normal functioning of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General and infringing on the personal freedom of their staff members as normal “adequate security measures”. It can be seen to what lengths the Indian Government has gone in obstinately persisting in its contempt of the norms of international relations.

The Indian Government not only denied its tearing up of the agreement on the establishment of Consulates-General between the two countries, it even pretended in its note that it did not know the existence of “any agreement” between the two countries. The Chinese Government must remind the Indian Government that the agreement between the Governments of China and India on the mutual establishment of Consulates-General in Calcutta and Shanghai was reached in 1950, and that, two years later, the two parties further agreed on the mutual establishment of Consulates-General in Bombay and Lhasa. Only a dozen years have passed since then; can it be that the Indian Government is so forgetful? The only possible explanation is that in the eyes of the Indian Government, those international agreements which do not suit its needs are simply nonexistent. If this is not perfidy, then what is it?

There exists a profound traditional friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples; the Chinese Government and people well understand the situation of the Indian people and have never regarded the anti-China measures taken by the Indian Government and the anti-China clamours made by a handful of persons as expressions of the will of the Indian people. It is the Indian Government alone which should be held responsible for the above-mentioned unilateral action and other anti-China measures; the Indian Government can never absolve itself of the guilt of damaging Sino-Indian relations and the interests of the people of both countries.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 11 March 1963

The Chinese Government has received the memorandum of the Ministry of External Affairs of India dated February 8, 1963 to the Chinese Embassy in India.

It is an indisputable fact that while withdrawing from Lhasa, the former Indian Consul-General in Lhasa and others inflicted damage on India’s buildings and property in Yatung and other places. On the night before their departure from Lhasa, the Indian officials gathered in the Consulate-General and indulged in drinking. Some of them, fully drunk, broke the glass of the doors and windows of the Consulate-General with frying-pans and sticks. On December 15, when they stopped at Yatung on their way back to India, the Indian officials did more damage. They destroyed with axes, steel rods and
other things the auto-vehicles, electric-generators and scores of drums of gasoline and diesel oil kept in the courtyard of the then Indian Trade Agency, glass panes of the doors and windows, etc. All these are hard facts that cannot be denied, and the eye-witnesses and evidence are all there. No quibbling denials made by the Indian Government in order to help them shirk the responsibility will be of avail. The attempt made in the Indian memorandum to describe what they had done as something perpetrated "with the connivance of the Chinese local authorities" is sheer fabrication. If the said damage had not been done by the Indian officials themselves, and if the allegation made in the Indian memorandum that the former Indian Consul-General found glass panes of the doors and windows of the former Indian Trade Agency in Yatung broken and all valuable property there removed when he arrived there were true, certainly he would not have failed to take up the matter with the Chinese local authorities; and he should have taken up the matter with the Chinese local authorities so as to ascertain what had really happened and find out who must be held responsible. But he did not dare to do so. And the Indian Government remained silent about this matter. This is ample proof that the Indian side had a guilty conscience. It was only after the Chinese Government delivered to the Indian Embassy in China a memorandum explaining the truth of the matter that the Indian Government unscrupulously made the false counter-charge against the Chinese local authorities. This unseemly action can deceive no one. The Chinese Government firmly rejects the Indian Government's preposterous claim that the Chinese local authorities in Lhasa and Yatung should be held responsible for the damage done by the Indian officials to the property under their care, and reiterates that it reserves the right to take further action in this case.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 11 March 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, dated December 28, 1962, to the Chinese Embassy in India, has the honour to state the following:

The unwarranted and fabricated charge made by the Indian Government in its memorandum to the Chinese Embassy in India dated November 4, 1962 that the former Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa had been subjected to harassment was rationally refuted by the Chinese Government in its memorandum to the Indian Embassy in China, dated November 17, 1962. After that, the Indian Government repeated in its note of December 28, 1962 the hackneyed words contained in the above-mentioned memorandum. This is nothing but an unwarranted and mischievous act with a view to further worsening the relations between the two countries. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the groundless charge of the Indian Government.

On the other hand, as the Chinese Government pointed out in its previous notes to the Indian Government, it was precisely the Indian authorities that imposed various sorts of obstruction and unwarranted
restrictions on the normal activities of the two Chinese Consulates-General in India and crudely encroached upon the personal freedom of their personnel, thus making it impossible for the Chinese Consulates-General to carry on their normal functions; and finally went to the length of unilaterally tearing up the agreement on mutual establishment of Consulates-General between China and India. The Indian Government has so far made no proper explanation of these actions which openly trample under foot international law and practice; instead, it has repeatedly lodged unwarranted charges against what it calls harassment against the former Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa by China and haggled endlessly over the matter. That is completely unjustified. The Chinese Government resolutely opposes such patent trouble-making actions of the Indian Government and hopes that the Indian Government will desist from making fabrications and creating troubles to further worsen the relations between the two countries.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 March 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's notes both dated 11th March 1963.

Due to onerous restrictions placed by the Chinese authorities on the effective functioning of the Indian Consulates General, particularly the Consulate General at Lhasa, the Government of India were forced to withdraw them as no useful purpose was served by maintaining these Consular Missions when they were denied the normal facilities for carrying on their normal functions. Having come to this decision, the Government of India requested the Chinese Government to take similar steps to withdraw the Chinese Consular Missions in Bombay and Calcutta. This was fully in accordance with international law and practice. The Government of India regret that the Chinese Government should ignore these patent facts and continue to make wild and baseless allegation of "unilateral action" by the Indian Government.

It has already been pointed out in the Indian Government's notes dated 1st and 24th January 1963 that there has never been any "agreement on mutual establishment of Consulates General between China and India". The Indian and Chinese Consular Missions had been functioning in Shanghai and Calcutta respectively even before the Government of the People's Republic of China came into power. As for the Chinese Consulate General in Bombay, the Government of India had agreed in 1952 to its being established on an ad hoc basis at the time of the re-designation of the Indian Mission in Lhasa as a Consulate General. It will be clear from this that no agreement as such had been concluded between the two Governments in regard to the establishment of their Consular Missions. However, the Chinese Government have unscrupulously invented non-existing agreements and have built up a completely unacceptable set of arguments on this false premise. The Government of India emphatically
repudiate the allegation in the Chinese note that they have in any way violated any international agreement by the closure of the Consulate General.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 1 April 1963


The Government of India in their Memorandum of 8th February, 1963 had already given full facts regarding the vandalism on the buildings of the former Indian Trade Agency at Yatung caused by unauthorised persons with the connivance of the local authorities. There is no need to reiterate the same.

Even in July 1962, it had come to the notice of the former Indian Consul General at Lhasa that the former Trade Agency buildings at Yatung had been forced open, glass panes on the doors and windows broken and all the valuable properties removed. Soon after this was reported by the Consul General to the local authorities, the Vice-Director, Mr. Hang, of the Lhasa Foreign Bureau told him that the local authorities were neither responsible for the safety of the property left at Yatung nor were they interested in what happened. In the face of this, it is very strange that the Chinese Government are now trying to shield the actions of the local miscreants carried on with the connivance of the local authorities. The "guilty conscience" referred to in the Chinese Government's note therefore appropriately applies to the Chinese side and not to the Indian side. In order to shake off their responsibilities the Chinese Government have now attempted to slander the officials of the former Indian Consulate General at Lhasa with the sole idea of deceiving others. The Indian Government therefore categorically rejects the Chinese Government's slanderous allegations and continue to hold the Chinese Government solely responsible for the damage done to the properties of the Government of India at Lhasa and Yatung.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 30 April 1963


1. In its memorandum of October 8, 1962, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China already stated that when the Chinese Government agreed to the former Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa taking charge of the buildings of the former Indian
Trade Agency at Yatung, it expressed clearly that it could not agree to the Indian Government keeping a small staff to look after the buildings as a resting place for Indian officials and couriers traveling to and from Lhasa, as that would be tantamount to establishing another official mission in China. But when India withdrew its Trade Agency from Yatung, it unilaterally kept in the buildings quite a number of Chinese and foreign personnel of its former Trade Agency at Yatung. While unable to produce any tenable justification for this illegal action, the Indian Government in its memorandum alleged that the Chinese Government “deny permission to use the buildings”. That is obviously utterly unreasonable. As is well known, it is one thing to use a building, and another to set up a mission in a disguised form on the pretext of keeping personnel to look after the buildings. The Indian Government’s attempt to mix up the two things is futile. It is totally against regular international procedure and practice for the Indian Government to insist that the Chinese Government grant it the right to establish a mission in a disguised form where it has a building. The Chinese Government categorically rejects this unjustifiable demand of the Indian Government.

In June 1962, when India asked China to permit the Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa to take charge of the buildings of the former Indian Trade Agency at Yatung, China gave its consent promptly. The Indian Government has never entrusted the Chinese Government with the care of the buildings of the former Indian Trade Agency at Yatung. The Chinese Government of course has no responsibility for the upkeep of the buildings and property in question. It must also be pointed out that the former Indian Consul-General in Lhasa and his party deliberately did serious damage to the buildings and property of the former Indian Trade Agency at Yatung during their stopover there on December 15, 1962, on their way back to India after their withdrawal from Lhasa. This has already been condemned by the Chinese Government in its memorandum to the Indian Embassy in China on December 29, 1962. In these circumstances the Indian Government’s claim that the Chinese Government should be held responsible for the damage done to the buildings of the former Indian Trade Agency at Yatung is not only groundless but made with ulterior motives. The Chinese Government firmly rejects this provocative claim of the Indian Government, and once again condemns the barbarous destructive activity of the former Indian Consulate General in Lhasa and his party.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 1 June 1963


The Ministry of External Affairs had made clear in its Memorandum dated the 31st October, 1962, that, in accordance with the conditions laid down by the Chinese Government, the Indian Government would not retain any Indian nationals to look after the buildings and property of the former Indian Trade Agency at Yatung,
and would keep instead only five Chinese (Tibetan) nationals, who were ex-employees of the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung. However, the local authorities in Tibet not only denied permission to Indian Government officials to use the buildings while on official journeys but also prevented the local employees of the Government of India from taking proper care of the buildings by denying them permission to stay on the premises, the Government of India cannot see what justification the Chinese Government can have for this unreasonable, and arbitrary attitude adopted by them in contravention of all norms of international custom and practice.

At no time had the Indian Government insisted on any right to establish "a mission in a disguised form" in the Trade Agency building at Yatung as baselessly alleged in the Chinese Memorandum. All that the Government of India desired was that their buildings and property at Yatung should be properly protected. It is surprising that the Chinese Government have deliberately chosen to describe the employment of a few local Tibetan ex-employees of the former Trade Agency, with the prior knowledge and approval of the Chinese Government, as "illegal" maintenance of staff whose function it was to act as "a mission in a disguised form"! The truth of the matter is crystal clear and it is futile for the Chinese Government to extend unreasonable arguments to substantiate their characteristic intransigent attitude.

The Ministry of External Affairs in its Memoranda dated the 8th February, 1963 and 1st April, 1963, has already given indisputable facts regarding the vandalism perpetrated on the buildings of the former Indian Trade Agency at Yatung by unknown persons acting with the conviniance of the local authorities. The Government of India reiterate that they hold the Chinese Government wholly responsible for the destruction caused to the Government of India's properties at Yatung and reserve the right to claim full compensation for the same.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 25 March 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

On March 10, 1963, the Tibetan rebel clique, which is sheltered and backed by the Indian Government, made public a so-called Tibetan constitution, presumptuously declaring that China's territory of Tibet is a "unitary state", and issued a traitorous statement in the name of the Dalai Lama, once again openly inciting riots in Tibet, China. These were done in New Delhi, the capital of India, and the spokesman of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs has declared them to be an "exercise." The whole thing constitutes a more flagrant interference in China's internal affairs by the Indian Government using Tibetan rebel bandits as its tool, and a serious provocation against the Chinese Government and people. Against this, the Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government.
Over these years, the Indian Government has been using the fugitive Tibetan rebel bandits in India to carry out subversive and disruptive activities against Tibet, China. The Chinese Government has lodged many protests regarding this and seriously advised the Indian Government to stop interfering in China's internal affairs and curb the Tibetan rebel bandits. But the Indian Government, while repeatedly and hypocritically denying the facts by claiming that it does not permit the Tibetan rebel bandits to carry out political activities in India and that the Tibetan rebel bandits enjoy "rights which flow from established democratic traditions of India", has actually continued to instigate the subversive activities of the Tibetan rebel bandits. It is in these circumstances that the Tibetan rebel clique has redoubled its efforts to clamour for inciting rebellion, organize political demonstrations and meetings in India and harass the Chinese frontiers by armed incursions, and has even brazenly emerged in the capacity of an "emigre government". The recent publication of the so-called statement and "Tibetan constitution" by the Tibetan rebel bandits is obviously another burlesque of "independence of Tibet" directed by the Indian Government, as well as an iron-clad proof of the Indian Government's perfidy.

Numerous facts have demonstrated that the Indian Government has never been reconciled to China's exercise of sovereignty in China's own territory Tibet. For instance, when the Indian Government launched massive military attacks along the Sino-Indian border in 1962, the Indian political circles, including the General Secretary of the ruling Congress Party, clamoured for the invasion and occupation of Tibet, China. The Indian President, Vice-President and Prime Minister summoned Dalai to New Delhi for consultation. The Indian Government's intensified use of the Tibet rebel bandits for subversive activities further reveals its expansionist greed for China's territory Tibet. The Chinese Government hereby serves the Indian Government a stern warning: Interference in China's internal affairs is absolutely impermissible. India's expansionist dream, like the dream of the fugitive Tibetan serf-owners for a come-back, is doomed to be shattered. The Chinese Government once again urges the Indian Government to fulfil its past promise, observe the minimum principles guiding international relations and immediately stop all interference in China's internal affairs.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 April 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Government's note dated 25th March, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India have repeatedly made clear to the Chinese Government that there is absolutely no question of the Government of India giving support to any subversive political activities
whatsoever by Tibetans, who have left their homes and come as refugees to this country. Inspite of this, the Chinese Government have continued to make slanderous and unfounded allegations against the Indian Government, and have now again accused the Indian Government of having supported political activity by Tibetans in India. The Government of India firmly repudiate these utterly untenable and false allegations.

Basing itself upon a News despatch of a foreign press agency, the Chinese Government have slanderously alleged that the Spokesman of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs has declared the publication of a draft Constitution of Tibet as an "exercise". This is in keeping with the Chinese Government's practice of mischievously quoting statements out-of-context and even fabricating statements never made, so as to suit their own purposes. No press conference was held by the Spokesman of the Ministry about the Dalai Lama's proclamation of a new Constitution.

If there are any disturbances in Tibet, these are matters for the Chinese Government to deal with. It is absurd for the Government of China to blame the Government of India for any internal difficulties and to make the mischievous suggestion of the existence of an "Emigre Government" in this country. Even the Foreign Press Report referred to in the Chinese note makes it clear that there is no change in Government of India's policy on this matter as will be seen from the following:

"Indian official spokesman dismissed as "imagination and fabrication" Wednesday Chinese Communist allegation India fostering emigre Tibetan Government. 'There is no such Government and India has not changed her policy of not recognising any such Government', said spokesman for Ministry of External Affairs. He was commenting on Peking People's Daily editorial monitored in Tokyo."

The Government of India's policy in regard to India's relations with Tibet has been given in the Prime Minister of India's statement in Parliament as early as on April 27, 1959 where the Prime Minister stated that the three main governing factors were:

"(1) the preservation of the security and integrity of India;
(2) our desire to maintain friendly relations with China; and
(3) our deep sympathy for the people of Tibet. That policy we shall continue to follow because we think that it is a correct policy not only for the present but even more so for the future. It would be a tragedy if the two great countries of Asia, India and China, which have been peaceful neighbours for ages past, should develop feelings of hostility against each other.

We for our part will follow this policy, but we hope that China also will do likewise and that nothing will be said or done which endangers the friendly relations of the two countries which are so important from the wider point of view of the peace of Asia and the world. The
Five Principles have laid-down, inter alia, mutual respect for each other. Such mutual respect is gravely impaired if unfounded charges are made and the language of cold war used.

In regard to Tibetan refugees who had come to India, the Prime Minister then stated, "...we have also some Tibetan emigres in India. All of these deeply respect the Dalai Lama. Some of these have been exceedingly unhappy at developments in Tibet. No doubt they have anti-Chinese sentiments. We have made it clear to them that they will not be permitted to carry on any subversive activities in India and I should like to say that by and large they have acted in accordance with the directions of the Government of India". This straight-forward and upright policy of the Government of India was spelt out once again in the statement of the Foreign Secretary to the Chinese Ambassador made on 23rd May, 1959, in reply to a statement by the Chinese Ambassador of 16th May, 1959, which had contained unwarranted attacks against the Government of India.

In the context of the above facts there can be no question of the Government of India having supported any form of political activity directed against the People's Republic of China by the Tibetan population in India. The baseless and slanderous charges of "expansionism" on the part of India are merely a Chinese pretext to carry on venomous anti-Indian propaganda for creating anti-Indian feelings and fomenting war hysteria among the people of the neighbouring region of Tibet, with whom India has had a long-standing tradition of friendship and cultural affinity. The events since September, 1962 show that far from India entertaining "expansionist dreams", it is China that has by her massive attacks and unwarranted aggression on Indian territory demonstrated her expansionist aims and inimical intentions against a friendly and peaceful neighbour who had done so much to assist and support her in various ways.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances its highest consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 19 April 1963

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, and has the honour to state the following:

On February 20 this year the Chinese Embassy verbally drew the attention of the Ministry of External Affairs to the screening in Bombay of a U.S. anti-Chinese film "Satan Never Sleeps", and demanded that the screening of the film be immediately stopped. Now the film has again been shown in Delhi. In disregard of the proper demand of the Embassy, the Indian authorities should have continued to allow the screening in India of this U.S. film which insults the Chinese people, slanders and attacks the People's Republic of China. This is another unfriendly act towards the People's Republic of China.
The Embassy lodges a protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs against this, and once again demands that the Indian authorities take immediate measures to put an end to the screening of the said film.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 25 May 1963


In its Memorandum, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs once again slandered the Chinese press for its reporting of Prime Minister Nehru's speech at the Belgrade Conference of Non-Aligned countries. As repeatedly pointed out by the Chinese Government, the Chinese press has always abided by the principle of true, objective and accurate reporting, and it was in accordance with this principle that the Chinese press accurately reported the Indian Prime Minister's speech at the Conference of Non-Aligned countries. Similarly, the Chinese newspaper have the full right to make the appropriate comments. No one has any right to interfere with this freedom of the press. But in its note and memoranda, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs persistently repeated its unwarranted charges against the Chinese press. As a matter of fact, the Chinese Hsinhua News Agency and the paper concerned have long protested against and sternly refuted such slanders. The Memorandum of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, not daring to say one word in regard to the reply of the Hsinhua News Agency, only emptily talked of so called "deliberate and wilful misreporting in the Chinese press of statements and speeches made by responsible Ministers of the Indian Government". This is indeed a "deliberate and wilful" crude interference in China's freedom of the press. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government, which keeps on flaunting its protection of the "freedom" of the Indian press, will learn to respect the freedom of the press of other countries.

2. It is clear that the crux of the matter in this debate solely provoked by the Indian side does not at all lie in the fact that the Chinese press reported the speech made by Prime Minister Nehru, but that that speech of the Indian Prime Minister in truth did not conform to the political realities of present-day Asia and Africa. That is to say, that speech ran counter to the common desire of the people of Asia and Africa to oppose imperialism and old and new colonialism, to win national liberation and to uphold national independence. The responsibility for the reactions which such a speech evokes rests upon the speaker himself, and the Chinese news agency and newspapers which faithfully reported the speech cannot be blamed. The repetition of unwarranted charges against the Chinese press in the Memorandum of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs only accentuated the unseemliness of such actions. The Indian
Government is advised to stop this debate which can bring no good but only harm to the Indian side.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 31 May 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the note from the Chinese Embassy dated April 19, 1963.

The film "Satan Never Sleeps" was approved for commercial display by the Central Board of Film Censors, an autonomous body. The film is an American production made outside India and based on a fictitious story with a Chinese background, concerning a period before the People's Government of China was established. It does not purport to show actual events, nor does it in any way seek to insult the Chinese people. The Government of India cannot accept the argument that the screening of this film by private commercial agencies is in any way an unfriendly act on the part of the Government of India towards the People's Republic of China.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 1 June 1963

The memorandum of the Chinese Government of 25th May, 1963 illustrates the persistence with which the Chinese Government are continuing their set policy of presenting a distorted and tendentious view of the Indian Prime Minister's statements at the Belgrade Conference of non-aligned countries.

The memorandum in blatant violation of all rules of international behaviour, goes on to state that the India Prime Minister's speeches "did not conform to the political realities of present-day Asia and Africa". The Government of China, it is hoped, will appreciate that the Government of India is quite competent to form its own assessment of the political realities of the present day and does not require any commendation from the Chinese Government on India's close and friendly relations with Afro-Asian countries. It is the Chinese Government that has, by its aggressive and expansionist policies and unprovoked aggression against a peaceful and friendly neighbour and by its arrogant rejection of proposals made by six friendly and non-aligned countries of Asia and Africa in Colombo, exposed its contempt for the desire of Afro-Asian countries to preserve peace and unity in these regions.
APPENDICES

Letter from the Prime Minister of Ceylon, to the Prime Minister of India, 15 December 1962

Your Excellency,

I have the honour to convey to Your Excellency the text of proposals that were agreed upon by the Conference of six Afro-Asian non-aligned countries which met in Colombo from the 10th to the 12th of December, 1962. At the request of the Conference, I am submitting these proposals for your consideration. They represent the unanimous conclusions of the six countries that participated. As you are aware, the purpose of our Conference was to find a means by which India and the People's Republic of China could be brought together with a view to consolidating the cease-fire and negotiating a settlement of their border dispute.

It was the unanimous opinion of the countries which participated that these proposals provide such a basis and we earnestly hope that they will deserve your careful consideration, and subsequently win your approval and acceptance. The Conference decided that I should visit India and China personally to convey these decisions and discuss them with the Prime Ministers of the two countries. However, as it is not possible for me to leave Ceylon immediately I am transmitting the text of these proposals through His Excellency Mr. G. S. Peiris, Ceylon Ambassador to Burma, who was a member of Ceylon's delegation to the Conference.

Therefore, in accordance with the wish of the Conference, I shall be grateful if you will give me an opportunity to visit your country personally at an early date to discuss these proposals with you. In this connection I wish to inform you that His Excellency Mr. Aly Sabry, Chairman of the Executive Council of the UAR has expressed his willingness to be present at these discussions. May I take this opportunity of acknowledging your letter of November 27 which actually reached me on the 7th of December as it was not delivered to me by Shrimati Menon, when she was in Colombo, due to an oversight.

(Sd.) SIRIMAVO BANDARANAIKE,
Prime Minister of Ceylon.

Enclosure to letter dated 15 December 1962, from the Prime Minister of Ceylon

Proposals of the Conference of six non-aligned nations held at Colombo (10th to 12th December 1962).

1. The Conference considers that the existing de facto cease fire period is a good starting point for a peaceful settlement of the Indian Chinese conflict.
2. (a) With regard to the Western Sector, the Conference would like to make an appeal to the Chinese Government to carry out their 20 kilometres withdrawal of their military posts as has been proposed in the letter of Prime Minister Chou En-lai to Prime Minister Nehru of November 21 and November 28, 1962.

(b) The Conference would make an appeal to the Indian Government to keep their existing military position.

(c) Pending a final solution of the border dispute, the area vacated by the Chinese military withdrawals will be demilitarized zone to be administered by civilian posts of both sides to be agreed upon, without prejudice to the rights of the previous presence of both India and China in that area.

3. With regard to the Eastern Sector, the Conference considers that the line of actual control in the areas recognised by both the Governments could serve as a ceasefire line to their respective positions. Remaining areas in this sector can be settled in their future discussions.

4. With regard to the problems of the Middle Sector, the Conference suggests that they will be solved by peaceful means, without resorting to force.

5. The Conference believes that these proposals, which could help in consolidating the ceasefire, once implemented, should pave the way for discussions between representatives of both parties for the purpose of solving problems entailed in the ceasefire position.

6. The Conference would like to make it clear that a positive response for the proposed appeal will not prejudice the position of either of the two Governments as regards its conception of the final alignment of the boundaries.

Clarifications given by the representatives of the Colombo Powers, to the Government of India, 13 January 1963

Upon request from the Government of India, the following clarifications of paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the Colombo Conference proposals were given by the Delegations of Ceylon, U.A.R. and Ghana:

**Western Sector**

(i) The withdrawal of Chinese forces proposed by the Colombo Conference will be 20 kilometres as proposed by Prime Minister Chou En-lai to Prime Minister Nehru in the statement of the Chinese Government dated 21st November and in Prime Minister Chou En-lai's letter of 28th November, 1962, i.e. from the line of actual control between the two sides as of November 7, 1959, as defined in maps III and V circulated by the Government of China.

(ii) The existing military posts which the forces of the Government of India will keep to will be on and upto the line indicated in (i) above.
(iii) The demilitarised zone of 20 kilometres created by Chinese military withdrawals will be administered by civilian posts of both sides. This is a substantive part of the Colombo Conference proposals. It is as to the location, the number of posts and their composition that there has to be an agreement between the two Governments of India and China.

**Eastern Sector**

The Indian forces can, in accordance with the Colombo Conference proposals, move right up to the south of the line of actual control, i.e. the McMahon Line, except for the two areas on which there is difference of opinion between the Governments of India and China. The Chinese forces similarly can move right up to the north of the McMahon Line except for these two areas. The two areas referred to as the remaining areas in the Colombo Conference proposals, arrangements in regard to which are to be settled between the Governments of India and China, according to the Colombo Conference proposals, are Chedong or the Thagla ridge area and the Longju area, in which cases there is a difference of opinion as to the line of actual control between the two Governments.

**Middle Sector**

The Colombo Conference desired that the status quo in this sector should be maintained and neither side should do anything to disturb the status quo.

---

**Letter from the Prime Minister of India, to the Prime Minister of Ceylon, 26 January 1963**

My dear Prime Minister,

In my letter of 13th January and the memorandum attached to the letter, I indicated to you the acceptance by the Government of India in principle of the Colombo Conference proposals in the light of the clarifications given by you and your colleagues during our meetings in Delhi on 12th and 13th.

2. As indicated in these communications to you of 13th January, the Colombo Conference proposals and the clarifications given by you and your colleagues were placed before the Indian Parliament for consideration on 21st. These were discussed in both Houses of Parliament for three days, from 23rd to 25th.

3. I have now the honour to state that the Government of India accept in toto the proposals of the Colombo Conference as clarified and explained to us by you and your colleagues during our discussions on 12th and 13th.

4. I thank you for your message in which you transmitted the Chinese Government’s reply to your communication of 14th January on the Colombo Conference proposals and the clarifications. I received it through your High Commission in New Delhi on the morning of 25th. It is obvious from this message that the Chinese
Government have not accepted the Colombo Conference proposals in regard to certain important matters. As indicated in our discussions on 12th and 13th January, the reservations of the Government of China on the scope of the Colombo Conference proposals and their interpretation are contrary to the proposals made by the Conference. We, on our part, have accepted these proposals in toto and made no attempt to vary them in any manner. Obviously, both the Government of India and China must accept the Colombo Conference proposals and clarifications in toto before the next stage of settling the remaining issues left for decision by the two Governments can be taken up in direct talks and discussions. The question of giving effect to the Colombo Conference proposals as clarified will, therefore, arise only when the Government of China have accepted the proposals and the clarifications without any reservations on their scope or interpretation.

5. Please accept, My dear Prime Minister, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) JAWAHARLAL NEHRU.
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Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 April 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note from the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated January 4, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The Indian Government's note, apart from directing unwarranted abuses and slanders against China, merely reproduces the contents of the two Indian notes dated December 5, 1962. This shows that the Indian Government is utterly devoid of case or arguments.

In its note of December 31, 1962 in reply to the two Indian notes dated December 5, 1962, the Chinese Government already proved in detail who refuses to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question peacefully through negotiations and who provoked the armed conflict on the border. No lies or prevarications on the part of the Indian Government can alter the history in recent years in which India nibbled into and encroached upon Chinese territory, carried out continuous armed provocations and went to the length of launching all-out massive attack on China, nor can they cover up the fact that today India is still trying hard to obstruct the holding of direct negotiations between the two parties, stepping up arms expansion and war preparations and attempting to restore tension on the border. It is entirely meaningless for Indian notes to repeat over and over the hackneyed phrases which were thoroughly refuted long ago. If in future India continues to make such unreasonable haggling, the Chinese Government will not reply any more.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 1 May 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note of April 20th. in reply to this Ministry's note of January 4th, 1963.

This Ministry's note of January 4, 1963 merely states the following facts:

(i) Progressive forcible occupation of Indian territory by China, mainly in the western sector of the boundary, since 1957.
All claims by the Chinese that they have always been in possession of this area are, apart from documentary and other evidence cited by the Indian side, baseless because the Chinese came into Tibet only in 1950; nor could they have been in possession of any of these areas till 1956 because they knew the boundaries shown in the Indian maps, of which they had copies, and yet did not contest the India-China boundary in this area either at the time of the 1954 Agreement or during the discussions between Prime Minister Chou En-lai and the Indian Prime Minister during their meetings in 1954 and 1956.

(ii) India's repeated efforts to have this surreptitious aggression corrected by peaceful methods.

(iii) Minimum defence measures that India was compelled to take to halt this continuing aggression.

(iv) Further aggression by China, from 8th September 1962, in the eastern sector of the boundary, which had so far not been seriously disturbed.

and

(v) Details of Chinese massive attacks, since 20th October 1962 against Indian defensive posts in the eastern and western sectors of the boundary.

The Indian note also gives details of the efforts made by India, even after the further aggression since 8th September 1962 and the massive attacks since 20th October 1962, to persuade China to restore the status quo prior to the further aggression since 8th September 1962 and to revert to the paths of peace and peaceful settlement of the India-China differences.

The Government of China have taken recourse to use of violent words and brushed aside these incontrovertible facts of recent history in India-China relations by calling them "abuses" "slanders", "lies and prevarications" and "hackneyed phrases". These facts of Chinese aggressive activities since 1957 have, however, to be faced and dealt with. It is futile for the Government of China to attempt to run away from these facts.

There have been important developments since the Indian note of 4th January. The Prime Minister of Ceylon, Madam Bandaranaike, who presided over the Colombo Conference of the six non-aligned countries, has visited Peking and Delhi and explained the proposals made by the Conference to the Governments of India and China. These proposals made by independent, objective and impartial representatives of six non-aligned countries do not attempt to deal with the differences between India and China on the border question. They deal only with the limited question of consolidation of cease-fire arrangements and have been specifically made because the Colombo countries were of the view that "these proposals which could help in consolidating the cease-fire, once implemented, should pave the way for discussions between representatives of both parties for the purpose of solving problems entailed in the cease-fire position."
The Government of India have accepted these proposals without any reservations. It is the Government of China who are maintaining their own reservations which, in effect, nullify these proposals.

The crisis of confidence created by the latest Chinese aggression and massive attacks against India cannot be resolved by unilateral measures of cease-fire and withdrawals or release of prisoners. These are only palliatives intended for propaganda purposes. The crisis can only be resolved by acceptance without reservation of the proposals made with this specific purpose by the six non-aligned countries. These can then be followed up by bilateral implementation of agreed cease-fire arrangements.

The Government of India are, despite the crisis created by China, keen on setting in motion processes which can make it possible to settle the India-China border differences by peaceful means. They have indicated these processes in their note of 3rd April, 1963. The initial step in these processes is obviously acceptance by the Government of China of the Colombo proposals without reservations.

The Government of India hope that the Government of China will reconsider their attitude to the Colombo proposals. stop resorting to violent and provocative language or juggling with slogans and, consistently with their oft-repeated desire to settle the India-China border differences peacefully, accept the constructive suggestions made by the Government of India in their note of 3rd April, 1963.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 21 July 1963

Mr. R. B. Schoenmen and Mr. P. B. Pottle, representatives of Lord Russell, arrived in Peking on July 9, after visiting India and Ceylon. They stated that they had brought with them an oral message from Prime Minister Nehru. On July 12 they were received by Premier Chou En-lai. Mr. Schoenmen said to Premier Chou En-lai: “Prime Minister Nehru made a proposal which he asked us to convey to Premier Chou En-lai orally. Prime Minister Nehru said that if China would agree that the strip formed by China’s twenty-kilometre withdrawal in the western sector of the Sino-India border becomes a no-man’s land and be vacated of all civilian posts, he would not request any civilian posts to be placed there and India would hold negotiations with China. During the negotiations, India would not mention this question again.” Mr. Schoenmen said. “Prime Minister Nehru further said that, for his part, he did not want such talks to fail but wanted to discuss the whole question of the boundary, and that in the talks there would be give and take.” Mr. Schoenmen further said that Prime Minister Nehru had asked them to return to India after visiting China and tell him about China’s reaction to his oral message.
2. On July 13, Mr. Huan Hsiang, former Chinese Charge d'Affaires in Britain, was entrusted to have a talk with the two representatives. During that talk, Mr. Schoenmen said that the above-mentioned proposal (the proposal to turn the strip formed by China's twenty-kilometre withdrawal in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border into a no-man's land) was not put forward by Prime Minister Nehru but was suggested to Prime Minister Nehru by himself. Mr. Schoenmen said: "I asked Prime Minister Nehru if the strip formed by China's twenty-kilometre withdrawal in the western sector is turned into a no-man's land, what action would you be prepared to take to break the ice on the question of holding negotiations? Prime Minister Nehru said that if that strip could become a no-man's land, he would be willing to hold negotiations. He said he would not raise the question of setting up civilian posts in the negotiations, but would be prepared to negotiate the entire boundary question—on the basis of give and take he would negotiate the entire boundary, including the western, middle and eastern sectors."

3. It can be seen, by comparison, that there is a discrepancy between the two accounts given by Mr. Schoenmen of what he termed Prime Minister Nehru's oral message, and therefore, it is hard to judge its accuracy.

4. On July 20 Premier Chou En-lai again received Mr. Schoenmen and Mr. Pottle and made the following points on behalf of the Chinese Government:

The Sino-Indian border situation has already eased as a result of China's initiative measures of cease-fire, withdrawal, return of captured Indian military equipment, and release and repatriation of the captured Indian military personnel. Particularly, the Chinese frontier guards, after withdrawing twenty kilometres from the line of actual control between China and India, have vacated the areas there, there is a dispute about the cease-fire arrangements, thereby disengaging the armed forces of China and India; this is a fact which is even more conducive to the continued relaxation of the situation. The continued relaxation of the Sino-Indian border situation would be assured so long as India does not again cross the line of actual control into the Chinese side for armed provocation, intrusion or invasion.

In order to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question peacefully, China has already taken a number of initiative steps. If any further initiative steps are required to bring about direct Sino-Indian negotiations, it is now India's turn to take such a step and there is no reason to ask China to take another such step. Of course, China, for its part, is not asking India to take any initiative step as a pre-condition to the opening of negotiations. China has always stood for the immediate opening of direct negotiations without any pre-conditions and on the basis of acceptance of the Colombo proposals in principle by China and India. To impose on China the entire Colombo proposals, and even the Indian interpretation, as an arbitral award, to compel China to carry them out, and to allow no room for discussion—this is absolutely unacceptable to the Chinese Government. If Prime Minister Nehru does agree with Mr. Schoenmen's ideas, as the latter has said, India may well advance such ideas as its own proposal, or advance other proposals of its own, in the Sino-Indian negotiations.
Naturally, China also has the right to advance such proposals as it may
deem appropriate for discussion between the two sides. The Chinese
Government would of course welcome direct Sino-Indian talks if they
could be held and if they were really aimed at a final settlement of
the entire Sino-Indian boundary question including the eastern, mid-
dle and western sectors and not intended for a breakdown which
would cause the already eased situation to grow tense again.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi,
to the Embassy of China in India, 30 July 1963

The Chinese Government’s Memorandum of July 21st has
attributed a statement to Mr. R. B. Schoenmen and Mr. P. B. Pottle,
two representatives of the Earl Russell, to the effect that they brought
with them to Peking an oral message from Prime Minister Nehru.
The Ministry would like to state categorically that no message of
any kind was given by Prime Minister of India to these gentlemen.

2. The facts are as follows:

Mr. R. B. Schoenmen and Mr. P. B. Pottle arrived in India on 17th
June 1963 for discussions with the Gandhi Peace Foundation on
questions connected with the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation.

The two gentlemen called on the Prime Minister while he was
holidaying at Pahalgam in Kashmir. During their informal discus-
sions which related to the setting up of Bertrand Russell Peace
Foundation, they also referred to the India-China border conflict.
Referring to the 20 kilometre demilitarised zone in the western sector
where, in accordance with Article 2(e) of the Colombo Proposals
civil posts of both sides have to be established. M/s. Schoenmen and
Pottle indicated that China did not accept this part of the Colombo
Proposals but, in their view, China would be agreeable to neither
side having posts of any kind in this demilitarised zone and asked
whether India would accept such an arrangement.

The Prime Minister gave these gentlemen a resume of the circum-
stances leading to China’s treacherous attack on India on October
20th, of the efforts made by six friendly Afro-Asian countries towards
restoring peace in this area of India’s acceptance of the proposals
made by these countries despite certain distinct disadvantages and
the fact that China had not accepted the Colombo Proposals but
proceeded unilaterally to implement its declaration of unilateral cease-
fire and withdrawals and set up seven posts in the demilitarised zone
in the Western Sector. If China now wanted to modify the Colombo
Proposals in the sense stated by them and decided to withdraw the
seven posts set up in the demilitarised zone, the new situation which
might merit consideration would have to be discussed by him with
his colleagues.

3. The facts stated above indicate clearly that no message of any
kind was given by the Indian Prime Minister to the representatives
of the Earl Russell.
4. The steps taken by India in fully accepting the Colombo Proposals have made a far-reaching contribution to further the chances of a peaceful settlement of the India-China border differences. It is for the Government of China to take the first step in the processes of peaceful settlement outlined in this Ministry's note dated 3rd April 1963 by accepting the Colombo Proposals.

*Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 September 1963*

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Ministry's note dated the 3rd April, 1963 wherein various constructive steps had been suggested for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question.

The Government of India regret that over five months should have elapsed without a reply having been received from the Chinese Government on these constructive suggestions which are reproduced once again for the information of the Government of China:

"(i) The Government of China should accept, without reservations, the Colombo Proposals just as the Government of India have done.

(ii) The acceptance by both sides of the Colombo proposals can be followed up by a meeting of the officials to arrive at settlement of various matters left by the Colombo Powers for direct agreement between the parties and to decide the details regarding implementation of the Colombo proposals on the ground.

(iii) The officials of both sides concerned can then take action to implement these proposals on the ground so that agreed cease-fire arrangements are established on the ground.

(iv) Thereafter, in the improved atmosphere, India and China can take up the question of their differences on the boundary question and try to reach a mutually acceptable settlement in one or more than one stage. If a settlement is reached, this can then be implemented in detail on the ground."
(v) If a settlement is not reached in these direct talks and discussions between the two parties, both sides can consider adoption of further measures to settle the differences peaceably in accordance with international practices followed in such cases. Both India and China can agree to make a reference, on the differences regarding the boundary, to the International Court of Justice at The Hague and agree to abide by the Court's decision. If this method of peaceful settlement is, for any reason, not acceptable to the Government of China, both parties can agree to some sort of international arbitration by a person or a group of persons, nominated in the manner agreed to by both Governments, who can go into the question objectively and impartially and give their award the award being binding on both Governments'.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew the assurances of its high consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 September, 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows:

On March 2, 1963, the Government of India protested against the agreement signed by the Governments of China and Pakistan on the alignment of the border between China (Sinkiang) and that part of the Indian Union territory of Jammu and Kashmir which has been unlawfully seized by Pakistan. In that protest the Government of India had made it clear that Pakistan had no common border with China and the agreement between China and Pakistan to locate and align the boundary in Kashmir, was further proof of the Chinese design to exploit the differences between India and Pakistan to their advantage and to incorporate unlawfully part of Indian territory in Kashmir by conceding to Pakistan the other area of Kashmir, forcibly occupied by Pakistan.

2. In their efforts to mislead world opinion and to cover up their collusion in aggression on Indian territory, both the Governments of China and Pakistan declared that the agreement is only provisional in nature. That these declarations were obviously insincere was clear from the arrangements stipulated in Article 4 of the Agreement regarding the appointment of a Boundary Commission, setting up of border markers and drawing up of Protocols, as such arrangements are normally made for permanent demarcation of the international frontier. That, so far as the Chinese and Pakistan authorities are concerned, there is nothing provisional about this agreement is clear from the visit of the Chinese Boundary Commission delegates to Gilgit, Nagar and Hunza and the announcement that boundary demarcation teams of both sides have reached agreement on ground survey, aerial photography and erection of boundary markers along the border.
3. The Government of India affirms that this fixing of boundary markers on Indian territory by the Governments of Pakistan and China is a violation of international law and practice in these matters. This collusive aggressive effort to change the status of Indian Union territory in Jammu and Kashmir and to alter the traditional boundaries, well established by treaties and custom will never be accepted by the Government of India.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.


The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the notes of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated April 3 and September 6, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

Apart from repeating in the above-mentioned notes the hackneyed slander about Chinese aggression against India, which has long been exploded, the Indian Government pretentiously suggested five so-called constructive steps purporting to deal with the boundary differences. In fact they are nothing but a hotchpotch of the unreasonable propositions which India has maintained for some time and which China has refuted, and they are not constructive steps at all. The Indian Government itself admitted in its note that these steps merely "reiterated" the propositions it had put forward. There would have been no need to refute these propositions again. But the Indian Government has prized them and tediously dished them up once again in its note of September 6, 1963 and even complained about the fact that China has not replied to these "constructive suggestions". Well then, the Chinese Government might as well as use some ink and paper and analyse the substance of these so-called constructive suggestions made by India and see what stuff they are really made of.

The five steps proposed by the Indian Government consist of no more than the following three points: (1) The Chinese Government must "accept, without reservations, the Colombo proposals" before a meeting of officials can be held to discuss and implement the details of the proposals; (2) only when "these proposals" have been "implemented on the ground" and "in the improved atmosphere" so judged by the Indian Government can the two sides "take up the question of their differences on the boundary question": and (3) If no agreement is reached between the two sides on the so-called boundary differences, a reference shall be made regarding the boundary differences to international arbitration of one kind or another. Comment on these three points follows:

(1) Concerning the question of so-called unreserved acceptance and implementation of the Colombo proposals.
The Indian Government has repeatedly claimed that it has accepted the Colombo proposals without reservations and asked the Chinese Government to do the same as a pre-condition to a meeting of the officials. This position of the Indian Government is hypocritical and it is an attempt to impose its own interpretation of the Colombo proposals on China.

The task of the Colombo Conference was to mediate and not to arbitrate. Its proposals are only a recommendation for the consideration of China and India and not a verdict or arbitral award which China or India must accept in toto. Although the Colombo Conference nations expressed the hope that the Colombo proposals would be accepted by both sides, they have never said that direct negotiations can start only when the Colombo proposals have been accepted in toto. On the contrary, more than one of them have expressed the view that even if the proposals were only partially accepted it would yet mark a step forward towards bridging the differences between China and India, and that there is no need for China and India to agree to all the Colombo proposals before going to the Conference table. The Indian Government's insistence that China must accept the Colombo proposals without reservations is in fact an attempt to turn the Colombo proposals into an arbitral award. This attitude of imposing one's will upon others is diametrically against the purpose and objective of the Colombo Conference.

It is deceitful to say that the Indian Government has accepted the Colombo proposals without reservations. As is well known, India's so-called acceptance of the Colombo proposals without reservations actually means accepting the Colombo proposals plus the clarifications produced in New Delhi, which are in fact the Indian Government's interpretation of the Colombo proposals. There is authoritative proof that the so-called New Delhi clarifications were drafted by the Indian Government and written in its own language as a summary of the discussions in New Delhi, and that the key part of these clarifications, which holds that administration of the demilitarized zone in the western sector by civilian posts of both sides forms "a substantive part of the Colombo Conference proposals," is no comment by the Ceylonese Prime Minister or her colleagues but the Indian Government's own assertion. The Indian Government has done so in order to tamper with the Colombo proposals and make them conform to India's unreasonable demand for the restoration of its fruits of aggression prior to September 8, 1962.

Even Prime Minister Nehru has admitted that certain provisions of the Colombo proposals are not clear. It is, therefore, inevitable that the proposals give rise to difference in interpretations. It is elementary knowledge that the different interpretations held by China and India can only be left for discussion and settlement in the negotiations. The Chinese Government has consistently held that China and India should accept the Colombo proposals in principle as a basis for direct negotiations. China has put forward its own interpretation, but has not made it a pre-condition to negotiations. China's attitude is reasonable and open and above board. By contrast, India has insisted on disguising its own interpretation as clarifications of the Colombo proposals, and attempted to force it on China.
under the pretext of acceptance of the Colombo proposals without reservations. This is not only utterly unreasonable, but also quite dishonest.

(2) Concerning the so-called taking up of the question of differences on the boundary question.

It cannot escape notice that the Indian Government draws a sharp distinction between negotiations on the boundary question itself and those on the ceasefire arrangements. The Indian Government stipulates that the two parties can “take up the question of their differences on the boundary question” only after the Chinese Government has accepted in toto and implemented the Colombo proposals as interpreted by the Indian Government and when there is an improved atmosphere so judged by it. In the past years, the Indian Government has kept saying that there must be an appropriate atmosphere before boundary negotiations can start, and it has deliberately cast a shroud of mystery over this question, so much so that nobody knows what is meant by an appropriate atmosphere. On the other hand, it has ceaselessly poisoned Sino-Indian relations and even stirred up troubles and manufactured rumours so as to create artificial tensions. What is more, there is every reason to believe that the Indian Government will not be prepared to negotiate the boundary question in earnest and bring about a settlement even if all its pre-conditions are fulfilled. It has always been the attitude of the Indian Government that it completely denies the existence of a boundary question between China and India. It arbitrarily holds that the alignment it claims is the fixed boundary between China and India; and at most it admits the existence of some minor “differences”. Hence it holds in effect that Indian-occupied Chinese territory is not negotiable, that the question of Indian-craved Chinese territory is not negotiable either, and that negotiations, if any, must be confined to China’s withdrawal or India’s entrance. Up to now, one can see no change in this attitude of the Indian Government. In these circumstances, it can be foreseen that no results will be obtained even though boundary negotiations are held. No wonder the Indian Government is already planning to substitute international arbitration for direct negotiations before there is any sign of boundary negotiations.

(3) Concerning so-called international arbitration.

The Sino-Indian boundary dispute is an important issue involving the sovereignty of both countries, and the territory involved totals more than a hundred thousand square kilometres. It goes without saying that this issue can be settled only through direct negotiations between the two parties, and absolutely not through any form of international arbitration.

The Indian Government has gone back on its own stand. In the past, it also admitted that arbitration was not the proper method to apply to the settlement of disputes over sovereignty as the Sino Indian boundary question. But of late, the Indian Government has described the issue as one involving the interpretation of treaties, agreements and other factual data and should be referred to international arbitration. At one time the Indian Government said that arbitration was not applicable to disputes over sovereignty, at another
it said that it was applicable. Such a way of argument is utterly mischievous. The Indian Government was clearly aware that the Chinese Government could not agree to referring the Sino-Indian boundary question to international arbitration and that the International Court of Justice at the Hague is an organ of the United Nations, among whose judges there is an element of the Chiang-Kai-shek clique, nonetheless it continues to propose to refer the Sino-Indian boundary dispute to the International Court or other organs of international arbitration. This is nothing but a clumsy attempt to disguise its unreasonable stand of dodging direct negotiations.

In a word, the purpose of the Indian Government in suggesting these steps is, to put it bluntly, by no means to bring about negotiations for a peaceful settlement of the boundary question, but to make negotiations impossible by setting up an array of obstacles.

The Indian Government does not have the least desire to hold negotiations with China, but has every determination to wage long-term cold war against China. It is known to all that the Indian Government has been begging for large amounts of military assistance from U.S. imperialism for arms expansion and war preparations, and has recently even openly colluded with the United States and Britain in preparing to conduct joint air manoeuvres. The Indian Government has already moved its armed patrols up to the Sino-Indian border along its entire length. In the period from November 22, 1962 to the end of August 1963, Indian troops have intruded nearly thirty times into Chinese territory by crossing the line of actual control, and Indian aircraft have made, eighty sorties into China's airspace. These well-established facts can by no means be denied by accusing China of making "baseless allegations" and "propaganda" as was done in the Indian note.

The Chinese Government has consistently striven to make its southwestern boundaries, boundaries of peace and friendship. It has already reached agreements on, and so settled, its boundary questions with a number of neighbouring countries on the basis of friendship, equality, mutual respect, mutual understanding and mutual accommodation. Naturally, it wishes to see the Sino-Indian boundary question also speedily settled in a peaceful way. Should the Indian Government indeed have the same wish, it should discard all its useless pretexts and subterfuges and accept the Chinese Government's proposal for both sides to accept the Colombo proposals in principle as a basis for the immediate holding of direct negotiations so as to stabilize the ceasefire, disengage their forces and settle the Sino-Indian boundary question peacefully. The Chinese Government's proposal is the truly effective way to settle the boundary question and a truly constructive step. The Indian Government has no reason to reject it. This is a test of whether the Indian Government is sincere about a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 16 October, 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to
the note of October 9, presented to the Indian Embassy in Peking has
the honour to state as follows:

That the Chinese Government did not reply for six months to the
constructive suggestions made by the Government of India for a
peaceful settlement of the India-China differences and, when re-
mined several times, begins its reply with a facetious and arrogant
preamble—"Well then, the Chinese Government might as well use
some ink and paper and analyse the substance of these so-called
constructive suggestions made by India and see what stuff they are
really made of"—shows clearly that the Chinese Government has
no intention whatsoever of resolving the India-China differences by
peaceful methods and is determined to continue its policy of seeking
military solutions.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the Chinese Government
has adopted the philosophy of "might is right" and will not consider
any other methods of settlement of its differences with its friends and
neighbours except submission to its dictates and failing that, settle-
ment by war. Why does China still talk at the same time of setting
questions peacefully on the basis of friendship and five principles?
Is this an adaptation of the principle—"strategically we should
slight all enemies and tactically we should take full account of
them"—in its relations with friends and neighbour?

The history of India-China relations since the inauguration of
the Chinese People's Republic in 1949 illustrates this Chinese stra-
tegy of duplicity and equivocation. It appears that the boundary
question or any other that the Chinese may want to raise will not
be brought up by them till necessary military preparations are com-
pleted against an unsuspecting friend or neighbour when in Chinese
parlance conditions become "ripe for settlement." The Chinese
Government expressed gratification in 1950 at the desire of the
Government of India "to stabilise the Chinese-Indian border" and
accepted the statement of the Government of India that "the recog-
nised boundary between India and Tibet should remain inviolate".
In the years immediately preceding the 1954-Agreement between
India and China, the Chinese authorities themselves conveyed the
impression that they were anxious to safeguard the economic and cul-
tural interests of India in Tibet and that there was no territorial
dispute or any controversy between India and China on this matter.
During the negotiations on the 1954 Agreement, which promulgated
the Panchsheel principles, no territorial dispute or boundary ques-
tion was raised. After the Agreement, the economic and cultural in-
terests of India in Tibet safeguarded under the Agreement were pro-
gressively squeezed out and a clandestine military penetration in
the Aksai Chin area of the Indian province of Ladakh began since
1957.
It was on the basis that there was no boundary question between China and India that the Government of India took up the question of Chinese intrusions in the Aksai Chin area by diplomatic correspondence in the full expectation that this matter will be settled in a peaceful and friendly way. It was only in 1959 that China put forward for the first time its claim to substantial areas of Indian territory and raised a boundary dispute where, according to its own earlier pronouncements and position, none existed. Prime Minister Chou En-lai himself admits this in his letter dated 23rd January, 1959, addressed to the Indian Prime Minister: “It was true that the border question was not raised in 1954 when negotiations were being held between the Chinese and the Indian sides under the Agreement on Trade and Intercourse between Tibet region of China and India”. Prime Minister Chou En-lai’s letter goes on and almost cynically adds: “This was because conditions were not yet ripe for its settlement......”. In brief, there was no boundary question or dispute in the earlier years of India-China relations but when Chinese military dispositions in Tibet along the India-China frontiers reached a certain stage of preparation, conditions became “ripe” for raising the question and forcing a settlement on Chinese terms.

The Government of China’s attitude to the Colombo proposals and to the constructive suggestions for peaceful settlement made by the Government of India runs true to form. Having achieved its immediate objectives by its sudden and unprovoked massive aggression against India last autumn, China wants to hold on firmly to the fruits of its further aggression. While holding on to this firm position, it goes on talking about peace and friendship and settlement by peaceful means. The comments in the Chinese note of October 9 on the constructive suggestions made by the Government of India display the same equivocation and duplicity as in the past, and can be seen from the following paragraphs.

I

Colombo Proposals

The Chinese Government in the note of October 9, alleges that India is adopting an unreasonable and dishonest attitude and is attempting to impose its own interpretation of the Colombo proposals on China and is tampering with the Colombo proposals and is making them conform to India’s unreasonable demand for the restoration of the position prior to 8th of September 1962. What are the facts?

(i) The Prime Minister of Ceylon in forwarding the proposals of the Conference to India and China stated: “We earnestly hope that they will deserve your careful consideration and subsequently win your approval and acceptance”. This makes it clear that the Colombo Conference countries asked both India and China to accept the proposals.

(ii) The proposals themselves state: “The Conference believes that these proposals, which could help in consolidating the cease-fire, once implemented, should pave the way for discussions between representatives of both parties”.

The Colombo proposals laid down not only that the proposals should be accepted but also laid down that they should be implemented before discussions between representatives of India and China on the main question of India-China differences can start.

(iii) When the Prime Minister of Ceylon went to Peking to explain the proposals she handed over to the Chinese authorities during the discussions a document entitled "The Principles underlying the proposals of the Six" giving the rationale of the proposals. The Chinese reservations communicated to the Ceylon Prime Minister towards the end of the Peking meeting contravene not only the Colombo proposals as formulated but also the principles underlying the proposals of the Six given in writing by the Ceylon Prime Minister to the Chinese authorities at Peking as can be seen from the following quotation from "The Principles underlying the Proposals of the Six:

"6(a) On the Eastern Sector, it seems to be clear that, whether the McMahon Line is considered to be an illegal imposition or not, it has in fact become a line of actual control, with the Chinese Government exercising exclusive administrative control to the north of it, and the Indian Government exercising exclusive administrative control to the south of it, except in Che Dong and Longju which are disputed.

(b) for purposes of a cease-fire, the Six considered that this line of actual control would be the most appropriate."

The Chinese reservation that Indian forces should not re-enter areas in the Eastern sector from which the Chinese forces have withdrawn in accordance with their unilateral declaration of ceasefire and withdrawal, is in direct contradiction of the above principles underlying the proposals of the Six given by the Ceylon Prime Minister to the authorities in Peking during her visit.

Again, as regards the Western sector, after stating the facts in para 8, para 9 of the Principles states:

"9. Bearing these considerations in mind, the six propose as a basis for a ceasefire—

(a) that Chinese forces should carry out the withdrawal proposed by Prime Minister Chou En-lai on November 21, 1962 on the Western sector;

(b) that Indian forces should remain where they are i.e., on the traditional customary line as claimed by China;

(c) that the area in-between should be demilitarised pending a final settlement of the border dispute;

(d) that the demilitarised zone should be so administered as not to exclude the presence of either India or China as hitherto, pending a final settlement of the border dispute;"
(e) that pending a final settlement of the border dispute this zone should be so administered as to exclude the presence of military forces of both sides. It is therefore proposed that this zone should be administered by civilian posts to be agreed upon by both sides.”

The Chinese reservation that there should be no Indian civilian posts in the demilitarised zone in the Western sector is directly contrary to the principles stated above in the proposals of the Six.

The Chinese stand on the Colombo proposals and the principles underlying them was taken and the Chinese reservations stated above were made before the Prime Minister of Ceylon and her colleagues came to Delhi. The subsequent visit to Delhi and the clarifications given in Delhi against which China has been fulminating had no connection whatever with the position adopted by China as stated above. The opening sentence of the clarifications given by the representatives of the Colombo powers to the Government of India on 13th January, 1963, reads: “Upon request from the Government of India the following clarifications of paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the Colombo Conference Proposals were given by the delegations of Ceylon, the U.A.R. and Ghana.” This was on 13th January, 1963. But the Chinese reservations were made in a memorandum dated 6th January and letter dated 8th January given to Mrs. Bandaranaike. It will be seen from this that the clarifications given in Delhi which are quite consistent with the principles underlying the proposals of the Six quoted above have, in any case, no relation to the reservations made by China so many days before the clarifications were even thought of.

If the Chinese reservations on the Colombo proposals are maintained, the resulting position would conform in great degree to just the position that China has tried to force on the Government of India under the Chinese declaration of the so-called unilateral cease-fire and withdrawal dated 21st November 1962. This is obviously what China wants to achieve. Its acceptance of the Colombo Proposals “in principle” is merely a cunning device to distort these proposals to suit its own position. Otherwise there can be no ground for denouncing the proposals as illogical, inequitable, ambiguous, etc., while maintaining the facade of acceptance “in principle”.

The above account makes it clear that it is China and not India who is unreasonable and dishonest and that it is China who is trying to impose its own interpretation of the Colombo proposals on the Colombo countries and on India.

II

Taking up the question of differences on the boundary question, the Chinese note of 9th October makes a grievance of the fact that the Indian Government draws a distinction between negotiations on the boundary question itself and those on the cease-fire arrangements. This distinction has been made not only by India but by the Colombo Conference countries themselves in formulating the
Colombo proposals. The following quotation from the principles underlying the proposals of the Six refers to this point:

"1. The Sino-Indian boundary dispute must be settled by peaceful negotiations between China and India. The object of the Six is to create an atmosphere which would enable China and India to enter upon negotiations with dignity and self-respect.

2. The proposals of the Six are intended to create such an atmosphere.

3. In considering the proposals made by them, the Six welcomed the announcement of a unilateral ceasefire and withdrawal made by China on November 21, 1962.

4. In the formulation of these proposals, the Six paid particular attention to the following principles:—

(a) neither side should be in a position to derive benefit from military operations;

(b) a stable cease-fire must precede any attempt at negotiations between China and India;

(c) any cease-fire arrangements must be without prejudice to the boundary claims of either party."

Also, the Colombo proposals themselves contain the following:

"The Conference believes that these proposals, which could help in consolidating the ceasefire, once implemented, should pave the way for discussions between representatives of both parties for the purpose of solving problems entailed in the cease-fire position."

The Chinese note of 9th October questions the Indian Government's statement that there must be an appropriate atmosphere before boundary negotiations can start and goes on to say that there is a shroud of mystery over what is meant by appropriate atmosphere. The Chinese Government should know the above views of the Colombo Conference countries which were communicated to it. It should also know that the crisis of confidence created by its massive attack on India in which 3,942 persons were taken prisoner, 2,300 were killed, 770 are still missing and which has enabled China to continue to be in a forcible occupation of 15,000 square miles of Indian territory, cannot be wished away by mere words. This crisis has to be resolved as recommended by the Colombo Conference countries by bilateral ceasefire arrangement arrived at on the basis of these proposals, before the substantive question of India-China differences regarding the border can be discussed.

The Colombo proposals and the principles underlying the proposals of the Six handed over to Chinese authorities at Peking by the Ceylon Prime Minister refer to the need for a proper atmosphere. This is no invention of India and the Chinese Government
knows this. It is China who declines to accept the Colombo proposals and the principles underlying the proposals of the Six and who takes an unreasonable and dishonest attitude.

III

International Arbitration.—The Chinese Government has not only stated that it could not agree to referring the Sino-Indian boundary question to the International Court of Justice at the Hague but has categorically stated that this issue can be settled "only through direct negotiations between the two parties and absolutely not through any form of arbitration." The rejection by China in advance and in absolute terms of the internationally accepted practice of settling by arbitration differences between nations which cannot be resolved bilaterally, leaves only one of the two alternatives; acceptance of Chinese dictates backed by military force, or continuance of the conflict. No independent country can, consistently with its honour and dignity, accept dictates backed by military force. China has tried to impose its will on the Colombo Conference countries by refusing to accept the Colombo proposals and the principles underlying the recommendations of the Six. It is at the same time attempting to force India to accept a settlement on Chinese terms, equivocation, duplicity and military forces being used by turns to get its own way. These attempts are bound to fail.

The Government of China has referred to the boundary agreements it has reached with other countries. It is not for the Government of India to comment on them except to say that so far as the settlement of the boundary question between Pakistan and China is concerned, this is being done by Sino-Pakistan collusion to divide, between the two aggressors, the gains of the earlier Pakistan aggression in the Indian Union territory of Jammu and Kashmir. Every principle of the Panch Sheel is violated by this collusive aggression and misappropriation of Indian territory.

The Government of China has, throughout these last 9 years, flouted the five principles to which it had solemnly pledged itself in 1954. How can the principles of friendship, equality, mutual respect, mutual understanding and mutual accommodation be reconciled with the Chinese clandestine aggression and occupation of 12,000 square miles of Indian territory in Ladakh between 1957 and 1960? What happened to these principles when China mounted unprovoked massive attacks in October/November 1962 and committed further violations of India's territorial integrity? The six non-aligned Afro-Asian countries at the Colombo Conference made certain proposals acceptance of which would have given China a chance to redeem its past violations of the Five Principles. China continues to spurn these proposals and yet goes on glibly mouthing these five principles while continuing to violate them in every detail. China's arrogant and facetious rejection of the constructive proposals made by the Government of India for a settlement of the differences by peaceful means makes it absolutely clear that China believes in no principles, Panchsheel or any others, which govern international relations. It only acts on the jungle law of "Might is right".
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In the face of this aggressive and militant attitude of China, the Government of India has to continue its efforts to strengthen its defences against the continuing Chinese threat to India's territorial integrity and independence. The Government of India hopes that eventually wiser counsels will prevail and China will revert to the paths of peace. Meanwhile, it is obvious to everyone that it is not India but China who waged a hot war and disturbed the peace on the India-China frontier and it is not India but China who is continuing in its determination to wage a long-term cold war in total violation of all principles governing international relations.

The Ministry of External Affairs renews to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 25th June 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the Indian Government's note of May 27, 1963, has the honour to state the following:

The Indian Government's allegations in its note that Chinese soldiers entered areas south of Longju on April 26, 1963, is purely a deliberate slander. The Chinese frontier guards have long since completely withdrawn from the twenty-kilometre zones on the Chinese side of the line of actual control of November 7, 1959. As for Longju, it has always been part of China's territory and is situated on the Chinese side of the line of actual control. However, in order to create an atmosphere conducive to direct negotiations between the two sides, China has vacated it as one of the four disputed areas and has not even established any civilian checkpost there. This is a fact known to the whole world. The Indian note first alleged that on April 26, 1963, "20 Chinese in blue uniform" went to areas south of Longju, and then asserted that they were "Chinese military forces". This obvious contradiction belies the Indian assertion. In fact, no Chinese whosoever went to any area south of Longju on April 26. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the unwarranted Indian protest.

The wanton slanders made by India against China are obviously intended to reduce the influence of China's peace efforts and create tension so as to cover up its unwarranted refusal to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question peacefully. However, facts are more eloquent than words. India will never achieve its desired goal no matter how many lies it may tell.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5th July 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to state that on three successive days, from 21st June to 23rd June, Chinese military patrols intruded into Sikkim State across Nathula. The most serious of these intrusions occurred on June 21, 1963 at 2300 hours when a Chinese patrol consisting of about 25 persons intruded into Sebu La 100 yards inside Sikkim State. On being challenged by the border defence personnel, the patrol retired.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest against these latest provocations by Chinese forces.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 30 July 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

On July 4 and 11, 1963, Indian troops twice intruded into Hsialinkung terrace (south of Sama) on the line of actual control of November 7, 1959 in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, erected military structures on Chinese territory north of the line, and carried out reconnaissance towards the Chinese civilian checkpost at Sama.

Following the measures of ceasefire and withdrawal taken by the Chinese Government on its own initiative, the Indian Government repeatedly stated that it would not take any action to impede the Chinese side in effecting the ceasefire and withdrawal. Facts, however, have shown that India has failed to abide by its statement. Indian troops have not only repeatedly intruded into Chinese territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, but have recently extended their intrusions to the eastern sector. Shortly after the Indian troops had intruded on June 20 into the Chinese side of Tungmula on the line of actual control in the eastern sector, they further intruded into Chinese territory at Hsialinkung terrace. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest against the Indian provocative act of persisting in intruding into Chinese territory and deliberately creating tension in disregard of the Chinese Government’s repeated warnings. The Chinese Government hopes that India would not mistake the measures of ceasefire and withdrawal taken on China's own initiative for a chance to renew Indian military intrusions and demands that India immediately put an end to these intrusions.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 31 July 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated July 5, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

In its note, the Indian Government baselessly alleged that Chinese personnel intruded into Sikkim across Natu La from June 21 to 23, 1963, and that about 25 Chinese intruded into "Sebu La 100 yards inside Sikkim" at 2300 hours late at night. This is nothing but a sheer fabrication. China and Sikkim have always lived together in peace and no Chinese forces have ever crossed into Sikkim; this is a fact not to be distorted. In its note dated June 15, 1963, the Indian Government itself admitted that its troops had constructed many military structures around Natu La, thus interrupting normal traffic across the border between Tibet and Sikkim. In these circumstances, one may ask how could Chinese personnel possibly have intruded into Sikkim across Natu La on three successive days? The Chinese Government categorically rejects the unwarranted Indian protest based on lies.

As a matter of fact, it is the Indian troops that crossed Natu La and constructed many military structures inside China. The Chinese Government has time and again lodged serious protests with India against this and asked for a joint investigation. The present slanderous allegation fabricated by India that Chinese personnel had crossed Natu La was obviously made with the ulterior motive of trying to cover up its own aggression against China. Nevertheless, to whatever cunning tricks India may resort, it will absolutely not be able to turn lies into facts.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 31 July 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and,
"A sketch map of Indian military forces aggressively crossing the Sikkim-China Boundary at Nathula and constructing protective works."

Explanation.—In the picture the mountain ridge is the boundary line between China and Sikkim. Nathula Pass is situated on the boundary line. In the picture the area between the mountain ridge line and the line interpolated is the area where Indian troops have intruded and built several (tens) aggressive works.

The long arrow from the ridge to the left leading to the sketch map points to Nathula Pass. The direction indicator on top of the picture running from left to right points to North. The arrow at bottom right-hand corner pointing left, indicates road.

In the inset map, big cross indicates Nathula Pass. The road from Nathula leads westwards to Gangtok. Road on the East of the Pass (broken line) leads to Yatung. (Presumably the road indicated on the photograph is this).

The river running Northwards from Yatung is the Amu. The river on the inset map running North-South from the Sikkim-China border is the TEESTA.
with reference to the Indian Government’s note of June 15, 1963, 
has the honour to state the following:—

In its note of June 4, 1963, the Chinese Government lodged the 
third serious protest with the Indian Government against the Indian 
troops crossing Natu La on the China-Sikkim boundary, intruding 
into Chinese territory and illegally constructing military structures 
there. Confronted with a mass of conclusive and powerful evidence 
furnished by China, the Indian Government had to admit in its note 
that India did build military structures around Natu La and this 
“had led to the interruption of normal trade and traffic across the 
border between Sikkim and Tibet”.

Nevertheless, the Indian Government prevaricated that the mili-
tary structures built by India at Natu La were “protective defence 
works” “on its own side of the border”, (meaning on the Sikkim 
side). This allegation is utterly untenable. It has been admitted 
by India itself that according to the relevant provisions of the Sino-
British Convention of 1890, the boundary between China and Sikkim 
runs along the watershed, and that Natu La is located on the only 
watershed in that area, which can be identified at a glance, and 
there can be no misunderstanding about it. The military structures 
built by India at Natu La clearly lie beyond this watershed and ex-
tend to the slope on the Chinese side of the pass (see attached photo-
stat). How can it be said that they lie on the Sikkim side and were 
erected for “defence” purposes? The Indian aggressive acts are 
further borne out by the following fact: On June 12, 1963, i.e. 
three days before India sent out its note, about fifty Indian soldiers 
crossed Natu La and, taking advantage of the fog, levelled out part 
of the military structures illegally built by India on Chinese terri-
tory; later, the Indian side reinforced and camouflaged the rest of 
the military structures on Chinese territory. This shows that the 
aggressive acts of the Indian side are so glaring and unveiled that 
it had to seek ways and means to obscure them on the spot in order 
that it may entrench itself there indefinitely, while continuing to 
make denials. The Chinese Government once again lodges a pro-
test with India against its occupation of Chinese territory across 
Natu La and once again demands that India immediately demolish 
its military structures on Chinese territory and withdraw its troops 
which have intruded into Chinese territory.

The Indian note admitted that the former United States Ambas-
sador to India had visited Sino-Sikkim border. This unusual action 
took place at a time when India was stepping up its aggressive ac-
tivities along the Sino-Sikkim border, when India was redoubling its 
efforts to beg the United States for military aid and when the United 
States and India declared jointly that they share “a mutual defen-
sive concern” with regard to China. How can the Chinese Govern-
ment remain indifferent to it?

In its note the Indian Government had no scruples in vilifying 
China and invoked the questions of the Sino-Indian boundary and 
the Colombo proposals which have nothing to do with this subject.
This only shows that India is finding itself devoid of all sound arguments, and vainly attempting to use these questions to divert people's attention from the Indian aggressive activities. The Chinese Government has long ago repeatedly and sternly refuted Indian lies and slanders on these questions and there is no need to make any more refutation here.

In view of the fact that India in its note continues to adopt an unreasonable attitude of denying the facts and turning things upside down, the Chinese Government hereby reiterates that in order to remove the tension now existing on the Sino-Sikkim border and distinguish right from wrong, India should immediately dispatch officials to conduct with Chinese officials a joint investigation of the case of Indian troops crossing the Natu La and encroaching on Chinese territory. An investigation will readily clarify the facts as to whether or not the military structures built by the Indian troops have extended beyond the watershed, whether they are within Chinese territory or within Sikkim territory and who are "confusing world public opinion". If India is not afraid of the revelation of truth, there should be no reason for it to reject this reasonable demand of the Chinese Government.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 August 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to its Note of 30th July, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India are surprised at the constant repetition by the Chinese Government of brazen and utterly false allegations. In its note of July 16th, the Indian Government has already categorically refuted the Chinese charge of an intrusion at Tungmula. It is not understood why the matter should once again be raised by the Chinese Government.

The further allegation that Indian troops have intruded across the international frontier into Tibet in the region Sama is equally unfounded. The border in this area is well-defined and there has been no instance of Indian personnel having crossed the border, much less erected military structures.

The Chinese protest is apparently made to cover up their own intrusion on 10th July when 13 persons in Lama robes were observed carrying out reconnaissance near Dichi in the Lohit Division of NEFA.
It would appear that the Chinese objective in making baseless charges is to cover up their reconnoissance activities and to continue tension on the border. This is also clear from the increased concentration of Chinese troops along the Tibetan areas of the India-China border and feverish construction of barracks and communications by Chinese forces in these areas.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 August 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India dated June 11, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

In its note of June 2, 1963, the Chinese Government has factually pointed out that the entry on three occasions of so-called Chinese soldiers into the Spanggur Lake area as alleged in the Indian note of May 11, 1963 was actually the sending out by the Chinese side of a number of civil police to that area, which is on China's side of the line of actual control, to clear obstacles and mines and repair the road so as to ensure smooth progress of the work of repatriating captured Indian military personnel. This is a matter purely within China's sovereignty. Nevertheless, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs twice furnished the relevant information to the Indian Embassy in China on April 29 and May 3, 1963. The Indian Government was clearly aware of the above on May 11, yet it lodged an unwarranted protest with China, slanderingly charging China with "intrusions" and "provocative activities". What is more, even after the Chinese Government gave a detailed account of the facts in its reply to India on June 2, India still kept on haggling in its latest note in regard to this matter. While no longer daring to mention the so-called "intrusions" by Chinese soldiers on May 4 and 5, it continued, in disregard of facts, to assert that the Chinese "frontier guards" resorted to "provocative firing" on April 27. The Chinese Government wishes to point out once again that the Chinese frontier guards had already withdrawn from the area mentioned by India by the end of last February, and the assertion that they had resorted to "firing" is an utter fabrication. In its note of June 2, the Chinese Government categorically rejected the unwarranted protest of India. The allegation made in the Indian note that China has not denied the intrusion is obviously a distortion and an attempt to impose its view on others.
The Spanggur Lake area has always been part of China's territory. This has been convincingly proved by the conclusive evidence cited by China at the meetings of officials of the two countries and in many documents and by the map of 1956 mentioned in Premier Chou En-Lai's letter of December 17, 1959. It is also an undeniable objective fact that this area is situated on China's side of the 1959 line of actual control. Even Prime Minister Nehru himself has admitted in his letter to Premier Chou En-Lai dated November 14, 1962, that China had set up a post at Spanggur before 1959. How then could it have suddenly been turned into an area which was "forcibly seized" by China in 1962?

In its note, India again repeated its shopworn allegations about so-called Chinese "intrusions" and "massive attacks." But it remains to be an indisputable fact that it is India who has committed aggression against China, who set up a large number of military strongpoints on Chinese territory in 1962 and who finally launched massive attacks on the Chinese frontier guards. This cannot be distorted by an Indian prevarication. As for the allegation that China has acted "in disregard of the Colombo proposals," it has already been refuted in detail by the Chinese Government in its note of June 26, 1963, and no repetition is needed here.

Judging from the Indian notes and from its recent intensified efforts to spread rumours about Chinese "intrusions" and "concentration of Chinese troops", it is not difficult to see that India is trying in a vain attempt to use lies and calumnies to minimise the far-reaching influence of the ceasefire and withdrawal and other peaceable efforts made by China on its own initiative and to cover up India's intrusions. But this attempt will be futile. In this note, the Chinese Government has once again patiently made clear the facts; and if India should for the above purpose continue to haggle over the matter, the Chinese Government will take no more trouble to answer.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 26 August 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

In its notes of June 28 and July 30, 1963, the Chinese Government lodged strong protests with the Indian Government against the Indian troops' intrusion into Tungmula Pass and Hsialinkung.
Terrace on the line of actual control in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, their crossing of the line of actual control for reconnaissance activities and their crossing of that line at Hsialinkung Terrace to build military structures. In its reply notes of July 16 and August 8, the Indian Government resorted to its usual practice of flat denial. However, on August 10, just two days after India had sent out its second note, two more Indian soldiers intruded into Hsialinkung Terrace at about 11.20 hours. They crossed the line of actual control and carried out observations with field glass towards the Chinese civilian checkpost at Sama for about forty minutes, and did not leave until around 1200 hours. This fresh intrusion has belied India's prevarication.

In its note of August 8, India claimed that the "borders" in the area of Sama "is well-defined." This is, of course, untrue. However, the line of actual control between China and India in this area is clear indeed. The Indian troops had definitely crossed this line of actual control, and the military structures they built at Hsialinkung Terrace are definitely beyond that line. The Chinese Government once again lodges a strong protest against the Indian provocative act of continuously violating the line of actual control and creating tension.

In the above two notes, India not only tried hard to deny its own intrusions, but attempted to make false counter-charges against China. When the Chinese Government protested against the Indian troops' intrusion into Tungmula Pass on June 20, India falsely counter-charged in its note of July 16 that "two Chinese intruders who were in plain clothes" proceeded to the south of what it called Dom La on June 20. When the Chinese Government protested against the Indian troops' crossing the line of actual control at Hsialinkung Terrace on July 4 and 11, India groundlessly alleged in its note of August 8 that "13 persons in Lama robes" had been observed near Dichu on July 10. It is precisely these strange and fantastic assertions that constitute the "brazen and utterly false allegations" as described in the Indian note. Moreover, the Indian Government, after nearly one month, suddenly mentioned in equivocal terms these so-called instances in its notes aimed at denying its own intrusions; this also exposes the unjustifiable position and guilty conscience of the liar. Thus it is not difficult to see that it is the Indian Government, and nobody else, which has tried to cover up its own intrusions by telling lies. As for the trumped-up story about the "concentration" of Chinese troops, etc., it cannot deceive any one, no matter how often India may repeat it.

The Indian intrusions in deliberate violation of the line of actual control cannot be denied either by a blunt disavowal or by making false counter-charges. The military structures built by the Indian troops at Hsialinkung Terrace north of the line of actual control remain clearly there. Is this not an iron-clad proof of the Indian troops' intrusions? In order to ease the border tension, India must immediately stop its intrusions.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New De'hi, to the Embassy of China in India, 28 August 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to Chinese Foreign Office's Note dated the 25th June, 1963.

The Government of India's note dated the 27th May, 1963, was sent after careful verification of the facts and it is a matter of regret that the Chinese Government has arbitrarily denied the intrusion by a Chinese party into Indian territory in the area south of Longju, on April 26th, 1963.

The Chinese Government has declared Longju to be one of "four areas" where there is a dispute about cease-fire arrangements and has indicated in its note of March 2nd that both sides should refrain from entering these areas. Yet Chinese forces have not hesitated to cast aside this restriction and to intrude into areas even south of Longju. These activities on the part of the Chinese Government expose the insincerity of China's constant avowals of desiring a peaceful solution of the India-China boundary dispute.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 29 August 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with regard to the entry into the Wuje area, which is part of Chinese territory, by Indian troops and administrative personnel and their unlawful detention of Chinese border inhabitants, has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government has recently learned that in June 1963 dozens of Indian soldiers and administrative personnel carrying radio sets intruded into the Wuje area, which is part of Chinese territory in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border, and have illegally set up tents and barracks there for entrenchment. Furthermore, they have unjustifiably harassed and detained Chinese border inhabitants who went or travelled through there for trade. On June 22, 1963, Jongpa Dorje and six other Chinese citizens were unreasonably hindered from moving forward in Wuje by two Indians. They were cross-questioned on June 23 by three Indian administrative personnel who tried to secure military intelligence and information in other fields on China. Thereafter, Jentzen Wongjal and nine other Chinese border inhabitants were unlawfully searched by Indian soldiers on separate occasions and were driven back. On July 26,
Jong Chung and another Chinese citizen were likewise interrogated by three Indian soldiers in Wuje. What is more serious, on July 22 and 25, the Indian personnel illegally entrenched in Wuje went so far as to detain unlawfully Tashi Pengtso and eight other Chinese citizens for several days long and maltreat them, giving them no food and lodgings. They were not released until July 29. The Indian even told them in a threatening tone that no more Chinese citizens would be allowed to go there.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious and strong protest against the aforesaid Indian provocative acts of encroaching on Chinese territory, disregarding China's sovereignty and unlawfully searching and detaining Chinese citizens.

The Wuje area is part of Chinese territory and located on the Chinese side of the 1959 line of actual control. In response to the peaceable call of the six Asian and African countries of the Colombo Conference, the Chinese Government has not only effected a twenty-kilometre withdrawal on its own side of the 1959 line of actual control along the entire Sino-Indian border, but has vacated Wuje and all the other areas where there is a dispute about the ceasefire arrangements, refraining even from setting up any civilian check-post there. However, in disregard of China's conciliatory measures, the Indian side has gone so far as to send its troops and administrative personnel for entrenchment in the Wuje area, which China has vacated on its own initiative, and even flagrantly detained and harassed Chinese citizens on Chinese territory. This further demonstrated the Indian Government's deliberate attempt to take advantage of the conciliatory measures of the Chinese side to create new tensions in the Sino-Indian border areas by repeating its old tactics for upsetting the status quo on the border and nibbling away Chinese territory. The Chinese Government cannot but take this seriously. The Chinese Government sternly asks India to withdraw immediately its troops and administrative personnel who have unlawfully intruded into the Wuje area for entrenchment and conduct a thorough investigation into the cases of unjustifiable harassment and detention of Chinese border inhabitants.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 31 August 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Foreign Office note dated the 13th August, 1963.

2. The Government of India's note dated May 11, 1963 had referred to three clear instances of intrusion in the Spanggur lake area, towards the end of April and early May, 1963, by parties of Chinese
soldiers who were carrying out provocative activities in these areas from which the Chinese Government had earlier claimed to have withdrawn. Subsequently, in their notes, the Chinese Government claimed that these activities were on account of work connected with the clearing of obstacles and mines “so as to ensure smooth progress of the work of repatriating captured Indian military personnel”. However, no attempt has been made either in the Chinese Government’s note of 2nd June, 1963 or in the note under reply, to explain how or why Chinese “Civil Police” had to resort to provocative firing on April 27, 1963, south of Pimple. There can be absolutely no relation between the act of provocation which occurred on April 27, 1963 and the clearing of obstacles about which mention was made to the Indian Embassy at Peking on April 29th and May 3rd, 1963. It is precisely this act of provocation that belies the Chinese Government’s claim that Chinese forces have withdrawn from this area by 20 kilometres.

At the Official Talks in 1960, the Indian side adduced sufficient evidence to prove that the international boundary between India and China in this area cuts across the eastern part of Spanggur Lake and follows the northern and eastern watershed of the river Indus through the Chang Pass upto the Jara Pass. The Chinese note under reply states that the map of 1956 mentioned in Premier Chou En-lai’s letter of 17th December, 1959 and the evidence cited by China at the Official Talks in 1960, proves that the Spanggur Lake area has been part of China’s territory. What the Chinese note does not and cannot explain is the discrepancy between the Chinese map of 1956 referred to in Prime Minister Chou-En-Lai’s letter of 17th December, 1959 and the Chinese map of 1960 produced at the talks between officials in 1960. This only confirms that the maps produced by the Chinese Government do not follow normal cartographic practices but are varied from time to time to suit the aggressive designs or the actual results of aggressive thrusts, of the Chinese army as the case may be.

3. The Chinese note states that in the letter dated the 14th November, 1962, Prime Minister Nehru had admitted that the Chinese Government had set up a post at Spanggur before 1959. This letter exposed the falseness of the Chinese argument that the “line of actual control as on November 7, 1959”, i.e. the claim line which the Chinese Government has repeatedly sought to impose upon India, coincides with the Chinese claim line of 1960. The letter clearly proved that, in 1959, the so-called “line of actual control” upto which Chinese forces had encroached by then was a line connecting the forward-most Chinese posts as existing on 7th November 1959, i.e., a line connecting the Spanggur post, Khurnak Fort and Kongka La and then northwards to join the main Aksai Chin Road. Prime Minister Nehru’s letter of 14th November, 1962 does not support but actually contests the Chinese claim that because there was a Chinese post at Spanggur before 1959, the whole area was under Chinese control. In any case, the area of the latest intrusion which is the subject matter of the current exchange of notes was further to the West even of the place where the illegal Chinese post at Spanggur had been located in 1959. The Chinese Government has
wilfully tried to confuse their so-called line of actual control as it actually existed in 1959 with the boundary line that was claimed by the Chinese side in the Officials Talks in 1960 and with the line that has been physically established by the massive Chinese attacks in the winter of 1962. All these three are, as it is plain to everyone, entirely different.

4. The denials by the Chinese Government of the massive attack by the Chinese forces against Indian defensive positions in the Eastern and Western Sectors of the border is absurd in the face of clearly established facts. That the Chinese Government continues to hold to its aggressive policies is demonstrated by its rejection of the Colombo Proposals after having earlier pretended to accept these Proposals "in principle". The latest increased concentrations of Chinese forces on the India-China border are a further indication of the Chinese Government's aggressive designs.

5. In the light of the above facts, the Government of India reject the baseless contentions in the Chinese Note of 13th August, 1963.

6. The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 September 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Foreign Office Note of August 29, 1963.

2. In its Note of April 9, the Ministry of External Affairs had clearly stated that since 1958 the Government of India had refrained from sending armed patrols into this area, and that from April 1963, in view of the Chinese Government's assurance in its Note of April 3 that it would refrain from sending any Chinese civilian personnel, the Government of India also decided to reciprocate by suspending the practice of sending civilian personnel to the Bara Hoti plain as had been done hitherto. This decision has been strictly implemented by the personnel of the Government of India. The Government of India wish to state categorically that there has been no Indian military or civilian personnel in this area from April 9, 1963, and any allegation to the contrary is false, baseless and mischievous.

3. The Chinese Note tries to substantiate its allegations by citing the case of 7 Tibetans who came into India for purposes of trade. The Chinese Government is well aware that no facilities for trade between Tibet and India exist at present. If Chinese nationals entered Indian territory, the purpose of their visit must have been other than trade. The Chinese Note itself admits that the party went "through" the area for trade. The fact is that a group of 7 Tibetans with 210 goats came through the Tunjung La from Tibet
into the Bara Hoti area on 22-6-1963 and, as stated in the Chinese Note, proceeded through this area southwards where they were stopped at an Indian checkpost. This checkpost, as has been stated in the Ministry of External Affairs Note of January 17, 1963 is some kilometres to the south of Bara Hoti. The Tibetans were told that there was no trade taking place, and were requested to return to Tibet, which they did.

4. The Government of India has no information regarding the coming into Indian territory of a person called Jentzen Wongjal and 9 other Chinese border inhabitants as alleged in the Chinese Note, nor is there any corroboration of the allegation in the Chinese Note that on July 26, two Chinese citizens crossed the international frontier while coming southwards. The Government of India is, however, aware of another clandestine intrusion of Chinese nationals on July 24 when a group of 8 Tibetans came southwards via Tunjung La through the Bara Hoti plain to the Indian checkpost. They were also asked to return to Tibet, which they did.

5. It will be seen from the above facts that the allegations made by the Chinese Government of incidents concerning Tibetan traders are completely false. The allegation that Indian soldiers have entered the Bara Hoti area and set up tents and barracks is another piece of mischievous falsehood. The Government of India firmly reject the false and mischievous allegations contained in the Chinese Note.

6. The Government of India has scrupulously observed the recommendation made by the Colombo Conference that the status quo should be maintained in the central sector in which this area falls. The only aim of the Chinese Government in fabricating such allegations can be the creation of tension in this area which has so far been perfectly peaceful.

7. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of the opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 September 1963**

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

On September 1, 1963 at 1100 hours, eight Indian military personnel bringing field glasses with them crossed the Lo Pass on November 7, 1959 line of actual control between the two sides in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border and intruded into the vicinity of the Chinese civilian checkpost at Tamaden which is north of the line for spying. This again is another provocation aimed at creating tension by Indian military personnel following their successive intrusions since last June across the line of actual control.
Tungmula Pass and Hsialinkung Terrace in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this, and demands that the Indian side immediately put an end to such intrusions.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 September 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Foreign Office note dated the 26th August, 1963.

2. In their note under reference, the Chinese Government have not only repeated the baseless charges that have already been fully exposed in the Government of India's notes dated the 16th July and 8th August, 1963, but also come up with a new story that "two more Indian soldiers entered into Hsialinkung Terrace at about 11.20 hours" on 10th August, 1963. The location of the area referred to as "Hsialinkung Terrace" had been vaguely stated to be "south of Sama" in the Chinese Note dated the 16th July, 1963. Nevertheless the matter had been carefully investigated by the Indian Government and it had been established that the Chinese allegations were without any foundation. As pointed out in the Indian note of 8th August, 1963, the India-China border is well defined in this area. The Government of India are fully satisfied that no Indian personnel crossed the boundary in the areas specified in the Chinese note, or for that matter anywhere else.

3. The Chinese Government have tried to belittle and deny the charges contained in the Indian notes referred to above, regarding the incidents of intrusion by Chinese to the south of Domla and in the vicinity of Dichu in the Lohit Division of NEFA respectively on the 20th June, 1963 and 10th July 1963. But describing the charges as "strange and fantastic" does not in any way detract from their authenticity.


5. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 September 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state as follows:

According to reports from the local authorities, three mounted Indian soldiers crossed the line of actual control of November 7, 1959
from Parigas in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border and intruded into the Chinese village of Demchok for reconnaissance and harassment on August 13, 1963. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against that.

Since the cease-fire effected by China on its own initiative Indian troops have made more than twenty intrusions into Chinese territory across the line of actual control. In disregard of the Chinese Government’s protests against all those instances, the Indian troops have not yet ceased such intrusions. Following their intrusion and stationing in the Wuje area in the middle sector of the border, which is part of Chinese territory, the Indian troops recently went on to intrude into the Chinese territory of Demchok Village in the western sector of the border. The Chinese Government cannot but express its concern about that. The Chinese Government once again seriously urges the Indian Government to respect earnestly the line of actual control and stop the insatiable encroachment of the Indian troops.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 September 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

The Chinese Government has received a report, which has been verified after checking the facts, that on the morning of August 5, 1963 a group of Indian soldiers crossed the Sino-Sikkim boundary at the Tagi La and intruded into the Chiehma pasture ground, which is situated north of the Pass in Tibet, China. They forcibly kidnapped two Tibetan shepherds, Zlaba Mgonpo and Tshe Dbang, and seized all the 800 and more sheep which they were pasturing there. The whereabouts of Zlaba Mgonpo and Tashe Dbang is so far still unknown. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned intrusion by Indian soldiers and their atrocious acts of openly ignoring China’s sovereignty and seizing persons and sheep on Chinese territory, and asks the Indian Government promptly to conduct a thorough investigation into the case, release the kidnapped Chinese shepherds and return the robbed sheep.

It must be pointed out that the Sino-Sikkim boundary has long been formally delimited and that the border there had all along been tranquil. In recent years, India has repeatedly made use of Sikkim territory to violate Chinese territory and deliberately created incidents along the Sino-Sikkim border in vain attempt to undermine the friendly and good-neighbourly relations between China
and Sikkim. The Chinese Government wishes to tell the Indian Government squarely that this scheme definitely will not succeed.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 September 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the note of the Chinese Government of 31st July presented to the Indian Charge d'Affaires at Peking.

Ever since the Prime Ministers of India and China met in 1960 when in reply to a question at a Press Conference Premier Chou En-lai stated "China respects India's relations with Sikkim and Bhutan", the Chinese Government has, on one pretext or another, been challenging the position that the Government of India is responsible for the defence and external relations of Sikkim. It was pointed out by the Indian side at the Official Talks held in 1960 that "the Chinese Government had recognised the continued validity of the Anglo-Chinese Convention of 1890 between Great Britain acting for the Government of India, and China, regarding Sikkim. This Convention itself recognised by both sides, lays down the boundary between Sikkim on the one hand and the Tibet Region of China on the other". The same Convention also recognised the responsibilities of the Government of India for the external relations of Sikkim.

The note of 31st July, which is the latest in the series of notes beginning with the Chinese note of 2nd July, 1960, making baseless allegations about Indian intrusions into Chinese territory in this sector, has the same mischievous design of contesting the treaty-relations between India and Sikkim. This pernicious move has, as its further objective, the covering up of China's aggressive concentrations in the Chumbi Valley where Chinese troops have been pouring in, garrisons have been established and barracks have been constructed replete with gun emplacements, pillboxes and other military installations.

The Chinese note refers to interruption of normal trade and traffic across the border between Sikkim and Tibet as a result of India building up military structures around Nathu La. The responsibility for the disruption of normal trade and traffic in this sector of the India-China boundary rests squarely on the shoulders of the Chinese Government who mounted unprovoked massive attacks against India in October-November, 1962. The Government of India, in the discharge of their responsibility for the defence of Sikkim, had to take appropriate action for the defence of this sector of the boundary against the threat of Chinese aggression.

That these Indian troops and military structures are located entirely on the Indian side of the boundary in this sector should be
clear from the attached photostat which presents a clear picture of
the highest watershed ridge passing through Nathu La which is the
international frontier between India and China in this Sikkim sector.
The stone marker, referred to in various Chinese notes, which com-
memorates the opening of the Gangtok-Nathu La road on September
18, 1958, is marked with a cross in the photostat. This is 74 feet
on the Indian side of the border along the Gangtok-Nathu La Road.
Indian military installations in this sector are at a considerable
distance away from this stone marker on the Indian side of the
border. The travellers in this region who are familiar with the
rough location of the boundary along the watershed ridge have been
placing pilgrim prayer flags approximately along this ridge. These
flags can be seen clearly in the photostat.

The allegation that Indian forces have occupied Chinese territory
across the international boundary in the Nathu La region is false
and baseless. The international boundary in this sector is well
defined and well known. The Indian defence forces are a consider-
able distance away from the international boundary, on the Indian
side. The Chinese demand for a joint investigation of the baseless
and mischievous Chinese allegations must, therefore, be rejected.

The Chinese Government has also referred in its note to the
question of removing tension on this Sikkim sector of the Indian
border. It is for the Chinese authorities to stop this series of vexa-
tious and mischievous notes which are solely designed to create and
maintain tension on the Sikkim sector of the India-China border.
That the Chinese Government is bent on maintaining an atmos-
phere of tension and conflict all along the India-China border, includ-
ing this Sikkim sector, would be obvious to anyone from the hostile
and aggressive attitude the Government of China has adopted, on
the recommendations made by the six non-aligned countries, for the
acceptance of both parties, with a view to easing the tensions along
the India-China border and creating an atmosphere in which a pur-
poseful attempt could be made to resolve the differences on the
boundary question between India and China, by peaceful talks and
discussions in accordance with the procedures suggested by the
Government of India in its note of 3rd April, 1963.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew
the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of
its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 1 October 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to
refer to the Chinese Foreign Office Note dated the 31st July, 1963;
regarding the intrusions across Sebu La by Chinese military patrols
between 21st and 23rd June, 1963.
1. Photo showing the highest watershed ridge marking India-China boundary in the Nathula Pass. The outline of the ridge can be clearly seen.

2. In the foreground is the Gangtok-Nathula Road, a metalled road, with masonry supports.

3. At point indicated by × is a stone marked to commemorate the opening of the Gangtok-Nathula Road on September 18, 1958. The marker is located 74 ft. on the Indian side of the border.
2. The facts had been conveyed to the Government of China in the Ministry's note of 5th July, 1963 after a careful and detailed investigation. These intrusions are a direct result of the increase in concentrations of Chinese troops over the last few months across the Sikkim sector of the India-Tibet border which has led to an increase in provocative Chinese activities in this region.

3. The Government of India again reiterate their strong protest against the intrusions committed by Chinese military patrols across Sebu La.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 14 November 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China, and, with the honour to state the following:

It has been verified by the Chinese Government that at noon time, September 22, 1963, four Indian militarymen with five horses illegally crossed the Karakoram Pass at the western extremity of the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary and intruded about two kilometres into Sinkiang, China, for reconnaissance.

The Karakoram Pass is a pass on the boundary, and the area to its north has always been indisputable Chinese territory. The Indian Government itself has explicitly admitted this at the meeting of Chinese and Indian Officials in 1960. While making incessant intrusions into Chinese territory during the past few years, Indian troops had never dared to cross that Pass. Yet now the Indian side has flagrantly extended its activities of intrusion into this area, an area which India itself has definitely acknowledged as Chinese and where tranquility long prevailed. This is obviously a deliberate attempt to create tension and broaden the boundary dispute. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government and urges the Indian Government to put an immediate end to all its intrusions into Chinese territory.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 23 August 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to
the Note from the Chinese Foreign Office dated the 13th September, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The allegation contained in the note of intrusions in the vicinity of the Chinese Checkpost at Tamadem is a further instance of baseless fabrications resorted to by the Chinese Government to keep alive a state of tension on the India-China border. The Lo Pass is situated on the international boundary between India and China and on Indian military personnel have crossed this line.

The earlier baseless allegations of the Chinese Government that Indian military personnel crossed the so-called line of actual control near "Tungmula Pass" and "Hsiulinkung Terrace" have been replied to by the Government of India in notes dated 16th July, 8th August and 16th September, 1963. It is evident that the Chinese Government is continuing to make these allegations to suit its own purpose.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 22 October 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the note from the Chinese Foreign Office dated the 18th September, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

A reference to the Government of India's earlier notes dated the 31st October and 9th December, 1961, 21st May and 18th August, 1962, would make it clear that the Demchok area of Ladakh has always formed part of India. Indian border defence forces had also been stationed there to protect the area from Chinese intrusions until they had been overrun by the massive Chinese attacks on Indian territory during October/November, 1962. Though the Chinese forces had, ever since 1957, been making surreptitious advances in various areas of Ladakh, there had been no Chinese presence of any kind on the Indian side of the traditional customary boundary south of Rezang La, till the massive Chinese invasion last winter.

Despite the above clear position and the fact that even recent Chinese maps also show Demchok clearly on the Indian side of the so-called Chinese "line of actual control of 7th November 1959", the Chinese Government has alleged that Indian personnel have "intruded" into the area which is admittedly within Indian territory even according to the fantastic Chinese claims of the so-called "line of actual control of 7th November 1959".

The Chinese Government has tried to confuse the issue by drawing a distinction between a location it refers to as Pariggs and the village of Demchok, acknowledging Pariggs as being on the Indian side of the so-called "line of actual control", and maintaining
that Demchok is on the Chinese side. This is yet another instance of the Chinese Government attempting to lay claim by devious means to areas acknowledged by it to be Indian territory.

The Government of India has confirmed after detailed investigations that no Indian military personnel crossed the so-called "line of actual control" in the Demchok area on 13th August, 1963.

The Government of India has, in various other notes, clearly exposed the baselessness of the Chinese Government's allegations of so-called intrusions by Indian personnel. While rejecting the protest, the Government of India would stress that the repetition of these baseless allegations only serves to intensify the already existing tensions on the India-China border created by Chinese aggression.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Embassy of China in India, 2 November 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, and has the honour to refer to Chinese Foreign Office Note dated the 14th October, 1963.

2. The Government of India has carefully investigated the allegation by the Chinese Government that on 22nd September, 1963 "4 Indian military men with 5 horses" had crossed the Karakoram Pass and "intruded about two kilometres into Sinkiang, China, for reconnaissance". It has been established that this allegation is without any basis whatsoever.

3. As the Chinese Government is aware, the India-China boundary in this portion of the western sector starts from the trijunction of the boundaries of India, China and Afghanistan at approximately Longitude 74° 34' East and Latitude 37° 03' North and runs eastward through the Kilik Pass, Mintaka Pass, Kharchanai Pass, Parpik Pass, and the Khunjerab Pass, after which it follows the spur down to the north-western bend of the Shaksgam or Muztagh river which it crosses at that point and ascends the crest line of the Aghil mountains. It then runs along the crest of the Aghil watershed, through the Aghil Pass, the Marpo Pass, and the Shaksgam Pass to the Karakoram Pass. From the Karakoram Pass the boundary lies along the watershed between the Shyok and the Yarkand and runs through the Qara Tagh Pass to cross the eastern bend of the Qara Qash river (north west of Haji Langar) and ascends the main Kuen Lun mountains. Thereafter, the boundary runs through the Yangi Pass along the crest of the mountains separating the Yurungkash basin from those of the lakes in Aksai Chin. It leaves the main crest of the Kuen Lun mountains at a point approximately Longitude 80° 21' East and descends in a South-Westerly direction, separating
the basins of the Amtogor and Sarigh Jilganang lakes in India from those of Leighton and Tsoggar lakes in Tibet. The Government of India is fully satisfied that there has been no case where Indian defence personnel have crossed into Chinese territory anywhere along this international border.

4. In the light of the above facts, the Government of India rejects the Chinese Government's note under reference.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Embassy of China in India, 12 November 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated the 19th September, 1963.

2. The Chinese Government's allegation of "intrusion" by a group of Indian soldiers across the Sikkim border of the India-China boundary is entirely without foundation. The allegation that Tibetan shepherds have been "forcibly kidnapped" is also entirely baseless.

3. One Tsewang Topgya and one Dawa Gombu, residents of village Keyo in Tibet, had illegally crossed the border through Bamchho La into Sikkim territory. They had been apprehended on 4th August, 1963, and as their entry was in violation of local laws, they were arrested. The Chinese note is a deliberate distortion of this factual position.

4. Tsewang Topgya and Dawa Gombu will be allowed to return to their native village after they have served their sentences for the offence of having illegally crossed the international border for which they have been convicted.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 14 October 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Government dated October 1, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The Indian Government's note contains nothing new; it only repeats the lies fabricated in its note of July 5, 1963, alleging that
Chinese military personnel intruded into Sikkim between June 21 and 23, 1963. This has already been sternly refuted by the Chinese Government in its note of July 31, 1963. It is now necessary to point out only one thing: India first asserted in its note of July 5 that “on three successive days” Chinese military personnel “intruded into Sikkim State across Nathula”, and that they once “intruded into Sebula 100 yards inside Sikkim State”. When this had been refuted by the Chinese Government which pointed out that the Nathu La had long been blockaded by Indian troops who had crossed the border to build military structures, the Indian Government, in its note of October 1, no longer dared to mention the alleged crossing of the Nathu La, but asserted that Chinese personnel crossed the border through Sebu La during the three days. This contradictory allegations amply reveal the clumsy tactics of the liar. The Ministry considers it meaningless to continue the exchange of notes between China and India on these lies of the Indian side. If the Indian side should continue to haggle over this matter, the Chinese side will ignore it.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 30 November 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated September 19, 1963, has the honour to state the following:

In its note, the Indian Government had to admit once again in ambiguous terms that Indian troops had constructed military structures around Natu La, which is located on the China-Sikkim boundary. Nevertheless, it continued to argue fallaciously that the Indian military structures were all built inside Sikkim at a distance from the boundary. It even pretentiously enclosed a photostat in a vain attempt to absolve itself of the crime of encroachment. Since the photostat shows only the Sikkim side of Natu La, it is only natural that the dozens of large and small Indian military structures which are built beyond the watershed inside Chinese territory, do not appear in it. Such a photostat is of no value at all. The Indian attempt to pass the matter off by deceitful tricks will never succeed.

It is an indisputable fact that the Indian side has crossed Natu La and built military structures there. The Chinese Government has established it by citing many conclusive evidences in its previous notes. Now that the Indian Government persists in denying that it has built military structures on the Chinese side of Natu La, the most effective method to be taken in order to find out the truth is for the two sides to dispatch officials to conduct a joint investigation of the case. This proposal of the Chinese Government is completely proper and reasonable. The Indian Government's lack of courage
to accept a joint investigation precisely reveals its guilty conscience, for it is afraid that its lie will be exploded in the face of the evidences.

In its note, the Indian Government again dwelt on such irrelevant matters as Indian-Sikkim relations and repeated its lies about alleged concentrations of Chinese troops. Since the Chinese Government has in its previous documents made clear its position on those matters and thoroughly refuted the Indian slanders, there is no need to make any repetition here.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of India in India, 11 December 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and with reference to their note dated the 14th November, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

2. In its note dated the 5th July, 1963, the Government of India had lodged a protest against intrusions into Sikkim State by a Chinese military patrol in the Nathula region. It was also pointed out in this note that the most serious of these intrusions had occurred on 21st June, 1963, at 23-00 hours when a Chinese patrol intruded into Sebula, 100 yards inside Sikkim State.

3. In its note of 1st October, 1963, the Government of India had reiterated the above position. As the Chinese Government is aware, Sebula is only about a mile from Nathula and there can, therefore, be no doubt in the mind of the Chinese Government about the area where these intrusions have taken place. It is futile for the Chinese Government, in these circumstances, to try and evade these established charges by pretending that they are “contradictory”.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China, the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 26 December 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated November 12, 1963, has the honour to state the following:

The Indian note begins with the vehement denial stating that the Chinese Government’s protests against the crossing of the China-Sikkim border by a group of Indian soldiers and their abduction of
two Chinese shepherds, Zlaba Mgonpo and Tshe Dbang, "is entirely without foundation". However, it then admits that the two shepherds have been "apprehended" and "arrested" by the Indian side. It can thus be seen that the Chinese protest is not "without foundation", and that the Indian side is prevaricating without any reasonable ground.

As the Chinese Government stated in detail in its note of September 19, 1963, Zlaba Mgonpo and Tshe Dbang, together with the 800 and more sheep which they were pasturing, were carried away by force from the Chiehma pasture ground inside Chinese territory north of the Tegi La, which is located on the China-Sikkim boundary, on the morning of August 5 by a group of Indian soldiers who had illegally intruded into that area. The Indian note conversely charged that the two Chinese shepherds were apprehended because they had "crossed the border into Sikkim territory". This is nothing but an attempt to confound right and wrong and a false counter charge.

The Chinese Government once again seriously asks the Indian side to release immediately the Chinese shepherds in question and return the seized sheep.

The Ministry avails itself of the opportunity to renew the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 22 January 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs' note dated the 26th December, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The detailed facts regarding the arrest of Tsewang Topgya and Dawa Gombu, who had illegally crossed the border through Barochho La into Sikkim territory, have been given in the Indian Government's note dated the 12th November, 1963. It is completely incorrect for the Chinese Government to state, as they have done in the note under reference, that this is a case of "abduction". It has already been pointed out in the Indian Government's note dated the 12th November, 1963, that the Chinese Government's allegations in this regard are entirely without foundation. Any further notes by the Chinese Government on the subject, repeating such unfounded and meaningless allegations, will not merit a reply.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 23 January 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to
The Chinese Government’s note dated the 30th November, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The International boundary in the Nathula region of the Sikkim-Tibet border is well defined and well-known. Indian defence forces are stationed at a considerable distance away from the boundary on the Indian side. As has been reiterated in the Indian Government's note of 19th September, 1963, any request for a joint investigation of this region is merely propagandistic in nature and, therefore, unacceptable to this Government as completely unnecessary. In point of fact, it is Chinese military personnel who have been guilty of crossing over into Indian territory in this area. The Government of India have protested against these intrusions in their note dated the 5th July, 1963. The most serious intrusion was when a Chinese military patrol intruded into Sebula which is on the frontier about a mile south of Nathula.

The Chinese note under reference makes the absurd complaint that the photostat attached to the Government of India's note dated the 19th September, 1963, "shows only the Sikkim side of Nathula". Obviously the photostat could not show the Chinese side of Nathula, which must be on the other side of the pass. Any photograph, taken by Indian authorities in this area has, naturally, to be only from the Indian side of the pass, to which Indian personnel and forces are always strictly confined.

The Chinese Government’s note dated the 30th November, 1963, succeeds merely in further exposing the baseless nature of the allegations made against the Indian Government. In the light of the above facts, the Government of India categorically reject the note in question of the Chinese Government.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 8 July 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the Indian note of June 26, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The allegation made by the Indian Government in its note to the effect that Chinese aircraft had flown over Bameng and Koloriang of the so-called North East Frontier Agency of India on May 27 and June 5, 1963, is a pure fabrication. The two places mentioned in the Indian note are Chinese territory under Indian occupation lying south of the illegal McMahon Line. Although China has never recognised the so-called McMahon Line, Chinese aircraft have never flown beyond that illegal line. In the interest of a relaxation of the border situation, Chinese aircraft have never even flown over.
Chinese territory lying close to the line of actual control between China and India. The Indian Government is itself well aware of this. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the false charges and unwarranted protest contained in the Indian note.

In its notes dated June 11 and June 12, 1963, the Indian Government further repeated its allegations of so-called violations by Chinese aircraft of the airspace over Chhageon which lies south of the illegal McMahon Line, and Chaam, which is in Uttar Pradesh State, India. The Chinese Government already refuted such utterly groundless fabrications in its notes dated May 9 and June 2, 1963. What can one say when the Indian Government, in an effort to slander China, even tries to invalidate the public statement made by its own Deputy Minister of Defence in the Indian Parliament that there has been no Chinese “air violation”. The Chinese Government can only deplore such an attitude of India.

It is well known that the Indian Government, owing to its internal and external political requirements, is deliberately maintaining the tension and vitiating the Sino-Indian relations. For this purpose, the Indian Government is recklessly fabricating tales and carrying on cold war propaganda. But this practice can only further expose its own real features and utterly discredit itself instead of bringing any advantage to India. One would advise that the Indian Government had better stop this unseemly practice.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 9 July 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated July 2, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The allegation made by the Indian Government in its note to the effect that on June 19, 1963, a Chinese aircraft flew over Gamsali-Puling-Sumdo (referred to as Pulamsunda in the Indian note) and Tsungsha (referred to as Nelang in the Indian note) is nothing but a sheer fabrication and a wanton slander. The Chinese Government does not know what place is the Gamsali referred to by India. Puling-Sumdo and Tsungsha are situated in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border, and are both Chinese territory occupied by India since 1954; and Puling-Sumdo, as is well-known, was one of the ten markets for trade specified in the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement to be opened by China. But in spite of all this, the Chinese Government has all along maintained that, pending a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, both sides should maintain the status quo of the boundary and respect the line of actual control of November 7, 1959. No Chinese aircraft has ever flown anywhere near the
line of actual control. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the unwarranted charge and protest contained in the Indian note.

The Chinese Government has noted that the Indian side has of late been particularly keen in making lies of so-called Chinese intrusions so as to maintain and augment anti-China hysteria. Now, immediately following its fabrication about Chinese aircraft flying over the illegal McMahon Line, India has again trumped up a story about a Chinese aircraft flying over Puling-Sumdo and other places; it can be seen that India is bent on creating new tension along the entire length of the border. But the more tales one trumps up, the less do people believe in them. And this practice of the Indian side can only meet with thorough bankruptcy.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 August 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state that cases of violations of Indian air space by Chinese aircraft continue and are on the increase.

On 30th July, 1963, at 23-55 hours a four-engined Chinese aircraft was seen flying over Narayan Parbat 3 miles North-West of Badrinath (co-ordinate 7925 East and 3046 North) at a height of about 20,000 feet. The Chinese aircraft penetrated 16 miles into Indian territory into the State of Uttar Pradesh across the Uttar-Pradesh-Tibet border.

Again on the 1st of August, 1963, a Chinese jet aircraft flew over Dharchula (80° 32' East, 29° 51' North) at 16-05 hours. The aircraft again appeared at 16-20 hours over Askot (80° 20' East 29° 46' North). The Chinese aircraft was flying at an approximate altitude of 20,000 feet and it penetrated approximately 48 miles into Indian territory in the State of Uttar Pradesh.

These violations of Indian air space are in addition to the earlier violations brought to the notice of the Chinese Government in Government of India's note dated the 25th July, 1963. The Government of India demand that these violations of Indian airspace by Chinese aircraft must cease.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 August 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with
The allegation made by the Indian Government in its note that on 4th July, 1963, a Chinese aircraft “intruded” into Indian air space at Kalapani and Kuthi in Uttar Pradesh State, like the series of other charges it made recently, is an out-and-out fabrication. No Chinese aircraft has ever flown over the said places. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the unwarranted protest of the Indian Government.

The Indian Government has of late repeatedly spread slanderous rumours about “intrusions” into Indian air space by Chinese aircraft. This is obviously a continuation of its attempt to confuse public opinion and cover up the repeated intrusions into China’s airspace by its own aircraft (vide the Chinese Government’s note of July 12, 1963). It should be pointed out in particular that it is by no means fortuitous that the latest false charge was made by the Indian Government at a time when India was stepping up its military collaboration with the United States and had reached an “air defence” agreement with the United States and Britain and when it was thus condemned by public opinion both at home and abroad. The Chinese Government wishes to tell once again the Indian Government seriously that if any unidentified aircraft should indeed intrude into India’s airspace, the Indian Government should, in accordance with the suggestion made in the Chinese Government’s notes, take every effective measure to shoot down or force down this or these aircraft so as to find out which country after all is the owner of such aircraft which are carrying out provocations. If it wants to cover up its further subservience to the West by spreading such rumours, recourse to this clumsy trick of casting slanders on China will not help it in the least.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to the Embassy of India in China, 17 August 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Government of August 8, 1963, has the honour to state the following:

In its Note, Indian Government uttered the nonsense that Chinese aircraft intruded into Indian air space one on July 30, 1963, over Narayan Parbat in the State of Uttar Pradesh and another on August 1, 1963, over Dharchula and Askot in the same State. This is outright wanton slander. The Chinese Government expressed its indignation at this groundless charge made once again by the Indian Government and resolutely rejects it.
Allegations of so-called intrusions into Indian air space by Chinese aircraft had in the past been categorically refuted again and again by the Chinese Government in its previous notes. The Chinese Government had also solemnly declared its stand and attitude on this question. The Indian Government is advised to refer to the latest note of the Chinese Government of August 13, 1963, and no repetitions will be made here.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, the...
The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 August 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, and with reference to Chinese Foreign Office's notes dated July 9th, 1963, August 13th, 1963 and August 17th, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India's notes dated July 2nd, 1963, July 25th, 1963 and August 8th, 1963 are based on verified instances where Indian air space has been violated by Chinese aircraft. Pre-emptory denials by the Chinese Government cannot alter the fact of these aerial intrusions.

In its note of July 9th, the Chinese Government pretends ignorance of the location of Gamsali which is situated at 30° 45' N and 79° 45' E in the Uttar Pradesh State of India. Furthermore, the Chinese note continues to try and confuse the identity of Puling-Sumdo and Pulamsumda. It has been clearly pointed out at the official talks in 1960 that Pulamsumda is situated in the Uttar Pradesh State and is quite different from Puling-Sumdo which is in Tibet. The co-ordinates of Pulamsumda are 31° 18' North and 79° 08' East, while the coordinates of Puling Sumdo are 31° 19' North and 79° 27' East. The two places are thus distinct and the Chinese Government is trying to treat them as one for its own purposes.

The Chinese Note of August 13th, 1963, is an unwarranted attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of the Government of India and must therefore be rejected. It is for the Government of India to take such measures as may be necessary to strengthen the capacity of Indian forces to defend India's air space.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew the assurances of its high consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 16 October 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

1. During the three-month period of July, August and September, 1963, 25 sorties were made by Indian aircraft in violation of China's air space (see appendix for details). They crossed the 1959 line of actual control and for many times willfully circled over Chinese civilian checkposts for reconnaissance. Some of them even flew deep into the air space over the hinterland of Tibet and Sinkiang, China.
For instance, on September 29, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space north of Rudok, Tibet, China, then went northward along the Sinkiang-Tibet Road and flew over vast areas of Aksai Chin and Saittulla of Hotien and Shannushi of Yehcheng, all in Sinkiang. It made reconnaissance over Chinese territory for nearly two hours and penetrated a depth of about 180 kilometres inside China. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against these acts perpetrated by India in contempt of China's sovereignty over its air space and in a deliberate attempt to create tension. It urges the Indian Government to put an immediate end to any unlawful intrusion of this kind.

2. In its notes of July 12 and 24, 1963, the Indian Government, as usual, flatly denies the established facts about the Indian air intrusions into Chinese air space in April, May and June this year. But this cannot whitewash the crimes of intrusion committed by India. Furthermore, the Indian Government states in its note of July 24 that "no Indian aircraft has ever flown over China or Tibet". The Indian Government thus deliberately put Tibet on a par with China, hinting its non-recognition of Tibet as part of China. This is another exposure of its disregard of China's sovereignty and territorial integrity, at which the Ministry expresses its regret.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

**APPENDIX**

[List of Indian Air Intrusions into China in July, August and September 1963]

---

1. Intrusions over the Sinkiang and Tibet regions in the Western Sector of the Sino-Indian border (13 sorties):

1. On July 9, 1963, at 1825 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Height 5651 metres in Sinkiang.

2. On July 24, 1963, at 1120 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the civilian checkpost at Kongka Pass in Tibet and its vicinity.

3. On August 5, 1963, at 1111 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the vicinity of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet.

4. On August 5, 1963, at 1150 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the vicinity of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet.

5. On August 28, 1963, at 1105 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the vicinity of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet and circled over there again and again for reconnaissance.
6. On August 30, 1963, at 1018 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Sirijap and other places in Tibet and circled over there repeatedly for reconnaissance.

7. On September 11, 1963, at 1105 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Kongka Pass in Tibet and circled over there for reconnaissance.

8. On September 11, 1963, at 1112 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Kongka Pass in Tibet.

9. On September 21, 1963, at 1120 hours, two Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Kongka Pass in Tibet and circled over there for reconnaissance.

10. On September 26, 1963, at 1305 hours, two Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the vicinity of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet.

11. On September 29, 1963, about 1230 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the area north of Rudok in Tibet, then went northward along the Sinkiang-Tibet Road and flew over vast areas of Aksai Chin and Saittula of Hotien and Shannushi of Yecheng, all in Sinkiang. Then it turned back and left China after flying over the Chip Chap River Valley and the Galwan River Valley in Sinkiang. It reconnoitered over Chinese territory for about two hours and penetrated as deep as 180 kilometres inside China.

II. Intrusions over Tibet region in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border (3 sorties):

1. On July 6, 1963, at 1225 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Pulan Dzong, Renkung, Parkha and other places in Tibet for reconnaissance. It did not leave until 1302 hours. It penetrated over seventy kilometres into Chinese territory.

2. On July 30, 1963, at 1138 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the civilian checkpost at Polling in Tibet.

3. On September 21, 1963, at 1055 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the area south-west of Gyanime in Tibet and circled over there for reconnaissance.

III. Indian air intrusions over the Tibet region to the north of the 1959 line of actual control in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border (7 sorties):

1. On July 22, 1963, at 1155 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the civilian checkpost at Le, Tsona, Dzong, Kuomei and other places in Tibet and circled over there for reconnaissance, penetrating over fifty kilometres north of the line of actual control.

181 E.A.—5
2. On July 23, 1963, at 1138 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Lingchin, Kuomei, Chawutang and other places in Tibet, penetrating over fifty kilometres north of the line of actual control.

3. On August 16, 1963, at 1415 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Sama in Tibet.

4. On August 26, 1963, at 1204 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the civilian checkposts at Hsiao and Le, Tsona Dzong and other places in Tibet.

5. On August 27, 1963, at 1200 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Tanghsu, Cheku, Tsona Dzong and other places in Tibet for reconnaissance, penetrating about 100 kilometres north of the line of actual control.

6. On August 29, 1963, at 1204 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the civilian checkpost at Hsiao and other places in Tibet.

7. On September 9, 1963, at 1111 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Tsona Dzong, Cheku, the civilian checkpost at Le and other places in Tibet and circled over there for reconnaissance. It penetrated about 100 kilometres north of the line of actual control and did not leave until 1148 hours.

IV. Intrusions over the Tibet region on the China-Sikkim and China-Bhutan borders (2 sorties):

1. On August 28, 1963, at 1141 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Lung La in Tibet.

2. On August 29, 1963, at 1145 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Chumbitan and other places in Tibet.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 17 October 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

On October 10, 1963, an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over Lhasa, the capital of Tibet, China, and flew over vast areas in the hinterland of Tibet for reconnaissance and harassment. About 1300 hours of that day, the aircraft intruded from southwest of Shigatze, passed over Shigatze, then turned north along a highway and flew over Wayu, Damshune, areas near the Toke Lake, and Nagchuka (located more than 200 kilometres north of Lhasa). Then it turned southward, flew over Lhasa, Gyantse and Tuichiung, and left China in a south-westward direction. It engaged in unlawful activities over Chinese territory for more than two hours, covering a distance of
more than 1,700 kilometres and penetrating a depth of more than 400 kilometres north of the 1959 line of actual control on the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border.

At about 1530 hours of the same day, another Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Yatung, Phari, Wakeshachu, the Pumuchang Lake and other places in Tibet.

The aforesaid activities of intrusions by Indian aircraft were quite extravagant. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against such wanton intrusions into China's air space for provocation committed by the Indian side in the face of the numerous representations made by the Chinese Government. It demands that an immediate end be put to such intrusions into China.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India 19 October 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows:

The Note of the Chinese Government of 17th October alleging the flight of an Indian aircraft over Shigatze, Damshune, Nagchuke and Gyantse is an utterly baseless fabrication.

The Chinese Government is well-aware that no Indian aircraft has intruded over Chinese air space in the vicinity of Lhasa and Shigatze. And yet, it has continued to maintain a continuous flow of false allegations to support its mischievous propaganda regarding provocative activities by India so as to cover up its own aggressive concentrations and activities along the India-China border.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of the opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 23 October 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office note dated the 16th October, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

2. The Government of India have in their earlier notes repeatedly made clear that all Indian aircraft have very strict instructions to keep within India airspace. There has been no instance of any Indian
aircraft crossing into Chinese airspace. Nevertheless, on each occasion when the Chinese Government have made a complaint, careful enquiries have been made and it has always transpired that the complaints have been without any factual basis whatsoever. The present Chinese allegations of “violation of China’s airspace” have also been carefully investigated and it has been established that they are as baseless as allegations made on previous occasions.

3. There is a reference in the Chinese note of 16th October to a so-called intrusion by an Indian aircraft over Sirijap. The Government of India would affirm in unmistakable terms that Sirijap lies in Indian territory.

4. The Government of India note that it has become standard practice for the Chinese Government to make fictitious and absurd allegations about Indian aircraft violating Chinese airspace. While making these fictitious allegations, Chinese aircraft have continued to violate Indian airspace on numerous occasions and Chinese troops continue to remain in forcible occupation of large areas of Indian territory. The Government of India deplore this aggressive stand of the Chinese Government which is in no way conducive to a peaceful settlement of the India-China boundary question.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 October 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the July 11, 1962 note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India, has the honour to state as follows:

Since the Chinese Government proposed in December 1961 to negotiate a new agreement on trade and intercourse between China and India to replace their existing 1954 agreement, many notes have been exchanged between the Chinese and Indian Governments on this subject. The Chinese Government made the proposal time and again, and every time the proposal was rejected by the Indian Government.

It was entirely out of a desire to improve the Sino-Indian relations that the Chinese Government took the initiative in making this proposal. The negotiating and conclusion of such a new agreement would not only have been beneficial to trade and intercourse between the two countries, but would have helped relax the tension between China and India and create a friendly atmosphere for opening up the way to the eventual settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question.

The Indian Government, however, proceeding from its set anti-China policy, adopted an extraordinarily rigid attitude and totally unreasonable position on this question. It took the friendly proposal of the Chinese Government for a sign of weakness on the part of China, thinking that China was asking India for a favour; therefore,
it vainly tried to take the opportunity to blackmail and swindle China on this question. It deliberately linked the question together with the Sino-Indian boundary question in a far-fetched way and absurdly insisted on China's unconditional acceptance of India's unilateral claims on the boundary question as a precondition to the negotiating of the proposed agreement; and in this way it unreasonably rejected the friendly proposal of the Chinese Government.

Any one who is impartial can make a fair judgment here as to who is right and who is wrong on this question. In its note under reference to the Indian Government reiterated its slanders and calumnies against the Chinese Government and made prevarications once again on its unlawful occupation of China's territory of Puling-Sumdo. All this is of no avail. In view of the fact that the 1954 Sino-Indian agreement ceased to be in force long ago and all the hackneyed arguments of the Indian side have long been duly refuted, the Chinese Government does not prepare to continue the exchange of notes with the Indian Government on this question, as that would be devoid of any practical meaning. Therefore, if the Indian Government should further haggle over this question by sending in another note, the Chinese Government will ignore it.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 3 January 1964.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and has the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the Note dated 24th October, 1963, from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China.

This Note of the Chinese Government is an acknowledgement and a reply to the Note dated 11th July, 1962, delivered 15 months ago by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi. It is obvious that, after the massive aggression by China across the Indian borders, both in the Western and Eastern sectors of the India China boundary, in October, 1962, there could be no further exchanges on the subject of the revival of the Agreement on Trade and Intercourse with Tibet, referred to in the Note of 11th July, 1962. The Government of India has no intention of continuing this correspondence, beyond reiterating its contention that the Chinese Government itself must bear the responsibility for the fact that an Agreement on Trade and Intercourse with Tibet, in continuation of the 1954 Agreement, could not be negotiated because of the crisis of confidence created by massive unprovoked Chinese aggression along the Indian borders.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 19 July 1963

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India and has the honour to state the following:

The Embassy has learnt that since April this year the Indian Government has again unjustifiably arrested Chinese nationals or ordered many Chinese nationals to quit India. For instance, Chinese nationals in Bombay Mr. Wang Kee-hua and Mr. Ah Rhuai Alias Ya Kao were arrested; Chinese nationals in Bombay Madam Tan Lei Hsiong, Mr. Liu Ta-hsiang, Mr. Tu Hsi-chen, Mr. Liu Hsi-hsiang, Mr. Hsia Chung-ho, Mr. Hsia Wing-sent, Mr. Lee Shyh-wenn and Chinese nationals in Calcutta Mr. Sin Koi Chung, Mr. Chen Jung, Mr. Hou Shun-lai, Mr. Tam Ying, Mr. Ho Paingwah and Madam Hou Fung-lan were ordered to leave India at a short notice.

It must be pointed out that in disregard of the repeated protests and serious representations by the Chinese Government, the Indian Government has continued to step up its persecution of peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals. Recently in Calcutta and Bombay it should have unjustifiably arrested Chinese nationals and ordered a large number of Chinese nationals to leave India. It is obvious that in taking this measure the Indian Government aims at keeping on worsening the relations between China and India. The Embassy lodges a strong protest against this and demands that the Indian Government immediately stop all forms of persecution of the Chinese nationals and cancel the orders unwarrantedly compelling the Chinese nationals to leave India.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the notes of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated September 10, December 3 and December 4, 1962 and its memorandum of December 4, 1962, has the honour to state as follows:

The Indian Government has for a long time imposed all sorts of restrictive and discriminative measures upon Chinese official missions and personnel in India and repeatedly connived at the provocations and trouble-making in front of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General by Indian ruffians. This line of action of the Indian Government is in total contravention of diplomatic practice and the principles of international law. And the Chinese Government has repeatedly laid protests against this with the Indian Government. But in the above-mentioned notes and memorandum, the Indian Government continued to engage in prevarications, and denials. The Chinese Government greatly deplores this.
The Indian Government prevaricated that its restrictive and discriminative measures against Chinese official missions in India were taken "in the interest of the Chinese missions in India" and to "afford additional protection". This is a most despicable and shameless assertion. As everyone knows, the Indian Government's purpose in doing this is to make it practically impossible for the Chinese missions in India to discharge their normal functions.

Furthermore, the Indian Government termed its pre-emptory measures against the Chinese missions in India as based on "strict reciprocity". This is even more non-sensical. As a matter of fact, the Chinese Government has always treated the Indian missions in China in exactly the same way as it has all the other foreign missions in China, and there has never been any special regulation applicable exclusively to the Indian missions. The Indian Embassy in China and the Indian Government are well aware of this fact. Take exit formalities for example. The Chinese regulations on the exit formalities for personnel of foreign Embassies and Consulates apply to personnel of all foreign missions in China and not exclusively to the personnel of the Indian missions in China, and are completely in conformity with acknowledged international practice. But the regulations mentioned in the Indian Government's notes dated November 7, and 8, 1962 are directed exclusively against China and, what is more, in the title of the regulations the Indian Government flagrantly used the term "restrictions on Chinese nationals", this is obviously a total violation of diplomatic practice and the principles of international law. Can this fact be denied by the Indian Government.

The Indian Government, trying in every way to shirk its responsibility for conniving at Indian ruffians in their repeated provocations and trouble-making in front of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General in India, asserted that the provocations were "spontaneous", "peaceful", etc. Facts show exactly the contrary: Such trouble-making by the ruffians was carried out under the protection and support of the Indian Government and is a component of the anti-China drive engineered by the Indian Government. Apart from seriously obstructing the discharge of normal functions by the Chinese Embassy and the former Chinese Consulates-General in India, it has even threatened the personal freedom and safety of the Chinese personnel.

As usual, the Indian Government in its notes repeated its shopworn argument of "Chinese aggression". This lie is completely unworthy of refutation. The irrefutable facts about the Sino-Indian boundary question conclusively show that it was India which committed aggression against China and that China was the victim; that it was the Indian troops that launched massive attacks against China after Prime Minister Nehru personally declared he would free Chinese territory of Chinese frontier guards, and that it was only under the circumstances in which the Chinese frontier guards were pressed beyond the limits of forbearance and left with no room for retreat that they were compelled to strike back in self-defence.

The Chinese Government wishes to point out that what the Indian Government should do is to respect the principles of international law and stop the restriction, discrimination and all other
pre-emptory measures against the Chinese Embassy in India. Any
prevarication of the Indian Government is futile and will merit no
further refutation.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity
to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest conside-
ration.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of
External Affairs, New Delhi, 31 July 1963

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents
its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of the Republic
of India and has the honour to state the following:

1. The Chinese Government has thrice sent ships to bring back
victimized Chinese nationals unreasonably interned by the Indian
Government. But there is now still a large number of victimized
Chinese being interned in Indian prisons and the concentration camp.
They have been deprived of their freedom and means of living, sub-
jected to all sorts of inhuman maltreatment and persecution and are
leading a miserable life. The Chinese Government is greatly con-
cerned about their situation. In order to rescue these victimized
Chinese from their dire misery, the Chinese Government has decided
to send its ship for the fourth time to bring them back to their
motherland. It is hoped that the Indian Government will give due
cooperation and assistance.

2. In his talk with Mr. Ma Mu-ming, First Secretary of the
Chinese Embassy, on June 5 concerning the Chinese Government's
third operation of bringing back victimized Chinese nationals Mr. A.
P. Venkateswaran, Deputy Secretary of the Indian Ministry of Exter-
nal Affairs, went to the length of stating that the third operation
would be the last one. This statement patently reveals the Indian
Government's deliberate attempt to forcibly detain the large number
of victimized Chinese nationals now held in the concentration camp.
Such an act of the Indian Government is absolutely unacceptable
to the Chinese Government.

3. Since it arrested and interned a large number of innocent
Chinese nationals, the Indian Government has all along refused to
furnish the Chinese Government with a list of all the interned
Chinese nationals. In the course of the Chinese Government's ship-
ing back the interned Chinese nationals, the Indian authorities col-
luded with Chiang Kai-shek gang elements in obstructing the return
of victimized Chinese and detained some of those whose names had
already been included in the list of returning Chinese. The Chinese
Government had lodged repeated protests against this, but the Indian
Government persisted in going its own way and gave no considera-
tion to them. This cannot but arouse the indignation of the Chinese
Government. The Chinese Embassy firmly opposes the Indian Gov-
ernment's detention of victimized Chinese under whatever pretext,
and resolutely demands that the Indian Government allow all the in-
terned Chinese nationals to return to their motherland together with
their family members.
4. The Chinese Government has taken serious note of the fact that outside the concentration camp, there is also a big number of Chinese nationals in India who are suffering dire miseries under the discrimination and persecution of the Indian Government. Among them, some have lost their jobs or the chance of going to school; some have been robbed of their property; some have had their families broken; and some have been rendered homeless. In short, these Chinese nationals can no longer make a living in India, nor are they capable of bearing the travel expenses for their trip back to China. The Chinese Government once again demands that the Indian Government immediately end all its discrimination against and persecution of Chinese nationals, and has decided that in sending its ships to bring back interned victimized Chinese, it will also ship back those Chinese nationals who can no longer make a living in India and who desire to return to China.

5. The Chinese Embassy has been instructed by its Government to discuss with the Indian Government matters concerning the Chinese Government's decision to continue sending its ships to bring back Chinese nationals. It is hoped that an early reply will be given by the Indian Government.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 3 August 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated June 21, has the honour to state the following:

According to the agreement between the Chinese and Indian officials, all family members of an interned Chinese shall come back to China together with him in the same ship. The names of Shen Tien-feng's three sons had originally been included in the list of the second batch of returning family members of victimized Chinese, but the Indian Government failed to make arrangements for their return together with Shen Tien-feng in the same ship, nor did it include their names in the third batch of returning family members of victimized Chinese. No amount of prevarications in the Indian note can possibly deny those illegal acts of detaining family members of victimized Chinese in open violation of the agreement.

After the victimized Chinese Shen Tien-feng had rejected the Indian authorities' threatening demand that he should sign a written declaration expressing his willingness to leave his sons in India, the Indian authorities abducted him by force and set him free only after he had been coerced into putting down his signature on a prepared paper. This is an iron-clad fact which can in no way be covered up by any prevarication or distortion.
The Indian note charged the Chinese Government with "purposefully ignoring the fact" that Shen Tien-feng's wife and two other sons remained in India. As a matter of fact, the continued stay of Shen Tien-feng's wife and two other sons in India was a decision of their own family; and this is quite another matter and has nothing to do with the Chinese Government's protest against the Indian authorities' detention of Shen Tien-feng's three sons whose names had already been included in the list of returning victimized Chinese. It is precisely the Indian Government which deliberately tries in its note to confuse these two matters of different nature in an attempt to cover up its illegal acts of detaining victimized Chinese.

In abducting Shen Tien-feng, the Indian officials had openly insulted Chinese diplomatic officials in disregard of the minimum diplomatic etiquette. But later the Indian authorities falsely charged the Chinese officials with assaulting the Indian officials; and now they have changed their charge by alleging that the Chinese officials had made a display of force to obstruct Indian officials from carrying out their duty. These self-contradictory allegations all the more prove that the Indian Government, having a guilty conscience, is lacking sound arguments and unable to justify its own case.

The Chinese Government resolutely rejects the unjustifiable prevarications contained in the Indian Government's note and once again demands that the Indian Government strictly abide by the agreement on the shipping back of Chinese nationals reached between the Chinese and Indian officials and ensure that all the interned Chinese nationals together with their family members will return to China.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, dated 8 August 1963.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Foreign office note dated 23rd July, 1963 handed over to the Indian Embassy in Peking, and desires to state as follows:

The Chinese note continues to make baseless allegations regarding "restrictive and discriminative measures" imposed upon Chinese Official Missions in India, and about "conniving at Indian ruffians in their repeated provocations and trouble-making in front of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates-General in India".

The correct facts regarding these allegations have been clearly conveyed to the Chinese Government in our notes of the 10th September, 3rd December and 4th December 1962 as well as in our Memorandum of 4th December, 1962. Having no basis whatsoever in facts
the trumped up charges made by the Chinese Government do not merit any refutation.

While categorically rejecting the Chinese note under reference, the Government of India takes strong objection to the abusive and offensive language in which the note has been couched. It is to be pointed out that such notes violate all normal codes of courtesy in International relations. Factual distortions and intemperate language cannot help in bolstering the false charges made by the Chinese Embassy.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 August 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and with reference to the Embassy’s note dated the 31st July, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India in their notes dated January 25th and March 7th, 1963, had indicated that they were prepared to extend facilities to those internees of Chinese origin and their dependents who wished to avail of the Chinese Government’s offer of repatriation and that the views of the internees were being ascertained.

The Government of India extended full facilities to the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi for the repatriation, in three batches, of 2,395 persons of Chinese origin comprising internees who had opted to go and their dependents. With the departure of the third batch the remaining internees have clearly indicated that they do not want to avail of the Chinese Government’s offer and expressed their firm desire to remain in India.

The Chinese note is based on the unwarranted assumption that there are still a large number of persons of Chinese origin in India who desire to proceed to China. The fact, is however, that persons of Chinese origin who are now in India want to continue living in India peacefully as law-abiding and loyal citizens and have no intention of leaving this country. In case persons of Chinese origin desire in future to leave India for permanent settlement elsewhere, Government of India will always be prepared to give such persons necessary facilities and normal commercial transportation for the purpose is also available.

In numerous notes it has been clearly explained to the Chinese Government that the Government of India does not interfere with the freedom of persons of Chinese origin in India to decide whether they should leave this country or stay on in India. All internees of Chinese origin and their dependents who had desired to avail themselves of the offer of the Chinese Government have now left the
country. There can, therefore, be no question of the Chinese Government despatching another ship for repatriation of a fourth batch as there are now no persons of Chinese origin who desire to be repatriated. This position has been made clear to the Chinese Charge d'Affaires by the Director of the China Division in their meeting on August 1, 1963.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 12 August 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to refer to the notes of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated March 18 and May 4, 1963.

1. In its notes of December 30, 1962 and February 21, 1963 the Chinese Government fully refuted the unwarranted charges made by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs against China for issuing service passports to Mr. Liu Chang-ching and Mr. Yu Hsiao-hai. The issuance of service passports by the Chinese Consulates-General to its functionaries is a matter in which the Indian Government should not have interfered. The Indian Government, however, has kept on haggling over the subject. If, as alleged by the Indian Government in its notes, the Chinese Consulates-General had issued service passports to its functionaries "with a view to circumventing local legislation," which "is an indication of the absence of elementary understanding of international practice," then what was the intention of the former Indian Consulates-General in Shanghai and Lhasa and even the Indian Embassy in China, which is a diplomatic mission, in issuing service passports to some Indian nationals; for instance, Mr. Sohan Singh and Mr. Jag Singh, who were holding ordinary passports and had registered at the office of the local authorities in charge of alien affairs? What does this indicate? It is not a proof of big-power chauvinism which gives you the exclusive freedom to do something while forbidding others to do the same.

2. In its notes of December 7, 1962 and March 9 and April 27, 1963, the Chinese Government already thoroughly refuted the unwarranted charge made by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs about the failure of non-diplomatic staff members of the Chinese Missions in India to fulfill aliens' registration formalities. This charge made by the Indian Government has nothing in common with the fact and is a sheer fabrication or slander.

3. The Indian Government has kept on haggling over the matter long after the two Chinese Consulates-General in India and their officials had withdrawn from India. This is obviously a mischievous trouble-making. The Chinese Government expresses great regret at this unreasonable act of the India Government.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 14 August 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to refer to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated March 13.

In its notes of November 5, November 21, December 8, and December 14, 1962 and February 23, 1963, the Chinese Government has solemnly condemned the Indian authorities for their violation of the accepted principles of international law by such illegal acts as unwarrantedly closing down and forcibly taking over the Calcutta Branch and the Bombay Agency of the Bank of China and outrageously persecuting the personnel of the Bank, and has repeatedly raised its proper and reasonable demands in this connection. In its above mentioned notes, the Chinese Government has fully refuted all the Indian Government's sophistries aimed at denying its crimes. In its note under question, the Indian Government still tries to use so-called national laws to cover up its crimes. This, however, is nothing but a repetition of the platitudes that have long been refuted and can only result in an even more thorough exposure of its arbitrary and unreasonable attitude.

The Chinese Government once again declares that the Indian Government must be held fully responsible for all the losses suffered by China as a result of the closing down and taking over by the Indian authorities of the establishments of the Bank of China in India, and that the Chinese Government reserves its right to ask for compensation.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 26 August 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China, and with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India dated August 10, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:—

1. In its note of July 31, the Chinese Embassy notified the Indian Ministry of External Affairs that the Chinese Government had decided to send its ship for the fourth time to bring back Chinese nationals and hoped that the Indian Government would give cooperation and assistance. It is surprising that the Indian Government should assert in its reply note that "...there are now no persons of Chinese origin who desire to be repatriated." This is an utterly baseless assertion, to which the Chinese Government absolutely cannot agree. The Chinese Government reaffirms that it
resolutely opposes the Indian Government’s detention of large numbers of victimized Chinese and its act of obstructing the Chinese Government from sending more ships to bring them back under whatever pretext.

2. According to verified information available to the Chinese Government and revelations made by the third batch of returned Chinese, a large number of peaceable law-abiding Chinese nationals are still interned in the Indian concentration camp and prisons. In the Deoli concentration camp alone, their number totals as many as six hundred. “Interrogation chambers” and “dark cells” have been set up in the concentration camp for the purpose of coercing the Chinese nationals into expressing their “desire” to remain in India and their “unwillingness to go back to China”.

Furthermore, the Indian authorities have imprisoned hundreds of innocent Chinese in various places, and have never furnished the Chinese Government with any information about them. Among the third batch of returned victimized Chinese, more than twenty had been kept in the prison at Nowgong.

3. Outside the concentration camp, there is now an even greater number of Chinese nationals who have asked the Chinese Embassy to arrange for their return as they are unable to earn a living as a result of the discrimination and persecution by the Indian Government. On July 30, for instance, the Hindustan Standard reported that there were about 1,000 Chinese nationals outside the Deoli camp who had asked the Chinese Embassy to arrange for their return. The Indian Government’s assertion that “persons of Chinese origin who are now in India...have no intention of leaving this country” is completely false.

4. In order to continue the work of bringing back the victimized Chinese nationals in India, the Chinese Government has instructed the Chinese Embassy in India to discuss with the Indian Government concrete arrangements for shipping them back, and has asked the Embassy to send its officials to Calcutta, Bombay and other places for registering the Chinese nationals who desire to return to China. To this end, the Chinese Government requests the Indian Government:

   (1) to provide a complete name list along with the health conditions of the Chinese nationals interned in the concentration camp and prisons at various places;

   (2) to instruct the local Indian authorities to render proper facilities to the Chinese Embassy officials for carrying out their work there, and effectively ensure their safety;

   (3) to hold concrete discussions with the Chinese Embassy on questions related to the Chinese Government’s continued shipping back of Chinese nationals, such as the time and port of embarkation for the shipping, simplification of their departure procedures and the question of bringing back their properties etc.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 28 August 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office Note dated the 12th August, 1963, has the honour to repeat that Mr. Liu Chang-ching a local employee of the Chinese Consulate General at Calcutta and his wife Mrs. Liu Chang-ching were holding ordinary Chinese passports. At the time of their departure from India, the Chinese Consulate General applied for exit permits for them to the Ministry of External Affairs through the State Government. Since they were holding ordinary Chinese passports and they had already been registered as Chinese nationals with the local Registration Office, the State Government informed the Chinese Consulate General that Mr. and Mrs. Liu should obtain their exit permits from the local Registration Office. Thereupon, with the deliberate intention of circumventing the local regulations the Chinese Consulate General replaced their ordinary passports by service passports and again applied to the Ministry of External Affairs for their exit permits. The Chinese Consulate General at Bombay also repeated the same procedure in regard to Mr. Yu Hsiao Hai. This was not only irregular but against all norms of international courtesy and practice.

However, consistent with their desire to facilitate the smooth winding up of the Chinese Consulates General in Calcutta and Bombay, the Ministry of External Affairs issued exit permits to Mr. and Mrs. Liu Chang-ching and also Mr. Yu Hsiao Hai. Any number of angry denials couched in intemperate language cannot hide the above facts and the Chinese Government are only further exposing themselves by continuing an aimless and empty harangue for purposes of propaganda.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 September 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China, and with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India dated December 3, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

With regard to the incidents in which Chinese border inhabitants were harassed by the Indian checkpost at Mordo, the Chinese side pointed out in its note of September 30, 1962:

1. On July 20, 1962, when Chinese border inhabitants Gago and Tsaipei went to India for petty trade as usual, they were illegally detained by the Indian checkpost at Mordo
for one day before they were released. And an Indian soldier wrested from them their exit permits.

2. On July 26, 1962, when Chinese border inhabitant Kung-gachienchan went to India for petty trade as usual, he was also unreasonably detained by the Indian checkpost at Mordo for one day and questioned about military matters in Rudok Dzong in Tibet, China. The Indian soldiers subjected him to maltreatment and personal insults. The Indian soldiers even forcibly took away a fat sheep from him.

The foregoing are all conclusive facts. The Chinese Government expresses its regret at the fact that the Indian Government should deny and defend the harassing of Chinese border inhabitants by the Indian checkpost at Mordo.

The Chinese Government once again lodges a protest against these unwarranted acts of violence committed by Indian soldiers and reiterates its demand that the Indian Government should speedily return the exit permits of the Chinese citizens forcibly taken away by the Indian checkpost, compensate the losses suffered by the Chinese citizens in the aforesaid incidents and adopt measures to prevent the recurrence of similar incidents.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 3 September 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office note dated 3rd August, 1963, handed over to the Embassy of India in Peking has the honour to state as follows:

The freely expressed wishes of the persons concerned, was the basic consideration that governed the repatriation of the interned Chinese and their dependents.

As far as the complaint of Mr. Sang Tee Wung is concerned, this Ministry conveyed the correct facts to the Chinese Government in its note of the 21st June. It is surprising that in spite of this clear statement of facts the Chinese Government deliberately tries to distort the same. The Chinese note under reference has failed to reckon with the fact that Mr. Sang's wife and two of his sons never opted to go back to China. His remaining three sons originally indicated their desire to go to China, but later on withdrew their option. This explains the fact of their names being included in the original list of the second batch of internees to be repatriated and their later failure to take the ship to China. In spite of Mr. Sang being informed two days before he left the internment camp on the 20th May, 1963, of the decision of his three sons
to stay on in India, he proceeded to Madras. In the declaration which Mr. Sang had furnished to the Camp authorities at Deoli, he made it quite clear that he knew of his family's wishes when he stated on the form "I am unable to speak for my family". No amount of vociferous accusations by the Chinese Government can alter the basic facts regarding Mr. Sang Tee Wung's case.

As far as the unseemly conduct of the Chinese diplomats during the repatriation of Mr. Sang is concerned, correct details have been conveyed in the Indian memorandum of the 26th May, 1963 and Note dated 21st June, 1963 addressed to the Chinese Government.

The Chinese Government is obviously embarrassed by the behaviour of the Chinese officials, on the occasion of the repatriation of the second batch of Chinese internees and their dependents which shows up in sharp contrast to the consistent cooperation and courtesy shown by Indian officials while making arrangements for the repatriation of the internees and their dependents in three batches.

As regards the allegation about so-called obstructions placed by the Government of India against the overseas Chinese desirous of going to China, this is clearly refuted by the fact that as a result of arrangements made by the Government of India 1,665 internees and 730 dependents have been repatriated. Further the Government of India have placed no impediment in the way of persons of Chinese origin who are desirous of going to China availing of normal travel facilities.

The Government of India consider the various allegations made in the Chinese note under reference repetitious and tendentious and not meriting any further refutation. The Government of India categorically reject the protest made by the Chinese Government.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 September 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and, with reference to the Foreign Office Note dated the 26th August, 1963, handed over to the Indian Charge d'Affaires at Peking, has the honour to state as follows:—

It has been made clear both in meeting of the Chinese Charge d'Affairs with the Director of the China Division on August 1, 1963 and in the Government of India's Note dated the 10th August, 1963 that those internees in the Central Internment Camp and elsewhere, including Nowgong, which the Chinese Note refers to, as well as their dependents who expressed their desire to go to China have been given necessary facilities and they have all left for China along with the three batches of repatriates. All internees of
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Chinese origin now in the custody of the Government of India desire to continue in this country as peaceful and law-abiding citizens. The Government of India are taking necessary steps for their welfare and rehabilitation. There can, therefore, be no question of the Chinese Government sending a fourth ship to India for the repatriation of internees of Chinese origin and their dependents.

In numerous notes and in the meetings with the officials of the Chinese Embassy, the Government of India have stated unequivocally that the Government of India will not place any impediment in the way of other Chinese nationals wanting to proceed to China. As has been pointed out in the Government of India Note dated August 10, 1963 "In case persons of Chinese origin desire in future to leave India for permanent settlement elsewhere, Government of India will always be prepared to give such persons necessary facilities and normal commercial transportation for the purpose is also available". It is clear that what the Chinese note calls "interrogation chambers" in the Deoli camp for the purpose of coercing the Chinese nationals to stay on in India are vile and baseless fabrications.

The Chinese Government's note basing itself on a vague and unsubstantiated newspaper report refers to over 1000 Chinese nationals corresponding with the Chinese Embassy to arrange their return. The report is palpably false.

There are in India a large number of people of Chinese origin who desire to live as peaceful citizens of this country and who do not want any interference from the Chinese Government or their Embassy. The Government of India regret therefore that they cannot permit Chinese Embassy personnel to visit Calcutta, Bombay and other places to coerce or harass these people of Chinese origin under the pretext of registration of Chinese nationals.

As for the three demands of the Chinese Government:

(a) Complete name-lists of those persons who have left for China have already been furnished to the Chinese Embassy.

(b) As there can be no question of Chinese Embassy officials carrying out their so-called work of "registration" of persons not willing to go to China, there is no need for the Government of India to render "proper facilities to the Chinese Embassy officials" in this regard.

(c) The Government of India have already informed the Chinese Government that there is no necessity to despatch a fourth ship as there are no more Chinese desiring repatriation and hence the question of holding discussions to arrange concrete matters in respect of the same does not arise.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 September 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and, with reference to Embassy's Note No. M/161/63, dated July 19, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The persons mentioned in the above quoted note had, in accordance with local laws, been arrested and/or asked to leave India because of activities prejudicial to the State. The externment of these persons of Chinese origin from India is a matter that is entirely within the domestic jurisdiction of this country and any interference by the Chinese Embassy in this matter is unwarranted.

The Chinese Government are fully aware that thousands of peaceful and law-abiding Chinese nationals continue to stay in India and are carrying on their usual vocations. This clearly proves that the allegation made in the Chinese note that "the Indian Government has continued to step up its persecution of peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals in India" is only intended to serve China's propagandist purposes.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 September 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office note dated the 14th August 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India have, in their notes dated the 28th December, 1962 and 13th March, 1963, already clearly pointed out that the liquidation of the Bank of China's branches in India was a result of normal legal processes operating in this country. The attention of the Chinese Government is once again drawn to the above-mentioned notes of the Government of India.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 7 October 1963

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and has the honour to state as follows:

The Embassy has learnt that, in disregard of the repeated protests and representations by the Embassy and the Chinese Government,
the Indian Government has continued its wilful persecution of Chinese nationals in India. For instance, Chinese nationals in Bombay, Mr. Wang Chi Chang, Mrs. I Feng Lin alias Yee Fong Lin, Mrs. Peng Chin Chi and her three children, Mr. Chao Ping Kwai, Mr. K. C. Liang alias Liang Kan Chen, Mrs. Chin Huan Yang and her three children, and Chinese nationals in Calcutta, Mr. Chow Chen Sheng alias Chou Chen Sheng, Miss Hou Yueh Lan and Mr. Pi Kwan Yu were all unwarrantedly ordered to leave India within a short period. This is another planned outrageous act of persecuting peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals and depriving them of their property.

So far the Indian Government has expelled a large number of Chinese nationals from India, but has failed to give any authentic evidence to prove that they were guilty. Such practice of the Indian Government is an act of trampling upon the code of conduct of international relations, which is obviously for the purpose of opposing China and of deliberately vitiating the relations between China and India. The Embassy lodges a protest against this and demands that the Indian Government immediately put an end to all the persecutions of the Chinese nationals and cancel the orders forcing the Chinese nationals to quit India.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 9 October 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and, with reference to the note No. 11/219, dated 2nd September, 1963 from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, has the honour to state that in this Ministry's note dated 3rd December, 1962 it was stated that the allegations made by the Chinese Government had already been investigated and had been found to be baseless. Therefore, the Government of India, once again, categorically reject the Chinese Government's note.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 November 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the
Embassy's Note No. M[195/63, dated the 7th October, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The persons referred to in the note of the Embassy were served with orders to leave India on account of their anti-Indian or anti-social activities. This was well within the sovereign competence of the Government of India and the charge that the Government of India persecuted "peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals" is absolutely groundless.

The note under reply, alleges that the Government of India are "trampling upon the code of conduct of international relations". The Chinese Embassy should be aware that it is an accepted code of conduct that foreign nationals should respect local laws and not act in a manner prejudicial to the security of the State wherein they reside. The many thousands of Chinese nationals who continue to reside peacefully in India constitute living proof of the fact that there is no impediment placed in regard to their stay in this country so long as they respect the laws of the land.

In the light of the facts stated above, the protest of the Chinese Embassy is rejected.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China, the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 7 November 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India dated June 10, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government’s note of June 6 once again exposed with established facts the Indian Government’s atrocious persecution of Chinese nationals in India and its obstruction of the victimized Chinese nationals from returning to China. The Indian Government’s note of June 10, instead of making a serious reply, merely repeated its hackneyed tune in an attempt to whitewash itself; but the more it tried to hide, the more it was exposed. Moreover, it wantonly slandered and calumniated the peaceable foreign policy of China. The Chinese Government categorically rejects those slanders and calumnies, firmly refutes the Indian Government’s arguments for persecuting Chinese nationals and reiterates its demand contained in its note of June 6 for an immediate end to the Indian Government’s persecution of Chinese nationals.

In view of the fact that the Indian note makes no clarification on the reports about the Indian authorities’ discussions with Chiang Kai-shek elements on the issue of Chinese nationals and that it
evades an answer about the real intention of the Indian authorities in using the term "continental China" in their official documents, the Chinese Government once again solemnly declares its resolute opposition to any activities of the Indian Government in following the U.S. imperialists to create "two Chinas" and asks the Indian Government to give an unequivocal clarification on the reports about Indian officials' discussions with Chiang Kai-shek elements on the issue of Chinese nationals.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 November 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office's Note, dated November 7, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India, in numerous notes, has fully replied to the absurd charges that people of Chinese origin in India are being subjected to harassment. Leaders of the Chinese community in India have themselves exposed these allegations as false. The Chinese Government is well aware that the Government of India has continued to give full opportunity to persons of Chinese origin resident in India to lead a peaceful life, so long as they respect the laws of the land.

As for the clarifications that the Chinese Government has sought on vague reports about so-called discussions by Indian officials with representatives of Chiang Kai-shek the Government of India has already stated in its memorandum dated January 6, 1963, that the reports were without any foundation at all.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 11 December 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated October 9, 1963 to the Chinese Embassy in India regarding the case in which Chinese border inhabitants were harassed by the Indian checkpoint at Mordo, has the honour to state the following:

It is an established fact that the Indian checkpoint at Mordo unlawfully detained, harassed and persecuted the Chinese border inhabitants Gago, Tsaipei and Kungga-chienchan and wrested from them
their exit permits for Chinese citizens. The Indian Government can in no way shirk its responsibility by vehement denials. The Chinese Government hereby declares that it reserves the right to demand that the Indian Government return the exit permits of the Chinese citizens forcibly taken away by the Indian checkpost and compensate them for their losses suffered in the aforesaid case.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to the Embassy of India in China, 25 December 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India dated September 4, has the honour to state the following:

Ignoring the just and proper demands of the Chinese Government, the Indian Government has time and again unreasonably rejected the Chinese Government's offer to send more ships to bring back its victimized nationals in India. This fact further exposes the Indian Government's deliberate intention to continue its persecution of Chinese nationals, prevent the Chinese Government from exercising its right to protect its nationals and thus aggravate the relations between the two countries.

The Indian note alleged that all the detained Chinese nationals "desire to continue" to stay in India "as peaceful and law-abiding citizens." As is known to all, those Chinese nationals have all along been peaceable and law-abiding. Starting in October 1962, however, in its campaign against China, the Indian Government made wholesale arrests of Chinese nationals and detained and cruelly persecuted them throughout India on such trumped-up charges as "anti-India activities." Now it has suddenly changed its tune and stated that they are "peaceful and law-abiding." These contradictory statements merely show that the past allegation of the Indian Government was made for the purpose of persecuting the Chinese nationals and that its present assertion is made in order to prevent the Chinese Government from sending more ships for bringing back its nationals and to perpetuate the persecution of Chinese nationals.

In its note, the Indian Government stated that it was "taking necessary steps for the welfare and rehabilitation" of the victimized Chinese nationals detained in the concentration camp. Obviously, that is not true. The fact is that large numbers of innocent Chinese nationals are still detained in concentration camp and prisons and that they have long been deprived of personal freedom and subjected to most cruel persecution and maltreatment. Is that the "welfare and rehabilitation" provided to them by the Indian Government?
The Chinese nationals outside the concentration camp are also subjected to discrimination and persecution of every kind by the Indian Government. In order to continue its persecution of Chinese nationals, the Indian Government has gone so far as to slanderously charge that the purpose of the Chinese Government in sending officials of the Chinese Embassy to Calcutta, Bombay and other places where Chinese communities exist is “to coerce or harass” the Chinese nationals and tries on this pretext to deprive the Chinese Embassy of its right to protect its nationals, which is acknowledged by international law. Moreover, it asserted that “there are in India a large number of people of Chinese origin who desire to live as peaceful citizens of this country and who do not want any interference from the Chinese Government or their Embassy”. As is well known, the “Foreigners Law (Application and Amendment) Ordinance” promulgated by the Indian Government in October 1962 for the purpose of persecuting Chinese nationals and the subsequent wholesale arrests and detention of Chinese nationals involved people of Chinese origin who had acquired Indian citizenship and become Indian citizens. The Indian Government now deliberately tries to confuse Chinese nationals with Indian citizens of Chinese origin. Its purpose in so doing is none other than depriving the Chinese Government of the right of protecting its nationals so as to prevent China from sending more ships to bring back its victimized nationals. The Chinese Government absolutely cannot agree to the Indian Government’s despicable practice of continuing to persecute Chinese nationals in violation of principles of international law.

The Chinese Government hereby firmly demands that the Indian Government.

1. Provide a complete name list of the Chinese nationals interned in the concentration camp and prisons at various places along with information on their health conditions;

2. Immediately release all the victimized Chinese nationals interned in the concentration camp and prisons in various parts of India, return to them their property and compensate for their losses; and

3. Put an immediate end to all the discrimination and persecution of Chinese nationals in India and strictly ensure them personal freedom and the safety of their lives and property.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 1 January 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to Reference to the Not. No. 11/268, dated the 11th December, 1963. Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and, with from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of
China, has the honour to point out that in the Ministry's Notes dated 9th October, 1963 and 3rd December, 1962, it had already been conveyed that the allegations made by the Chinese Government were fully investigated and found to be baseless.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 January 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office note dated the 25th December, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

1. The Chinese Government is fully aware that all persons of Chinese origin interned in the Central Internment Camp, Deoli, who had expressed their desire to go to China, have been extended the necessary facilities to leave for China. No impediments are placed in the way of any other person of Chinese origin making his own arrangements to go to China. As the Government of India have already indicated in their note of 4th September, 1963, there is no need to send a ship for a fourth time for any such so-called repatriation. The continued insistence on sending a ship when there is no need for such a ship, can only be looked upon by the Government of India as the usual form of propaganda, which the Chinese Government ordinarily, unnecessarily indulges in, and little else.

2. The Chinese Government's propaganda theme that it is "the Indian Government's deliberate intention to continue its persecution of Chinese nationals" is, furthermore, a mechanical repetition of the charge that has long been refuted in the communications of the Government of India and by persons of Chinese origin in India, themselves, following upon the massive attack by Chinese forces on Indian territory. The Government of India have, in the past, on three separate occasions, provided necessary facilities for internees and members of their families who expressed their desire to return to China to do so in ships provided by the Government of China. As the Government of China are aware, about 2400 persons of Chinese origin had availed of these facilities and been allowed to leave India. It is obvious that the Chinese Government finds it unpalatable to have to admit that large number of persons of Chinese origin desire to adopt India as their country of residence and do not wish to return to China. Consequently, the Chinese Government have been mischievously making baseless charges of ill-treatment of people of Chinese origin in India, despite the fact that all this has been refuted by the resident Chinese community in India itself.

3 As for the 3 demands of the Chinese Government:

(a) a complete name-list of those persons who left for China has already been furnished to the Chinese Embassy and there is no question of providing any further name-lists;
(b) those internees who have remained behind in India, in preference to being repatriated to China, are being released and rehabilitated; and

(c) the mischievous allegation that Chinese nationals in India are being “persecuted” and “discriminated against” deserves only to be firmly rejected.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 17 July 1963

According to reports from citizens in Peking, staff members of the Indian Embassy in China have recently used radio receivers to disseminate at a public centre in Peking anti-China Indian broadcasts in the Chinese language. From about eight o’clock to half past nine on the evening of June 18, three staff members of the Indian Embassy in China brought a radio receiver to the Peking Jih Tan Park. They first attracted visitors in the park by tuning in a music programme and then loudly played a Chinese language programme of an Indian radio station, including slanders about “Chinese aggression” against India. From five past eight to ten past nine on the evening of July 12, one of the above-mentioned three staff members of the Indian Embassy in China again used a radio receiver to disseminate anti-China Indian radio broadcasts in Chinese in the Jih Tan Park.

These provocative acts of the Indian Embassy personnel have roused strong indignation among the Peking citizens who were present. They resolutely asked the Chinese authorities concerned to take necessary measures to stop such anti-China activities on the part of the personnel of the Indian Embassy in China.

The Chinese Government must sternly point out that the Indian Embassy personnel’s practice of disseminating anti-China propaganda at a public centre in China is most despicable and seriously violates the standards of international relations. The obvious aim of the Indian Embassy personnel’s practice is to create trouble so as to poison the atmosphere between the two countries. The Chinese Government absolutely will not allow this. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs asks the Embassy immediately to take effective measures and guarantee against the recurrence of similar incidents. Otherwise, the Embassy will be held responsible for all the consequences arising therefrom.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 1 August 1963

The Embassy of China in New Delhi may kindly refer to Chinese Foreign Office Memorandum given to the Embassy of India in Peking on the 17th July, 1963.
The complaint that some members of the Indian Embassy on two occasions switched on a portable radio in the Peking Jih Tan park and thereby indulged in dissemination of anti-Chinese propaganda and violated standards of international relations is too exaggerated and distorted a version of the facts to merit serious consideration.

This is yet another effort by the Chinese Government to harass the staff of the Indian Embassy and deny them the usual facility of outing in a local park with a portable radio—a common enough occurrence in any country—and to continue to foster an atmosphere of tension.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 7 August 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China, and has the honour to refer to this Ministry’s notes dated the 17th July, 1962 and 12th September, 1962.

It has been pointed in these notes that due to the harsh application of new and arbitrary regulations imposed by Chinese authorities Indo-Tibetan trade was systematically whittled down with the result that the traditional trade and cultural ties between India and Tibet had been totally disrupted. Those arbitrary regulations prevented the Indian traders from disposing of large quantities of goods they had already imported into Tibet much before the termination of the 1954 Agreement and they had, therefore, been forced to leave behind these goods as well as other immovable property acquired over a period of several decades and also large amounts of unsettled trade claims and credits, facilities for the recovery of which had been denied by the local authorities.

The total assets left behind by Indian traders in Tibet are of the order of several lakhs of rupees. Details of these assets are available with the Government of India.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 13 August 1963

The Chinese Red Cross Society received a telegram from the Indian Red Cross asking for permission to send parties to certain places with the 20-kilometre zone vacated by the Chinese frontier guards on the Chinese side of the 1959 line of actual control in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, for the purpose of collecting bodies of Indian military personnel there. In its reply the Chinese Red Cross Society stated that the bodies of Indian military personnel had been properly buried. Then the Indian Red Cross sent in another telegram saving that it was the
general custom in India to cremate the dead; therefore, it was hoped that proper arrangements would be made for the cremation of the bodies of the Indian military personnel. To meet the request of the Indian Red Cross, the Chinese Red Cross Society, having contacted the local Chinese authorities concerned, has now decided to send its personnel to certain places within the 20-kilometre zone vacated by the Chinese frontier guards on the Chinese side of the 1959 line of actual control in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border to collect the bodies of the Indian military personnel and carry out the cremation.

The personnel of the Chinese Red Cross Society will enter the following areas: The Chip Chap River Valley area, the area west of the source of the Karakash River, the Galwan River Valley area, the area northwest of Nyagzu, the areas of the Pangong and Spanggur Lakes and parts of the Demchok area (east of the 1959 line of actual control, including the Jara pass).

The personnel of the Chinese Red Cross Society will start entering the above areas in batches on August 15, 1963 and will accomplish the task of collecting and cremating the bodies around August 30, 1963.

The Chinese Red Cross Society will hand over the ashes and bodies to the Indian Red Cross after the collection and cremation are completed. The time and place for the handing over will be arranged later on.

The personnel of the Chinese Red Cross Society will carry Red Cross banners and wear the Red Cross arm insignia.

In order to ensure the safety of the personnel of the Chinese Red Cross Society and facilitate the work of collecting and cremation the bodies, the Chinese Government has decided to dispatch a small number of civil policemen to accompany the different batches of Chinese Red Cross personnel into the above-mentioned areas and to leave the areas together with them upon completion of the task.

The aforesaid activities, which are exclusively a matter within China's sovereignty and will be conducted entirely on the Chinese side of the 1959 line of actual control, do not affect the Chinese Government's stipulations in regard to its measures such as withdrawal by the Chinese frontier guards and non-establishment of civil checkposts in the areas where there is a dispute about the ceasefire arrangements. However, the Chinese Foreign Ministry wishes to inform the Embassy of the aforesaid matter and arrangements and requests the Embassy to report them to the Indian Government as soon as possible. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will instruct in time the Indian authorities concerned not to take any action detrimental to the collection and cremation of the bodies of Indian military personnel by the personnel of the Chinese Red Cross Society.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 August 1963

Reference Memorandum handed over to the Indian Charge d'Affaires in Peking on 13th August, 1963.

The original request made by the Indian Red Cross Society for facilities to collect and cremate or bury Indian military personnel in accordance with the Indian custom, was sent 4 months ago on 5th April. An urgent reply was sought as the summer season was fast advancing.

On 29th April, the Chinese Red Cross sent a reply which was indicative of the utterly callous attitude of the Chinese authorities to normal human and religious considerations, stating that the authorities concerned were of the view that there was no need to send parties as Indian military personnel were properly buried.

On the 8th of May, a further telegram was sent to the Chinese Red Cross once again requesting for these facilities and mentioning that it was with a view to carrying out the usual religious rites at the time of cremation that this request was being pressed.

A reminder was sent on 4th June and a further reminder on 9th July.

It was only on the 27th July, almost 4 months after the original request was conveyed that the Chinese Red Cross sent a further telegram stating that they had again approached the authorities concerned.

The presence of an Indian Red Cross party including a priest is indispensable for proper identification of dead bodies and performance of essential religious rites connected with cremation.

The Indian Red Cross Society will, therefore, be sending two Red Cross parties one to Demchok and the other to Chushul on 16th August weather permitting. Contact between Chinese and Indian Red Cross parties at Demchok should be effected at 3 P.M. Indian Standard time on 16th. In the Spanggur region, the Indian Red Cross party would be waiting at 3 P.M. at the point where repatriation of Indian military personnel took place on 17th May.

Indian Red Cross parties would be in a position to proceed to the remaining areas by helicopter as from 18th August. It would be appreciated if the exact locations to which the parties should proceed in these remaining areas are communicated and normal identifications for the landing area for helicopters are set up.

Each party will comprise two Red Cross officials, three attendants and one priest.

The Government of India trust that the permission given by Chinese authorities to the Chinese Red Cross Society is motivated by a genuine humanitarian concern to see that military personnel
who gave up their life in the defence of their country are given their last rites in accordance with normal religious customs. Government of India hope the two parties of the Indian Red Cross will be given the necessary facilities to take over the bodies and to cremate the dead bodies in accordance with the usual religious rites.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 15 August 1963

Reference memorandum handed to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India on August 14, 1963.

1. The Chinese Government categorically rejects all the charges made by the Indian Government against China.

2. The areas where the Chinese Red Cross Society was going to collect and cremate the bodies of Indian military personnel are all within the demilitarized zone on the Chinese side of the 1959 line of actual control. By March 1, 1963, the Chinese frontier guards had completely evacuated these areas, which are moreover areas where there is a dispute about the ceasefire arrangements and where no Chinese civilian checkpoints have been established.

3. It was because of the repeated requests of the Indian Red Cross Society that the Chinese Red Cross Society and the Chinese authorities, out of friendly and humanitarian considerations, decided to send its working personnel to these areas to collect and cremate the bodies of Indian military personnel, and have, out of good will, informed the Indian side of the matter.

4. Now, the Indian Government suddenly suggested that the Indian Red Cross Society would also send people into these areas; it arbitrarily decided on the specific time, place and means of transportation, etc. for the entry without any consultation with the Chinese Government, and even fixed the time and place for meeting the personnel of the Chinese Red Cross Society before their arrival. The Indian side was really too arrogant, presumptuous and unreasonable in taking such a course of action. The Indian Government should know that these areas are Chinese territory located on the Chinese side of the 1959 line of actual control, and it is absolutely impermissible for any Indian personnel to enter them without the consent of the Chinese authorities. The above arbitrary step taken by the Indian Government in disregard of China's sovereign rights is obviously an act of provocation and interference, which is intended to create trouble. This is what the Chinese Government absolutely will not agree to.

5. The Indian Government has the duty of stopping at once the aforesaid attempt to make an unauthorized entry into Chinese territory. If, in disregard of the Chinese Government's warning, the Indian Government should connive at the Indian personnel's unlawful entry into Chinese territory under the name of the Indian Red Cross Society, it must be regarded as a grave provocation, and the
Indian Government must bear the responsibility for all the consequences arising therefrom. The Chinese Government asks the Indian Government to give an immediate reply as to whether the attempt of those personnel has been stopped.

6. Pending a positive reply from the Indian side on the above point, the Chinese side has decided to hold execution of its plan for the collection and cremation of the bodies and the Chinese Red Cross personnel will stop entering the areas where the bodies are to be collected, so as to avoid any trouble caused by Indian provocation.

7. As regard the question of how to handle the bodies of the Indian military personnel, the Chinese Government will reconsider the whole matter in the light of the forthcoming answer of the Indian Government.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 August 1963

Reference memorandum handed over to the Charge d' Affaires, Embassy of India in Peking on 15th August, 1963.

The proposal to send Red Cross parties for identification and cremation of the bodies of Indian military personnel who died in the Western Sector was made as early as April 3, 1963 and is by no means a sudden suggestion as indicated in the memorandum. Repeated reminders were sent and it was only on August 13, after a period of four months of the original request having been made, that the Chinese Government indicated its unilateral determination to carry out a proposal which was completely alien to the Indian request.

The Indian Government reiterates that its original proposal of April 3 was made with a view to carrying out the last rites of dead Indian personnel who had fallen in the defence of their country. These rites cannot obviously be carried out by the Chinese Red Cross and any such suggestion is unacceptable.

The areas involved are indisputably Indian territory which were forcibly occupied by Chinese forces following massive attacks launched against India in October-November, 1962. After the unilateral declaration of so-called cease-fire and withdrawal made by the Chinese Government, the Government of India had, consistent with its desire for a peaceful settlement and in deference to the proposal made by the six-non-aligned Afro-Asian countries, decided not to do anything that would interfere with the alleged cease-fire or withdrawal. Indian forces had accordingly scrupulously refrained from crossing the so-called Chinese "line of actual control" in Ladakh. This act of self-restraint on the part of India cannot, under any circumstances, imply that Chinese aggression and forcible occupation of Indian territory by China gave China any rights over this Indian territory. The Chinese Government is aware
that even the cease-fire proposals suggested by the Colombo pro-
posals envisaged that this particular area should be administered as
an interim measure by civilian posts of both sides.

The Chinese memorandum has described the suggestion to send
Indian Red Cross teams to the areas concerned as an "attempt to
make an unauthorised entry into Chinese territory". Indian Red
Cross teams had at no time contemplated unilaterally crossing the
so-called "line of actual control" before contact had been established
with the Chinese side. As stated in the Indian memorandum of
August 14, Indian Red Cross parties were to be sent to Chushul and
Demchok in order to establish contact with the Chinese side. By
taking objection to the sending of Indian Red Cross teams to these
places to await contact by the Chinese side, the Chinese Govern-
ment presumes to dictate even in regard to areas which are to the
West of the so-called Chinese "line of actual control" where Indian
Red Cross teams should await further contact with their Chinese
counterparts. This is too absurd to require repudiation or comment.

The opposition of the Chinese Government to the Indian Govern-
ment's proposal that Indian Red Cross parties should work along
side with the Chinese Red Cross parties in collecting and cremating
bodies of Indian military personnel not so far recovered in Ladakh,
clearly indicates that the Chinese Government has not in the least
been motivated by humanitarian considerations of any kind but
impelled by other ulterior motives.

The Government of India reiterates that it cannot agree to any
unilateral action proposed to be taken by the Chinese in regard to
the cremation of bodies of Indian military personnel unless full
facilities are given for the performance of the normal customary
religious last rites by the Indian priests who will accompany the
Indian Red Cross parties for this purpose.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking,
to the Embassy of India in China, 20 August 1963

Reference the memorandum of the Indian Ministry of External

The distribution by the Indian Embassy in China of copies of
"India Calling" which carries anti-China articles is a serious case of
abusing the courtesies accorded it by the Chinese Government and
of flagrantly slandering the Chinese Government and interfering in
China's internal affairs on Chinese territory. It was entirely neces-
sary for the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs to lodge a strong
protest against this with the Indian Embassy in China on June 3,
1963 and demand an immediate halt of such anti-China activities.
In its memorandum of June 10, 1963 the Indian Ministry of External
Affairs, in disregard of the stern protest of the Chinese Government,
deliberately avoided mentioning the erroneous act of the Indian
Embassy in China, and further cast shameless aspersions on the
Chinese Government. The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs
expresses its extreme indignation at this.
The publicity work of a diplomatic mission in the host country should be conducted in accordance with international practice. The Indian Government again and again indicated clearly in the past that according to international usage, a foreign mission is not entitled to distribute any unofficial materials attacking the Government of the host country. However, the Indian Embassy in China distributed on Chinese soil the No. 4 issue of “India Calling” which carried anti-China articles signed by individuals in their personal capacity viciously slandering the Chinese people and Government. Such a practice of the Indian Embassy in China far exceeds the scope of the normal functions of a diplomatic mission and grossly violates the principles guiding international relations. It must be pointed out that such deliberate violations of the code of international conduct and its repeated abuse of its rights by the Indian Embassy in China as well as the unjustified and arbitrary defence put up by the Indian Government for such actions show that the Indian Government is bent upon turning the Indian Embassy in China into an anti-China propaganda organ. The Chinese Government once again sternly serves notice to the Indian Government that it must stop using the Indian Embassy in China for anti-China propaganda activities.

The publication of official documents of the Chinese Government concerning the Sino-Indian boundary question by the Chinese Embassy in India in its bulletins is both legal and proper and is a right enjoyed by all diplomatic missions. Even the Indian Government itself repeatedly declared that it was not against the diplomatic missions doing so in their bulletins. This is a fact which can by no means be denied by the Indian Government. Furthermore, no country may willfully make use of its home legislation as a pretext for violating international practice. The unreasonable trouble-making of the Indian Government over the bulletin of the Chinese Embassy in India and its wanton prevention of the exercise of the legitimate rights of a diplomatic mission can only prove its deliberate lack of good faith in infringing upon the legitimate rights of the Chinese Embassy. These are acts in violation of international law, and the Indian Government must stop them forthwith.

As for the good treatment received by the captured Indian military personnel in China, it is a fact known to the whole world. The Sino-Indian border conflict was provoked by the Indian Government and the capture of the Indian military personnel was precisely an outcome of the Indian Government’s aggression. In the spirit of friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples, the Chinese Government accorded them genuinely humanitarian treatment. During their stay in China, the captured Indian military personnel formed deep sentiments for the Chinese people. This demonstrates that the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples is indestructible by any despicable means.

The Indian Government, while obstructing by every means the issuance of the Chinese Embassy bulletin in India, has directed its Embassy in China to carry on anti-China propaganda by spreading rumours and slanders. This precisely shows that it is the Indian Government itself which fears the truth and fears the people knowing the truth.

It should be said that the Chinese side has demonstrated the best of intentions and the great generosity in its handling of the bodies of the Indian military personnel killed during the Sino-Indian border conflict. Even while fighting was still in progress, the Chinese frontier guards did their utmost to bury part of the bodies of the Indian military personnel. Upon the cessation of the conflict, the Chinese frontier guards carried out a checking and properly buried all the bodies of Indian military personnel which they could find.

On April 3, 1963 four and half months after the Chinese side had declared the cease-fire and withdrawal on its own initiative, the Indian Red Cross cabled the Chinese Red Cross Society, asking for permission to send its personnel to certain places within the 20-kilometre demilitarized zone on the Chinese side of the 1959 line of actual control in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border for the purpose of collecting the bodies of Indian military personnel there. After making contact with the Chinese authorities concerned, the Chinese Red Cross Society promptly replied on April 29 that since the bodies of the Indian military personnel had already been properly buried, there was no need for the Indian Red Cross to send its personnel into Chinese territory.

Then the Indian Red Cross again cabled the Chinese Red Cross Society, repeating its request and stating that it was the custom in India to cremate the dead. In view of the repeated requests of the Indian Red Cross, the Chinese Government informed the Indian Government on August 13, 1963 that in spite of the numerous difficulties which actually existed, the Chinese Red Cross Society had decided to send its personnel to the areas concerned to collect and cremate the bodies of the Indian military personnel and then hand over the ashes and part of the bodies to the Indian side. This offer of the Chinese side far exceeds the requirements of the Geneva Convention and all international practice in this respect; it fully demonstrated the humanitarian spirit of the Chinese side and its friendly attitude towards the Indian people.

However, in disregard of China's good intentions, the Indian Government in its memorandum of August 14 went so far as to declare its decision to send Indian personnel to enter the relevant areas without awaiting a reply from China. The Chinese Government of course could only express its strong opposition to this arbitrary action of the Indian Government which disregarded China's sovereignty and constituted a deliberate provocation. It is completely futile for the Indian Government to make the prevarication now in its memorandum of August 20 that the Indian Red Cross teams had at no time contemplated unilaterally crossing the line of actual control before consulting the Chinese side. Can it be regarded as
consultations with the Chinese side for the Indian Government to make an arbitrary decision on the time, place and means of transport for the Indian personnel’s immediate entry into Chinese territory and arbitrarily designate the time and place where the parties of both China and India “should” contact? The Indian Government attempted to play down the matter and describe itself as simply wanting to send Indian personnel to places on the Indian side of the line of actual control to establish contact with the Chinese side; and it charged that China “presume to dictate” even in regard to areas which are to the west of the line of actual control. But the facts are exactly to the contrary. With the exception of Chushul, the areas mentioned in the Indian Government’s memorandum of August 14 are all on the Chinese side of the line of actual control. Indian Government’s distortion of the Chinese reply could not have stemmed from its ignorance of the location of the line of actual control. It harbours the big plot of attempting by this means to revise the line of actual control and thus nibble away Chinese territory on the Chinese side of the line of actual control.

In its memorandum of August 20, the Indian Government referred to what it called ulterior motives. It will never succeed in pinning such a label on China. Unless things are turned upside down, it is inconceivable that China was impelled by ulterior motives when it offered to collect and cremate the bodies of Indian soldiers and hand the ashes and bodies over to the Indian side. On the contrary, it is precisely the Indian side which, in insisting on sending persons to worm into places on the Chinese side of the line of actual control, really harbours ulterior motives.

No matter how the Indian Government may quibble, those places are Chinese, and not Indian, territory. With a view to avoiding a recurrence of conflict and promoting Sino-Indian reconciliation, the Chinese side has not only withdrawn its frontier guards from those places, which are on the Chinese side of the line of actual control, but has even refrained from setting up civilian checkpoints at the places where there is a dispute between the two sides about the cease-fire arrangements. The Indian Government, on the other hand, is insistently trying under various fabricated pretexts to worm into the Chinese side of the line of actual control to make troubles. The Indian Government even declared its intention to send personnel into Chinese territory in order to carry out so-called rites for the Indian military personnel “who had fallen in the defence of their country” (which should be read as “who had been unfortunately driven to their deaths by the Indian Government’s policy of aggression”). One would like to ask, what does this amount to if not an attempt to conduct openly on Chinese territory anti-China activities and flagrant provocations against the Chinese people? Could this be tolerated by the Chinese people?

In concluding its memorandum of August 20, the Indian Government declared that it could not agree to any action of the Chinese side in regard to the collection and cremation of bodies unless the Chinese side accepted its demand of sending personnel into Chinese territory. This shows that the Indian Government is in fact not at all interested in collecting the bodies of Indian military personnel.
and that it is actually interested in carrying out provocations under the name of collecting bodies. In these circumstances, the Chinese Government after giving thought to all aspects of the matter cannot but regretfully announce the cancellation of its original plan for collecting and cremating the bodies. It goes without saying that the responsibilities and consequences arising therefrom rest entirely with the Indian side.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 September 1963


The “India Calling”, a programme journal of the All India Radio does not contain articles which are anti-China in character. As has been pointed out in the Government of India’s memorandum dated June 10, 1963 if the Chinese Government took exception to the distribution of a magazine which is mainly informative in character, it was open to the Chinese Government to legislate against its distribution.

The Allegation in the Chinese Embassy’s memorandum that the Government of India are directing the Indian Embassy in China to carry on anti-China propaganda is too ridiculous to merit refutation. As the Chinese Government are aware, the bulletin of the Indian Embassy “India News” is a modest effort on the part of the Government of India to present the facts on India-China differences but as is well known the Chinese Government have for a long time severely restricted its distribution.

Numerous established instances are available of the Chinese Embassy actively publishing and distributing material, which is anti-Indian in character, in contravention of the law of the land. The Chinese Government seek to justify this on the ground of “international practice” in the publicity work of a diplomatic mission. However, the Chinese Embassy in India has been grossly guilty of contravening this code several times. In contrast to the Indian Embassy’s bulletin entitled “India News” which only publishes the official documents and statements of the Government of India, the Chinese Embassy’s publication “China Today” has specialised in cheap slander aimed at the host country. In fact, in recent times the Chinese Embassy’s bulletin went to the extent of including sordid remarks against the Prime Minister of India, to which the Government of India have taken strong exception. The Indian Embassy in Peking has never been guilty of such violations of the codes of international conduct.

The Chinese memorandum under reference has dwelt once again on the proscription of some of the issues of the bulletin of the Chinese Embassy in India, “China Today”. As pointed out above, certain issues of this bulletin have grossly misrepresented the correct position regarding the India-China differences and contained
statements which transgressed the established principles of courtesy and violated specific provisions of the laws of the country. The Government of India were accordingly constrained to prevent circulation of these issues which infringed the laws. The Government of India totally repudiate the statement in the Chinese memorandum that in this action the Government of India have been guilty of any violation of international law.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 October 1963

Reference the Memorandum dated September 16, 1963 from the Chinese Foreign Office.

2. The claim made in the Memorandum about Chinese side's "greatest generosity in its handling of the bodies of the Indian military personnel killed during the Sino-Indian border conflict", can best be assessed by all concerned on the basis of the facts given below:

(i) The Indian Red Cross Society first put forward as early as on 3rd April, 1963 their request for assistance in the proper cremation of persons who died in the defence of Indian soil.

(ii) Three reminders were sent before the Chinese Government replied on the 13th August, 1963, more than four months later, that arrangements would be made by the Chinese side for the cremation of the bodies of dead Indian soldiers and that the ashes of these persons would be handed over at a place and time to be notified later.

(iii) The Chinese Government made this belated offer of unilateral action purely for propaganda purposes, completely disregarding normal human and religious considerations to be taken into account when performing the last rites of these brave men who gave their lives in the defence of the territorial integrity of their motherland.

(iv) The Memorandum of the Chinese Government makes it clear that the Chinese Government had no intention at all of carrying out the cremation of the Indian soldiers in accordance with customary religious rites. When their propaganda move was exposed, they tried to seek cover under spurious and totally false allegations that the Indian Government had decided "to send Indian personnel to enter the relevant areas without awaiting a reply from China" and that India was trying "to worm into places on the Chinese side of the line of actual control". The Indian Memorandum of 20th August adequately establishes the utter baselessness and absurdity of these Chinese allegations.

(v) Now the Chinese Government "announce the cancellation of its original plan for collecting and cremating the
bodies". No clearer proof is required to establish the utter insincerity of the original offer made by the Chinese Government.

3. The utter callousness which the Chinese Government has shown in wilfully preventing the last rites from being performed in the case of these Indian military personnel who died in the defence of their motherland, deserves nothing but condemnation.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 7 October 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China, and with reference to the note of Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated June 1, 1963, has the honour to state the following:

1. In its note the Indian Ministry of External Affairs charged the Chinese Government with "resorting to prevarications and propagandistic statements regarding captured Indian military personnel," and brought forward what it called "facts" about the Indian captured personnel. Such being the case, the Chinese Government wishes to deal once again with the facts of the matter in order to explode the lies of the Indian Government.

The more than 3,900 Indian military personnel were captured during the armed border conflict provoked solely by the Indian Government while the Chinese frontier guards were compelled to strike back in self-defence. In the spirit of Sino-Indian friendship and in accordance with its consistent policy of treating the captured personnel with leniency, the Chinese side accorded unparalleled amicable treatment to the captured Indian military personnel. The Chinese side promptly released and repatriated the sick and wounded among them, and then took the initiative to release and repatriate all the captured Indian military personnel. That is why the captured Indian military personnel were most grateful for the treatment accorded to them during their stay in China. From their own experience they became truly aware of the consistent efforts made by the Chinese Government for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, and deeply appreciated the sincere desire of the Chinese Government and people to uphold Sino-Indian friendship.

These are well-known facts about the captured Indian military personnel. The Indian Government will never succeed in its attempt to cover up and distort them with calumnies and fabrications.

2. In its note the Indian Ministry of External Affairs wilfully distorted the three-point proposal of the Chinese Government as put forward in its statement of October 24, 1962, alleging that the Chinese Government had "in fact" made the release of Indian prisoners "conditional" on the Government of India's acceptance of the so-called "dictates of the Chinese Government". This allegation is completely untenable. If the Chinese Government had really put
forward any conditions, how was it conceivable that it should have released and repatriated the captured Indian military personnel in the absence of any ceasefire order from the Indian Government or its response to any of the peaceable proposals of the Chinese side?

3. Moreover, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs made in its note mischievous references to China's repatriation of Captured Indian officers of and above field-grade from the interior by vilifying China as "parading" those officers "in the cities of China" for "highly objectionable and propagandistic purposes." This is another flander flying in the face of the facts.

In consideration of the desire of some captured Indian officers of and above field-grade to visit the interior of China, taking into account the weather conditions and transport facilities in the Sino-Indian border areas and the health conditions of those officers and with a view to enabling them to rejoin their families at any early date, the Chinese authorities concerned decided to release and repatriate them through the interior of China and made arrangements for their sight-seeing in a number of cities as the occasion presented itself. Throughout their tour, the Chinese side arranged no public meetings for them at all, nor had it published any news reports about them before they left China. How can it be said that the Chinese side "paraded" them "in the cities of China" for "high objectionable and propagandistic purposes"?

4. In the same note the Indian Ministry of External Affairs again haggled over the requests of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Indian Red Cross Society for permission to send persons to visit the captured Indian military personnel. In this connection, the Chinese Red Cross Society and the Chinese authorities concerned had already made clear-cut replies to the Indian Red Cross Society and the International Committee of the Red Cross respectively. In its reply note to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated May 18, 1963, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs also provided full explanations on the matter. When the Chinese Government proposed on its own initiative that discussions be held between China and India on the question of releasing the captured Indian military personnel, the Indian Government showed no interest in receiving them and, putting the cart before the horse, showed particular "zeal" in raising the question of so-called sending persons to visit the captured Indian military personnel. This only proves that the Indian Government harbours ulterior motives.

5. The release and repatriation of all the captured Indian military personnel have long been completed and the Indian Government's lies and slanders on this matter have more than once been thoroughly refuted. If the Indian Government will still not rest at this but continue to haggle over the matter, the Chinese Government will give it no further notice.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 October 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and, has the honour to state that the following five Kashmiri Muslims of Indian origin had been arrested on trumped up charges by the local authorities in Tibet and awarded long term prison sentences without any trial:

1. Haji Habibullah Shamo, arrested at Lhasa on August 10, 1959 and sentenced to 15 years imprisonment on June 20, 1960.
2. Haji Abdul Gani Naik, arrested on August 7, 1959 and sentenced to 12 years imprisonment on June 20, 1960.
3. Abdul Gani Shakali, arrested at Lhasa on May 2, 1960 and sentenced to 15 years imprisonment.

From the time of their arrests, the Indian Consul General at Lhasa had constantly pressed the local authorities for their release, but the authorities resisted his representations on the ground that the persons concerned were of Chinese nationality.

After the closing down of the Indian Consulate General in Lhasa in December, 1962, the Indian Embassy in Peking had taken up with the Chinese Foreign Office the question of the release of the above named Kashmiri Muslims from prison and their subsequent repatriation to India. The Government of India have now been informed by their Embassy in Peking that the Chinese Foreign Office has verbally intimated the Indian Embassy that the matter had been investigated and it had been found that there were no Indians in Tibet.

The contention of the Chinese Government that the above named Kashmiri Muslims are not Indian nationals is not only arbitrary but also contrary to the principle to which the Chinese Government themselves continue to subscribe in regard to the nationality question. It is an undeniable fact that, according to the Chinese Nationality Law, every descendant of a Chinese national, irrespective of the country of residence, is considered to be of Chinese nationality. Although the above named Kashmiri Muslims had been living in Tibet for the last several years they had not lost their national status as Indians at the time of their arrests. As they are of Indian origin, in terms of the relevant clauses of the Indian Constitution and Citizenship Act of 1955, they are also fully entitled to the privilege of Indian Citizenship. No general grounds can therefore be advanced by the Chinese Government by which these Indian nationals can be deemed to have lost their claim to Indian Citizenship.
The families of these persons are at present staying in India and they are in straitened circumstances due to the absence of the earning members of their families. The wife of Haji Habibullah Shamo mentioned at No. 1 in the list above died of anxiety and worries about the welfare of her husband. The families of the four others are now placed likewise and are in real distress.

In view of the foregoing the Government of India find it patently illogical that the Chinese Government should affirm that the matter of the arrests and illegal detention of the five Indian nationals had been investigated and it had been found that there were no Indians in Tibet. The Government of India refuse to accept this contention and desire that these five Indian nationals who are undergoing inhuman treatment in the local prisons in Tibet should be released forthwith and all facilities be given to them for their repatriation to India to enable them to join their families.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 26 October 1963


In order to promote reconciliation between China and India and uphold Sino-Indian friendship, China has shown the utmost sincerity and magnanimity in dealing with a number of matters, including the handling of the bodies of dead Indian military personnel. This is a fact known to all. The fact that the Indian Government repeated again and again its hackneyed charges and openly spread slanders against China has fully shown that the Indian Government harbours a most wicked intention in this matter.

The Indian Government's absurd arguments and unreasonable demands have been sternly refuted and firmly rejected by the Chinese Government in its memoranda dated August 15 and September 16. If the Indian Government should haggle further over this matter by sending in more memoranda, the Chinese Government will take no trouble to make any more reply.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 October 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note dated the 7th October, 1963.
2. The Chinese Government note under reference has merely rehashed and served up a set of arguments that have long ago been disproved and discredited in the Indian Government's notes of 29th March and 1st June, 1963. As pointed out in the Indian Government's note dated the 1st June 1963, the Chinese Government has made it a practice to proclaim loudly its so-called desire for a pacific settlement of the border question while doing everything it can to intensify the already existing tensions.

3. The Government of India has no desire to continue this exchange of correspondence except to expose the duplicity of the Chinese Government's protestations about its peaceful intentions.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 November 1963

Reference the Chinese Foreign Office's memorandum dated October 26, 1963.

That the Chinese Government had deliberately prevented the last rites of the dead Indian military personnel being performed, has been clearly shown in the Government of India's memoranda dated October 5, and August 20, 1963.

In their memorandum dated September 16, 1963, the Chinese Government had made clear their intention not to co-operate with the Indian authorities in the performance of the solemn task connected with the last rites of the Indian soldiers. By doing so, the Chinese Government have not only flouted all standards of civilized behaviour but have also broken the Geneva Conventions of 1949 to which the Chinese Government is a signatory. Under these Conventions, amongst other things, the dead should be honourably interred, if possible, according to the rites of the religion to which they belonged. In this, as in other cases, the Chinese Government have shown that they are not bound by the prevailing standards of International conduct.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 November 1963

In its memorandum, the Indian Government repeated the groundless charges made in its earlier memoranda against China regarding the question of the former official Indian missions in Tibet, China, employing local Chinese workers and the question of medical treatment for Mr. N. R. Sharma of the former Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse. As it has already set forth the facts in its previous memorandum to India, the Chinese Government does not consider it necessary to give a further answer to the unreasonable haggling over these questions.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 November, 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India dated June 1, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

With regard to the illegal entry of Ram Parkash and Narain Gir into a non-pilgrimage area deep in Tibet, China, without valid Chinese documents, the Indian Government has repeated in its note the utterly groundless arguments contained in its previous notes which have been repeatedly refuted by the Chinese Government in its previous notes to the Indian Government. The Chinese Government expresses deep regret at the unreasonable haggling made by the Indian Government and deems it unnecessary to give a further answer in this regard.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 23 November 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the notes of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India dated July 17 and September 12, 1962 and August 7, 1963 has the honour to state as follows:

1. The Chinese Government has always actively striven to promote trade between Tibet and India and faithfully abided by the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement on Trade and Intercourse, between the Tibet Region of China and India. The Indian Government, on the other hand, has done its utmost to obstruct that trade and, from the very beginning, had no intention of abiding by the 1954 Agreement. Besides, the Indian Government interfered in the currency reform in Tibet, raised objections to the local taxation policy, opposed proper control over foreign exchange and foreign traders by the local Government of Tibet and incessantly harassed and detained travelling border inhabitants of both sides. The Indian Government, moreover, rejected the friendly proposal of China for the conclusion of a new agreement on trade and intercourse in place of the 1954 Agreement. All these facts show that it is India which has strangled the traditional trade and communication and intercourse between Tibet and India, and it is also India which has violated and wrecked the Five Principles and the 1954 Agreement.

2. As is well-known, the local Chinese authorities have always protected the lawful property of the Indian nationals in Tibet and given them various facilities in legitimate trade. Even during the massive attacks of the Indian forces in China, the Chinese side did not adopt any restrictive or discriminative measures against the Indian nationals and traders in Tibet. Up to now, it remains free for
Indian traders to engage in commercial activities in the Tibet region of China as stipulated by the relevant Chinese laws.

In its note, the Indian Government asserted that "compensation should be paid" by the Chinese authorities "for all property left behind by Indian nationals in Tibet due to causes beyond their control". This is a completely unwarranted demand which has long been refuted by the Chinese Government in its previous notes and can by no means be accepted now.

3. Facts have shown very clearly that all the difficulties and obstacles in regard to trade between Tibet and India have come from the Indian side. It is entirely futile for the Indian side to try to reverse the facts in this matter. If the Indian Government should continue to haggle over it by sending in another note, the Chinese Government will ignore it.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 26 November 1963


In its memoranda dated June 3 and August 20, 1963, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China cited many facts about the Indian Embassy in China conducting anti-China propaganda. It is futile for the Indian Government to attempt a denial by evading the facts as the Indian Ministry of External Affairs has tried once again to do in its memorandum of September 19. Apart from repeating certain irrelevant arguments, the Indian memorandum again failed to provide any tenable contention in the face of the just charges brought forward by the Chinese Government. Therefore, it does not merit refutation.

The Indian memorandum under reference alleged that the bulletin of the Chinese Embassy in India contained so-called "scurrilous remarks" against the leaders of India. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs firmly rejects this baseless allegation. As everyone knows, the Chinese Government was compelled to issue statements to clarify the situation and refute the repeated slanders and numerous fantastic lies about China fabricated by the Government and leaders of India. It is entirely proper and necessary for the Chinese Embassy in India to publish in its bulletin statements of the Chinese Government. Besides making unwarranted comments on the content of the Chinese Government's official documents, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs has now gone so far as to question whether it was proper for the Chinese Embassy bulletin to carry official documents of its own government. This is encroaching on the due rights of the Embassy and contradicts the verbal note given by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy dated September 24, 1959, which stated that it did not object to diplomatic missions publishing and circulating official statements of their own government.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 6 December 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India dated October 14, 1963, has the honour to state the following:

Regarding the nationality of the Kajis in the Tibet region of China and the sentences passed by the local Chinese authorities in Tibet on a few Kajis who committed offences against the law, the Chinese Government clearly stated in its note to the Indian Embassy in China dated September 23, 1960: "The Chinese Government has always considered the Kajis to be Chinese. The Chinese Government would naturally respect the wishes of the Kajis concerned, who do not want to remain Chinese, and settle the question of their nationality in accordance with the regulations of the Chinese Government". The same note further pointed out: "As to the few Kajis who committed offences against the law, it is entirely correct for the Government to deal with them in accordance with the law, and is also a matter entirely within the scope of China's sovereign rights in which the Indian Government has no right to meddle". In its note the Indian Government has again haggled over the same matter in an attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of China to which the Chinese Government absolutely cannot agree. The Chinese Government can only express its regret at this unreasonable action of the Indian Government.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 December 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and, with reference to Note No. 11/143, dated 13th November, 1963 from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China has the honour to state as follows:—

The two pilgrims Ram Parkash and Narain Gir had been taken into custody by the Chinese officials on the 5th August, 1961 and kept under illegal detention at Shigatse, a far off place from the place of pilgrimage, till 25th September, 1961. They had not only been prevented from getting in touch with the Indian representatives
at Lhasa, Gartok, Gyantse and Yatung, but also subjected to constant interrogation during the whole period of detention, i.e. one month and twenty days. These facts clearly prove that the pilgrims were not only prevented from getting to their destination but were also deliberately misguided by the local authorities with a view to harass and persecute them.

In none of their notes the Chinese Government have given any valid reasons for their high handed actions but have merely attempted to evade the issue by claiming that the Government of India are "unreasonably haggling" over the matter.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 7 December 1963


The Chinese Government cannot deny that, judging even from the stringent regulations governing employment in Tibet, the facts mentioned in the various Memoranda of the Indian Government on the question of employing local Tibetan workers in the former Indian Missions in Tibet are unquestionable.

The facts have also established beyond doubt that if timely medical aid had been afforded to Mr. N. R. Sharma of the former Indian Trade Agency at Gyantse, his life could have been saved.

The Chinese Government's Memoranda on these questions have only exposed their inhuman, unfriendly and uncooperative attitude towards the former Indian Missions in Tibet. It is indeed regrettable that in the fact of undeniable facts the Chinese Government should continue to try and justify their unreasonable stand.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 31 December 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and desires to bring to the notice of the Embassy the following:

On the 26th November, 1963, Shri Ananda Swarup, a postman who is an employee of the New Delhi Post Office, went to the Chinese Embassy between 5 and 6:30 P.M. to deliver some unregistered articles. Finding the door of the reception room closed, Shri Ananda Swarup pressed the call-bell installed outside. There was no immediate response and the postman was obliged to continue to ring the bell. After sometime, four Chinese members of the Embassy staff appeared and asked him rudely what he wanted. Seeing that he was to deliver the mail he was asked to come in. The Embassy staff took
delivery of the mail and then fell upon the postman and beat him across his face, and also delivered several blows on his head and chest and abused him in broken Hindi and English for pressing the call-bell "frequently".

Shri Darshan Singh, Town Inspector of the Post and Telegraph Department went to the Embassy to investigate the case, later, on the 18th December, 1963. Shri Darshan Singh endeavoured to investigate the complaint of the postman, a copy of which was handed over to the Embassy officials. He also suggested that a letter box may be installed outside the premises of the Embassy to facilitate the delivery of mail. The Embassy official were extremely rude and took the written complaint of the Postman to an inner room. After half an hour the Second Secretary of the Embassy came up, followed by five or six other Chinese officials and took Shri Darshan Singh to an ante-room. Here the latter was joined by Shri Anand Swarup, the postman, who had also reached the Embassy for delivering the first batch of mail for that day. Both Shri Darshan Singh and Shri Anand Swarup were questioned rudely by the Chinese officials, who went on shouting that the postman's complaint was false. The Chinese officials even went to the extent of questioning the credentials of the Town Inspector. As no enquiries were possible in these circumstances, the Town Inspector asked for the return of the written complaint made over to the Chinese officials, which the Chinese officials did not return. Instead, these officials assumed threatening postures, locked the door of the inner room and refused to allow either the Town Inspector or the Postman to leave the room, unless they signed a statement withdrawing the postman's complaint. Finding no other alternative, the Town Inspector then signed some such statement, and only after this were the Inspector and the postman permitted to leave the Embassy.

The Government of India take the most serious exception to the extraordinary behaviour of the Chinese Embassy officials in this matter. Not only have the Embassy officials attacked a Government of Indian official in the discharge of his normal duties, but they are also responsible for the unlawful detention and the extortion of a statement from the Town Inspector sent to investigate the complaint. The Government of India firmly protest against all this conduct on the part of the officials of the Chinese Embassy and would insist that the Embassy ensures that there is no further repetition of such incidents.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, 7 January 1964

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and, with
reference to the Ministry's note dated December 31, 1963, has the
honour to state as follows:

1. The staff of the Chinese Embassy have always maintained a
friendly attitude towards the Indian people and have always kindly
received all Indians coming to the Chinese Embassy on business, in-
cluding postmen. The trumped-up charge of the Indian authorities
concerned that members of the Chinese Embassy staff fell upon an
Indian postman and detained a post office inspector is utterly unten-
able. The story given in the note of the Indian Ministry of External
Affairs of December 31, 1963 is all the more full of fallacies and
scarcely requires refutation.

The Indian Ministry of External Affairs must be aware that the
inspector of the New Delhi post office came to the Chinese Embassy
on December 18, 1963 to conduct a so-called investigation into a
completely groundless complaint. Although astonished, the Embassy
in a quiet and friendly manner pointed out to the inspector that the
complaint was false. The postman who allegedly had been attacked
happened to come at the time to the Embassy to deliver mail, and
the inspector asked him to stay in. The Chinese Embassy officials
patiently checked the acts with them. The result of the checking
clearly established the fact that no attack or abuse had ever happened.
Consequently, the inspector put down a written statement confirming
that the Indian postman had not been attacked and that the com-
plaint was inconsistent with the fact. The case was thus cleared up.

2. The Chinese Embassy has all along maintained self-restraint
in regard to the aforesaid unwarranted charge. On December 28,
1963 the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs pointed out verbally
to the Indian Embassy in China that this case was a sheer fabrica-
tion aimed at smearing the Chinese Embassy and drew the attention
of the Indian Government to that. It was surprising that in its
note of December 31, 1963 the Indian Ministry of External Affairs
should have completely ignored the well-established facts cited by
the Chinese side and redoubled its effort to slander the Chinese
Embassy, even fabricating the story that the inspector had been de-
tained, that his statement was extorted, and so on and so forth. The
assertions of the Indian Government are indeed very clumsy, pre-
posterous and ridiculous. This line of action only shows that the
Indian Government harbours ulterior motives.

3. The Chinese Embassy categorically rejects the protest made in
the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and expresses its
utmost regret at the malicious slander of the Indian authorities.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the
assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs New Delhi
to the Embassy of China in India, 8 January 1964

Reference memorandum of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs

It has been clearly established in previous notes of the Govern-
ment of India that the Indian Embassy in China has never carried
on anti-China propaganda. The Chinese Government's allegations to this effect are, therefore, too absurd to deserve any notice.

The Memorandum under reply, grossly misinterprets the Government of India's memorandum dated September 19, 1963. This memorandum did not question the Chinese Embassy's practice of publishing in its bulletins, official documents handed over to the Government of India. What the Government of India cannot agree to is, that the Chinese Embassy should indulge in slandering the policies of the Government of India and its leaders in bulletins meant for distribution on Indian soil. It is an accepted international practice that no country abuses the hospitality afforded to its diplomatic mission by indulging in propaganda against the host country itself. It is precisely because the bulletins of the Chinese Embassy constantly contravene the laws of the land by publishing material, other than Chinese Government statements or documents handed over to the Government of India, which wilfully slander and misinterpret the policies of the Government of India, that the Government of India have been constrained to prescribe the offending issues. By doing this, the Government of India have in no way violated any principle of international law.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 January 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and, with reference to the Note dated 23rd November, 1963, from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, has the honour to state as follows:

Indian traders had been engaged in trade with Tibet for the last several decades and most of the transactions had been on a credit or barter basis. However, since 1959, the Chinese Government's attitude towards Indo-Tibetan trade had hardened to such an extent that despite the continuing validity of the 1954 Agreement on Trade and Intercourse between Indian and the Tibet Region of China, it became virtually impossible for Indian traders to carry on their customary trade. Many of the former Tibetan associates of Indian traders were also put under arrest and their properties confiscated by the Chinese authorities on various pretexts and several others moved from western Tibet to Shigatse and Lhasa and these towns declared as "out of bounds" for Indian traders. This was obviously done with the deliberate intention of denying to Indian traders their normal commercial contacts, as well as to place obstructions in the way of their recovering their dues from the Tibetan traders concerned. The local Chinese authorities even went to the extent of encouraging Tibetan traders not to repay their debts to the Indian traders. To harass the Indian traders further the Chinese Government put a stop to the barter trade and introduced so-called "currency reforms" to hasten an end to the traditional pattern of trade between India and
Tibet. The above unscrupulous and arbitrary measures of the Chinese Government, which have been detailed in the Indian Government’s notes dated the 17th May, 1960, 16th November, 1961 and 17th July, 1962, inevitably resulted in Indian traders leaving behind large assets in Tibet.

In the face of the above facts it is absurd for the Chinese Government to still assert as they have done in their note under reference, that they have always actively striven to promote trade between Tibet and India and that they have faithfully abided by the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement on Trade and Intercourse between Tibet region of China and India. The Chinese note has also had the temerity to describe the Government of India’s reasonable request that equitable compensation should be paid to the Indian traders in respect of all property, moveable and immovable left behind by them in Tibet due to causes beyond their control, as “a completely unwarranted demand”. Such a stand is completely contradictory to all canons of International law and Convention accepted by civilised Governments.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 18 January 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and, with reference to Note No. 11/312, dated the 6th December, 1963, from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China regarding the detention of the five Kashmir Muslims in Tibet, has the honour to state as follows:—

Although these five Indian Muslims have been in Tibet for several decades, they, all along retained their separate identity and culture and continued to maintain their traditional connection with their home land. As the Chinese Government are also fully aware, these Indian Muslims had never renounced their right to Indian citizenship to which they are entitled under the provisions of Indian law by virtue of their origin. The Government of India are surprised that, knowing this, the Chinese Government continue to try to press the contrary view on the Government of India, regarding the national status of these Indians. This attitude of the Chinese Government is not only wrong in International law and practice, but is also completely at variance with their own policy on the question of nationality of overseas Chinese as has been pointed out before by the Government of India. Even today the Chinese Government affirm the right of persons of Chinese origin, who have been living for generations in foreign countries, to Chinese nationality regardless of their birth and residence and the nationality laws of the countries concerned. The Government of India are constrained to point out that
the Chinese Government's refusing to apply these same tests to these persons of Indian origin, who have been residing in the Tibet region of China, contradicts China's own much advertised concepts of nationality.

In their note referred to above the Chinese Government have stated that the five persons concerned have "committed offences against the law", and that it is entirely for the Government to deal with them "in accordance with the regulations of the Chinese Government". The facts are that these five persons were leaders of the Kashmiri Muslim Community in Tibet. Due to the harassment and oppression by the local authorities, they expressed their desire to return to India. They were then sought to be forced by the local authorities to register as Chinese nationals, which they refused to do. This stand of theirs displeased the local authorities and they thereupon trumped up false charges against them and awarded them long prison sentences, extending up to 15 years, without giving them any opportunity to defend themselves against the charges before any constituted authority.

The Government of India have, naturally no desire to interfere in China's internal affairs, but they have every right to question the arbitrary and inhuman treatment meted out by the Chinese Government to Indian nationals. It is absurd to interpret this right, which is recognised by international law, as an attempt by the Government of India to interfere in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of China.

In the light of the above facts, the Government of India reiterate their demand that these five Indian nationals held in unjustifiable detention in Tibet, whose families are living in India in distress, should be released, forthwith, and repatriated to India.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note of the Ministry of External Affairs sent to the Embassy of China in India, 21 January 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Embassy's Note No. M/404/64, dated January 7, 1964, has the honour to state as follows:

The facts regarding the outrageous behaviour of the Chinese Embassy personnel towards the Postal employees, Shri Anand Swarup and Shri Darshan Singh, have already been detailed in the Indian Government's Note dated December 31, 1963. These facts established beyond any doubt the gravely objectionable behaviour of the officials of the Chinese Embassy. The reply of the Embassy that the charges are "a sheer fabrication" is, therefore, completely untenable.
In the light of the above facts, the Government of India cannot accept the version of the incident given in the Chinese Note, dated January 7, 1964, nor do they desire to continue further correspondence on this subject. While, therefore, expressing the hope that such unseemly incidents will not be repeated in future, the Government of India do not propose to take notice of any further Notes from the Embassy in regard to this incident.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails of itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

___

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 21 August 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to notify the following:

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has been informed by the local authorities concerned at Yatung, Tibet, China that a section (about 18 metres in length) of the compound wall of the premises of the former Indian Trade Agency at Yatung collapsed not long ago, and that as this state of affairs created a public hazard, obstructed traffic and presented a rather unpleasant sight, the local authorities concerned at Yatung found it necessary in the latter part of May, 1963 to repair the compound wall for the owner. The repair expenses totalling JMP 122.36 yuan was provisionally advanced by the local authorities at Yatung for the Indian side.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

___

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 September 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs present its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and, with reference to their note of the 21st August, 1963, regarding the former Indian Trade Agency buildings at Yatung, has the honour to state as follows:

The Agency premises had been lying unguarded from the time the Indian Trade Agency had been wound up in June, 1962, due to the Chinese Government's unreasonable attitude in not allowing even former local employees of the now defunct Indian Trade Agency to take care of the buildings. As mentioned in this Ministry's Aide Memoire dated the 25th July, 1962, in the course of discussions on the withdrawal of the Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet, the Chinese Embassy had been informed of Government of India's intention to retain some care-takers to look after their buildings and
property in Yatung. Accordingly five local employees of the former Trade Agency were also retained for the purpose. Even these employees were however turned out of the Agency premises and, in their note dated 8th October, 1962, the Chinese Government extended the fantastic plea that the Indian side was trying to take advantage of its ownership of the buildings and that the retention of the caretakers would be tantamount to setting up of another official establishment on Chinese soil. Can anything be more absurd than this?

The contents of the Chinese Government's note itself now make it clear that it is essential to have caretakers to look after the buildings and the property they contain. It is, therefore, hoped that at least now the Chinese Government will agree to the appointment of at least one or two of the former local employees of the Agency as caretakers for the building.

Since it is the desire of the Government of India to keep its buildings in Tibet in a good state of repair, the Indian Embassy in Peking is being authorised to make payment of a sum of JMP 122.32 yuan to the Chinese Foreign Office towards the expenditure incurred by the local authorities at Yatung for repairing the compound wall of the premises. It is, however, hoped that, in future, whenever repairs are required to Indian Government buildings in Tibet the Chinese Government will inform the Government of India immediately so that the necessary repairs can be carried out after mutual consultations.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 16 October 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the memorandum of June 1, 1963 and the note of September 4, 1963 of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India, has the honour to state as follows:

As far back as June 2, 1962, that is, before the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung was withdrawn, the Chinese Government clearly pointed out to the Indian side that the Chinese Government certainly would not agree to the Indian proposition to retain a staff in the buildings of the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung after its withdrawal and use the buildings as a resting place for Indian officials and couriers on their way to and from Lhasa, as that would be tantamount to the setting up of another official establishment on Chinese soil. This is fundamentally different in nature from the matter of retaining care-takers in the buildings as put forward in the Indian External Affairs Ministry's note of September 4. Therefore what
is really absurd is the line of action taken by the Indian Government of haggling repeatedly and unreasonably over this matter and making trumped-up charges against the Chinese Government while trying deliberately to cover up its original true intentions.

Since the Indian Government has expressed its desire to have care-takers to look after the buildings and keep them in a good state of repair, the Chinese Government has now instructed the local authorities concerned to render assistance and employ two or three care-takers for the Indian side. The Ministry will inform the Embassy of the details afterwards.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 12 November 1963

Reference Memorandum of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated April 1, 1963 to the Chinese Embassy in India.

With regard to the case of the former Indian Consul-General in Lhasa A. R. Deo and his staff damaging the building of the former Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa on the eve of their withdrawal from Lhasa and seriously damaging the property within the premises of the former Indian Trade Agency at Yatung when they were passing through Yatung on their way to India from Lhasa, the Chinese Government has in its memoranda to the Indian Embassy in China dated December 29, 1962 and March 11, 1963 given a clear account of the facts and pointed out that the above-mentioned acts of the former Indian Consul-General and his staff are an underhand attempt to shift the blame on the Chinese side. The eye witnesses and evidences testifying to their damaging acts are all there; neither denial nor counter-charge can absolve the Indian side from the blame. The Chinese Government once again condemns the despicable acts of the former Indian Consul-General and his staff and reserves the right to look further into the matter.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 December 1963

Reference Memorandum No. 11/80 dated 12th November, 1963 from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China regarding the damages caused to the buildings and property of the former Indian Missions at Lhasa and Yatung.

The Ministry of External Affairs Memoranda dated 8th February, 1963, and 1st April, 1963, state the full facts about the vandalisms on the Government of India buildings and property at Yatung caused by the miscreants with the connivance of the local authorities. In
order to shield the actions of these hooligans the Chinese Govern-
ment have attempted to slander the officials of the former Indian
Consulate-General at Lhasa. The Vice-Director of the Chinese
Foreign Bureau himself told the former Indian Consul-General that
the local authorities would be neither responsible for the safety of
the property of the Government of India left at Lhasa and Yatung
nor interested in what happened.

It is mentioned in the Chinese Memorandum that the Chinese
Government “reserve the right to look further into the matter.” The
Government of India earnestly hope that the Chinese Government
will really look into the matter further and suitably deal with the
miscreants who have caused damage to the property of a foreign
Government.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking
to the Embassy of India in China, 6 December 1963

In its note of September 4, 1963 to the Chinese Embassy in India
regarding the buildings of the former Indian Trade Agency at
Yatung, the Indian Government expressed the hope that the build-
ings of the former Indian Trade Agency at Yatung would be kept
in a good state of repair and that there would be caretakers to
look after the buildings. In its reply of October 16, 1963 to the In-
dian Embassy in China, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs told
the Indian side that in consideration of the expressed desire of the
Indian side, the Chinese Government had instructed the local autho-
rities concerned to render assistance in this connection and employ
two or three caretakers on its behalf and that the Ministry would
inform the Embassy of the details afterwards.

Now the Ministry informs the Embassy as follows:

The local authorities concerned in Tibet, China, have employed
the following three caretakers for the Indian side:

1. Tchoichiehpu—Male, age 18, Chinese of Tibetan nationality.
2. Chiangyang—Male, age 20, Chinese of Tibetan nationality.
3. Pienpatochi—Male, age over 40, Chinese of Tibetan nation-
ality.

The above-listed caretakers entered the premises of the former
Indian Trade Agency at Yatung on December 1, 1963, and have been
looking after the buildings since then. Their monthly wage is JMP
50 yuan each, which the Embassy is requested to remit direct to
them every month. Henceforth, the Embassy may keep direct
contact with the caretakers in connection with the repair and main-
tenance of the buildings.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 December 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, and with reference to Note No. 11/237 dated the 16th October, 1963, of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China regarding the former Indian Trade Agency building at Yatung, has the honour to state as follows:

As mentioned in the Indian Government's Note dated 4th September, 1963, the Chinese Embassy had been informed of the Government of India's intention to retain some caretakers to look after their buildings and property in Yatung. It was in accordance with this declared intention that five local employees of the former Indian Trade Agency had been retained on the premises. This action of the Government of India had, however, been deliberately misinterpreted by the Chinese Government and the employees, although they were all Tibetan nationals, had been turned out of the Agency premises without any provocation. To justify further their high handed action the Chinese Government did not scruple to take cover behind the absurd argument that the retention of the caretakers would have been tantamount to the setting up of another "official establishment" on Chinese soil.

It is, however, seen from paragraph 3 of the Chinese Government's Note under reference that the Chinese Government have now instructed the local authorities concerned "to render assistance and employ two or three caretakers for the Indian side and that the Chinese Ministry for Foreign Affairs will inform the Indian Embassy of the details afterwards". Here it may be mentioned that the intention of the Government of India was to engage ex-employees of the former Indian Trade Agency as Government of India employees and not as employees of the Chinese Government. The Government of India, therefore, desire that the local employees turned out of the Agency premises by the local authorities be re-appointed as caretakers of the former Trade Agency building at Yatung.

As the Indian Government property in Tibet had been lying unguarded since June, 1962, the Government of India propose to depute shortly one or two officials of their Embassy in Peking to visit Lhasa, Gyantse and Yatung, so that they may be in a position to inspect the Indian Government's buildings and the property they contain and also to make arrangements for the appointment of caretakers as agreed to by the Chinese Government. The Government of India hope that the Government of China will extend full facilities to the Embassy officials when they are deputed for the purpose.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 December 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, at the request of the local authorities concerned in Tibet, China, has the honour to state the following:

According to the lease contracted by the Chinese and Indian parties in 1958 under which a piece of land was rented to the then Indian Consulate-General at Lhasa, the Indian party should pay for the land under the premises of the Indian Consulate-General at Lhasa a rent of 100 Chinese silver yuan (equivalent to JMP 150 yuan) annually. The Indian party has not paid the rent since June 25, 1962. The delay in paying the rent is obviously in contravention of the lease.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 January 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and, with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office Note No. (63) Pu Ling Erh Tzu No. 11/308, dated the 19th December, 1963, has the honour to state that the rent for the land leased by the former Consulate-General of India at Lhasa had not been paid on the due date in 1963, because, as the Chinese Government are fully aware, the Consulate-General of India at Lhasa was closed on the 15th of December, 1962. The delay in payment was, therefore, due to unavoidable reasons.

The Government of India have since authorised their Embassy in Peking to make the necessary payment and the Chinese Government would have received the same by now. The Government of India trust that the protection of their properties in Tibet from depredation and theft will be carefully ensured by the Chinese Government.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of People's Republic of China in India, 9 January 1964.


It was pointed out in the Indian Government's note dated the 4th September, 1963 that what the Government of India desire is to engage, as caretakers for their properties, ex-employees of the
former Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet. These caretakers were to have been employees of the Government of India and not employees of the Chinese Government. This position was again reiterated in the Government of India's note dated the 11th December, 1963. The action of the Chinese Government in employing three unconnected persons as caretakers of the buildings of the former Indian Trade Agency at Yatung is, therefore, not acceptable to the Government of India. The Government of India would once again reiterate their request to the Chinese Government, that the Tibetan caretakers turned out of the Agency premises by the local authorities should be reappointed.

In their note dated the 11th December, 1963, the Government of India had also requested the Chinese Government for facilities to be extended to one or two officials of the Indian Embassy in Peking to visit Lhasa, Gyantse and Yatung so that they may inspect the Indian Government's buildings and the property they contain and also make arrangements for the appointment of caretakers as agreed to by the Chinese Government. The Government of India would now request that these facilities are made available early.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 27 July 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

According to a report of the Press Trust of India on July 20, a so-called "Buddhist Delegation" of the Chiang Kai-shek clique in Taiwan recently "visited" India. Indian Prime Minister Nehru received them on July 19. The "Delegation" also met Home Minister Shastri, Law Minister Sen and other high-ranking officials of the Indian Government. As is well known, Pai Sheng, the head of that "Delegation", is the president of the so-called "Chinese Buddhist Association" which is a tool of the Chiang Kai-shek clique in Taiwan. He is a Chiang gang element engaged in political activities under the cloak of religion, and a scab among the Chinese Buddhist circle. According to Indian press reports, while in India he publicly slandered China as having committed "aggression" against India, thus violating international peace and Buddhist teaching. This, clearly reveals the political aim of the activities of this so-called "Buddhist Delegation" in India.

It must be pointed out that since it stepped up its anti-China policies, the Indian Government, through the planning and match making by U.S. imperialism, has all along been covertly or overtly firing and having dealings with the Chiang Kai-shek clique which is entrenched in Taiwan and has long been repudiated by the Chinese people. Now, the Prime Minister and other high-ranking officials of the Indian Government officially received Chiang gang elements, and the press agency of India made open reports about it. This shows that the Indian Government has completely gone
back on its of-repeated pledge to the Chinese Government that it recognizes only the People's Republic of China and is opposed to "two Chinas," and has openly served the U.S. imperialists' plot of creating "two Chinas."

The Chinese Government wishes to ask: What is the aim of the Indian Government in doing this? Where does it want to lead Sino-Indian relations which have already been seriously vitiated by the Indian Government. The Chinese Government asks the Indian Government to give a clear answer to these questions.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the People's Republic of China in India, 7 August 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to Chinese Government's note dated the 27th July, 1963.

Buddhist pilgrims visiting India from the neighbouring countries of Asia in the pursuit of religious enlightenment have been traditionally welcomed in this country eversince the time of Fa Hien and Huen Tsang. The Government of China as also the rest of the world know that the Government of India recognises only the People's Republic of China. This however, cannot be any ground for departing from the time honoured practice of welcoming Buddhist pilgrims visiting India.

Six Buddhist divines led by the Venerable Pai Sheng were on a pilgrimage to Buddhist centres of South-East Asia. They were given facilities to come to India to visit the birthplace of Buddha and other centres in this country that are hallowed by Buddha's life and teachings. They visited, amongst other places, Rajgir, Nalanda and Bodh Gaya.

The party travelled on sworn affidavits endorsed by the Indian representative at Hong Kong and not on Formosan passports.

Like many other religious notabilities visiting India the Venerable Pai Sheng and his pilgrim companions had expressed a desire to make courtesy calls on the Prime Minister and others and arrangements were made accordingly.

The Government of India reject the Chinese note which is an unwarranted interference in the internal arrangements made by the Government of India for the extension of facilities to foreign Buddhist pilgrims visiting this country.
The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 September 1963

The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs, Republic of India and, with reference to the Ministry’s notes dated December 5, 1962, June 13 and August 9, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

With regard to the matter of the Chinese Universal Testing Machine and Brinell Hardness Testor, the Embassy in its note to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated as far back as August 14, 1962 clearly stated that as Messrs. K.T. Steel Industries (P) Ltd., Bombay did not get valid import licence, these two machines were not sold to them and are still samples belonging to China National Instruments Import Corporation. The machines are being kept in the K.T. Steel Industries (P) Ltd., Bombay only as samples deposited there, which in no way involves the matter of transfer of ownership. In the note mentioned above the Embassy further pointed out that the official notification of the Indian Customs, Bombay confirmed the facts mentioned above by the Embassy. In its notification the Bombay Customs clearly stated that due to the fact that the sale was not put through, the question of recovering of duty does not arise. In fact, the Chinese Corporation has never received any payment from Messrs. K.T. Steel Industries (P) Ltd., for the machines. However, in its note the Indian Ministry of External Affairs should have made such baseless allegation that Messrs. K.T. Steel Industries (P) Ltd., have made the payment and that the payment has already been remitted through the Bank of China. This is entirely inconsistent with the facts. It is highly absurd that the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, basing itself on what is nonexistent at all, should have charged the Embassy with having completed a “highly irregular” transaction. The Embassy cannot but express its regret at this.

This Embassy avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 4 October 1963

The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India and, with regard to the incidents in which the Indian authorities concerned unwarrantedly delayed, opened and examined the Embassy’s mails such as letters, newspapers, magazines, etc., has the honour to state as follows:

On June 18, 1963, the Embassy posted a registered letter to the Chinese Embassy in Nepal. It occurred that the letter sealed with
wax by the Embassy was opened and examined by the Indian authorities concerned. Another registered letter sealed with wax and sent by the Embassy to the Asia Trading Company, Hong Kong, on July 11, 1963 was also opened and examined by the Indian authorities. The original covers of these letters are being kept by the Embassy. Four copies of their photographs are enclosed herewith as an evidence.

It must be further mentioned that for a long time mails of newspapers and magazines from Peking and Hong Kong to the Embassy have constantly been delayed, opened and examined by the Indian authorities. In its memoranda to the Ministry dated August 16 and November 23, 1962 and March 7, 1963, the Embassy repeatedly took up the matter with the Ministry regarding the opening, examination and delay of the Embassy's mails by the Indian authorities. However, the above-mentioned unwarranted practice has not only gone unabated but become intensified. It must be pointed out that such acts of the Indian authorities are in total contravention of the international practice, and seriously impede the normal functioning of the Embassy. The Embassy hereby lodges a protest with the Ministry and demands that the Indian Government immediately stop this unreasonable practice and ensure that the Embassy's mails of letters, newspapers and magazines, etc. will not be delayed, opened and examined in the future.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 31 October 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

According to press reports, the notorious Indian reactionary politician M. R. Masani, General Secretary of the Swatantra Party of India and Member of the Indian Lok Sabha, recently went to the U.S.-occupied Chinese territory of Taiwan and engaged in activities hostile toward the People's Republic of China. In Taiwan, he made statements on many occasions viciously slandering the People's Republic of China and clamouring for allying India with the Chiang Kai-shek clique in Taiwan against the People's Republic of China. Moreover, he went to the Chinese territory of Quemoy, where he "visited so-called military defence installations of the Chiang Kai-shek gang so as to bring up the morale of its troops, and even personally sent out a so-called psychological warfare balloon for the Chiang Kai-shek gang against the People's Republic of China, thereby taking a direct part in the traitorous activities of the Chiang Kai-shek gang.

As everyone knows, Masani is a member of the Indian Lok Sabha, his trip to Taiwan and all his scheming activities there were carried out with the connivance of the Indian Government. The Indian Government cannot shirk its responsibility for all this. This
is another proof of the Indian Government serving the United States in the latter's plot to create "two Chinas". The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government in this connection and asks it to make an unequivocal reply with regard to Masani's political activities in Taiwan against the People's Republic of China.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 November 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office Note dated the 31st October, 1963 has the honour to state as follows:

Shri M. R. Masani is a member of the Lok Sabha and a leading member of the Swatantra Party which functions as an Opposition Party in Parliament. During a recent lecture tour to several countries abroad Shri Masani expressed certain views. These do not represent the views of the Government of India.

2. Citizens of India are free to express their views and enjoy full freedom in this regard within the laws of the land. Shri Masani is entitled to the same rights as are enjoyed by all Indian nationals, of freely expressing his opinions provided they do not transgress the laws of the country.

3. The Chinese Government is aware that Shri Masani is a member of the opposition party. It is also aware of the freedom of expression and other democratic freedoms that Indian citizens enjoy under the laws of the land. And yet it chooses to make this fantastic and mischievous protest. The charge that Shri M. R. Masani proceeded abroad on an assignment from the Government of India is equally absurd. The Government of India rejects the Chinese protest note of 31st October, 1963.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 14 November 1963


1. The Indian Government is so much afraid of the faithful and objective reporting by the Chinese press on Prime Minister Nehru's speech at the Belgrade Conference of Non-Aligned Countries that it.
does not scruple to make repeated charges against the Chinese press, although it has failed to provide any tenable arguments. This is really unwarranted trouble-making.

2. As everybody knows, Prime Minister Nehru stated glibly at the Belgrade Conference of Non-Aligned Countries that "the era of classic colonialism is gone and is dead," and that "imperialism, colonialism, racialism and the rest" are somewhat over-shadowed. Fair and established judgements have long been formed in Asian and African countries regarding the meaning of these statements of Prime Minister Nehru, and they cannot be changed by arguing.

3. If the Indian Government should continue to haggle over this matter, the Chinese Government will ignore it.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 12 December 1963


2. As pointed out in the Government of India's Memorandum dated the 1st June, 1963, the Chinese Government has by its aggressive and expansionist policies and unprovoked aggression against a peaceful and friendly neighbour and by its arrogant rejection of the proposals made by the six friendly and non-aligned countries of Africa and Asia, clearly exposed its contempt for the desire of all Afro-Asian countries to preserve peace and unity in these regions. The Chinese Government in its latest memorandum has again tried to confuse the larger issues of War and Peace with misleading slogans about "imperialism" and "colonialism". However, China's opposition to imperialism or "colonialism" is strictly determined by her own private interests. She has deliberately opposed on specious pretexts the emergence into independence of the former colonial territories of Sabah, Sarawak and Singapore when they federated with Malaya forming the new Federation of Malaysia.

3. The dogmatic attitude of the Chinese Government on the issues of War and Peace and peaceful co-existence of States with different political and social systems, is well known. The Chinese Government's opposition to the partial test ban treaty which has been welcomed by over 100 countries and that Government's continued pre-occupation with warlike methods is also too-well-known to need comment. The brusque rejection by the Chinese Government of the alternative methods for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian differences on the border, namely, adjudication by the International Court of Justice or international arbitration, which are accepted methods for settling international differences, and which are specifically mentioned in the Bandung declaration to which China is a signatory, is incontrovertible evidence of China's contempt for any policy of peaceful understanding.

4. The Indian Government has no interest in carrying on an exchange of correspondence on this subject with the Chinese Government. However, the facts have been stated to ensure that the tendentious charges of the Chinese Government are clearly exposed.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi,
to the Embassy of China in India, 28 December 1963

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi, and has
the honour to state as follows:

The Government of China has in contravention of normal diplo-
matic courtesies in its relations with the Government of India,
addressed a telegram from Chairman Liu Shao Chi directly to the
Maharaja of Sikkim, on the 5th of December, 1963, instead of for-
warding it to this Government for onward transmission. The Gov-
ernment of China is well aware that the external relations of Sikkim
are entirely the responsibility of the Government of India and that
any communication, either formal or informal from the Government
of China to the Government of Sikkim or its ruler should be chan-
nelled through the Indian Government. The procedure adopted by
the Chinese Government is, therefore, entirely unacceptable to the
Indian Government and they trust that in future all communications
pertaining to Sikkim will be addressed to the Government of India
only.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of the opportunity
to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assur-
ances of its highest consideration.

——

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of
External Affairs, New Delhi, 6 January 1964

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents
its compliments to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and has
the honour to state as follows:

In October 1963, Chiang Kai-shek gang elements K. C. Yap, Chang
Chi-hua and others openly held meetings in Calcutta and other places
in India to celebrate the bogus national day and the birthday of the
bogus president Chiang Kai-shek, shouted such reactionary slogans
as "Victory for the Counter-Offensive", "Long Live the Republic of
China" and made propaganda for overthrowing the People's Republic
Rearmament were present on these occasions. Obviously all these
were carried out with the connivance of the Indian authorities. The
Indian Government, while cruelly persecuting and discriminating
against large numbers of the Chinese nationals in India connives
with the Chiang gang elements in frantically carrying out activities
against the Chinese Government on the territory of India. This
once again reveals that the Indian Government deliberately serves
the U.S. imperialists' plot of creating "two Chinas" and continues to
worsen the relations between China and India. The Embassy hereby
lodges a strong protest against this act of the Indian Government
which seriously violates the principles of international law and
demands that the Indian Government immediately take effective measures to prevent activities against China by the Chiang gang elements in India.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 January 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and, with reference to the Embassy's Note dated 19th September, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

It has been established beyond doubt that the two machines, the Chinese Universal Testing Machine and the Brinell Hardness Testor have in fact been handed over by the Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay to M/s. K. T. Steel Industries (P) Ltd., Bombay and, they are not stored in that firm as samples belonging to China National Instrument Import Corporation, as stated in the Chinese Note under reference. These machines have been in regular use and the Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay had also been informed of it by the Director of M/s. K. T. Steel Industries (P) Ltd., as far back as March, 1962. When the firm pointed out to the Chinese Consulate-General that several parts of the machines were missing, some of the missing parts were even supplied by the Consulate-General as replacements. In the face of these facts the statement of the Chinese Embassy that the machines have been deposited with M/s. K. T. Steel Industries (P) Ltd., Bombay, as samples is far from the truth. The Government of India regret this attitude of the Chinese Embassy.

As the Embassy is aware, Foreign Missions are entitled to duty free import of samples for display only. Rules are clearly laid down to the effect that such samples will be used solely for display in the premises of the Foreign Missions and will not be put into use. In these circumstances the Government of India fail to understand as to how and why the Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay allowed the machines to be taken over by M/s. K. T. Steel Industries (P) Ltd., and also to be put into use. This irresponsible action of the Chinese Consulate-General is a flagrant abuse of diplomatic/consular privilege and contrary to the conditions under which the import of these machines was allowed. If the transfer of ownership of the two machines has not been effected as claimed by the Embassy in their above-mentioned Note, immediate action should now be taken to bring back the machines to the Embassy premises or to re-export them, failing which the Embassy should arrange for the immediate payment of Rs. 7,941.20 nP. as customs duty on the machines.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
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earnestly hopes that its proposal will receive the favourable con-
sideration and positive response of the Government of your country.

Please accept the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Sd.) CHOU EN-LAI,
Premier of the State Council of
the People's Republic of China.

Text of Prime Minister's reply, dated August 14, 1963, to Premier
Chou En-lai letter, dated 2 August 1963

Your Excellency,

I have received your letter of the 2nd of August incorporating
some proposals relating to nuclear disarmament, which was handed
over to our Charge d'Affaires in Peking by the Deputy Director of
the Foreign Office.

2. The proposals of the Government of the People's Republic of
China suggest a declaration being made by all countries—

(a) to prohibit all nuclear weapons;

(b) not to use nuclear weapons, nor export them or import
them or test them or manufacture them or stockpile them;

(c) to destroy all existing nuclear weapons and their means
of delivery; and

(d) to destroy all existing establishments for the research,
testing and manufacture of nuclear weapons.

In order to implement this declaration, the statement of the Govern-
ment of the People's Republic of China proposes adoption of certain
measures in the first instance, including cessation of all nuclear tests.
It also proposes that a conference of the heads of governments of all
countries be convened to discuss the question of complete prohibi-
tion and destruction of all nuclear weapons step by step as well as
to consider the question of taking the initial measures.

3. The Government of India are convinced that general and
complete disarmament in regulated stages and under effective inter-
national control and supervision is the most urgent and the most
vital objective of the peoples of world. They have, therefore,
repeatedly urged upon the international community the essential
necessity of reaching agreement on a comprehensive treaty in that
behalf. They believe that disarmament should be general and com-
plete and cover conventional weapons and forces as well as nuclear
and thermo-nuclear weapons and their means of delivery and that
the treaty should also provide appropriate machinery for keeping
the peace in a disarmed world. The Government of India also
believe that, pending the conclusion of such a treaty, immediate and
positive steps should be taken by agreement to reduce international
tension and build up confidence and that these steps should, \textit{inter alia}, embrace various measures of arms control and limitation and of reduction of the risks of war. Naturally, all countries should subscribe to these measures—initial, intermediate as well as final so that all peoples of the world can move forward towards disarmament and to development, each according to its genius, in peace and freedom.

4. The Government of India are greatly heartened to find that there is wide agreement on these objectives and methods, which have been subscribed to by most countries, in the United Nations and in international gatherings like the Bandung Conference. For example, the Bandung Conference "declared that universal disarmament was an absolute necessity for the preservation of peace and requested the United Nations to continue its efforts, and appealed to all concerned speedily to bring about the regulation, limitation, control and reduction of all armed forces and armaments, including the prohibition, experimentation and use of all weapons of mass destruction, and to establish effective international control to this end". "Pending the total prohibition of the manufacture of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons, the Conference appealed to all the Powers concerned to reach an agreement to suspend experiments with such weapons". The United Nations has also continued its efforts in this direction. In its resolution 1378 (XIV), the General Assembly of the United Nations asked the Disarmament Commission to work out measures leading towards the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The Disarmament Committee of Eighteen meeting in Geneva since March 1962 has been negotiating this problem in a comprehensive manner. Agreement has already been reached in the Committee on a preamble as well as the first four articles of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament.

5. The International Community has thus been fully seized of the problem and has been endeavouring to deal with it in all its aspects. The proposals made by the People's Republic of China concern only one part of the problem of universal disarmament, namely nuclear disarmament and refer only to some of the measures conducive to a speedy realisation of general and complete disarmament. The United Nations and the Disarmament Committee have, in fact, been dealing with the entire gamut of the problems of disarmament and of a disarmed world.

6. I would not like to burden this letter with an enumeration of the various measures of reduction of tension, arms control and disarmament, which are being negotiated in Moscow, Geneva, New York and elsewhere. I would, however, like to take this opportunity of dealing with the suggestions made by Your Excellency on the limited aspect of nuclear arms control and disarmament.

7. Firstly, the declaration proposed in the statement of the Government of the People's Republic of China has been made in various international forums. Your Excellency was a signatory to the Bandung Declaration. The United Nations has also adopted various resolutions in that regard. In particular, by its resolution 1653 (XVI) entitled "Declaration on the prohibition of the use of
already taking the first step, namely, signing a Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. We hope that the People's Republic of China, in harmony with the majority of the countries of the world, will also take this step. Negotiations are proceeding in Moscow and elsewhere for taking further steps. We hope that agreement will be reached speedily on other measures of arms control and reduction of tension and that the People's Republic of China will subscribe to them.

14. Your Excellency has suggested that a Conference of the heads of Governments of all countries be convened to discuss nuclear disarmament. As stated in the Bandung declaration, nuclear disarmament is a part of the question of general and complete disarmament. The problems of general and complete disarmament and the various steps to be taken to deal with them are highly complicated matters requiring a lot of detailed work and are not matters which can be debated and settled at a large conference of the kind proposed. By their very nature, these intricate issues need to be negotiated in smaller committees and often at the level of experts. The United Nations has tried to discuss them in various forums. The U.N. Disarmament Commission comprises the entire membership of that body. It has, however, been found by experience that it was not possible to negotiate these problems in such large gatherings. That is why the United Nations has accepted by a unanimous vote that the question of general and complete disarmament, including that of collateral tension-reducing measures, be negotiated by a Committee of Eighteen Nations. The Committee is doing useful work though progress has been rather slow. The Government of India believe that the only practical and businesslike approach to the problem of general and complete disarmament involving both conventional weapons and forces and nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons is to give maximum possible co-operation and assistance in the work of this Disarmament Committee, so that agreement on a draft treaty on general and complete disarmament is reached as early as possible.

15. The Government of India agree that it is essential that all countries of the world subscribe to a Treaty on general and complete disarmament. But a conference of plenipotentiaries of all countries of the world can be useful only when substantial progress has been made in working out a draft treaty on general and complete disarmament.

16. The Government of India have always urged that a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament be agreed upon as speedily as possible. This is, however, not a matter which can be achieved in a few days or a few weeks. It requires careful and detailed negotiations. At the same, it is essential that steps be taken, one after the other, which would reduce international suspicion and tension. The Government of India in common with other countries of the world, therefore, hope that positive and constructive measures like the Test Ban Treaty will receive universal acceptance.

Please accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) JAWAHARLAL NEHRU.
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MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
ERRATA

1. Page 32, line 5, from the bottom, after the word “boundary” and before the words “at any time”, insert the words “at any point”.

2. Page 35, line 8, for the word “stopped” read “stepped”.

3. Page 36, item I(1), line 3, for the word “Khurank” read “Khurnak”.

4. Page 36, item I(2), line 1, for the word and figures “October 5, 1963” read “October 15, 1963”.

5. Page 37, item III(5), line 3, for the word “Thetang” read “Tsetang”.

6. Page 37, item III(7), line 1, for the word and figures “November 1, 1963” read “November 11, 1963”.

7. Page 38, item III(8), line 1, for the word “and” read “an”.

8. Page 38, item III(11), line 2, for the word “Nishi” read “Nihsi”.

9. Page 38, item IV(1), line 2, for the word “Yakeshachu” read “Wake-shachu”.

10. Page 38, item IV(1), line 3, for the word “Numuchang” read “Pumu-chang”.

11. Page 41, line 7, after the word “into” and before the word “airspace” insert the word “Indian”.

12. Page 43, para 4, line 1, after the opening words “As has” and before the word “stated” insert the word “been”.

13. Page 43, para 4, line 1, for the word “repeately” read “repeatedly”.

14. Page 44, para 1, line 6, for the word “Country” read “County”.

15. Page 52, line 11, after the words “referred to” and before the word “paragraph”, insert the word “in”.

16. Page 52, para 7, line 11, for “1953” read “1963”.

17. Page 54, line 7, for the word “innoctnt” read “innocent”.

18. Page 55, last line, after the word “Government” insert the words “of India”.

19. Page 77, para 5, line 6, for the word “targe” read “large”.

20. Page 83, line 13, from the bottom, after the word “nuclear” and before the word “by” insert the word “weapons”.
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Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 31 December, 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government, dated July 16, September 16, October 15, October 22 and November 2, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

1. In the above-mentioned notes, the Indian Government tried hard to deny the fact that Indian troops had successively intruded into the area northwest of the Spanggur Lake, the Hsialinkung Terrace, the area north of the Lo Pass and Demchok Village, in Tibet, and the area north of the Karakoram Pass, in Sinkiang, China. This is completely futile.

2. In its note of July 16, the Indian side asserted that it had not crossed the 1959 line of actual control between the two sides. Unfortunately, such is not the fact. In its documents and maps, the Chinese Government time and again clearly specified the location of the line of actual control and made it known to the world. The above areas into which Indian troops intruded are all on the Chinese side of the line. This indisputably shows that the Indian side's claim that it respects the Colombo proposals and has not crossed the line of actual control is a sheer lie.

3. As for the line of actual control in the Demchok area, the Chinese Government long ago pointed out that on the whole it coincides with the traditional customary line in this area. Only Parigas was included in the Indian side of the line of actual control, because it had been occupied by India before 1959. In an attempt to include Demchok Village, too, in the Indian side of the line of actual control, the Indian side in its note of October 22 confused this village with Parigas in disregard of the fact and alleged that China had in the past accepted India's absurd claim. But back in 1960 during the meeting between the officials of the two countries, the Chinese side already pointed out the different locations of the two places: “West of Demchok, after crossing the Chopu river, one arrived at Parigas” (cf p. 21, the Indian report in the Report of the officials of the Governments of India and the People's Republic of China on the Boundary Question). In order to expand its aggression, the Indian side did not hesitate to repeat its old trick of confusing place names. This is indeed an unseemly act.

4. In its note of November 2, the Indian side not only completely denied the fact that Indian troops had crossed the Karakoram Pass to intrude into Chinese territory, but took the opportunity to dwell on its one-sided claim about the boundary, arbitrarily describing as Indian territory large tracts of Chinese territory, which are irrelevant to the places where Indian troops intruded. The aggressive and expansionist ambition entertained by the Indian Government is once again revealed.
5. In view of the fact that the Indian side keeps denying the facts and resorting to unreasonable prevarication, the Chinese Government will not exchange more notes with the Indian side on the above-said intrusions by Indian troops. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government, in its future actions, will strictly abide by its promise of not crossing the line of actual control between the two sides so that the situation on the Sino-Indian border, which has been eased owing to China's efforts, may remain eased.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 11 January, 1964.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the two notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated April 9 and September 4, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

In its note of September 4, 1963, the Indian Government virtually admitted that Indian troops and administrative personnel had intruded into the Wuje area. Despite its vigorous attempt to minimize its crime of unjustifiable harassment and detention of Chinese border inhabitants by juggling with the specific date and detailed facts, the Indian side had to admit that Chinese border inhabitants going to the Wuje area were harassed and “stopped at an Indian checkpost.”

In order to explain away its intrusion, the Indian side asserted that the Indian checkpost was located “some kilometres to the south of Wuje”. This false argument has already been refuted by the Chinese Government many times. In an attempt to make up for its inconsistency in stating the size of the Wuje area, the Indian side racked its brains to cook up the story that “the Bara Hoti plateau” was “about 6 square miles” and that “the Bara Hoti Plain is 1.5 square miles in size.” This sort of patch work merely serves to show up the seams. There is only one Wuje area; how can it be said that there are two, one of them a “plateau” and the other a “plain”? Such sophistry by the Indian side for the purpose of territorial expansion can deceive no one.

As the Chinese Government pointed out long ago, the Wuje area is about 150 square kilometres in size. With a view to easing the border situation, the Chinese Government has on its own initiative vacated the entire area of 150 square kilometres, which has always been China's territory, as one of the areas where there is a dispute about the ceasefire arrangements, refraining even from setting up a civilian checkpost there. The Indian side has stated in its notes that it, too, would not enter the Wuje area. If the
Indian side is sincere in this assurance and truly desires to keep the situation eased on the Sino-Indian border in the middle sector, it should suit its action to its words and stop sending its personnel into the entire 150 square kilometres of the Wuje area which has been vacated by China on its own initiative, and should not make any more prevarication on the size of Wuje.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 February, 1964.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

2. The Government of India have recently obtained very definite information that the Chinese troops who are in illegal occupation of Indian territory in Aksai Chin, after China's massive invasion across the Indian borders in October/November, 1962, are now setting up stone cairns in this region to mark the so called "line of actual control" as unilaterally defined by the Government of China.

3. The Government of India, in various notes addressed to the Chinese Government, have pointed out that after announcing their so called acceptance "in principle", of the Colombo proposals the Chinese Government have been deliberately doing all they could to subvert these proposals by their unilateral actions. Under the guise of accepting the Colombo proposals "in principle", the Chinese Government have, in open and wilful contravention of the same proposals, established 7 posts in the Western Sector, 6 of which are located in the 20 kilometre demilitarized zone. As indicated in the Government of India's note dated the 6th July, 1963, these posts which China claims to be only civilian posts are largely the creation of the massive Chinese aggression on India in October/November, 1962. It is obvious that what the Chinese Government seek to do is to impose an unilateral settlement on India in the terms of the Chinese declaration of 24th October and 21st November, 1962.

4. This illegal activity of attempting to mark what China calls the "line of actual control" by setting up stone cairns, referred to in paragraph 2 above, is a clear proof of the Chinese intention to consolidate their illegal occupation of Indian territory in the Western Sector, which they have over-run by force of arms. Needless to say that this action of the Chinese Government is in direct contradiction to China's acceptance "in principle" of the Colombo proposals. By their latest action, the Chinese Government stand convicted of deliberately negativising the spirit, as well as the letter of the Colombo proposals, which specifically stipulate that the acceptance of the proposals would not in any way "prejudice the position
of either of the two Governments as regards its conception of the final alignment of the boundaries”.

5. The Government of India wish to make it perfectly clear that if it is imagined that these stone cairns that are now being erected will demonstrate, at some future date, the existence of any demarcated boundary along the so-called “line of actual control”, the Government of China are deceiving no one but themselves. The Government of India are perfectly well aware that no such stone cairns have existed before and that they are being set up only now during these last few weeks, by the Chinese army of occupation, completely illegally and with obvious sinister motives.

6. The Government of India wish to place it on record that these latest moves of the Chinese Government must necessarily add to the existing tensions between the two countries and can in no way help towards a peaceful settlement of the India-China differences, which the Chinese Government have always professed to seek.

7. The Government of India hereby vehemently protest against this latest action of the Chinese Government and demand that the Chinese Government immediately cease their illegal activities to consolidate their hold on Indian territory in the Western Sector of the India-China border.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China, the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 7 March, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and with reference to the note dated December 31, 1963, handed over by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, People’s Republic of China, to the Indian Embassy in Peking, has the honour to state as follows:

2. The Government of India have, in their earlier notes conclusively proved the baselessness of the Chinese allegations about so-called intrusions by Indian troops into areas like the north-west of Spanggur Lake, the “Hsialingkung Terrace”, the area north of the Karakoram Pass and across the so-called “line of actual control” in the Demchok area in Ladakh.

3. In keeping with the Government of India’s earnest desire to find a peaceful solution to the boundary question and out of deference to the Proposals made by the Six friendly Afro-Asian countries who met at Colombo, the Government of India have all along ensured that Indian defence forces do not cross the so-called Chinese “line of actual control”. At no stage, whatsoever, since the Chinese attack of October-November, 1962, have Indian troops gone beyond the limits upto which they could station themselves.
under the Colombo Proposals. The Government of India, therefore, have no hesitation in categorically rejecting these baseless Chinese allegations.

4. The Chinese Government have, in their note dated September 18, 1963, and again in the note under reply made vague allegations that Indian troops had crossed the so-called Chinese "line of actual control" from Parigas and 'intruded' into Demchok. Apart from these allegations being without any foundation, it may be pointed out that even recent Chinese maps depicting the so-called Chinese "line of actual control" show Demchok clearly on the Indian side. The Chinese Government, have once again resorted to their old practice of inventing place names to expand the area of their claims. Thus, a meaningless distinction has been drawn by the Chinese Government between what they call Parigas and what has always been known as Demchok, the former being supposedly to the west of the so-called Chinese "line of actual control" and the latter east of this arbitrary Chinese line. As has been pointed out in the Government of India's note dated 22nd October, 1963, there had been no Chinese presence of any kind on the Indian side of the traditional customary boundary south of Rezangla till the massive Chinese invasion across the Indian borders in October/November, 1962.

5. The absurd Chinese allegations that Indian troops crossed the international frontier at the Karakoram Pass and proceeded into Chinese territory in Sinkiang, have already been fully refuted in the Government of India's note dated November 2, 1963. In that note, the Government of India gave a clear description of the international frontier in this area, establishing that there is no ambiguity as to where the boundary lies, and it is a fact that Indian troops have never crossed this international boundary.

6. The Chinese Government's note under reply, states that the Government of India have made a 'promise' that Indian troops would not cross the so-called "line of actual control" as unilaterally defined by the Chinese Government. As has been pointed out above, in keeping with their acceptance of the Colombo Proposals, the Government of India have, all along scrupulously refrained from crossing this line. However, this by no means, can be taken to mean that the Government of India have thereby given up their legitimate and sovereign rights over these territories. Indeed, the Colombo Powers themselves have made it quite clear that the acceptance of their Proposals would not in any way "prejudice the position of either of the two Governments as regards its conception of the final alignment of the boundaries". Obviously, what the Chinese Government are now attempting to do by their repeated references to their so-called "line of actual control" is to subvert the spirit of the Colombo Proposals which China has, so far, refused to accept.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 26 March, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs' Note of January 11, 1964 has the honour to state as follows:

In their Note dated April 9, 1963, the Government of India stated quite clearly that in view of the Chinese Government's assurance that they have decided "to vacate the Wuje (Bara Hoti) area", the Government of India would reciprocate "by suspending the practice of sending civilian personnel to the Bara Hoti plain which has been followed hitherto". The Government of India had, in fact, as long ago as 1958, suggested that neither civil nor military personnel of either side should be sent to the Bara Hoti area.

The Chinese note under reference has again raised the fictitious charge of "unjustifiable harassment and detention of Chinese border inhabitants .... going to the Wuje area." In their reply dated September 4, 1963, to the Chinese Government's Note dated August 29, 1963, which had initially made these allegations of so-called "harassment" of Tibetans coming into India, the Government of India had pointed out that these Tibetans had proceeded well beyond the Bara Hoti plain and come up to the Indian check-posts situated some kilometers to the south of Bara Hoti, where they had been apprehended. The Tibetans in question were then requested to return to Tibet, which they did. Rather than proving the Chinese allegations in any way, this episode only goes to establish beyond all doubt that the Government of India have been scrupulously adhering to the decision conveyed in their Note dated April 9, 1963, that they would not despatch any military or civilian personnel to enter the Bara Hoti plain, so long as the Chinese Government also abide by their commitment not to despatch any military or civilian personnel to the Bara Hoti area.

In their note under reference the Chinese Government have claimed that "the Wuje area is about 150 square kilometers in size." This statement is in keeping with the ignorance that has been constantly displayed by the Chinese Government in regard to the extent and the size of the Bara Hoti area (which they call Wuje). This fact has been adequately brought out in the Government of India's Notes dated August 27, 1962, January 17, 1963 and April 9, 1963. As pointed out in these notes, the demilitarisation of Bara Hoti was arrived at by mutual agreement between the Governments of India and China, at the Officials Talks in 1958. Since the Chinese Government had not then agreed to the further suggestion made by the Indian side, that civil patrols of either side should also not go into the area, the Government of India had been constrained to continue sending their civil administrative personnel to the Bara Hoti plain, which is 1.5 square miles in area and not 150 square kilometres as claimed by the Chinese. Following the statement by the Chinese Government in their note dated April 3, 1963, that they had decided to "vacate the Wuje area", the Government of India have, since April 1963, also not sent even civil personnel to the Bara
Hoti plain, despite their earlier practice. The Chinese Government, however, have tried to confuse this clear enough situation to suit their own purposes, by arbitrarily expanding the size of what they term the Wuje area, to 150 square kilometers.

The Chinese Government's allegation made in their Note dated August 29, 1963, of so-called “harassment” of Tibetans in the Bara Hoti area has been shown to be completely baseless in the Government of India's reply dated September 4, 1963. It is regretted that in spite of this fact, the Chinese Government should persist in their baseless allegations and even resort to the device of expanding the size of the area in question in a meaningless attempt to prove that the Government of India have not honoured their obligations. The Government of India have no intention of taking any further notice of any repetition by the Chinese Government of these baseless allegations.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note Given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 31 March 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated February 26, 1964, has the honour to state the following:

In its note the Indian Government charges that Chinese troops were now setting up stone cairns in Aksai Chin region of Sinkiang, China to mark the Sino-Indian boundary line of actual control of November 7, 1959 and on this pretext lodges a vehement protest with the Chinese Government. This charge of the Indian Government is a sheer fabrication and slander, which is aimed at aggravating the Sino-Indian border situation which has already eased and at conducting anti-China propaganda. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the Indian Government's unwarranted protest.

As is known to the world, for the purpose of stopping the border conflict and promoting peaceful negotiations to settle the boundary question, the Chinese frontier guards, after taking the initiative in effecting the ceasefire, voluntarily began to withdraw along entire Sino-Indian boundary on December 1, 1962 and by February 28, 1963 had completed their withdrawal to areas twenty kilometres behind the line of actual control on the Chinese side. Since then, the Chinese frontier guards have never entered the twenty-kilometre zone; how could they have come to the line of actual control to set up stone cairns?

The Indian Government asserts that the Chinese frontier guards are setting up stone cairns in order to mark the line of actual control. This is most absurd. The Chinese Government consistently holds that its boundary questions should be settled through friendly consultations with its neighbouring countries and then the boundaries should be jointly demarcated. It has never approved of any unilateral action. With regard to the line of actual control along the
Sino-Indian border, the Chinese Government consistently holds that, pending a settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, both China and India should strictly abide by this line and neither side may upset the *status quo* on the boundary by unilateral action. The exact location of the line of actual control along the Sino-Indian border has long been published by the Chinese Government in both descriptions and maps for the world to see. Any breach of the line of actual control cannot possibly escape notice. Under such circumstances, what is the need for the Chinese side to be anxious to mark the line of actual control by setting up stone cairns?

The Indian Government asserts that Chinese troops were setting up stone cairns in the region of Aksai Chin, but fails to describe their specific location and conditions. According to the note of the Indian Government of February 26, 1964, the Chinese troops were setting up stone cairns “during these last few weeks,” and were still doing so “now”. The period thus indicated by the Indian Government was in the winter season when the Aksai Chin border region was snow-bound. Moreover, the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border between the Aksai Chin area of China and Ladakh is several hundred kilometres long. Yet the Indian Government asserts that Chinese troops were then and there setting up stone cairns to mark the line of actual control. Is this not a sheer fable?

The Indian Government cannot answer even these common-sense questions which are directly relevant. The rumour fabricated by the Indian Government to the effect that Chinese troops were allegedly setting up stone cairns to mark the line of actual control can deceive no one but only exposes once again the Indian Government’s usual practice of trumping up charges.

In its note, the Indian Government also unscrupulously slanders and attacks China in connection with its establishment of seven civilian checkpoints in the western sector of the border. This shows that the Indian Government indeed has “obvious sinister motives” when it plays this “stone cairns” trick. As is known to all, the twenty-kilometre demilitarized zone, which is formed as a result of the withdrawal made by the Chinese frontier guards on China’s own initiative from the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, has always been Chinese territory and under the effective control of the Chinese Government. Even before November 7, 1959 China had maintained seven frontier posts here. It was only after 1959, and especially after 1961, that the Indian side took advantage of the halting of patrols by the Chinese frontier guards to make military encroachments and set up 45 aggressive strongpoints in a small part of this area. After repulsing India’s massive attacks and clearing up these aggressive strongpoints, the Chinese frontier guards on China’s own initiative withdrew twenty kilometres from the line of actual control as of November 7, 1959 in order to effect a disengagement and create an atmosphere for peaceful negotiations. and that was how the present demilitarized zone was formed. Within this demilitarized zone, China only maintains civilian checkpoints at the seven places where there used to be frontier posts even before November 7, 1959. Moreover, the Chinese side on its own initiative has vacated
all the places where Indian troops once set up 43 aggressive strong-points and the places where additional frontier posts were set up by China for surveillance against Indian encroachments, and has even refrained from setting up civilian check-posts in all these areas, as being areas where there is a dispute about the ceasefire arrangements. These are measures taken by China on its own initiative for promoting direct Sino-Indian negotiations for a peaceful settlement of the boundary question and major efforts made by China in response to the call of the Colombo Conference. On the other hand, the Indian Government has failed so far to make any positive response to China's peace efforts; more than that, it now attacks China for setting up the seven civilian check-posts in the western sector and, disregarding the fact that all these civilian check-posts are located at places where China used to maintain frontier posts before November 7, 1959—a fact which India itself partially recognized—makes the absurd charge in its note under reference that these civilian check-posts "are largely the creation of the massive Chinese aggression on India in October-November, 1962." The Indian Government's act of distorting the facts and confounding right and wrong can only serve to show that it is deliberately trying to hoodwink world opinion and aggravating the border situation which has already eased.

Through fabricating the story about Chinese troops setting up stone cairns to mark the line of actual control, the Indian Government charges China with an action which is "in direct contradiction to China's acceptance 'in principle' of the Colombo proposals." This charge does not deserve refutation. Its worth is clearly indicated by the stone cairns trick itself. The Chinese Government's support for the peaceful efforts of the Colombo Conference nations and its positive measures have won the unanimous appreciation of these and other Asian-African nations. The Chinese Government consistently holds that China and India should immediately enter into direct negotiations on the basis of the Colombo proposals for a peaceful settlement of the boundary question and hopes that the Indian Government will take the same attitude. The Chinese Government is convinced that the Sino-Indian boundary question can only be settled peacefully through negotiations and that a peaceful settlement will be attained in the end.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, dated 7 July, 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with regard to India's repeated intrusions into China's territory and air space along the Sino-Indian border and its intrusive activities on the China-Sikkim and the China-Bhutan borders occurring in the first half of 1964, has the honour to state the following:
1. In the first half of 1964, there occurred twenty-three intrusions of China's territory by Indian military personnel crossing the line of actual control between China and India as of November 7, 1959 (See Appendix I for the specific cases). The intruding Indian troops repeatedly spied on the Chinese civilian checkpoints there, with some of them carrying out unlawful activities for more than one and half hours. At the same time, the Indian troops which had crossed the Nathu La on the China-Sikkim border remained entrenched in Chinese territory and moved around.

2. In the first half of 1964, there occurred twenty-six sorties of Indian air intrusions over Sinkiang and Tibet, China, across the 1959 line of actual control between China and India and across the China-Sikkim and the China-Bhutan borders (See Appendix II for the specific cases). The Indian aircraft brazenly circled over China's territory, with some coming even over such important cities and towns in Tibet as Lhasa, Damshune, Shigatse, Lhatse, Rudok Dzong and Shanho, for prolonged harassment and reconnaissance, penetrating as deep as over 230 kilometres.

3. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned continuous serious Indian intrusions into China's territory and air space, and urges the Indian side to put an immediate stop to such unlawful intrusions.

4. The Sino-Indian border situation has long since eased as a result of the ceasefire, withdrawal and other measures effected by China on its own initiative. In the past year and more, despite the fact that the Indian side has ceaselessly made intrusions and harassments, the Chinese Government has all along scrupulously abided by its pronouncement and refrained from sending frontier guards into the twenty-kilometre zone on the Chinese side of the line of actual control, in the continued hope that after China's patient reasoning and solemn protests the Indian side might stop its intrusions. It is to be regretted that, the Indian Government, while refusing to take any corresponding measures to ease the situation and trying to renew tension on the border, has in its replies to the Chinese notes of protest claimed many places intruded by the Indian side to be within India and slanderously countercharged China with "occupying" Indian territories. This peremptory and unreasonable attitude shows that the Indian Government has not yet given up its expansionist ambition towards China's territory, but persists in its refusal to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question through peaceful negotiations.

5. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian side will change its course, stop its intrusions, and act truly in accordance with its own repeated promise of not crossing the 1959 line of actual control between China and India, so as to keep the Sino-Indian border situation relaxed.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
APPENDIX I.

Intrusions into Chinese Territory by Indian Troops in the First Half of 1964

I. In the western sector of the Sino-Indian border:

In January, March and April 1964, five batches of Indian troops, totalling nine persons, successively crossed the 1959 line of actual control between China and India and intruded into the area west of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet, China, for reconnaissance towards the Chinese civilian checkpost at Spanggur. The times and numbers of persons involved are as follows:

1905 hours on January 5, two persons; 1655 hours on January 18, three persons, reconnoitring for about 30 minutes; 1128 hours on January 30, one person; 1155 hours on March 27, two persons, reconnoitring for about 45 minutes; 1115 hours on April 11, one person, carrying out illegal activities for over one and half hours.

II. In the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. In February and March 1964, three batches of Indian troops, totalling thirteen persons, crossed the 1959 line of actual control between China and India and intruded into Ruyu in the Longju area (one of the areas where there is a dispute between China and India about the cease-fire arrangements) in Tibet, China for reconnaissance and harassment. The times and details are as follows:

In the evening of February 21, two Indian officers and four Indian soldiers, all fully armed, intruded into Ruyu. At around 1200 hours on March 6, one Indian officer and three Indian soldiers, all fully armed, intruded into Ruyu and did not leave until the following morning. At around 1400 hours on March 18, one Indian officer and two Indian soldiers, all fully armed intruded into Ruyu and did not leave until the following day.

2. In the first half of 1964, fifteen batches of Indian troops, totalling 37 persons successively intruded into the Hsialingkung Terrace on the 1959 line of actual control between China and India, crossed that line and observed the Chinese civilian checkpost at Sama. The times and numbers of persons involved are as follows:

1140 hours to 1220 hours on January 1, two batches, totalling four persons; 1235 hours to about 1300 hours on January 4, two batches, totalling five persons; 1840 hours on March 29, two persons, observing for about 40 minutes; 1804 hours on April 2, five persons; 1220 hours on April 21, two persons; 1040 hours on April 27, one person; 1140 hours on April 30, one person; 1425 hours on May 9, four persons, observing for about 40 minutes; 1150 hours on May 10, five persons; 1755 hours on May 13, four persons; 1155 hours on May 24, one person, observing for about 30 minutes; 1520 hours on June 18, one person; and 1425 hours on June 28, two persons.
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III. On the China-Sikkim border:

In the first half of 1964, the Indian troops which had unlawfully intruded into the Chinese side of the Nathu La on the China-Sikkim border since September 1962 remained entrenched in the aggressive military structures which had been unlawfully built on Chinese territory, refused to withdraw and came forth for reconnaissance and harassment from time to time.
APPENDIX II

Indian Air Intrusions into China’s Air Space in the First Half of 1964

I. Intrusions into China’s air space over Sinkiang and Tibet to the east of the 1959 line of actual control in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border (twelve sorties):

1. On January 16, 1964, at 1514 hours, an Indian air-craft intruded into China’s air space over the civilian checkpost at the Kongka Pass and its vicinity in Tibet for reconnaissance.

2. On January 18, 1964, at about 1600 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over Shanho, the civilian checkpost at Khurnak Fort and other places in Tibet for reconnaissance. It did not leave until flying for about one hour over Chinese territory.

3. On January 19, 1964, at about 1300 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over Manlachu, Kaijake, Shanho, Rudok Dzong, the civilian checkpost at Spanggur, and other places in Tibet for reconnaissance, penetrating as deep as over 110 kilometers. It flew for as long as one hour over Chinese territory.

4. On January 29, 1964, at 1245 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over Sirijap and its vicinity in Tibet.

5. On January 30, 1964, at 1135 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over Sirijap and its vicinity in Tibet.

6. On February 11, 1964, at 1154 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet.

7. On March 14, 1964, at 1515 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang.

8. On April 11, 1964, at 1155 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the Spanggur and Pangong Lake areas in Tibet. It repeatedly circled for reconnaissance over the Chinese civilian checkpost at Spanggur, Sirijap and other places for over one hour.

9. On April 18, 1964, at 1005 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang.

10. On May 8, 1964, at 0940 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang.

11. On May 12, 1964, at 1105 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s air space over the civilian checkpost at the Kongka Pass and its vicinity in Tibet for reconnaissance.
12. On June 30, 1964, at 0935 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang.

II. Intrusions into China's air space over Tibet to the north of the 1959 line of actual control in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border (eleven sorties):

1. On January 8, 1964, at 1330 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Sama in Tibet.

2. On January 9, 1964, at 1204 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the civilian checkpost at Hsiao, Kata, the civilian checkpost at Tamaden and other places in Tibet for reconnaissance for over an hour.

3. On January 9, 1964, at 1337 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Ketang in Tibet.

4. On January 9, 1964, at 1415 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the civilian checkpost at Tsayul in Tibet for reconnaissance.

5. On March 18, 1964, at 1730 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Longju, the civilian checkpost at Migyitun and its vicinity in Tibet for reconnaissance.

6. On March 31, 1964, at 1000 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the civilian checkpost at Lusha and other places in Tibet for reconnaissance.

7. On April 11, 1964, at 1150 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the civilian checkpost at Hsiao, Kata, Tsona Dzong, the civilian checkpost at Le and other places in Tibet.

8. On April 14, 1964, at 1203 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space in Tibet over the Chinese air ports at Hsiao and Le and other places for reconnaissance.

9. On May 14, 1964, at 0845 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Sama in Tibet.

10. On May 23, 1964, at 1138 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Sama in Tibet.

11. On May 24, 1964, at 1205 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Tibet for reconnaissance, flying successively over Tsona Dzong, Tsetang, Lhasa, Tuilungteching and Damshune, turning westward to fly over Gyantse, Shigatse, Lhatse and other places, and then left in the south-west direction. Its illegal flight over Tibet lasted over four hours and twenty minutes; the scope of its intrusion into China's air space extended over 230 kilometres from south to north and over 430 kilometres from east to west.
III. Intrusions into China's air space over areas of Tibet along the China-Sikkim border and the China-Bhutan border (three sorties):

1. On April 11, 1964, at 1105 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over Phari, Chumbitan, Yatung and other places in Tibet for reconnaissance.

2. On April 14, 1964, at 1130 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the Lamo Lake, Khamba Dzong and other places in Tibet.

3. On May 24, 1964, at 1144 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's air space over the area south of Khamba Dzong in Tibet.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the note of the Chinese Foreign Office dated March 31, 1964, has the honour to state that the Ministry's Protest Note of February 26, 1964 was based on definite and indisputable facts, and the Government of India are, accordingly, constrained to repeat the charge that Chinese personnel have set up stone cairns along the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector.

2. The Chinese Government has, in this Note in question, showered compliments upon itself for its so-called unilateral actions which are alleged to have brought about an 'easing of the situation on the border'. As is well-known to everyone the basic facts are that the People's Republic of China launched a massive attack across the Indian border, committed aggression, and China's armed forces today continue to occupy over 14,500 square miles of Indian territory in the Ladakh region of India. The Chinese armed forces have resorted to every possible means to consolidate their hold over this territory illegally occupied by them. The People's Republic of China have refused to accept all reasonable proposals for negotiations, including those made by the six Asian and African countries at the Colombo Conference. They have brought into Tibet large concentrations of military forces which are poised against the Indian border and they have continued to conduct a concerted propaganda campaign against India not only in China but also outside China in other countries, especially in Asia and Africa. These actions of the Chinese Government, far from easing the situation, have obviously led to the continuation of the tension on the Sino-Indian border.

3. The Chinese Government has in its Note under reference sought to justify their action in setting up, unilaterally, civilian posts in the demilitarized area in Ladakh. This unilateral action of the Chinese Government is a clear violation of the letter as well as the spirit of the Colombo Proposals, which clearly stated that 'pending a final solution of the border dispute, the area vacated by the Chinese military withdrawals will be a demilitarized zone to be administered by the civilian posts of both sides to be agreed upon without prejudice to the rights of the previous presence of both India and China in the area'. No amount of juggling with words can obscure this clear recommendation of the Colombo Conference. In justifying the unilateral establishment of civilian posts, the Chinese Note has gone to the extent of claiming that the 20 k.m. demilitarized zone "has always been Chinese territory and under the effective control of the Chinese Government". This is a false and historically unjustified claim. It is well-known that the first intrusions by China into India took place in the northeastern part of Aksai-Chin in 1957 when it illegally unlawfully
built a road across Indian territory. By the end of 1959 Chinese forces had only set up a series of illegal posts in this area. In November, 1959, these Chinese posts were at Spanggur, Khurnak Fort, Kongka la and near the main Aksai-Chin Road. From 1960 onwards the Chinese forces made deep encroachments into Indian territory in this Sector. The present so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector was reached by Chinese personnel only as a result of their aggression and invasion in the autumn of 1962.

To claim, seriously, that what has been acquired by these aggressive military operations has always been Chinese territory and under the effective control of the Government of China, is something that India and world opinion cannot and does not accept.

4. The Chinese Note has attempted to expatiate on what it calls "the major efforts by China in response to the call of the Colombo Conference" and of "the Chinese Government's support for the peaceful efforts of the Colombo Conference nations". The facts are that ever since the Colombo Proposals were formulated by friendly Asian and African countries the major efforts of the Chinese Government have been directed towards thwarting and circumventing these proposals. While India, responding positively to the call of the Colombo Conference accepted the proposals fully and completely, China has all along talked about accepting them only "in principle". If there is one thing clear about the Chinese Government's attitude to the Colombo Proposals, it is that they have, hitherto, refused to accept them. Mrs. Bandaranaike, the Prime Minister of Ceylon, speaking in the Ceylonese Senate on the 23rd February, 1964, said that the Chinese Government "have accepted the proposals in principle as a basis to start negotiations, but unfortunately they have not accepted in toto as India has". Everybody knows that the so-called 'acceptance in principle' by China was a euphemism for non-acceptance in practice of the Colombo Proposals. Indeed, the Chinese leaders themselves have admitted their negative response to these Proposals. Marshal Chen Yi, the Vice-Premier of the People's Republic of China, told a correspondent of the Swedish Broadcasting Corporation on February 17, 1963, that the Colombo Proposals "are neither a command, nor an arbitration decision. The Chinese Government is not obliged to accept them in toto". Marshal Chen Yi also said: "The Colombo Proposals contain contradictions and fallacies in logic". Is this what China calls her positive response to the Colombo Proposals?

5. In the context of all this the Government of India must reiterate their protest recorded in their Note of February 26, 1964, on the setting up of stone cairns in the region of the so-called line of actual control and emphasise again that if it is imagined that these stone cairns that have now been erected can demonstrate, at some future date, the existence of any demarcated boundary in this region, the Government of China are sadly deceiving themselves.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, 28 July, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to
draw their attention to certain serious and objectionable activities of
Chinese military personnel in Ladakh, and to firmly protest against
the continuance of these military activities in this region.

2. On May 30, 1964, seven armed Chinese military personnel were
observed 8 miles north of Fukche in Ladakh. This area, as China is
aware, falls in the 20 k.m. demilitarized zone specified by the
Colombo proposals. The Chinese military personnel returned to-
wards Chang La, after coming all the way up to Dumchele. Similar
military activity was also observed in Kongka La, Jara La, and Chang
La areas. These Chinese intrusions amply prove the falsity of the
statement in the Chinese Government's note dated March 31, 1964
that "Chinese frontier guards have never entered the 20 k.m. zone"
after the so-called unilateral withdrawal by Chinese forces in

3. In their note dated the 27th May, 1963, the Government of
India had lodged a protest about the intrusions by a Chinese party
into Indian territory in the area south of Longju on April 26, 1963.
The Government of India in their note dated the 7th June, 1963, had
again protested about the intrusion at Rezang La in Ladakh by a
Chinese force of 200 men with eighty or more horses. In their note
dated the 5th July, 1963, the Government of India had protested about
Chinese military patrols which had intruded into Sikkim State near
Sebu La. These land intrusions, it must be stated, were over and
above a number of violations of Indian air-space by Chinese aircraft.

4. The Chinese Government has so far sought to convey the im-
pression that it has accepted the Colombo proposals "in principle",
although it has continued to maintain reservations of substance in
regard to these proposals. This posture of the Chinese Government
stands fully exposed by the above-mentioned Chinese action in the
20 k.m. demilitarized zone.

5. The Government of India hereby lodge a strong protest in re-
gard to this continuous military activity by Chinese troops on Indian
territory. This aggressive activity, the Government of the People's
Republic of China should realise, not only adds to tensions in the
area, but is in open contravention of the provisions of the Colombo
proposals and the declarations of the Chinese Government them-

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity
to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, the as-
surances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 1 September, 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated July 28, 1964, hereby replies in refutation as follows:

1. In its note the Indian Government slanderously asserted that on May 30, 1964, armed Chinese personnel were observed eight miles north of Fukche and that similar military activity was also observed in Kongka La, Jara La and Chang La areas. This is a sheer fabrication. The fact is that since the withdrawal on China's own initiative in the end of February 1963, no Chinese military personnel had at any time ever been to these areas. And the Indian Government is fully aware that all the above-mentioned places are within Chinese territory and that the twenty kilometre wide demilitarized zone was vacated through the withdrawal by China from its side of the boundary merely for the purpose of relaxing the border situation and promoting a reconciliation between China and India. It is really the height of absurdity for the Indian Government to assert stubornly on the basis of a fabrication of its own making that Chinese troops were engaged in "military activities" in these places and lodge a so-called protest with the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government cannot but categorically reject it.

2. The Indian Government repeated its lies about "intrusions" by Chinese personnel into the area south of Longju, Rezang La and Sebu La respectively in April and June 1963. These lies were thoroughly refuted by the Chinese Government. Take the so-called Rezang La, even the map attached to the "Letters of the Prime Minister of India" published by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting of the Indian Government in December 1962 shows it on China's side of the 1959 line of actual control. And yet the Indian Government talks about an "intrusion" of Chinese troops at "Rezang La" in 1963. Is this not outright trouble-making?

3. It must be pointed out that the Indian Government's purpose of tirelessly fabricating lies about Chinese "intrusions" is obviously to create tension so as to achieve its unpresentable aims in its domestic and foreign policies. The Indian Government's unreasonable stand of persistently rejecting a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question through negotiations and its continuous provocations of sending military personnel and aircraft to intrude into China's territory and airspace are becoming ever more obnoxious and have placed it in an extremely difficult position both at home and abroad. Thereupon, the Indian Government sought help through spreading lies, vainly attempting thereby to counterbalance the tremendous influence produced by the measures taken by China for the peaceful settlement of the boundary question, cover up India's intrusions and escape condemnation by the people of India and by other Asian and African countries and just world opinion. However, lies can in no way take the place of the facts. Such a vicious practice on the part of the Indian Government can only serve to expose itself all the more and cannot have any other result.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 September, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state that on 27th August, 1964, at 1830 hrs. a Chinese military patrol consisting of three men intruded into Sikkim State, across Nathula.

2. The Chinese Government is well aware that under the Anglo-Chinese Convention of 1890, between Great Britain, acting for the Government of India, and China, the boundary between Sikkim and Tibet was clearly recognised by both sides. The Government of the People's Republic of China, in various notes exchanged between the Government of India, has also recognised this position. The latest Chinese intrusion into Sikkim is, therefore, a calculated violation of a well-recognised boundary and a projection of the aggressive concentration of troops and military installations by China in the Chumbi Valley. In the context of the Chinese Government's negative and intransigent attitude towards the Colombo Proposals and other constructive suggestions made by India for a peaceful and honourable settlement of the border problem, these military concentrations, and intrusions across the border are, undoubtedly, part of China's scheme for keeping up the tension along the Sino-Indian boundary.

3. The Government of India hereby lodge a strong protest against this intrusion into the Sikkim State and ask the Government of China to desist from such aggressive activities.

4. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 5 September, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi, and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note of the 7th July, 1964.

2. The Government of India have, in their previous notes, clearly established the total lack of substance in complaints made by the Chinese Government of violation of Chinese air-space by Indian aircraft. It is regrettable that the Chinese Government in their note of the 7th July, 1964, continues to repeat the same type of baseless allegations. Enquiries conducted by the Government of India have confirmed, beyond any doubt, that no Indian air-craft
has ever crossed the traditional and well-recognised boundary of India.

3. As regards the allegations in the note in question of intrusions by Indian army personnel, it is well-known that in keeping with India's full acceptance of the Colombo Proposals, Indian defence personnel are under strict instructions not to cross even the Chinese so-called "line of actual control". The Chinese Government are fully aware that although the Government of India have at no stage accepted the Chinese version of the so-called "line of actual control", they have exercised supreme self-restraint and not sent any Indian troops across this line, even though the international frontier in the Western Sector of the India-China border lies far to the East of this line. In these circumstances, it is fantastic that the Chinese Government should have alleged intrusions by Indian troops across Nathu La. The Chinese Government is fully aware that the India-China boundary in this sector is not only well-defined but has been actually demarcated on the ground.

4. The Chinese note under reference states "the Indian Government has not yet given up its expansionist ambition towards China's territory....". It is ironic that China should accuse India of expansionist ambitions, when China openly preaches violence, revolution and the overthrow of established Governments in Asia, Africa and other parts of the world, and when China continues to occupy by force, 14,500 square miles of Indian territory in the Ladakh region. The expansionist nature of the Chinese Government itself is further demonstrated by the fact that many of the places, where the so-called violations by Indian aircraft are alleged to have taken place in the Chinese note, are in acknowledged Indian territory.

5. In the light of the above facts, it is obvious that the Chinese Government has made the false allegations in its note of 7th July 1964, merely to serve the ends of its anti-Indian propaganda and to heighten the tension on the India-China border. This is confirmed by the veiled threat introduced in paragraph 5 of the note, that "the Chinese Government hopes that the Indian side will change its course, stop its intrusions......so as to keep the Sino-Indian border situation relaxed". It is clear that the Chinese Government has fabricated these so-called Indian 'intrusions' solely for the purpose of stepping up more and more tension on the border.

6. In view of all this, the Government of India, categorically reject the Chinese Government's note of 7th July, 1964.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 28 September, 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

Having made repeated checking, the Chinese Government has recently confirmed that Indian troops have crossed the Tungchula Pass (southeast of the Nathu La Pass) on the China-Sikkim boundary and intruded into China’s Tibet. Up to August 1964, Indian troops had successively built up eighteen aggressive military structures (dugouts, shelters, bulwarks, etc.) on the Chinese side of the above mentioned pass or on the boundary line (eleven on the Chinese side and seven on the boundary line). The Indian troops entrenched there have engaged in incessant harassment. Besides, Indian troops have time and again intruded into China’s territory across other passes on the China-Sikkim boundary. On August 12, 1964, at about 1400 hours, five Indian soldiers crossed the Tagi Pass on the China-Sikkim boundary and intruded into China's territory for reconnaissance. On August 14, 1964, at about 1500 hours, four Indian soldiers crossed the Peilungla Pass (west of the Tagi Pass) and intruded into China’s territory for reconnaissance. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned grave intrusions by Indian troops.

As early as September 1962, Indian troops already crossed the China-Sikkim boundary, built up dozens of aggressive military structures on the Chinese side of the Nathu La Pass and unlawfully entrenched themselves there, blocked the pass and interrupted normal traffic of border inhabitants. Disregarding the repeated protests of the Chinese Government, the Indian Government has up till now refused to withdraw its intruding troops or make a joint investigation by the two parties into the intrusion by Indian troops. Now, the Indian Government has further sent its troops to cross the Tungchula Pass, build up military structures there and repeatedly infringed on Chinese territory at other places on the China-Sikkim border. These iron-clad facts clearly demonstrate that the Indian Government, un-reconciled to the relaxation of the Sino-Indian border situation due to the initiative measures of the Chinese side, is not only making repeated intrusions along the Sino-Indian border, but also extending its aggressive activities along the China-Sikkim border in order to create tension to meet the needs of its domestic and foreign policies.

It should be pointed out that the Indian Government and its propaganda organs have recently been pouring out abuses and groundlessly slandering China as “concentrating troops” and “building bases” along the China-Sikkim border, “penetrating deep into Sikkim”, etc. The purpose is evidently to provide a cover for India’s own aggressive activities and make anti-China propaganda. This trick of a thief crying “Catch thief!”, which is often played by the Indian Government, will deceive nobody and will only be appreciated by U.S. imperialism and its followers.

In order to safeguard China’s territory and sovereignty and maintain tranquillity along the China-Sikkim border, the Chinese Government seriously urges India to put an immediate stop to its aggressive activities, dismantle all the military structures it has built up
on Chinese territory and on the China-Sikkim boundary line and withdraw all its troops which are unlawfully entrenched on Chinese territory.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 29 September, 1964


The above allegation of the Indian Government is an out-and-out fabrication. As is well known, even before the Indian Ministry of External Affairs delivered the note, a spokesman of the Indian Defence Ministry spread on September 3, 1964, the lie about Chinese intrusion into Sikkim. However, not only are the stories about the Chinese "intrusion" fabricated by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and the Indian Defence Ministry full of loopholes, the two Indian Ministries have given the lie to each other. The Hsinhua News Agency of China was authorised to issue a statement on September 11, 1964, exposing and sternly refuting the Indian fabrication. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the Indian Government's unjustifiable and mischievous protest.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 7 October 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Foreign Office note, (64) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 460, dated 1st September, 1964.

2. The Government of India's note of 28th July 1964, protesting against Chinese military activities in the demilitarized area in the Ladakh region of India was based on verified facts. The Chinese note has not only blandly denied these indisputable facts, but has made the untenable assertion that all the places intruded into by the Chinese forces are in the territory of China. It is well-known that not only the 20 k.m. demilitarized zone but the entire area of 14,500 square miles in Ladakh, now in the unlawful occupation of China, was seized by the Chinese, at first, by clandestine intrusions
and, later, by large-scale aggression. It was because they had come into this area, illegally and in violation of international law, that the Chinese troops ultimately withdrew 20 k.m. behind their advance positions in Indian territory. It is perfectly well-known that it was due to this very reason that the six Asian-African countries who met at the Colombo Conference asked the Chinese Government to withdraw its troops 20 k.m. behind the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector. In the face of these facts it is futile for the Government of China to contend that what are the fruits of its aggression on Indian soil have always been "Chinese territory". The Government of India vehemently reject this expansionist logic of the Chinese Government, and once again register a strong protest against the military activities of China in the demilitarized area in Ladakh.

3. The Government of India in its note of 28th July had reiterated its protest against the various intrusions made by Chinese troops into places like Longju, Rezangla, Sebula, as well as against the violations of Indian air-space by Chinese aircraft. The Chinese note has tried to dismiss these legitimate protests by taking refuge in undiplomatic language and using the simple word "lies". This is, of course, no answer at all in official correspondence, by any international standards. In addition to the intrusions and violations mentioned above, Chinese troops have recently, on August 27, intruded into Sikkim, across the well-recognised and demarcated border between China and Sikkim and, as the Chinese Government is aware, the Government of India lodged a strong protest with the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi about this latest violation in their note dated 5th September, 1964.

4. In its attempt to confuse matters and to cover up its military intrusions, the Chinese note has referred to a rough sketch map in an Indian booklet "Chinese Aggression in War and Peace—Letters of the Prime Minister of India"—, and claimed that Rezangla is on the Chinese side of the so-called 'line of actual control'. The inscription below this map in the booklet makes it clear that what it shows is the "fictitious line now being claimed by Chinese as the line of actual control of November 1959". This fictitious line of actual control is actually the line of aggression reached by the Chinese forces in their massive invasion of India during October-November, 1962. As the Government of India had pointed out in earlier notes, there had been no Chinese presence of any kind on the Indian side of the traditional, customary boundary, south of Rezangla and India had, in fact, maintained a defence post at Rezangla, until November, 1962, when it fell under China's massive attacks. To say, in these circumstances, that Rezangla is on the Chinese side of the so-called 'line of actual control' of November, 1959, is a fantastic and aggressive claim.

5. In para 3 of the Chinese note it has been alleged that India has persistently rejected a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question and carried out provocative intrusions into Chinese territory. This is a complete travesty of facts. It is the Government of China who has turned its back on peaceful negotiations and is indulging in military pressure on India and is guilty of intrusions into Indian territory in the pursuit of its long-term strategy of conflict
with India. Nothing makes this basic policy of the Chinese Government clearer than its attitude towards the Colombo Proposals. India has accepted these Proposals formulated by disinterested Afro-Asian countries, but China has, so far, resolutely refused to accept them. If China has any desire for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian border question, it should accept the Colombo Proposals and enter into negotiations with India. That alone will meet the aspirations of the peoples of India and China, and enable the Chinese Government to talk with a clear conscience about Sino-Indian friendship and Afro-Asian solidarity.

6. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 6 November, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Foreign Office note dated September 28, 1964.

2. The Ministry of External Affairs, in a statement issued by its official spokesman on October 5, had categorically denied the wild allegations of so-called Indian intrusions into Tibet contained in the Chinese note under reply. The boundary between Sikkim and Tibet is demarcated and well recognized, and Indian defence forces have at no time crossed this boundary at any point. The Chinese allegations are nothing but fabrications, pure and simple, designed to meet the ends of China's propaganda and to keep up the tension on the Sino-Indian border.

3. The Chinese note has mentioned Tungchula, Peilungla, and Tagi Pass as points at which Indian defence forces are alleged to have crossed the international boundary. These names do not correspond to the names of any of the passes that the Government of India are aware of on this well-known Sikkim-Tibet border. The Chinese note has not given the location and the co-ordinates of these "passes". The rough sketch map of the so-called Indian intrusions which was published in the 'Peking Review' of 9th October, along with the text of the Chinese note, also did not give the co-ordinates of these passes. It is obvious that this vague sketch map in the 'Peking Review' is a sheer propaganda device. The charge in the Chinese note that Indian troops have built military structures, 11 on the Chinese side and 7 on the boundary, at the so-called Tungchula Pass is a totally baseless fabrication.

4. The Government of China, in its note in question, has chosen to resurrect the old and unfounded charge that India has, as early as 1962, built dozens of military structures on the Chinese side of Nathula and has up to now refused to withdraw its "intruding troops" or make joint investigations. The Government of India had effectively and finally answered these false charges in their note dated
16th January, 29th March, 15th June and 19th September, 1963, and had pointed out that there was no case whatever for a joint investigation. It is interesting that the Chinese note has alleged that India had crossed the China-Sikkim boundary in September, 1962, and that the "Indian Government has up till now refused to withdraw its intruding troops". The Government of China knows that it was after September, 1962, that the Chinese forces launched their massive invasion of India in the name of self-defence and penetrated deep into Indian territory. In these circumstances, to say that Indian troops had intruded into Tibet in September, 1962, and continued to remain there up till now (and also maintained military structures) is a story that nobody can believe.

5. The note of the Chinese Government ends with a peremptory demand for the dismantling of military structures and the withdrawal of troops from Chinese territory "in order to safeguard China's territory and maintain tranquillity along the Chinese-Sikkim border". As there are absolutely no Indian, military structures or troops in any part of Chinese territory, the question of dismantling structures or withdrawing troops does not at all arise. The Government of India would like to recall to the Chinese Government that it was under the pretext of safeguarding Chinese territory and maintaining tranquillity along the border that the Chinese armed forces launched their massive attacks across the Indian border in the autumn of 1962. If the Chinese Government is genuinely interested in a peaceful settlement of the border question, it should put a stop to making these unnecessary and meaningless demands and accept, instead, the Colombo Proposals, unreservedly, so that negotiations may take place between the two countries as the Government of India has so often stated.

6. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 6 November, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Foreign Office note dated September 29, 1964.

2. The Government of India, in its note of September 5, 1964, had lodged a strong protest with the Chinese Embassy against the intrusion into Sikkim State by a Chinese patrol party of three military personnel. This protest was based on observed and verified facts. The Chinese note and the Hsinhua statement of 11th September referred to therein have tried, in vain, to deny these facts and to draw what looks like a smokescreen over the whole incident of intrusion by alleging contradictions between the protest note of the Ministry of External Affairs and the statement made by the spokesman of the Ministry of Defence. There is absolutely no contradiction in the Government of India's stand, which is that a Chinese
patrol consisting of three men intruded into the Sikkim State from Tibet on August 27, 1964. The Government of India once again strongly protest against this violation by Chinese troops of Sikkim territory.

3. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to the Embassy of India in China, 14 November, 1964.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and hereby makes the following refutation of the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated July 16 and October 7, 1964.

The rumours fabricated by the Indian Government that the Chinese personnel had set up stone cairns along the line of actual control between the two countries in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary and that Chinese military personnel had entered the twenty-kilometre zone on the Chinese side of the line of actual control have been thoroughly refuted in detail by the Chinese Government in its notes of March 31 and September 1, 1964. In the face of the established facts cited by the Chinese Government, the Indian Government found itself devoid of all arguments and unable to give any answer. However, it evaded the facts by rambling haphazard, continued to level all sorts of slanders on China and persisted in its unreasonable protests. This sort of fabrication and unreasonable attitude is indeed rarely seen. The Chinese Government cannot but express regret at that.

The Chinese Government wishes to point out once again that the Chinese side has never set up any stone cairns to mark the line of actual control between the two countries on the Sino-Indian border and it holds that there is no need to do that at all. As for the location and origin of the line of actual control, the Chinese Government has long since made them known to the world both by documents and by maps. The line of actual control has long existed and China has always exercised effective jurisdiction over the areas up to the line of actual control on its own side. All this is a conclusive historical fact. It will be futile for the Indian Government to deny the objective facts no matter how many myths it may create in order to deceive the public.

In its note the Indian Government once again attempted to deny the existence of some of the posts set up by China prior to November 7, 1959 within the twenty-kilometre zone on the Chinese side of the line of actual control in the western sector, and even insolently claimed that large tracts of territory which have always belonged to China were Indian. But this is of no avail. The Chinese Government has fully elucidated the facts and furnished evidences in this
regard in numerous documents and will pay no more heed here to India's nonsensical haggling.

More and more people have now become aware of the truth about the Sino-Indian boundary question, the attitudes of China and India towards the Colombo Proposals and direct Sino-Indian negotiations, etc. Of late, in its Statement of October 9, 1964, the Chinese Government made another clear exposition on that and there is no need to repeat it here. The Chinese Government wishes to tell the Indian Government in all seriousness that whatever distortions or slanders the Indian Government may resort to, it will never succeed in its attempt to take advantage of the Colombo Proposals and China's sincere desire for a peaceful settlement of the boundary question to achieve its aim of seizing China's territory.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 31 December, 1964**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows:

On December 25 at 1710 hours two armed Chinese personnel violated the border of Sikkim and intruded 800 yards into Sikkim about one and a half miles East South-East of Nathu La. Again at 1720 hours on the same day a larger group of fifteen Chinese military personnel were seen about 800 yards inside the border in the same area. The Chinese intruders took up firing position on observing an Indian patrol. On December 26 at 1730 hours another group of three armed Chinese intruders were seen approximately 50 yards on the Sikkim side of the border about two miles East South-East of Nathu La. Seeing an Indian patrol they withdrew into Tibet and after crossing the border fired one green verey light into the sky.

The Government of India lodge a vehement protest against these provocative intrusions by Chinese troops into Sikkim territory. The boundary between Sikkim and Tibet is well-defined and well-recognised. The violations of this border cannot, therefore, be anything but calculated aggressive moves by China. In the context of the large concentration of Chinese troops in the Chumbi Valley and the resolute refusal of China to accept the Colombo Proposals, these frequent intrusions into Sikkim cannot be ignored by the Government of India. The Government of India hereby register their strong protest and ask the Chinese Government to desist from violations of this recognised international border.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the
Embassy of India in China, 3 January, 1965

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the
honour to state the following: —

After careful checking, the Chinese authorities concerned have
recently confirmed that Indian troops have again crossed the China-
Sikkim boundary and perpetrated the following fresh intrusions.

1. Up to November 1964, Indian troops had built 27 military
structures (dug-outs, bulwarks, etc.) on the Chinese side of the Jelep La
(nearly five kilometres southeast of the Natu La) or on the boundary
line. They also erected breast works and dug communication trenches
and placed guards there.

2. Up to November 1964, Indian troops had built four military
structures on the boundary line at the Cho La (about five kilometres
northwest of the Natu La).

3. On November 27, 1964, a group of Indian troops crossed Latuo
La (about 16 kilometres southeast of Choding Gompa of Khamba
County) on the China-Sikkim boundary, intruded into Chinese terri-
tory for reconnaissance and harassment and seized 59 yaks which be-
longed to the Chinese herdsman Akyid and others.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the
Indian Government against this series of grave intrusions by the
Indian troops.

It must be pointed out that long before their intrusions listed
above, the Indian troops had built up a mass of aggressive military
structures at the Natu La and the Tungchula on the China-Sikkim
boundary and unlawfully entrenched themselves there, and have up to
now refused to withdraw therefrom in spite of the repeated serious
protests from China. Nor was it the first time that Indian troops
intruded into Chinese territory to seize live-stock of Chinese herdsmen
(reference Chinese Government's note of September 19, 1963). In
bluntly disregarding China's sovereignty and constantly expanding
the scope of intrusion, India is obviously attempting to create tension
and disturb the tranquility along the China-Sikkim border.

In its note of November 6, 1964, the Indian Government made a
vain attempt to deny its aggressive activities at the Tungchula, the
Tagi La and the Poilungla on the China-Sikkim boundary. To seek
a pretext, India tried to make it appear that it was not aware of the
location of the three passes. In fact the Chinese side has long made
public the related sketch map, and India also admitted in its note
that it had seen this map. This map clearly shows the location of
these three passes. Take for instance the Tungchula. It is distinctly
shown on the map as just located southeast of the Natu La. Is it
conceivable that the Indian Government is not even aware of the
location of the Natu La. Take the Tagi La for another instance. Five
notes were exchanged between China and India on the incident of
Indian troops crossing that Pass to kidnap Chinese shepherds and
seize their sheep in August 1963. In that exchange of notes the
Indian side did not say that it was unaware of the location of the
Tagi La, and what is more it admitted the fact that Chinese shepherds had been “apprehended” by it. How is it that the Indian side now suddenly pretends ignorance about the location of the Tagi La. As a matter of fact, the Indian Government itself is well aware of where Indian troops have carried out aggressive activities. India’s repeated refusal to conduct joint investigation of the Indian troops’ intrusion at the Natu La is a best proof of its guilty conscience.

In order to safeguard China’s territorial sovereignty and maintain the tranquillity along the China-Sikkim border, the Chinese Government once again urges the Indian side to dismantle immediately all its military structures built on Chinese territory or on the China-Sikkim boundary line, withdraw all its troops unlawfully entrenched there, return the livestock of Chinese herdsmen seized by the Indian troops and stop all its aggressive activities.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 January, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in New Delhi, and has the honour to state as follows:—

On January 19 at 0400 hours 30 armed Chinese soldiers in uniform carrying a wireless set and accompanied by two civilians were noticed approximately 2½ miles inside Sikkim south of Kongrala (Longitude: 88°—37’—52”, Latitude: 28°—03’—48”). The Chinese intruders withdrew into Tibetan territory on being detected by an Indian patrol party in the area.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest against this latest intrusion by Chinese troops into Sikkim. Having built up large concentrations of armed forces and a net-work of military installations in Tibet on the other side of Sikkim, China has been, in recent months, slowly extending its aggressive activities well across the border of Sikkim. On August 27, 1964 a Chinese military patrol intruded into Sikkim across NATHULA. Again, on December 25 and 26, 1964 Chinese patrol parties violated the Sikkim border east south-east of Nathula, and one of these parties even took up firing position on observing an Indian patrol. In the latest intrusion, which took place on January 19, 1965, the Chinese troops came nearly 2½ miles inside Sikkim territory south of Kongrala. The boundary between Sikkim and Tibet is well-defined and clearly recognized, and there could be no misunderstanding at all as to where the border lies in this sector. Therefore, the Government of India is compelled to look upon these frequent intrusions as nothing but projections of China’s aggressive moves and designs against India. The Government of India call upon the Chinese Government to refrain from such aggressive and provocative activities along the Tibet-Sikkim boundary.
The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 February, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government note of January 3, 1965.

The Chinese note has alleged that up to November 1964, Indian troops had built 27 military structures on the Chinese side of JELEP LA and along the boundary line at CHO LA on the SIKKIM-TIBET border. The Government of India have made careful enquiries into this matter and have found that these allegations are complete false and unfounded. The Government of India are absolutely certain that their troops and defence works are located, beyond any possibility of doubt, on the SIKKIM side of the border. They have not stationed any troops or built any military structures whatsoever on the TIBETAN side of the border, nor have Indian troops crossed the border at any point and seized yaks from Chinese herdsmen as alleged in the Chinese note. The Government of India, therefore, categorically reject the protest lodged by the Chinese Government as entirely baseless and unwarranted.

In its note under reply, the Chinese Government has once again raked up the old and worn-out allegation that Indian troops had built military structures on the TIBETAN side of NATHU LA and "TUNGCHU LA" and committed intrusion across passes, which it calls "TAGI LA" and "PEILUNG LA". All these charges have been thoroughly refuted by the Government of India in their note of November 6, 1964. It is regrettable that the Chinese Government is once again harping upon these allegations, obviously for the purpose of creating trouble and tension on the border. The Chinese note has criticised the Government of India's statement that they are not aware of the so-called 'TUNGCHU LA', 'PEILUNG LA' and 'TAGI LA', and has asserted that the location of these passes is well-known. At the same time, the Chinese note has refused to throw any light on the location of these passes and to give the exact co-ordinates of these places. It was already pointed out in the Government of India's note of November 6, 1964 that the map published in the "PEKING REVIEW" of October 9, 1964 was a vague sketch-map and little more than a propaganda document, which does not give any information about the co-ordinates of these passes. As regards 'TAGI LA', while it is true that several Chinese notes have mentioned this name, the Government of India had, in their note of September 10, 1962 told the Government of China that the Indian Government "are not aware of any places called TZELENGLA and TAGILA". The assertion in the Chinese Note that the Indian side had admitted that Chinese shepherds were 'apprehended' by it at Tagila is a complete distortion of facts. The Chinese note of 19th September, 1963, had alleged that on the morning of August 5, 1963, a group of Indian
soldiers crossed the Sino-Sikkim boundary and kidnapped two Tibetan shepherds and seized their sheep. India in its note of November 12, 1963, denied this allegation, and said that two Tibetans who had illegally crossed the border through Banchola into Sikkim were apprehended on 4th August, 1963. To concluded from this that the Government of India admitted that it knew the location of Tagila is a deliberate and unwarranted distortion. The Government of India are surprised that the Chinese Government should continue to put forward such spurious and confusing arguments and keep referring to vague sketch maps when they make serious allegations of border crossings, instead of giving the correct co-ordinates of the “passes” in question where incidents are alleged to have taken place.

The Government of India are a little puzzled by the increasing number of false and reckless charges which are being made by the Government of China in regard to the Sikkim-Tibet border. It is significant that since January, 1963 the Chinese have gradually enlarged the extent of their allegations and fabrications concerning this border. First it was NATHU LA, then “TUNGCHU LA”, “TAGI LA” and “PEILUNG LA” and now JELEP LA and CHO LA. These baseless charges are accompanied by unreasonable demands for withdrawal of troops and dismantling of Indian military structures in Tibetan territory which do not exist at all, and by a propaganda demand for joint investigations. The Chinese note also contains veiled threats about safeguarding “China’s territorial sovereignty” and maintaining “the tranquility of the border”. This attitude of the Chinese Government is all the more serious in view of the considerable concentration of Chinese troops and the construction by them of a net-work of military installations in the CHUMBI VALLEY, just across the Sikkim border. There have also been recently a number of violations of this border by Chinese troops. The Government of India had vehemently protested against these intrusions to the Chinese Government, in their notes of September 5, November 6, December 31, 1964, and January 21, 1965. It is obvious that the false allegations of Indian intrusions and the building up of military structures by India across the Tibetan border are intended as a cover for the aggressive activities of the Chinese troops along the Sikkim-Tibet border. These allegations are reminiscent of the charges which the Chinese Government levelled against India in the autumn of 1962 before launching their massive attacks across the border. The Government of India hope that similar charges are not now being repeated, again and again, in order to build up tension and to provide a pretext for more serious incidents.

The boundary between Sikkim and Tibet is well-defined and well-recognised. The Chinese Government is fully aware and has, indeed, admitted that this boundary had been formally delimited, long ago, and that there could be no misunderstanding as to its exact location on the ground. As far as Indian troops and personnel are concerned, they have never transgressed this boundary, at any time. On the contrary, it is Chinese troops who have repeatedly violated the boundary of Sikkim. The Government of India would urge the Chinese Government to abandon their policy of tension and conflict on the Sino-Indian border. India has declared that she is willing
to enter into talks with China on the basis of the Colombo Proposals. It is now for China to demonstrate its willingness for a negotiated settlement by accepting the Colombo Proposals.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 12 February 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Foreign Office note of November 14, 1964.

2. The Chinese note under reply has not only attempted to deny the incontrovertible fact that Chinese troops have set up stone cairns along 'the line of actual control' in the Western sector in Ladakh, but has also maintained that there is "no need to do that at all" as this, so-called line of 'actual control' has "long existed" and is well-known. The truth of the matter is that 'the line of actual control' was created as a result of Chinese aggression and was the farthest line of advance reached by the Chinese forces during their massive military operations in Ladakh in the autumn of 1962. The above fact was reflected in the Colombo Proposals, which asked the Chinese Government to withdraw its forces 20 kilometres from the 'line of actual control' while asking the Indian Government "to keep their existing military position" in the Western Sector. It was also reflected in the recommendation of the Colombo Conference that "pending a final solution of the border dispute, the area vacated by the Chinese military withdrawals will be a demilitarized zone to be administered by the civilian posts of both sides to be agreed upon without prejudice to the rights of the previous presence of both India and China in this area". It is, therefore, preposterous for the Chinese Government to argue that 'the line of actual control' and the Chinese posts in the demilitarized area had "long existed" and that China has always exercised effective jurisdiction up to this line. The entire area of 14,500 square miles of territory in Ladakh, stretching up to the so-called 'line of actual control', was seized by force by China and is, at present, illegally in her occupation. To argue that this illegal occupation "is a conclusive historical fact" is to fabricate history in a vain attempt to sanctify aggression.

3. The Chinese note has referred to the Chinese Government's statement of October 9, 1964, and claimed that it contained "a clear exposition" of the attitudes of India and China to the Colombo Proposals. The Government of India cannot but point out that this statement once again proves, if any proof was still necessary, China's uncompromising refusal to accept the Colombo Proposals and to enter into talks with India on the border question. Furthermore, this statement, which was issued, significantly, at the time of the Cairo Conference of the Non-Aligned Nations, went to the extent of admonishing the Colombo Powers for trying to enter into consul-
tations amongst themselves on the border question. "Such consultations", the statement said, "will place more obstacles in their way, making it more difficult for the six Colombo Conference Nations to conduct mediation in the future". It is clear that the purpose of issuing this warning was to dissuade the Colombo Powers from undertaking any mediatory efforts to bring India and China to the Conference table. This October 9 statement also contained a categorical rejection of the suggestion that the two countries should enter into discussions on the basis of there being no posts of either side in the de-militarized zone in the Western Sector. As has been pointed out earlier in this note, the Colombo Proposals has unambiguously laid down that the demilitarized area should be administered by civilian posts of both India and China. China has not only refused to accept this provision, but has unilaterally set up her own posts in the demilitarized area, in defiance of the Colombo Proposals. It is well-known that the suggestion that there should be no posts of either side in this area was made by an impartial third party; in order to overcome one of the major reservations the Chinese Government had raised in regard to the Colombo Proposals. By reacting positively to this suggestion, India made a definite gesture of conciliation. To say that it was "an Indian precondition to negotiations" is a deliberate distortion of facts. Nobody, who studies the facts objectively, will be deceived by this kind of Chinese propaganda.

4. The Chinese note ends by asserting that India "will never succeed in its attempt to take advantage of the Colombo Proposals". Were the Colombo Proposals made by the friendly Asian-African countries to be accepted, or were they made only to be rejected by either or both sides to the conflict? All that the Government of India can say on this is that if only China had taken 'advantage' of the Colombo Proposals by accepting the Proposals, the present unfortunate deadlock in Sino-Indian relations would not have continued and negotiations would have taken place for a peaceful settlement of the border question. It is up to the Chinese Government to accept the Colombo Proposals, even today, and to sit down for talks with India if China sincerely desire to solve the conflict through peaceful methods.

5. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 23 January, 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

1. Disregarding the repeated protests made by the Chinese Government, the Indian Government has kept on dispatching its aircraft to intrude into China's airspace. During the period of October-December 1963, the total number of verified intrusions by Indian aircraft reached forty-two sorties (See appendix for details).
These Indian aircraft time and again crossed the 1959 line of actual control between the two sides on the Sino-Indian border and unscrupulously circled over China's frontier areas for reconnaissance. One of them even flew over Shigatse, Lhasa, Damshune and Nagchuka across vast areas in the hinterland of Tibet for reconnaissance, penetrating a depth of more than 400 kilometres north of the line of actual control and making harassment for more than two hours. The Chinese Government noted the fact that India had stopped up its air intrusions into China at a time when the Indian Government was conducting air exercises jointly with the United States and Britain and strengthening its military collusion with them. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned serious intrusions by the Indian aircraft, and urges the Indian side to put an immediate end to all its intrusions into China's airspace.

2. In its notes of October 19 and 23, 1963, the Indian Government, as usual, denied the established facts about Indian air intrusions into China's airspace in the third quarter and on October 10, 1963 as cited by the Chinese Government. Moreover, in its note of October 23, the Indian Government absurdly claimed that one of the Chinese areas into which Indian aircraft intruded lies in Indian territory. This can only serve to further reveal the unreasonable position of the Indian side.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
APPENDIX

Facts of Indian Air Intrusions into China's Airspace in October, November and December, 1963

I. Intrusions into China's airspace over areas of the Sinkiang and Tibet regions on the western sector of the Sino-Indian border (eighteen sorties):

1. On October 11, 1963, at 1354 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Khurank Fort and Nyagzu in Tibet.

2. On October 5, 1963, at 1033 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the vicinity of the civilian checkposts at Spanggur in Tibet.

3. On October 15, 1963, at 1035 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the vicinity of Sirijap in Tibet.

4. On October 15, 1963, at 1120 hours, two Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet.

5. On October 20, 1963, at about 1400 hours, two Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet.

6. On October 30, 1963, at 1250 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Tashigong and Gargunsa in Tibet and circled over there for reconnaissance, penetrating a depth of more than 70 kilometres inside China.

7. On November 11, 1963, at 1220 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the vicinity of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet.

8. On November 11, 1963, at 1248 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the vicinity of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet.

9. On November 20, 1963, at 1125 hours, two Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the vicinity of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet and circled over there for reconnaissance.

10. On November 29, 1963, at 0950 hours, two Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Sirijap in Tibet.

11. On December 1, 1963, at 1317 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Nyagzu in Tibet.

12. On December 1, 1963, at 1330 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Sirijap in Tibet.


II. Intrusions into China's airspace over areas of the Tibet region on the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border (three sorties):

1. On October 12, 1963 at 1345 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Gyanima in Tibet.

2. On October 12, 1963, at 1630 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Gyanima in Tibet.

3. On October 12, 1963, at 1653 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Gyanima in Tibet.

III. Intrusions into China's airspace over areas of the Tibet region to the north of the 1959 line of actual control on the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border (nineteen sorties):

1. On October 9, 1963, at 1308 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Sama in Tibet.

2. On October 10, 1963, at about 1300 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Shigatse, Tibet, from the southwest, then went northward along a highway and flew over Wuyu, Damshune, the vicinity of the Toke Lake, and Nagchuka (located over 200 kilometres north of Lhasa). Then it turned southward and flew over Lhasa, Gyantse, and Tuichiung and left China in a southwest direction. This aircraft flew illegally for more than two hours over Chinese territory, covering a distance of over 1700 kilometres and penetrating a depth of over 400 kilometres north of the line of actual control.

3. On October 11, 1963, at 1540 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Sama in Tibet.

4. On October 23, 1963, at 1257 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Tsayul, Chikung, Polo and other places in Tibet, circling repeatedly over there for reconnaissance and penetrating a depth of more than 70 kilometres north of the line of actual control.

5. On October 30, 1963, at 1000 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Kata, the vicinity of Hsuekke, Minla, Thetang, Langkatzu, Khamba Dzong and other places in Tibet for reconnaissance. Its unlawful flight over Chinese territory lasted about two hours, penetrating a depth of over 160 kilometres north of the line of actual control.

6. On November 11, 1963, at 1149 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Chihpa in Tibet.

7. On November 1, 1963, at 1153 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Chikung, the civilian checkpost at Tsayul and other places in Tibet.
8. On November 18, 1963, at 1314 hours, and Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over the civilian checkpoints at Lusha, Nanyi and Tamaden and other places in Tibet.

9. On November 19, 1963, at 1210 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over Tsona Dzong, Kata and other places in Tibet.

10. On November 21, 1963, at 1230 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over Kata, Lungtzu and other places in Tibet.

11. On November 22, 1963, at 1305 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over Linchih, Nishi and other places in Tibet, repeatedly circling over there for reconnaissance and penetrating a depth of more than 50 kilometres north of the line of actual control.

12. On December 18, 1963, at 1455 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over Tiyu and other places in Tibet and circled over there for reconnaissance.

13. On December 19, 1963, at 1034 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over Ketang in Tibet.

14. On December 20, 1963, at 1300 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over the civilian checkpoints at Tamaden and Laiguo Bridge and other places in Tibet for reconnaissance.

15. On December 20, 1963, at 1342 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over the vicinity of Sananchulin in Tibet.

16. On December 21, 1963, at 1100 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over Sananchulin in Tibet.

17. On December 21, 1963, at 1342 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over the civilian checkpoint at Budzong and other places in Tibet.

18. On December 28, 1963, at 1248 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over the civilian checkpoint at Titung and other places in Tibet.

19. On December 31, 1963, at 1355 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over Hsuehka in Tibet.

IV. Intrusions into China’s airspace over areas in the Tibet region bordering on Sikkim and Bhutan (two sorties):

1. On October 10, 1963, at about 1530 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over Yatung, Phari, Yakeshachu, the Numuchang Lake and other places in Tibet.

2. On October 11, 1963, at 0915 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace via Natu La, which lies on the Sino-Sikkim boundary.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 12 February, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows:

2. On the 18th January, 1964, a Chinese jet aircraft intruded into Indian airspace in the Ladakh area. It flew over Leh at 1109 hours and then onwards to a point 45 nautical miles south of Leh, at a height of about 35,000 feet. Thereafter the aircraft turned east and disappeared. The Chinese jet aircraft had thereby penetrated over 120 kilometres into Indian territory, even measured from the nearest point of the India-China boundary.

3. This renewed violation of Indian airspace by Chinese aircraft reveals the continued aggressive intention of the Chinese Government and the threat posed to India's security and territorial integrity. The Government of India lodge a strong protest against this latest violation of Indian air space by a Chinese aircraft and demand that the Chinese Government put a stop to such intrusions forthwith.

4. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, the assurances of its highest consideration.

——

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 29 February, 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

In its note of February 12, 1964, the Indian Government slanderously charged that a Chinese airplane intruded into the airspace of Leh and other places on January 18, 1964. But the Indian Government cannot turn lies into facts. The Chinese Government clearly pointed out long ago and the Indian Government is well aware that Chinese aircraft never go beyond China's territorial air. In fact, Chinese aircraft have never even come over China's frontier areas by the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border, how is it possible for them to commit “violation of Indian airspace”? The Chinese Government categorically rejects the unwarranted protest of the Indian Government.

In its notes of August 23 and 26, 1963, the Indian Government repeated the slander that Chinese aircraft had violated Indian airspace several times in the same year. The Chinese Government has repeatedly refuted such slanders, and deems it unnecessary to pay further attention to them.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 March, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, and with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office Note, dated January 23, 1964, has the honour to state as follows:

2. In keeping with the Government of India's acceptance of the Colombo proposals in toto and without reservations, the Government of India have issued strict instructions to Indian aircraft not to cross what the Chinese term the "line of actual control" in the Western Sector, as also the International border in the Middle and Eastern Sectors of the India-China border. However, after receipt of the Chinese Government's Note dated January 23, 1964, alleging violations by Indian aircraft of "China's air space", detailed investigations have been carried out and the Government of India hereby categorically confirm that no Indian aircraft, have been involved in any such flights. The Chinese allegations in their note under reference are false and baseless.

3. In the appendix to the Note under reply, the Chinese Government have listed 14 alleged "intrusions" by Indian aircraft in the Western Sector of the India-China border. At least 11 of the places mentioned refer to areas which are indisputably within Indian territory, although presently under the illegal occupation of China. As the Government of India have repeatedly pointed out, approximately 14,500 square miles of Indian territory in the Western Sector of the India-China border have been forcibly seized, progressively, by Chinese forces ever since 1957. These incursions culminated in the massive invasion launched by Chinese forces in October/November, 1962, across India's northern frontiers. Since the Government of India have accepted the Colombo proposals, as the first step towards the possible peaceful solution of the India-China border differences, consistent with this, Indian aircraft have, at no time, crossed the so-called Chinese "line of actual control". This is, of course, purely a self-imposed restraint in keeping with the Colombo proposals, and can, under no circumstances be construed to imply that China has acquired any right over the area presently under the illegal occupation of Chinese forces. The allegations that Indian aircraft have flown across the international border to areas like Tashigong and Gargunsa in Tibet, are factually equally false and baseless. So are the allegations that Indian aircraft have flown across the international border in the Middle and Eastern Sectors of the India-China border. It is clear that the Chinese Government continue to make these false allegations solely for the purpose of propaganda.


The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of the opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 March, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, and with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office's Note, dated February 29, 1964, has the honour to state as follows:

The Note of the Government of India, dated February 12, 1964, had clearly pointed out the fact that a Chinese aircraft had intruded into airspace near Leh in Ladakh. This fact cannot be denied by calling it a 'slander' or merely asserting that the "Chinese aircraft never go beyond China's territorial air". The explanation given by the Chinese Government is, therefore, rejected.

The Government of India's notes dated August 23, 1963 and August 26, 1963, had merely reaffirmed the earlier instances of violation of Indian airspace by Chinese aircraft in regard to which violations protests had been lodged with the Chinese Government. The fact of these violations cannot be altered by mere denials on the part of the Chinese Government.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to the Embassy of India in China on the 4 June, 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

At noon time on May 24, 1964, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace and wantonly carried out reconnaissance and harassment for a long time over a number of important cities and towns in Tibet.

The Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Tibet around 1205 hours on May 24, flew successively over Tsona, Tsetang, Lhasa, Tuilungtehching, and Damshune, turned westwards to overfly Gyantse, Shigatse, Lhatse and other places and then left in the southwest direction. Its illegal flight over Tibet lasted over four hours and twenty minutes; and the scope of its intrusion exceeded 230 kilometres from south to north and 430 kilometres from east to west.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this serious incident in which an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace of Tibet, China, for prolonged reconnaissance and harassment over vast areas in such an unbridled way.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 27 July, 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

On July 19, 1964, at 1315 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the Demchok area in Tibet, China in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border. It then flew over Tashigong, Gargunsa, Toling, Poling and other places, circling over Chinese territory for reconnaissance for nearly an hour before it flew back to India through the vicinity of the Mana Pass in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border at 1408 hours. It penetrated Chinese airspace as deep as about 100 kilometres. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against such unscrupulous intrusion of the Indian aircraft.

It must be pointed out that as late as July 7, 1964 the Chinese Government lodged a strong protest with the Indian Government against India’s repeated intrusions into Chinese territory and airspace occurring in the first half of 1964. However, only twelve days thereafter, the Indian Government brazenly sent another aircraft deep into China’s airspace for reconnaissance and harassment. This once again shows that the Indian Government is bent on creating tension and unwilling to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question peacefully.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India, 28 July, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government’s note dated June 4, 1964, alleging that an Indian aircraft had “carried out reconnaissance and harassment for a long time over a number of important cities and towns in Tibet.”

2. This allegation is not only completely baseless but is, obviously, yet another attempt by the Chinese Government to serve the ends of their anti-Indian propaganda. The fictitious and propagandist nature of the charge is demonstrated by the fact that these false allegations were first publicised in a New China News Agency report of the 26th May, 1964, and the same have been incorporated in a formal note of the Chinese Government more than a week later.

3. The Chinese note under reference dated June 4, 1964, has made the fantastic allegation that the flight of Indian aircraft “over Tibet lasted over four hours and twenty minutes and the scope of its intrusion exceeded 230 kilometres from south to north and 430
kilometres from east to west”. This Chinese charge appears part-
cularly absurd in the context of the Chinese Government’s state-
ment in their note of October 17, 1962, that “the Chinese side, upon
discovering any intruding alien aircraft in China’s airspace, will
immediately force them to land or shoot them down”. It is patent
that the Chinese Government has concocted these false allegations
for propaganda purposes only, in order to step up tension on the
Sino-Indian border.

4. As has stated repeatedly in earlier notes of the Government of
India, all Indian aircraft have strict instructions to keep within the
international frontiers of India and these instructions are being
scrupulously observed. There is, therefore, no question of any
Indian aircraft having at any time intruded into Chinese airspace.
The Government of India accordingly firmly reject the Chinese
protest in their note of June 4.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity
to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China, the
assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 9 September, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to
refer to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs note (64) Pu Yi Ya
Tzu No. 401, dated July 27, 1964:

The note of the Chinese Government, alleging the flight of an
Indian aircraft over the air-space over places in the Tibet region
of China, like Tashigong, Gargunsa, Toling, Poling, for so-called
reconnaissance, lasting for nearly an hour, is utterly baseless. It
may be pointed out that though no Indian aircraft has flown over
Demchok in Ladakh, as stated in the note under reply, this area is
unmistakably in Indian territory, a fact already made clear in the
earlier notes of the Government of India.

The allegations of violations of Chinese airspace by Indian air-
craft, contained in the Chinese Government note of July 7, 1964,
have already been rejected as being utterly baseless fabrications.
However, once again, the Chinese Government have chosen to in-
vent so-called instances of violation of Chinese airspace by Indian
aircraft in their note, dated July 27, 1964. All this can only mean
that the Chinese Government is making these allegations merely to
suit their propaganda purposes.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity
to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the
assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, dated 28 December, 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

On December 16, 17 and 20, 1964, Indian airplanes successively intruded into China's airspace over extensive areas well inside Tibet and Sinkiang for long-duration reconnaissance and harassment. One of these planes even intruded over Szechuan Province. The details are given as follows:

1. On December 16, at about 1310 hours, an Indian airplane intruded into China's airspace from southeast of Pulan, Tibet, and flew northward along the Sinkiang-Tibet Road, passing over Gartok, Gargunsu, Rudok and Shanho in Tibet and Howetian, Tienwentian, Kangsewar and Saittulla in Sinkiang. The plane reached as far as Pishan (Ghuma Bazar Country) at 1457 hours, then flew eastward to intrude over Hotien and then turned back to Kangsewar, from where it flew along the Sinkiang-Tibet Road, passing over Tienshuihai, Shanho, Gargunsu and other places, and returned to India at about 1600 hours. The aforesaid plane conducted reconnaissance over Chinese territory for as long as about three hours and penetrated as deep as about two hundred and fifty kilometres.

2. On December 17, an Indian airplane intruded into China's airspace from southwest of Tsona, Tibet, at about 1320 hours, and flew over Chayul, Linchih and other places. Then it flew eastward and reached as far as Paiyu, Szechuan Province, from where it turned and flew over Chiangda, Chamdo, Pienpa and other places in Tibet. It flew over Lhasa at 1613 hours, and then passing over Gyantse, it flew southwestward and left China at about 1640 hours. The Indian plane made harassments over Chinese territory for more than three hours and the deepest place of intrusion was more than three hundred kilometres from the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border.

3. On December 20, an Indian airplane intruded into China's airspace from southwest of Rongshar, Tibet, at about 1300 hours, and flew over Shigatse, Gyantse, Lakang, Jiacha and other places. It intruded into the airspace over Lhasa at 1442 hours. Then the plane flew northward over Damshune, reaching as far as the vicinity of Nagchuka, from where it turned back to Damshune and flew over Lhasa again. Then it flew southwestward and left China from southeast of Khamba at about 1600 hours. The Indian plane made harassments over China's territory for about three hours and the deepest place of intrusion was about three hundred and fifty kilometres from the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border.

The successive frantic intrusion by Indian airplanes and their penetration into the airspace over areas well inside China for long duration reconnaissance and harassment constitute a flagrant defiance of China's sovereignty and airspace and serious provocations against China. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this and demands that India put an immediate stop to all its intrusive activities.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 January, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to refer to Chinese Foreign Office note of December 28, 1964.

2. The allegations contained in the Chinese note, that on December 16, 17 and 20, 1964, Indian airplanes intruded into China's airspace have already been refuted in a statement issued by a spokesman of the Ministry of External Affairs on December 29, 1964. As the Government of India has informed the Chinese Government on several occasions in the past, all Indian aircraft have strict instructions not to cross the well-recognised borders of India. The instructions also apply to the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector. Indian aircraft have invariably and scrupulously complied with these instructions, and there has never been any instance of an Indian aircraft flying beyond the international border of the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector. Careful enquiries made on the receipt of the Chinese note under reference have shown that the allegations contained in the Chinese note are absolutely false and are pure fabrications. It is obvious that the Chinese Government has fabricated these 'violations' for propaganda purposes. The Government of India reject the Chinese protest note of December 28, 1964.

3. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 8 February, 1964

The Chinese Government and the Chinese Embassy in India have time and again made serious representations and lodged protests with the Government of India against its wanton persecution and expulsion of Chinese nationals in India. The Indian Government, however, in disregard of these protests and representations, has arbitrarily continued its unwarranted expulsion of innocent Chinese nationals. The Embassy has recently learnt that Mr. Chung Ping-nan alias Chung Parn-nam, Mr. Chen Chih-wen, Mr. Wang Hung-hsiang, Mr. Mao Szu-kuan and Mr. Liao Tien-hsing, Chinese nationals in Calcutta, have been all ordered to leave India within a short period. It is obvious that in taking this measure the Indian Government aims at keeping on worsening the relations between China and India. The Embassy hereby lodges a protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs against this and demands that the Indian Government immediately stop all forms of
persecution of Chinese nationals and provide facilities to the above-
mentioned victimized Chinese nationals in their departure proce-
dures and in bringing back their properties and give them necessary
time.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 March, 1964

Reference Chinese Embassy's Memorandum dated the 8th Febru-
ary, 1964:

2. The five Chinese nationals referred to in the abovementioned
Memorandum were served with orders to leave India on account
of their anti-Indian and anti-social activities. Apart from indulg-
ing in these activities, in wilful violation of the local laws, they had
acted in a manner highly prejudicial to the security of this country.
The extermination of such lawless elements is a matter within the
sovereign internal jurisdiction of the Government of India and
there can be no justification for the Chinese Embassy to attempt to
interfere therein.

3. The Chinese Embassy is aware that there are thousands of
Chinese nationals living, peacefully, in India, and no impediments
are placed in regard to their stay in this country so long as they
abide by the laws of the land. There is no basis, whatsoever, for
the Embassy's allegation that the Indian Government are "perse-
cuting" Chinese nationals living in India.

4. In the light of the above facts, the Government of India cate-
gorically reject the Chinese Memorandum under reference.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the
Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 22 May, 1964

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India has re-
cently learnt that in January 1964 Chinese national in Bombay
Mrs. Ma Kee alias Mary Kee, wife of Yu Fah Chaun, and her three
children were unjustifiably ordered to leave India within a period
of one month. Failing to leave India for lack of money to cover
the travelling expenses, she was imprisoned for as long as two
months. After she was released, she and her children were again
ordered to leave India within a short period. This is another out-
rageous act of persecuting the peaceable and law-abiding Chinese
nationals in India by the Indian Government in disregard of the
repeated representations and protests by the Chinese Government
and the Embassy. This act not only cruelly tramples upon the
principles of the international law but constitutes a deliberate viti-
atation of the relations between China and India. The Embassy
hereby lodges a protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs
against this and demands that the Indian Government immediately
stop all forms of persecution of the Chinese nationals in India.
Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 6 July, 1964

The Chinese Embassy has learnt that Mr. Yu Tsungchuan and Mr. Wang Tao-Shin alias Wang To-sheng, Chinese nationals in Bombay, and Mr. Chen Ai-chun alias Chen Ai-khen alias Cheng Aoi-kheng, Chinese national in Calcutta, were unjustifiably ordered to leave India within a short period in November 1963 and February 1964 respectively. This is another act of persecution of the peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals in India by the Indian Government in disregard of the repeated representations and protests by the Chinese Government and the Chinese Embassy. The Embassy hereby lodges a protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs against this and demands that the Indian Government immediately stop all forms of persecution of the Chinese nationals in India.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 July, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Ministry's Note No. C/436/1/163/TB, dated the 29th May, 1963 has the honour to give below particulars regarding the death of the six Chinese nationals referred to in the Chinese Embassy's note No. M/138/63, dated the 6th May, 1963:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Name(s) of the deceased</th>
<th>Date of death</th>
<th>Cause of death</th>
<th>Place of death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China, New Delhi, 4 September, 1964


Mrs. Ma Kee alias Mary Kee was served with a notice on 6th January, 1964 directing her to leave India with her children on account of her anti-social activities. As she failed to comply with the Government orders legal proceedings were taken against her by the State Government. She was convicted and also sentenced to two months imprisonment as she was found guilty. On her return from imprisonment, on a guarantee of good conduct, quit India proceedings were suspended and she was allowed to continue to stay in India. It may, however, be stated that should the subject continue to indulge in anti-social activities, it is within the competence of the Government of India to take proceedings against her and also to send her out of India.

It is alleged in the Chinese Memorandum under reply that the Government of India are trampling upon the principles of International Law with a view to deliberately vitiating the relations between China and India. This is a baseless and mischievous allegation. It may be emphasized that according to the Code of Conduct for foreign nationals they are required to respect the local laws and not indulge in anti-social and anti-national activities. The Government of India have informed the Chinese Embassy several times that in the case of Chinese nationals living in India peacefully as law-abiding citizens, no impediments will be placed in regard to their stay in this country.

In view of the foregoing the Chinese Embassy's protest memorandum is rejected.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 September, 1964


In the numerous notes and memoranda it has been unequivocally stated that the Government of India would not place any impediments in the way of peaceful and law-abiding Chinese nationals in their continued stay in India and carrying on their usual avocations. In the case of the three Chinese nationals mentioned in the Memorandum under reference it had been established beyond doubt that they were engaged in activities highly prejudicial to the State. Therefore, in accordance with the local laws, the State Governments concerned were compelled to serve them with quit India notices.

It may be emphasised that the extermination of these three Chinese nationals is purely a matter within the internal jurisdiction of the Government of India and this interference of the Chinese
Embassy in the internal affairs of the Government of India is unwarranted. The Embassy's protest in this regard is, therefore, rejected.

Note given by Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 15 September, 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the note addressed to the Chinese Embassy in India by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs on January 1, 1964, states as follows:

The Chinese Government is not the least satisfied with the reply of the Indian Government regarding the case in which Chinese border inhabitants were put in a difficult position at the Mordo Post in India. This reckless and totally irresponsible attitude adopted by the Indian Government on this question is sufficient proof that Indian Government has deliberately sabotaged the traditional and habitual trade and contact between the peoples of China and India. The Chinese Government declares: Before receiving a satisfactory reply from the Indian side, the Chinese side reserves the right to raise its demand as put forward in the note on this question by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Embassy of India in China on December 11, 1963.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of the opportunity to convey to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 3 October, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to refer to note No. 13/26 dated 15th September, 1964, from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China. The Ministry of External Affairs in their notes dated 3rd December, 1962, 9th October, 1963 and 1st January, 1964 had categorically stated that the allegations have been investigated and found utterly baseless. It may be emphasised that this Ministry will not entertain any more notes repeating the same baseless allegations.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 31 January, 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents compliments to the Embassy of India in China, and
with reference to the Embassy's notes dated December 6, 1963, January 4 and January 11, 1964, addressed to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, wishes to state as follows:

Regarding the question mentioned in the above-mentioned notes of the Embassy, a clear reply had already been given by the Assistant Director Feng Hsienpi of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs during the conversations with Mr. Damodaran, the First Secretary of the Embassy on December 7, 1963 and January 11, 1964 respectively. That is, according to stipulations of the authorities concerned, during the period of trial, the request from any person to see the defendant is unacceptable; at the same time, the case is concerned with social morals, so no public hearing can be held. Therefore, visitors are unacceptable. As regards the question of arranging a defender, the local authorities concerned will accord the facilities in accordance with the regulations of the Chinese side.

We avail of this opportunity to convey to you the assurances of our highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 March, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and, with reference to Note No. 6/8, dated the 31st January, 1964, from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China regarding the arrest of Shri M. L. Das, an Indian national in Shanghai, has the honour to state as follows:

2. On the 29th October, 1963, Shri Makham Lal Das, an Indian national resident in Shanghai, was arrested by the local authorities on alleged criminal charges. On 1st November, 1963, a consular official of the Embassy of India, Peking, met an official of the Consular Department of the Chinese Foreign Office and requested him that information on the circumstances leading to the arrest of Shri Das be furnished to the Embassy, urgently. As no information was made available for some time, the Embassy sent a Note dated 6th December, 1963, to the Chinese Foreign Office, requesting an early reply and also seeking facilities for an Embassy representative to meet Shri Das in prison, in accordance with international law and practice. On 7th December, 1963, Mr. Feng Hsien-pi, the Assistant Director and Section Chief of the Consular Department of the Chinese Foreign Office, received the Indian Charge d'Affaires and informed him that the matter was still under investigation. The Charge d'Affaires was also told that according to the report of the local authorities, it was a case of criminal assault. However, no further information was given as to when the alleged offence was said to have taken place or even in regard to the name of the alleged victim. Regarding facilities for an Embassy representative to meet Shri Das,
Mr. Feng Hsien-pi stated that the Foreign Office would contact the local authorities, but that, as far as they knew, it would be impossible to meet him before Shri Das had been sentenced! No further details were given to the Charge d'Affaires, beyond stating that “the local authorities have made very detailed and serious investigations”.

3. Following a reminder from the Embassy dated January 4, 1964, for the details earlier requested in its note of 6th December, 1963, the Assistant Director of the Consular Department of the Chinese Foreign Office again received the Indian Charge d'Affaires. He, however, made no concrete reply to the points raised by the Charge d'Affaires who was seeking facilities under international law, but merely repeated, over and over again, the meaningless statement that “the Chinese Government have always given reasonable treatment to the nationals of other countries living in China” and that “there is no discrimination against Indians in this regard.” Mr. Feng Hsien-pi informed the Charge d'Affaires again that they would be getting in touch with the local authorities. During this interview Mr. Feng Hsien-pi, however, provided the extraordinary piece of information that the alleged victim of the “assault” had already given birth to a child and stated that “this child very much resembles an Indian”! Shri Das was arrested on October 29, 1963, on alleged criminal charges and Mr. Feng Hsien-pi gave this piece of information in January, 1964. All this cannot but arouse serious doubt about the bona fide nature of the charges levelled against Shri Das.

4. In a Note dated 11th January, 1964, the Embassy of India in Peking had reiterated their request, in conformity with normal Consular privilege, recognised in international law and practice, for the following facilities:

(i) To meet Shri Das in prison;
(ii) to be present at his trial; and
(iii) to arrange for his defence.

5. It is indeed surprising that the Chinese Government in their Note under reference should have adamantly refused to grant any of the legitimate facilities requested by the Embassy. The Chinese Government have perversely tried to justify their stand on various excuses, stating that: “according to stipulation of the authorities concerned, during the period of trial, the request from any person to see the defendant is unacceptable; at the same time, the case is concerned with social morals, so no public hearing can be held. Therefore, visitors are unacceptable. As regards the question of arranging a defender, the local authorities concerned will accord the facilities in accordance with the regulations of the Chinese side”.

6. The Government of India feel compelled to ask whether the “regulations of the Chinese side” conform to normally accepted international law and practice or not in these matters relating to the arrest, detention and trial of foreign nationals. One of the main functions of any Embassy is to protect the interests of its nationals living in the country of its accreditation, within the limits of international law. As the Chinese Government are fully aware, it is well
recognised International Law and practice that a consular officer has the right to be informed of the arrest of nationals of his country, to visit them if they are in prison, custody or detention, and to converse and correspond with them and also to arrange for their full and proper legal representation, whenever and wherever found necessary. The Embassy in its notes dated 6th December, 1963, 4th January, 1964 and 11th January, 1964, has accordingly repeatedly requested the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China to have the matter investigated, and the facts of the case and the reason for the arrest ascertained and communicated. The Embassy, at the same time, had requested that facilities referred to paragraph 4 above to be extended to it by the Chinese Government. However, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs has flatly denied these facilities on the flimsiest pretexts, completely ignoring international law and practice recognised all the world over.

7. The laws and regulations of all Governments are required to give full effect to the purpose for which specific rights have been accorded to consular officers under International Law. The laws and regulations of the receiving State must give full effect to the purposes for which consular rights have been accorded to a consular officer under International Law, and the laws and regulations of a receiving State cannot nullify the rights which accrue from International Law. That these rights have always been recognised in the law and practice of all States will be evident from the fact that they are embodied in Article 36 of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, 1953. The Indian Embassy in Peking has the right, under International Law, to visit Shri Das in prison and also to arrange for his legal representation before the court which is supposed to try him for the alleged criminal offence, and the Chinese Government would be flouting International Law and Convention if it continues its present stand.

8. The Chinese Government have stated that no public hearing is to be held and arrangements for Shri Das's defence can be made only in accordance with “the regulations of the Chinese side”. This attitude of the Chinese authorities clearly indicates that they have no intention of administering proper justice to Shri Das. This is not only a denial of justice to the accused, but is also a clear violation of International Law.

9. In view of the above facts, the Government of India earnestly urge the Chinese authorities to reconsider their stand and to provide immediately facilities to the Indian Embassy in Peking to visit Shri Das in prison, arrange for his defence, and also for the Embassy officials to be present at his trial, when the trial takes place.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 16 September, 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with
reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India on January 18, 1964, states as follows:

Regarding the question of nationality of Kajis in China's Tibet region and the question of passing sentence on a few law-breakers of the Kajis in China by the local authorities of China's Tibet region, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs had already fully and clearly stated the stand and the views of the Chinese side in its notes addressed to the Embassy of India in China on September 11, 1959, December 31, 1959 and September 23, 1960 respectively, and during the conversation held between Keng Piao, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs and His Excellency Ambassador Parthasarathi on July 14, 1960. Yet the Indian Government had more than once in its notes repeated its standpoint which had for long already been refuted by the Chinese side. Hence, the Chinese Government holds that it is not necessary to give any more reply towards such unreasonable haggling. If the Indian side continues with its unreasonable haggling on this question, the Chinese side will pay no attention to it.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to convey to the Embassy of India in China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 December, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and, with reference to note No. 13/296 dated 16th September, 1964 of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, would like to state as follows:

In their note dated 31st December, 1959, the Chinese Government have admitted that the Kashmiri Muslims resident in Tibet are of Indian origin. Therefore, it is unreasonable for the Chinese Government to take the stand now that these Kashmiri Muslims are not nationals of India, but of China. These persons are, undoubtedly, Indian in origin and in law, and are entitled to be treated as foreign nationals in Tibet with the right to return to their country of origin. As the Indian laws are consistent with the recognized international principles of nationality, the Government of India cannot accept any so-called law of nationality or executive decree of the Chinese Government which would deprive Indian nationals in Tibet of their nationality and citizenship.

The Chinese Government in their note under reference have termed the five Kashmiri Muslims under detention in Lhasa as "Law breakers", because they were leaders of the Kashmiri Muslim community in Tibet. As stated in this Ministry's note dated 18th January, 1964, all that they did was to express a desire to return to India due to the harsh and inhuman treatment meted out to them by the Chinese local authorities. Their refusal to register themselves as Chinese nationals has, obviously, displeased the local authorities and false charges were framed against them in order to take
revenge on these innocent people. The local authorities have even gone to the extent of sentencing them to long imprisonment without giving them an opportunity to defend themselves before a legally constituted authority. The Government of India once again vehemently protest against the arbitrary and inhuman treatment meted out by Chinese local authorities in Tibet to these Kashmiri Muslims and demand that these innocent people be released and repatriated to India in order to enable them to return to their homeland and to join their families.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 December, 1963

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated August 8, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The building of the former Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong had all along been property of and used by the Trade Agency. Since the withdrawal of the Trade Agency, the building has been under the charge of the Chinese Embassy in India. Therefore, there can be no question of handing over the building to the owners.

The Chinese Government has noted the information, to which the Indian note referred, that some Indian miscreants had broken into the building of the former Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong early in May this year and that the Indian local authorities had posted a guard on the building. The Chinese Government asks the Indian Government to keep its guard on the building of the former Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 29 January, 1964.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and has the honour to state as follows:

In the earlier part of January 1964, a so-called Tibetan troupe organized by the Tibetan rebel bandits in India staged at Chandigarh, Punjab State, an anti-China play entitled "the blood in the land of milk and honey", openly describing China's Tibet region as an "independent country" and making vicious slanders against the Chinese
Government. The Indian press gave publicity to this play by carrying its stage photograph and the description of its contents. This once again proves that the Indian Government, in violation of the principles of international relations and its own past pledge, continues to connive with the Tibetan rebel bandits in carrying out political activities in India against the People's Republic of China. The Embassy hereby lodges a protest with the Indian Government against this and demands that the Indian Government take effective measures to put an end to such activities.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 31 January, 1964

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India and, with reference to the Ministry's note dated January 9, 1964, has the honour to state as follows:

It is an established and unalterable fact that the Indian authorities concerned unwarrantedly delayed, opened and examined the Embassy's mails. The Embassy is in possession of conclusive evidence for this. The explanation made in the Ministry's note is obviously a fallacious argument; at such an attitude of disregarding facts the Embassy expresses its regret. If the Indian side continues to make denials on this matter, the Embassy will ignore it. The Embassy demands that the Indian Government take measures to ensure against the recurrence of incidents of delaying, opening and examining the Embassy's mails.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 12 February, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and, with reference to Chinese Embassy's Note No. M/48/64, dated the 31st January, 1964, has the honour to state as follows:—

The Embassy has been informed in the Ministry's Note dated the 9th January, 1964, that diplomatic mail intended for foreign missions in India are not subject to censorship and, on the contrary, they are despatched to the addresses with the utmost expedition. It is regretted that the Embassy should have again repeated its previous baseless allegations, which have already been refuted by the Government.
In the light of the above facts the Government of India reject the Chinese Note dated the 31st January, 1964.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 March, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and, with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office Note dated the 2nd December, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:

The building as well as the land on which the premises of the former Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong had been located, have never been the property of the Chinese Government. They had merely been let out for the use of the Chinese Trade Agency. This position had been clearly conveyed in the Government of India’s Note dated the 16th November, 1959, wherein it was stated that while the West Bengal Government would not take possession of the property for the time being, so as not to inconvenience the Trade Agency, “transfer of the property by sale or permanent lease by the owner will, however, not be permissible”. The reference in the Chinese Note to the building “having all along been the property of and used by the Trade Agency” is, therefore, not correct.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China, the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 23 March, 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

1. The Tibetan rebel clique, which has all along been shielded and supported by the Indian Government, issued on March 9, 1964, another traitorous statement in the name of the Dalai Lama, viciously slandering the Chinese Government and people and making another effort to stir up a rebellion in Tibet, China. The Indian official press agency published this statement. Indian Minister without Portfolio Shastri declared in the Indian Parliament on the same day that Dalai had been functioning in accordance with the Indian Government’s policy, and that there was no bar on the activities of Dalai. On March 10, he further declared in the Indian Parliament that the Indian Government would discuss with the Tibetan rebel clique the “details” of Dalai’s intended “visit” to Buddhist countries in South-east Asia.
India still maintains diplomatic relations with China, and yet the Indian Government supported the fugitive Tibetan rebel clique in India in its activities against the motherland. This is a grave action on the part of the Indian Government constituting out-and-out interference in China's internal affairs and violations of principles governing international relations. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this action.

2. Five years ago, the Indian Government engineered and supported the rebellious activities of the reactionary clique of the upper social strata in the Tibet Region, China, and failed ignominiously. In the ensuing years it has been using the Tibetan rebels, who fled to India, to carry on subversive and disruptive activities against Tibet, China. The Chinese Government has on many occasions lodged protests against this and offered serious advice for the Indian Government to stop interfering in China's internal affairs. In this regard, the Indian Government has more than once assured the Chinese Government that the Tibetan rebel clique would not be allowed to engage in any political activity in India directed against the People's Republic of China. But the assurances of the Indian Government are totally hypocritical. In fact, the Indian Government has year after year continued to allow and support the Tibetan rebels to issue traitorous statements and carry on other activities against the motherland. The Indian Government's conduct of going back on its own words and violating faith has been condemned by just world opinion.

3. Going from bad to worse, the Indian Government now has not only again supported the Tibetan rebel clique in issuing a traitorous statement, but openly directs Dalai to carry on activities in regions outside India, in a vain attempt thereby to sow discord in China's friendly relations with Southeast Asian countries. It is obvious that the Indian Government is still dreaming of expansion into China's territory of Tibet. The Chinese Government seriously warns the Indian Government once again that interference in China's internal affairs is absolutely intolerable and that, like the fugitive Tibetan serfowners' dream of a comeback, the Indian Government's dream of expansion is doomed to be shattered.

4. The Chinese Government once again asks the Indian Government to fulfil its promise in earnest, respect the minimum standards of international relationship and immediately stop supporting the Tibetan rebels and cease its activities of interference in China's internal affairs.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 March, 1964.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and, with reference to the
latter's Note No. M/407/64, dated the 29th January, 1964, has the honour to state that the Government of India reject the protest lodged by the Embassy of the People's Republic of China against the staging of a Tibetan play in Chandigarh in the month of January, 1964.

2. The play in question was staged by the Tibetan Refugees Cultural and Dramatic Troupe and was part of a Cultural programme, which included Tibetan songs, dances and folklore. Neither the Government of India nor the State Government of the Punjab had anything to do with the cultural performance arranged by these Tibetan refugees, who are residing in India with the permission of the Government of India. As the Embassy of the People's Republic of China is aware, India is a democratic State, where all sections of the resident population, including all foreigners, enjoy, inter alia the freedom to stage plays and organise other cultural activities, provided these do not offend against the laws of the land. Newspapers in India are also free to report these activities, in consonance with the freedom of expression they enjoy in this country.

3. The Government of India are, therefore, surprised that the Embassy should have thought it proper to lodge a protest against the staging of a cultural performance by Tibetan refugees in India, whom the Embassy Note under reference unwarrantedly describes, as 'Tibetan rebel bandits'. The Government of India firmly repudiate the suggestion in the Chinese note under reference, that any Tibetan refugees in India can be described as “rebel bandits”. It has been repeatedly made clear to the Chinese Government that the Government of India do not permit the Tibetan refugees in India to indulge in subversive political activities directed against the People's Republic of China. In spite of the unfriendly and aggressive attitude of the Chinese Government towards India, the Government of India have always scrupulously adhered to this policy. That does not, however, mean that Tibetan refugees should be prohibited from staging plays and other cultural performances which do not, in any way, offend against the laws of India.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 25 April, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and, with reference to the Note dated March 23, 1964, sent by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, to the Embassy of India in Peking, has the honour to state that all the allegations made in this Chinese Note are false and malicious. The Chinese protest is, therefore, firmly and categorically rejected by the Government of India.

The Chinese Government have once again levelled wild and baseless charges against the Government of India, using bitter and
unbecoming language, which is against normal international practice and usage. The charges levelled against the Government of India in this Note have been disproved and repudiated by the Government of India on more than one occasion in the past. It is clear that they are being now repeated, solely with a view to stepping up tension between India and China and to provide a camouflage for China’s aggressive designs against India.

The Note under reference has repeated outmoded allegations, that the Government of India, five years ago, “engineered and supported the rebellious activities of the reactionary clique of the upper social strata in Tibet...”. As the world is fully aware, the popular rebellion in Tibet, five years ago, was not something which the Government of India had ‘engineered’, but was the spontaneous and inevitable reaction of the unfortunate people of Tibet against the attempt by the Chinese Government to extinguish by brute force the autonomy of Tibet, which China had solemnly undertaken to respect. The Government of the People’s Republic of China is, doubtless, aware of the dictum that where there is oppression there is bound to be resistance. It is, therefore, of no avail to blame India for the trouble that the Chinese Government has itself created in Tibet. The truth is well known to the world that, far from interfering and supporting rebellious activities in Tibet, the Government of India had voluntarily relinquished their historic rights in Tibet and extended their hand of friendship to China, which the Government of China grasped, to begin with, only to be able to stab India in the back all the more effectively, later.

The Chinese note has also accused the Government of India of having “shielded and supported” the so-called “Tibetan rebel clique”, of having allowed them to make “traitorous statements”, and directed the Dalai Lama to carry on activities outside India. In order to give these absolutely false allegations an air of verisimilitude, the Chinese note has quoted out of context and completely misconstrued some of the remarks of the Minister Without Portfolio in the Indian Parliament. What the Minister Without Portfolio said in the Parliament was merely the reaffirmation of the policy that the Government of India had announced when the Dalai Lama was given political asylum in India in 1959, and to emphasise that the Dalai Lama has been in fact, functioning in India within the framework of that declared policy. On May 14, 1959, the Prime Minister of India had made the attitude of the Government of India perfectly clear, at a press conference in New Delhi, when he said: “I have told the Dalai Lama that he is perfectly free to say or to do what he likes, to go back to Tibet, to remain here or to go anywhere else. But having said that, I pointed out that he will no doubt consider the circumstances and events leading up to his coming here and the present position, and function wisely and with some restraint”. On April 27, 1959, the Prime Minister also stated in Parliament that it was “open to the Dalai Lama, at any time, to go back to Tibet or wherever he wants to”. It is this policy that the Minister Without Portfolio reaffirmed in Parliament on March 9 and 10, 1964. The Dalai Lama and the Tibetan refugees in India have never been allowed by the Government of India to indulge in subversive political
activities directed against the People's Republic of China. That does not, however, mean that the Government of India has denied them freedom of expression and freedom for legitimate activities which do not offend against the laws of the land. Nor does it mean that the Government of India will place any obstacles in the way of the Dalai Lama if His Holiness wishes to make a tour of the Buddhist countries of Asia.

The Chinese note has specifically referred to the statement issued on March 9, 1964, on behalf of His Holiness the Dalai Lama. The Government of India holds no responsibility for this statement and rejects the allegations in the Chinese note that they have "supported" the statement issued on behalf of His Holiness and "gone back upon their words" and "violated faith" and "the principles of international relations". As for sowing discord in the friendly relations with the countries of Asia or South East-Asia, it is precisely the Chinese Government who have made such mischievous and vain attempts, in accordance with their neo-imperialistic policy of dividing and dominating Asia. And yet, the Chinese note has the audacity to speak of "the Indian Government's dream of expansion". As mentioned earlier, far from trying to "expand" into or interfere in Tibet, the Government of India has willingly and completely relinquished the privileges she had inherited in Tibet. China, on the contrary, has not only gone on to destroy the historic autonomy of Tibet, but has advanced fantastic territorial claims against India and even committed aggression across the northern borders of India, in furtherence of Chinese policies. The "dream" that is haunting Asia, today, is the dream of Chinese expansionism.

In conclusion, the Government of India regret to note that besides making unjustified allegations, the Chinese note has also held out a threat and a warning against absolutely imaginary Indian interference in the internal affairs of China. To hurl accusations and warnings in this manner is to render hollow the professions of the Chinese Government that they have done and are doing everything possible to ease the tension between India and China and that they want to live in "peaceful co-existence" with their neighbours.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 4 June, 1964.

Reference memorandum of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated January 8, 1964

In its memoranda of June 3, August 20 and November 26, 1963, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China repeatedly stated that there were conclusive and undeniable evidence proving that the fact that the Indian Embassy abused the courtesies accorded it by the Chinese Government by carrying out
anti-Chinese propaganda on Chinese territory. However, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs has so far prevaricated and failed to give a serious and responsible reply. In its memorandum of January 8, 1964, it vainly attempted to evade its bounden responsibility for the above-mentioned wrong deeds, by using a single sentence denying the facts. This will never succeed but merely shows that the Indian Government is devoid of all reason and arguments.

Moreover, in its memorandum of January 8, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs once again arbitrarily levelled slanders against the normal publicity work of the Chinese Embassy in India. As everybody knows, it is unimpeachable and fully consistent with international practice for a diplomatic mission to carry in its bulletin official documents and statements of its own government. In its verbal note of September 24, 1959, the Indian Government explicitly stated that it had no objection to the publication and distribution by diplomatic missions of official statements of their own governments. But the Indian Government has again and again confiscated the Chinese Embassy’s bulletins carrying documents of the Chinese Government, and has restricted and disrupted the normal publicity work of the Chinese Embassy. Such practice on the part of the Indian Government contradicts its own words. The Indian Foreign Ministry’s memorandum of January 8 shows that the Indian Government not only has no intention to cease such unreasonable practice but is playing with words in an attempt to seek pretexts for continuing its wanton infringements of the proper rights of the Chinese Embassy. This further reveals the Indian Government’s deliberate intention of violating accepted international practice.

That the Indian Embassy has carried on anti-Chinese propaganda on Chinese territory and that the Indian Government has restricted and disrupted the normal publicity work of the Chinese Embassy in India are iron-clad facts. No matter how many more times the Indian Ministry of External Affairs may make denials, it cannot alter the facts, nor can it absolve the Indian Government of its responsibility. Should the Indian Government haggle any further, the Chinese Government would deem it unnecessary to give the matter further attention.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 8 June, 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

Entrusted by the Scientific and Technical Association of China and the Peking Centre of the World Federation of Scientific Workers, the Chinese Embassy in India on April 29, 1964 requested the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to forward letters inviting Indian scientists to attend the scientific symposium to be held in Peking in August this year. It was purely out of the desire of strengthening the friendship between the peoples of China and
India and promoting international scientific and cultural exchange that the Chinese side sent out the invitation. The Indian Government should have taken measures of active assistance to this friendly act on the part of the Chinese side, or at least shown normal courtesy. However, in his reply of May 4, 1964 to the counsellor of the Chinese Embassy in India, the official of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs not only unreasonably refused to consider the cordial invitation from the Chinese side but viciously attacked the Chinese Government. The rudeness of the Indian Government is indeed surprising, and the Chinese Government cannot but express its deep regret at it.

That no satisfactory settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question has so far been reached is entirely caused by the Indian side. This is a fact for everybody to see. The Chinese Government, therefore, deems it unnecessary to make detailed explanations here. As for the shop-worn slander of "violation of India’s territorial integrity by China" repeated by the official of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs in his letter, it is not at all worthy of refuting.

The Chinese Government holds that although there is a dispute between the Governments of China and India on the Sino-Indian boundary question, it should not prejudice friendly contacts between the two peoples. On the contrary, such contacts are exactly needed for promoting understanding and creating a favourable atmosphere for a peaceful settlement of the boundary question. But the Indian Government is using the boundary issue as a pretext resolutely to obstruct any friendly contacts between the peoples of China and India. The one thousand million people of China and India should thus be able to see clearly which party really desires to ease the relations between the two countries.

In line with its consistent stand of upholding Sino-Indian friendship, the Chinese Government has once again seriously set forth the reason with the hope that the Indian Government, like the Chinese Government, will adopt a positive attitude towards the promotion of friendly contacts between the Chinese and Indian peoples.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 25 June, 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated March 20, 1964, has the honour to state the following:

The building and grounds of the former Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong are property of the Chinese Government. No empty
denial by the Indian Government can deprive the Chinese Government of its title to this property.

As for the facts regarding the purchase of the above-mentioned property by the former Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong, the Chinese Government has given a detailed account in its previous notes. Should the Indian Government continue to distort the facts and make unreasonable haggling, the Chinese Government will no longer give the matter further attention.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew, the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 26 June, 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

1. Recently a Delegation of Indian Members of Parliament led by D. V. Patel, member of the Indian Rajya Sabha, arrived in China's Taiwan Province on June 18 for a so-called visit. This Delegation including a member of parliament of the Indian ruling party, the Indian National Congress, has been carrying out unbridled anti-Chinese activities in Taiwan. They openly called the Chiang Kai-shek clique "free China" and stated that their desire was through this visit to "gradually normalize" the relations between India and the Chiang Kai-shek clique.

This "visit" to Taiwan by the Delegation of Indian Members of Parliament is another serious step taken by the Indian Government in following U.S. imperialist scheming activities to create "two Chinas" as well as an open provocation to the Chinese people. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this.

2. The whole world knows that Taiwan is China's territory, that the Chiang Kai-shek clique, long repudiated by the Chinese people, has been able to prolong its feeble existence in Taiwan only because it is being protected and fostered by U.S. imperialism; and that the purpose of the U.S. imperialist plot of creating "two Chinas" is to perpetuate its occupation of Taiwan so as to facilitate the execution of its policies of aggression and war in Asia. While maintaining diplomatic relations with China, the Indian government has in recent years made continuous flirtations with the Chiang Kai-shek clique and served the U.S. imperialist plot of creating "two Chinas". The bulletin of the Indian Embassy in China even carried anti-Chinese resolutions of the Chiang Kai-shek clique's so-called "Overseas Chinese Association of India". There appeared such terms as "mainland China" and "the Republic of China" in a note addressed by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to China. Both the Indian Defence Minister Y. B. Chavan and Finance Minister T. T. Krishnamachari openly clamoured about
the alleged existence of "two Chinas". Speaking in Parliament, the Indian Minister of Education M. C. Chagla openly called the Chiang Kai-shek clique "Nationalist China". Indian member of Parliament M. R. Masani visited Taiwan last year and claimed that China was a common enemy of India and the Chiang Kai-shek clique. The late Indian Prime Minister himself received the Chiang Kai-shek clique's "Buddhist Delegation" which went to India for scheming activities.

The Chinese Government has lodged more than one protest with the Indian Government against these anti-Chinese activities in which it followed U.S. imperialism in trying to create "two Chinas". Yet the Indian Government, while hypocritically professing that it only recognizes the People's Republic of China, has continued its collusion with the Chiang Kai-shek clique for anti-Chinese activities. The present visit of the Delegation of Indian Members of Parliament to Taiwan is a case of such anti-Chinese activity. It shows that the Indian Government willingly serves U.S. imperialism as a tool for pushing ahead with its "two Chinas" plot and does not scruple to violate principles guiding international relations and exacerbate the relations between China and India.

3. The Chinese people are determined to recover Taiwan and complete the unification of their motherland. Foreign interference in China's internal affairs absolutely will not be tolerated. The U.S. imperialist plot to create "two Chinas" is doomed to go bankrupt. The Chinese Government advises the Indian Government to treasure the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples, respect the elementary principles guiding international relations and immediately stop its activities of creating "two Chinas". The Indian Government would definitely gain nothing should it insist on following the lead of U.S. imperialism and ganging up with the Chiang Kai-shek clique without regard for the consequences.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 27 June, 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India dated December 11, 1963 and the memorandum of January 9, 1964, has the honour to state as follows:

As the Indian Government had expressed the wish that somebody may be kept for the caretaking of the premises of the former Indian Trade Office in Yatung, the authorities concerned in China's Tibet region, proceeding from friendly assistance, had already hired 3 house caretakers for the Indian side. The concerned information was communicated to the Embassy by the Ministry of Foreign
Affairs in its memorandum of December 6, 1963. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs once again draws the attention of the Indian side to the relevant information given in the above-mentioned memorandum of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails of this opportunity to convey to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 August, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, and with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office Note No. (64) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 349, dated the 26th June, 1964, handed over to the Indian Embassy at Peking, has the honour to reject categorically the protest lodged therein in regard to the visit of certain Indian nationals to Taiwan in June last.

2. The Chinese Government is aware that the citizens of India enjoy freedom of travel and freedom of speech in accordance with the law of the land. It is a fact that some members of the Indian Parliament visited Taipeh in June last, but they had gone there purely in their private capacity. The Government of India has absolutely no responsibility for their visit or for any statements that they may have made during or after the visit. The protest lodged by the Chinese Government is, therefore, completely uncalled for and amounts to little other than an attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of India. The Government of India must state very categorically that they resent this interference by the Chinese Government.

3. The Chinese Note has, maliciously and without the slightest regard for truth, accused the Government of India of serving "US imperialism as a tool for pushing ahead with the 'two China's plot'". This is a perfectly ludicrous charge. As the world knows and the Government of the People's Republic of China knows, India was one of the first countries to recognise the People's Republic of China and India has, year after year, pressed for the restoration to China of her proper place in the United Nations. And yet in its propaganda, it is evident from the Note under reply, the Chinese Government persists in its attitude of returning evil for good. There is no other explanation for the patently untruthful allegation that the Government of India "has continued its collusion with the Chiang Kai-shek regime". In its anti-Indian frenzy, the Chinese Note has not only tried to hold the Government of India responsible for statements made by members of the Opposition parties in the democratically elected Indian Parliament, but has also taken out of context and distorted the remarks of some of the Ministers of the Government. All this hardly merits any detailed refutation. It has also levelled the false charge that a member of the Indian National Congress was one of the group of Parliamentarians who went to Taipeh, when
in fact, there was no such person in the group. Falsehood and distortion of facts seem to have become an integral part of Chinese propaganda.

4. The Government of China is aware that there are a number of countries in the world, including some in Asia and Africa, who recognise Taiwan and have diplomatic relations with Taiwan; but India is not one of these. Nevertheless, the Chinese Government has chosen to direct this volley of false propaganda against India for its so-called "collusion with the Chiang Kai-shek regime". All this only makes it obvious that the root-cause of these false charges and hostile propaganda is nothing but the anti-Indian animus that China has allowed herself to develop in recent years.

5. The Chinese Note in question sanctimoniously advises the Government of India "to treasure the friendship between the Chinese and the Indian peoples". It would be pertinent to ask whether China has given any evidence of being in the least interested in friendship and good relations with India. The Chinese Government has struck a heavy blow at the traditional friendship between the two countries by its massive invasion and aggression across the northern Himalayan border of India in October-November 1962. This invasion was a blow aimed at the stability, prosperity and dignity of the people of India and was a woeful negation of the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence. With what face can the Chinese Government give advice about friendship between the peoples, when the invading Chinese armies continue to occupy 14,500 square miles of Indian territory in the vital Ladakh region of India? Friendship between peoples must be based on other things than violence, aggression and false and malicious propaganda, and the Government of India are waiting to see evidence of this in the China of today.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 10 August, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Note No. 13/71, dated 27th June, 1964 of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China has the honour to state as follows:

In the Note under reference it is stated that "as the Indian Government had expressed the desire to appoint care-takers, the local authorities in Yatung had already hired three care-takers for the Indian side". In this connection an extract of the Government of India's Note, dated the 4/5th September, 1963 is reproduced below:

"The contents of the Chinese Government's Note itself now make it clear that it is essential to have care-takers to look after the buildings and the property they contain. It is.
therefore, hoped that at least now the Chinese Government will agree to the appointment of at least one or two of the former local employees of the Agency as care-takers for the building."

Without taking this fact into consideration the Chinese side in its Note, dated the 16th October, 1963, informed the Government of India that the Chinese Government had instructed the local authorities concerned to employ two or three care-takers for the Indian side. The intention of the Government of India to engage ex-employees of the former Indian Trade Agency was reiterated in the Government of India's Note, dated the 11th December, 1963. It was also mentioned in this Note that it was proposed to depute one or two officials of the Indian Embassy in Peking to visit Lhasa, Gyantse and Yatung to inspect the Indian Government's buildings and property and also to make arrangements for the appointment of care-takers as already agreed to by the Chinese Government.

In the context of what has been stated above the Government of India request the Chinese Government in the first instance, to extend facilities for a consular officer of the Indian Embassy in Peking to visit Lhasa, Yatung and Gyantse at an early date so that an inspection of the Indian Government buildings and property in Tibet may be undertaken and necessary arrangements made for the appointment of care-takers.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 August, 1964


2. It has been already clearly established in previous notes of the Government of India that the Indian Embassy in China has never indulged in anti-China propaganda. The Memorandum under reference contains little more than a repetition of baseless charges against the Indian Embassy in China.

3. In their Memorandum, dated January 8, 1964, the Government of India have clearly pointed out that they do not question the Chinese Embassy's right of publishing in its bulletins official documents of the Chinese Government handed over to the Government of India. Such official documents of the Chinese Government, addressed to the Government of India, are allowed to be circulated in India when printed in the Chinese Embassy's publicity bulletins, even when these documents are critical of the Government of India's policies. This has been the consistent policy of the Government of India and has been brought to the notice of the Chinese Embassy in India even as early as on September 4, 1959.
4. The Government of India must however reiterate their contention that they cannot permit the Chinese Embassy in India to print and circulate articles with a propagandist, anti-Indian bias, in the Embassy's bulletins, particularly articles that violate the law of the land.

5. In the light of the above facts, the Government of India reject the Chinese Government's Memorandum under reference.

---

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, 3 September, 1964

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India and, with regard to the incidents in which the Indian authorities unwarrantedly confiscated and delayed the Embassy's mails, has the honour to state as follows:

The Embassy has received three letters dated August 18, 1964 from the Asstt. Collector of Customs for Postal Appraisement, G. P. O., Calcutta, saying that a number of packets of books sent to the Embassy from Peking are liable to confiscation. Besides, the "People's Daily" regularly airmailed from Peking to the Embassy, the "Daily News Release" of the Hsinhua News Agency regularly airmailed from Hongkong to the Embassy, and other packets of books and magazines sent from Peking to the Embassy, have still been constantly confiscated or delayed by the Indian authorities without any justification. For instance, ten issues of the "People's Daily" and twenty issues of the "Daily News Release" in the month of July have not yet been received up to now. The Embassy has made inquiries at the Indian Post Office, but no reply has been received as yet.

It must be pointed out that all the above-mentioned mails are sent to the Embassy for official use and that the delay in delivery and confiscation of these mails by the Indian Post Office or Customs are outrageous acts in total.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 9 September, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's Note dated June 25, 1964, in regard to the premises occupied by the former Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong.

In its Note dated January 15, 1960 the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India had stated as follows:

"With regard to the attempt of the Darjeeling local authorities of India to acquire without any justification the land being used by the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong, the
Embassy would like to reiterate to the Ministry that it is clearly laid down in the Notes exchanged in 1954 pertaining to the Agreement between China and India on Trade and Intercourse between the Tibet Region of China and India that the two Governments agree to render assistance to each other's Trade Agencies in the use of land and in housing. The Embassy, therefore, still requests that the Government of India, in line with the above-mentioned provisions, withdraw the acquisition of the land being used by the Chinese Trade Agency and kindly give facilities so that the two properties of buildings and land concerned may be transferred to the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong at an early date”.

In the context of the above statement by the Chinese Embassy the present contention of the Chinese Government that “the building and ground of the former Trade Agency in Kalimpong are the properties of the Chinese Government” is not sustainable. As stated in the earlier Notes of the Government of India and reiterated in their last Note dated March 20, 1964, the building, as well as the land on which the premises of the former Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong had been located, have never been the properties of the Chinese Government. They had merely been let out to them for the use of the Chinese Trade Agency.

The Government of India would like to state here that they have no interest in continuing this futile correspondence. Any further Note from the Chinese Government repeating the baseless claims in this regard, will not merit a reply.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 September 1964

Please refer to the memorandum of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India on December 6, 1963.

With ulterior motives, on the eve of withdrawal from China, the staff of the former Indian Consulate-General in Lhasa had carried out grave destruction of the premises and property of the former Indian Consulate General in Lhasa and the former Indian Trade Agency in Yatung; the testimony of witnesses and material evidence are all there, and as such absolutely cannot be prevaricated. In its Memoranda of December 29, 1962, March 11, 1963 and November 12, 1963 to the Indian side, the Chinese Government had given a full explanation of the truth of the fact and its stand on this question. After the foul act by its officials was exposed, the Indian Government had over and again repeated its unfounded accusations in an attempt to extricate itself from the quandry. The fact, however, remains a fact. No matter how the Indian side painstakingly fabricate and
prevaricate, it is futile. The Chinese Government once again con-
demns such foul act of the Consul-General of India and others. Should the Indian side continue to haggle on it, the Chinese Gov-
ernment will not pay attention to it. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, however, reasserts that the Chinese Government reserves the right to look into the matter.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the
Embassy of China in India, 7 October, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the
Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the
honour to refer to the Chinese Foreign Office Note (64) Pu Yi Ya
Tzu No. 326, dated the 8th June, 1964.

2. On April 29, 1964, the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi handed
over to the Ministry of External Affairs two letters of invitation for
the Association of Scientific Workers of India, to attend the 1964
Peking Symposium. On May 4, the Ministry of External Affairs
wrote to the Chinese Embassy, saying that "in the context of the
occupation of Indian territory by Chinese forces and the consequent
violation of India's territorial integrity by China, it would not be
possible for any delegate from India to participate in the 1964 Peking
Symposium".

3. The Chinese note, in question, has characterized this reply
as an act of 'rudeness of the Indian Government', and has argued
that China had sent out the invitation to the Indian Scientists 'purely'
out of the desire of strengthening the friendship between the people
of China and India and promoting international scientific and cultural
exchange.

4. In the context of the Chinese aggression in October/November,
1962, this is, to say the least, sanctimonious hypocrisy. The Gov-
ernment of the People's of Republic of China has advanced vast and
fantastic territorial claims against India, launched a massive invasion
across the Indian borders in the autumn of 1962, and is still unlaw-
fully occupying 14,500 square miles of Indian territory in Ladakh. To
talk of promoting friendship with India, without any intention of
undoing these wrongs and without showing any concrete signs of
wanting to enter into negotiations on an honourable basis, is nothing
but a thinly veiled attempt to mislead and deceive world public
opinion.

5. As regards the promotion of international scientific and cultural
exchange mentioned in the Chinese Note, the world is painfully
aware of the Chinese Government's policy of opposition to the
Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, which has been signed by an overwhelming
majority of the nations of the world, and the open declaration by
Chinese leaders that it is bent upon manufacturing that mighty wea-
pon of destruction—the atom bomb. It is clear that the Government
of China are trying feverishly to harness the forces of science, not
for the peaceful purpose of improving the living standards of the six
hundred and fifty million people of China, but for serving the chau-
vinistic, expansionist, big-power dreams of the Chinese Government.
The Government and the people of India, committed as they are to the peaceful uses of atomic energy, cannot enter into any 'international scientific and cultural exchange' with China, as long as China openly advocates the use of nuclear science for war-like purposes.

6. The Chinese Note has referred to the creation of 'a favourable atmosphere for a peaceful settlement of the boundary question'. It was precisely for this that the six Asian-African countries who met at the Colombo Conference formulated certain proposals for the acceptance of India and China. India has accepted the Colombo Proposals, but China has not. If the People's Republic of China are sincere in their desire to create a favourable atmosphere, they should accept the Colombo Proposals, completely and without any reservations, just as India has done, so that negotiations may commence between the two countries as envisaged in the Colombo Proposals.

7. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 October 1964


In the Ministry of External Affairs Memoranda dated the 8th February, 1963, 1st April, 1963 and 6th December, 1963 indisputable facts have been given to prove that the vandalism perpetrated on the buildings and property of the Government of India at Yatung and Lhasa had been deliberately caused by miscreants with the connivance of the local authorities. In spite of this, the Chinese Government, in their characteristic manner, are still trying to shield the actions of these hooligans by slandering the officials of the former Indian Consulate General at Lhasa.

The Chinese Government are fully aware that Mr. Hang, the Vice Director of the Lhasa Foreign Bureau had himself told the former Indian Consul General that the local authorities were neither responsible for the safety of the Indian Government's property left at Yatung nor were they interested in what happened. What does this attitude of a Chinese Government official indicate? Is it not a clear proof that the local authorities had deliberately adopted an indifferent attitude so as to encourage the hooligans to destroy the Indian Government's property left behind in Tibet? Instead of dealing with the miscreants who have caused damages to the property of a foreign Government, the Chinese Government continue to slander the Indian officials. This can deceive nobody and the Government of India continue to hold the Chinese Government solely responsible for the damages done to the property of the Government of India at Lhasa and Yatung.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

1. In its note of April 3, 1964 to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Indian Embassy in China extended an invitation on behalf of the Organizing Committee for the XXII International Geological Congress to the Chinese Government to send its official delegates to the XXII International Geological Congress which will be held in New Delhi in December, 1964. The Chinese Government has always actively favoured and vigorously supported cultural and scientific interflow and friendly contacts between the peoples of different countries, including the peoples of China and India. In this spirit, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs sent a reply to the Indian Embassy on May 30 expressing its appreciation for the Indian invitation and its readiness to give it favourable consideration. However, an Indian responsible officer of the Organizing Committee for the XXII International Geological Congress had earlier indicated to the Chinese organisation concerned that the Committee intended to invite the Chiang Kai-shek clique in Taiwan. Moreover, the Chinese Government learned that the XXII International Geological Congress is sponsored by the International Union of Geological Sciences of which the Chiang Kai-shek clique in Taiwan remains up to now a member. In view of this, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in replying to the invitation note of the Indian Embassy, solemnly made clear its just stand of resolutely opposing the utilization of any international conference to create “two Chinas,” and put forward three relevant questions for clarification by the Indian Government.

On July 28, 1964, the Indian Embassy in China sent a note in reply to the Chinese Foreign Ministry whose substance consisted only of three words, something which is indeed seldom seen in diplomatic correspondence.

The first question raised in the Chinese note was: Whether the Organizing Committee for the XXII International Geological Congress has changed its original stand of intending to invite the Chiang clique? The answer in the Indian Embassy’s note was: “No.” The second question was: Whether the International Union of Geological Sciences has deprived the Chiang clique in Taiwan of membership? The Indian Embassy answered: “No.” The third question was: Whether an invitation has been extended to the Chiang clique to attend any of the other international conferences and activities in the field of the geological sciences due to take place concurrently with the XXII International Geological Congress? The Indian Embassy answered: “Yes”.

This shows that the Indian Government has long been aware that the Chiang clique elements in Taiwan have been invited to attend the XXII International Geological Congress. Yet the Indian Government glaringly sent a diplomatic note to the Chinese Government inviting it to send its official delegates to the Congress. Is this not a flagrant attempt to create a situation of “two Chinas” at an international conference to be held in New Delhi? The Chinese
Government cannot but express extreme indignation at this and hereby solemnly state once again that the Chinese Government will never send delegates to any conference in which Chiang clique elements are taking part and that it will definitely not play into the hands of the Indian Government. Incidentally the Indian Government is advised to note the fact that the U.S. imperialist scheme of creating “two Chinas” is becoming more and more discredited in the world and has long been repudiated by all countries which uphold justice and face up to reality. The Indian Government, however, is ever more energetically working to promote this scheme. This will bring no other result than exposing the Indian Government before the world as a tool serving the policies of U.S. imperialism.

2. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that in April this year China invited Indian scientists to attend the 1964 Peking Symposium held last August. This was done solely for the purpose of promoting international scientific exchanges and friendship between the people of different countries. It was regrettable that the Indian Government not only unreasonably rejected the invitation before the invited Indian organizations had time to give their reply, but took the opportunity to slander China by rehashing its shop-worn charge of Chinese “violation of India’s territorial integrity”. In its note of June 8, 1964 to the Indian Embassy in China, the Chinese Foreign Ministry reasoned things out in a serious manner and refuted the truculent and unreasonable attitude of the Indian Government.

The Indian Ministry of External Affairs, however, continued to make slanders and attacks against the Chinese Government in its October 7 note of reply to the Chinese Embassy in India. In this note, while slanderously charging China once again with “aggression”, the Indian Government racked its brains and sought out a pretext to obstruct the friendly contacts between the Chinese and Indian peoples by declaring that as the Chinese Government was opposed to the tri-partite partial test ban treaty and was determined to manufacture atom bombs, India could not enter into any scientific and cultural exchanges with China. Such sophistry is indeed both nonsensical and clumsy.

The Chinese Government’s just stand on the tripartite partial test ban treaty and on nuclear weapons has long been elucidated in detail in numerous official documents. It is futile for the Indian Government to vilify China on this score. It should be pointed out that if, according to the Indian Government’s logic, no cultural and scientific interflow should be carried out with China because China is determined to manufacture atom bombs, then, one may ask the Indian Government whether it has stopped its contacts with the United States whose government has for the past twenty years conducted hundreds of nuclear tests and has manufactured, stockpiled and is continuing to manufacture huge quantities of nuclear weapons. The United States has established nuclear bases in many parts of the world and U.S. Air and naval forces armed with nuclear weapons are rushing hither and thither throughout the world, intimidating the peoples and jeopardizing world peace; has the Indian Government made any effective opposition to all that? All the world knows that it is precisely the Indian Government which is in a passionate embrace with the U.S. nuclear overlord. The facts
are very clear: In making the question of nuclear weapons a pre-text for disrupting friendly contacts between the Chinese and Indian peoples, the Indian Government is motivated by sheer hypocrisy and is serving the U.S. imperialist policies of nuclear monopoly and blackmail.

3. The two matters mentioned above are by no means unrelated to each other. They precisely show that while painstakingly trying to make use of the international conference to be held in India to promote the scheme of creating "two Chinas," the Indian Government is bent on obstructing and sabotaging genuine cultural exchanges between nations and friendly contacts between the Chinese and Indian peoples. These most unseemly acts of the Indian Government will surely meet with the just condemnation of the peoples of China and India and fair-minded public opinion of the world.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 14 November, 1964

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, and has the honour to state as follows:

On October 10, 1964, the Chiang Kai-shek clique elements in India held so-called national day celebrations in Calcutta, Bombay, Kalimpong, Darjeeling and Jalpaiguri in India, and made all sorts of slanders and raised hue and cry against the People's Republic of China. On October 31, the Chiang Kai-shek clique elements openly held meetings in Calcutta to celebrate the birthday of bogus president Chiang Kai-shek, clamouring against China. In Calcutta, a responsible office-bearer of the West Bengal organization of the Indian ruling Congress Party even went so far as to take part, together with some people of the United States of America and South Korea, in such activities of opposing the People's Republic of China as the so-called national day celebrations of the Chiang Kai-shek clique elements. The Indian press outrightly carried articles saying "October 10 is the National Day of China" and calling the Chiang Kai-shek clique "Republic of China" and "the Government of China". It must be pointed out that the Chiang Kai-shek clique elements would not have been able to carry out these illegal activities but for the connivance and support of the Indian Government. This shows that how far the Indian Government has gone along the road of scheming to create "two Chinas" and deliberately worsening the relations between China and India, while it still maintains diplomatic relations with China. The Embassy expresses great indignation at this, lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government and demands that no similar incident shall recur.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 December, 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic, of China and has the honour to refer to the Embassy's note No. M/541/64, dated November 14, 1964.

The Government of India, in its note of January 23, 1964, in reply to a similar protest lodged by the Chinese Embassy on 6th January, had clearly stated that people in India enjoy the fullest freedom to assemble and hold meetings, as long as they do not infringe the law. The Chinese nationals who held meetings in Calcutta and other places had obviously done so in full conformity with the law of the land. For the Chinese Embassy to protest against this and to 'demand that no similar incident shall recur' is a futile and meaningless attempt on their part to interfere in the internal affairs of India. It is equally meaningless for the Chinese Embassy to say that these meetings could not have taken place 'but for the connivance and support of the Indian Government'. In making this charge, the Embassy is either trying deliberately to distort the facts or is betraying its inability to understand that lawful assemblies and meetings can and do take place in India, at any rate without 'the connivance and support' of the Government. The Chinese Embassy has also seized this occasion to accuse India of 'scheming to create two Chinas'. This utterly false accusation demonstrates the strange unwillingness of the Chinese Government to appreciate the support the Government of India has given, ever since 1950, to the cause of the restoration of China's seat in the United Nations. The Government of India reject this propagandist protest note of the Chinese Embassy.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

——

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 28 December, 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and refutes the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated August 5, 1964 as follows:—

1. In its note the Indian Government could not but admit that a delegation of Indian Members of Parliament had "visited" Taiwan and carried out anti-Chinese activities, yet it quibbled that this was "freedom of travel and freedom of speech" in accordance with the law of India. It further said that the Chinese Government's protest with the Indian Government against its activities to create "two Chinas" "amounts to little other than an attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of India". This is indeed most absurd. It shows that the Indian Government is getting so frantic in its anti-Chinese campaigns that it is talking utter nonsense.

2. The Indian Government maintains diplomatic relations with China and has stated on numerous occasions that it recognizes the 182 EA---6.
People’s Republic of China only. However, in the past few years, it has carried out flirtations and come into ever closer contacts, both overt and covert, with the Chiang Kai-shek clique which has long been repudiated by the Chinese people, working ever more energetically for the U.S. imperialist plot to create “two Chinas”. Following the “visit” to Taiwan by the Delegation of Indian Members of Parliament last June, an Indian named S. N. Sinha went to Taiwan in November in an ambiguous capacity and joined the Chiang clique in making the clamour that the People’s Republic of China was the common enemy of India and the Chiang clique. Immediately thereafter, Member of the Indian Parliament Patel and others went to Taiwan to attend a conference of the “Asian people’s anti-communist league” and clamoured for restoration of diplomatic relations between India and the Chiang clique. According to the Indian Government, all these are “freedom of travel and freedom of speech enjoyed by the citizens of India in accordance with the law of the land”. The Indian Government is thus revealing its unseemly features by listing all activities serving the U.S. imperialist plot of creating “two Chinas” as “freedom” protected by the law of India.

3. Moreover, both the official organs of India and its Ministers have openly clamoured about the existence of “two Chinas”. Unable to deny these iron-clad facts in its note, the Indian Government tried to slip away by falsely charging the Chinese Government with having “taken out of context and distorted the remarks of some of the Ministers of the Government”. This is of no avail. The Seventh World Fellowship of Buddhist Conference was illegally held in India between the end of November and the beginning of December this year. During that conference, the Indian Government treated the so-called Buddhist delegation sent by the Chiang clique as guests of honour. According to news reports, the Indian President openly received the Buddhist delegation of the Chiang clique and accepted gifts from the Chiang clique elements; the Chief Minister of West Bengal of India had a friendly meeting with them; and with the arrangement of the Indian Government, the Chiang clique elements held talks with Dalai, the rebel Chief-tain of Tibet. One would like to ask the Indian Government: Is this whole series of grave acts in collusion with the Chiang clique not an attempt to create “two Chinas” or a violation of the accepted standards of international relations? No amount of sophistry and prevarications can deny the facts.

4. What is more absurd and ridiculous is that in its note the Indian Government has gone so far as to call the just protest of the Chinese Government “an attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of India”. Well, let the people of the whole world see who after all is interfering in the internal affairs of the other. The Indian Government is helping U.S. imperialism in its attempt to carve out China’s sacred territory Taiwan Province by creating “two Chinas”. Is this not gross interference in China’s internal affairs? The Indian Government has been directing the fugitive Tibetan rebels in India to engage in all sorts of subversive and disruptive activities against China’s Tibet, and recently it even supported the attempt to place the so-called “Tibet question” on
the agenda of the U.N. General Assembly. Is this not gross interference in China's internal affairs? In the face of these instances of naked interference in China's internal affairs, the Chinese Government has every reason to lodge its serious protests. The Indian Government, however, has labelled this as China's "attempt to interfere in the internal affair of India." It is really unthinkable that the Indian Government should have made such an arbitrary and unreasonable statement which confounds the right and wrong.

5. In its note, the Indian Government repeated its slanderous allegation of what it called China's "invasion" and "occupation" of Indian territory. As is well known, in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, India is up to now in occupation of 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory; and in the western sector, it has laid claims to large tracts of China's territory. But the Indian Government has all along refused to hold peaceful negotiations. World opinion has long formed its definite judgment as to who is right and who is wrong on the Sino-Indian boundary issue. Although the Indian Government has all along used its slanderous shopworn charge about China's "aggression" as a fig-leaf to cover up its subservience to U.S. imperialism, its begging for foreign aid and its frantic anti-China activities, the people of the world have already seen through this trick and it no longer works. The pro-American and anti-Chinese policy persistently followed by the Indian Government has not only seriously impaired the traditional friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples but also run counter to the vital interests of the Indian people. The Indian Government is advised not to follow U.S. imperialism any longer in taking the anti-China road which is a blind alley and to put an immediate end to all its scheming activities for creating "two Chinas".

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 9 February, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to refer to the Embassy's note No. M/498/64, dated September 3, 1964.

2. The Chinese Embassy is presumably aware that under the existing regulations in India, entry into India of any publication or document which directly or indirectly questions the territorial integrity of India or is of such a nature as would affect India's friendly relations with third countries, is prohibited. The Chinese Embassy is presumably also aware that, according to the practice prevailing in India as also according to the international practice, any material transmitted through ordinary postal channels must not violate the law.
3. In their note dated September 3, 1964, the Chinese Embassy has made a reference to the letter received from the Postal Customs Authorities informing the Chinese Embassy that certain packets addressed to the Embassy had been held up by the Postal Customs. This is in keeping with the prevailing regulations where the Postal Customs Authorities are required to send a notice to parties to whom the offending material has been addressed, requesting the addressees to state their views on the material seized. From the letter from the Postal authorities addressed to the Chinese Embassy enclosed with the note under reply, it is clear that the material sent to the Chinese Embassy could not have been meant for the official use of the Embassy, as claimed in the Embassy's note, but was meant for carrying on propaganda against countries with whom India has friendly relations. It is impermissible for foreign diplomatic missions accredited to India to conduct propaganda against countries with whom India has friendly relations.

4. The Government of India cannot accept the view that this action of the Postal Customs Authorities in seizing offensive material infringing the laws of India addressed to the Chinese Embassy, have, in any way, created "utmost difficulties for the normal functioning of the Embassy". The Ministry of External Affairs are constrained to point out the fact that the "normal functioning" of the Chinese Embassy in India must not include the conducting of adverse propaganda against countries with whom India has friendly relations.

5. In view of the circumstances explained above, the protest of the Chinese Embassy dated September 3, 1964, is categorically rejected.

6. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 12 February, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Foreign Office notes, dated November 11 and December 28, 1964, and to say that the "protests" made in both these notes are rejected by the Government of India for reasons stated in paragraph below.

Both these notes harp on the usual, mendacious Chinese propaganda theme, that the Government of India is pursuing a policy of creating "two Chinas". Everyone knows that India recognizes the People's Republic of China and has diplomatic relations with it, and that India does not recognize Taiwan and has no diplomatic relations with it. India has not changed its policy in this matter, in spite of the wanton aggression committed by the People's Republic of China on the soil of India. As against this, it may be significant to
record that there are many countries in Asia and Africa and elsewhere which, unlike India, have diplomatic relations with Taiwan and do not recognize the People's Republic of China. In fact, some 50 countries have diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China, while over 50 countries still recognize Taiwan and have diplomatic relations with Taiwan. The Government of India can well appreciate the feelings of the Chinese Government in this matter, but it fails to understand why the Chinese Government should simulate indignation and direct slanderous charges against the Government of India, who does not have any diplomatic or official relations with Taiwan. These meaningless allegations are all the more extraordinary, because, as a matter of fact, the Chinese Government carries on commercial and cultural contacts and has friendly relations with a number of countries who continue to recognize Taiwan. Indeed, some countries whose diplomatic Missions the Chinese Government have received in Peking still maintain Consular Offices in Taiwan. And yet it is the Indian Government which has frequently been singled out by the Chinese Government for virulent attacks for alleged "flirtations" with the Taiwan Government and for "plotting to create two Chinas". It is obvious that by making these charges and protests, the Chinese Government is merely adding grist to its propaganda mill, and also betraying its animus against the people and the Government of India.

In its note of December 28, the Chinese Foreign Office has cited the visits of private individuals from India to Taiwan to prove that the Government of India is supporting the idea of creating "two Chinas". It has been pointed out to the Chinese Government, on several occasions in the past, that the Government of India hold no responsibility for these visits of private individuals to Taiwan, and that to protest against such visits is a waste of effort, since personal freedom is guaranteed to citizens of India under the Indian Constitution and the Government of India can, therefore, pay no serious attention to "protests" on this issue.

The Chinese note of November 11, 1964, refers to the invitations issued by the Organizing Committee for the 22nd International Geological Congress to representatives of the People's Republic of China and Taiwan, for attending the 22nd International Geological Congress which was held in New Delhi in December, 1964. The Chinese Government is aware that the International Geological Congress is a non-governmental body, and the invitations to the Congress are governed by the rules and procedures of the International Geological Congress itself. The statute of the Congress lays down that geological institutes all over the world should be invited to send one or more representatives to the Congress Sessions. The Organizing Committee for the 22nd Session, which was held in New Delhi, was following this prescribed practice in respect of invitations. At the previous Sessions of the Congress held in other countries invitations had been set to, both, the People's Republic of China and Taiwan. It is, therefore, surprising that the Chinese Government has chosen to "protest" about this to the Government of India and to deliberately misconstrue the invitation extended to it as "evidence" of the so-called Indian attempt to create "two Chinas".
The Chinese note of November 11, has complained about the brevity of the reply given by the Government of India in its note of July 28. The above note was in answer to a peremptory demand contained in the Chinese note of May 30, 1964, according to which India was asked three questions and required to give a 'clear-cut answer'. It is extraordinary that when clear-cut and unambiguous answers have been given the Chinese Government should feel aggrieved about the precision and brevity of the replies.

The Chinese note has taken objection to a statement in the Indian note of October 7, 1964, that India could not enter into “any international, scientific and cultural exchange” with China, as long as China remains in illegal possession of Indian territory and advocates the use of nuclear science for war-like purposes. The Chinese note, deviating from the scurrilous into the perversely romantic, has alleged that the Government of India “is in passionate embrace with the U.S. nuclear war-lord”. In its note of December 28, 1964, further slanderous expressions like “subservience to U.S. imperialism” and “begging for foreign aid” have been used about India. The Government of India would like to tell the Chinese Government that nobody is impressed by this kind of bad language. As regards India's nuclear policy, it is too well-known to suffer from China's misrepresentations. India has held that the production, testing and proliferation of nuclear weapons is against the interest of peace and the aspirations of mankind, especially of those millions of human beings in Asia and Africa who are struggling to raise their living standards and to consolidate their newly-won political freedom through economic and social development. Between the Government of India's policy of peaceful utilisation of nuclear energy for the benefit of mankind and China's policy of producing and stockpiling nuclear weapons for war and destruction, there can be no meeting point. What is strange is that when more than 100 nations of the world have signed the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, as a practical step towards total and complete disarmament, China has not only refused to sign the Treaty, but opposed it vehemently and has conducted a nuclear explosion of its own. China stands condemned for its Lop Nor explosion because this nuclear test was conducted in defiance of powerful opinion expressed by the 47 non-aligned nations who had just then debated this question and called upon “all States to accede to the Moscow Treaty partially banning the nuclear tests and to abide by its provisions in the interests of peace and welfare of mankind”. To argue that China's nuclear policy, today, is a “just stand”, it may be pointed out, is a surprising reversal of what the Chinese Government had stood for in the Bandung declaration of 1955 which had appealed to all powers to reach an agreement to suspend nuclear experiments. The Lop Nor explosion thus stands condemned even in terms of China's own solemn commitment in 1955 which China apparently wants her friends to forget.

The Chinese Foreign Office note of December 28, 1964 has referred to the 7th World Fellowship of Buddhist Conference, recently held in India. The Chinese Government has taken this opportunity to vilify the Government of India, because some Buddhist religious
leaders from Taiwan came to India and took part in this Conference. The Government of China is aware that the World Fellowship of Buddhists is a non-governmental organisation. The Conference was held in India under the auspices of this organisation and not that of the Government of India. It is, therefore, extraordinary that the Chinese Government should have thought it fit to protest about this to the Government of India. India is a secular state where all religions enjoy full freedom. India is also the historic home of Buddhism. It was, therefore, only natural that Buddhist religious leaders from different parts of the world should have come to attend this Conference in India. The Chinese Government's protest is, therefore, impertinent and unwarranted and cannot be entertained by the Government of India. The Chinese note has made this also an occasion for accusing India of "directing the fugitive Tibetan rebels in India to engage in all sorts of subversive and disruptive activities against China's Tibet". This is a completely false allegation which has been thoroughly refuted by the Government of India on many occasions in the past. The Government of India has already told the Chinese Government that if China has any trouble from the people of Tibet, it is solely because of the oppressive policies they have pursued against the traditional autonomy and the elementary human rights of the people of Tibet. The Government of India is prepared to repeat this again and again so that China may realise the folly of its inhuman policy towards the people of Tibet.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Copy of letter dated the 17th October, 1964 from His Excellency Mr. Chou En-lai, Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China to the Prime Minister of India.

On October 16, 1964 China exploded an atom bomb, thus successfully making its first nuclear test. On the same day, the Chinese Government issued a statement on this event, setting forth in detail China's position on the question of nuclear weapons.

The Chinese Government consistently stands for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. China has been compelled to conduct nuclear testing and develop nuclear weapons. China's mastering of nuclear weapons is entirely for defence and for protecting the Chinese people from the U.S. nuclear threat.

The Chinese Government solemnly declares that at no time and in no circumstances will China be the first to use nuclear weapons.

The Chinese Government will continue to work for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons through
international consultations and, for this purpose, has put forward in its statement the following proposal:

"That a summit conference of all the countries of the world be convened to discuss the question of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and that, as the first step, the summit conference should reach an agreement to the effect that the nuclear powers and those countries which may soon become nuclear powers undertake not to use nuclear weapons, neither to use them against non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones, nor against each other".

It is the common aspiration of all peace-loving countries and people of the world to prevent a nuclear war and eliminate nuclear weapons. The Chinese Government sincerely hopes that its proposal will be given favourable consideration and positive response by your Government.

Please accept the assurances of my highest consideration.


Statement of Chinese Government dated 16 October, 1964

China exploded an atom bomb at fifteen hundred hours on October sixteen nineteen sixty-four, A.D. thereby conducted successfully its first nuclear test. This is a major achievement of the Chinese people in their struggle to increase their national defence capability and oppose the U.S. Imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail and nuclear threats.

To defend oneself is the inalienable right of every sovereign state. And to safeguard world peace is the common task of all peace-loving countries. China cannot remain idle and do nothing in the face of the ever increasing nuclear threat posed by the United States. China is forced to conduct nuclear tests and develop nuclear weapons.

The Chinese Government has consistently advocated the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. Should this have been realized China need not develop the nuclear weapon. But this position of ours has met the stubborn resistance of the U.S. imperialists. The Chinese Government pointed out long ago that the treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests signed by the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union in Moscow in July nineteen hundred sixty three was a big fraud to fool the people of the world that it tried to consolidate the nuclear monopoly held by the three nuclear powers and tie up the hands and feet of all peace loving countries and that it not only did not decrease but had increased the nuclear threat of U.S. imperialism against the People of China and of the whole world. The U.S. Government declared undisguisedly even then that the conclusion of such a treaty does
not at all mean that the United States would not conduct underground tests or would not use, manufacture, stockpile, export or proliferate nuclear weapons. The facts of the past year and more fully proves this point.

During the past year and more the United States has not stopped manufacturing various nuclear weapons on the basis of the nuclear tests which it had already conducted. Furthermore seeking for ever greater perfection the United States has during this same period conducted several dozen underground nuclear tests and thereby more perfecting the nuclear weapons it manufactures. In stationing nuclear submarines in Japan, the U.S. is posing a direct threat to the Japanese people, the Chinese people and the peoples of all other Asian countries. The U.S. is now putting nuclear weapons into the hands of the West German revanchists through the so-called multinational nuclear force and thereby threatening the security of the German Democratic Republic and the other East European Socialist countries. U.S. submarines carrying polaris missiles with nuclear warheads are prowling the Taiwan straits, the Tonkin Gulf, the Mediterranean Sea, the Pacific Ocean, the Indian Ocean and the Atlantic Ocean, threatening everywhere peace loving countries and all peoples who are fighting against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. Under such circumstances, how can it be considered that the U.S. nuclear blackmail and nuclear threat against the people of the world no longer exist just because of the false impression created by the temporary halting of atmospheric tests by the United States?

The atom bomb is a paper tiger. This famous saying by Chairman Mao Tse-Tung is known to all. This was our view in the past and this is still our view at present. China is developing nuclear weapons not because we believe in the omnipotence of nuclear weapons and that China plans to use nuclear weapons. The truth is exactly to the contrary. In developing nuclear weapons, China's aim is to break the nuclear monopoly of the nuclear powers and to eliminate nuclear weapons.

The Chinese Government is loyal to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. We believe in the people. It is the people who decide the outcome of a war, and not any weapon. The destiny of China is decided by the Chinese people, and the destiny of the world by the peoples of the world, and not by the nuclear weapon. The development of nuclear by China is for defence and for protecting the Chinese people from the danger of the United States launching a nuclear war.

The Chinese Government hereby solemnly declares that China will never at any time and under any circumstances be the first to use nuclear weapons.

The Chinese people firmly support the struggles for liberation waged by all oppressed nations and people of the world. We are convinced that, by relying on their own struggles and also through mutual aid, the peoples of the world will certainly win victory. The mastering of the nuclear weapon by China is great encouragement to the revolutionary peoples of the world in their struggles and a great contribution to the cause of defending world peace. On
the question of nuclear weapons, China will neither commit the error of adventurism nor the error of capitulationism. The Chinese people can be trusted.

The Chinese Government fully understands the good wishes of peace loving countries and people for the halting of all nuclear tests. But more and more countries are coming to realise that the more the U.S. imperialists and their partners hold on to their nuclear monopoly, the more is there danger of a nuclear war breaking out. They have it and you don’t, and so they are very haughty. But once those who oppose them also have it, they would no longer be so haughty, their policy of nuclear blackmail and nuclear threat would no longer be so effective, and the possibility for a complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons would increase. We sincerely hope that a nuclear war would never occur. We are convinced that, so long as all peace loving countries and people of the world make common efforts and persist in the struggle, a nuclear war can be prevented.

The Chinese Government hereby formally proposes to the Governments of the world that a Summit Conference of all the countries of the world be convened to discuss the question of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, and that as a first step, the Summit Conference should reach an agreement to the effect that the nuclear powers and those countries which will soon become nuclear powers undertaking not to use nuclear weapons, neither to use them against non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones, nor against each other.

If those countries in possession of huge quantities of nuclear weapons are not even willing to undertake not to use them, how can those countries not yet in possession of them be expected to believe in their sincerity for peace and not to adopt possible and necessary defensive measures?

The Chinese Government will, as always, exert every effort to promote the realisation of the noble aim of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons through international consultations. Before the advent of such a day, the Chinese Government and people will firmly and unswervingly march along their own road of strengthening their national defences, defending their motherland and safeguarding world peace.

We are convinced that nuclear weapons, which are after all created by Man, certainly will be eliminated by man.

Copy of letter dated the 27th November, 1964, from the Prime Minister of India, to His Excellency Mr. Chou En-lai, Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China.

I have received your letter of the 17th of October, 1964, on the atomic explosion conducted by China, the previous day, along with a statement issued by the Government of the People's Republic.

2. Your Excellency's letter and the statement repeat the same arguments and make the same proposal which you made in July-
August, 1963, when the nations of the world were preparing to sign the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, which Your Excellency's Government refused to subscribe to.

3. As you are aware, over a 100 nations have since adhered to that Treaty and the international community has repeatedly hailed the Treaty as a significant landmark in the quest of humanity towards general and complete disarmament. The cessation of atmospheric test explosions, which followed, also reduced radio-activity in the atmosphere and consequently the hazards to health which these explosions were inflicting on the innocent inhabitants of the earth. This was the first time in the history of mankind that the peoples of the world took a concrete step towards the ultimate objective of a disarmed world. Since then, the international community has taken several steps in that direction, particularly towards non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and limitation of the arms race by reducing the production of fissile material for weapons purposes. I regret to note that the Government of People's Republic of China has not only denied its cooperation in this common endeavour of the peoples of the world for progress towards elimination of nuclear weapons and general and complete disarmament, but has also placed serious obstacles to it. Whatever the political or military considerations, the nuclear explosion conducted at Lop Nor on the 16th of October in total defiance of the opinion of the nations of the world and in complete disregard of the health of its innocent inhabitants is a development that people all over the world must regard as retrograde and deplorable.

4. Your Excellency has proposed "that a summit conference of all countries of the world be convened to discuss the question of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and that, as a first step, the summit conference should reach an agreement to the effect that the nuclear powers and those countries which may soon become nuclear powers undertake not to use nuclear weapons, neither to use them against non-nuclear countries and nuclear free zones, nor against each other". As I said earlier, this proposal is similar to the one Your Excellency made when the Government of the People's Republic of China refused to sign the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. My predecessor then replied to Your Excellency at some length. He said that general and complete disarmament covering conventional weapons and forces, as well as nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, was the most urgent and the most vital objective of the peoples of the world. Pending the conclusion of a comprehensive treaty, it was necessary that immediate and positive steps, embracing measures of arms control and limitation and reduction of the risks of war, be taken to reduce international tension and build up confidence. The international community had been seized of the problem and the United Nations and the Disarmament Committee had been dealing with the entire gamut of the problems of disarmament and of a disarmed world. My predecessor then enumerated the steps which had already been taken and were being taken by the international community in this regard. He made particular reference to the stoppage of nuclear weapons tests in respect of which an international treaty had just been entered into. He drew attention to the fact that Your Excellency was one of the signatories of the Bandung declaration, which stated, inter alia,
that "Pending the total prohibition of the manufacture of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, the conference appealed to all powers concerned to reach an agreement to suspend experiments with such weapons". He hoped that the People's Republic of China, in harmony with the majority of the countries of the world, would subscribe to the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, which was not only a step towards general and complete disarmament, but also of great significance in saving humanity from the death-dealing fall-out resulting from explosions in the atmosphere.

5. I regret to say that Your Excellency's Government has belied this hope and ignored the appeal of the peoples of the world. The radioactive fall-out from the Chinese explosion has traversed the atmosphere of the globe, spreading its unhealthy debris over the peoples of the world. It has also given a set-back to the efforts being made by the international community to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons and bring the world nearer to its goal of general and complete disarmament.

6. In your letter, last year, Your Excellency had ignored conventional disarmament. This particular aspect of the matter cannot be absent in any proposal from the People's Republic of China which has the largest army in the world, not including millions of armed men in the Chinese militia. In your last letter, Your Excellency had also proposed a Summit Conference, which was to consider the question of prohibition and destruction of all nuclear weapons and of taking certain measures as initial steps. These initial steps included establishment of nuclear-free zones, including one which would cover China, refraining from export or import of nuclear weapons and technical data for their manufacture and cessation of all nuclear tests. This time, Your Excellency has omitted these suggestions, as the People's Republic of China, in complete disregard of its own proposals, has now established China as a nuclear weapons zone, rather than a non-nuclear zone, and conducted a nuclear weapons test explosion. Now Your Excellency only suggests that steps to be taken should be that nuclear powers should not use nuclear weapons. There is no reference to non-manufacture of weapons, non-possession of weapons or non-testing of weapons.

7. In the reply we had sent to your last communication, we had pointed out that the problems of general and complete disarmament, including nuclear and conventional arms, were highly complicated matters requiring a lot of detailed work and were not matters which could be debated and settled at a large conference of the kind proposed by Your Excellency. By their very nature, these intricate issues need to be negotiated in smaller committees and often at the level of experts, as was being done by the United Nations. We agreed that it was essential that all countries subscribed to a treaty on general and complete disarmament, but we felt that a conference of plenipotentiaries of the countries of the world could be useful only when substantial progress had been made in working out a draft treaty on general and complete disarmament.

8. The Government of India continue to adhere to these views, which are also the views of the majority of the nations of the world. What is needed is not declarations or exhortations, but concrete and
specific steps, like cessation of tests, prohibition of the use of fissile material for purposes of weapons, non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, reduction of large and intimidating armies etc. In this context, I trust Your Excellency's Government will take early steps to subscribe to the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and stop the production of these weapons of mass destruction.

9. The Government of India believe that general and complete disarmament is the most urgent and the most vital problem facing mankind today. They have, for years, urged that a treaty on general and complete disarmament be agreed upon as speedily as possible, and have lent their full support to all measures, comprehensive or partial, preliminary or otherwise, to that end. They will continue to do so. We believe in the ultimate victory of the spirit of humanity over the glorification of war and violence to the detriment of the human race.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.
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I. SINO-INDIAN BOUNDARY DISPUTE

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 March, 1965.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows:

2. The Sino-Pakistan joint communique signed on March 7, 1965, in Peking has announced that the so-called joint China-Pakistan boundary commission has completed the work of boundary demarcation of the China-Pakistan border and that a boundary protocol is shortly to be signed by the Foreign Ministries of China and Pakistan. The Government of India has also seen reports of the speech made by the Chairman of the People's Republic of China at a banquet given on March 2, 1965, in honour of the President of Pakistan. In his speech the Chairman of the People's Republic of China is reported to have praised the Sino-Pakistan Boundary Agreement describing it as not only conducive to the strengthening of friendly and good-neighbourly relations but also an important contribution to Asian and African solidarity and world peace.

3. It is common knowledge that Pakistan and the People's Republic of China have no common border, the two countries being separated by the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. The presence of Pakistan in the northern part of Kashmir is based on aggression and illegal occupation and Pakistan has no locus standi whatsoever to enter into negotiations or conclude agreements with any country regarding the boundary in this sector. The Boundary Agreement entered into between China and Pakistan in March, 1963, is, therefore, altogether illegal and invalid. The Government of India had on several occasions pointed out this fact to the Chinese Government and protested against the action of the Chinese Government in concluding an agreement with Pakistan. Notwithstanding these protests, the Government of China has, under the pretext of entering into a provisional agreement with Pakistan, gone ahead with the appointment of a joint boundary commission and the demarcation of the boundary. These measures taken by the Chinese Government belie the Chinese claim that the so-called boundary agreement with Pakistan is a provisional one. Indeed, in the joint communique issued in Peking on March 7, 1965, it seems that even the pretence that the agreement is a provisional one has been abandoned. It is obvious that China's motive in concluding this agreement is to share the fruits of aggression with Pakistan and to exploit Indo-Pakistan differences in the pursuit of China's aggressive designs on India.

4. In the past, the Government of the People's Republic of China had declared in a joint statement issued by Premier Chou En-Lai and the Prime Minister of Poland in Peking on April 11, 1957, that the Kashmir issue "should not be allowed to be made use of by external forces to create new tensions". Again, in a note given by the Ministry 98 E.A.—2.
of Foreign Affairs Peking, to the Embassy of India in China on 31st May, 1962, the Chinese Government had stated that its attitude is one of "never getting involved in the dispute over Kashmir". Contrary to these declarations, China is making use of the Kashmir question in order to poison relations between India and Pakistan and to create tension in the region. The motive behind this volte face is obvious. Far from contributing to good neighbourly relations and to Asian and African solidarity, these actions of the Chinese Government are calculated to worsen relations and to create disunity amongst Asian-African countries. The Government of India strongly protest against these statements and activities of the Chinese Government and are constrained to point out that they are contrary to the principles of peaceful co-existence as well as the Bandung Principles to which China pays vociferous lip-service.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of thus opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India 7 April, 1965.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

On 10th March, 1965, the Government of India sent a protest note to the Chinese Government on learning that a so-called Boundary Protocol under the illegal Sino-Pakistan Boundary Agreement entered into by both countries in March 1963, was going to be signed during the visit of China's Foreign Minister to Pakistan. The Government of India have seen reports that this so-called Protocol has actually been signed on March 26, 1965.

The State of Jammu and Kashmir forms an integral part of India and the Chinese Government has neither right nor legality on its side in conducting the present series of negotiations with the Government of Pakistan. China has no common border with Pakistan and the territory referred to in the so-called Sino-Pakistan Boundary Protocol is part of India's Jammu and Kashmir State where the occupying forces of Pakistan have entrenched themselves in defiance of international law. As has been pointed out repeatedly on earlier occasions by the Government of India, any such illegal arrangements involving Indian territory between parties that have no legal or constitutional locus standi in invalid and inadmissible. The actions of the Chinese and Pakistan Governments in holding talks between officials of the two countries, signing a so-called Agreement and a Protocol, setting up boundary pillars on Indian territory etc. are illegal and no Government of India, present or future, will recognize the validity of these actions.

The Government of India strongly protest against the signing of the so-called Boundary Protocol. The signing of the so-called Boundary Protocol by the Chinese Government is final proof of the
fact, that motivated solely by their hostility towards India, the Chinese Government and the Government of Pakistan are opportunistically making use of their unlawful seizure of parts of the Indian Union territory of Jammu and Kashmir.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 17 May, 1965.

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tza No. 358

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and with reference to the notes of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated March 10, and April 7, 1965 has the honour to state as follows:

1. In its two notes in question the Indian Government lodged so-called protests and repeated its unreasonable attacks on China in connection with the signing of the protocol by China and Pakistan on the demarcation of the boundary between China's Sinkiang and the contiguous areas the defence of which is under the actual control of Pakistan. The Chinese Government categorically rejects these protests and attacks.

2. In the past three years the Indian Government delivered eight notes to the Chinese Government on the efforts of China and Pakistan to settle their boundary question and made endless anti-China clamours. It repeatedly shouted that “China and Pakistan have no common border” that “the Chinese Government has neither right nor legality on its side in conducting the present series of negotiations with the Government of Pakistan,” that “China is making use of the Kashmir question in order to poison relations between India and Pakistan,” that she was “exploiting Indo-Pakistan differences in the pursuit of China's aggressive designs on India,” and so on and so forth. All these absurdities have long been completely refuted by the Chinese Government in its previous notes. The Indian Government can deceive nobody even if it repeats its slanders a thousand more times.

3. It is a well-known fact that China and Pakistan are neighbours with China's Sinkiang bordering on areas the defence of which is under the actual control of Pakistan. This boundary is several hundred kilometers long and was never delimited before. Both China and Pakistan are sovereign states which have every right to delimit this boundary through negotiations. The sole purpose of China and Pakistan settling their boundary question was to ensure tranquility on the border and develop good neighbourly relations. It is explicitly provided in the China-Pakistan Boundary Agreement that after the settlement of the Kashmir question the Chinese Government will reopen negotiations on the boundary with the sovereign authorities concerned. Everyone can see that China's stand is fair, reasonable
and above board. How can it be alleged that China was making use of the Kashmir question to poison India-Pakistan relations or exploit India-Pakistan differences for the purpose of aggression against India?

4. The Indian Government has ceaselessly attacked China in connection with the settlement of the boundary question between China and Pakistan not because China has done anything wrong but because the Indian Government has been obstinately clinging to its anti-China policy. Unwilling to settle its own boundary question with China, India has made desperate attempts to prevent others from settling boundary questions with China. The Indian Government's great-power chauvinistic and expansionist position has become increasingly absurd as China settled her boundary question with one Asian neighbour after another through negotiations on an equal footing. That is why, in shame and anger it has fabricated all sorts of pretexts to attack China maliciously. Actually this will only further show up the awkward position and isolation it is in.

Now the boundary question between China and Pakistan has been smoothly settled. This is a very good thing, which is in the interests of Asian-African solidarity and world peace. It rejoices the peoples of Asia and Africa and all the peace-loving people of the world. It is futile for the Indian Government to spread slanderous news engaging in disruptive activities however energetically it may go about it.

5. The Chinese Government would like to advise the Indian Government: If it wants to deliver itself from isolation, it should change its stand of serving imperialism and undermining Asian-African solidarity, abandon its policy of great-power chauvinism and expansionism, and handle India's relations with other Asian-African countries and settle its boundary disputes with neighbouring countries in accordance with the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and the Ten Principles of the Bandung Conference. There is no other way. Should the Indian Government continue to haggle over the China-Pakistan boundary question the Chinese Government will pay no more attention.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 June, 1965.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office note dated the 17th May, 1965 has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government has, in its note under reply, tried in vain to justify and uphold, through propagandist arguments and slanderous allegations, the legally invalid and politically mischievous boundary agreement and protocol concluded between China and Pakistan. This so-called boundary agreement and protocol is an integral part of the growing and carefully calculated collaboration and collusion between
the Chinese and Pakistan Governments against India. To characterize it as a “very good thing which is in the interests of Asian-African solidarity and world peace” is to pass off evil for good and to underestimate the intelligence of those to whom this propaganda is directed.

2. The Chinese note makes the extra-ordinary assertion that “China and Pakistan are neighbours” because “China’s Sinkiang” borders on “areas the defence of which is under the actual control of Pakistan”. How did Pakistan, one may ask, gain actual control of these areas of the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir adjoining Sinkiang? It is well-known that Pakistan seized control of these areas by physical force through aggression. Therefore, Pakistan is a neighbour of China only by virtue of aggression and what the so-called Sino-Pakistan boundary agreement has done is to share between them the fruits of aggression at the expense of India.

3. The note of the Chinese Government says that “both China and Pakistan are sovereign States which have every right to delimit this boundary through negotiations”. But it is an admitted fact that Pakistan does not exercise sovereignty over the areas adjoining China. Even the Chinese note admits this when it refers to the “areas the defence of which is under the actual control of Pakistan”. Moreover, China and Pakistan, as sovereign States, have no right to delimit the boundary of an area which is under the sovereignty of neither and which is Indian territory. Again, while claiming that it is the sovereign right of China and Pakistan to delimit the boundary, the Chinese note says, almost in the same breath, that “after the settlement of the Kashmir question the Chinese Government will re-open negotiations on the boundary with the sovereign authorities concerned”. If anything is obvious from this, it is that neither Pakistan nor China has any right, sovereign or any other, to conclude a boundary agreement concerning territory which is legally and constitutionally a part of the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir.

4. The Chinese note has charged India with great-power chauvinism and expansionism and blamed it for not settling its boundary disputes with neighbouring countries. Great-power chauvinism and expansionism is a cap which fits the People’s Republic of China more than any other Government in Asia and Africa, and indeed in the whole world today. As for settling boundary disputes, it is China who has resorted to force in order to solve the Sino-Indian border problem in its favour and who has rejected all reasonable proposals for negotiations including the proposals made by the six Asian-African countries who met at the Colombo Conference.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Chinese Embassy the assurance of its highest consideration.
II. BORDER ISSUES AND INCIDENTS

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 January, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 4

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with regard to continued Indian intrusions, during the second half of 1964, into Chinese territory and airspace across the Sino-Indian border and Indian intrusive activities on the China-Sikkim and the China-Bhutan borders in the same period, has the honour to state the following:

I. During the second half of 1964, Indian troops made twenty-four intrusions into Chinese territory across the 'line of actual control' on the Sino-Indian border or across the China-Sikkim border (specific cases are listed in Annex I), of which the following instances are particularly serious:

(1) In the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border, Indian military and administrative personnel again intruded into and entrenched themselves in the Wuje area which China had vacated on its own initiative as one of the areas where there is a dispute about the cease-fire arrangements.

(2) In the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, so far the Indian troops have not yet dismantled the aggressive military structures at the Hsialinkung Terrace, which they built beyond the 'line of actual control' on the Chinese side. Moreover, they frequently carried out reconnaissance and harassment across that line.

(3) Along the China-Sikkim border, the Indian troops built about fifty aggressive military structures either beyond or on the boundary line at Tungchu La, Jelep La and Cho La, and posted guards there.

II. During the second half of 1964, Indian aircraft flew twenty-one sorties across the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border as well as across the China-Sikkim and the China-Bhutan borders, intruding into Chinese airspace over Sinkiang and Tibet (specific cases are listed in Annex II). These Indian aircraft brazenly carried out prolonged reconnaissance and harassment over China's territory, reaching as far as such important cities of Tibet or Sinkiang as Lhasa, Shigatsye, Damsune, Pishan and Hotien, with one penetrating as far as the Szechuan Province. The farthest point of such Indian air intrusions was some 350 kilometres behind the 'line of actual control' on the Sino-India border.

III. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against its above-mentioned grave intrusion into China's territory and airspace, and urges the Indian side to put an immediate end to such unlawful intrusions.
IV. It must also be pointed out that in its note dated September 5, 1964, the Indian Government, as usual, flatly denied the well-established facts of Indian intrusions into Chinese territory and airspace during the first half of 1964. What is more, it vilely charged that China's protest against the Indian intrusions was "solely for the purpose of stepping up more tension on the border". Such an arbitrary and overbearing attitude of the Indian Government of indulging in making intrusions while forbidding others to protest against the same exactly reveals its own "expansionist nature". If the Indian Government has any scruple about just condemnations, it should put an immediate end to all its intrusive activities against China, for no amount of denial or vile charges can cover up the crime of aggression of the Indian side.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
ANNEXURE I

Intrusions into Chinese Territory by Indian Troops during the Second Half of 1964

I. Intrusions into China’s Sinkiang and Tibet to the east of the 1959 ‘line of actual control’ in the Western sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. On July 16, 1964, at 1415 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Spanggur in China’s Tibet for reconnaissance.

2. On August 2, 1964, at 1924 hours, one Indian jeep carrying three Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Spanggur in China’s Tibet for reconnaissance.

3. On August 11, 1964, at 1010 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Tienwentian in China’s Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

4. On August 12, 1964, at 1300 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Spanggur in China’s Tibet for reconnaissance.

5. On August 12, 1964, at 1320 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Tienwentian in China’s Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

6. On August 15, 1964, at 1900 hours, seven Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in China’s Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

7. On August 21, 1964, at about 1000 hours, one Indian officer and two soldiers intruded into Demchok in China’s Tibet for reconnaissance.

8. On August 22, 1964, at 1530 hours, seven Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the Civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in China’s Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance there for about one hour and twenty minutes.

9. On September 14, 1964, at 1100 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Spanggur in China’s Tibet for reconnaissance.

10. On September 15, 1964, at 1130 hours, one Indian soldier intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Tienwentian in China’s Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

11. On October 8, 1964, at 1715 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Tienwentian in China’s Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance there for more than two hours.
12. On October 9, 1964, at 1230 hours, one Indian soldier intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Tienwentsian in China's Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance there for more than three hours.

13. On October 20, 1964, at 1800 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Spanggur in China's Tibet for reconnaissance.

14. On November 24, 1964, at 1250 hours, four Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Tienwentsian in China's Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance for more than one hour.

II. Intrusions into China's Tibet to the north of the 1959 'line of actual control' in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border:

In the summer of 1964, Indian military and administrative personnel again intruded into and entrenched themselves in the Wuje area which China had vacated on its own initiative as one of the areas where there is a dispute about the cease-fire arrangements.

III. Intrusions into China's Tibet to the north of the 1959 'line of actual control' in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border:

So far the Indian troops have not yet dismantled the aggressive military structures at the Hsialinkung Terrace which they built beyond the 'line of actual control' on the Chinese side and frequently carried out reconnaissance and harassment across that line.

IV. Intrusions into China's Tibet along the China-Sikkim border:

1. On July 1, 1964, at about 1300 hours, five Indian soldiers crossed the Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary and intruded into China's territory for reconnaissance lasting about two hours.

2. On July 11, 1964, at about 1400 hours, three Indian soldiers crossed the China-Sikkim boundary and intruded into the area north of the Peilung La for reconnaissance.

3. On August 12, 1964, at about 1400 hours, five Indian soldiers crossed the Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary and intruded into China's territory for reconnaissance.

4. On August 14, 1964, at about 1500 hours, four Indian soldiers crossed the Peilung La on the China-Sikkim boundary and intruded into China's territory for reconnaissance.

5. On November 27, 1964, a group of Indian soldiers crossed the Latuo La on the China-Sikkim boundary, intruded into China's territory for reconnaissance and harassment and seized 59 yaks belonging to Tibetan herdsmen.

6. Indian troops crossed the Tungchu La and intruded into China's territory, successively building nearly twenty aggressive military
structures (dug-outs, shelters, bulwarks, etc.) either on the Chinese side of the Tungchu La or on the boundary line, and unlawfully entrenched themselves there.

7. Indian troops crossed the Jelep La and intruded into China's territory, building 27 aggressive military structures (dug-outs, bulwarks, etc.) either on the Chinese side of the Jelep La or on the boundary line, and placed guards there.

8. Indian troops intruded into the Cho La on the China-Sikkim boundary and built four aggressive military structures on the boundary line.

9. Indian soldiers continued their unlawful entrenchment on the Chinese side of the Natu La and refused to withdraw.
ANNEXURE II

Indian Air Intrusions into China’s Airspace during the Second Half of 1964

I. Intrusions into the airspace of China’s Sinkiang and Tibet to the east and to the north of the 1959 ‘line of actual control’ in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. On July 17, 1964, at 14.45 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Nyagzu in Tibet.

2. On August 4, 1964, at 11.30 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over the area southwest of Tashigong in Tibet.

3. On September 23, 1964, at about 13.00 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over the civilian checkpoint at Tienshuihai, Howeitan, the Galwan River Valley and other places in Sinkiang and circled over there for about one and half hours for reconnaissance, penetrating as deep as more than 120 kilometres inside China.

4. On October 1, 1964, at 12.43 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over the civilian checkpoint at the Kongka Pass, the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs, Linghithang, the Aksai Lake, the Tsoggar Tso, Shanho and other places in Sinkiang and Tibet and circled over there for one hour and twenty minutes for reconnaissance, penetrating nearly 140 kilometres inside China.

5. On October 7, 1964, at 12.45 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over Tashigong and other places in Tibet.

6. On October 12, 1964, at 13.48 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over the Galwan River Valley, Howeitan and other places in Sinkiang.

7. On October 13, 1964, at 13.53 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over the area northeast of the civilian checkpoint at Nyagzu in Tibet.

8. On October 16, 1964, at 11.30 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over the area south of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet.

9. On October 20, 1964, at 11.00 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over the area south of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet.

10. On December 16, 1964, at about 13.10 hours, an Indian aircraft coming from a point southeast of Pulan, Tibet, intruded into
China's airspace and flew northward along the Sinkiang-Tibet Road, passing over Gartok, Gargunsa, Rudok and Shanho in Tibet and Howeitan, Tienwentian, Kangsewar and Saittulla in Sinkiang. It went as far as Pishan at 14.57 hours, then turned east to Hotien and then turned back to Kangsewar, whence it again followed the Sinkiang-Tibet Road, flying over Tienshuihai, Shanho, Gargunsa and other places, and returned to India. The aforesaid aircraft conducted reconnaissance over Chinese territory for as long as about three hours and penetrated as deep as about two hundred and fifty kilometres inside China.

II. Intrusions into the airspace of China's Tibet to the east and to the north of the 1959 'line of actual control' in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. On July 19, 1964, at 13.15 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Demchok, Tashigong, Gargunsa, Toling, the civilian checkpost at Poling and other places in Tibet and carried out reconnaissance for nearly an hour.

2. On July 22, 1964, at 12.13 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Silangta and other places in Tibet and circled over there for reconnaissance.

3. On August 12, 1964, at 10.10 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace for reconnaissance over the civilian checkpost at Poling and other places in Tibet.

4. On September 23, 1964, at 13.10 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Shipki and other places in Tibet and circled over there for reconnaissance.

III. Intrusions into the airspace of China's Tibet to the north of the 1939 'line of actual control' in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. On July 4, 1964, at 19.10 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Migyitun and its vicinity in Tibet and circled over there for reconnaissance.

2. On October 13, 1964, at 13.35 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Tsayul in Tibet.

3. On December 17, 1964, at about 13.20 hours, an Indian aircraft coming from a point southwest of Tsona, Tibet, intruded into China's airspace and flew over Linchih and other places. Then it flew eastward, reaching as far as Paiyu, Szechuan Province, whence it turned round, flying over Chiangda, Chamdo, Pienpa and other places in Tibet. It continued to fly over Lhasa and then, in a southwesterly direction, passing over Gyantse, until it left China. The harassing flight of this Indian aircraft inside China lasted more than three hours, penetrating as far as more than three hundred kilometres behind the 'line of actual control' on the Sino-Indian border.
4. On December 20, 1964, at about 1300 hours, an Indian aircraft coming from a point southwest of Rongshar, Tibet, intruded into China's airspace and flew over Shigatse, Gyantse, Lakang, Jiacha and other places until it intruded into the airspace over Lhasa at 1442 hours. Then it flew northward over Damshune, reaching as far as the vicinity of Nagchuka, and then turned round to fly over Damshune and Lhasa again. Then it flew in a south-westerly direction until it left China at a point southeast of Khamba. The harassing flight of this Indian aircraft over China's territory lasted about three hours, penetrating about three hundred and fifty kilometres behind the 'line of actual control' on the Sino-Indian border.

IV. Intrusions into China's airspace over Tibet across the China-Bhutan and the China-Sikkim borders:

1. On July 10, 1964, at 22.00 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the area southwest of the Pumuchang Lake in Tibet.

2. On December 15, 1964, at 11.03 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Yatung and its vicinity in Tibet and circled over there for reconnaissance.

3. On December 17, 1964, at about 13.00 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the area south of the Lamo Lake in Tibet.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 2 April, 1965.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government’s note of January 18, 1965.

2. The Chinese Foreign Office has made a number of allegations of intrusions into Chinese territory by Indian army personnel and of violations of Chinese air space by Indian aircraft during the second half of 1964. These allegations have been carefully investigated and every one of them has been found to be completely false and baseless. The Government of India, therefore, categorically reject the protest note of the Chinese Government. A detailed refutation of the Chinese allegations is made in the two annexures to this note.

3. The Government of India had stated, on many occasions in the past, that Indian defence personnel and aircraft have strict instructions not to cross the international borders of India, or the so-called ‘line of actual control’ in the Western Sector or the well-recognised Sikkim-Tibet border. There has not been a single instance when these instructions of the Government of India have not been observed by Indian military personnel and aircraft. Even though India does not recognise the so-called ‘line of actual control’ created by China through military aggression in the Western Sector, Indian defence forces have not crossed this line in the hope that the Government of China will eventually see the error of its ways and agree to negotiations on the basis of the Colombo Proposals and undo the aggression it has committed on the soil of India. It is amazing that, in spite of the self-restraint and desire for peaceful settlement demonstrated by India, the Chinese Government persists in fabricating false charges from time to time about Indian intrusions into Tibet and Sinkiang. Obviously, these baseless allegations are being made and widely disseminated through the high-powered organs of Chinese propaganda in order to step up tension and to worsen the border situation and to cover up the provocative intrusions Chinese troops have been constantly making into Indian territory across the border. This false and strident propaganda against India is the anti-thesis of the concept of Asian-African solidarity which China so glibly talks about.

4. The Chinese Foreign Office has attached to its note of January 18, two annexures which contain a long list of alleged intrusions by India into Tibet and Sinkiang. These annexure are nothing but a catalogue of falsehoods. In order to make the list of violations long and impressive, a large number of allegations which had been made in the past and which were conclusively refuted and rejected by the Government of India, have been repeated without further argument or evidence.
5. As for the fresh allegations in the list, they are not only false but are alleged to have taken place many months ago. No formal or informal protests were made about these so-called intrusions earlier. It would seem that the Chinese Government has been piling up these fabrications over a period of time and has now put them forward altogether in a note for creating a propaganda effect. But adding zeroes to zero can only result in a zero. This new Chinese technique of the long lie is nothing but an adaptation of the old and discredited Hitlerian propaganda technique of the big lie. The Chinese note betrays this mischievous propaganda motive of the Chinese Government when it talks of the "expansionist nature" of the Indian Government and "the crimes of aggression of the Indian side". Who is expansionist and who is committing crimes of aggression is well-known to the world. Everybody knows that it is China which is expansionist and chauvinistic and is guilty of aggression. It is China, not India, which has the largest army in the world, which has mobilized millions of its people into a vast militia on the belligerent principle that every citizen should be an armed soldier; it is China which has exploded a nuclear bomb contrary to the Bandung Declaration prohibiting nuclear tests and is frantically trying to explode more such bombs; it is China which has laid aggressive claims to large areas of Indian territory and is in illegal occupation of 14,500 sq. miles of Indian territory in Ladakh; and, it is China which is openly preaching world revolution through violence and advocating the sordid doctrine of the inevitability of war.

6. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.
ANNEXURE I

1. Allegations of intrusions by Indian personnel across the so-called line of actual control in the Western Sector of the India-China border.

In Section I of Annexure I of the Chinese note under reply, a list of 14 allegations have been made of Indian personnel crossing the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector. These incidents are stated to have taken place several months ago, some of them as far back as on July 16, August 2, August 11, 1964, etc. In spite of the fact that these so-called violations have been brought to the notice of the Government of India after a very considerable lapse of time, careful enquiries have been made and it has been found that these allegations are absolutely false and baseless.

The places where Indian soldiers are alleged to have intruded, viz., Spanggur, Hot Springs and the place in the Chip Chap region which the Chinese Government refer to as Tienwentian, etc. are all in Indian territory which has been illegally occupied by China. Even though these places are part of the sovereign territory of India, Indian personnel have not visited these places in keeping with the recommendations of the Colombo Proposals, as they are located east of the so-called 'line of actual control'. As for Demchok which is mentioned in item 7 of Section I of Annexure I of the Chinese note, the Chinese Government is aware that it is on the Indian side of the 'line of actual control' and even Chinese maps have shown it accordingly. There is, therefore, no question of Indian troops "intruding" into Demchok.

It should also be mentioned that the Chinese "civilian checkposts" at Hot Springs, Spanggur and in the Chip Chap region ("Tienwentian") are in the 20 km demilitarized zone, where China has set up posts unilaterally in defiance of the provisions of the Colombo Proposals

2. Allegations of intrusions by Indian personnel in the Middle Sector of the India-China border.

The Chinese allegation that Indian military and administrative personnel "intruded and entrenched" themselves in Barahoti, which the Chinese Government refer to as Wuje, is an old one, which the Chinese have been mechanically repeating since July 30, 1962. These have been thoroughly refuted by the Government of India in their notes dated August 27, 1962, April 9, 1963, and March 26, 1964.

Barahoti, as has been amply proved in various notes of the Government of India and during the Officials' Talks of 1960, is clearly on the Indian side of the international border in the Middle Sector.

The Government of India had stated in their note dated April 9, 1963 that in view of the Chinese Government's assurances that they
have decided “to vacate” the Wuje (Barahoti) area, the Government of India would reciprocate “by suspending the practice of sending civilian personnel to the Barahoti Plain which has been followed hitherto”. The Government of India had in fact, as long ago as 1958, suggested that neither civil nor military personnel of either side should be sent to the Barahoti area, but it was the Chinese Government which turned it down then. However, since the Chinese Government gave assurances in their note dated April 3, 1963 that they will not set up civil posts at Barahoti, the Government of India taking note of this have sent no administrative personnel to this area, much less have they “entrenched themselves” there, as is alleged in the Chinese note under reply.


The Chinese allegations that Indian troops have not yet dismantled the so-called military structures at Hsialinkung Terrace, supposed to have been built across the international border in this area, is an old and baseless charge. The Chinese Government first mentioned it as early as on July 30, 1963 and have repeated it on numerous occasions. The international border in this region, namely, McMahon Line, is clearly known and well-defined. As has been pointed out in the Government of India note dated August 8, 1963, and in subsequent notes on the subject, there has been no instance of Indian personnel having crossed the border in this area, much less erected military structures. There is no question, therefore, of dismantling military structures which do not exist in the first place.

4. Allegations of intrusions by Indian personnel across the Sikkim-Tibet border.

As the Chinese Government itself has recognised, the Sikkim-Tibet border is well-known and clearly defined under the Anglo-Chinese Convention of 1890. The Chinese allegations that Indian troops have intruded into Tibet across the Sikkim border and built military structures on the Tibetan side, have already been rejected in various Government of India notes.

Items 3 and 4 of Section IV of Annexure I to the Chinese note have been the subject matter of a Chinese note dated 28 September, 1964 and have been refuted in the Government of India note dated 6th November, 1964. In this note, it was clearly pointed out that the places where Indian soldiers have allegedly intruded like ‘Tagi La’ and ‘Peilung La’ do not correspond to the names of any of the passes that the Government of India are aware of on this well-known Sikkim-Tibet border and the annexure to the Chinese note does not give the location and the co-ordinates of the “passes”. Items 1 and 2 also refer to the places mentioned above and refer to incidents, alleged to have taken place on July 1 and July 11, 1964. The Government of India are absolutely certain that no Indian troops have ever crossed the Sikkim-Tibet border. The Chinese Government’s allegations are therefore nothing but pure fabrications.
Items 5—9 of Section IV of Annexure I, once again are repetitions of the false allegations contained in a Chinese Government's note dated 3 January, 1965, which have been dealt with in the Government of India's reply dated 2 February, 1965. In this note, the Government of India had stated: "The Government of India are absolutely certain that their troops and defence works are located beyond any possibility of doubt on the Sikkim side of the border. They have not stationed any troops or built any military structures whatsoever on the Tibetan side of the border, nor have Indian troops crossed the border at any point and seized yaks from Chinese herdsmen as alleged in the Chinese note. The Government of India, therefore, categorically reject the protest lodged by the Chinese Government as entirely baseless and unwarranted".

The Chinese Government's repetitions of these allegations, which have been proved baseless, are only a cover for the Chinese Government's massive military build-up on the Tibetan side of the Sikkim-Tibet border and are projection of China's aggressive designs.
ANNEXURE II

1. Allegations of aerial intrusions by Indian aircraft across the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector of the India-China border.

In Section I of Annexure II to the Chinese note of January 18, 1965, 10 allegations have been made of Indian aircraft crossing the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector. In some of the alleged incidents, it has even been stated that Indian aircraft actually overflew places in Sinkiang and Tibet. The Government of India categorically repudiate all these allegations.

Most of the places mentioned in this section of Annexure II of the Chinese note under reply, like Nyagzu, Chip Chap region, Galiwan River Valley, Kongka Pass, Hot Springs, Lingzithang, Aksai Lake and the area to the South of Lake Spanggur are located in Indian territory in Ladakh, which is now under the illegal occupation of China. In keeping with their acceptance of the Colombo Proposals, the Government of India have given strict instructions to Indian aircraft not to cross the so-called 'line of actual control'. Therefore, the allegation contained in items 3 and 4—Section I of Annexure II that an Indian aircraft circled over for about one and a half hour and for one hour and twenty minutes respectively across the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector is completely false. Items 6, 7, 8, and 9 in this section also refer to places to the east of the 'line of actual control' in India's Ladakh under China's illegal occupation, and these allegations are equally false. The allegations that Indian aircraft flew over places in Tibet and Sinkiang are even more ridiculous.

2. Allegations of aerial intrusions by Indian aircraft across the Middle Sector of the India-Tibet border.

The statement at 1 of Section II of Annexure II that on July 19, 1964 an Indian aircraft "intruded" into China's airspace over Tashigong, Gargunsa, Toling and Poling is merely the repetition of an old allegation which was made in a Chinese note dated July 27, 1964. The Government of India had denied and rejected this allegation in its note dated 9 September 1964. It must be pointed out, however, that though no Indian aircraft has flown over Demchok on July 19, 1964, as the Chinese note alleges, Demchok is Indian territory which even according to Chinese maps is on the Indian side of the so-called 'line of actual control'.

As for the other fabrications contained in items 2 to 4 Section II of Annexure II to the Chinese note, these refer to incidents which are supposed to have taken place between July 22—September 23, 1964. Government of India are absolutely certain that no Indian aircraft has overflown Tibetan territory across the well-established border in the Middle Sector.

No Indian aircraft have ever crossed the well-recognised international border of India in the Eastern Sector, namely the MacMahon Line. For the Chinese Government to allege that Indian aircraft made "harassing flights" for three hours penetrating 350 km beyond the international border is both ridiculous and mischievous. The same applies to allegations contained in items 1 and 2 of Section III of Annexure II that Indian aircraft overflew the Chinese post at Migyithun on July 4, 1964 and over the vicinity of the Chinese post at Tsayal in Tibet on October 13, 1964. As for items 3 and 4 of Section III of Annexure II to the Chinese note, the Chinese Government are only repeating allegations already made in a Chinese Government note dated 28 December, 1964 which were repudiated in the Government of India note dated 11 January, 1965.

4. Allegations of aerial intrusions by Indian aircraft into Tibet across the Bhutan-Tibet and Sikkim-Tibet borders.

There is absolutely no substance in any of the three allegations contained in Section IV of Annexure II to the Chinese Government's note under reply. They are pure fabrications.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 April, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:—

On April 1, 1965, a Chinese military patrol intruded approximately six miles west of the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Chip Chan River Valley region of Ladakh. (Longitude 73°01 E, Latitude 35°17' N). It is evident that the Chinese patrol had proceeded from the check-post which the Chinese Government has set up in the Chip Chap River Valley region in the 20 k.m. demilitarized zone in defiance of the Colombo Proposals. By this military activity and intrusion, the Chinese Government has—(i) introduced military personnel in the 20 k.m. demilitarized zone, contrary to the provisions of the Colombo Proposals and the unilateral declaration of the Chinese Government itself; (ii) crossed the 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector in defiance of the Colombo Proposals and the Chinese declaration; and (iii) intruded into territory which, even according to the Chinese Government, is indisputably Indian. The Government of India lodge a strong protest against this blatant violation of Indian territory by Chinese military personnel and urge the Chinese Government to desist from such activities which are calculated to create tension and conflict between the two countries.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 May, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to say the following:—

At 1200 hours on May 9, 1965, a Chinese military party intruded approximately half a mile into Indian territory from across the Mana Pass in the Middle Sector of the India-Tibet border. On seeing an Indian police patrol at a distance on the Indian side of the border, the Chinese intruders fired three shots and withdrew into Tibet through the Mana Pass.

The Government of India hereby lodges a strong protest against this deliberate violation of Indian territory by Chinese military personnel. The international boundary in the Middle Sector of the India-China border is marked by clear natural features and is long-established and well-understood. Even according to the Chinese
Government's description of the India-China border for the Middle Sector given by the Chinese officials in 1960 at the Officials' Talks, it was clearly admitted that the boundary passes through the Mana Pass. Moreover, the Mana Pass has been specifically mentioned as a border Pass in the 1954 Agreement, between the Governments of India and China, on Trade and Intercourse between the Tibet region of China and India. There could be no ambiguity, therefore, about the boundary in the area where the latest Chinese intrusion has taken place. It is, undoubtedly, a deliberate act of violation and provocation which can only serve to increase tension along the India-China border. The Government of India urges the Chinese Government to put a stop to these aggressive activities on the part of Chinese forces.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic to China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 31 May, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 366

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to refute the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated April 21, 1965, as follows:

The Indian note falsely alleged that on April 1, 1965, a Chinese military patrol crossed the line of actual control in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border and "intruded approximately six miles west of the... line... in the Chip Chap River Valley region of Ladakh. (Longitude 18°01' E, Latitude 35°17' N), and lodged a so-called protest. The allegation is an out-and-out fabricated and deliberate attempt to smear China.

It is well-known that the Chinese Frontier Guards long ago completed their 20-kilometre withdrawal behind the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border. Making no positive response to this, the Indians have incessantly crossed the line and made harassments in the past two years or more. Nevertheless, China has all along adhered to its decision and has never sent a single soldier into the 20-kilometre zone on the Chinese side of the line of actual control. The Chinese Government's sincere desire for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question is evident. The fact that the Indian Government has fabricated a charge, spread groundless rumours and attacked the Chinese Government once again proves that it is none other than the Indian Government which has made the deliberate attempt "to create tension and conflict between the two countries". The Chinese Government categorically rejects the Indian side's unwarranted protest.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 7 June, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 409

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following in refutation of the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated May 14, 1965 which falsely accused Chinese military personnel of transgression in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian boundary:

In order to maintain the tranquillity on the Sino-Indian border, for a long time China has refrained from sending any military personnel into the 20-kilometre-zone on the Chinese side of the line of actual control in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border. It is an out-and-out fabrication for the Indian Government to allege in its note that on May 9, 1965 a Chinese military party intruded into Indian territory from across the Mana Pass and fired three shots at an Indian police control at a distance. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the unwarranted and mischievous protest of the Indian Government.

It must be pointed out that the middle sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, like its eastern and western sectors, has never been formally delimited, but that there exists a traditional customary line. In pursuance of an expansionist policy, the Indian Government breached this traditional customary line and has, up to now, occupied about two thousand square kilometres of Chinese territory in the middle sector. China has all along exercised restraint and forbearance on this matter and stood for a settlement by means of negotiations. The Indian Government, however, has always unreasonably rejected negotiations and, in order to feed its anti-China propaganda, has now fabricated the fantastic tale of Chinese military personnel transgressing across the Mana Pass. Recently, the Indian Government has more than once resorted to such false charges. It will certainly not succeed in its attempt to play new tricks by such tactics.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 11 June, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 390

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated December 31, 1964 and January 21 and February 2, 1965:

1. Indian troops have built military works beyond or astride of the China-Sikkim border, seized Chinese herdsmen and livestock and carried out other aggressive activities. These are all incontestable facts which the Indian Government can hardly deny. But in its note of February 2, 1965, India alleged that these activities were
carried out "on Sikkim side," and continued to deny knowledge of
the location of Tungchu La and other passes. Such unreasonable
quibblings, instead of absolving the Indian Government of its guilt,
have served all the more to reveal the premeditated nature of its
intrusions.

2. In order to mislead the public, the Indian Government has
repeatedly spread the rumour that China has concentrated large
numbers of troops on the China-Sikkim border. In its notes of
December 31, 1964 and January 21, 1965, it went to the length of
fabricating four incidents in which Chinese military men "intruded
into Sikkim," and alleged that three of the "intrusions" took place
in the vicinity of Natu La. However, it is a well-known fact that
as early as September 1962 Indian troops invaded and occupied Natu
La and its vicinity on the China-Sikkim border, built military works
there and barricaded the pass. Then Indian troops built numerous
aggressive military works beyond or astride of the border at Jelep La,
Cho La and Tung-chu La, which are passes on both sides of Natu La,
and have up to now refused to withdraw in disregard of the protests
lodged by the Chinese Government. In these circumstances, how
would Chinese military personnel cross and recross the border at will
in the vicinity of Natu La? It is asserted in the Indian note of
December 31, 1964 that at 1710 hours on December 25 two armed
Chinese personnel "intruded into Sikkim", and that at 1720 hours on
the same day "a larger group of fifteen Chinese military personnel
were seen" in the same area. Yet, in replying to a question in Lok
Sabha on February 22, 1965, less than two months after the Indian
Government delivered the note, Indian Minister of State in the
Ministry of External Affairs Mrs. Lakshmi Menon stated that only
"two armed Chinese personnel intruded into Sikkim" on December
25, 1964. Such is the way the Indian Government babbles, telling
one story now and a different one another time. Which is the version
that counts, in the Indian Government's own opinion? It is ridic-
ulous for the Indian Government to lodge so-called protests with the
Chinese Government on the basis of such stories, which cannot stand
the slightest refutation.

3. It should be pointed out that, in making frequent intrusions
on the China-Sikkim border on the one hand and inventing lies about
so-called Chinese intrusions on the other, the Indian authorities
clearly aim at conducting anti-China propaganda, sowing discord
between China and Sikkim and creating tension. In order to make
the truth known to the world, the Chinese Government has repeatedly
suggested that China and India send their personnel to Natu La for
a joint investigation into India's intrusive activities. With a guilty
conscience, the Indian Government has never dared accept this
suggestion. As the Indian Government is once again reversing right
and wrong, the Chinese Government now deems it necessary to
renew this demand. Should the Indian Government dare to face
the reality, it ought to accept a joint investigation, in order to find
out which party has in fact been carrying out aggressive activities
on the China-Sikkim border.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity
to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its
highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 14 June, 1965.

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 446

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government has received reports which have been thoroughly verified to the effect that on the morning of May 29, 1965, three Indian soldiers crossed the China-Sikkim border and carried out reconnaissance and harassment for a long time on Chinese territory at Dai (approximately 28° 09' N, 88° 39' E) and its vicinity in Khamba County. What was particularly serious was that in broad daylight the intruding Indian soldiers forcibly abducted two young Chinese women named Damque and Jitzongm who were gathering dye-stuff at Dai. Up to now these women have not been released and their parents are overwhelmed by grief and anxiety over the loss of their daughters. These brigandish acts of the Indian soldiers who intruded into Chinese territory and kidnapped Chinese women in glaring violation of China's sovereignty have aroused intense resentment among the population of that area. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government and demands that it promptly return the abducted Chinese women, punish the culprits and take effective measures to ensure against the recurrence of such incidents.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 July, 1965.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs' note No. (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 446, dated the 14th June, 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India have thoroughly investigated the allegations contained in the Chinese note that on 29th May, 1965, three Indian soldiers crossed the Sikkim-Tibet border at a location approximately given as 28° 09' N, 88° 39' E, carried out reconnaissance and harassment, and "forcibly abducted two young Chinese women, named Damque and Jitzongm". The Government of India cannot but express their profound regret that the Government of the People's Republic of China finds it necessary to concoct increasingly absurd and baseless allegations in their attempt to maintain Sino-Indian border tension and to justify their anti-Indian posture.
The Chinese Government is aware that the boundary between Sikkim and Tibet has been clearly delimited by the Anglo-Chinese Convention of 1890 to which both India and China are parties. The boundary runs along well-defined and clearly distinguishable natural features and is well-known both to India and China. Indian personnel have always scrupulously respected this boundary and have at no time crossed the border at any place. It is, therefore, futile for the Chinese Government to persist in accusing India of border violations.

Investigations by the Government of India into the incident alleged in the Chinese protest note have shown that on May 29, 1965 two Tibetan women, who were fleeing from Tibet, entered Sikkim at approximately 28° 04' N, 88° 38' E. The two women, who gave their names as Thokchoe and Keyzom, stated to the Indian authorities that they had fled from Tibet because of the intolerable economic conditions obtaining in Tibet and because of the repressive measures adopted by the Chinese against the Tibetan people. They pleaded pathetically for refuge in Sikkim and declared that they had no desire to go back to Tibet. Evidently, the allegation that Indian soldiers had forcibly abducted two Tibetan women from Tibetan territory is a story which the Chinese Government has concocted in order to cover up the above incident. The Government of India categorically reject the Chinese protest note as a baseless fabrication. The Indian Government has no wish to interfere in the internal affairs of China, but must point out that manufacturing charges against India is no means of combating the popular discontent arising out of Chinese policies in Tibet.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 29 July, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 514

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with regard to Indian intrusive activities on the Sino-Indian and China-Sikkim borders during the first half of 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

1. During the first half of 1965 Indian troops made 26 incursions into Chinese territory across the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border or across the China-Sikkim boundary (specific cases are listed in Annex I). Among them, special mention should be made of the following:

(1) In the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, Indian troops not only failed to dismantle their military structures for aggression
which they had built on the Chinese side of the line of actual control at the Hsialinkung Terrace, but had in an even more unscrupulous manner carried out reconnaissance and harassment across the line.

(2) On the China-Sikkim border, apart from maintaining their military structures for aggression around Natu La, Tungchu La and two other passes and continuing their illegal entrenchment there, Indian troops made 10 intrusions in May and June into Chinese territory around Tagi La and other places and on one occasion carried out reconnaissance and harassment lasting as long as two hours. Of special gravity was the fact that on the morning of May 29, three Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory at Dai and its vicinity of Khamba County and in broad daylight abducted two young Chinese women named Damque and Jitzongm who were gathering dye-stuff at Dai. These two women have not been sent back up to now.

2. During the first half of 1965, Indian aircraft flew 12 sorties across the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border and intruded into Chinese airspace over Sinkiang and Tibet (specific cases are listed in Annex II), penetrating as deep as some 170 kilometres behind the line.

3. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government for the above-mentioned grave intrusions into Chinese territory and airspace in disregard of China's sovereignty.

4. In its note of April 2, 1965, the Indian Government vainly tried to quibble over or deny the Indian intrusions into Chinese territory and airspace during the second half of 1964. However, these stark facts cannot be covered up with lies on paper. The Indian note and its annexures, which are loaded with far-fetched phrases and worn-out arguments, contain malicious and wilful vilifications and slanders against China. These are indeed not worth refuting for they only show that with a guilty conscience, the Indian Government has found itself devoid of any presentable argument.

5. It should be pointed out that it is out of its domestic and foreign policy requirements that the Indian Government has kept sending its troops and aircraft to intrude into Chinese territory and airspace with a view to creating tension on the border. Notwithstanding this, the Chinese Government, in order to cut down the exchange of notes between China and India so as to facilitate a gradual ease of relations between them, has since the first half of 1964 taken the step of lodging a comprehensive protest with the Indian Government every half a year against the frequent Indian intrusive activities, except in cases of special gravity against which prompt protests are needed. An official of the Chinese Foreign Ministry clearly explained to Mr. Damodaran, First Secretary of the Indian Embassy in China, this measure and motivation of the Chinese Government when he handed the latter on July 7, 1964 the
Chinese Government's note containing a comprehensive protest against the Indian intrusions during the first half of 1964. The Chinese Government also informed the six Governments participating in the Colombo Conference of this measure taken by China in its note of July 10, 1964. This measure of the Chinese Government, which is open and above-board, is taken entirely out of goodwill. The Indian Government, however, alleged in its note of April 2, 1965 that "no formal or informal protests were made" by China about the Indian intrusions and that the Chinese Government had grouped together all the incidents of Indian intrusion in a single note for the purpose of propaganda. It is indeed astonishing that the Indian Government should have resorted to this petty trick of pretending to be ignorant and standing on its head. But the Indian Government certainly will not attain its end of covering up Indian intrusions by vainly attempting to distort China's well-intentioned measure. The Chinese Government wishes to advise the Indian Government once more that if it entertains any fear of its crimes of aggression being exposed, the only way is immediately to stop all its aggressive activities.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
ANNEXURE I

Intrusions into Chinese Territory by Indian Troops During the First Half of 1965

I. Intrusions into China's Sinkiang and Tibet to the east of the 1959 line of actual control in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. On February 10, at about 1000 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into an area near the civilian checkpost at Kongka Pass in Tibet for reconnaissance.

2. On February 24, at about 1400 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into an area near the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance for about one hour.

3. On February 26, at 1050 hours, one Indian soldier intruded into an area north of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet and conducted reconnaissance for more than one hour.

4. On March 14, at 2030 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into an area north of the civilian check-post at Spanggur in Tibet for reconnaissance.

5. On March 20, at about 1130 hours, one Indian soldier intruded into an area north of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet for reconnaissance.

6. On March 23, at 1440 hours, one Indian soldier intruded into an area near the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet for reconnaissance.

7. On April 17, at 1000 hours, one Indian soldier intruded into an area near the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

8. On the morning of April 29, two Indian soldiers intruded into areas around Rato in Tibet, conducted harassing activities for a long time and shot in provocation.

9. On May 10, at about 0800 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into an area near the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet for reconnaissance.

10. On the morning of June 19, three Indian soldiers intruded into an area near Rato in Tibet for reconnaissance.

II. Intrusions into China's Tibet to the north of the 1959 line of actual control in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. The Indian troops have not yet dismantled their military structures for aggression at Hsialinkung Terrace which they built on the
Chinese side of the line of actual control and frequently conducted unscrupulous reconnaissance and harassment across the line.

2. On May 30, at about 1200 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into an area near the civilian checkpoint at Sama for reconnaissance.

III. Intrusions into China’s Tibet along the China-Sikkim border:

1. On May 7, at about 1300 hours, eight Indian soldiers intruded into an area east of Tagi La for reconnaissance.

2. On May 12, at about 1300 hours, one Indian soldier intruded into an area east of Tagi La for reconnaissance.

3. On May 15, at about 1500 hours, four Indian soldiers intruded into an area east of Tagi La for reconnaissance.

4. On May 16, at about 1400 hours, two Indian soldiers with a hound crossed Kailu La and intruded into China’s territory for reconnaissance and harassment and seized a sheep from a Chinese herdsman.

5. On May 18, at about 1600 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into China’s territory near Tagi La for reconnaissance.

6. On the morning of May 29, three Indian soldiers intruded into Dai and its vicinity in Khamba County, conducted reconnaissance and harassment for a long time and abducted two Chinese women, named Damque and Jitzongm, who were gathering dye-stuff at Dai.

7. On May 29, at about 1400 hours, eight Indian soldiers intruded into an area east of Tagi La and conducted reconnaissance for about one hour and a half.

8. On June 6, at about 1400 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into China’s territory near Tzelung La and conducted reconnaissance for about one hour and a half.

9. On June 9, at about 1300 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into China’s territory near Tzelung La and conducted reconnaissance for about two hours.

10. On June 14, at about 1200 hours, two Indian soldiers with four hounds crossed Kailu La and intruded into China’s territory for reconnaissance.

11. The Indian troops have not yet dismantled their military structures for aggression which they have built since 1962 on China’s side of the border at Natu La, where they continue their unlawful entrenchment.

12. The Indian troops have not yet dismantled their military structures for aggression which they have built either on China’s side of the border or astride of the boundary at Tungchu La, where
they continue their unlawful entrenchment and from where they constantly prowl around.

13. The Indian troops continue to maintain the more than twenty military structures for aggression which they have built either on China’s side of the border or astride of the boundary at Jelep La and constantly carry out illegal activities in Chinese territory.

14. The Indian troops have still not dismantled their military structures for aggression which they have built astride of the boundary at Cho La.
ANNEXURE II

Indian Air Intrusions into China's Airspace during the First Half of 1965

I. Intrusions into the airspace over China's Sinkiang and Tibet to the east of the 1959 line of actual control in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. On February 6, at 1150 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Kongka Pass and its vicinity in Tibet.

2. On February 6, at 1155 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Tienwentian and its vicinity in Sinkiang.

3. On February 9, at 1140 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Kongka Pass and its vicinity in Tibet.

4. On February 27, at 1214 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Spanggur and its vicinity in Tibet.

5. On March 10, at 1100 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Spanggur and its vicinity in Tibet.

6. On June 2, at 1100 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Tienwentian and its vicinity in Sinkiang.

II. Intrusions into the airspace over China's Tibet to the north of the 1959 line of actual control in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. On January 23, at 1200 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over an area to the east of Tsayul, Chikung and other areas and conducted reconnaissance for nearly one and a half hours.

2. On February 24, at 1257 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Tsona, Lungtzu and other areas.

3. On February 25, at 1237 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the vicinity of Tsona and Lungtzu.

4. On March 5, at 1244 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Tsona, Lakang, Paiti and other areas for reconnaissance. At 1313 hours, this aircraft flew to the southwest of
1. Lhasa, then turned back to Lakang and other areas and left China through the China-Bhutan border at 1329 hours. It penetrated a depth of about 170 kilometres from the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border.

5. On March 6, at 1145 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace across the line of actual control at the vicinity of Sama, flew over Tsayul and Chikung in a northeasterly direction, then turned back to Tsayul, then flew in a northwesterly direction, and then passed over Janwu and other areas and returned to areas south of the line of actual control.

6. On April 14, 1230 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Tsona, the civilian checkpost at Chuna and other areas.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 7 August, 1965.

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 566.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, in refutation of the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, dated July 13, 1965, has the honour to reply as follows:

In its note of June 14, 1965 the Chinese Government lodged a serious protest with the Indian Government against the intrusion into Chinese territory across the China-Sikkim border by Indian soldiers on May 29 and their kidnapping of two Chinese women named Damque and Jitzongm. In its reply note dated July 13 the Indian Government not only failed to promise to take action against the brigandage of the Indian soldiers and to return the abducted Chinese women, but slanderously asserted that the two Chinese women asked for "refuge" in Sikkim, attempting thereby to detain them indefinitely. The Chinese Government expresses its indignation at this unscrupulous course of action taken by the Indian Government.

All the facts are there proving the Indian soldiers' crossing the border and abducting the two Chinese women, and no wilful distortion or denial by the Indian Government will succeed. A Chinese herdsman named Jatso of Jeju (Keyo) village, Khamba County, China, saw with his own eyes the three Indian soldiers crossing the border and intruding into Chinese territory. On the morning of May 29, together with Damque and Jitzongm, who were later abducted by the Indian soldiers, Jatso had set out from Chiehyueh pasture, about 5 kilometres northeast of Dai (approximately 88° 39' E and 23° 09' N), Khamba County. Damque and Jitzongm had gone to Dai to collect dye-stuffs whereas Jatso had gone to nearby places to graze his sheep. At around eleven o'clock in the morning, Jatso suddenly saw three Indian soldiers, one of them carrying a rifle, trespass into Chinese territory across the China-Sikkim border near Kailu La and advance towards Dai. Thereupon Jatso had driven his sheep to a safe place to hide them. Later, when he hurried back to Dai to look for Damque and Jitzongm, he found that they had been abducted by the invading Indian soldiers, leaving scattered on the ground the two bags they had brought with them containing the dye-stuffs just collected and the barley cake and butter they had taken with them as provisions. Clear traces of the abduction of the two women by the Indian soldiers could be seen on the spot and on the path leading to Sikkim. The Indian Government will never succeed in its sophistry in the face of such conclusive evidence, both personal and material.

The Indian Government alleged that Damque and Jitzongm had "fled" to Sikkim through 88° 38' E, 28° 04' N for "refuge". This is an utterly groundless fabrication. They have grown up from childhood in Jeju Village. Damque has a family of three who depend on one another, and Jitzongm lived a happy and harmonious life with her parents and the younger children of the family. Since the liberation of Tibet, their families have been allotted land or livestock and their standards of living have been improving from year
to year. Their parents and they themselves have always ardently loved their motherland, actively supported Government policies and responded to the calls of the Government. Moreover, by actively leading other people in production, Damque has won the deep love of her fellow villagers. On the said occasion, they had gone at the bidding of their parents to Dai and the surrounding areas to gather dye-stuffs for dyeing woollen cloth. Before their departure, they had fixed with their parents the date and time of their return, their itinerary and the place for lodging. They lodged at Chiehueh pasture during their gatherings of dye-stuffs. Their bedding, shawls, several days' rations and other belongings were all left there after they were kidnapped. In view of all these facts, who can believe that they would desert their beloved motherland and happy families, "flee" from Tibet and "plead pathetically for refuge" in Sikkim? And how could they, while gathering dye-stuffs, suddenly be in such a haste to "flee" that they did not even have the presence of mind to take their rations with them? The crude lie concocted by the Indian Government can deceive no one. As for the Indian Government's attempt to place into the mouths of these two young women such things as "repressive measures adopted against the Tibetan people" and "intolerable economic conditions obtaining in Tibet", which are phraseology consistently used by the Indian Government to slander China, it is really both stupid and shameless. Bandits are still pandits. The fact that Indian soldiers crossed the boundary line and abducted the women cannot be obliterated by any lies. The Indian Government's attempt to cover up its crimes and conduct anti-China propaganda by fabricating such nonsense as "pleading for refuge" is utterly futile and can only further expose its despicable line of action.

It must be pointed out that this was not the first time that Indian soldiers crossed the China-Sikkim boundary, intruded into Chinese territory and kidnapped Chinese border inhabitants. As early as August 5, 1963, Indian soldiers kidnapped two Chinese shepherds, Zlaba Mgonpo and Tshe Dhang, and seized more than 800 sheep, and they have hitherto not been sent back. These crimes committed by Indian soldiers constitute not only wilful violations of China's sovereignty but also serious threats to the safety of Chinese border inhabitants. They have aroused the great indignation of the families of the victims as well as all the Chinese people. They unanimously strongly condemn the brigandage of the Indian troops and resolutely demand the return of their kinsfolk. The Chinese Government once again lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government and sternly demands that the Indian Government immediately return the two abducted Chinese women so that they may reunite with their families back in the motherland. Pending this, the Indian Government must absolutely guarantee their safety. The Indian Government should also severely punish the culprits and effectively guarantee against similar cases.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 27 August, 1965.

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 613.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

According to verified reports from local Chinese authorities concerned, four serious cases took place in succession during July 1965 in which Indian troops intruded into Chinese territory across the China-Sikkim border and carried out wanton activities. The most striking case took place on the afternoon of July 22, when nine Indian soldiers with rifles and pistols intruded into Chinese territory from a point north of Cho La, a pass on the China-Sikkim boundary. They pitched a tent at the Riwujig pasture and prowled hither and thither for reconnaissance, harassment and the gathering of information, and even intruded into tents of Chinese herdsmen to seize things. On July 23, two of these Indian soldiers came as far as twelve kilometres from the China-Sikkim boundary to the Khunggalhaka pasture near Hsiasima, Yatung, Tibet, China. The nine intruding Indian soldiers left China at noon on July 24 only after illegally staying in Chinese territory for two days and nights. They left behind them in the places they had come to a great amount of evidence of their intrusion.

The three other cases of intrusion by Indian soldiers are given below:

1. On July 2, at about 1100 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory across Latuo La for reconnaissance.

2. On July 3, at about 1900 hours, a group of five Indian soldiers crossed the China-Sikkim border and intruded into Dongnan grassland in Tibet, China. They carried out reconnaissance and harassment for as long as four days within Chinese territory before leaving China near Tungchu La at about 1300 hours on July 7.

3. On July 10, at about 1800 hours, an Indian soldier crossed the border near Tagi La and was discovered by a Chinese shepherd called Trashe Tsawang who was grazing his flock within Chinese territory. The intruding Indian soldier fired two shots at, and narrowly missed, the shepherd.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against these acts of aggression in flagrant disregard of China's sovereignty, disturbing the tranquillity on the China-Sikkim border and menacing the security of Chinese inhabitants there.

Since 1960 the Chinese Government has repeatedly protested against Indian intrusions on the China-Sikkim border. However, India has not only turned a deaf ear to all these protests, it has even more intensely and rabidly stepped up its acts of aggression. It has successively built a great number of aggressive military structures either inside Chinese territory or on the boundary line across Natu
La, Tungchu La, Jelep La and Cho La. Indian troops have more than once intruded into Chinese territory to kidnap border inhabitants and grab livestock. In the three months from last May to July, a total of fourteen cases took place in which Indian troops crossed the China-Sikkim boundary to carry out reconnaissance and harassment. It is particularly serious that the intruding Indian troops had the audacity to pitch tents on Chinese territory and prowl hither and thither, some even coming as far as more than ten kilometres from the China-Sikkim boundary to the vicinity of Hsiasima of the important county of Yatung, Tibet. Some Indian soldiers stayed on Chinese territory for as long as four days. All this can by no means be tolerated by any sovereign state. The Chinese Government must warn India that if it does not immediately stop such acts of aggression and provocation, it must bear full responsibility for the consequences that may arise therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 September, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Emabassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note No. (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 613 of August 27, 1965.

The Government of India have examined the allegations contained in the Chinese note of August 27, 1965. These allegations relate to what the Note calls the illegal intrusions and activities of Indian soldiers on four occasions in the month of July, 1965, across Tibet-Sikkim border. Having regard to the serious nature of the allegations, the Government of India have had a careful enquiry made into them. They find that there is no truth in these allegations. No Indian soldier has crossed into Chinese territory. As a matter of fact, the Indian troops have strict instructions not to go beyond the boundary of Sikkim with Tibet. The Government of India find it hard to believe that Indian soldiers could cross into Tibet territory at will and fire shots as alleged in the Chinese Note, in an area which, it is well known, has a strong concentration of Chinese forces.

The Chinese Government's Note of August 27, 1965, also repeats certain baseless allegations made in their earlier notes, namely, the building of so-called aggressive military structures either inside Chinese territory or on the boundary line across Natu La, Jelep La, Tungchu La and Cho La. The Government of India have already effectively replied to these notes and refuted the Chinese allegations. The Government of India have not constructed any military structures in Tibetan territory. They have, of course, every right to construct such structures on the Sikkim side of the Tibet-Sikkim border.
The Government of India cannot understand why the Chinese Government should choose to make such unfounded allegations, at the present time, in an aggressive and threatening manner as is clear from the terms of the Chinese Note of August 27, 1965. The Government of India are constrained to conclude that the Chinese protest is intended to malign India and to cause confusion in the international world and also to prepare a pretext for any illegal actions directed against India which the Chinese Government might be contemplating. The Government of India reject the protest note handed by the Chinese Government.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 8 September, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 682.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

Indian troops crossed the China-Sikkim boundary on 4 successive occasions in July 1965 for unbridled harassment activities and instead of withdrawing continued to entrench themselves on Chinese territory. Against this the Chinese Government has already lodged a protest with the Indian Government and given it warning. Now Indian troops further repeatedly intruded into China's territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border in August and carried out reconnaissance and provocations close to Chinese civil check-posts.

1. On August 1 at about 1630 hours 4 Indian soldiers on horse back and carrying rifles intruded into Tibet China in the vicinity of the Kongka Pass and flanked the Chinese civil check-post at Kongka Pass to its south-east and south for reconnoitring and provocative activities lasting more than 3 hours, penetrating about 18 km. inside Chinese territory.

2. Between August 2 and 25, 4 groups of Indian soldiers successively intruded into vicinity of the civil check-post at Hot Springs in Sinkiang, China, along the Changlung river to conduct provocative activities. The details are as follows:

On August 2 at about 1620 hours 6 Indian soldiers on horse back intruded deep into China's territory to a point within 500 metres of the Chinese civil check-post at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance and map making for about one hour. At 1755 hours they turned south-west to a point about 3 km. to the south of the civilian check-post at Hot Springs and continued their activities there for more than one hour and half.
On August 17 at about 1120 hours 2 Indian soldiers intruded into an area south-east of the Chinese civilian check-post at Hot Springs and conducted reconnaissance there for more than 2 hours.

On August 21 at about 1320 hours and again on August 25 at about 1110 hours 3 Indian soldiers intruded into vicinity of the Chinese civilian check-post at Hot Springs and conducted reconnaissance there each time for nearly an hour.

The Chinese Government hereby lodge a strong protest with the Indian Government against the above described serious cases of Indian troops violating China's territory and sovereignty in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border for 5 successive times within a single month.

It is well known that thanks to the series of efforts made by China the situation on the Sino-Indian border has eased since the large scale armed conflict provoked by India in 1962. However India has never desisted from intrusion into Chinese territory. It has not only carried out frenzied provocative activities in all the sectors of the Sino-Indian border. It has repeatedly crossed the China-Sikkim boundary to penetrate deep into Chinese territory for harassment and even illegally built aggressive military structures beyond or on the China-Sikkim boundary which it refuses to withdraw up to now. All this shows that India has never for a moment abandoned the idea of creating new tension on the Sino-Indian border.

The Indian provocations in August in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border cannot be regarded as isolated cases. They are by no means accidental, occurring as they did at a time when the Indian Government was carrying out armed suppression against the people in Kashmir and unleashing and expanding its armed aggression against Pakistan. Facts have proved once again that India has not the slightest respect for its neighbours but makes incursions, harassment and encroachments upon them whenever there is a chance.

China cannot but pay serious attention to the Indian Government's expansionist actions against its neighbours and strengthen China's defences and heighten her alertness along her borders. The Chinese Government once again solemnly warns the Indian Government: India must dismantle all the aggressive military structures it has illegally built beyond or on the China-Sikkim boundary, withdraw its aggressive armed forces and stop all its acts of aggression and provocation against China in the western, middle and eastern sectors of the Sino-Indian border. Otherwise India must bear responsibility for all the consequences arising therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 12 September, 1965.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, and with reference to the Chinese Government's note of September 8, 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

2. It was only two weeks ago on August 27 that the Chinese Government had lodged a protest with India on alleged violations of the Tibet-Sikkim border by Indian troops. These allegations were repudiated by the Government of India in its note of September 2. It is interesting that the Chinese Government has rushed another note on the same subject a few days later, adding some more baseless allegations to the old charges and issuing unwarranted warnings and threats to the Government of India. This has only confirmed what the Government of India had stated in its note of September 2, namely, that the "Chinese protest is intended to malign India and to cause confusion in the international world and also to prepare a pretext for any illegal actions directed against India which the Chinese Government might be contemplating."

3. On several occasions in the past the Government of India have informed the Government of China that Indian troops have never crossed the Sikkim-Tibet boundary which has been formally delimited and is clearly distinguishable by well-marked natural features. Nor have Indian troops built any structures either on the Tibetan side of the border or on the border itself—there is indeed no need for India to do so. Therefore, the demand of the Chinese Government to dismantle the structures and to withdraw the troops is meaningless. But since the Chinese Government has been making these allegations and demands over and over again the Government of India are willing to allow an independent and neutral observer to go to the border in this sector in order to see for himself the actual state of affairs. Nothing could be fairer than this.

4. Extending the area of false allegations to the western sector the Chinese note alleges that Indian troops intruded into Kongka Pass and Hot Springs on five occasions. The Chinese note asserts that these places are in Tibet and Sinkiang respectively. It is necessary to point out that Kongka Pass and the Hot Springs are neither in Tibet nor in Sinkiang, but in Indian territory illegally occupied by China. Even though India does not recognise this illegal occupation and the so-called 'line of actual control' in the western sector (a phrase which surprisingly has not been used this time in the note under reply), the Government of India, exercising restraint in the interest of peace, has given strict instructions to all its personnel not to cross this line. These instructions have always been scrupulously observed by the Indian troops and personnel. The so-called five intrusions across 'the line of actual control' in August are, therefore, fictitious. The Government of India therefore rejects the protest of the Chinese Government.

5. The Chinese note under reply has made a reference to events in Kashmir and accused India of 'armed suppression against the people of Kashmir' and 'armed aggression against Pakistan'. This is a
complete distortion of facts. The world knows that it is Pakistan which committed aggression against India by sending out armed infiltrators into Kashmir across the cease-fire line and following it up by a massive attack across the international boundary in the Chhamb area of the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. The Pakistan attack was supported by heavy artillery, heavy aircraft and other weapons acquired by Pakistan under military pacts of which it is a member. Pakistan has further extended the conflict by air raids on Indian cities and civilian population. These are facts which are well-known to the world. The Chief Military Observer of the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan in his report to the U.N. Secretary-General has unequivocally stated that it was Pakistan which violated the cease-fire line in Kashmir by sending thousands of armed infiltrators into Kashmir. In the face of these facts it is extraordinary that Chinese should accuse India of 'suppressing the people of Kashmir' and of 'unleashing aggression' on Pakistan, when India is actually defending the people of Kashmir and the integrity of India against unprovoked Pakistan aggression.

6. The Chinese Government's attempt to connect the events in Kashmir with fictitious intrusions by Indian troops across the 'line of actual control' in the western sector is mischievous. The Kashmir question and India's unfortunate relations with Pakistan are a separate problem and has nothing to do with the Sino-Indian border question. In trying to connect the two, the Chinese Government is doing the opposite of what it had stated in its note to India of 31st May, 1962 viz. that the attitude of the Chinese Government is one of "never getting involved in the dispute over Kashmir" and also in contradiction to the declaration in the joint statement issued in Peking by the Prime Ministers of China and Poland on April 11, 1957, that the Kashmir issue "should not be allowed to be made use of by external forces to create new tensions". The involvement of external forces in the current unfortunate conflict imposed on India by Pakistan will only impede a peaceful solution at a time when India, the United Nations and the peace-loving countries of the world are urgently striving for the restoration of peace between the two countries.

7. On the Sino-Indian border question, to which the Chinese note makes a reference, any impartial observer would admit that India has striven her utmost to find a peaceful solution. In its ceaseless search for a settlement India has made a number of constructive proposals and also accepted mediatory proposals made by disinterested third parties friendly to both India and China. Notwithstanding China's mounting hostility India still preserves the hope that a peaceful settlement of the border question can and will be arrived at between the two countries.

8. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the
Embassy of India in China, 16 September, 1965.

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 760

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of
China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and
has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the notes of the
Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated September 2 and 12, 1965:

(1) In its notes the Indian Government continues to resort to its
usual subterfuges in an attempt to deny the intruding activities of
Indian troops along the Sino-Indian boundary and the China-Sikkim
boundary. This attempt cannot possibly succeed. Since cease-fire
and troop withdrawal were effected along the Sino-Indian border by
China on her own initiative in 1962, Indian troops have never
stopped their provocations, and there have been more than 300
intrusions into China either by ground or by air. The Chinese
Government has repeatedly lodged protests with the Indian Gov-
ernment and served warnings to it, and has successively notified
some friendly countries. The facts are there, and they cannot be
denied by the Indian Government by mere quibbling. Moreover,
the Chinese Government has four times proposed (the latest
occasion in June 1965) Sino-Indian joint investigation into India's
illegal construction of military works for aggression on the Chinese
side of the China-Sikkim boundary, but has each time been refused
by the Indian Government. Now, the Indian Government preten-
tiously says that the matter can be settled if only an independent
and neutral observer should go to the border to see for himself. It
further shamelessly asserts that Indian troops have never crossed
the Sikkim-China boundary which has been formally delimited
and that India has not built any military works either on the
Chinese side of the border or on the border itself. This is a bare-
faced lie. How can it hope to deceive anyone?

(2) It must be pointed out that, in each of its notes, the Indian
Government has blatantly claimed parts of Sinkiang and Tibet on
the Chinese side of the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary
to be Indian territory “illegally occupied” by China. But in fact
these areas have never belonged to India, and even had never been
marked as within Indian territory before India tampered with the
maps. On the other hand, it should be pointed out that 90,000 square
kilometres of Chinese territory south of the illegal McMahon Line
in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border have all along been
illegally occupied by India, that eight areas in the middle sector
and Parigas in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border are
also illegally occupied by India, and that such illegal occupation has
never been recognized by the Chinese Government. The Chinese
Government for ever retains the right to settle these questions.

(3) Supported by the U.S. imperialists and their partners, the
Indian Government has always pursued a policy of chauvinism and
expansionism towards its neighbouring countries. Its logic for
aggression is that all places it has seized belong to it and that
whatever place it wants to grab but has not yet done so belongs to it too. It was this logic that motivated the large-scale armed attack the Indian Government launched against China in 1962, and it is the same logic that motivates the massive armed attack it is now launching against Pakistan. The Chinese Government has consistently held that the Kashmir question should be settled on the basis of respect for the Kashmiri people's right of self-determination, as pledged to them by India and Pakistan. This is what is meant by China's non-involvement in the dispute between India and Pakistan. But non-involvement absolutely does not mean failure to distinguish between right and wrong; it absolutely does not mean that China can approve of depriving the Kashmiri people of their right of self-determination or that she can approve of Indian aggression against Pakistan on the pretext of the Kashmir issue. Such was China's stand in the past and it remains so at present. Yet some countries have acknowledged Kashmir as belonging to India. In that case, how can one speak of their non-involvement in the dispute? The question now is that India has not only refused to recognise the right of the Kashmiri people to self-determination, but openly launched an all-out armed attack against Pakistan, this cannot but arouse the grave concern of the Chinese Government. Reason and justice must prevail in the world. So long as the Indian Government oppresses the Kashmiri people, China will not cease supporting the Kashmiri people in their struggle for self-determination. So long as the Indian Government persists in its unbridled aggression against Pakistan, China will not cease supporting Pakistan in her just struggle against aggression. This stand of ours will never change, however many helpers you may have, such as the United States, the modern revisionists and the U.S. controlled United Nations.

(4) As is known to everybody, the Indian Government has long been using the territory of Sikkim to carry out aggressive activities against China. Since September 1962—not to mention earlier times—Indian troops have crossed the China-Sikkim boundary, which was delimited long ago, and have built a large number of military works for aggression either on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary or on the boundary itself. There are now fifty-six such military works, large and small, which they have built in the past few years all over the important passes along the China-Sikkim boundary, thus wantonly encroaching upon China's territory and violating her sovereignty. In these years, the Chinese Government has made thirteen representations to the Indian Government. But the Indian Government has all along turned a deaf ear to them and does not have the slightest respect for China's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Far from stopping its acts of aggression, the Indian Government has intensified them by ordering its troops to intrude into Chinese territory for reconnaissance and provocations. The intruding Indian troops even penetrated deep into Chinese territory, made unbridled harassing raids, kidnapped Chinese border inhabitants and seized their livestock. Is there any international boundary or any principle guiding international relations in the eyes of the Indian Government? This is indeed preposterous and going too far in bullying others!
The Chinese Government now demands that the Indian Government dismantle all its military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary or on the boundary itself within three days of the delivery of the present note, and immediately stop all its intrusions along the Sino-Indian boundary and the China-Sikkim boundary, return the kidnapped Chinese border inhabitants and the seized livestock and pledge to refrain from any more harassing raids across the boundary. Otherwise, the Indian Government must bear full responsibility for all the grave consequences arising therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 17 September, 1965.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Government's note No. (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 760 of September 16, 1965, has the honour to say as follows:—

Ever since the Sino-Indian border problem was raised by the Chinese Government, the Government of India had made strenuous attempts to settle the question peacefully and with honour. Even after the unprovoked Chinese attack across the border in October-November, 1962, the Government of India consistently followed the policy of seeking a peaceful settlement honourable to both the parties concerned. It was in this spirit that India accepted the Colombo Proposals, which China has not accepted hitherto.

2. As has been pointed out in various notes to the Chinese Government in the past, the Government of India has given strict instructions to its armed forces and personnel not to cross the international boundary in the Eastern and Middle Sectors and the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector. The Government of India are satisfied, after careful and detailed investigations, that Indian personnel as well as aircraft have fully carried out these instructions and have not transgressed the international boundary and the 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector at any time at any place. The Government of India, are, therefore, absolutely convinced that the allegations contained in the Chinese note under reply are completely groundless. The Government of India are constrained to reject these allegations and to reassert emphatically that they do not accept the claims to vast areas of Indian territory in the Western, Middle and Eastern Sectors of the border put forward in the Chinese note under reply. As regards China's stand on Kashmir and on the present unfortunate conflict between India and Pakistan, it is nothing but interference on the part of China calculated to prolong and to enlarge the conflict.

3. The Chinese note has once again repeated the allegations of so-called violations of the Sikkim-Tibet border by Indian personnel. These charges have been already answered and refuted by the
Government of India. Indian personnel have never crossed the Sikkim border and committed any harassments or raids into Chinese territory. Nor have they seized livestock belonging to Tibetan herdsmen or kidnapped any Chinese inhabitants from Tibetan territory. In the Government of India's note of July 13, 1965, it was clearly stated that the two Tibetan inhabitants alleged by the Chinese Government to have been kidnapped by Indian troops were actually refugees from Tibet who sought asylum in Sikkim. As the Chinese Government is aware a number of Tibetans have come over into India from time to time on their own volition and without our permission. Such persons are detained and questioned, and any of them desiring to go back to Tibet are always permitted to do so. The two Tibetans in question can also go back to Tibet if they wish to do so.

4. The Chinese Government's note has reasserted the old allegations that India has built military structures on the Tibetan side of the border. The Government of India has refuted this allegation on several occasions in the past. In September, 1962, some defence structures were constructed on the Sikkim side of the Sino-Indian frontier. These structures have not been in occupation since the cessation of hostilities in November, 1962. Since the Chinese Government alleged that some of the structures were on their side of the border India had, in its note of September 12, gone to the extent of suggesting that an independent observer be allowed to go to this border to see for himself the state of affairs. The Chinese Government has not, unfortunately, accepted this reasonable proposal of the Government of India, and has reiterated its proposal for joint inspection. Even though the Government of India are convinced that their troops have not built military structures in Tibetan territory, they have no objection to a joint inspection of those points of the Sikkim-Tibet border where Indian personnel are alleged to have set up military structures in Tibetan territory. The Government of India on their part are prepared to arrange such an inspection as early as possible, at an appropriate official level, on a mutually convenient date. If any structures are found on the Tibet side of the border, there can be no objection to their being demolished.

5. The Government of India would like to point out, in conclusion, that the charges made by the Chinese Government in its note are really minor ones and could well be settled through peaceful procedures such as those proposed in this note. These allegations do not, on any reckoning, justify the kind of threatening language and ultimatum held out by the Chinese Government. It is clear that China is fabricating these charges only to find a pretext for further aggression against India. India is a peaceful nation and has no desire for war-like conflicts. If, however, such a conflict is thrust on India by aggression from China the responsibility for the grave consequences that might follow from such action will lie squarely on the shoulders of the Chinese Government.

6. The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 September, 1965.

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 763.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated September 17, 1965 as follows:

The Chinese Government has noted a conspicuous change of tune in the note under reference compared with the previous notes of the Indian Government.

Over the past two years and more, the Chinese Government had on thirteen occasions made representations and lodged protests concerning the construction of military works for aggression by Indian troops crossing the China-Sikkim boundary, and the Indian Government invariably flatly denied its building of any military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary or on the boundary itself. In the present note, however, the Indian Government suddenly changes its tune by admitting that the possibility of the presence of its military works on the Chinese side is not excluded, stating that if any such works are found, there is no objection to their being demolished.

In all its previous notes, the Indian Government categorically refused to return the Chinese border inhabitants kidnapped by Indian troops. In the present note, however, it suddenly changes its tune by saying that two of the kidnapped Chinese inhabitants will be permitted to come back to China if they wish to do so.

The Indian Government four times rejected the Chinese Government's demand for a joint investigation as being unnecessary. In its present note, however, the Indian Government suddenly changes its tune by saying that it has no objection to a joint investigation, although the demand was not reiterated in the Indian Government's note of September 16.

Why does the Indian Government suddenly change its tune while defending its habitual stand of expansionism? Obviously, this is because the stern demand made by the Chinese Government in its note of September 16 has produced effect. But has the Indian Government really altered its aggressive intentions and actions? Far from the case. To put it bluntly, the Indian Government is using this tactic to play for time, evade China's just demand and refuse to dismantle its military works for aggression within Chinese territory or on the boundary line.

But muddling through will never do.

The Chinese side is in possession of ample and abundant evidence which can prove to the world that Indian troops have crossed the China-Sikkim boundary to build military works. The Indian Government is aware of this. There is now no longer any need
for investigation. In its present note, the Indian Government admits that the possibility of the existence of Indian military works on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary is not excluded and it does not object to dismantling such military works as may exist. This in effect shows that there are indeed Indian military works for aggression within Chinese territory and on the boundary line. The China-Sikkim boundary is a delimited one. The Chinese frontier guards know the places where Indian troops have built military works across the boundary as they know their own palms. The Chinese Government firmly demands that the Indian Government dismantle these military works for aggression. In order to give the Indian Government the opportunity to do so, the Chinese Government is willing to put off the time-limit set in its note of September 16 to before midnight of September 22.

Besides dismantling the Indian troops, military works for aggression within Chinese territory and on the boundary line, the Indian Government must hand back the four Chinese border inhabitants who have been kidnapped and the eight hundred sheep and fifty-nine yaks that have been seized by Indian troops on the China-Sikkim border. All these kidnapped persons and seized livestock were explicitly mentioned in previous notes of the Chinese Government. The Indian Government asserts in its note that two of the Chinese inhabitants who were kidnapped by Indian troops went to Sikkim to seek asylum and that they will be permitted to return only if they wish to do so. This is a hoax. All the border inhabitants kidnapping and the livestock seized by Indian troops must be returned unconditionally, not short of a single one. The Indian Government must further guarantee that absolutely no intrusions or harassing raids across the border will recur in future.

In its note, the Indian Government pretends to be peace-loving, alleging that India is a peaceful nation, that it has made consistent attempts to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question peacefully, and that the matters raised by the Chinese Government in its note of September 16 are minor ones which do not call for the use of “threatening language” and the form of an “ultimatum”. Is all this true? No. We did endeavour to believe that India would be willing to live together in peace with her neighbours. But gradually we came to discover that peace is only a smokescreen used by the Indian Government to cover up its prosecution of an expansionist policy. China and India should have been friendly neighbours co-existing peacefully in accordance with the Five Principles. The Chinese Government has indicated to the Indian Government its desire for friendship on innumerable occasions. But all these demonstrations of friendship have failed to prevent the Indian Government from nibbling away, intruding into and making harassing raids on Chinese territory, setting up a large number of strong points there, and even launching a massive armed attack on China along the entire Sino-Indian boundary. It was only when the Chinese Government used stern language in talking to the Indian Government and put its words into practice by repulsing India’s massive armed attack in self-defence that the Indian Government slightly restrained itself.
It is a tactic of the Indian expansionists to describe all their acts of aggression against India's neighbours as minor matters which do not jeopardize peace; but if you earnestly demand the cessation of their acts of aggression, they will charge you with using "threatening language" and the form of an "ultimatum". But innumerable facts have shown that the Indian Government does not heed good words of advice, and only sober up a little when faced with categorical just demands and with firm will to see these demands fulfilled. The Indian intrusions and harassing raids across the China-Sikkim boundary are by no means minor matters, nor are those occurring in any sector of the entire Sino-Indian border. The Chinese Government must deal with them seriously.

From their own experience the Chinese people can deeply understand how Pakistan has been bullied by the Indian Government. The Indian Government's expansionism has linked China with all the other neighbouring countries which India has been bullying. The Chinese Government gives all-out support to the people of Kashmir in their struggle for the right of national self-determination. The Chinese Government gives all-out support to Pakistan in her just struggle against Indian aggression. The Chinese Government fully supports the desire of the neighbours of India to safeguard their independence and neutrality and protect their internal affairs from interference. This stand of the Chinese Government is not to be shaken by any tricks on the part of the Indian Government.

In its note the Indian Government flatly denies the fact about its occupation of and intrusions and harassing raids into China's territory, and pretends that the Sino-Indian boundary question has already been settled. This will not succeed. India is now still in occupation of 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory south of the illegal McMahon Line in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, eight pieces of Chinese territory in the middle sector and China's Parigas in the western sector. After 1962, Indian troops kept on crossing the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border for harassing raids, and even lately they are still doing so. None of these facts can be denied by the Indian Government. All these issues must be settled, and nothing whatsoever can make the Chinese Government give up its right of settling these issues. The Chinese Government for ever retains the right to settle these issues.

In conclusion, the Chinese Government reiterates that the Indian Government must dismantle all its military works for aggression either on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary or on the boundary itself before midnight of September 22, 1965, immediately stop all its intrusions along the Sino-Indian boundary and the China-Sikkim boundary, return the kidnapped Chinese border inhabitants and the seized livestock and pledge to refrain from any more harassing raids across the boundary. Otherwise, the Indian Government must bear full responsibility for all the grave consequences arising therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 September, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 769

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with regard to a grave incident of Indian troops intruding into Chinese territory and making an armed attack on Chinese civilian personnel, has the honour to state as follows:

At 1450 hours on September 19, 1965, a group of Indian soldiers, who had intruded into Dumchele within Chinese territory in the Western Sector of the Sino-Indian border, penetrated to an area about four kilometres eastward for harassment and brazenly made an attack by opening fire on the Chinese civilian personnel who were on duty there. After serving warnings without avail, the Chinese civilian personnel had to strike back, and thus repulsed the intruding Indian soldiers. This incident is the gravest armed provocation India has made on the Sino-Indian border since her massive armed attack against China in October, 1962, was checked. The Chinese Government hereby lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government.

Dumchele is Chinese territory. It is on the Chinese side of the 1959 line of actual control between China and India and is under effective Chinese control. It was only after the Chinese frontier guards began to withdraw all along the Sino-Indian border on December 1, 1962 that this place was vacated as part of the demilitarized zone. In its note to China dated July 28, 1964, the Indian Government also recognized Dumchele as being within the Chinese demilitarized zone, yet, Indian troops not only set up an aggressive strongpoint at Dumchele back in June 1965, but have now made an armed attack on Chinese civilian personnel. This is an act of serious encroachment upon Chinese territory and sovereignty and deliberate provocation of an armed conflict.

The Chinese Government demands that the Indian Government immediately stop all its intrusions and provocations on the Sino-Indian border and absolutely guarantee that it will not again invade and occupy Dumchele in China and that similar incidents will not recur. Otherwise, India must bear full responsibility for all the consequences that may arise therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 21 September, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Government Note No. (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 763 of September 19, has the honour to reply as follows:

2. The Government of India are surprised by the language and contents of the Chinese Note of September 19. We have no desire to compete with the Chinese Government in the use of abusive and
undignified language. But it must be pointed out that neither vituperation nor intimidation is conducive to a peaceful settlement.

3. It is regrettable that the Chinese Government has not responded to the peaceful gesture and the reasonable proposal made by the Government of India in its note of September 17.

4. In regard to the defence structures alleged by the Government of China to have been built by the Government of India on the Tibetan side of the Sikkim border, since matters of facts were in dispute the Government of India suggested in their Note of September 12 an inspection by an independent observer but the Chinese Government did not accept this reasonable proposal. The Government of India, therefore, agreed to the suggestion of joint inspection by Indian and Chinese officials reiterated in paragraph (1) of the Chinese Note of 16th September. It is extraordinary that China now refuses to accept its own proposal for joint inspection into the allegation that Indian troops have built military structures on the Tibetan side of the Sikkim border.

5. The Chinese Government have now demanded that “the Indian Government dismantle all its military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary or on the boundary itself before mid-night of September 22, 1965.” It has already been stated in the Government of India’s note of September 17 that if after joint inspection any structures are found on the Tibetan side of the border there can be no objection to their being demolished. Surely, if in fact there were in existence any such structures on the Tibetan side of the border, the Chinese Government would not have waited for our consent to demolish them or asked us to do so by sending our personnel across the border.

6. Furthermore, it is not clear what the Chinese Government mean when they speak of military works not only on the Tibetan side of the border but also “on the boundary line”. The Chinese Government are concerned only with the alleged military works on the Tibetan side of the border in respect of which the Government of India have already clearly stated their position in their note of September 17, and which has been reiterated above. As regards military structures on the Indian side of the border whether they exist or not is a matter which concerns only the Government of India within its own sovereign rights, and the Chinese Government is in no way concerned with any matter pertaining to Indian territory.

7. The second demand of the Chinese Government is in respect of handing back 4 Tibetan inhabitants who are wrongly alleged to have been kidnapped and also for the return of 800 sheep and 59 yaks alleged to have been seized by Indian troops. In their note of September 17, the Government of India have already stated that a number of Tibetans—and there are, as the Chinese Government is aware thousands of such refugees in India—have come over into India from time to time on their own volition and without our permission, and any of them desiring to go back to Tibet are always permitted to do so.

8. The Government of India has told the Chinese Government again and again that our troops have not kidnapped any Tibetans
nor have they seized any livestock. The two Tibetan inhabitants mentioned in the Indian note of September 17 and the two Tibetan herdsmen who had come into India in 1963 with their livestock are free to go back to Tibet at any time if they desire to do so. The Chinese Government are aware that there are not four but many thousands of Tibetans who have left their homeland and sought refuge in India. As regards yaks we have already told the Chinese Government in our note of February 2, 1964, that no yaks have been seized by our personnel.

9. It is clear that the Chinese Government are repeating these false and frivolous allegations and accusing India of "acts of aggression" merely to find a pretext for committing aggression.

10. Finally, the Chinese Government have asked for assurance that "no intrusions or harassing raids across the border will occur in future." The Government of India have already, in their note of September 17 and earlier Notes, informed the Chinese Government that the Government of India have given strict instructions to its armed forces and personnel not to cross the international boundary in the Eastern and Middle Sectors and the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector, and these instructions have been observed strictly. Having given the replies to the specific demands made by the Chinese Government, the Government of India cannot but observe that China, taking advantage of the present unfortunate conflict between India and Pakistan, is concocting without any valid basis casus belli in order to commit aggression against India. The Chinese Government accuse the Government of India of expansionism which is totally false as is self-evident to the world, in order to justify its own aggressive intentions and desire to extend their domination over the whole of Asia. The Chinese Government in the Note under reply have enunciated the new doctrine that China must interfere in the inter-se relations of Asian countries. This claim of China to assume the role of guardianship and hegemony over Asian countries is a role which no self-respecting nation in Asia would be prepared to accept or recognise. Large or small, strong or weak, every country in Asia has the fullest right to preserve its independence and sovereignty on terms of equality. The dominance of the Chinese will not be accepted by any of them. The Government of India, therefore, reject the claim of China to advise the Government of India how to resolve its differences with its neighbour Pakistan over Kashmir or any other matter.

11. India's record as a peaceful country and a good neighbour is well-known to the world and it is not necessary for the Government of India to argue this point with the Chinese Government who is blinded with hatred for India. It is also well-known to the world how India since the establishment of the People's Republic of China extended the hand of friendship to China and how, in return, the rulers of China committed aggression against India and occupied by force 14,500 sq. miles of Indian territory in Ladakh. India has neither forgotten nor accepted this illegal occupation of its territory by China. The Chinese note under reply has also repeated their aggressive claims to Indian territory in the Eastern, Middle and Western Sectors, claims which the Government of India categorically reject.
12. China's aggressive intentions are clear from the fact that even while they have in their note extended the time-limit by 72 hours, in actual fact they have started firing at our border posts both in Sikkim and Ladakh having already crossed the Sikkim border at Dongchui La and Nathu La. In the western sector, at Demchok, several hundred Chinese troops have taken position across the Indian checkpost which is well within the Indian side of the so-called "1959 line of actual control". This action by China is in clear violation of the recommendation of 2(a) of Colombo proposals and China's own so-called "unilateral cease-fire" declaration of 21st November, 1962.

13. The whole attitude of the Chinese Government, its threats and the three-day ultimatum prove that China is not at all interested in a peaceful settlement of the border question or in peaceful co-existence between India and China. India can only urge the Chinese Government to forsake the path of belligerence and intimidation and to return to the path of peace and reason in its relations with India. On her part, India has always been and continues to be willing to settle these differences by peaceful means.

14. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 September, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows in reply to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs Note (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 769, dated September 20, 1965.

The Chinese Note under reply has stated that at 1450 hours on September 19, a group of Indian soldiers intruded into Dumchele within "Chinese territory" in the Western Sector and opened fire on Chinese civilian personnel. The fact of the matter is that it is actually Chinese troops who have crossed into Indian territory and opened heavy fire on an Indian civilian police party near Tsaskur (E 7908 N 3304). Dumchele, as the Chinese Government is aware, is on the Chinese side of "the line of actual control" about 2-1/2 miles north-east of Tsaskur. As a result of this incident, three Indian personnel are still reported missing. Evidently, the Chinese Government has distorted the facts and accused India of intrusion into Dumchele in order to cover up their own intrusion and firing on Indian civilian personnel in undisputed Indian territory near Tsaskur. Even though the Government of India has never recognised the so-called 'line of actual control' unilaterally declared by China, Indian personnel have never crossed that line in the interest of peace and in the hope that China would through peaceful methods vacate its aggression in Ladakh. The Chinese Note has asserted that Dumchele is in Chinese territory, when it is actually in Indian territory illegally occupied by China. It is in vain for the
Chinese Government to hope that by such assertions it can legalise its unlawful presence on Indian soil.

In the context of the ultimatum served by China on India, these concocted allegations of Indian intrusions combined with violent and provocative acts by Chinese military personnel, assume a dangerous significance. The Government of India has noted the statement by the Chinese Government that the so-called incident at Dumchele is "the gravest armed provocation" which India is alleged to have made on the Sino-Indian border. It is well known that in October 1962, the Chinese Government launched a massive attack on India under the pretext of self-defence. Therefore the reference to the events of 1962, at the present juncture is ominous.

The Government of India categorically reject the Chinese protest and urge the Chinese Government to desist from the belligerent course it has set for itself in its relations with India.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 September, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

Even while the Chinese Government has in their note of September 19, extended the time-limit by 72 hours for an answer to what was virtually an ultimatum, the Chinese forces have moved up all along India's northern border and started firing at Indian border posts both in Sikkim and Ladakh.

Western Sector

The Chinese troops have, at several points, violated the 20-kilometer demilitarised zone, crossed the so-called 'line of actual control', and entered Indian territory.

(1) On the afternoon of September 19, 1965, a party of fifty mounted Chinese troops intruded into Indian territory near our civil post at Tsaskur (E 7908 N 3304), after crossing the 'line of actual control', and opened heavy fire on an Indian civilian police party patrolling in the area well within Indian territory. As a result of this aggressive action by Chinese troops, three of the Indian personnel are still missing.

(2) On September 19, 1965, Chinese troops intruded up to a depth of two miles into Indian territory west of the 'line of actual control' near the Indian check-post at the track junction between Daulat Beg Oldi and Murgo and have taken up position approximately at F 7801 N 3517.
(3) Chinese forces after moving from their post at Mabdo La have entrenched themselves in strength at several points opposite our Hot Spring check-post (approximately E 7857 N 3418) on the Indian side of the line of actual control.

(4) In the eastern part of Demchok the Chinese troops after violating the 20 kilometer demilitarised zone, moved forward in strength right up to the Charding Nullah and have assumed a threatening posture at the Indian civilian post on the western side of the Nullah on the Indian side of the 'line of actual control'.

**Middle Sector**

16 Chinese soldiers were observed on 19th September, 1965, in the Barahoti area on the Indian side of the international boundary. The entry of Chinese military personnel into Barahoti is in violation of the clear understanding between India and China, and the provisions of the Colombo Proposals according to which, both sides pending a settlement of the border question, are to refrain from sending armed personnel into Barahoti area.

**Sikkim Sector**

(1) At 1100 hours on 20th September 1965, Chinese troops moved up in company strength, backed by a battalion, over the Dongchui La Pass in Sikkim. They resorted to firing and attempted to encircle a position occupied by our observation post. In order not to provoke an incident, our observation post withdrew and the Chinese occupied the area, about 800 yards on our side of the border, and they continue to be in occupation there.

(2) At 0220 hours on 21st September, Chinese troops fired across the Nathu La Pass towards our post south of the border. Again, in order not to provoke an incident, the Indian post withdrew 300 yards to the rear. Later, our troops when surveying the area discovered that Chinese troops in company strength were entrenched not only in the area from which our post withdrew temporarily, but further inside Sikkim territory. Chinese troops continue to be deployed on the Sikkim side of the border.

The Government of India are gravely concerned by these unprovoked and aggressive activities of Chinese troops across the border. Coming after threats and ultimatum issued by the Chinese Government these cannot be considered anything other than premeditated acts of provocation and aggression. It is now obvious to the whole world that the Chinese Government had deliberately trumped-up allegations of Indian intrusions and Indian structures in Chinese territory for providing an excuse for an attack on India. The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government and urge that China stop these military intrusions and provocations.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 22 September, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, and has the honour to state as follows:

Government of India have received reports that on the 21st September, 1965, at 1100 hours 60 Chinese soldiers came down Lipu Lekh Pass into Indian territory and carried out reconnaissance for several hours.

As the Chinese Government is aware Lipu Lekh Pass is one of the six passes mentioned as border passes in the Agreement on Trade and Intercourse between India and the Tibet Region of China signed in April 1954. Obviously, this latest act of violation of the border is not unconnected with the series of similar incidents which China has created along the India-China border during the last few days.

Government of India would once again urge the Chinese Government to desist from such unwarranted aggressive acts on the Indian border and to return to the path of peace.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24 September 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India have now received detailed information regarding the incident created by the Chinese troops near the Indian civil police post at Tsaskur (E 7908 and N 3304). At 1300 hours on September 19, 1965, a party of five Indian civilian policemen was carrying out routine patrol in the vicinity of the Indian check-post at Tsaskur, well inside Indian territory when 20 mounted Chinese soldiers suddenly opened fire at them. Two of the Indian policemen took cover while the three others withdrew towards the Indian post at Tsaskur. Another party of 30 Chinese soldiers who were hiding nearby fired upon the three policemen, overpowered them physically and carried them into Chinese occupied territory. A discarded pair of P. T. shoes and a blood-stained web-belt belonging to the policemen were subsequently found on the Indian side at a distance of half a mile from the 'line of actual control'. Subsequently, twenty Chinese soldiers came up to the Tsaskur civil post, ransacked it and withdrew to the Chinese side at 1700 hours.
According to a Peking radio broadcast of September 28, Chinese personnel were reported to have discovered the bodies of three Indian "soldiers" in the so-called 'battle-field' at Dumchele. The Government of India in its note of September 21 had clearly pointed out that the Chinese allegations contained in their note of September 20 about Indian intrusion into Dumchele was intended to cover up their own intrusion and firing on Indian civilian personnel in undisputed Indian territory near Tsuskur. It now transpires that the Chinese troops not only intruded into Indian territory, fired at our policemen, and ransacked our civil check-post, but abducted three of our policemen and later on killed them. The Government of India lodge a strong protest against these wanton and inhuman actions of the Chinese soldiers and ask the Chinese Government to put a stop to such aggressive activities. The Government of India demand the return of the dead bodies of the three Indian policemen and reserve the right to demand full compensation for the damage to Indian life and property inflicted by the intruding Chinese troops.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 September, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 781

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and with reference to the note of the Indian Government of September 21 in reply to the note of the Chinese Government of September 19, has the honour to state as follows:

In its note the Indian Government feigns peaceableness and innocence and accuses China of "belligerence" and "intimidation". It imagines that by so doing it can cover up its own crimes of aggression against China and elude the Chinese Governments stern condemnation and just demands. Such clumsy tactics can deceive no one.

The fact that Indian troops built military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary is established by conclusive evidence and cannot be overthrown by quibbling. Yet over the past years the Indian Government flatly denied the existence of such military works. Only after the Chinese Government demanded their dismantling within a specified time-limit did the Indian Government admit in its note of September 17 that the possibility of the existence of such military works was not excluded. In its note of September 21, the Indian Government further says: "Surely, if in fact there were in existence any such structures on the Tibetan side of the border, the Chinese Government would not have waited for our consent to demolish them or asked us to do so by sending our personnel across the border." The Indian Government thinks that it can get away with it by sophistry but in fact this only
further exposes itself and is tantamount to admitting that Indian troops did build these works on Chinese territory and that they should be dismantled.

In reality, India has withdrawn the intruding Indian troops within the specified time-limit set by the Chinese Government and demolished some of her aggressive military works. The Chinese frontier guards are now in full control of the sites of the Indian troops' military works for aggression and are in possession of abundant evidence. In these circumstances, if the Indian Government continues to quibble and prevaricate, it will only lose face completely before the people of the whole world.

In its note the Indian Government again refuses to hand back the Chinese border inhabitants kidnapped and the livestock seized by its troops. The note asserts that "there are not four but many thousands of Tibetans who have left their homeland and sought refuge in India," implying that since the thousands are not being returned, what do four persons matter? We hereby serve you notice that while the case of those thousands must be settled, that of the four persons must be settled immediately. These four persons were forcibly kidnapped by Indian troops from Chinese territory in broad daylight, and there can be no talk whatsoever of "asylum". The eight hundred sheep and the fifty-nine yaks were likewise carried away from Chinese territory by Indian troops. The Indian side must assume the responsibility of returning all the four persons and all the livestock, not short of a single one. As for those several thousand persons, including Dalai Lama, they are no "refugees" either, but were enticed or coerced to go to India after the failure of the rebellion of serf-owners instigated by the Indian Government in the Tibet region of China. Nominally, the Indian Government is giving them "political asylum", but in fact it is using them for continued subversive and disruptive activities against China. Since you have mentioned these several thousand persons, we deem it necessary to remind you that this debt you owe us must be settled.

In its Note the Indian Government once again asserts that it has given strict instructions to its armed forces and personnel not to make intrusions or harassing raids into China, and that these instructions have been strictly observed. But facts have thoroughly exploded these lies. Even within the past month and more—not to go into earlier history—Indian troops repeatedly intruded into China's Hot Springs, the vicinity of the Kongka Pass, Dumchele and Demchok in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border for harassing raids and armed provocations, and provocatively opened fire at the Natu La and the Jelep La on the China-Sikkim border. These are the proofs. We are all too familiar with the Indian Government's practice of saying one thing while doing another. It must be pointed out that to continue to play such double-faced tricks will never do. The Indian Government must in its deeds truly stop all intrusions and provocations; otherwise, it must face all the grave consequences which may arise therefrom. We mean what we say.

The Indian Government glibly claims that it is a peaceful country and a good neighbour, but in fact it is an arch-hypocrite talking no end of fine words while doing no end of evil deeds. Under the guise
of friendship with China, it tried its utmost to obstruct the peaceful liberation of Tibet and seized 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border. It invaded and occupied eight pieces of Chinese territory in the middle sector. After the failure of the rebellion of Tibetan serf-owners which it instigated, it advanced a claim to more than 30,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory in Aksai Chin. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the Indian Government's territorial claim, and it forever retains the right to settle these issues of Chinese territory still being occupied by India.

What India calls "peaceful co-existence" in fact is a smokescreen for covering up its pursuance of an expansionist policy. This is the way India deals with China as well as with her other neighbouring countries. She has perfidiously deprived the people of Kashmir of their right to self-determination, attempting to seize the whole of Kashmir for herself. Recently she has brazenly launched a war of naked aggression against Pakistan. These expansionist crimes of the Indian Government have been severely condemned by countries and peoples upholding justice. In order to cover up its crimes and divert the attention of the people of the world, the Indian Government has in its note turned to slander China as desiring to extend her domination over the whole of Asia, and allege that China wants to assume the role of "hegemony" and "guardianship" over Asian countries. These charges are too preposterous. It may be asked; of the independent Asian countries of today which has stepped into the shoes of imperialism and turned a neighbour into her "protectorate"? Was it not India but China that assumed the role of a guardian of another Asian country in the current incident of the China-Sikkim border? India launched an all-out armed aggression against Pakistan. This is not termed an attempt at "hegemony" over Asian countries, yet China, who together with other countries upholding justice opposed this aggression, is said to want to assume the role of "hegemony" over Asian country. Is there such logic on earth?

China is a country that abides by reason and upholds principles. China will never commit aggression against others, nor will she tolerate unscrupulous aggression by any country. We will certainly oppose aggressors and support victims of aggression. So long as India still commits aggression against Pakistan, so long as she still deprives the people of Kashmir of their right to self-determination, China will not cease to support Pakistan against Indian aggression or support the people of Kashmir in their just struggle for their right to self-determination.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 September, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Yu Tzu No. 782

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China, and has
the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the two notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government of September 21 and its note of September 22, 1965.

In the above-mentioned notes the Indian Government alleges that Chinese troops have made military provocations against India on the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim border. The results of check ups by the Chinese Government show that the incidents enumerated in the Indian notes are either out-and-out fabrications or complete distortions. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the unwarranted protest of the Indian Government.

1. Western Sector of the Sino-Indian Border

(1) The Indian Government alleges that on September 19, 1965, fifty mounted Chinese troops intruded into Indian territory near the Indian Civil Post at Tsaskur and opened fire on an Indian Civilian Police Party. In fact, it was Indian troops who on that day intruded into an area about four kilometres East of Dumchele within Chinese territory and made an attack by opening fire on the Chinese civilian personnel there. The Chinese Government has given a detailed and factual account of the incident in its note of September 20, and it is in possession of conclusive evidence. In clearing the field the Chinese civilian personnel found the bodies of three Indian soldiers, whom they have swathed with cloth and buried. They also found four rifles used by Indian troops, which are now kept in their custody.

(2) The Indian Government alleges that on September 19, 1965, Chinese troops intruded into Indian territory in the vicinity of Daulet Beg Oldi and took up position at approximately 78° 01' E, 35° 17' N. This is a sheer fabrication. It may be pointed out that these coordinates were also mentioned in the note of the Indian Government dated April 21, 1965. At that time, however, the Indian Government asserted that these coordinates were six miles west of the 'line of actual control' whereas in its latest note, it asserts that they are two miles west of the 'line of actual control'. This self-contradiction on precisely proves that the Indian Government has been concocting lies at will.

(3) The Indian Government alleges that Chinese forces have entrenched themselves opposite India's Hot Springs check-post. As a matter of fact, it was Indian troops who, within the period of one and half months from early August to September 16, 1965, intruded seven miles into the vicinity of the Chinese civilian checkposts at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and at the Kongka Pass in Tibet for reconnaissance and harassment.

(4) The Indian Government alleges that Chinese troops moved forward up to so-called Charding Nullah in the eastern part of Demchok and assumed a threatening posture towards an Indian civilian post. In fact, it was Indian troops who on September 18, intruded into the vicinity of the Demchok village on the Chinese side of the 'line of actual control' after crossing the Demchok River from Parigas (in Tibet, China) which has been illegally occupied by India.
2. Middle Sector of the Sino-Indian Border

(1) The Indian Government alleges that Chinese troops have entered the Wuje area. In fact, it is the Indian Government which every year sends its troops for illegal stationing in this area in violation of the agreement between the two sides.

(2) The Indian Government alleges that 60 Chinese soldiers went into Indian territory through the Lipu Lekh Pass on September 21, 1965. The fact is that at no time have Chinese soldiers crossed this pass into Indian territory.

3. China-Sikkim Boundary

The Indian Government allegsthat on September 20, 1965, Chinese troops crossed the Tungchu La, fired at Indian troops and occupied an arca 800 yards on the Sikkim side of the border; it further alleges that on September 21, Chinese troops fired across the Natu La towards an Indian post South of the border and were entrenched inside Sikkim territory. In fact, it was Indian troops who twice fired from a place near the Natu La at Chinese frontier guards within Chinese territory at 1830 hours and 1900 hours respectively on September 20, and who fired from a place near the Jelep La at Chinese frontier guards at 2000 hours on the same day.

The Indian Government has hastily delivered three notes in succession, in which it made fabrications and confounded black and white. Its intention in so doing is only too obvious. In the face of the stern warning and resolute demands of the Chinese Government, the Indian Government has been compelled to admit the fact about its construction of aggressive military works on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary and has stealthily demolished or abandoned these military works. In groundlessly slandering Chinese troops as making intrusions and provocations on the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim border, the Indian Government now tries to cover up its own crimes of aggression and retrieve its lost face. But how can it fool anyone by such a clumsy trick of a thief crying, "stop thief"?

The Indian Government can never succeed in its attempt to pin its own crime on China. The indisputable fact is that India has long been perpetrating intrusions and provocations against China, and has of late grown particularly reckless. The Indian Government must genuinely stop all its intrusions and provocations along the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim border. Any quibbling, lying or counter-charge will only get you into a still worse position. The Chinese Government has every right to strengthen its defences and heighten its alertness along the border or to act in self-defence. If you insist on keeping up your wilful intrusions, you must bear full responsibility for all the consequences arising therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 27 September, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, and has the honour to state as follows:

On September 26, 1965 a three-men Indian army patrol, consisting of one NCO and two others were patrolling within forty yards of the Sikkim-Tibet border on the Indian side of Dongchui La, when a group of forty Chinese soldiers descended upon them, surrounded them and forcibly kidnapped them. An Indian patrol party which was sent to investigate the whereabouts of these three men found that the Chinese soldiers who had kidnapped the men, were still entrenched on the Sikkim side of the border. When the Indian patrol was within fifty yards of the Chinese soldiers the latter shouted at them “go back or we will shoot you”. The Indian patrol Commander then asked about the whereabouts of the three men to which the Chinese waved their hands adopting a provocative posture.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against the crossing of the Sikkim border by the Chinese troops and the kidnapping of our personnel, and demand that the three men be returned to the Indian side immediately. The Government of India are gravely concerned by these frequent intrusions and aggressive acts of the Chinese forces across the Sikkim border and urge the Chinese Government to abandon its provocative and war-like course.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 27 September, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 809

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China, and has the honour to state as follows:

At 16.30 hours on September 26, 1965 three Indian soldiers armed with ordinary and semi-automatic rifles intruded into Chinese territory by crossing the Tungchu La on the China-Sikkim boundary for reconnaissance and provocation. They were arrested forthwith by Chinese troops.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned intrusion into Chinese territory by Indian soldiers, and demands that India immediately stop all intrusions into and provocations against China and ensure that similar incidents will not recur.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to review to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 1 October, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Government's Notes No. (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 781 dated September 24, 1965, and No. (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 798 dated September 26, 1965, and has the honour to state as follows:

In the two notes under reply the Chinese Government has again belaboured the trumped-up and farcical allegations which have formed the terms of its impertinent ultimatum to India. The Government of India have already repudiated each and every one of these allegations. As regards the so-called military structures, which the Chinese had made into a casus belli, the Government of India and the entire world are amused by the Chinese Government's statement that these have since been demolished by Indian troops while "withdrawing" within the time-limit set by the Chinese Government. The fact was that there were no Indian troops in Tibetan territory to be withdrawn and that there were no Indian military structures in Tibet to be destroyed. The Chinese Government had, indeed, admitted this indirectly by its refusal to allow an independent observer to go to the border and also by rejecting its own proposal for joint inspection when the Government of India accepted it. Both the 'construction' and the 'demolition' of military structures by Indian troops were a Chinese myth—a myth which has now exploded in the face of its own authors.

About the four Tibetan inhabitants allegedly kidnapped by Indian troops, an adequate reply has been given in the Indian notes of September 17 and 21. Like other Tibetan refugees these four people had come into India on their own volition and without our permission and taken refuge in India. They are free to go back to Tibet at any time if they desire to do so. Apropos the 800 sheep and 59 yaks the Government of India have already given a reply in the clearest terms possible. We know nothing of the yaks and as regards the sheep it is up to the two herdsmen concerned to take them to Tibet if and when they choose to go back to their homeland.

In its note of September 26, China has protested against the peaceful demonstration which was held near the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi on September 24 when some of the citizens of Delhi took in procession about 800 sheep. The Government of India had nothing to do with this demonstration. It was a spontaneous, peaceful and good-humoured expression of the resentment of the citizens of Delhi against the Chinese ultimatum and the threat of war against India on trumped-up and trivial issues. In India, as the Chinese Government is, no doubt, aware, citizens have the right of peaceful assembly and of peaceful demonstration. There is no reason
for the Government of China to protest against this. The demonstra-
tion was not only peaceful but the demonstrators kept themselves
more than 50 yards away from the gate of the Embassy building.
Full security protection was provided to the Chinese Embassy by
the Indian authorities. This peaceful demonstration by a number
of private citizens of Delhi was entirely in conformity with the laws
of India and with the rights and freedoms enjoyed by Indian citizens
under the Constitution. The Chinese Government has absolutely
no right to interfere in the internal affairs of India. The protest
is, therefore, rejected as completely unwarranted.

The Chinese Government appears to have been embarrassed by
the statement in the Indian note that there are not four but
thousands of Tibetans who have left their homeland and taken
refuge in India. But that is a fact, though not a creditable one for
the Chinese regime in Tibet. The Chinese note has stated that these
thousands of Tibetan refugees are a debt which India owes to China.
On the contrary, it is a debt which China owes to the people of
Tibet for making it impossible for them to live in freedom and
dignity in their own motherland. It is interesting that a mention
has been made in the Chinese note to His Holiness the Dalai Lama.
In March, 1959, when the Dalai Lama fled from Lhasa, following the
Chinese invasion of Tibet, and took asylum in India, the Chinese
Government had stated that His Holiness was "abducted to India by
Tibetan rebels" and kept under duress by the Indian authorities.
However, on December 17, 1964, the State Council of China, while
dismissing the Dalai Lama from his posts as the Chairman and mem-
er of the Preparatory Committee for the autonomous region of
Tibet, described His Holiness as having "staged a traitorous armed
counter-revolutionary rebellion against the country in 1959" and to
have fled abroad. Now the Chinese Government has changed its
tune once again and has alleged that the Dalai Lama and others were
"enticed or coerced to go to India." The falsehoods propagated by
the Chinese Government do not even possess the virtue of con-
sistency. The Chinese Government ought to be aware that rebel-
lions do not take place under enticement or coercion. Where there
is oppression, there is rebellion. It is futile to blame India for the
troubles in Tibet and for large number of Tibetans being forced
to leave their hearths and homes for refuge in other countries.

The Government of India have told China again and again that
Indian personnel and aircraft have strict instructions to respect the
international boundary as well as the 'line of actual control' in the
western sector. We are fully satisfied that these instructions have
been observed and that there has been not a single instance of in-
trusion from our side. Yet, the Chinese Government is maliciously
repeating the charges of Indian intrusions and harassing raids. This
can only be to cover up and justify their own violations and aggres-
sive actions across the border. It is well-known that in the name of
self-defence and in order to lend assistance to its ally Pakistan, China
has mobilized its forces on the Indian border and had, in certain
sectors, actually moved its troops into Indian territory and committed
great acts of provocation. In Sikkim, Chinese troops made serious
intrusions across the border, opened fire at Indian posts and kidnapped
three Indian soldiers whom they have not yet returned. Chinese
troops are at present deployed in considerable strength close to the border of Sikkim where they have been building military structures and installations. In the Western Sector, China has virtually re-militarized the 20 k.m. demilitarized zone in clear contravention of the Colombo proposals, and also made serious intrusions and raids into Indian territory including kidnapping and killing of three Indian civilian police personnel. It is therefore the Chinese Government who should take immediate steps to put a stop to aggressive acts by its troops across the border into Indian territory. There is no use hurling allegations and threats at India when it is actually China which is the law-breaker and the aggressor.

In the present crisis the Chinese Government has made Sikkim a special target of its aggressive attention. It is, therefore, not surprising that China has referred in its note to the relations between India and Sikkim. The special and friendly relationship between India and Sikkim is the natural result of history, geography and culture and is based on a treaty freely entered into by the two parties in 1950 under which India is responsible for the defence and external relations of Sikkim. Mr. Chou En-lai, the Prime Minister of China, had recognised this when in 1960 he stated at a press conference in New Delhi that “China respects India's relations with Sikkim and Bhutan”. The stand now taken by the Chinese Government is, therefore, one of those somersaults in Chinese policy towards India. The Government of India reject the attempt of the Chinese Government to interfere in the relations between India and Sikkim and emphatically affirm their responsibility for the defence and external relations of Sikkim.

The Chinese Government has taken exception to our statement that China wants to assume the role of hegemony and guardianship over Asian countries. India is aware that China's hegemonistic ambitions are not confined to Asia alone. While professing Asian-African solidarity China is, in fact, doing everything possible to split the Asian-African community and to widen and exacerbate the cleavages between Asian and African countries. It is in tune with its policy of divide and rule that the Chinese Government has openly taken sides with Pakistan in the current unfortunate Indo-Pakistan conflict and sought to fan the flames of war and threatened to open a second front against India, when almost every country in the world has been trying to bring about a cessation of hostilities. The Government of India would like to tell China that it is doing the greatest possible dis-service to Asia and to Asian-African solidarity by its doctrine of intervention and its assumption of guardianship over others under the pretext of defence against aggression. This behaviour of the Chinese Government cannot go unnoticed by the peoples of the world and particularly the nations of Africa and Asia.

The Chinese note has expressed annoyance at India's appeal to the Government of the People's Republic of China to forsake the path of belligerence and intimidation and to return to the path of peace and reason. It would appear that the Chinese Government finds the very words 'peace' and 'peaceful co-existence' embarrassing and irritating. In recent Chinese notes and statements, there is not even a single reference to peaceful settlement of the differences
between India and China. On the contrary, there have been threats and ultimata, peremptory demands and fantastic claims to vast areas of Indian territory. In the two notes under reply, India is threatened with "grave consequences" and warned that "all accounts will have to be settled". This is the language of aggression and not of peaceful settlement. The Government of India would urge the Chinese Government to realize that such language and threats are of no avail and that there is no alternative to a peaceful and rational solution of the problems between the two countries.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 October, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Government's notes No. (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 782 dated 24th September, 1965 and No. (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 809 dated 27th September, 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

In the notes under reference the Chinese Government has tried to evade responsibility for intrusions and acts of aggression by Chinese troops by making concocted counter-charges against India. These counter-charges are, obviously, to camouflage the continuing intrusions and provocations by Chinese forces all along the Sino-Indian border.

Western Sector

(1) The Government of India in its note of September 21, 1965, had protested against the wanton incident provoked by China at the Indian civilian post at Tsaskur on September 19, 1965, when the intruding Chinese troops kidnapped and killed three Indian policemen and ransacked the Indian civilian post. The Chinese Government has tried to cover up this incident by alleging that Indian troops had intruded into Dumchele and that the dead bodies of the three Indian policemen were discovered at the battle-field at Dumchele. The Government of India once again protest against this act of aggression and destruction by Chinese troops and demand that the bodies of the three Indian policemen be returned to the Indian side immediately.

The following further instances of intrusions into Tsaskur area by Chinese troops have come to the notice of the Government of India:—

(a) On September 24, a Chinese patrol intruded one mile beyond the 'line of actual control' towards Tsaskur post and later withdrew.

(b) On September 26, about 20 Chinese soldiers intruded one and a half miles beyond the 'line of actual control' and returned at about 1400 hours. Immediately afterwards, another party of 7 soldiers came to the area and hoisted
a small flag at a place about one mile north-east of Tsaskur Lake.

(c) On September 27, at about 1600 hours the Chinese patrol again transgressed the 'line of actual control' and entered into the area adjacent to Tsaskur Lake.

(d) On September 28, a party of four Chinese soldiers again intruded across the 'line of actual control' towards Tsaskur Lake.

(e) On September 29, at 1000 hours a group of 24 Chinese soldiers intruded all the way up to the Indian civilian post at Tsaskur and took up positions around the post. They withdrew after some time.

(2) A party of about 20 Chinese soldiers was observed at Silung Barma Nullah on the morning of September 23, 1965. Although this group withdrew after an hour, considerable Chinese military activity has been observed in this area opposite the Indian civilian post at Hot Springs.

(3) On the morning of September 24, a party of 30 Chinese soldiers took up position across the Indian civilian check-post in the Demchok area. In the afternoon of the same day another group of 100 soldiers reached the area and took up offensive positions for about 3 hours. All these acts are in wilful violation of the 20 k.m. demilitarized zone.

(4) In the last few days the Chinese soldiers have re-established the Rezang Lungpa post south of Spangur Lake and 4-5 miles north of Rezang La which had remained vacant since China's so-called "unilateral withdrawal". This Chinese action is in grave violation not only of China's own so-called "ceasefire declaration" but also the Colombo Proposals which clearly stipulate that military personnel should not be stationed in the 20 k.m. demilitarized zone in the Ladakh Sector.

In their note of the 24th September, 1965, the Chinese Government have attempted to deny incontrovertible facts of Chinese aggression by referring to the so-called "self-contradictions" in the map references provided by the Indian Government. The Chinese Government will recall that India's protest note dated September 21, 1965 clearly pointed out that Chinese troops entered into Indian territory on September 19, 1965, near the Indian Track Junction civilian post, the approximate map reference of which was mentioned as E 7801 N 3517. The Chinese Government cannot be in any doubt about the place under reference, as Chinese troops subsequently dug trenches and began to establish military positions there. They must know that this place is clearly to the west of the 'line of actual control' in this sector and the Chinese Government are indulging in needless quibbling over the question of its precise location in miles and yards.

Sikkim Sector

(1) Chinese troops still remain poised in strength across the Sikkim-Tibet border. Chinese troops have also been engaged in erecting military structures on the border. On the Jelep La pass the
Chinese have erected a low stone wall and are manning it with machine guns and mortars. Intrusions across this pass have also been observed.

The Chinese Government has not yet given a reply to the Government of India's demand contained in its note of September 27 for the return of the three Indian soldiers forcibly kidnapped by Chinese troops from the Sikkim side of Dongchui La. Instead it has been stated in the Chinese note of September 27, 1965, handed over to the Indian Embassy in Peking at 1.00 A.M. (Peking Time) on the morning of 28th September that three Indian soldiers had "intruded" into Tibet and that the Chinese authorities have detained them. This counter-charge is a transparent attempt to cover up the kidnapping of the three Indian personnel by Chinese troops. The Government of India demand the immediate return of the three Indian soldiers.

The Government of India wish to express their grave concern at the continuing Chinese aggressive activities. We would once again urge the Government of China to desist from wilful provocations on the India-China border.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 October, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

At 10.15 A.M. today a group of 25 Chinese soldiers approached Yak La on the Sikkim-Tibet border. About 20 of these soldiers crossed into Sikkim territory and surrounded an Indian Observation post consisting of three men situated well within Sikkim side of the boundary. At 10.35 A.M. the intruding Chinese troops opened fire at the Indian post. According to latest reports received, the Chinese are reinforcing their troops in this area.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest against this violation of the border, the wanton firing at Indian personnel, and the increasingly aggressive posture of the Chinese forces across the border of Sikkim.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 October, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 816.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and
has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated September 24, 1965:

In its note of September 20 to the Indian Government, the Chinese Government has set forth the facts and lodged the strongest protest about the Indian troops' intrusion into China east of Dumchele and their armed attack on Chinese civilian personnel on September 19, 1965. But the Indian Government, in an attempt to cover up its criminal acts of aggression, reversed right and wrong and falsely accused the Chinese soldiers of being the first to open fire on the Indian personnel near an Indian post. This will not do. Facts remain facts, and cannot be changed by any fabrications and distortions. What needs to be pointed out is that, knowing itself to be guilty, the Indian Government at first did not dare play up the incident. On September 20 an Indian official spokesman only vaguely said that Chinese troops "indulged in a few provocative shots" at Dumchele. It was only after the Chinese Government lodged its protest that the Indian Government changed its tune and said in its reply note of September 21 that Chinese troops "opened heavy fire" on the Indian civilian policemen, and described the site of the incident, east of Dumchele which the Indian side itself recognises to be on the Chinese side of the 'line of actual control', as being so-called Tsaskur in the Indian territory. In the same note, the Indian side also said that three Indians were missing. As a matter of fact, the incident took place three days earlier. This shows that the Indian Government knew nothing about what had happened. It was only after the Chinese side announced the discovery of the bodies of three Indian soldiers at the site of the Indian troops' intrusion that the Indian Government suddenly seemed to wake up to a realisation of the fact and concocted the story about Chinese troops "abducting" three Indian policemen, taking them to Chinese territory and then "killing them". One cannot help asking, how came for three days the Indian side was unaware if indeed the incident had occurred near an Indian post, three Indian "policemen" had been abducted and the Indian post had been ransacked, as the Indian side alleged. A mere comparison of the above inconsistent versions given by the Indian side shows that the Indian Government is talking twaddle in complete disregard of the facts.

It is quite clear that the Dumchele conflict was wholly caused by the Indian troops intruding into Chinese territory. It is indeed unreasonable and impudent to the extreme for the Indian side in its note to reserve the so-called right to demand compensation. The Chinese Government expresses its indignation at this and stresses that India has forcibly occupied large tracts of Chinese territory, kidnapped Chinese border inhabitants and seized livestock, and that there have been more than 300 cases of Indian troop and air intrusions into and provocations against China including the latest Dumchele conflict. The Indian Government must be held responsible for compensating for the losses caused by all these cases. The account will have to be settled eventually.

As for the bodies of the three Indian soldiers, the Chinese Government, in the spirit of humanitarianism and out of a desire to safeguard the friendship between the two peoples, is ready to return
them, together with their rifles, to the Indian side. The Indian Government may, through diplomatic channels and at a time agreed upon by both sides, appoint officials to get into contact with the Chinese civilian checkpost at Spanggur, Tibet, for receiving them. At the same time, the Chinese Government once again demands that the Indian Government stop all its intrusions into and provocations against China and guarantee that similar incidents will not recur.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 October, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

On October 4 at 1015 hours a platoon of Chinese troops advanced up to Yak La on the Sikkim-Tibet border, crossed the international border and attempted swiftly to close up with the Indian defence personnel in the area well inside Sikkim territory. The Chinese troops fired three long light machine gun bursts on Indian defence personnel. On being engaged by the Indian defence personnel, the Chinese troops withdrew into Tibetan territory.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest against this aggressive intrusion across the border and firing on Indian personnel by Chinese forces, and ask the Chinese Government to put a stop to these provocative activities.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 6 October, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 826.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows concerning serious cases in which Indian troops again repeatedly carried out armed provocations against Chinese personnel on the China-Sikkim border:

(1) At about 1130 hours on the morning of October 2, 1965, a group of Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory through the Ya La (situated about 3.5 Kilometres northwest of the Natu La) on the China-Sikkim boundary and opened heavy fire on a unit of Chinese frontier guards who were carrying out routine duty on Chinese territory, firing more than 200 rounds and wounding a Chinese frontier guard. The unit of Chinese frontier guards were
thus compelled to defend themselves. Under the returning fire of the Chinese side, the Indian troops retreated in panic.

(2) Between 1030 hours and 1230 hours on October 4, 1965, in the vicinity of Ya La a group of Indian soldiers again opened fire on two successive occasions with light and heavy machine-guns and mortars upon a unit of Chinese frontier guards who were on duty within Chinese territory.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned serious cases in which Indian troops wantonly intruded into Chinese territory, made provocations and wounded a Chinese frontier guard.

In the circumstances in which the Indian side has repeatedly provoked border conflicts, the Chinese Government cannot but heighten its vigilance and strengthen its defences on the border, and is closely following the development of the situation. The Chinese Government once again warns the Indian Government that the Indian side must immediately stop its intrusions, failing which it must bear full responsibility for all the grave consequences arising therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 October, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

At 0530 hours on October 9 three armed Chinese soldiers intruded into Indian territory across the Lipu Lekh Pass in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian boundary. On encountering an Indian patrol party well inside Indian territory the Chinese troops opened fire which was returned by the Indian patrol in self-defence.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest against this intrusion across the border and firing by Chinese troops on Indian personnel on normal patrol duty. The Government of India once again urge the Chinese Government to put a stop to these continuing provocations and aggressive activities by Chinese troops across the Indian border.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 October, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 873

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated September 27, 1965:

On September 26, 1965 three Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory by crossing the Tungchu La on the China-Sikkim boundary and were arrested on the spot by Chinese defence troops stationed there. Against this intrusion the Chinese Government lodged a strong protest with the Indian Government on September 27. In its note of the same day, the Indian side, instead of admitting its own mistake, falsely accused Chinese troops of crossing the border and kidnapping three Indian soldiers and even lodged a so-called protest with the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government categorically rejects this unwarranted and mischievous protest and expresses its surprise and indignation at the Indian practice of wilfully confounding right and wrong.

In the past few years, Indian troops have carried out repeated intrusions and harassing raids on the China-Sikkim border. The Chinese Government has repeatedly made representations to and protested with the Indian Government, in the hope that the Indian side will rectify these errors. However, the Indian side has turned a deaf ear to the words of the Chinese Government and even taken advantage of China's forbearance to make shameless denials and prevarications, saying that if Indian troops have carried out repeated intrusions and harassments, "how is it that there has not been a single case of an Indian soldier being caught on Tibetan territory?" (Reference remarks made by an Indian official spokesman on September 17, 1965.) The Indian Government should understand that there is a limit to the Chinese Government's forbearance. The fact that Chinese defence troops have now arrested three intruding Indian soldiers on a single occasion has completely belied the denials of the Indian side. The three intruding Indian soldiers who were arrested have personally admitted that they were sent on orders to intrude into Chinese territory for reconnaissance; that they were arrested after intruding into Chinese territory in disregard of the warnings served by the Chinese defence troops on the spot. The culprits and material evidence are all there. The lie painstakingly concocted by the Indian Government that Chinese troops crossed the border and kidnapped Indian soldiers has been exploded. The Indian Government is slapping its own face by lodging a counter protest with China in an attempt to deny the responsibility for its crime and vilify China. Facts are more eloquent than words. The more the Indian Government insists on lie-making, the more will be the loss of face. The Chinese Government once again advises the Indian Government to draw a lesson from its past experience and restrain itself. If it insists on making intrusions and provocations, it will come to no good end.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 October, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs note dated 29th July, 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government's note declares that "in order to cut down the exchange of notes" between India and China and "to facilitate a gradual ease of relations between them" the Chinese Government has decided to lodge a comprehensive protest with the Indian Government every year except in cases of "special gravity against which prompt protests are needed". Yet, in practice what the Chinese Government has been doing is to protest frequently about so-called instances of 'special gravity' and then include these again every six months in the comprehensive protest note, which, in addition, contains a mass of mendacious and concocted allegations against India. Far from easing tension this procedure is intended to escalate tension and to mislead world public opinion. The behaviour of the Chinese Government in the past few weeks conclusively proves this. As the whole world knows, the Chinese Government had since the end of August, 1965, sent a series of protest notes falsely accusing Indian personnel of having intruded into Chinese territory, built military structures and kidnapped Tibetan inhabitants and sheep and yaks. The world also knows that on the basis of these fantastic allegations the Chinese Government had served an ultimatum on India and threatened India with "grave consequences". Is any other proof needed for the aggressive intentions and actions of the Chinese Government?

Of the 38 so-called "Indian intrusions" mentioned in the Chinese note some relate to the first six months of 1965. They are, in fact, mere repetitions of old allegations which have already been effectively refuted by the Government of India in the past. In the case of some other allegations (serials 4, 6, 8, 9 and 10 of part III of annexure of the Chinese note) Chinese Government has not given the exact location and the co-ordinates of the places concerned. This only adds to the vagueness of the Chinese charges.

The Government of India have given standing instructions to all Indian personnel and aircraft not to cross the established borders of India and "the line of actual control" in the Western Sector. These instructions also apply to the border of Sikkim. Detailed and thorough investigations of the specific allegations contained in the annexures to the Chinese note have shown conclusively that Indian personnel have scrupulously complied with the instructions of the Government of India. The Chinese allegations are, therefore, completely false and the Government of India categorically reject them.
It is obvious that these allegations were fabricated by the Chinese Government in order to prepare an excuse for the ultimatum which it served on India on September 16 and for the provocative and aggressive actions it has been taking across the Indian border in collusion with Pakistan.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 October, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

On October 27, 1965, about 10 to 12 Chinese soldiers intruded 100 yards into Sikkim territory across the Sebu La on the Sikkim-Tibet border. The Chinese soldiers withdrew when they were engaged by Indian troops in the area. The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against this violation of the border and the provocative intrusion into Sikkim.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 30 October, 1965 (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 918

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the two notes dated October 2, 1965 and the notes dated October 6 and 10, 1965 from the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government, has the honour to state the following:

1. In one of its notes dated October 2, the Indian Government made a whole series of charges against China concerning alleged military provocations along the China-India border and the China-Sikkim border. All of them are fabrications or deliberate distortion of the facts, and some are a repetition of lies already refuted by the Chinese Government point by point in its note of September 24, 1965. The Chinese Government will now make a comprehensive refutation of these false charges. Firstly, with regard to the September 19 armed conflict at Dumchele, it is well known that it was entirely provoked by the Indian side. After its occurrence, the Chinese Government for a time ordered its civilian personnel to enhance their alertness in that area. Upon orders, the Chinese civilian personnel also cleaned up the site of the conflict, properly handled the dead bodies of three
Indian soldiers found there and returned them to the Indian side at Spanggur on October 10. The activities of the Chinese side in the Dumchele area took place on Chinese territory and were within China’s sovereign rights, and the Indian Government has no right to interfere. Secondly, the places mentioned in the charges contained in paragraphs (2), (3) and (4) of the Indian note are all within Chinese territory. The Indian Government has no right to question Chinese activities in those areas. What is more, there were in fact no Chinese troops operating in those areas. Thirdly, Chinese troops never crossed the China-Sikkim boundary and went beyond Chinese territory, whereas the truth about Indian forces crossing the boundary to build aggressive military works and making continuous intrusions and harassments has long been exposed before the whole world. The Chinese side is up to this day in control of the sites where the Indian aggressive military works used to be. And the three Indian soldiers who crossed the boundary at Tungchu La on September 26 were arrested on the spot by the Chinese side (reference the Chinese Government’s notes of September 27 and October 18). The Indian Government can never overthrow the multitude of evidence of its crimes.

2. In its second note of October 2 and its note of October 6, the Indian Government slandered the Chinese side as having opened fire on the Indian side Ya La on the Chinese-Sikkim boundary. The truth of the matter has already been stated in the Chinese Government’s note of October 6: It was Indian troops who carried out successive armed provocations at Ya La on October 2 and 4 against units of Chinese frontier guards on duty within Chinese territory and wounded one of the Chinese frontier guards.

3. In its note of October 10, the Indian Government made the slanderous charge that three Chinese soldiers crossed the Lipulekh Pass in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border and opened fire on Indian troops. This is a sheer fabrication. No Chinese troops were present in the vicinity of the Lipulekh Pass, and so it is out of the question that any Chinese soldiers should have intruded into Indian territory and opened fire on Indian troops.

4. It is none other than India that has made continuous intrusions and provocations on the China-India border and the China-Sikkim border. Lately, the Indian side was compelled to demolish part of its aggressive military works within Chinese territory as a result of repeated warnings from the Chinese Government, but it has not reconciled itself to this. In order to meet the needs of its domestic and foreign policies and retrieve lost face, the Indian Government has been seeking every opportunity to continue its intrusions and provocations and create tension. On the other hand, the Indian side is afraid of being exposed and condemned, and so has resorted to the trick of a thief crying “Stop thief!”, wilfully trumping up counter-charges against China after having made intrusions and provocations itself. However, in the face of the facts, no resort to trickery will be of any avail. Should the Indian Government continue its senseless haggling by repeating these slanderous allegations, the Chinese Government will pay no attention to it.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 November, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to refer to the Chinese note (65) Yi Ya Tzu No. 873 of 18th October, 1965.

In its attempt to cover up the kidnapping of the three Indian soldiers by Chinese troops from Sikkim territory, the Chinese Government has repeated the completely false allegation that it was the Indian personnel who had crossed the border at Donchui La and intruded into Tibet on September 26, 1965. The fact, however, was that the three Indian soldiers were patrolling well within Sikkim territory when a group of Chinese soldiers, who had illegally crossed the border, descended upon them, surrounded them and forcibly kidnapped them. Neither denials nor counter-charges by the Chinese Government can alter this fact. An attempt has also been made in the Chinese note to hold up the three kidnapped Indian soldiers as "proof" of the wild and baseless allegations of Indian intrusions and raids on the Tibet-Sikkim border which the Chinese Government has been making. The reference in the Chinese note to a remark by an Indian spokesman on September 17 that there has not been a single case of an Indian soldier being caught on Tibetan territory and the statement that "Chinese defence troops have now arrested three intruding Indian soldiers on a single occasion" only goes to show that the kidnapping of the three Indian soldiers was a deliberate, calculated and perverse action taken by Chinese troops for the express purpose of producing 'evidence' to bolster up their patently false allegations against India. The claim made in the Chinese note that the kidnapped Indian personnel have "admitted that they were sent on orders to intrude into Chinese territory" only confirms this.

The Government of India have noticed that Chinese newspapers have published a so-called "confession" by the three Indian personnel "admitting" that they had intruded into Tibet. The world is only too well aware of the devices used by the Chinese Government and the deceptions practised by Chinese propaganda to take such "confessions" seriously and as truth. The Government of India regret that the Chinese Government has not only committed intrusions across the Sikkim border and kidnapped our personnel, but has resorted to false propaganda accompanied by threats against India. The Government of India demand that the three kidnapped soldiers be returned to the Indian side immediately. Pending their return the Chinese Government will be held responsible for their safety and welfare.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 November, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 967

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy and has the honour to reply in refutation of the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated October 30, 1965 as follows:

In its note the Indian side made the slanderous charge that on October 27 Chinese soldiers “intruded 100 yards into Sikkim territory across the Sebu La on the Sikkim-Tibet border,” and so on and so forth. This is an out-and-out fabrication. The Chinese Government categorically rejects this unwarranted protest by the Indian side.

The boundary between China and Sikkim has long been delimited. The Chinese defence troops have never crossed this boundary. Conversely, it is the Indian side that has constantly committed intrusions and provocations against China on the China-Sikkim border. In repeatedly concocting lies to slander China, the Indian Government obviously intends to confuse the public in a vain attempt to cover up its own criminal acts of aggression. But the facts are all there and no fabrications can deceive people.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 November, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 986

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

According to an emergency report received by the Chinese Government from the military authorities concerned at 0730 hours (Peking Time) on November 13, 1965 more than a hundred Indian soldiers at Tungchu La on the China-Sikkim boundary started a fierce attack with light and heavy machine-guns on Chinese frontier guards on duty within Chinese territory. In the meantime, more than ten Indian soldiers crossed the Chinese boundary and outflanked and attacked the Chinese frontier guards on duty. The Chinese frontier guards were compelled to resort to self-defence. The Indian troops were still firing at the Chinese troops towards that evening. The Chinese Government hereby lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government against this provocation by Indian troops crossing the boundary and making unwarranted attack on the Chinese frontier guards on duty.

It must be pointed out that recently Indian troops at Ya La on the China-Sikkim boundary continuously opened heavy fire on
Chinese frontier guards and wounded one of them. The Chinese Government lodged a strong protest against this on October 6. This time the Indian troops have launched an even fiercer attack on Chinese frontier guards and once again intruded into Chinese territory. This fully shows that the Indian Government is bent on committing armed aggression against China and creating tension on the China-Sikkim border. The Indian troops are even now continuing their attack on the Chinese frontier guards. The situation is extremely grave and the Chinese authorities concerned are following it closely. The Chinese Government seriously warns the Indian Government that it must at once order its troops to stop their intrusion into and provocation against China. Otherwise the Indian Government will have to bear full responsibility for all the consequences arising therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 November, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, and has the honour to state as follows:

At 0700 hours on November 13, 1965 a party of 70 to 100 Chinese troops advanced across Dongchui La on the Tibet-Sikkim border and opened heavy fire upon the two Indian outposts situated well within the Sikkim side of the border. The Indian personnel returned the fire in self-defence, but the Chinese troops continued firing until the evening of November 13. As a result of the firing one Indian soldier and two Chinese soldiers were killed. Before withdrawing from Sikkim territory the Chinese troops dragged with them the dead bodies of the Indian soldier as well as the two Chinese soldiers.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against the unprovoked firing and the wanton aggressive activities of Chinese troops across the Sikkim border. It may be recalled that it was across Dongchi La that the Chinese troops intruded in strength on September 26, 1965 and forcibly kidnapped three Indian defence personnel from within Sikkim territory. The Chinese Government has not, in spite of repeated demands by the Indian Government returned the Indian soldiers kidnapped by their troops on September 26. The Government of India once again urge the Chinese Government to return the kidnapped soldiers to the Indian side. The body of the Indian soldier killed in the firing on November 13, must also be returned. These continuing intrusions and firing on Indian personnel are grave provocations on the part of the Chinese troops who have entrenched themselves in strength in the Chumbi valley across the Sikkim border. The Government of India urge the Government of the People's Republic of China to order its troops to stop their acts of provocation and aggression on the Sikkim-Tibet border.
The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 November, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1009

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government, dated November 14, 1965:

1. On November 13, 1965 the Chinese Government lodged the strongest protest with the Indian Government regarding the incident on the same day in which Indian troops crossed the China-Sikkim boundary and made an unwarranted provocative attack on Chinese frontier guards. Instead of owning up to its criminal act of aggression, the Indian Government in its note of November 14 invented a false story to counter-charge China and lodged a so-called protest with the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government categorically rejects this groundless protest and expresses extreme indignation at the slanderous counter-charge of the Indian side.

2. In its note, the Indian side asserted that 70 to 100 Chinese troops crossed the border and opened fire on Indian troops, and that before withdrawing they dragged away the dead body of an Indian soldier. Furthermore, on November 15 Mr. Chavan, the Indian Defence Minister, came forward in person and alleged sanctimoniously before the Indian Parliament that the trail of dragging the body by the Chinese was still “visible”. These allegations of the Indian side are sheer fabrications. The fact was that an Indian detachment of more than a hundred soldiers opened heavy fire on Chinese frontier guards on duty at Tungchu La on the China-Sikkim boundary. At the same time, more than ten Indian soldiers under the cover of fire crossed the boundary, intruded into Chinese territory and outflanked and attacked the Chinese frontier guards on duty. The Chinese frontier guards were compelled to fight back in self-defence. One of the intruding Indian soldiers, being wounded thereupon, threw away his weapon and tumbled and crawled back to Sikkim territory, where he died. Evidently, the Indian troops, relying on its superior strength, vainly attempted to wipe out the small number of Chinese frontier guards in a surprise attack. The outcome was that when the Chinese frontier guards just began to return fire the Indian troops fled pell-mell. In order to deny their criminal act of aggression and cover up their defeat, the Indian Ministries of Defence and of External Affairs hastily invented a story by turning the facts upside down, and even fabricated the lie that “two Chinese soldiers were killed”. How ludicrous and miserable this is!
3. For three days the body of the killed Indian soldier was **plainly** lying there within Sikkim territory, and yet the Indian side, instead of disposing of it, asked China to return it. Was that not mischievous trouble-making? Only after a responsible officer of the Chinese Defence Ministry refuted the rumour spread by the spokesman of the Indian Defence Ministry and gave a piece of advice, did Indian troops come to the spot and carry away the dead body of the Indian soldier on November 16. This fully shows that the Indian official pronouncements were all fraudulent. Is it not the height of absurdity that the Defence Minister of India should have told a bare-faced lie and then on that basis the Indian Ministry of External Affairs should have asked China for the dead body?

4. As for the three Indian soldiers who intruded into Chinese territory at Tungchu La on September 26 and who were captured on the spot, the Chinese Government had already instructed the authorities concerned to make arrangements for their deportation under armed escort, considering the fact that they had admitted their mistake. However, owing to the occurrence of this extremely grave incident in which Indian troops outflanked and attacked the Chinese frontier guards at Tungchu La, the Chinese Government now has to defer consideration of the disposal of the three intruding Indian soldiers.

5. Recently, the Indian side has stepped up its intrusions into and provocations against China. The Chinese Government has lodged repeated protests with the Indian Government. In the period since August alone, the Chinese Government has nine times solemnly warned the Indian Government that it must bear full responsibility for all the serious consequences arising from its intrusions and provocations. However, turning a deaf ear to these warnings, the Indian side has continued to indulge in making intrusions into and provocations against China and has now gone to the length of outflanking and attacking Chinese frontier guards by armed force. This is absolutely intolerable. The Chinese Government solemnly states that the Chinese frontier guards are duty-bound to defend China's territory. If the Indian troops dare to continue their brazen encroachments upon Chinese territory or again open fire on the Chinese frontier guards, the Chinese frontier defence troops will have to punish them as they deserve.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 November, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

On November 19, 1965, at 1200 hours a party of fifty Chinese soldiers intruded, for a distance of about one mile, into North
Sikkim across the Bomchola Pass on the Sikkim-Tibet border. An Indian patrol party on routine duty in the area saw the Chinese intruders and chased them, whereupon the Chinese withdrew to the Tibetan side of the border at about 1300 hours the same day. The Government of India lodge a strong protest against this unwarranted and aggressive intrusion by Chinese troops into Sikkim territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 November, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

At 1000 hours on November 20, 1965 forty armed Chinese soldiers crossed the Sikkim border through Kongra La and intruded nearly two and a half miles deep into Sikkim territory in the vicinity of Gayum Chhona lake approximately three miles north-east of Dongkung in North Sikkim. An Indian patrol which was sent out to the area of intrusion observed the Chinese intruders from a distance of about 500 yards. On seeing the Indian patrol party the Chinese started withdrawing at 1630 hours and finally crossed back into Tibet at 1800 hours. The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against this latest instance of blatant intrusion by Chinese troops into Sikkim territory. The Government of India had already protested to the Chinese Government against another intrusion into North Sikkim by Chinese troops which took place across Bomchola on November 19, 1965. On November 13 Chinese troops had wantonly intruded in strength into Sikkim across Dongchuila and opened heavy fire on two Indian outposts killing one Indian soldier. On October 27 a party of about 10 to 12 Chinese soldiers intruded 100 yards into Sikkim across Sebula. Earlier on September 26 a party of Chinese troops crossed the Sikkim border at Dongchuila and kidnapped three Indian soldiers on patrol duty well within Sikkim territory.

These continuous and increasingly aggressive activities of Chinese troops on the Sikkim border is a matter of grave concern to the Government of India. Following the Chinese ultimatum to India in September 1965, Chinese troops have remained entrenched in considerable numbers along the Sikkim-Tibet border and seem to be determined to create incidents across the border. The Government of India urge the Chinese Government to order its troops to put a stop to their aggressive and provocative actions across the Sikkim border.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 23 November, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

On November 21st at 1600 hours over 30 armed Chinese soldiers intruded into north Sikkim to a depth of 1,500 yards in the area north-west of Bom Cho. The Chinese intruders withdrew into Tibetan territory on seeing an Indian patrol on routine duty in the area. The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against the continuing intrusions by Chinese troops into Sikkim. As the Chinese Government themselves have recognized the boundary of Sikkim with Tibet has been formally delimited and is well-marked by natural features. The frequent intrusions by Chinese troops across this boundary cannot, therefore, be anything but deliberate acts intended to create tension on the border.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 23 November, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

On the morning of November 19th at 0900 hours about 60 Chinese soldiers in two heavy vehicles intruded into Indian territory near the Track Junction in the Daulat Beg Oldi area well to the west of the 'line of actual control'. They took up positions on the eastern slope of a hill feature at approximately longitude 78° 01' E, latitude 35° 17' N. The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against this deliberate and aggressive intrusion by Chinese troops into undisputed Indian territory and demand their withdrawal. This latest violation of Indian territory is in the same area and, in fact, the same point where the Chinese troops had intruded on the 19th September, 1965 (Indian Government's protest note of 21st September, 1965 refers). This wanton act is not isolated from the increasing instances of intrusions and provocations by Chinese troops in other sectors of the border and underlines the aggressive intentions of the Chinese Government and their determination to create incidents and raise tension on the India-China border. The Government of India urge the Chinese Government to reverse this aggressive course adopted by them and to order their troops to stop violating the 20-k.m. demilitarized zone and the 'line of actual control' to intrude into undisputed Indian territory.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 November, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1036.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

At 1030 hours on November 24, 1965, a group of three Indian soldiers crossed the Tungmu La Pass on the 1959 Line of Actual Control between the two sides in the Eastern Sector of the Sino-Indian border and intruded into the area of Laiguo Bridge in Tibet, China, for armed provocation. On discovering them, Chinese personnel of a civilian checkpoint immediately served warning on the Indian soldiers and demanded that they withdraw. Instead of heeding the warning, the Indian soldiers opened fire on the Chinese personnel of the civilian post. The latter were compelled to return fire in self-defence, and the three intruding Indian soldiers were killed in the exchange of fire. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned provocative intrusion by Indian troops.

It must be pointed out that this provocative intrusion by Indian troops is most serious and in no way accidental. Recently, the Indian side has repeatedly made provocative intrusions on the China-Sikkim border and continuously sent its aircraft to intrude into China's air space for reconnaissance in the Western Sector of the Sino-Indian border. At the same time, India has been amassing large numbers of troops towards the Sino-Indian boundary and the China-Sikkim boundary, and the Indian Government has been constantly spreading lies and wanton slanders against China. What is particularly serious is that this armed provocative intrusion by Indian troops in the Eastern Sector of the Sino-Indian border occurred only eleven days after November 13 when Indian troops brazenly crossed the China-Sikkim boundary at Tungchu La to outflank and attack the Chinese Frontier Guards on duty. All this clearly shows that the Indian Government is deliberately creating new tensions along the entire Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim border.

The Chinese Government has repeatedly warned the Indian Government that if Indian troops should continue their wanton intrusions or open fire on Chinese Frontier Guards or civilian checkpoint personnel, they will surely be punished as they deserve. The Chinese Government now reiterates this warning. Should Indian troops again make armed provocative intrusions, the Chinese side will resolutely fight back without fail.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 25 November, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

At 12:15 P.M. on the 24th November, 1965, 40 armed Chinese soldiers intruded about 1500 yards into north Sikkim territory in the area north-west of Bom Cho. An Indian patrol on routine duty in the area warned the Chinese soldiers and demanded their withdrawal. When the Chinese troops ignored the warning and continued to advance towards our patrol, the Indian personnel opened fire in self-defence. Thereupon the Chinese soldiers withdrew across the Sikkim-Tibet border.

Three days earlier a similar act of intrusion had taken place in this area (Our note of 23rd November 1965 refers). The Government of India lodge a strong protest against these continuing acts of wanton provocation and intrusion across the well-known Sikkim-Tibet border, and once again urge the Chinese Government to order their troops to stop these deliberate and aggressive border violations.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 25 November, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1041

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

1. On November 24, 1965 three Indian soldiers crossed the Tungmu La Pass on the 1959 line of actual control between the two sides in the Eastern Sector of the Sino-Indian border, intruded into the area of Laiguo bridge in Tibet, China and opened fire on the Chinese personnel of the civilian check-post there. The latter were compelled to return fire in self-defence. The three Indian soldiers were killed in the exchange of fire, and their bodies are still in the Laiguo bridge area. If the Indian side wishes to take back the bodies, the Chinese Government, acting in its consistent spirit of revolutionary humanitarianism, is ready to consent.

2. On September 26, 1965 three Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory by crossing Tungchu La on the China-Sikkim boundary and were captured on the spot by the Chinese defence troops stationed there. The three intruders truthfully confessed as to how they had crossed the border for reconnaissance upon orders
from their superiors. The Chinese Government, taking into consideration the fact that they have admitted their mistake of crossing the boundary and acting in its consistent spirit of revolutionary humanitarianism, has decided to show them clemency as was the case with the intruding Indian soldiers captured on previous occasions. The Chinese Government has instructed the authorities concerned to send them to the border under armed escort. The Indian Government may send personnel to receive them at the time and place specified by the Chinese side.

3. As for the specific time and place and other matters concerning the receiving by the Indian side of the three Indian soldiers captured during intrusion and the collection of the bodies of the three Indian soldiers killed during intrusion, the Chinese Government will notify the Indian Government of them through diplomatic channels.

4. It must be pointed out that recently Indian troops' provocative intrusions into China along the Sino-Indian and China-Sikkim borders have been most unbridled. Yet the Indian side has repeatedly spread lies slandering China as committing intrusions. What is particularly despicable is that, although there is personal and material evidence testifying to the intrusion and arrest of the three Indian soldiers, yet the Indian side has, in the face of the iron-clad facts, refused to own up to its mistake, and instead has made denials and even false counter-charges against China in a number of notes. The Chinese Government solemnly reiterates its warning to the Indian Government that the Indian side should draw a lesson from the failure of its above-mentioned two intrusions and stop all its aggressive activities against China.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 November, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to Chinese Government's note No. (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 816 dated 2nd October, 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India note with regret that the Chinese Government are still attempting to evade their responsibility for the Tsaskur incident in which three Indian civilian personnel were kidnapped and killed by Chinese troops. The Chinese Government in its note under reply has expended much effort to sustain their own fabricated version of the incident by distorting facts. Therefore, the Government of India consider it necessary to place on record the following:

1. The Chinese note has claimed that on the 20th September, 1965, an Indian spokesman "vaguely" said that a few provocative shots
had been fired near Dumchele. This is cited as proof that India did not “dare play up this incident”. The Chinese statement is a ridiculous distortion of the facts because it was in the same statement that the Indian spokesman had added that three policemen were overdue at their bases after a patrol.

2. The Chinese Government have tried to make much of the fact that they were first to lodge their so-called “protest”. They have even used their speed in lodging this “protest” as evidence that the Indian Government “knew nothing” about what had happened. This is another distortion. The Government of India, which had already announced on the afternoon of the 20th September that three Indian personnel were missing wanted to check that facts further and to make allowance for a natural mishap before lodging a formal protest. It is futile for the Chinese Government to use the fact that the Indian protest was lodged two days (and not three days as claimed in the Chinese note) after the incident, to detract from the gravity and veracity of the Indian protest.

3. The Chinese note has gone to the extent of claiming that India lodged its protest only after the Chinese Government announced the “discovery” of the dead bodies of the three Indian soldiers. This is a blatant falsehood. India’s protest against the wanton act of kidnapping from Indian soil and killing of the three Indian personnel by Chinese soldiers was lodged in a note handed over to the Chinese Charge d’Affaires in Delhi on the 21st September, 1965, at 9 P.M. As far as the Government of India are aware, Peking Radio’s first announcement of the so-called “discovery” of the three dead bodies came only on the night of 23-24th September. How then can it be argued, as the Chinese note has tried, that India’s protest came only after the Chinese announcement?

4. The Chinese note has made some references to the location of Dumchele vis-a-vis the line of actual control. This is irrelevant since the incident took place not at Dumchele but well to the west of the “line of actual control” near the Indian check-post at Tsaskur.

All these facts prove conclusively that in its haste to disguise its inhuman and aggressive activities on Indian territory the Chinese Government have used false and even dishonest arguments to bolster their concocted story of a so-called “Indian intrusion”. The Chinese Government should be aware that the strange thing is not that the Government of India waited to verify the facts and make allowance for a natural mishap before lodging a protest on the 21st September. On the contrary, what is curious is the fact that while putting across their concocted story the Chinese Government have overlooked the inherent inconsistency in protesting to India against an “Indian intrusion” on so-called Chinese territory on the 20th September and then taking three days to “discover” the dead bodies of the Indian personnel who, it is claimed, were found on “Chinese territory”. It is futile to try and evade facts with such fabrications.

China’s responsibility for the death of the three Indian personnel is by no means over with the handing over of their dead bodies. The
Government of India reserve the right to demand full compensation for the damage to Indian life and property inflicted by the intruding Chinese troops near Tsaskur on the 19th September, 1965.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 27 November, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

On the morning of 24th November, 1965, three men of the Assam Rifles were on routine patrol in the area south of Domla Pass, well within Indian territory, in the Eastern sector of the Indian-China border. This small Indian patrol party was ambushed, kidnapped and killed by a group of intruding Chinese soldiers. The Government of India lodge a stern protest against this brutal and inhuman crime committed by Chinese troops.

The Chinese Government have sought to disguise this by putting out a completely fabricated story. In their notes dated the 24th and 25th November, 1965, the Chinese Government have tried to twist facts by claiming that it was the Indian personnel who had “intruded” into Tibet and that Chinese soldiers had killed them in “self-defence”. Do the Chinese Government really imagine that the world will be deceived by such a story? In this sector the boundary between India and China is identical with the so-called “line of actual control” and runs along a watershed with clear-cut geographic features. Domla Pass is a well-known and easily recognizable natural feature. Indian personnel have strict instructions to respect the border and they have always scrupulously observed these on all occasions. It is therefore inconceivable that Indian personnel would have, wilfully or accidentally, crossed the border into Tibet. No amount of concocted counter-charges will absolve the Chinese Government from the responsibility for this cruel deed.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 27 November 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India have noted with grave concern that during the last two weeks Chinese troops have been concentrating on all the major sectors of the India-China border and indulging in
aggressive and provocative intrusions across the border. In the Eastern Sector, which had remained relatively calm since China's massive aggression of 1962, groups of armed Chinese soldiers have crossed the international boundary at several points and intruded into Indian territory. In Ladakh Chinese troops have moved up in strength from their bases in Tibet, and in contemptuous defiance of the Colombo Proposals, entered the 20-k.m. demilitarized zone in several areas. At certain points they have even crossed the 'line of actual control' and intruded into undisputed Indian territory—Chinese troops have yet to vacate the Daulat Beg Oldi area. Across the boundary of Sikkim which the Chinese Government have unambiguously recognized as formally delimited and clearly defined by natural features, intrusions and provocations have been taking place almost daily.

Instead of putting a stop to this aggressive course adopted by their troops the Chinese Government have been levelling unfounded allegations and making naked threats against India. There is once again talk of "serious consequences", "punishment", "coming to no good end", and also the threat of "resolutely fighting back without fail" against imagined "Indian intrusion" into Tibet. These allegations and threats are nothing but a smokescreen for the calculated acts of aggression which the Chinese troops have been committing across the border of India.

**Eastern Sector**

(1) On November 20, 1965 about 200 Chinese troops crossed the international boundary at Zang La and intruded about one mile into Indian territory.

(2) On November 21, 1965 a group of Chinese soldiers came across the boundary to the Sumdorong ridge on the Indian side and on November 23 extended their intrusion to the left bank of the Namjangchu river north of its junction with Sumdorongchu.

(3) On November 23 another party of Chinese troops crossed the international boundary at the Thagla ridge and entered the Namkachu valley in India. (The Thagla Ridge area is one of the "remaining areas" under the Colombo Proposals to which both India and China are to refrain from sending troops. Further, the Chinese Government had undertaken that it would not even establish civil checkposts in this area.)

(4) On November 22 about 300 Chinese troops crossed Siungla Pass and intruded to a depth of 200 yards into the Siang Division of the North East Frontier Agency of India. The Chinese troops further sent forward two of their scouts for reconnaissance to a depth of two miles.

On November 24, the Chinese troops withdrew into Tibet from all the areas of intrusion mentioned above. However, this afternoon at 1400 hours an Indian police party patrolling in Indian territory in the vicinity of Gilling was attacked and fired upon by Chinese
soldiers who had intruded into Indian territory across Kepangla on the border of the Siang District of the North East Frontier Agency of India. One of the Indian constables was wounded in the arm.

The Chinese Government are aware that all the areas mentioned above are on the Indian side of the international boundary. The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against these serious violations of the border and the territorial integrity of India by Chinese troops. The fact that the Chinese troops have extended and intensified their acts of intrusion along the entire border exposes the belligerent and aggressive intentions of the Chinese Government against India.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 28 November, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1050

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

1. At 1707 hours on November 24, 1965 a group of Indian soldiers at the Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary unwarrantedly fired two shells at the Chinese frontier guards on patrol duty on the Chinese side of the pass. Following their continuous armed provocations against the Chinese side since mid-November, Indian troops have this time gone to the length of firing shells at Chinese frontier guards. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this rabid provocation.

2. In its note of November 25, 1965, the Indian Government slanderously alleged that on November 24 Chinese soldiers had entered Sikkim territory in the vicinity of the Tagi La (referred to as “The area north-west of Bom Cho” in the Indian note) and had then withdrawn after Indian personnel opened fire, and lodged a protest with the Chinese Government on these grounds. It is quite clear that, in concocting this story, what the Indian side tried to do was none other than make a false counter-charge in order to cover up its own criminal act of provocative shelling. The Chinese Government hereby sternly condemns the Indian side's slanderous fabrication and categorically rejects its unwarranted protest. It must be pointed out that it is India and no one else who should stop her “deliberate and aggressive border violations”. If the Indian side refuses to heed reason and persists in shooting today and shelling tomorrow on the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim border, it will be dealt counter-blows as it deserves.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the four notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated November 20, 21 and 23, 1965.

1. In its notes the Indian Government accused Chinese soldiers of crossing the "Bomchola Pass" and the "Kongrala" on the China-Sikkim boundary to enter Sikkim territory and crossing the boundary in the Western Sector of the Sino-Indian border to enter the Daulat Beg Oldi area, and so on and so forth. This is sheer fabrication. At no time and in no place have Chinese Frontier guards crossed the China-Sikkim boundary or the Sino-Indian boundary. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the Indian Government's protests based on lies entirely of its own concoction.

2. In its notes, the Indian side also rehashed a multitude of other slanderous charges against China. The Chinese Government has already set forth the relevant facts and thoroughly refuted the Indian lies in its notes of September 24, September 27, October 18, November 13 and November 18, 1965. Even though the Indian side repeats those lies a thousand times, it will not succeed in turning them into facts.

3. Why should the Indian Government have recently increased its vilifications against China to such an extent? This is not accidental. It is common knowledge that the Indian Government is now having a hard time. It is eagerly begging the U.S. imperialists and their collaborators for money, food and weapons. Facts over the past years have proved that at such junctures the Indian side invariably intensifies its provocative intrusions into China and creates tension on the border. And the more the Indian side intensifies its intrusions into China, the greater is its need to make false counter-charges against China in order to cover up its own crimes. But this trick on the part of the Indian Government has long gone bankrupt. Its renewed employment now can have no other effect than reveal the Indian Government's ugly features once again.

4. The Chinese Government advises the Indian Government truly to stop all its acts of aggression and its slanders against China. Otherwise it is bound to meet with even greater failures.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 November, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to their notes dated the 28th and 29th November 1965 has the honour to state:

The Government of India have noted that the Chinese Government are trying to evade responsibility for their provocative activities in North Sikkim and Ladakh and are seeking refuge in bland denials and fabricated counter-charges. In their note of the 28th November the Chinese Government have talked of "provocative shelling" by Indian troops on Chinese soldiers "on the Chinese side" of "Tagi Pass". On an earlier occasion (in their note dated the 6th November 1964) the Government of India had pointed out that they are not aware of any such place as "Tagi Pass" in this well-known sector of the Sikkim-Tibet border. Since the Chinese note under reply however has equated this "Tagi Pass" with the area north-west of Bom Cho, it is obvious that this false counter-charge has been levelled to confuse the facts regarding China's repeated acts of unwarranted intrusion in the North Sikkim area on the 19th, 20th, 21st and 24th November 1965. (Reference Government of India's notes dated 20th, 21st, 23rd and 25th November, 1965). Similarly, full facts about the wanton intrusion by the Chinese troops in the Daulet Beg Oldi area in Ladakh have been given in another note dated the 23rd November, 1965. No amount of denials can alter these facts.

The Chinese Government may recall that in their note dated the 26th December 1959, they had said of the Sikkim sector of the India-China border: "The boundary between China and Sikkim has long been formally delimited and there is neither any discrepancy between the maps nor any disputes in practice". Notwithstanding this, the Chinese Government have continued with their reckless policy of engineering provocations and injecting tension in an area where there is no territorial conflict. This clearly exposes the expansionist policy being pursued by the Chinese Government.

The Chinese notes under reply have talked of India's "ugly features" and "bankruptcy" and threatened India with "counter-blows" by the Chinese Government. Such language and threats are not used by one independent and sovereign nation to another. We have no desire to compete with the Chinese Government in this field. If the Chinese Government get carried away by their hatred of India and their opposition to India's peaceful policies, and use slander as a substitute for logic and reason, the Government of India cannot but express their regret at this.

The chain of border intrusions and provocative activities staged by the Chinese Government along India's northern frontier are no accidental occurrence. They are an integral part of the Chinese Government's deliberate policy of maintaining tension and conflict in this part of Asia.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Chinese Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state:

The Government of India have received information that since the 26th November 1965 armed Chinese troops have once again entered the Thagla ridge area in strength and have taken up positions at several points in this area. On the afternoon of December 1st, about 250 armed Chinese soldiers moved further south towards the Namkachu river and about 100 of them crossed over to the south bank and took up positions there. In carrying out this act of provocation and further extending their intrusive activities southward, the Chinese Government have repeated and enlarged their earlier intrusion in this same area which took place on the 23rd November, 1965 (Reference Government of India's note dated the 27th November 1965).

This latest and serious violation of the established boundary of India by Chinese troops is not only an infringement of India's territorial sovereignty but open defiance of the provisions of the Colombo Proposals and a negation of China's own cease-fire declaration. In sending its troops into the Thagla ridge area, which the Chinese Government call "Che Dong", the Chinese Government has violated the 20-k.m. demilitarized zone it claims to have established all along the India-China border including the Eastern Sector, violated the so-called 'line of actual control' and entered one of the four areas which it had undertaken to leave vacant. In his letter of April 20, 1963, Premier Chou En-lai wrote to the late Prime Minister Nehru that "in response to the Colombo Proposals, it (the Chinese Government) has decided to vacate these areas and refrain from establishing civilian checkposts there". On February 17, 1963, Marshal Chen Yi, China's Vice-Premier and Foreign Minister, said to a correspondent of the Swedish Broadcasting Corporation: "The Chinese Government has decided to leave vacant four places which are under dispute in the cease-fire arrangements and not even to set up civilian checkposts there. These four areas are in the Western Sector where India once set up 43 strong points, Wuje in the Middle Sector and Che Dong area and Longju in Eastern Sector of the Sino-Indian border".

In contravention of the above unequivocal assurances of the Chinese Government and in contemptuous defiance of the provisions of the Colombo Proposals Chinese troops have entered the Thagla ridge area a second time within one week, thereby violating the well-established international boundary of India in the Eastern Sector. This is nothing but a deliberate act of provocation and a calculated attempt to raise tension and create incidents on the India-China border. The Government of India lodge a strong protest against these continuing and increasingly aggressive acts by Chinese troops across the Indian border.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.
The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India have received reports that Chinese troops have once again intruded into Indian territory in the Eastern Sector of the India-China border. On the night of 5-6th December, 1965 armed Chinese troops crossed the international boundary at the Thagla ridge and re-entered the Namkachu Valley. On the night of 6-7th December they crossed the Namkachu river, and the next day they moved in strength up to Hatung La Pass which is about three miles south of the international border. The total strength of the intruding Chinese troops in the Namkachu Valley is now reported to be about 350.

The Government of India vehemently protest against this violation of Indian territory by Chinese troops. In their notes of 27th November and 4th December, 1965 the Government of India had protested against earlier intrusions by Chinese forces into the Thagla ridge area. The Chinese Government have paid no heed to these protests and are, on the contrary, allowing their troops to continue their reckless and aggressive acts against India. The facts of these intrusions are undeniable and there is nothing that even the Chinese Government have been able to invent in order to justify them. As has been pointed out in previous notes of the Government of India, the Chinese Government, by these provocative intrusions, have violated its cease-fire declaration, violated the 20-k.m. demilitarized zone, violated the Colombo Proposals and violated the assurances given to India as well as publicly to the whole world by Chinese leaders that China will not send its troops and not even set up civilian check posts in the Thagla ridge area. Having committed massive aggression against India and occupied a large area of Indian territory in the Western Sector, is the Chinese Government now trying to change by force the status quo on the Eastern Sector of the India-China border? The Government of India have always held that the border question cannot be settled through application of pressure or the exercise of brute force. Any such attempt is bound to fail and, as in the past, will only further embitter relations between the two countries and endanger the peace of the area.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 December, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:
The following instances of violation of the 'line of actual control' by armed Chinese troops in the Ladakh sector of the India-China border have been noted by the Government of India in the period since 1st December 1965.

(1) On 3rd December at 1800 hours two Chinese vehicles intruded about 2 miles west of the 'line of actual control' opposite the Indian civilian checkpost at Daulet Beg Oldi. They returned to the Chinese side of the line later in the evening.

(2) On the morning of 5th December, two vehicles with Chinese soldiers intruded about 2 miles west of the 'line of actual control' and came up to a hill feature near the Indian civilian checkpost at Track Junction. They remained in this area till the afternoon.

(3) On 6th December at 1430 hours four Chinese soldiers in a light vehicle intruded to a depth of one mile opposite the Indian civilian checkpost at Daulet Beg Oldi before returning on the same day.

(4) On 8th December between 1045 and 1615 hours about 20 armed Chinese soldiers intruded to a depth of 4 miles opposite the Indian checkpost at the Track Junction.

(5) On the 8th December at 1000 hours two Chinese vehicles intruded about 1.5 miles west of the "line of actual control" before withdrawing to the Chinese side of this line.

(6) On the 9th December between 1045 and 1400 hours two Chinese vehicles carrying about 20 soldiers intruded about 2 miles west of the "line of actual control" and came up to a hill feature near the Indian civilian checkpost at Track Junction.

In addition to these deliberate intrusions, in the period since 1st December 1965, the Government of India have noted the following instances of violation and remilitarization of the 20 km demilitarized zone in Ladakh.

(1) On the morning of December 2, 1965, about 70 Chinese soldiers visited the Silung Burma Nullah opposite the Indian civilian checkpost at Hot Spring and remained there up to 1600 hours.

(2) On December 4, between 0930 and 1630 hours about 50 Chinese soldiers were engaged in construction activity at a point about one mile east of the "line of actual control" opposite the Indian civilian checkpost at Daulet Beg Oldi. It has been noted that since then Chinese troops have set up a post in this area.

(3) On December 5, about 60 Chinese soldiers visited the Silung Burma Nullah between 0900 and 1700 hours. On 6th December some Chinese troops again visited this point between 0900 and 1600 hours.

(4) On December 6 between 1100 and 1400 hours 30 Chinese soldiers, some of them mounted, visited a hill feature near the Indian checkpost at Tsaskur.
In the past several days about 300 Chinese soldiers have been concentrated in the area near the Indian civilian checkpost at Demchok. They have been observed firing Verey lights and carrying out provocative exercises in the demilitarized zone.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest against the wilful and unprovoked acts of harassment and intrusions listed above and urge the Chinese Government to order their troops to put an immediate stop to them.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 12 December, 1965

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state as follows:

At 1435 hours on December 12, 1965, a group of more than 30 Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory for more than 500 metres through the Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary. These Indian aggressor troops opened heavy fire with rifles and artillery on the Chinese frontier guards who were on patrol duty there, killing one of them, so that the Chinese frontier guards were compelled to fire back in self-defence. The Indian aggressor troops then fled back to Sikkim territory helter-skelter. The Chinese frontier guards caught three Indian soldiers alive (among whom two were wounded), killed five and captured a light machine-gun, five rifles and a tommy gun. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this serious provocation in which Indian troops wantonly intruded into Chinese territory and launched an armed attack on the Chinese frontier guards.

It is common knowledge that recently Prime Minister Shastri, Defence Minister Chavan and other leaders of the Indian Government have made continual outcries against China, slanderously charging Chinese troops with "intrusions" across the China-Sikkim and the Sino-Indian boundaries and calling for "the necessary steps" "to deal with the Chinese intruders in strength," etc. At the same time, Indian troops have incessantly perpetrated acts of intrusion and provocation against China by firing rifles and artillery on the China-Sikkim border and the Sino-Indian border. Now they have gone to the length of launching an armed attack after invading Chinese territory. All this clearly shows that the Indian Government, in order to meet its present political needs, has frantically resorted to force to create tension on the border and oppose China.
The Chinese Government once again serves a stern warning to the Indian Government; it must immediately stop its intrusions and provocations against China, or else the Chinese side will give it such punishment as it deserves.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 December, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

On the 10th December 1965 about 400 armed Chinese troops entered the Longju area in Subansiri district of NEFA and intruded to a depth of 1½ to 2 miles into Indian territory. Following this unprovoked intrusion, Chinese troops have been digging trenches and setting up military works in this area.

This latest act of calculated intrusion in the eastern sector of the India-China border, has come in the wake of repeated Chinese provocations and intrusions in the other parts of this border. The Chinese troops who had penetrated into Indian territory south of the Thagla ridge (reference our note of 4th December 1965) are still entrenched there and have been strengthening their position at the Hatung La ridge.

These aggressive acts constitute a serious infringement of India's territorial integrity. They are also in gross violation of the Colombo Proposals and China's own statements and assurances.

In their statement of the 1st March 1963, the Chinese Government had stated:

"With regard to the four areas within the 20 km zone on our side of the line of actual control where there is a dispute between China and India about the cease-fire arrangements, namely, the Che Dong area and Longju in the eastern sector, Wu-Je in the middle sector and the area in the western sector . . . . . our Government in response to the appeal of the Colombo conference, has decided to vacate them and refrain from establishing civilian checkpoints there after the withdrawal of our frontier guards."

Confirming this Premier Chou En-lai in his letter to the Prime Minister of India dated the 3rd March 1963 said:

"Moreover, the Chinese Government has further decided to refrain from establishing civilian checkpoints in the four areas where there is a dispute about the cease-fire arrangement."
In blatant disregard of their own statements and public assurances the Chinese Government have now despatched armed forces to intrude into Longju across the international border of India. This is yet another provocative act in the chain of calculated violations of Indian territory by Chinese troops in recent weeks and is, obviously, designed to further China's scheme of creating tension and conflict in the Indian sub-continent. The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against these reckless and aggressive actions by Chinese troops.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 December, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

At 1130 hours on 12th December about 250 to 320 Chinese troops intruded into Sikkim territory, 3 miles north-west of Sese La in north Sikkim. The Chinese soldiers fired at an Indian patrol in this area using mortars and automatic weapons. The fire was returned by the Indian personnel in self-defence. The exchange of fire which started at 1200 hours was continued till dusk. In the firing two Indian soldiers were killed; seven others are missing, while 30 Chinese intruders were also killed. The dead Chinese were carried back under the cover of darkness.

This major incident was preceded by two other acts of provocation. On the 10th December 1965, at 1130 hours, 30 armed Chinese soldiers intruded into Sikkim territory to a depth of about 1500 yards in the area north-west of Bom Cho in the north Sikkim. The Chinese intruders retreated into Tibetan territory at 1530 hours when they sighted an Indian patrol which had been sent out to intercept them. On the night of 10th-11th December between 1830 and 0400 hours Chinese troops in the Nathu La area carried out unprovoked firing towards an Indian point south-east of Nathu La, 1000 yards inside Sikkim territory.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against these latest acts of aggression across the Sikkim border by Chinese troops. In order to cover up these criminal acts the Chinese Government has concocted baseless charges against India and handed over with indecent haste a so-called "protest" note to Indian Embassy in Peking at 4 a.m. on the morning of December 13. These are, however, much too serious to be covered up by fabricated allegations. The Chinese Government in its note has admitted that their intruding troops have killed 5 Indian soldiers and captured three others. The Government of India demand the immediate return of these to the Indian side.
The Ministry of External Affairs avails of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 17 December, 1965.

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1152.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

On December 12, 1965 Indian troops intruded into Chinese territory through Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary and made an armed attack on the Chinese frontier guards on duty there. Five of them were shot to death on the spot and three captured by the Chinese side. One of the three captured Indian soldiers died of his serious wound on the 13th. Acting in the spirit of revolutionary humanitarianism, the Chinese Government has instructed the authorities concerned to hand over to the Indian side the bodies of the six Indian soldiers mentioned above on the Chinese side of Tagi La at 1400 hours (Peking time), December 20, 1965. The Indian Government can send personnel, who shall carry a green flag as before, to receive the bodies at the place and time specified above. If no Indian personnel appear for receiving the bodies of the six Indian soldiers at the specified time, the Chinese Government will instruct the authorities concerned to bury them.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 December, 1965.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to their note of the 17th December 1965 has the honour to state as follows:

According to reports just received from the Indian defence personnel on the Sikkim-Tibet border, Chinese troops have today handed over the dead bodies of six Indian soldiers killed on the 12th December 1965 on Sikkim territory in an encounter between intruding Chinese troops and an Indian patrol. The handing over of the bodies and calling it "revolutionary humanitarianism" does not, of course, absolve the Chinese Government of the responsibility for the crime and for the aggressive intrusion. The Chinese Government has not yet returned the two other Indian personnel whom their troops had seized from Sikkim territory on December 12. The Government of India demand their immediate return to the Indian side.
The Ministry takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24 December, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Government’s notes of 6th October and 30th October, 1965 has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India’s notes of the 2nd October and 6th October, 1965 had given details of two incidents of the 2nd and 4th October when the Chinese soldiers carried out provocative intrusions across the Sikkim-Tibet border at Yak La and attempted to overrun Indian positions located well inside Sikkim territory. When the aggressive intrusions of the Chinese troops were foiled by the vigilant Indian personnel, the Chinese Government kept quiet about it and waited for four days after the receipt of India’s protest of the 2nd October to come out with their so-called “protest” on the 6th October. But a trumped-up counter-protest cannot cover up facts, especially when the Chinese intrusions in the Sikkim sector have become more and more frequent and threatening.

The Government of India’s note of the 10th October had given details of an incident across Lipu Lekh Pass on the 9th October when the Chinese troops intruded into Indian territory and opened fire on an Indian patrol. The Chinese Government are now denying his with the bland statement that no Chinese troops were present in the area. Such denials are futile because the Chinese troops not only intruded but opened fire on an Indian patrol party in the area.

The Chinese note of the 30th October abounds in falsehoods and self-contradictions. The facts of the Chinese provocations at Tsaskur cannot be evaded by mere denial or sophistry. Unable to deny China’s military activities in the 20-k.m. demilitarized zone in Ladakh, the Chinese Government have claimed that these activities took place in “Chinese territory”. The whole world knows that 20-k.m. zones in Ladakh is part of the 14,500 sq. miles of Indian territory forcibly seized and illegally occupied by Chinese troops. By introducing troops in the demilitarized area the Chinese Government have repudiated the Colombo Proposals and also their “unilateral cease-fire” declaration of the 21st November 1962. It is obvious that the Chinese government has done this to intensify tension and to re-open the order conflict. The further and even graver intrusions which are taking place all along the border demonstrate that the Chinese Government is not interested in peace or peaceful settlement but is pursuing a warped policy of creating trouble, tension and conflict.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 6th January, 1966

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 040.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the Notes of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated November 27 and 30 and December 4, 10, 11 and 13, 1965.

In the six notes under reference, the Indian Government trumped up a great number of slanderous charges about Chinese "intrusions" into India, alleging that China has been creating tensions and conflicts along the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim boundary, and on these bases lodged repeated "protests" with China. The Chinese Government expresses its indignation at these unwarranted charges and protests and categorically rejects them.

Whether on the Sino-Indian border or on the China-Sikkim boundary, the Chinese frontier guards and civilian personnel have not crossed either the line of actual control or the boundary between the two sides. The charges made by the Indian Government in its notes about Chinese "intrusions" are all deliberate and complete fabrications.

Regarding the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, the Indian side has accused Chinese personnel of "intrusions" across Zang La, Siungla, Kepangla and Sumdorong ridge. In the first place, the Chinese Government knows nothing about the location of what the Indian side refers to as Zang La and Siungla. The so-called junction of the Nyamjang Chu and the Sumdorong Chu south of Sumdorong ridge is situated north of Shatze and is obviously on the Chinese side of the line of actual control. As for the assertion that Chinese personnel had crossed Kepang La on the afternoon of November 27, 1965 to "attack" an Indian police party and "wounded" an Indian constable in the arm, it is all the more a sheer fabrication and is not worthy of any refutation.

Particularly absurd is the fact that the Indian side charged Chinese troops with entering Longju and the Che Dong area, alleging that China has "violated the well-established international boundary of India in the eastern sector". It has long been established that Longju is always part of the Migyitun Area of Tibet and is located north of the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border. Che Dong has always been under the administration of Le village of Tsona County of Tibet. It is even to the north and on the Chinese side of the illegal MacMahon line according to the original 1914 map of the line. In referring again to Longju and the Che Dong and describing the illegal MacMahon line as the Sino-Indian boundary in the Eastern sector, the Indian Government has merely revealed its expansionist design on Chinese territory. The Chinese Government hereby once again states to the Indian Government that the MacMahon line is illegal and has never been recognised by China. The 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory south of the MacMahon line is now still under India's unlawful occupation. The Chinese Government for ever retains the right to settle this question.
Regarding the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, the many cases of so-called “intrusions” by China enumerated by the Indian side are all charges about Chinese personnel entering the Dauletbeg Oldi area. But the fact is that the Chinese side has never crossed its own boundary, let alone entering the Indian area of Dauletbeg Oldi.

As for the China-Sikkim boundary, the Chinese Government long ago explicitly pointed out in its note of December 26, 1959 that the boundary between China and Sikkim has long been formally delimited and that there is neither any discrepancy between the maps nor any disputes in practice. China has always respected the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Sikkim and has never crossed the China-Sikkim boundary. On the other hand, ever since 1960 the Indian troops stationed in Sikkim have constantly intruded into China’s territory across the China-Sikkim boundary and have built a large number of military works for aggression on Chinese territory. Only when, in September 1965, the Chinese Government set a time-limit for the Indian side to dismantle these military works for aggression did the intruding Indian troops hastily withdraw. But since then Indian troops, attempting to stage a come-back, have continued repeatedly to cross the boundary for reconnaissance, and even launched armed attacks against the Chinese frontier guards. It is perfectly clear that India has been using Sikkim’s territory to commit ceaseless intrusions and provocations against China and create tension on the China-Sikkim boundary. No matter how many lies the Indian Government may fabricate, it can in no way disguise this iron-clad fact. In its notes under reference, the Indian Government talked nonsense about China’s open defiance of the provisions of the Colombo proposals and negation of China’s own cease-fire declaration. Here the Indian Government has lifted a rock only to have its own toes squashed. As is well known, back on October 24, 1962, the fourth day after India launched her massive armed attack on China, the Chinese Government issued its statement solemnly proposing that the armed forces of both sides withdraw 20 kilometres from the line of actual control along the Sino-Indian border. Soon afterwards the Chinese side unilaterally withdrew and vacated those areas where there is a dispute between the two sides about the cease-fire arrangement, without so much as setting up any civilian checkpoints there. These measures taken by the Chinese side far exceeded the requirements of the Colombo proposals. The Chinese Government repeatedly stated that the sole purpose of China in taking these measures on her own initiative was to ease the situation on the border and facilitate a peaceful settlement of the boundary question. At the same time, the Chinese Government explicitly reserved the right of self-defence and asked the Indian side to correctly understand China’s efforts for peace, to make a positive response and absolutely not to take advantage of China’s unilateral steps to commit intrusion or provocation. But in fact what has happened? Far from making any response to the measures taken by China to ease tension, the Indian side has taken advantage of China’s self-initiated withdrawal to intensify its intrusions and provocations against China and create tension. In the period of less than three years from November 1962 when China initiated a cease-fire on the Sino-Indian border up to September 1965, there occurred more than three hundred cases of
ground or air military intrusions by India. In the face of such rabid intrusions and provocations by India, the Chinese side is fully entitled to take all necessary measures in self-defence. To put it bluntly, it will never do for the Indian Government to permit itself recklessly to intensify its armed intrusion and create border incidents and forbid China to strengthen her defence and alertness and take the necessary defence measures on her own territory. It must be pointed out that the Indian Government’s recent frenzied effort to create tension by armed force along the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim border is entirely prompted by the requirements of its current internal and external policies. Facts in the past few years show that whenever the Indian Government needs to beg for aid from the U.S. imperialists and their collaborators, it intensifies its intrusions into China, creates tension and sets in motion its rumour-mongering machinery to smear her in a big way. It is precisely to cope with the increasingly serious food shortage at home and to meet the needs of its arms expansion and war preparations that the Indian Government is intensifying its intrusions into China.

The Chinese Government hereby reiterates its solemn word to the Indian Government; should the Indian side continue its intrusions and provocations against China or even against launch armed attacks on the Chinese frontier guards, the Chinese side will resolutely strike back. Should the Indian side continue to spread rumours and slanders against China, or even attempt to malign her on the protest of her measures for easing tension, it will not harm her in the least but will only further expose the Indian Government’s disgraceful doings.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 February, 1966

No. C/2/66

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

In the past several weeks Chinese troops in the western, middle and eastern sectors of the India-China border have continued their provocative activities and the following instances of intrusion and provocation have taken place in the period from 11th December, 1965 to the 15th January, 1966.

Western Sector

In contemptuous disregard of their own undertakings as well as the Colombo proposals, Chinese troops have continued to violate the “line of actual control” in a series of intrusions in the Dauletbeg Oldi area.
On 12th December, 1965, two vehicles carrying Chinese troops intruded 2 miles across "the line of actual control" and visited a hill feature opposite the Indian checkpost at Track Junction.

On 14th December, 1965, 60 Chinese soldiers in two vehicles intruded 4 miles west of the "line of actual control" and visited the hill features near the Indian checkpost at Track Junction between 1015 and 1510 hours.

On 15th December, 1965, two vehicles carrying 70 Chinese soldiers intruded 4 miles west of the "line of actual control" across the Indian Track Junction checkpost and visited a hill feature remaining there from the morning till afternoon.

On 16th December, 1965, two Chinese vehicles with 70 soldiers again intruded 4 miles west of the "line of actual control" to visit hill features near the Indian Track Junction checkpost at 1030 hours and returned to their encampment in the afternoon.

On 19th December, 1965, between 1040 and 1330 hours two Chinese vehicles carrying soldiers intruded 2 miles beyond the "line of actual control" and visited a hill feature near the Indian Track Junction checkpost.

On 23rd December, 1965, two vehicles with 50 to 70 Chinese soldiers intruded 4 miles west of the "line of actual control" and visited a hill feature near the Indian Track Junction checkpost.

On 25th December, 1965, from 1045 to 1515 hours two vehicles carrying Chinese soldiers intruded 4 miles beyond the "line of actual control" across the Indian checkpost at Track Junction.

On 2nd January, 1966, two vehicles with 25 Chinese soldiers intruded about 4 miles west of the "line of actual control" and visited two hill features near the Indian checkpost at Track Junction, remaining there from 0945 hours till afternoon.

On 9th January, 1966, between 1000 to 1150 hours two vehicles carrying Chinese soldiers intruded 2 miles beyond the "line of actual control" and visited a hill feature near the Indian checkpost at Track Junction before returning to their base.

On 15th January, 1966, between 1045 to 1230 hours two vehicles with Chinese soldiers intruded 4 miles west of the "line of actual control" and visited two hill features near the Indian checkpost at Track Junction.

In addition, incessant military activity has been carried out by Chinese troops in the 20 km demilitarized zone and Chinese troops have been actively engaged in setting up and enlarging two new military strong points opposite the Indian checkposts at Dauletbeg Oldi and Track Junction. Chinese troops have also been engaged in carrying out troops movements and exercises in the Silung Barma Nullah area and in the Demchok area. Chinese troops have also re-established their military post in the Rezang Lumpa area in the 20 km demilitarized zone.
**Middle Sector**

On 16th December, 1965, at 1010 hours a Chinese aircraft from Tibet intruded over the Mana area to a depth of 5 miles before returning to Tibet.

**Eastern Sector**

Chinese troops who had intruded south of the so-called "line of actual control" in the Thagla ridge area on the 5th-6th December 1965 (our note of 10th December, 1965, refers) and penetrated up to Hatung La ridge, carried out intensive entrenchment and construction activities in this area, erecting bunkers and observation posts, as well as digging trenches and other military works. The intruding Chinese troops also carried out provocative exercises including the firing of very lights from Hatung La ridge.

Chinese troops who had intruded into the Longju area in Subansiri district of NEFA on the 10th December 1965 (our note of 13th December, 1965, refers) extended their illegal occupation approximately one mile south of Longju and 2½ miles south of the international boundary and the "line of actual control". They carried out various construction activities in this area.

**Sikkim-Tibet Border**

On 19th December 1965, at 2130 hours Chinese troops on the right shoulder of Nathu La opened fire on Sikkim territory, without causing any damage.

These repeated intrusions can only be designed to keep up tension on the borders and to worsen relations between the two countries. The Government of India would once again demand that the Chinese Government refrain from such unprovoked aggressive activities.

The Ministry takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 3 February, 1966**


The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Government's notes of the 31st May, 7th June and 11th June, 1965 has the honour to state as follows:

Events of the last few months have already exposed the hollowness and hypocrisy of Chinese Government's contentions contained in the above-mentioned notes. China's policy of creating border incidents behind a smoke screen of fabricated counter-charges has now become all too clear to the world. Equally self-evident is the Chinese Government's contemptuous rejection of the conciliatory efforts of the Afro-Asian powers, who met at Colombo in December 1962, and formulated the Colombo proposals. Yet, it may be useful to examine these Chinese notes and to place on record some of the facts.
In their note of the 31st May 1965, the Chinese Government have tried to deny that a Chinese intrusion had taken place across the line of actual control" in the Chip-chap River area in Ladakh on the 1st April, 1965 by merely saying that Chinese troops have never been sent to the 20 km demilitarized zone. Since September 1965, the Chinese Government have repeatedly intruded to the west of the line of actual control" after having re-militarized the 20 km demilitarized zone. These are facts which cannot be denied.

In their note dated 7th June 1965, the Chinese Government have made similar futile efforts to deny facts of a Chinese intrusion into Indian territory across Mana Pass on the 9th May, 1965, by claiming that they have "exercised restraint and forbearance" and "stood for settlement by means of negotiations. This is a dishonest pretension in the face of the fact that China has not only rejected all reasonable proposals for talks, but has indulged in repeated, unprovoked intrusions into Indian territory and even threatened India with an impudent ultimatum.

In their note dated the 11th June 1965, the Chinese Government have made equally vain attempts to deny facts of Chinese intrusions across the Sikkim-Tibet border. Lacking in any substantial argument in defence of their intrusions, the Chinese Government have attempted at one point, to distort a brief reply given in Parliament on the 22nd February 1965, by the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, and alleged that the Indian Government have been giving contradictory stories. Such sophistry and air-splitting will not do. In the same note, the Chinese Government have also made mischievous insinuations about India "sowing discord between China and Sikkim". The Chinese Government are aware that, under the treaty relationship between India and Sikkim, the Indian Government are responsible for the defence and territorial integrity of Sikkim and that the external relations of Sikkim are also the responsibility of the Government of India. Premier Chou En-lai had recognised this special relationship between India and Sikkim in 1960 when, in reply to a question at a press Conference in New Delhi, he declared that "China respects India's relations with Sikkim and Bhutan". How then can there be any question of India creating discord between China and Sikkim? The very suggestion represents a crude attempt on the part of the Chinese Government to spoil the special and cordial relations which exist between India and Sikkim.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 February, 1966

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to refer to their Note No. (66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 040 dated the 6th January, 1966.
The facts that stand out clearly in the Chinese note under reply is the virtual admission by the Government of China that its troops entered the demilitarised zone in Ladakh and the Thagla Ridge area and Longju in the eastern sector of the India-China border. The Chinese Government, who has always been enthusiastic to deny indisputable facts, has not, in this case, cared even to make a pretence of repudiating these facts of grave violations by its troops. On the contrary, it has put forward the hypocritical plea of 'self-defence' to justify these acts of aggression and blatant violations of solemn assurances. It has been alleged that between November 1962 and September 1965 there occurred more than three hundred cases of ground and air military intrusions by India. This is a massive lie manufactured in Peking. In various notes the Government of India have already refuted, once and for all, each and every one of these Chinese allegations.

It is obvious that all these false and malicious charges against India have been made by the Chinese Government with increasing frequency and truculence, especially since September last year, in order to provide a pretext for the discarding of the Colombo proposals and the repudiation of China's own assurances, and to create incidents and tension on the border under the cover of exercising China's 'right of self-defence'. The world is only too painfully aware of what the Chinese Government means when it talks of 'self-defence'. Neither the people of India nor the people of the world have forgotten that it was in the name of 'self-defence' that the Chinese troops launched a massive invasion across the Indian border in the autumn of 1962. The Chinese Government is only deceiving itself and no one else, when it argues that it was in 'self-defence' that its troops carried out unprovoked violations of the demilitarized zone and the Thagla Ridge and Longju areas; according to reports received by the Government of India the Chinese troops who have intruded into Thagla Ridge area and Longju have, with the advance of winter, gone back into Tibet. Indian troops and personnel have on no occasion transgressed the historically established and well-known international boundary between India and China. As regards 'the line of actual control' in the Western Sector, Indian personnel have never crossed it at any point even though India does not recognise this 'line' which was unilaterally imposed by China as a result of its massive military operations in 1962. In regard to the 'disputed' Thagla Ridge area and Longju, India has scrupulously honoured the provisions of the Colombo proposals; indeed, even the Chinese Government has not suggested that Indian troops have been despatched to these areas. It is, therefore, evident that the Chinese violations and intrusions were not 'measures in self-defence' taken by China but naked and unprovoked acts of aggression.

The Chinese note under reply says that "the Indian Government talked nonsense about China's open defiance of the provisions of the Colombo proposals and negation of China's own cease-fire declaration". It is well-known that under the Colombo proposals the Chinese Government were to carry out in the Western Sector a 20-k.m. withdrawal of their troops and the area vacated by the Chinese military withdrawals was to be a demilitarized zone
to be administered by the civilian posts of both sides. In the Eastern Sector, the Chinese troops were to withdraw north of the McMahon Line, and the 'remaining areas' or 'the disputed areas' viz., Thagla Ridge area and Longju were to be kept vacant of the troops of both India and China. In a document entitled "The Principles Underlying the Proposals of the Six", which the representatives of the Colombo Conference gave to the Chinese Government in Peking, it was stated: "On the Eastern Sector, (a) it seems to be clear that, whether the McMahon Line is considered to be an illegal imposition or not, it has in fact become a line of actual control, with the Chinese Government exercising exclusive administrative control to the north of it, and the Indian Government exercising exclusive administrative control to the south of it, except in Che Dong and Longju which are disputed...". The Chinese Government, while maintaining reservations in regard to some of the important provisions of the Colombo proposals, had unequivocally accepted the recommendation to refrain from sending its troops to the Thagla Ridge area and Longju in the Eastern Sector, and also to the 'disputed areas' in the Middle and Eastern Sectors.

On February 17, 1963, speaking to the Swedish Broadcasting Corporation, Vice-Premier Chen Yi assured the world that the Chinese Government would leave vacant the four places which are under dispute in the ceasefire arrangements and not even set up civilian checkpoints there. Subsequently in an official statement issued by the Chinese Ministry of Defence on 1st March, 1963, it was stated: "With regard to the four areas within the 20 k.m. zone on our side of the line of actual control, where there is a dispute between China and India about ceasefire arrangements, namely, the Chedong area and Longju in the Eastern Sector, Wuje in the middle sector and the area in the Western Sector where India once established 43 military strong points and where China had set up additional frontier posts in order to resist India's invasion, our Government in response to the appeal of the Colombo Conference, has decided to vacate them and refrain from establishing civilian checkpoints there after the withdrawal of our frontier guards".

In a note to India dated March 2, 1963, the Chinese Government repeated this undertaking as follows: "It must be stressed that none of the above-mentioned civilian checkpoints is established in the four areas where there is a dispute between China and India about the ceasefire arrangement—namely, the Chedong area and Longju in the Eastern Sector, Wuje in the middle sector and the area in the Western Sector where India once established 43 military strong points and where China had set up additional frontier posts in order to resist Indian invasion. In response to the peace appeal of the Colombo Conference of six Asian and African countries, the Chinese Government has decided to vacate the four areas and to refrain from establishing civilian checkpoints there after the withdrawal of Chinese frontier guards".

On March, 3, 1963, Premier Chou En-lai wrote to the late Prime Minister Nehru: "Moreover the Chinese Government has further decided to refrain from establishing civilian checkpoints in the four areas where there is a dispute about the ceasefire arrangement".
Again on 20th April, 1963, Premier Chou En-lai wrote to the late Mr. Nehru “...in response to the Colombo proposals it (the Chinese Government) has decided to vacate those areas and refrain from establishing checkposts there”.

Thus both under the Colombo proposals and China’s own declarations and assurances the Chinese Government were committed, amongst other things, (1) not to cross the ‘line of actual control’, (2) to maintain the 20 k.m. demilitarized zone in the Western Sector under the Colombo proposals, and under the Chinese Declaration, in all the three sectors of the border, and (3) not to send its troops to the ‘disputed’ areas of Thagla Ridge, Longju, etc.

According to the Chinese note, India is “talking nonsense” when it reminds the Chinese Government of these provisions, assurances and declarations. One can only ask, what is the worth of China’s assurances to other countries and its loud slogan of Afro-Asian solidarity if such is its attitude to its own solemn commitments and to the sincere and constructive proposals of the Six Asian-African countries who met at the Colombo Conference for creating conditions for a meeting between India and China?

The Chinese Government, in its note under reference, has also tried to uphold its aggressive actions on the border on the ground that the Thagla Ridge area, Longju and the junction of Namjangchu and the Sumdorong Chu south of the Sumdorong ridge are situated north of the McMahon Line and of the ‘line of actual control’ in the Eastern Sector. This is an untenable and fallacious argument, and is nothing but a desperate effort to find a historical loophole for aggression. Regarding the alignment of the McMahon Line, the Government of India have already explained their position fully and clearly in various notes and memoranda to the Chinese Government. The memorandum attached to the late Prime Miniter Nehru’s letter to Premier Chau En-lai dated November 14, 1962, is relevant in this connection. The memorandum pointed out that “The Agreement of 1914 only formalized what was the traditional and customary boundary in the area which lies along the highest Himalayan watershed ridges. The maps attached to the Agreement were of small scale of 1 inch to 8 miles. They were sketch maps and intended to be only illustrative. All that they made clear was that the boundary ran along the main watershed ridges of the area. The parallels and meridians were shown only approximately in accordance with the progress achieved at that time in the sphere of scientific surveys. This is a common cartographic feature and the Chinese Government have themselves recognised this in Article 48 of their 1960 Treaty with Burma. The principle underlying the McMahon Line agreement was that the boundaries lie along the highest watershed ridges. As regards Longju, it is well-known that it was under Indian administrative control till August 1959, when the Chinese forces attacked the Indian outpost there. Since the withdrawal of the Chinese personnel in 1961, Longju has not been under the administrative control of either side. Regarding the Thagla Ridge area, it has always been under Indian administrative control till the Chinese forces crossed the Thagla Ridge, for the first time on 8th September 1962. In the face of these facts it is absurd for the Chinese Government to claim
hat these areas are north of the McMahon Line and in Tibetan territory. Furthermore, to induct troops into these areas is an attempt to change the status quo on the border by forcible penetration and is in gross disregard of China's own categorical assurances to India, the Colombo Powers and the world.

The Chinese note has blandly dismissed as 'fabrication' the incident at Kepang La in the Eastern Sector on November 27, 1965, when an Indian police-party was attacked by intruding Chinese soldiers. Regarding the intrusions across Zangla and Siungla it has pleaded ignorance of the location of these places. There is no use denying established facts and pretending ignorance in order to evade responsibility. Zangla and Siungla are known border passes and the intruding Chinese troops could not have been unaware of this fact when they crossed into Indian territory.

As for the border of Sikkim, the Government of India has noted that the Chinese Government has re-affirmed that "... the boundary between China and Sikkim has long been formally delimited and there is neither any discrepancy between the maps nor any disputes in practice". The question is why has the Chinese Government made repeated aggressive intrusions into Sikkim and created serious incidents involving loss of lives? And why has the Chinese Government concocted such ridiculous allegations of Indian intrusions and the so-called building of 'military works' in Tibetan territory and made them the pretext for its impertinent and theatrical ultimatum to India in the middle of September, 1965? That the gnomonious failure of this ultimatum is still rankling in the Chinese mind is evident from the repetition of the false and vainglorious claim that as a result of the ultimatum Indian troops "dismantled" the so-called military works and "hastily withdrew". Indian troops, who are in Sikkim for the defence of Sikkim, have never crossed the well-known border and never intruded into Tibet. The Chinese Government is repeating these baseless allegations ad nauseam in order to create tension and to apply military pressure on Sikkim. These aggressive and divisive tactics of the Chinese are bound to fail.

Regarding the Western Sector, the Chinese note claims that "the Chinese side has never crossed its own boundary, let alone entering the Indian area of Daulatbeg Old". It is significant that the Chinese note has tried to evade the important issue of the re-militarization by China of the de-militarized zone in Ladakh. The induction of Chinese troops into the demilitarized zone is a grave provocative action totally opposed to the spirit and provisions of the Colombo proposals and to the requirements of a peaceful settlement of the border question. The fact that Chinese troops have crossed even their own claim line and the so-called 'line of actual control' and intruded into undisputed Indian territory, makes the matter even more serious. It is futile for the Chinese Government to deny the hard facts of these intrusions which have, as pointed out in the Indian note of February 2, 1965, continued unabated even in January this year.

The Chinese note has referred to 'the line of actual control' in the Western Sector as the "boundary". The Government of India
rejects this expansionist pretension on the part of the Chinese Government. The 'line of actual control' is not the 'boundary' between the two countries but is merely the line up to which Chinese troops advanced in 1962 during their massive military operations against India. It is in vain to pretend that this line of Chinese aggression is the 'boundary' between the two countries and that the 14,500 square miles of Indian territory occupied by China in Ladakh is Chinese territory. It is also in vain to assert, every now and then, that 90,000 square kilometres of sovereign Indian territory south of the McMahon Line belongs to China. To threaten that "the Chinese Government for ever retains the right to settle this question" and "will resolutely strike back" only serves to unmask the expansionist and aggressive designs of China against India. The Government of India rejects these preposterous territorial claims and arrogant threats of the Chinese Government. It also rejects with contempt the mischievous insinuation in the Chinese note that India is intensifying "intrusions" into China on account of food shortages and the requirements of India's internal and external policy. If there is any Government in the world which is creating tensions and conflicts in order to serve the ends of its internal and external policies, it is none other than the Government of the People's Republic of China.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
III. TERRITORIAL AIR SPACE

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 November, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1024

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

At 1310 hours on November 18, 1965 an Indian military aircraft crossed the Sino-Indian boundary, intruded into China's air space over Tibet and circled above the civilian checkpost at Kongka Pass and its vicinity for reconnaissance. At 1050 hours on November 19, another Indian military aircraft flew across the Sino-Indian boundary, intruded into China's air space over Sinkiang and carried out reconnaissance over the Galwan River Valley and Panlung and its vicinity. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the repeated provocative intrusions into China's air space by Indian military aircraft.

It must be pointed out that the above-mentioned Indian air intrusions constitute another proof that recently the Indian Government has deliberately been creating new tensions along the Sino-Indian border and the Sino-Sikkim border. The Chinese Government once again warns the Indian Government that it must immediately stop all its ground and air intrusions into and provocations against China. Otherwise, the Indian Government will have to bear full responsibility for all the serious consequences arising therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 23 November, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and in reply to the Chinese Note (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1024 dated November 20, 1965, has the honour to state as follows: -

The Government of India have enquired into the allegations made in the Chinese note that Indian aircraft flew over Kongka Pass and its vicinity on November 18, at 1310 hours, and over Galwan Valley and Panglung on November 19, at 1050 hours. The enquiries have conclusively proved that the Chinese allegations are utterly false and that no Indian aircraft has flown over the areas mentioned in the Chinese note. It may, however, be pointed out that Kongka Pass,
the Galwan Valley and Panglung are not in Chinese territory as claimed in the Chinese note, but in Indian territory illegally occupied by Chinese troops as a result of their massive military action in 1962. The Government of India have, nevertheless, given strict instructions to all their personnel not to cross the 'line of actual control' either in the air or on the ground and these instructions have been scrupulously observed by them. The Chinese protest note is therefore rejected as a mischievous and baseless fabrication.

It is regrettable that the Chinese Government should make such false allegations against the Government of India and threaten India with "serious consequences" etc. It is in fact that Chinese Government which was continuously violated the 'line of actual control' both in the air and on the ground and even intruded into undisputed Indian territory in Ladakh. In view of all this, it is clear that the Chinese accusation about Indian aircraft overflying the areas east of the 'line of actual control' has been made with the sole purpose of increasing tension and providing an excuse for the continuing Chinese violations of 'the demilitarised zone' and the 'line of actual control' and even undisputed Indian territory in the Western Sector.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 16 December, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1153

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

At 1015 hours on December 14, 1965 an Indian military plane intruded into the Shigatse area of Tibet, China across Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary, and brazenly circled over the vast areas of Chago La, Tui La, Phari, Linghsi La and Khala for reconnaissance and harassment; not until 1050 hours did it fly back to Sikkim territory across Kungyangmila Pass on the China-Sikkim boundary. This Indian military plane penetrated into Chinese territory to a depth of more than 60 kilometres. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the repeated and extended provocative intrusions into China's airspace by Indian aircraft.

The facts are very clear. For obvious political purposes, the Indian Government has recently been making outcries against Chinese "intrusions" and lodging a chain of groundless "protests" with the Chinese Government. The Indian Government is grossly mistaken in thinking that it can, under a smokescreen of lies, expand its aggression against China at will not only on the ground but also in the air. The Chinese Government once again warns the Indian Government that if it persists in its reckless provocations against China, it definitely will not come to any good end.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 18 December, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese note of the 16th December, 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

In the past several weeks we have continued to witness a series of Chinese intrusions and provocations along the entire length of the India-China border. When the facts of these aggressive Chinese activities have been exposed, the Chinese Government have either sought refuge in concocted and unconvincing counter-charges or maintained guilty silence. Now the Chinese Government has gone a step further and escalated their false allegations by claiming that on the 14th December, 1965, an Indian aircraft intruded into Chinese territory up to a depth of "more than 60 kilometres" across the Sikkim-Tibet border. The Government of India have made careful investigations into the allegation and are completely satisfied that neither Indian personnel nor Indian aircraft have crossed into Tibet across the well-known Sikkim-Tibet border. The Chinese protest note is therefore categorically rejected. Instead of fabricating this kind of baseless and meaningless allegations the Chinese Government should stop creating trouble on the border and order their troops to desist from provocations and intrusions.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.
IV. ALLEGED ILL-TREATMENT OF CHINESE REPRESENTATIVES AND NATIONALS IN INDIA

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 25 February, 1965

No. M/632/65

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and has the honour to state the following:

The Embassy has learnt that recently the Indian Government has unjustifiably ordered Mr. Liu Wen Pao, responsible personage of Hsing Hwa Middle School in Calcutta, and Mr. Chen Chi Tu, the publisher of "The China Review", to leave India in a short period. It must be pointed out that despite the repeated representations and protests by the Chinese Embassy, the Indian Government, for a long time, has not stopped its unwarranted expulsion of the law-abiding Chinese nationals. Now the Indian Government again expels Mr. Liu Wen Pao and Mr. Chen Chi Tu successively. This is a peremptory measure taken by the Indian Government following its recent malicious anti-China slanders, and a vicious plot to strangle the cultural and educational establishments of the Chinese nationals in India. The cultural and educational establishments of the Chinese nationals in India having a history of many years have in recent years been almost completely destroyed by the Indian Government. The Indian Government, however, does not stop at that even now, and once again arbitrarily expels the responsible personages of the Chinese nationals' school and newspaper. Such action of the Indian Government demonstrates that it is bent on further worsening the relations between China and India. But this can only result in further exposing the diabolical countenance of the Indian Government before the people of China and India and of the world. The Chinese Embassy lodges a serious protest against such outrageous practice of the Indian Government and resolutely demand that the Indian Government cancel its expulsion order and allow Mr. Liu Wen Pao and Mr. Chen Chi Tu to continue to reside in India.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 27 March, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Embassy's note No. M/632/65, dated February 25, 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

The persons referred to in the Chinese Embassy's note, Messrs Liu Wen Pao and Chen Chi Tu, have been served with orders to
leave India on account of their anti-Indian activities. The Chinese Embassy should be aware that it is an accepted code of conduct that foreign nationals should respect local laws and not act in a manner prejudicial to the security of the State wherein they reside. As the two persons under reference conducted activities prejudicial to the security of India, the Government of India have been constrained to serve them with orders to leave India.

The Chinese Embassy note makes the unwarranted allegation that the Government of India are destroying the cultural and educational establishments of Chinese nationals in India. The Chinese Embassy must be aware that in India several thousands of Chinese nationals continue to reside peacefully. This is proof of the fact that there is no impediment in regard to their leading normal lives in this country so long as they respect the laws of the land. The charge that the Government of India are bent on worsening the relations between China and India is absurd. It is, in fact, the Chinese Government who, by its acts of aggression and violent and continuous anti-Indian propaganda, does everything possible to worsen relations between India and China.

In the light of the above facts the Chinese Embassy note is categorically rejected.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes the opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 4 May, 1965

The Chinese Embassy has learnt that on March 5, 1965, Mr. Liu Chi-yun, Chinese national in Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, was unjustifiably ordered to leave India within a short period. This is another act of persecution of the peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals by the Indian Government in disregard of the repeated representations and protests by the Chinese Government and the Chinese Embassy. The Embassy hereby lodges a protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs against this and demands that the Indian Government immediately stop all forms of persecution of the Chinese nationals in India.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 1 June, 1965


It has been made abundantly clear to the Chinese Embassy that the Government of India place no impediments in the way of peaceful and law-abiding Chinese nationals in their continued stay in India as long as they respect the laws of the land. The person referred to in the Chinese Embassy's memorandum has been found guilty of indulging in anti-national acts which constitute a threat to the security
of India. Hence, in accordance with the laws prevailing in India, the State Government was compelled to serve him with a notice to leave the country.

The externment of the Chinese national referred to in the Chinese Embassy memorandum under reply is a matter which falls purely within the internal jurisdiction of the Government of India and the Chinese Embassy memorandum is an unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of the country. The Embassy’s protest, therefore is rejected.

Memorandum given by the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 3 August 1965

The Chinese Embassy has learnt that on May 1965 Mr. Mao Po-lin, Chinese national in Calcutta, was unjustifiably ordered to leave India within a short period. This is another act of persecution of the peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals by the Indian Government in disregard of the repeated representations and protests by the Chinese Government and the Chinese Embassy. The Embassy lodges a protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs against this and demands that the Indian Government immediately stops all forms of persecution of the Chinese nationals in India.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi, 24 November, 1965


It is entirely within the sovereign competence of India to order foreign nationals found indulging in anti-Indian activities to leave the country. It is surprising that the Chinese Embassy in India persists in shielding the activities of persons such as Mr. Mao Po-lin, who was asked to leave India in October 1965. The many thousands of persons of Chinese origin who continue to reside in India amidst peace and tranquility are a living refutation of the Chinese Government’s propaganda charges of the so-called “persecution” of Chinese nationals in India. The Government of India categorically reject the Chinese Embassy’s protest.
V. TREATMENT OF INDIAN REPRESENTATIVES AND NATIONALS

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 April, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and, with reference to note No. 17/342 dated the 11th September, 1964, of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China regarding Shri M. L. Das has the honour to state as follows:

2. The Chinese Government has stated in the above note that "the way the Chinese side dealt with the case is unimpeachable and in full accord with international practice. However, regardless of the facts described above, the Indian Government in its note deliberately distorted the content of the aforesaid conversations, made unwarranted charges against the Chinese Government and deliberately attempted to interfere in a matter within sovereign jurisdiction of the Chinese Government. This is entirely impermissible".

3. Contrary to the Chinese Government's claim full facts about the case were never given to the Government of India in spite of repeated requests. Shri M. L. Das was arrested on the 29th October, 1963, and the Indian Embassy in Peking asked the Chinese Foreign Office on the 1st November, 1963, for information about his arrest. No information was made available to the Embassy for over a month. It was only after the Embassy sent a note to the Chinese Foreign Office on the 6th December, 1963, that, on the next day, the Chinese Foreign Office informed the First Secretary of the Embassy that Shri Das had been arrested on a charge of rape. Still the circumstances of the alleged offence were not conveyed to the Embassy. On the 4th January, 1964, the Assistant Director of the Consular Department of the Chinese Foreign Office suddenly gave the First Secretary of the Indian Embassy the extraordinary piece of information that the alleged victim of the offence had given birth to a child which resembled an Indian. The whole story as given by the Chinese Government cannot but arouse serious doubt about the genuineness of the charge levelled against Shri Das.

4. To give another instance of Chinese reluctance to give information, Shri Das's case was decreed on the 25th July, 1964, by the People's Court of Shanghai and both the Chinese Foreign Ministry and the Foreign Affairs Bureau in Shanghai were fully aware of this. During his visit to Shanghai on the 4th August, 1964, the Indian Charge d'Affaires repeatedly urged Mr. Lwo, an Official of the Foreign Affairs Bureau, Shanghai, to expedite the disposal of the case. At that time the Charge d'Affaires was not informed that Shri Das had already been found guilty and sentenced to imprisonment.

5. The Embassy of India in Peking repeatedly asked for certain facilities in conformity with normal consular privileges recognised in
international law and practice. The Government of India also re-

quested for these facilities in its note dated the 2nd March, 1964,

following the Embassy’s notes dated the 6th December, 1963, 4th


ignored this reasonable request for extending legitimate facilities to

the Indian Embassy. On the contrary, the Chinese Government in-
sisted on dealing with the case in complete secrecy in accordance

with the so-called “regulation of the Chinese side”. As was pointed

out in the Government of India’s note dated the 2nd March, 1964, it

is well recognised in international law and practice that a consular

officer has the right to be informed of the arrest of the nationals of

his country, to visit them if they are in prison, custody, or detention

and to converse and correspond with them and also to arrange for

their full and proper legal representation whenever and wherever

found necessary. This well-established right was denied to the

Indian Embassy in Peking. Instead the Government of India is

being asked to be satisfied with the unsubstantiated assertion of the

Chinese Government that “the evidence of his (Shri Das’s) guilt was

incontrovertibly established”. The Government of India cannot but

point out that the accused was denied elementary justice in blatant

violation of international practice.

6. Furthermore, when officers of the Indian Embassy in Peking

asked for permission to see Shri Das in jail, restrictions were placed

on the subjects they could discuss with him and no conversation was

allowed regarding the case itself. The result was that Shri Das was

not allowed to communicate with the Embassy either during or after

the trial nor was he allowed to engage a lawyer to defend himself.

Moreover, Shri Das’s interview in jail with one of the officers of the

Embassy was abruptly terminated by the jail authorities before it

had lasted even five minutes. Though the jail regulations allow

prisoners to receive visitors twice a month, on the first and third

Tuesday, his parents were not allowed to see him except on those

specific occasions when the Embassy made a request on their behalf

to the Chinese Foreign Ministry. It is not known what kind of

treatment and food Shri Das is receiving in jail, but when he was

seen in jail by an officer of the Embassy and later by his parents, he

was looking ill and emaciated. The letters which he wrote to the

Embassy were not forwarded to the destination by the jail author-

ities. All this cannot but raise serious suspicion that Shri Das is

being subjected to grave ill-treatment. It is clearly the responsibil-

ity of the Chinese Government to issue instructions to jail authorities

not to ill-treat him in jail and to provide him adequate diet and

medical attendance.

7. The Government of India emphatically lodges a protest to the

Chinese Government on the denial of justice to one of their nation-

tals Shri M. L. Das, and urges the Chinese authorities to provide im-

mediately facilities to the accused for appealing to a Higher Court

as it has been established beyond doubt that justice has not been

meted out to him by the People’s Court of Shanghai.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity

to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the

assurance of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 15 September, 1965.

(65) Pu Ling Ech Fa Tzu No. 666.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:—

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China has received the note of the Indian Ministry for External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India dated April 14, 1965. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China categorically rejects the so-called "strong protest" of the Indian Ministry for External Affairs, which is utterly unwarranted, in connection with the rape of a Chinese girl by Makham Lall Das.

1. Indian national in China M. L. Das forcibly raped a Chinese girl, seriously violating the right of person and damaging the physical and mental health of the victim, disrupting public order and breaking Chinese law. It is proper and unimpeachable that the Chinese local judicial authorities sentenced him to imprisonment according to law.

2. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China had repeatedly acquainted the Indian Embassy in China with the case long ago, and the Indian Ministry for External Affairs had acknowledged the fact in its reply notes. Yet in its latest note the Indian Ministry for External Affairs haggled unreasonably, asserting that it had not been told the "full facts" and the "circumstances". We would like to state clearly once again that Indian national M. L. Das had committed in China a very serious offence of raping a juvenile girl. Even the official of the Indian Embassy in China Mr. Damodaran admitted in his conversation with Assistant Director Mr. Feng Hsien-pi of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs on December 7, 1963 that he considered the offence a "shame". Yet now the Indian Ministry for External Affairs has appealed to so-called international law and practice and asked the Chinese Government to furnish it again with the "full facts" and "circumstances". This is entirely impermissible.

M. L. Das is guilty of the raping of a Chinese girl. Out of regard for the future and the name of the injured girl, the judicial authorities of the Chinese Government decided on a private trial. Hence it was entirely reasonable to deny attendance at the trial to officials from the Indian Embassy in China. This had been made clear by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs in its note to the Indian Embassy in China on January 31, 1964. However, in its note under reference, the Indian Ministry for External Affairs still talked drivel, alleging that the Chinese Government had "dealt with the case in complete secrecy". This is not only a vicious slander against the Chinese Government, but also an illegal interference with China's exercise of its sovereign rights.

In order to cast such slanders on China, the Indian Ministry for External Affairs groundlessly stated in its note that "M. L. Das was
not allowed to engage a lawyer to defend himself”. The fact was that the Chinese authorities concerned offered him a lawyer to defend him, but he refused and decided on defending himself.

The Indian Ministry for External Affairs also said in its note that M. L. Das was not allowed to communicate with the Embassy either during or after the trial. According to the regulations of the Chinese authorities concerned, visits to prisoners are allowed after they have been sentenced. From September 1964 to April 1965, a total of six requests were made by officials of the Indian Embassy in China and relatives of the criminal to meet the latter in prison; each request was met by the Chinese authorities concerned and not one was rejected. Even when the official of the Indian Embassy in China, Mr. Damodaran, failed to go to the prison at the specified time, the Chinese authorities concerned gave him special consideration and let him visit the criminal against the rule. These facts clearly show that the slanders made by the Indian Ministry for External Affairs against the Chinese Government cannot stand refutation.

The assertion in the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs that the interview of an official of the Embassy with the criminal “was abruptly terminated by the jail authorities before it had lasted even five minutes” is also a sheer distortion of the fact. The fact was that the visit to M. L. Das had to be stopped because the Press Attache of the Indian Embassy in China Mr. P. V. Srinivasan violated the regulations concerning visits although he had been informed of the regulations in detail beforehand by the jail authorities.

As is well known, the Chinese jail authorities always treat criminals humanely. The assertion of the Indian Ministry for External Affairs about M. L. Das being “ill-treated” is an absurd fabrication pure and simple. Instead of taking shame at the scandal caused by such a bad element as M. L. Das, the Indian Government has kept on haggling about it. Does it really think that this will bring it any honour?

It must be further pointed out that although the Middle People’s Court of Shanghai Municipality on January 27, 1964 passed a fair sentence on the offence committed by M. L. Das, at his request the authorities concerned permitted him to appeal to the Higher People’s Court of Shanghai Municipality. After going through another careful examination and full debate in court, the Higher People’s Court of Shanghai Municipality confirmed that the evidence of M. L. Das’s offence was conclusive, decided to uphold the original sentence and reject his appeal, and concluded that this was the sentence of the final trial and that no further appeal might be made.

3. The Chinese Government has dealt with the offence committed by M. L. Das in accordance with Chinese law. This is in full conformity with international practice, and also reasonable and unimpeachable as a judicial measure which any sovereign state is bound to take in order to safeguard public order and protect personal safety. The Chinese authorities concerned have rendered facilities to meet all the reasonable requests made by the Indian Embassy in
China concerning the case of M. L. Das, but the Indian Government has repeatedly made baseless and malicious slanders against the Chinese Government and openly interfered in matters which are within China's sovereign rights. This course of action is obviously pursued by the Indian Government with ulterior purposes, and the Chinese Government expresses its deepest regret at it.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 2 November, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to their note No. (65) Pu Ling Erh Fa Tzu No. 666, dated September 15, 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India reject the untenable arguments put forward by the Chinese Government in defence of the imprisonment and harassment of the Indian national, Shri M. L. Das. Right from the time of his arrest on the 29th October, 1963, until now, the Chinese Government have not shown the slightest regard for well-recognised principles of law and the ordinary canons of humanity in dealing with the case of Shri Das. On the contrary and in spite of protests by the Indian Government, they have persisted in victimising Shri Das through harsh and illegal actions.

The Chinese Government have claimed that they have repeatedly acquainted the Indian Embassy in China with this case. Facts are, however, different. Apart from the bland allegation that Shri M. L. Das “raped” a Chinese girl, that the girl within two months of the arrest of Shri M. L. Das gave birth to a child and that this child is aid to “look like an Indian”, the Chinese Government have all along refused to give any details of this case to the Indian Government. They merely informed the Indian Embassy in Peking more than ten months after Shri Das’s arrest that he was sentenced to five years imprisonment by the higher court of Shanghai. Further, in complete violation of internationally recognised practice, the Chinese Government refused to permit the Indian Embassy in Peking to arrange for legal aid for the defendant or even to attend the trial. It is significant that the Chinese Government themselves have described this so-called legal process as a “private trial”.

The Chinese note itself has admitted that Shri M. L. Das was sentenced on the 27th January, 1964. Yet, nothing was done by the Chinese Government to convey this information to Shri M. L. Das’s parents or to the Indian Embassy in Peking until 11th September, 1964, although during the period from the 29th October, 1963, to the 1st September, 1964, the Government of India addressed a total of our notes to the Chinese Government, and the Indian Embassy orally discussed this case and requested permission for a visit to Shri M. L. Das by his parents or Embassy officials on six separate occasions.
It was only on the 11th September, 1964, that the Chinese Government informed the Indian Embassy that Shri M. L. Das had been sentenced to five years imprisonment. Right from the time of the arrest of Shri Das it was repeatedly pointed out by us to the Chinese Government that the 70-year old parents of Shri M. L. Das were in a state of nervous shock on account of their anxiety for their son. The Chinese Government, in callous disregard of all accepted canons of humanity and international law, gave evasive replies for more than ten months and withheld permission for Shri M. L. Das's parents to meet their son in prison.

In its note under reply, the Chinese Government has boasted of its magnanimity towards Shri M. L. Das in permitting officials from the Indian Embassy to visit him after September, 1964. Yet on the 21st September, 1965, barely a week after handing over the note under reply, when an official of the Indian Embassy in Peking visited Shanghai for the purpose of meeting Shri M. L. Das in prison, the Chinese Government, notwithstanding the fact that they had been given prior intimation of this visit, refused to let this official meet Shri M. L. Das. In defence of this they advanced the flimsy excuse that the prisoner had "violated prison regulations".

In its frantic attempt to find justification for the ill-treatment of Shri M. L. Das, the Chinese Government has deliberately misquoted an official of the Indian Embassy in Peking and claimed, in its note dated 15th September, 1965, that this official had expressed "shame" at the offence allegedly committed by Shri Das. If they have the slightest regard for the truth, the Chinese Government will recall that on being informed of Shri M. L. Das's arrest on 7th December, 1963, the First Secretary of the Indian Embassy in Peking visited Shanghai  for the purpose of meeting Shri M. L. Das in prison, the Chinese Government, notwithstanding the fact that they had been given prior intimation of this visit, refused to let this official meet Shri M. L. Das. In defence of this they advanced the flimsy excuse that the prisoner had "violated prison regulations".

The allegation of the Chinese Government that Indian officials visiting Shri M. L. Das at the Shanghai jail have "violated regulations concerning the visits" is absurd. As a matter of fact, during each visit Indian Embassy officials counselled Shri M. L. Das to observe the jail "regulations" however distasteful they may be. The truth is that on more than one occasion the Chinese Government have forcibly prevented Shri M. L. Das from communicating with Indian Embassy officials. On one occasion while he was narrating facts regarding his treatment in prison to a visiting Indian official, Shri Das was physically dragged by the prison authorities back into his cell in the middle of the interview. The Government of India condemn these actions of the Chinese authorities and the denial to Shri M. L. Das of the right, under international law, to communicate with the representatives of his country. The Government of India urge that the Chinese Government stop the persecution of Shri M. L. Das and review his case on the basis of universally accepted canons of justice and law, and provide facilities to the Indian Embassy in Peking to extend to Shri M. L. Das full consular protection.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.
VI. MISCELLANEOUS

Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 11 June, 1964

No. M/466/64

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and, with reference to the Ministry's note dated January 8, 1964, has the honour to state as follows:

With regard to the Indian businessmen's misappropriation of the Chinese Universal Testing Machine and the Brinell Hardness Testor, the Embassy has made things quite clear in its notes to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated August 14, 1962 and September 19, 1963. It is surprising that the Indian Government, being fully aware of the fact that China is the wronged party, should have sent in another note making absurd charges against the Chinese Embassy and arbitrarily asserting that the former Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay had "handed over" the machines to M/s K. T. Steel Industries (P) Ltd., Bombay. The Indian Government's practice of reversing right and wrong obviously harbours ulterior motives.

As has been clearly pointed out by the Embassy, it is due to the fact that M/s. K. T. Steel Industries (P) Ltd. did not get valid import licence that these two machines were not sold to the firm and are had explicitly assured the Chinese Corporation that "the machines have been kept in M/s. K. T. Steel Industries (P) Ltd. because the former Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay at the time had no appropriate place to keep them and therefore temporarily deposited them in the godown of the firm. This is no way involves the matter of transfer of ownership. In fact M/s. K. T. Steel Industries (P) Ltd. had explicitly assured the Chinese Corporation that "the machines will not be put to use until authorised by you." It is obvious that the machines have not at all been sold to the firm and that the firm went back on its own words and misappropriated the Chinese machines. The Chinese Corporation and the former Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay time and again demanded the machines from the firm which, however, peremptorily refused to return them. The Indian Ministry of External Affairs, instead of denouncing such despicable behaviour of the Indian businessmen, has sided with these businessmen who have misappropriated the Chinese machines, and has repeatedly and unreasonably haggled with the Chinese Embassy. The Chinese Embassy cannot but express its deep regret at this and clearly states that the Embassy reserves the right to ask for compensation for the losses and will not give further notice to the unreasonable haggling of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs in the future.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 January, 1965

1. In the last few years, official mails of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India have repeatedly been held up or confiscated by Indian authorities. On many occasions since 1961, the Chinese side has made representations and protests to the Indian side, urging the Indian authorities to stop such an unwarranted practice. Again, on November 30, 1964, Director Chang Tung of the First Asian Department of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs made representations regarding this matter to Mr. J. S. Mehta, Charge d'Affaires a.i. of the Indian Embassy in China. Mr. Mehta said that he would report that to the Indian Government. Yet the Indian side has up till now failed to make a reply.

2. Not long ago, the Chinese Embassy in India received a letter from the Assistant Collector of Customs for Postal Appraisement, G.P.O., Calcutta, India, dated December 23, 1964, saying that copies of a certain issue of the "People's Daily" addressed to the Chinese Embassy which had been held up there for more than four months would be confiscated. In another case, the September 3, 1964 issue of the "People's Daily" was withheld and not delivered to the Chinese Embassy until December 28, 1964. Most of the issues of the "People's Daily" and of other mails addressed to the Chinese Embassy during December 1964 have not reached their destination. The above instances make it clear that the Indian Government has turned a deaf ear to the protests of the Chinese Government and continued to hold up or confiscate mails addressed to the Chinese Embassy.

3. The Indian authorities' detention and confiscation of the official mails of the Chinese Embassy are entirely unwarranted and constitute a serious contravention of international practice. This has caused immense difficulties for the Embassy to perform its normal functions. The Chinese Government hereby again lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government, urging the Indian Government to release immediately the official mails of the Chinese Embassy in India which have been held up or confiscated, and ensure against recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 27 March, 1965


In a note dated February 9, 1965, the Government of India have already clearly pointed out that there is no ground for the Chinese Government to lodge a protest with the Government of India that the action of the Postal Customs Authorities in seizing offensive material sent through the normal postal channels which infringe the laws of India, has in any way, created difficulties for the functioning of the Chinese Embassy.

The Chinese Government is aware that, under the existing regulations in India, entry into India of any publication or document which directly or indirectly questions the territorial integrity of India or is of such a nature as would affect India's friendly relations with third
countries, is prohibited. The Chinese Government must also be aware of the prevailing international practice that any material transmitted through ordinary postal channels must not violate the laws of the receiving State.

In the light of the above, the memorandum of the Chinese Foreign Office dated January 13, 1965, is categorically rejected.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 9 April, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India has learnt that the Chairman of the People's Republic of China, His Excellency Liu Shao-chi has sent a telegram of congratulations directly to His Highness the Chogyal of Sikkim on the occasion of His Highness' Ser-Thri-Nga-Sol. The Government of China is well aware that the external relations of Sikkim are the responsibility of the Government of India and any communications either formal or informal from the Government of China to the Government of Sikkim or the Chogyal should be channeled through the Indian Government. This is a procedure adopted by all governments and the Chinese Government's action in sending a telegram directly from the Chairman of the People's Republic of China to the Chogyal of Sikkim is totally unacceptable to the Indian Government. This position was explained to the Chinese Government by the Government of India in their note of December 28, 1963. The Government of India take a serious view of the action of the Chinese Government and hereby lodge a strong protest against it.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Chinese Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 April, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and, with reference to the latter's note No. M/466/64, dated the 11th June, 1964, has the honour to state as follows:

This Ministry deeply regrets that the Chinese Embassy is trying to evade a simple, straightforward issue by taking recourse to all manner of sophistry. If, as the Embassy claims, the two machines have not been sold to Messrs. K. T. Steel Industries Private Limited, then it should take necessary and immediate action to bring the machines back to the Embassy premises or re-export them to China failing which the Embassy should pay the customs duty to the Government of India. In its note under reference, the Chinese Embassy claims "that China is the wronged party" and that "the firm (Messrs. K. T. Steel Industries Private Limited) went back on its own words
and misappropriated the Chinese machines". But the fact cannot be denied that it is the Chinese Embassy who transferred the machines in question to a private party in India. This action of the Chinese Embassy was undoubtedly a deliberate abuse of the privileges enjoyed by the Embassy.

The Ministry of External Affairs cannot but express its deep regret at the unreasonable attitude taken by the Chinese Embassy in its refusal to "give further notice" to this Ministry's request for cooperation in setting right an irregular procedure. Import regulations established under the laws of the country have been contravened and the Chinese Embassy must be reminded of its obligation to co-operate fully with this Ministry in setting this matter right.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 July, 1965.

1. On June 1, 1965 Mr. Chen Chao-yuan, Charge d'Affaires a.i. of the Chinese Embassy in India, received a letter from the Indian postal authorities concerned, stating that a parcel of Renmin Ribao (People's Daily) addressed to him, which carried articles calling the Indian boundary into question "in violation of" Indian regulations, should be confiscated. On June 15 Mr. Chen further received a notice from the Indian postal authorities concerned, telling him that five copies of Renmin Ribao were confiscated.

In the past few years, mails addressed to the Chinese Embassy in India have constantly been unwarrantedly held up or confiscated by the Indian authorities. The Chinese Embassy has made repeated representations to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs or lodged protests. However, the Indian authorities have not only failed to stop such action in violation of international practice, but gone further to hold up and confiscate mails addressed to the Charge d'Affaires a.i. of the Chinese Embassy personally. The Chinese Government expresses its indignation at this and hereby lodges another serious protest with the Indian Government, demanding that the Indian authorities concerned immediately stop such unreasonable and peremptory action, and speedily return all the mails for the Chinese Charge d'Affaires a.i. and the Chinese Embassy previously held up and confiscated.

2. In its note of February 9, 1965 and its Memorandum of March 27, 1965 to the Chinese Embassy in India, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs alleged that mails addressed to the Chinese Embassy were confiscated by the Indian authorities concerned "under the existing regulations in India" and "according to international practice". This is utterly untenable. The Indian Government should know that newspapers and other mails for foreign embassies and diplomatic officials must not be confiscated or held up, whether they are brought by couriers or sent through postal channels. This is part of the internationally acknowledged diplomatic immunities.
No matter what pretext the Indian Government may fabricate, it has no right to confiscate mails addressed to members of a foreign embassy in India containing newspapers and magazines published in their own country. While diplomatic relations are being maintained between China and India, the Indian authorities' repeated wilful confiscation of journals addressed to the Chinese Embassy and Chinese diplomatic officials, and even of mails addressed to the Chinese Charge d'Affaires a.i. personally, constitutes a serious infringement of diplomatic immunities and a deliberate violation of international practice. It may be asked: If such arbitrary practice of the Indian side were in order, would there remain any code of international relations to speak of? To what extent are the Indian authorities intending to aggravate China-India relations?

3. As is well known, Indian newspapers have been publishing large numbers of anti-Chinese materials slandering and attacking China year in and year out. Yet consistently and strictly adhering to international practice, the Chinese authorities have never held up or confiscated any Indian journals sent to the Indian Embassy in China from Hongkong or through postal channels. This forms a sharp contrast to the unwarranted action of the Indian side in constantly holding up and confiscating the journals and mails addressed to the Chinese Embassy in India.

4. In its note the Indian Ministry of External Affairs also asserted that the seizure of journals addressed to the Chinese Embassy has in no way created difficulties for personnel of the Chinese Embassy in performing their normal functions. This is sheer nonsense. Chinese newspapers report on the situation in China, on China's foreign relations and international affairs, and reflect the domestic and foreign policies of the Chinese Government. Therefore, they are indispensable for the daily functioning of the diplomatic officials of the Chinese Embassy. By arbitrarily holding up and confiscating the Chinese journals addressed to the diplomatic officials of the Chinese Embassy, the Indian authorities are depriving them outright of their right to read journals of their own country and, of course, seriously hampering their normal functioning. The Indian authorities will never succeed in their attempt to shirk the responsibility they should take by quibbling.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 14 September, 1965.

(65) Pu Ling Yi Tzu No. 617

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with regard to the forcible closing and taking over of the Calcutta Branch and Bombay Agency of the Bank of China by the Indian Government, has the honour to state as follows:—

It is a well-known fact that the Calcutta Branch and Bombay Agency of the Bank of China, during the many years in which they carried on business in India, consistently abided by the local laws and regulations, enjoyed good credit and made useful contribution
to the promotion of Sino-Indian Trade. The forcible closing and taking over the establishments and assets of the Bank of China in India in November 1962 was a long-premeditated act of political persecution by the Indian Government. It was one of the grave steps taken by the Indian Government further to worsen the Sino-Indian relations after the Sino-Indian border conflict it provoked in October 1962.

In its note to the Indian Embassy in China dated February 23, 1963, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs thoroughly refuted the sophistry of the Indian Government in justifying its closing and taking over of the establishments of the Bank of China in India, and demanded the immediate return by the Indian Government of all the assets of the Bank of China that had been taken over, frozen and seized. However, the Indian Government has all along refused to consider the reasonable demand of the Chinese side. By long freezing and seizing the assets of the Bank of China in India, the Indian Government has seriously impaired the interests of China and of the large numbers of local depositors. In order to cover up its crimes of persecuting the Bank of China, it has repeatedly resorted to fabrication and vilification, falsely accusing the Bank of China of being "not quite innocent" and the Bank personnel of carrying on "political propaganda" and "undesirable activities". But, in all these years it has not been able to produce any facts to substantiate its charges. This despicable practice of the Indian Government cannot in the least injure the reputation of the Bank of China, nor can it defraud the public. On the contrary, it can only serve to further reveal the predicament in which it is afraid of being caught out because truth is not on its side, and the more it tries to hide, the more it is exposed.

It is an unlawful act rarely seen in the history of international relations that while diplomatic relations are maintained between China and India, the Indian Government should have unwarrantedly taken over, frozen and seized all the assets of the Bank of China in India and refused to hand them back for two years and ten months. This unreasonable measure has caused China great losses. Take the balance-sheet of the two establishments of the Bank of China alone. It showed a credit of more than nine million rupees when they were taken over by the Indian authorities. The Chinese Government once again lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this grave unlawful act and reiterates that the Indian Government must be held fully responsible for all the losses suffered by China as a result of the closing and taking over of the establishments of the Bank of China in India and of the freezing and seizure of the assets of the Bank of China in India by the Indian authorities. The Chinese Government demands that the Indian Government compensate for all the losses suffered by China as a result of the taking over, freezing and seizure of the assets of the Bank of China in India by the Indian Government. It demands a speedy and clear-cut reply on this matter from the Indian Government.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 26, September, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 798

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows:

In the afternoon of September 24, 1965, a mob of Indian hooligans went to the gate of the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi to make provocation led by Indian officials and congress leaders and driving a flock of sheep before them. They made a huge din, yelling that China had "invented absurd pretexts for threatening and intimidating India" that "China wants to start a world war over some sheep and a few yaks", and so on and so forth. This ugly farce was wholly instigated and staged by the Indian Government. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government.

The Indian Government will definitely not succeed in its attempt, by staging this ugly anti-Chinese farce, to cover up its crimes of aggression against China and the wretched picture of its troops fleeing in panic from the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary. For a number of years you have flatly denied that Indian troops had intruded into Chinese territory across the China-Sikkim boundary and built military works for aggression there. Yet within a few days of our demand for the dismantling of the military works for aggression within a specified time-limit, the Indian troops who had intruded into the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary could not but flee helter skelter under the surveillance of Chinese troops, leaving behind numerous evidence of their crime, thus suddenly exploding the falsehood which you had so painstakingly concocted over these years. How can you succeed in hiding your shame?

It was clearly because you knew yourselves to be in the wrong that you could not but hastily withdraw all your troops who had intruded to the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary and demolish some of your aggressive military works there. But then you felt it to be too great a loss of face, so you cast aspersions on China alleging that China wanted to start a war merely for some sheep and a few yaks. Actually, you knew full well that this was a deliberate lie. Otherwise, why did you withdraw all your intruding troops before the time-limit set by us was up? You must return every single one of the border inhabitants and livestock you kidnapped and seized from Chinese territory across the China-Sikkim border.

But the issue between China and India is absolutely not limited to a matter of some sheep and yaks. Are your subversive activities in Tibet only a matter of some sheep and yaks? Is your occupation of 92,000 and more square Kilometres of Chinese territory along the three sectors of the Sino-Indian border a matter of some sheep and yaks? No. All Indian intrusions, harassments and armed provocations against China are major questions involving China's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and these accounts will have to be settled.
The distinction between aggression and anti-aggression can never be blotted out. The whole world now sees that it was India which launched a war of aggression against Pakistan, thus endangering peace in Asia and the world, and that it was China and other justice-upholding countries which by their firm anti-aggressive stand punctured your aggressive arrogance. It is understandable that you are feeling very much ill at ease. But you will never succeed in your attempt to coerce China into abandoning her just stand by concocting the lie about China wanting to start a world war. The Indian Government should know that it cannot do what it likes to its neighbouring countries even with the backing of the U.S. imperialists and the modern revisionists. In staging a few forlorn and unseemly anti-Chinese demonstrations you have your undivulgeable motive—to seek reward from the imperialists and modern revisionists. But the Chinese Government must remind the Indian Government that there is a limit to everything, and that the exceeding of such a limit will not be tolerated.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 October, 1965

(65) Pu Ling Yi Fa Tzu No. 772

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following with regard to the unwarranted order of the Government of West Bengal prohibiting the publishing of "The China Review", an overseas Chinese newspaper in Calcutta:

"The China Review" is a newspaper published by Chinese nationals in India. Since it was launched in 1950, the paper has always abided by Indian laws and regulations and has devoted itself to promoting friendship between the peoples of China and India and Sino-Indian cultural exchanges. However, the Indian Government has been using all methods to persecute the paper since 1960. It has ordered five successive publishers of the paper and its staff members Liao Hui-Lan and others to leave India, among whom former publisher Wu Tao-Lung and former Editor Hou Hsing-Fu were unwarrantedly arrested by Indian authorities and then deported under armed escort. What was still more serious, after a band of hooligans raided the office of "The China Review" and knifed one of its office workers on January 17, 1962, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs openly absolved them of responsibility for the crime. As the above-mentioned unreasonable measures failed to compel the newspaper to close down, the Indian authorities on September 30, 1965 brazenly ordered the prohibition of its further publication.

The facts have proved that the planned persecution and final banning of "The China Review" is another unwarranted measure taken by the Indian Government to persecute Chinese nationals and aggravate Sino-Indian relations.
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In its order, the Indian Government talked the nonsense that "The China Review" was banned because it "weakens defence efforts of India." As is well-known, all the news "The China Review" has printed is well-grounded and from proper sources. Is it conceivable that an overseas Chinese newspaper can "weaken" the "defence" of India by reporting events back in the motherland and promoting cultural exchanges between China and India? This absurd allegation exactly serves to expose the Indian authorities as entirely devoid of reason in banning "The China Review".

The Chinese Government also notes that, while diplomatic relations are being maintained between China and India, the Indian Government has encouraged the "Chinese journal of India" run by Chiang Kai-shek clique elements in Calcutta to constantly slander China and conduct propaganda for the creation of "Two Chinas", despite its promise that it "will not permit any activities designed to promote the idea of two Chinas". This is clearly an instance of contempt for the principles guiding international relations as well as an act of perfidy. The Chinese Government expresses great indignation at this.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against its unwarranted measure of ordering the stoppage of "The China Review", a measure which is detrimental to the friendship between the peoples of China and India and to Sino-Indian cultural exchanges. It firmly demands that the Indian Government cancel its unwarranted order banning "The China Review" and ensure the safety of the staff of that newspaper.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 29 October, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to their note No. (65) Pu Ling Yi Tzu No. 617, dated September 14, 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

As early as the 28th December 1962 it was pointed out to the Chinese Government that the liquidation of the Bombay and Calcutta branches of the Bank of China was carried out towards the end of 1962 under the legally established procedure prevailing in India and that there can be no question of "political persecution". In their note dated the 24th January, 1963 the Government of India elucidated for the benefit of the Chinese Government, some features of India's judicial system, stressing the fact that in India the judiciary is independent of the executive branches of Government. It was further pointed out that an official liquidator, such as the one appointed after the liquidation of the Bombay and Calcutta branches of the Bank of China, would be responsible only to the judiciary, in this case the Calcutta High Court, which passed the orders for liquidation of these two branches on the 10th December 1962. Knowing these
facts, the Chinese Government have persisted in their unwarranted haggling over this question. This can only be construed as an attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of India.

The Chinese note under reply has made some slanderous references to what it calls "the steps taken by the Indian Government to further worsen Sino-Indian relations after the Sino-Indian border conflict it provoked in October 1962". Anyone familiar with the events in the autumn of 1962 will recall that it was the Chinese Government which launched an unprovoked and massive attack all along India's northern frontier. In the period since, it has been the Chinese Government which has all along rejected a peaceful solution to the India-China dispute. In the last few weeks it has been the Chinese Government, acting in collusion with Pakistan, which issued threats and ultimata and carried out a series of provocations on India's northern frontier. The world is familiar with these facts.

At the present juncture, it is precisely the Chinese Government which is attempting, for its own ulterior purposes, to distort the fact of the liquidation of the Indian branches of the Bank of China through legally established procedure. The Government of India reject the allegations made by the Chinese Government and wish to state that the question of a final settlement of the affairs of the Bank of China can be taken up only at an appropriate time after the completion of the liquidation proceedings.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Chinese Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 16 November, 1965


The Government of India are surprised to find that despite the clear-cut explanation contained in their memoranda dated the 9th February, 1965 and 27th March, 1965, the Chinese Government continue to lodge meaningless protests against the action taken by Indian authorities to prevent the circulation in India of publications questioning India's territorial integrity and prejudicing India's friendly relations with other countries. The Chinese Government ought to be aware that material can be transmitted through postal channels only in conformity with the laws of the receiving State. It is entirely within the sovereign competence of India to confiscate any material arriving by postal channels which is found to be in violation of the laws of the land. This is in conformity with the international practice and therefore it is unreasonable for the Chinese Government to characterize this as an "arbitrary practice" or "an infringement of diplomatic immunity". It is futile and unwarranted to link this up with question of diplomatic mail and the functioning of the Chinese Embassy with which Government of India have never interfered. The charges, contained in the Chinese memorandum under reply, are without foundation, and are therefore rejected.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 27 December, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Government’s Note No. (65) Pu Ling Yi Fa Tzu No. 772 dated the 20th October 1965 has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government’s protest against the banning of the “China Review”, a Chinese language newspaper published in Calcutta, is unwarranted and inadmissible. In their notes of 2nd March 1962 and 1st October 1962, the Government of India had pointed out the undesirable activities of the “China Review” and expressed the hope that the Chinese mission in India would not extend its support to such unlawful elements. The Chinese Government’s protest note in support of those who violate our laws is a gross interference in the internal affairs of India.

The Chinese note under reply has cited the cases of a few Chinese nationals who were expelled from India on account of their undesirable and anti-Indian activities. The facts relating to the expulsion of these individuals have been explained in several of the Government of India’s notes and memoranda, including those dated 17th October 1960, 5th May 1962 and 27th March 1965. It is unnecessary to repeat these details once again. In order to bolster up their charges of ‘Indian persecution’ the Chinese note has even raked up an incident which took place on the 17th January 1962. The Government of India’s notes dated 2nd March, 4th July and 1st October 1962 had given full details of the incident of January 17, 1962 and it is surprising that in spite of the clear explanations in the notes mentioned above, the Chinese Government are still repeating these groundless charges. There are many thousand foreign nationals, including those of Chinese origin, residing in India as contented and law-abiding individuals. This bears testimony to the liberal and fair treatment of foreign nationals resident in India.

It is ridiculous for the Chinese Government to suggest that the Government of India has “encouraged” the “Chinese Journal of India”. In India there is freedom for any one to run a journal provided the laws of the land are observed. No foreign government, especially one which has committed aggression on India, has the right to protest against and interfere in matters which are strictly within India’s internal jurisdiction.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4th January, 1966

No. C/1/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and with reference to the Government of India’s note, dated the 19th April 1965
has the honour to request the Chinese Embassy to expedite their reply.

The Ministry takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX I


On September 6, 1965, India suddenly launched an armed attack on Pakistan. Indian troops have crossed the International Boundary between India and Pakistan and are pushing towards Lahore, the Capital of West Pakistan. The Indian radio has announced general mobilization. Thus the Indian Government has enlarged the local conflict between India and Pakistan in Kashmir into a general conflict between the two countries. In the face of the massive armed attack by India, the President of Pakistan has called on the entire people of the country to rise in resistance against the enemy and appealed for sympathy and support from all peace-loving peoples of the world.

The Indian Government’s armed attack on Pakistan is an act of naked aggression. It not only is a crude violation of all principles guiding international relations but also constitutes a grave threat to peace in this part of Asia. The Chinese Government sternly condemns India for its criminal aggression, expresses firm support for Pakistan in its just struggle against aggression and solemnly warns the Indian Government that it must bear responsibility for all the consequences of its criminal and extended aggression.

The Indian Government has always been perfidious on the Kashmir question. It once pledged solemnly with Pakistan to grant the Kashmiri people the right of self-determination. But far from honouring its pledge it has brazenly declared that Kashmir is an integral part of India and subjected the Kashmiri people to brutal national oppression. Where there is oppression, there will be resistance. It is entirely proper that the people in the Indian occupied area of Kashmir should rise up in resistance. In order to cover up its sanguinary suppression of the Kashmiri people, the Indian Government openly breached the cease-fire line in the disputed territory of Kashmir to intrude into the area under the control of Pakistan and carried out military provocations and armed occupation. This, of course, could not but arouse Pakistan to counter attack in self-defence. All this was in the nature of a local conflict in the disputed territory of Kashmir between India and Pakistan.

India already committed aggression on the Kashmir issue. Now it has openly launched a massive armed attack on Pakistan. This is a still more serious act of aggression.

The United Nations has always had an ill-fame on the Kashmir question. It solemnly pledged to guarantee national self-determination for Kashmir. However, 18 years have passed during which the
United Nations watched on without lifting a finger while India acted lawlessly in Kashmir. The United Nations did not breathe a single word when India violated the cease-fire line. But as soon as Pakistan fought back in self-defence, the United Nations came out to mediate. This is by no means the end of the story. It is unconceivable that the United Nations, which has been unfair for 18 years, should suddenly become fair. The so-called mediation by the United Nations is based on a report of the Secretary General. The report itself is unfair. How can a fair conclusion be drawn from an unfair premise? On the Kashmir question, the United Nations has once again proved a tool of U.S. imperialism and its partners in their attempt to control the whole world. This will be further proved true during the current extended aggression against Pakistan by India.

India’s armed aggression against Pakistan is another exposure of the chauvinist and expansionist features of its ruling circles. The Indian Government glibly says that it pursues a policy of so-called peaceful co-existence. But actually it has never ceased for a single day its activities of bullying and encroaching upon its neighbours wherever possible. Almost every neighbour of India has known this from its own experience. The Indian ruling circles are the greatest hypocrites in contemporary international life. The Chinese people have had a deep experience of this. Although the Indian ruling circles did not gain anything from their massive armed attack on China in October, 1962, they have never stopped making intrusions and provocations along the Sino-Indian border. India is still entrenched on Chinese territory on the Sino-Sikkim border and has not withdrawn. It is constantly probing furtively and making intrusions and harassment against Chinese territory in the Western sector of the Sino-Indian border. Indian violations of Chinese territory are far from coming to an end. The Chinese Government has served repeated warnings, and it is now closely following the development of India’s acts of aggression and strengthening its defences and heightening its alertness along its border.

The Indian Government probably believes that since it has the backing of the U.S. imperialists and the modern revisionists it can bully its neighbours, defy public opinion and do whatever it likes. This will not do. Aggression is aggression. India’s aggression against any one of its neighbours concerns all of its neighbours. Since the Indian Government has taken the first step in committing aggression against Pakistan, it cannot evade responsibility for the chain of consequences arising therefrom.

The Chinese Government is deeply convinced that, with the sympathy and support of the peace-loving countries and peoples of Asia and the whole world, the hundred million people of Pakistan will rise as one-man to save their country and finally drive back the Indian aggressors.
Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's Statement in Parliament,
17 September, 1965

I want to inform the House that this morning we received a communication from the Chinese Government demanding that within three days we should dismantle our defence installations which they allege are located on their side of the border in Tibet across the Sikkim border. I might for the benefit of the House, read out the relevant portions of the communication, although I would be placing the communication and our reply on the Table of the House.

"In its notes the Indian Government continues to resort to its usual subterfuges in an attempt to deny the intruding activities of Indian troops along the Sino-Indian boundary and the China-Sikkim boundary. This attempt cannot possibly succeed. Since ceasefire and troop withdrawal were effected along the Sino-Indian border by China on her own initiative in 1962, Indian troops have never stopped their provocations, and there have been more than 300 intrusions into China either by ground or by air. The Chinese Government has repeatedly lodged protests with the Indian Government and served warnings to it, and has successively notified some friendly countries. The facts are there, and they cannot be denied by the Indian Government by mere quibbling. Moreover, the Chinese Government has four times proposed (the latest occasion in June 1965) Sino-Indian Joint Investigation into India's illegal construction of military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary, but has each time been refused by the Indian Government. Now the Indian Government pretentiously says that the matter can be settled if only an independent and neutral observer should go to the border to see for himself. It further shamelessly asserts that Indian troops have never crossed the Sikkim-China boundary which has been formally delimited, and that India has not built any military works either on the Chinese side of the border or on the border itself. This is a barefaced lie. How can it hope to deceive anyone?

"As is known to everybody, the Indian Government has long been using the territory of Sikkim against China. Since September 1962, not to mention earlier times, Indian troops have crossed the China-Sikkim boundary, which was delimited long ago, and have built a large number of military works for aggression either on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary or on the boundary itself. There are now fifty six such military works, large and small which they have built in the past few years all over the important passes along the China-Sikkim boundary, thus wantonly encroaching upon China's territory and violating her sovereignty. In these years the Chinese Government has made thirteen representations to the Indian Government. But the Indian Government has all along turned a deaf ear to them and does not have the slightest respect for China's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Far from stopping its acts of aggression, the Indian Government has intensified them by ordering its troops to intrude into Chinese territory for reconnaissance and provocations."
We are sending a reply to all these points and as I said I shall place the reply on the table of the House. I will read out the relevant portions of our reply.

“Ever since the Sino-Indian border problem was raised by the Chinese Government, the Government of India had made strenuous attempts to settle the question peacefully and with honour. Even after the unprovoked Chinese attack across the border in October-November, 1962, the Government of India consistently followed the policy of seeking a peaceful settlement honourable to both the parties concerned.

As has been pointed out in various notes to the Chinese Government in the past, the Government of India has given strict instructions to its armed forces and personnel not to cross the international boundary in the Eastern and the Middle Sectors and the so-called ‘line of actual control’ in the Western Sector. The Government of India are satisfied after careful and detailed investigations, that Indian personnel as well as aircraft have fully carried out their instructions and have not transgressed the international boundary and the ‘line of actual control’ in the Western Sector at any time at any place. The Government of India are, therefore, absolutely convinced that the allegations contained in the Chinese note under reply are completely groundless. The Government of India are constrained to reject these allegations and to reassert emphatically that they do not accept the claims to vast areas of Indian territory in the Western, Middle and Eastern Sectors of the border put forward in the Chinese note under reply. As regards China’s stand on Kashmir and on the present unfortunate conflict between India and Pakistan, it is nothing but interference on the part of China calculated to prolong and to enlarge the conflict.”

The background of the matter is that in September 1962 some defence structures were constructed on the Sikkim side of the Sino-Indian frontier. These structures have not been in occupation since the cessation of hostilities in November, 1962. Since the Chinese Government alleged that some of these structures were on their side of the border, India had in its note of September 12, 1965 gone to the extent of suggesting that an independent Observer be allowed to go this border to see for himself the actual state of affairs. The Chinese Government has not, unfortunately, accepted this reasonable proposal and has reiterated its proposal for joint inspection. In our reply which is being sent today, we are informing the Chinese Government that their contention is entirely incorrect. Nevertheless, as an earnest of our desire to give no ground to the Chinese for making this a pretext for aggressive action, we are informing them that we have no objection to a joint inspection of those points of the Sikkim-Tibet border where Indian personnel are alleged to have set up military structures in Tibetan territory. The Government of India on their part are prepared to arrange such an inspection as early as possible, at an appropriate official level, on a mutually convenient date.

We have sent a reply to the Chinese note accordingly and hope that Chinese Government would agree to action being taken as proposed. Copies of the Chinese note and of our reply have been placed on the table of the House.
I know the House would feel concerned about the intentions of the Chinese Government. We do hope that China would not take advantage of the present situation and attack India. The House may rest assured that we are fully vigilant and that if we are attacked, we shall fight for our freedom with grim determination. The might of China will not deter us from defending our territorial integrity. I shall keep the House informed of further developments.
APPENDIX III

Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri’s Statement in Parliament, 20 September, 1965

I place on the Table of the House the text of a further note which was handed over to our Charge d’Affaires in Peking yesterday.

The House will recall that we had taken an attitude calculated to maintain peace when replying to the last note which we had received from the Chinese Government. It is clear from the kind of response which China has sent that what China is looking for is not a redress of grievances, real or imaginary, but some excuse to start its aggressive activities again, this time acting in collusion with its ally, Pakistan. The extension of the time-limit for the ultimatum was, in our view, no more than a device to gain time to watch what comes out of the discussions in the Security Council.

The allegations which China has been making in the series of notes that it has been sending to us, are such that they would hardly justify any civilised Government in having recourse to force, even if the allegations were true. If there are any structures on Chinese territory in areas where the border is delimited and not in dispute even according to the Chinese, surely, there is nothing to prevent the Chinese Government from having them removed, instead of suggesting to us that we should have them removed, which would only be possible by our men going into their territory. Similarly, no one can imagine that any Government would threaten another on the ground that their cattle have been lifted or on the ground that out of the thousands of Tibetans who have sought asylum in this country two or four are being detained here against their wishes.

To justify its aggressive attitude, China is pretending to be a guardian of Asian countries who, according to China, are being bullied by India. The basic objective of China, therefore, is to claim for itself a position of dominance in Asia which no self-respecting nation in Asia is prepared to recognise. Large or small, strong or weak, every country in Asia has the fullest right to preserve its independence and sovereignty on terms of equality. The dominance of the Chinese cannot be accepted by any of them. We reject China’s claim to tell us anything about what we should or should not do about Kashmir which is an integral part of India. Our offer of resolving the differences over these minor matters by peaceful means is still open.

However, China’s aggressive intentions are clear from the fact that even while they have in their note extended the time-limit by 72 hours, in actual fact they have started firing at our border posts both in Sikkim and in Ladakh.

If, China persists in aggression, we shall defend ourselves by all means at our disposal.

A formal reply to the Chinese note will be sent later today.
May I say a word that we have just now received the full text of the resolution passed in the Security Council? Naturally, it deserves our very careful consideration, and I might be making a statement on that tomorrow in the House.
APPENDIX IV

Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's Statement in both the Houses of Parliament, 22 September, 1965

I place on the table of the House a copy of the Security Council resolution, dated the 20th September, 1965, relating to the current conflict between India and Pakistan—a conflict which commenced on the 5th August, 1965, when Pakistan launched a massive attack on India by sending thousands of armed infiltrators across the cease-fire line in our State of Jammu and Kashmir.

As the Hon'ble Members would see, the Security Council had demanded that both Governments should order a cease-fire effective from 12-30 p.m. Indian Standard Time today, the 22nd September, 1965. On the question of cease-fire, the views of the Government of India were stated in detail and without any ambiguity in my letters of September 14 and 15, 1965, addressed to the Secretary-General. As stated in these letters, the Government of India had clearly accepted that they would order a cease-fire without any preconditions on being informed that Pakistan had agreed to do the same. On receiving the Security Council resolution, therefore, we sent a communication to the Secretary-General, in accordance with our earlier stand, informing him that we would be prepared to issue orders for a simple cease-fire effective from the appointed time and date, provided Pakistan agreed to do likewise. A copy of this communication is also placed on the Table of the House.

Throughout yesterday, there was no further message from the Secretary-General, but in the early hours of this morning we received a message from him advising us to order a unilateral cease-fire in compliance with the relevant provisions of the Security Council resolution, with the proviso that our troops could fire back if they were attacked. This, of course, was entirely impossible. In a battle which is continuing, it is just not possible for one side to ask its soldiers to stop firing, leaving the other side free to continue its operations. Our representative at the United Nations was, therefore, instructed to inform the Secretary-General accordingly.

A further report was received a short while ago that at the request of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, an emergent meeting of the Security Council was convened, at which an announcement was made, on behalf of Pakistan that they also had agreed to issue orders for a cease-fire and cessation of hostilities. From our side, the requisite orders are now being issued to our field commanders to effect a complete cease-fire by 3-30 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The Security Council Resolution refers to other matters which will require consideration subsequently. However, the policy of the Government of India in regard to matters which are of vital importance to us and which relate to the present conflict, has been stated.
by me on more than one occasion on the floor of this House and also in my recent communications to the Secretary-General.

I do not propose to go into any further details at the present stage. Detailed discussions will have to take place and there would have to be a fuller study of the problems to which I have just referred. For this purpose, our representative at the United Nations will keep himself available to the Secretary-General.

There will now be a cessation of hostilities. Peace is good. However, there is still a threat from the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, which he held out today, while speaking in the Security Council. We have, therefore, to be very watchful and vigilant.

The nation has recently been going through its greatest trial. The times have been difficult but they have served a great purpose. The whole world knows now that the people of India—Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, Parsees and others—constitute a united nation with a determined common will and purpose. On the battle front, the supreme sacrifice has been made by the members of all communities who have shown that they are Indians first and Indians last.

To our armed forces, I would like to pay on behalf of this Parliament and the entire country, our warmest tributes. By their valour and heroism, they have given a new confidence to the people of India. Those who have lost their beloved on the battle front, have made a contribution to the preservation of our independence which will never be forgotten by a grateful nation. Their sorrow and their pride are shared by the whole country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would now seek your permission to express to all the members of this august House, to all the political parties in the country, to the leaders of public opinion, of labour organisations, of business and industry, and of many other voluntary associations, my feelings of the deepest gratitude. In the hour of trial each one of the 470 million people of this country stood up shoulder to shoulder to meet the challenge to our freedom.

I should like to inform the House that on 18th September, 1965, I received a message from Mr. Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers, USSR, offering his good offices for bringing about improved relations between India and Pakistan. Mr. Kosygin is impelled by noble intentions. No one can ever contest the view that ultimately India and Pakistan will have to live together as peaceful neighbours. We cannot therefore say no to any efforts, which may help to bring about such a situation, made by those who are sincere and genuine in their feelings of goodwill and friendship. I have therefore, informed Mr. Kosygin today that we would welcome his efforts and good offices.

I would also like to give the House some further details about the tragic accident in which the other day, we suffered a grievous loss. Investigations conducted on the spot show that the aircraft in which Shri Balvantray Mehta was travelling, was shot down by a Pakistani plane. The marks on the fuselage establish that gun fire had been used. Preliminary investigations by the Air Force
authorities who also have visited the scene confirm that the aircraft was shot down at a low height. The ammunition recovered at the site of the crash also proves that the attacking aircraft was a Pakistani plane. That a non-combatant civilian aircraft should have been shot down in this manner is one of the most inhuman acts which we must all deplore and condemn. Shri Balvantrayji, his wife and the others who were travelling with him have laid down their lives at the altar of the freedom of the country. Their names will remain enshrined in our memory.

We are still faced with the Chinese ultimatum. The House is aware that almost at the same time when the Chinese Government announced the extension of the time-limit of the ultimatum to India by 72 hours on September 19, their troops started provocative activities at several points of the border. On the Sikkim border, about which the Chinese have been making baseless and threatening allegations, the Chinese troops crossed the well-known and delimited boundary at Dongchui La and Nathu La on 20th and 21st of September respectively. They fired at our observation posts. They have tried also to intrude into our other territories. Our armed forces have clear instructions to repel the aggressor.

Yesterday we sent a reply to the Chinese note of September 20 in which India was alleged to have intruded into Dum Chale and committed armed provocation. The Chinese charge was rejected as a fabrication and a cover-up for the intrusion and firing at Tsas-kur to which I have referred a little while ago.

The House is aware that on September 19, the Chinese Government sent us a note couched in unbecoming language, extending the period of the ultimatum, making demands for destruction of military structures etc. A copy of our reply has been placed on the table of the House together with copies of two other notes we sent yesterday. Regarding the so-called military structures we have already told the Chinese Government that if after joint inspection any structures are found on the Tibetan side of the border there can be no objection to their being demolished. I have been told that China has announced that some of these so-called structures have been destroyed by our troops while withdrawing. All this is a product of their imagination.

I must tell the House that we view with grave concern the Chinese activities on the border and the armed intrusions into our territory. We have urged the Chinese Government in our note of September 21 replying to the Chinese note of September 19 to foresake the path of belligerence and intimidation and return to the path of peace and reason in its relations with India. I hope that even at this late hour China will respond to this call and prevent a major crisis.

We do not know what the Chinese will do next. We have, however, to remain vigilant all along the frontier.

There are times of the greatest trial for the nation, but the people all over the country are now in that mood which alone ensures
the preservation of country’s freedom. We may have to face many ups and downs, but I know the people have steeled themselves into a resolve to meet even this bigger challenge. On our Armed Forces, there may be a heavier responsibility. I have no doubt that they are in good spirits. We have no intention of underestimating the gravity of the situation. But we have resolved firmly to meet this challenge to our freedom.
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I. BORDER ISSUES AND INCIDENTS

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 27 January, 1966.

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 051.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and with reference to the three notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India, dated November 26 and 27; and December 14, 1965, has the honour to state the following:

In the last few months the Indian side has intensified its intrusions into China and repeatedly provoked armed conflicts. The three most outstanding cases took place respectively at Duncchele in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, in the Laiguo Bridge area in the eastern sector, and at Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary. The Chinese Government successively lodged strong protests with the Indian Government against the three armed conflicts. But the Indian Government, instead of admitting its mistakes sent the Chinese Government notes in which it tried hard to turn the truth upside down and lodged counter-protests to China. The Chinese Government expresses its indignation at this and hereby replies in refutation of the Indian notes as follows:

(1) Regarding the conflict of September 19, 1965 at Duncchele in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, it was clearly Indian troops that intruded into Chinese territory and launched an attack on Chinese civilian personnel. Yet the Indian Government asserted that Indian soldiers had been "kidnapped and killed" by the Chinese side, a story which was thoroughly refuted by the Chinese Government early in its note of October 2, 1965. And it was most absurd of the Indian side, in its note of November 26, 1965, to repeat its old tune and further to reserve its so-called right to demand compensation. Being the aggressor, the Indian Government must bear full responsibility for all the consequences of its acts of aggression. What qualification has it to ask for compensation? On the other hand, the Chinese Government has every right to demand that the Indian Government compensate it for all the losses caused by the Indian intrusions and provocations against China. The Indian Government can in no way repudiate these debts, which have all been placed on record.

(2) The armed conflict of November 24, 1965 in the Laiguo Bridge area in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border was provoked by Indian troops trespassing the line of actual control between the two sides. Regarding this conflict, in its note of November 27, 1965 the Indian Government copied the same lie it had told about the conflict at Duncchele in its attempt to hoodwink the world, alleging
that Indian troops were "kidnapped and killed" by the Chinese side. This is a shabby trick worth no refutation. Moreover, in its note the Indian Government again mixed up the illegal "McMahon line" with the boundary between China and India in an attempt to legalize this illegal line. This is an idle dream which will never come true.

(3) Regarding the armed conflict of December 12, 1965 at Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary, the indisputable fact was that more than thirty Indian soldiers intruded into the Chinese side of Tagi La and launched a frantic attack on seven Chinese frontier guards who were on duty there. But they were routed by the Chinese frontier guards and had to flee helter-skelter. Five of the Indian soldiers were killed within Chinese territory to a depth of between 100 and 500 metres. Three were captured within Chinese territory. Moreover, the Indian troops left behind on Chinese territory a large amount of weapons and ammunition as well as many craters. All these are conclusive evidence of the Indian troops intrusion. In its note of December 14, 1965 the Indian Government counter-charged Chinese troops with "intruding into Sikkim territory" and "firing" at the Indian side. This can deceive no one. The Indian side further told the fantastic tale to the effect that there were some 200 or 300 Chinese troops, that 30 of them were killed and that their bodies were carried back "under the cover of darkness", and so on and so forth. This was an attempt to present its shame as a cause for self-glorification, an act of self-delusion and deception. The Indian side will only add to its own shame by trying to cover up the miserable failure of its provocation with such lies.

(4) In its note of December 14, 1965 the Indian side trumped up two cases of so-called "provocation", falsely accusing Chinese soldiers of entering "the area north-west of Bom Cho in the north Sikkim" on December 10, 1965 and firing at the Indian side in the Natu La area on the night of December 10-11. These are sheer fabrications designed to confuse the public.

The series of facts listed above show that the Indian side deliberately made intrusions and provocations against China, but suffered one defeat after another and left behind numerous evidences of its crimes. And that was why it hastily cooked up lies in a vain attempt to shirk responsibility for its criminal aggression and hoodwink world opinion. To put it plainly, these tricks of the Indian side have long been exposed. If the Indian Government continues its senseless haggling about the above-mentioned conflicts, the Chinese Government will pay no attention to it.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 31 January, 1966.

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 071.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with regard to Indian intrusions along the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim boundary in the latter half of 1965, has the honour to state the following:

1. In the latter half of 1965, there were altogether 39 cases of Indian troops' intrusions into Chinese territory across the line of actual control along the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim boundary and of their provocations (For details see Annex I). Some intruding Indian troops carried on reconnaissance and harassment in Chinese territory for as long as four days; others penetrated Chinese territory to a depth of 18 kilometres; and still others even made incursions into the vicinity of Hsiasima of Yatung, an important county of Tibet. Particularly serious is the fact that in the western and eastern sectors of the Sino-Indian border and along the China-Sikkim boundary Indian troops carried out armed provocations and engineered clashes on five occasions, killing one Chinese frontier guard and wounding another. Along the China-Sikkim boundary, Indian troops also fired six times with rifles and artillery from the Sikkim side at Chinese frontier guards within Chinese territory.

In the latter half of 1965, Indian planes flew altogether 41 sorties across the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border and across the China-Sikkim boundary and intruded into China's airspace (For details see Annex II). The farthest point of these intrusions was about 150 kilometres from the line of actual control.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the above serious intrusions and provocations by the Indian side.

2. The latter half of 1965 was a period in which intrusions by Indian troops into Chinese territory were most numerous and most serious since the Indian side provoked the massive conflict on the Sino-Indian border in 1962. Indian air intrusions into China in the same period were also more frequent than any other period in the last two years. This was by no means accidental. In the latter half of 1965, the Indian Government intensified its arms expansion and war operation and unleashed a war of aggression, and India was internally beset with financial difficulties and a food crisis, which became unprecedentedly serious. In these circumstances, it was obviously for the purpose of currying favour with the U.S. imperialists and the modern revisionists and thereby obtaining more grain, arms and money from them that India intensified her intrusions into China, provoked armed conflicts and created tension. However, in eking out a living by opposing China like this, the Indian Government cannot improve its position of being hard pressed both at home and abroad, but will only come to a grievous end.
3. The Chinese Government has lodged protests with the Indian Government against the Indian intrusions into China's territory and airspace during the first half of 1965. In its note of October 21, 1965, the Indian Government tried hard to deny these facts. This was a futile attempt. The facts of Indian intrusions listed by the Chinese Government had all been repeatedly checked, and each of these intrusions is well established. The military works for aggression built on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary, which Indian troops failed to dismantle entirely are still there; the Chinese border inhabitants and cattle kidnapped by Indian troops who intruded into Chinese territory have not yet been returned. All these are iron-clad facts, which the Indian side cannot possibly obliterate.

4. The Chinese Government hereby warns the Indian Government once again that the Indian side must stop all its ground and air intrusions and provocations against China, otherwise it must bear full responsibility for the consequences that may arise therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

ANNEX I

Intrusions into Chinese Territory by Indian Troops During the Latter Half of 1965.

1. Intrusions into Sinkiang and Tibet, China, east of the 1959 line of actual control in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. On August 1, at about 1630 hours, four Indian soldiers on horseback intruded into Tibet in the vicinity of Kongka Pass and detoured to the flank and rear of the Chinese civilian checkpost for reconnaissance and provocation lasting more than three hours. The intruding Indian troops penetrated into Chinese territory for a depth of about 18 kilometres.

2. On August 2, at about 1620 hours, six Indian soldiers on horseback intruded into the vicinity of the Chinese civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted activities there for more than three hours. The intruding Indian troops pressed to a point within some 500 metres of the Chinese civilian checkpost for reconnaissance and map-making there.

3. On August 17, at about 1120 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into an area southeast of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities there for more than two hours.

4. On August 21, at about 1320 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities there for nearly an hour.

5. On August 25, at about 1110 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities there for nearly an hour.
6. On September 11, at about 1200 hours, four Indian soldiers on horseback intruded along the Changlung River to the south and southeast of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance and harassing raids for nearly seven hours, penetrating into Chinese territory for a depth of about three kilometres.

7. On September 16, at about 1120 hours, three Indian soldiers penetrated into Chinese territory for a depth of about three kilometres, intruded along the Changlung River to the southeast of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance for more than one and half hours.

8. On September 18, at about 1300 hours, three Indian soldiers crossed the Demchok River from Parigas, a Tibetan area which was under India's illegal occupation, and intruded into the vicinity of Demchok village on the Chinese side of the line of actual control, and conducted reconnaissance and harassing raids there.

9. On September 19, at 1450 hours, a group of Indian soldiers intruded into an area about four kilometres east of Dumchele, Tibet and brazenly made an attack by firing on the Chinese civilian personnel who were on duty there. After serving warnings without avail, the Chinese civilian personnel had to strike back, killing three Indian soldiers.

10. On September 22, at about 0820 hours, three Indian soldiers crossed the Demchok River from Parigas and intruded into the vicinity of Demchok village, Tibet for reconnaissance.

11. On October 4, at about 1200 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance and left Chinese territory at about 1320 hours.

12. On October 13, at about 1900 hours, five Indian soldiers on horseback intruded along the Changlung River to the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities for nearly an hour.

13. On October 14, at about 1130 hours, four Indian soldiers on horseback intruded into an area to the west of the civilian checkpoint at Tienwentian in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance and harassing raids for about two hours, penetrating into Chinese territory for a depth of about six kilometres.

14. On November 10, at about 1215 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

15. On November 25, at about 1330 hours, four Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Spanggur, Tibet for reconnaissance.

16. On December 10, at about 1340 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Spanggur, Tibet and conducted reconnoitring activities there for nearly two hours.
17. On December 14, at about 1550 hours, four Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Spanggur, Tibet for reconnaissance.

II. Intrusions into Tibet, China, north of the 1959 line of actual control in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border:

During the summer of 1965, Indian military and administrative personnel again intruded into the Wuje area of China and stationed themselves there.

III. Intrusions into Tibet, China north of the 1959 line of actual control in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. On November 24, at 1030 hours, three Indian soldiers crossed Tungmu La on the line of actual control and intruded into the area of Laiguo Bridge for armed provocation. Instead of heeding the warning for withdrawal served by the Chinese personnel of a civilian checkpoint, they opened fire at the Chinese personnel. The three intruding Indian soldiers were all killed in the exchange of fire.

2. At Hsialinkung Terrace, Indian troops have so far failed to dismantle their military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the line of actual control, but have frequently crossed the line of actual control for reconnaissance and harassment.

IV. Intrusions into Tibet, China along the China-Sikkim boundary:

1. On July 2, at about 1100 hours, two Indian soldiers crossed Latuo La and intruded into Chinese territory for reconnaissance.

2. On July 3, at about 1900 hours, five Indian soldiers crossed the China-Sikkim boundary and intruded into Dongnan grassland in Tibet, China. They carried out reconnaissance and harassing raids for as long as four days within Chinese territory before leaving China near Tungcha La around 1300 hours on July 7.

3. On July 10, at about 1800 hours, an Indian soldier crossed the boundary near Tagi La and opened fire at a Chinese shepherd called Trashe Tsewang.

4. On the afternoon of July 22, nine Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory from a point north of Cho La. They pitched a tent at the Riwujig pasture and prowled hither and thither for reconnaissance, harassment and the gathering of information and even seized things from Chinese herdsman. On July 23, two of the Indian soldiers sneaked as far as the vicinity of Hsiasima of Yatung, an important county of Tibet, penetrating into Chinese territory for a depth of about 12 kilometres. It was not until the noon of July 24 after the nine intruding Indian soldiers had illegally stayed on Chinese territory for two days and nights that they left the territory.

5. On September 26, at 1630 hours, three Indian soldiers crossed Tungchu La and intruded into Chinese territory for reconnaissance and provocation. They were arrested on the spot by Chinese defence troops.
6. On September 30, at about 1530 hours, four Indian soldiers crossed Toka La and intruded into Tunglang pasture in Dongnan grassland, and with their weapons intimidated Chinese herdsmen who were grazing cattle there.

7. On October 2, at about 1100 hours, 15 Indian soldiers crossed Toka La and intruded into Shu pasture in Dongnan grassland. They conducted reconnaissance and harassing raids for as long as five hours.

8. On October 2, at about 1130 hours, a group of Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory through Ya La and opened heavy fire on Chinese frontier guards who were on duty there, firing more than 200 rounds and wounding a Chinese frontier guard.

9. On October 20, at 1256 hours, 25 Indian soldiers occupied Toka La, eighteen of whom openly crossed the Pass and intruded into Dongnan grassland within Chinese territory for provocation against the Chinese frontier guards who were on duty there. The intruding Indian soldiers illegally stayed within Chinese territory until 1740 hours when they withdrew.

10. On November 13, at 0730 hours, more than a hundred Indian soldiers at Tungchu La started a fierce attack with light and heavy machine-guns on Chinese frontier guards who were on duty within Chinese territory. In the meantime, more than ten Indian soldiers crossed the boundary and outflanked and attacked the Chinese frontier guards. Under cross-fire, an Indian soldier, after being wounded, crawled back to the Sikkim side and died there.

11. On December 11, at about 1130 hours, seven Indian soldiers crossed Toka La and intruded into Dongnan grassland for reconnaissance and harassment. After being discovered by the Chinese frontier guards, this group of intruding Indian soldiers fled helter-skelter in the same direction from which they had made their intrusion.

12. On December 12, at 1435 hours, more than 30 Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory through Tagi La and opened heavy fire with rifles and artillery on the Chinese frontier guards who were on patrol duty there, killing one of them. The Chinese side was compelled to fire back, and three Indian soldiers were captured and five killed under cross-fire.

13. During the latter half of 1965, Indian troops continued to maintain a large number of military works for aggression on the Chinese side of Natu La, Tungchu La, Jelep La and Cho La, and illegally entrenched themselves there. It was not until the Chinese Government set a time-limit in its note of September 16, 1965 for the Indian side to dismantle these military works that the Indian side was compelled to demolish part of them and withdrew helter-skelter.

14. During the latter half of 1965, apart from making incessant intrusions by crossing the China-Sikkim boundary, Indian troops
repeatedly opened rifle and artillery fire on the border at Chinese frontier guards within Chinese territory.

(1) On September 20, at 1830 hours and 1900 hours, Indian troops twice fired from a place near Natu La at Chinese frontier guards.

(2) On September 20, at 2000 hours, Indian troops fired from a place near Jelep La at Chinese frontier guards.

(3) On October 4, between 1030 and 1230 hours, a group of Indian soldiers in the vicinity of Ya La opened fire on two successive occasions with light and heavy machine-guns and mortars upon the Chinese frontier guards who were on duty there.

(4) On October 9, at 1727 hours, Indian troops at Natu La fired six rounds at a sentry post of Chinese defence troops.

(5) On October 16, at 1530 hours, Indian troops at Ya La opened machine-gun fire on the positions of the Chinese defence troops.

(6) On November 24, at 1707 hours, a group of Indian soldiers at Tagi La fired two shells at the Chinese frontier guards on patrol duty.

AnnEX II

Intrusions into China’s Airspace by Indian Aircraft During the Latter Half of 1965.

1. Intrusions into the airspace over Sinkiang and Tibet, China, east of the 1959 line of actual control in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. On August 13, at 1150 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang.

2. On September 30, at 1156 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Kongka Pass in Tibet, the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang, and other places.

3. On September 30, at 1200 hours, an Indian aircraft flew over Ane Pass and intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Nyagzu and its vicinity in Tibet.

4. On October 24, at about 1300 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang.

5. On November 3, at 1033 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs and its vicinity in Sinkiang.
6. On November 3, at about 1300 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Nyagzu and its vicinity in Tibet.

7. On November 18, at 1310 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Kongka Pass and its vicinity in Tibet, and circled over there for reconnaissance.

8. On November 19, at 1050 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the Galwan River Valley and Panlung and its vicinity in Sinkiang.

9. On November 23, at 1115 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Yula and other places on the southern bank of Pangong Lake in Tibet, and circled over there for reconnaissance.

10. On November 27, at 1025 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the Galwan River Valley, Panlung and other places in Sinkiang.

11. On December 2, at 1202 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet.

12. On December 6, at 1201 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet.

13. On December 12, at 0631 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Chiakang, Jara Pass and other places in Tibet.

14. On December 13, at 1520 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the area of Pangong Lake in Tibet.

15. On December 19, at 1205 hours, an Indian aircraft flew over Kongka Pass and intruded into China's airspace.

16. On December 29, at 1150 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Height 5651 metres and other places in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Tienwentian in Sinkiang, and circled over there for reconnaissance.

II. Intrusions into the airspace over Tibet, China, east of the 1959 line of actual control in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border:

On September 24, at 1100 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Mtsore's (Churup) and its vicinity east of the area of Chuva and Chuje.

III. Intrusions into the airspace over Tibet, China, north of the 1959 line of actual control in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. On September 12, at 1101 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Sanachulin and other places.
2. On September 22, at 1120 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Milin, Linchih and other places.

3. On September 23, at about 2000 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Pangta and other places in Chamdo area, penetrating China's territory to a depth of about 150 kilometres.

4. On September 24, at 0715 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Chikung and its vicinity northeast of Tsayul.

5. On September 27, at 2117 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Pangta and its vicinity, penetrating China's territory to a depth of about 150 kilometres.

6. On October 4, at 1010 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Sama and its vicinity.

7. On October 5, at 1320 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Jihtung Chuwakan and other places each of Tsayul.

8 On October 8, at 0548 hours, two Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Janwu and other places in Chamdo area, and circled over there for reconnaissance for about half an hour.

9. On October 16, at 0755 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the Nu River Bridge and its vicinity in Chamdo area, and circled over there for reconnaissance, penetrating China's territory to a depth of about 130 kilometres.

10. On November 27, at 1005 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Le and its vicinity, and circled over there for reconnaissance.

11. On November 30, at 1251 hours, two Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Molo, Tamaden and other places.

12. On December 11, at 1607 hours, two Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Che Dong area north of the 1959 line of actual control.

13. On December 11, at 1615 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Tsona and its vicinity.

14. On December 12, at 1425 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over an area west of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao.

IV. Intrusions into the airspace over Tibet, China along the China-Sikkim boundary:

1. On September 23, at 0805 hours, an Indian aircraft flew over Tungchu La and intruded into China's airspace.

2. On September 30, at 1025 hours, an Indian aircraft flew over Cho La and intruded into China's airspace.

3. On October 15, at 1237 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace through Ya La and circled over China's territory for
reconnaissance at Natu La, Jelep La and Tungchu La. Then it returned to Ya La, and penetrated deep into the airspace over Ring-chingong, Yatung and other places for reconnaissance and harassment.

4. On October 26, at 0955 hours, an Indian aircraft flew over Ya La and intruded into China's airspace.

5. On October 26, at 1108 hours, an Indian aircraft flew over Ya La and intruded into China's airspace.

6. On November 23, at 1319 hours, an Indian aircraft flew over Ya La and intruded into China's airspace.

7. On December 14, at 1015 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the Shigatse area from above Tagi La and brazenly circled over Chago La, Tui La, Phari, Linghsi La, Khala and other places in this area for reconnaissance and harassment; it was not until 1050 hours that the aircraft flew back to Sikkim territory through the Kungyangmila Pass. This Indian aircraft penetrated China's territory to a depth of over 60 kilometres.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 March, 1966.

No. C/5/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Government's Note of the 27th January, 1966, has the honour to state as follows:

Since September last year Chinese troops had been indulging in armed provocations and creating a series of incidents across the border. The Government of India's protests against these incidents were based on verified and irrefutable facts. It is, therefore, of no avail for the Chinese Government to evade responsibility for their actions by bland denials and false counter-charges.

Detailed information pertaining to the incident of September 19, 1965, in Ladakh, the incident of 24th November, 1965, in NEFA and the armed clash of 12th December, 1965, in North Sikkim as well as the incidents of the 10th and 10-11th December, 1965, has been provided in the relevant protest notes of the Government of India. It is a fact that on September 19, 1965, Chinese troops crossed the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector and kidnapped and killed three Indian personnel in the vicinity of Tsaskur. It is also a fact that on 24th November, 1965, Chinese troops crossed the international border in the Eastern Sector near Domla Pass and ambushed, kidnapped and killed three Indian personnel who were on routine patrol in Indian territory. Again, on December 12, 1965, Chinese troops intruded into Sikkim and attacked an Indian patrol. In the encounter six Indian personnel and 30 intruding Chinese troops were killed. The Government of India reserve the right to demand compensation for damage to Indian life and property perpetrated by intruding Chinese troops.
The facts of Chinese provocations and violations cannot be brushed aside by calling them a 'shabby trick' and 'self-glorification' by India. As a matter of fact, it is the Chinese Government which is playing such 'tricks' and making vain-glorious claims about the aggressive prowess of their armed forces.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, 30 April, 1966.

No. C/6/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, and with reference to the Chinese Government's note of 31st January 1966, has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government has, in its note under reply, produced a consolidated list of so-called "intrusions into Chinese territory" by Indian troops and aircraft in the latter half of 1965. These allegations are totally false and have been concocted to malign India and to provide a justification for the aggressive actions of Chinese troops across the border in the latter half of 1965. Out of the 39 land "intrusions" listed in the Chinese note not less than 23 are a repetition of old charges which have already been investigated, found absolutely baseless and rejected by the Government of India in several of its earlier notes. The remaining 16 allegations are new but equally false. As regards the allegations of so-called "Air-intrusions", they are nothing but a fabrication. Thorough investigations conducted by the Government of India into these have conclusively proved that there has been not even a single instance in which Indian troops or aircraft had crossed the international border or the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector. The Government of India, therefore, reject the Chinese note and the allegations contained therein.

It is well-known that in the latter half of 1965 it was the Chinese Government who precipitated a war-like situation on the border. Taking advantage of the unfortunate conflict between India and Pakistan, they staged a series of military intrusions and incidents all along the border, and threatened India with a crude and impudent ultimatum. It is extraordinary that the Chinese Government should still harp upon the sheep and the yaks and the so-called "kidnapped" border inhabitants and try to maintain the fictitious charge that "the military works on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary which Indian troops failed to dismantle entirely are still there..." All these charges have been effectively disproved by the Government of India.
The Chinese Government have tried to give a propagandist twist and an ideological colouring to its protest note by saying that India is “eking out a living by opposing China”, and is “currying favour with the U.S. imperialists and the modern revisionists thereby obtaining more grain, arms and money from them”. The Government of India reject with contempt these impertinent remarks. If proof were needed that what lies behind these unceasing Chinese protests, allegations, threats and intrusions, is not so much the border question as the obsessive hostility of the Chinese Government towards India, these slanderous aspersions prove it.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 4 May, 1966.

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 309.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the three notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated February 2, 3 and 8, 1966:

After the Chinese Government's comprehensive protest of January 31, 1966 against India's intrusions into Chinese territory and airspace in the second half of last year, the Indian Government delivered three successive notes in which it groundlessly countercharged China with intrusions and even repeated the lies which had been thoroughly refuted by the Chinese Government seven or eight months earlier. Apparently, this was a vain attempt to confuse public opinion and cover up the facts of Indian intrusions. The Chinese Government has no intention to refute India's fabrications and platitudes point by point but only wishes, in all seriousness, to make the following points:

(1) In its notes under reference, the Indian side repeatedly asserted that China had sent her troops into the 20-kilometre zone on her side of the line of actual control along the Sino-Indian border and into the Longju, Che Dong and other areas which she had vacated on her own initiative and where she had refrained from establishing civilian checkposts, and that she had broken her promise and violated the provisions of the Colombo proposals. This assertion is utterly absurd.

The said 20-kilometre zone and Longju, Che Dong and other areas are all Chinese territory. It was to seek relaxation of the border situation that, after repulsing the armed Indian attack in the winter of 1962, China took the initiative to withdraw her frontier guards 20 kilometres behind the line of actual control between the Chinese and Indian sides and decided not to establish even civilian checkposts in Longju, Che Dong, Wuje and the areas in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, where there was a dispute about
the cease-fire arrangement. This fully testified to China's sincerity in seeking a peaceful settlement of the boundary question. The statements and documents issued at the time by the Chinese Government and its leaders, which were quoted in the Indian notes, precisely constitute a convincing proof of this sincerity.

But China's above action in no way meant relinquishment of sovereignty over her territory or of the right to take precautionary and self-defence measures against Indian intrusions and provocations. While withdrawing and taking other steps as mentioned above, the Chinese Government sternly demanded that India "refrain from making provocations again and from re-entering the four areas where there is a dispute about the cease-fire arrangement" and that she "correctly understand China's effort for peace and respond to it favourably". (See the statement by the spokesman of the Chinese Ministry of National Defence dated March 1, 1963 and the note of the Chinese Government to the Indian Government dated March 2, 1963). Moreover, the Chinese Government solemnly declared that, should India continue to make intrusions and provocations in disregard of the efforts made by China on her own initiative, "China reserves the right to strike back in self-defence, and the Indian Government will be held completely responsible for all the grave consequences arising therefrom". (See the statement of the Chinese Government dated November 21, 1962). The Chinese Government "hopes that history will not be repeated. If unfortunately it should be repeated, the Chinese Government believes that the whole world will be able to see even more clearly than before who should be held responsible for the tension along the Sino-Indian border". (See Premier Chou En-lai's letter to Prime Minister Nehru dated March 3, 1963). These words of the Chinese Government are perfectly clear and unequivocal.

In the past three years, India has not only failed to make any positive response to China's initiative measures but has kept up her intrusions and provocations on the Sino-Indian and China-Sikkim borders, violated the 20-kilometre demilitarized zone on the Chinese side of the line of actual control along the Sino-Indian border, and even repeatedly intruded into Longju, Che Dong, Wuje and other areas where China had on her own initiative refrained from establishing any civilian checkpoints. (See the notes of the Chinese Government dated July 7, 1964, January 31, 1966, etc.). There were as many as 374 Indian ground and air intrusions during the three years from late 1962 to the end of 1965. What was more serious, in the latter half of 1965 the intruding Indian troops provoked several armed clashes. In the face of such a grave situation, it was only natural for the Chinese Government to adopt the necessary precautionary and self-defence measures. Such is what the Chinese Government has said and also what it has done. The Indian Government will never succeed in its attempt to misrepresent China's initiative measure of withdrawal and to make China put up with its expansionist and aggressive policy indefinitely without checking it.

(2) As for the charge that China has violated the Colombo Proposals, it is even more absurd. In the first place, since the Colombo proposals are mere proposals, the question of violation or non-violation simply does not arise. Next, it must be pointed out that it was
when China had taken a whole series of measures on her own initiative that the Colombo proposals came into being. China's concrete steps of withdrawing her frontier guards to 20 kilometres behind the entire line of actual control and refraining from establishing civilian checkpoints in Longju, Che Dong and two other areas far exceeded the proposals of the Colombo Conference. On the other hand, the Indian Government, while prating about its acceptance of the Colombo proposals, in fact made no positive response whatsoever. On the contrary, by her intrusions India demonstrated that she had altogether cast the Colombo proposals to the winds. Obviously, India is using the Colombo proposals merely as a tool to compel China to make unilateral concessions, hoping that China will tolerate India's renewed and unbridled intrusions and provocations. It is a great irony for India to continue to harp on the Colombo proposals in these circumstances.

(3) As for the line of actual control between the two sides along the Sino-Indian border, it must be pointed out once again that the discrepancy between it and the Sino-Indian traditional customary boundary is entirely due to the fact that India has invaded and occupied large tracts of Chinese territory. It is an objective and undeniable fact that in the western sector it roughly coincides with the traditional customary boundary. In the eastern sector, the so-called McMahon Line has become the line of actual control between the two sides because the Chinese side, proceeding from the desire to maintain the status quo pending a settlement of the boundary question, decided not to cross it. But this has in no way altered the illegal nature of the "McMahon Line". On her part, India first seized 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory south of that line and then occupied China Khinzemane north of the line; later on she did not scruple to provoke two armed conflicts in order to invade and occupy the Longju and Che Dong areas north of the line. Now in its note the Indian Government further alleged that the junction of Nyamjang Chu and Sumdorong Chu north of Khinzemane is also to the south of the line. No sovereign state can tolerate these ever-growing and unbounded territorial ambitions. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the Indian Government's unwarranted allegations and wishes to point out that India will never be able to realize her ambitions of perpetuating her illegal occupation of Chinese territory.

(4) As for the China-Sikkim boundary, clearly the question now is that India has not only stationed large numbers of troops in Sikkim, but has constantly crossed the delimited China-Sikkim boundary to intrude into Chinese territory and provoke conflict. It is preposterous to assert that China attempts to "spoil the special and cordial relations which exist between India and Sikkim" and "to apply military pressure on Sikkim." What are the "special and cordial relations" between India and Sikkim? To put it bluntly, they are the protectorship imposed on the people of Sikkim by the Indian Government, which has inherited the mantle of aggression from British imperialism. Frankly speaking, such unequal relationship in which a big country bullies a small one and encroaches upon its sovereignty, has long been spurned by the people of the world, and especially by the awakened Afro-Asian peoples. It is most unseemly for India to try her utmost to maintain this relationship. Talking about "military pressure on Sikkim," it is not China that applies it, but precisely India, who is
tightening her military control over Sikkim on the pretext of "defence". Is not this the plain fact?

(5) As the Chinese Government has repeatedly pointed out, India's purpose, both in conducting border intrusions and in making slanderous counter-charges against China is to meet the needs of its domestic and foreign policies. Although the Indian Government has flatly denied this, its denial cannot alter the objective fact. In order to ask for food and money from the U.S. imperialists and the modern revisionists to solve the grave famine and economic difficulties at home, the Indian Prime Minister has recently not hesitated to repeatedly slander China as a "threat", cry that "China must be contained" and even boast about India's "contribution" along the Sino-Indian border, in the hope of receiving more "notice" and "thanks." This only enables the whole world to see more clearly the role the Indian Government is now playing in the international arena. We would like to tell the Indian Government that, as the Government of an Asian country, it will bring no good to its country by continuing to collaborate with imperialism and its accomplices and even hiring itself out and serving as their pawn, and that attempts at expansionism and aggression against its neighbours will bring nothing except more and more disasters to its people.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 July, 1966.

No. C/11/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and have the honour to state that since the middle of May 1966 Chinese troops have made the following intrusions into Indian territory:

(i) On May 19, 1966, a Chinese patrol from Migyitun in Tibet intruded across the international boundary in the Eastern Sector into the Alubari area about a mile south of Longju in the Subansiri District of India's North East Frontier Agency. The Chinese patrol returned to Migyitun on the same day.

(ii) On July 9, 1966, a Chinese patrol party was observed three miles inside Indian territory across the border in the vicinity of Muling La in the Middle Sector of the India-Tibet boundary.

(iii) On July 16, 1966, a Chinese patrol party crossed the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector and intruded into a depth of about two miles into Indian territory near the Track Junction in the Daulet Beg Oldi area and indulged in reconnaissance activities. The Chinese Government are fully aware that the Track Junction is west of 'the line of actual control' and is in Indian territory which has never been disputed by China.
2. The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Embassy of the People's Republic of China against these fresh instances of violation by Chinese troops of the 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector and the international boundary in the Middle and Eastern Sector of the border.

3. The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurance of their highest consideration.

---

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 August, 1966.**

No. C/13/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs present its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:—

On 25th July, 1966, a Chinese military party intruded approximately one mile west of the so-called ‘line of actual control’ in the Western Sector near the Track Junction in the Daulet Beg Oldi area. Further intrusions were made by Chinese military personnel into the same area on July 31, August 2 and August 4, 1966. The Government of India lodge a strong protest against these violations of Indian territory by Chinese military personnel. The Chinese Government are aware that the Daulet Beg Oldi area is west of the 'line of actual control' and is in Indian territory which has never been disputed by China.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of India in China, 5 September, 1966.**

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 604.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the notes of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated July 21 and August 11, 1966.

In its notes under reference, the Indian Government talked the nonsense that Chinese patrols and military personnel made 'intrusions into Indian territory' on seven occasions. This is an out-and-out lie. Neither in the western sector, nor in the middle and eastern sectors of the Sino-Indian boundary have the Chinese frontier guards and civilian personnel ever crossed the line of actual control between
the two sides. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the Indian side's unwarranted protests which are based on sheer fabrications.

In its note the Indian Government also asserts that Chinese patrols intruded across “the international boundary in the eastern sector” into an area one mile south of Longju and across “the India-Tibet boundary” into the vicinity of Muling La. As is well-known, the traditional customary boundary in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border is as far as more than one hundred kilometres south of Longju, and even according to the line of actual control between the two sides Longju is within the Chinese side; the traditional customary boundary in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border is also far west of Muling La. The Indian Government’s wild attempt to claim these places which have always belonged to China as “Indian territory” once again reveals its expansionist design over Chinese territory. What is particularly absurd is that in its note the Indian side went to the length of referring once again to the so-called “Indian-Tibet boundary”. Tibet is an autonomous region of China and is an inalienable part of Chinese territory. Obviously, the called “India-Tibet boundary”. Tibet is an autonomous region of fusing the public by putting Tibet on a par with state in its note under reference.

Of late, the Indian Government has addressed a succession of notes vilifying and slandering China; the Indian Prime Minister, Minister for External Affairs and the Defence Minister have also made repeated anti-Chinese outcries in the Parliament, and a spokesman of the Indian Government even made the sensational assertion that China could “launch an attack” on India. Depending constantly on opposing China for a living, the Indian Government whips up an anti-Chinese hysteria each time its Parliament is in session. This has very often been the case. But it is completely futile for the Indian Government to try to extricate itself from its predicament both at home and abroad by vilifying China.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 September, 1966.

No. C/14/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and have the honour to state that the Government of Bhutan have requested the Government of India to draw the attention of the Chinese Government to a series of intrusions in the Doklan pasture area which lies south of the traditional boundary between Bhutan and the Tibet region of China in the southern Chumbi area.

It is reported that on the 13th of April 1966, a patrol of the Royal Bhutanese Army observed that a Chinese patrol of 13 men had
intruded about three miles south-west of Sinchel La. On the 28th July 1966, another Bhutanese patrol found a party of 5 Tibetans with approximately 300 yaks encamped about two miles south of Sinchel La. The Tibetan graziers were informed by the Bhutanese patrol that they were in Bhutanese territory and asked to withdraw.

Again on the 8th of September 1966, a Bhutanese patrol found Tibetan graziers in the area in question. It was further discovered that two heaps of loose stones had recently been set up in the area with a view presumably to establishing a claim south of the traditional frontier.

Again on the 13th of September 1966, a Bhutanese patrol found not only that the graziers from the Tibet region of China were continuing to use these pastures but a part of Chinese troops had also intruded into the same area and had dug fresh trenches.

In view of the persistence of these intrusions by Chinese troops and nationals and the increasing strength of the intruders, the Government of Bhutan could no longer dismiss the incidents as accidental transgression of the frontier.

The traditional frontier in this segment runs from a point east of Batang La along the ridge which forms the northern water parting of the Torsa stream up to Sinchel La and thence to height 4421 metres.

The Government of India, on behalf of the Royal Bhutan Government, protest against these intrusions and urge that the Chinese personnel and troops should be withdrawn from Bhutanese territory and should refrain from future violations of this well-defined and traditional Bhutanese frontier.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 October, 1966.

No. C/16/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India, and in continuation of their note dated the 11th August, 1966, has the honour to bring to the notice of the Chinese Government the following fresh instances of intrusions by Chinese troops:

(1) On September 2, 1966, at 1225 hours, two armed Chinese soldiers visited a point about 2 miles west of the so-called “line of actual control” in Spanggur Gap in Ladakh. The Chinese soldiers returned to their post at Spanggur after staying in Indian territory for about 15 minutes.
(2) On September 10, 1966, at 1200 hours, three Chinese soldiers intruded approximately 1 mile inside Sikkim, south-east of Kangra La. The intruding personnel came approximately 1000 yards north-east of the Indian observation post and retreated into Tibetan territory on being detected.

(3) On September 12, 1966, at 1300 hours, two Chinese soldiers intruded into Indian territory about 1 mile west of the "line of actual control", about 4 miles north-east of the Indian checkpost at Track Junction. They withdrew after a stay of about 5 hours.

(4) On September 13, 1966, at about 1100 hours, a Chinese military party consisting of 10 soldiers again intruded into Indian territory at the same spot about 4 miles north-east of the Indian checkpost at Track Junction and withdrew after a short while.

(5) On September 20, 1966, at 1245 hours, a party of 5 mounted Chinese soldiers intruded three miles beyond the "line of actual control" and visited several points north-east of the Indian checkpost at Track Junction, before returning to their base.

(6) On September 21, 1966, at 1700 hours, four Chinese soldiers intruded to a depth of 2½ miles beyond the "line of actual control" opposite the Indian Track Junction checkpost and returned to their base.

(7) On September 23, 1966, at 1030 hours, four armed Chinese soldiers intruded to a depth of about three miles beyond the so-called "line of actual control" north-east of the Track Junction checkpost and withdrew after some time. Later, on the same day, at about 1300 hours, six Chinese soldiers again intruded two miles beyond the "line of actual control" and visited a hill feature near the Indian checkpost before returning to their base.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest against these repeated intrusions by Chinese troops and urge the Chinese Government to order their troops to stop their aggressive activities.

The Government of India have also noted that the Chinese Government in its note of September 5, 1966, has sought to deny the facts of intrusions by Chinese troops mentioned in the Indian notes of July 21 and August 11, 1966, by using the stock argument that these are "nonsense" and "out-and-out lies". Such bland and unreasoned denials fail to carry conviction and can never alter facts.

In the above mentioned note the Chinese Government has once again put forward its expansionist claim to the North East Frontier Agency of India and has also argued that Longju falls on the Tibetan said of the "line of actual control". These claims are baseless and preposterous and have already been conclusively refuted by the Government of India. The Chinese Government has also sought to
slander India by saying that India is “depending constantly on opposing China for a living” and that “it is completely futile for the Indian Government to try to extricate itself from its predicament both at home and abroad by vilifying China”. The whole world knows that it is China and not India which is taking up aggressive postures and vilifying other countries for extricating itself from its all-too-obvious predicament both at home and abroad.

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 November, 1966.

No. C/19/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

On October 24, 1966 at 1115 hours, approximately 150 men in blue uniforms intruded to a depth of 500 yards in Sikkim territory across Kongra La in four groups, along with four herds of sheep. They withdrew into Tibetan territory at 1310 hours.

On October 25, 1966 at 0930 hours about 50 persons in blue uniforms intruded to a depth of 200 yards across the international boundary in the Kongra La area, withdrawing into Tibet at 1410 hours.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest against these continuing acts of harassment and intrusion into Sikkim territory. It is a well-known fact and one recognised by the Chinese Government that the Sikkim-Tibet boundary has been formally delimited and is marked by clear natural features. These repeated Chinese intrusions cannot but be seen as wilful provocations intended to create tension on the border.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 December, 1966.

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 781.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China, and replies as follows in refutation of the Notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government, dated October 15, November 4 and 26, 1966.
The so-called "intrusions" by Chinese personnel and aircraft referred to in the Indian Government’s Notes under reference are all out-and-out fabrications. Neither along the Sino-Indian border nor along the China-Sikkim boundary did the Chinese side cross the line of actual control between the two sides or the boundary.

The Indian side failed to give any name for the places of "intrusion" in five of the seven charges contained in its note of October 15; it even failed to mention the nationality and identity of the "intruders" in the two charges contained in its note of November 4. This shows how clumsy the Indian Government’s tricks are in making fabrications. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the unreasonable protest made by the Indian side on the basis of its own lies.

What is worth pointing out is that, always relying on opposing China to beg for foreign aid for making a living, the Indian Government is vainly attempting to extricate itself from its difficult position both at home and abroad by vilifying China, but this will only result in daily aggravating its own difficulties. Such has been the case in the past, and so will it be in the future.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 February, 1967.

No. C/2/67.

This note of the Ministry of External Affairs to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India is in reply to the Chinese Government’s note No. (66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 309, dated 4th May 1966.

The Government of India in its note of February 8, 1966 had proved conclusively that both under the Colombo Proposals and the Chinese Government’s unilateral declaration of November 21, 1962, as well as other official statements, China was committed, amongst other things, (i) not to cross the so-called ‘line of actual control’, (ii) to maintain the 20 Km demilitarized zone in the Western Sector under the Colombo Proposals, and under the Chinese declaration, in all the three sectors of the border, and (iii) not to send its troops to the “disputed” areas of Thagla Ridge, Longju etc. It was also proved in that note that the Chinese Government had dishonoured all the three commitments undertaken by it solemnly and unequivocally in public statements as well as in communications addressed to the Government of India. The Chinese note under reply does not attempt to deny this fact. On the contrary what it seeks to do is to advance, feebly and unconvincingly, a justification for the dishonouring of these commitments and for the intrusions across the line of actual control and the induction of Chinese troops into the “disputed” areas of Thagla Ridge and Longju on the fantastic pretext that these were “the necessary precautionary and self-defence measures” against alleged Indian violations and provocations on the border. These allegations were all pure fabrications and the Government of India had refuted and rejected them in no uncertain terms. It is obvious that the Chinese Government had to fabricate such
false allegations against India in order to make the theory of ‘self-defence’ appear plausible. The whole world knows that “striking back in self-defence” is a grim Chinese euphemism for aggression.

The Chinese Government has maintained in its note under reply that in its statement of November 21, 1962 China had reserved “the right to strike back in self-defence” and that Premier Chou En-lai in his letter of March 3, 1963 to the late Prime Minister Nehru had darkly hinted about the “history” of the events of 1962 being “repeated”. The Government of India have not been unaware of these threatening clauses attached to the so-called “unconditional” and “unilateral” “initiative measures” announced by the Chinese Government after its attack on India. Indeed, the late Prime Minister Nehru in his letter of December 1, 1962 to Premier Chou En-lai had pointed out the “contradictory” nature of these Chinese statements. The threatening clauses in these statements now being invoked by the Chinese Government demonstrate that there was a dark and hypocritical side to China’s unilateral declaration of cease-fire and withdrawal and that the Chinese Government had always maintained its intention to resort to force, whenever circumstances suited it, in the pursuit of its expansionist territorial claims against India. Far from providing proof of “China’s sincerity in seeking a peaceful settlement of the boundary question” these showed up China’s unwillingness to tread the path of peace and conciliation and its tragic and mistaken faith in the methods of force and aggression. China’s negative attitude to the constructive and impartial proposals made by the Colombo Conference of Afro-Asian nations was striking evidence of this unwillingness of the Chinese Government to seek a peaceful settlement of the border question.

In regard to the Colombo Proposals the Chinese note asserts that as they are “mere proposals, the question of violation or non-violation simply does not arise”. This pooh-poohing of the proposals made by the Colombo Conference of Afro-Asian countries as ‘mere proposals’ has not, however, deterred the Chinese Government from accusing India for making “no positive response whatsoever” to the Colombo Proposals and for “casting the Colombo Proposals to the winds”. It would appear that the Chinese side is not aware of the contradiction in dismissing the recommendations of the Colombo Conference as “mere proposals” and at the same time trying to make out that India has discarded these proposals. The facts of the matter are well-known. The six Afro-Asian countries which met at Colombo had formulated these proposals for acceptance and implementation by India and China. Indeed the text of the proposals had stated very clearly that “The Conference believes that these proposals, which could help in consolidating the cease-fire, once implemented, should pave the way for discussions between representatives of both parties for the purpose of solving the problems entailed in the cease-fire position”. The discussions envisaged by the Colombo Conference could not take place because the Chinese Government refused to accept these proposals as a basis for talks. This is the plain fact of the matter and all the deceit and duplicity of Chinese diplomacy has not succeeded in convincing anybody to the contrary.
The note of the Chinese Government contains an unabashed reassertion of China's expansionist territorial claims against India. The Government of India has pointed out on several occasions that the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector is really the line of Chinese aggression, and that it is in vain to pretend that this line reached during the massive Chinese attack of 1962 is "the traditional customary boundary" between India and China. The line of actual control claimed by China in the Western Sector is neither traditional nor customary nor a boundary, but merely the line reached by Chinese forces in their massive attack in 1962. It is futile for the Chinese Government to pretend that this is the boundary and that the 14,500 sq. miles of Indian territory in Ladakh illegally occupied by Chinese troops belongs to China. In regard to the Eastern Sector the Chinese Government has once again raked up its expansionist dream of claiming the vast areas of India's North East Frontier Agency. The Chinese note has hinted that India cannot perpetuate "the occupation" of its own sovereign territory. It has also claimed areas like the Thagla Ridge, Longju and the junction of Namjang Chu and the Sumdorong Chu as lying north of the McMahon Line. These claims and pretensions of the Chinese have been conclusively refuted and rejected by the Government of India in the past. The reassertion of these vast claims now together with the argument of "striking back in self-defence" is clear indication of China's aggressive and malevolent designs against India.

The tirade contained in the Chinese note against the relations between India and Sikkim is evidence of China's mischievous attempt to spoil these special and cordial relations. It is a fact that China is using military pressure through its troop concentration in the Chumbi Valley and intrusions across the border for the same nefarious purpose. Nobody is taken in by the Chinese Government's professions of friendship and equality in its relations with neighbouring countries. The brutal suppression of the autonomy of Tibet and the betrayal of even those Tibetan leaders who collaborated with China is an outstanding example of Chinese policy. As for India having "inherited the mantle of aggression from British imperialism", it is really the present rulers of China who have donned the imperial mantle of the Manchus and have conjured up dreams of hegemony in Asia.

Indulging in plain slander the Chinese note has said that India has "hired itself out" to the "imperialists" and "the revisionists" and is following "anti-China" policies in order to "meet the needs of its domestic and foreign policies". This kind of slander together with blatant interference in India's internal affairs has now become the monotonous stock-in-trade of Chinese propaganda. Such propaganda is, obviously, intended to divert the attention of the Chinese people and of the world from the ruthless and naked struggle for power and the disorder and violence raging in China today making life intolerable for millions of the good and decent citizens of China.
Note given by Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 March 1967.


2. It is an indisputable fact that, as stated in the Indian notes of 15th October, 4th November and 26th November, 1966, during the months of September, October and November last year Chinese troops repeatedly intruded across the boundary into India and Sikkim and also crossed the so-called "line of actual control" in Ladakh. Neither sophistry about the "nationality" of the intruders nor slander about "begging foreign aid" can camouflage the aggressive nature of the border violations by Chinese troops.

3. In this context Government of India wish to bring to the notice of the Chinese Government a further act of intrusion by Chinese troops which occurred on the 28th November last year. On that date between 0800 and 1800 hours, ten armed Chinese soldiers intruded to a depth of about one mile south of the international border at Longju in the Eastern Sector. It was yet another instance of China's defiance of the Colombo proposals and the Chinese Government's own statements and assurances regarding Longju. The Government of India lodge a strong protest against this violation.
II. TERRITORIAL AIR SPACE

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 November, 1966.

No. C/22/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows:

On 5th November, 1966, a Chinese jet aircraft intruded into Indian airspace in the Ladakh area. It flew from the east towards Darbuk (3407 N/7806 E) penetrating 26 nautical miles beyond the so-called "line of actual control". It then turned south-east and flew to Tangtse (3401 N/7811 E) which is 23 nautical miles beyond the so-called "line of actual control". Thereafter, the aircraft returned to the east and disappeared.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest against this latest violation of Indian airspace by Chinese aircraft.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
III. ALLEGED ILL-TREATMENT OF CHINESE REPRESENTATIVES AND NATIONALS IN INDIA

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 12 January, 1966.

(66) Pu Ling Yi Fa Tzu No. 12.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

Since October 1962, the Indian Government has arrested large numbers of innocent Chinese nationals and thrown them into a concentration camp and jails in various places; at the same time, it has subjected the other Chinese nationals to persecution of various kinds. The Chinese Government has repeatedly demanded that the Indian Government release these victimized Chinese nationals and stop all persecution of Chinese nationals, but the Indian Government has always made quibbles in an attempt to shirk responsibility.

In August 1963, the Indian Government unreasonably rejected the proper demand of the Chinese Government for continuing to send its ship to bring back the victimized Chinese nationals. After the Chinese Government's stern refutation and its repeated demand that the Indian Government release all the detained Chinese nationals, the Indian Government, finding itself devoid of any valid argument, pretended in its notes of September 4, 1963 and January 8, 1964 that it was taking necessary steps for the welfare and rehabilitation "of the detained victimized Chinese nationals and that they were being released and rehabilitated". However, the facts in the last two years and more have demonstrated that these statements of the Indian Government are utterly false.

At present, several hundred innocent Chinese nationals are still being detained in the concentration camp and the jails in various places of India. They have long been deprived of their personal freedom, they are being subjected to all sorts of inhuman maltreatment and persecution in the concentration camp and the jails; and even their property has been placed under custody as "enemy property". Moreover, in the last few years the Indian Government has constantly ordered peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals to leave India within a set time-limit and subjected them to all sorts of discrimination and persecution. All this fully reveals that the Indian Government is deliberately continuing its policies of opposing China and discriminating against Chinese nationals, and worsening Sino-Indian relations in order to meet the needs of its internal and external policies.
For more than three years the Indian Government has been unscrupulously detaining and maltreating large numbers of peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals. These crimes which grossly trample upon the principles of international law are rare in the history of international relations. In this connection, the Chinese Government lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government and reiterates the demands that the Indian Government: (1) Immediately release all the victimized Chinese nationals detained in the concentration camp and the jails in the various places, return their property and compensate them for their losses, (2) immediately stop all discrimination against and persecution of Chinese nationals in India and effectively guarantee their personal freedom and the safety of their life and property.

The Chinese Government demands a speedy and definite reply from the Indian Government.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 July, 1966.

No. C/9/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

In their note of 12th January 1966, the Chinese Government have levelled a number of allegations about the "ill-treatment" of and "discrimination" against persons of Chinese origin residing in India. They have even gone to the extent of talking of "persecution", "maltreatment" and "throwing them in a concentration camp". The fact that the Government of India have on numerous occasions demonstrated these charges to be patently false, has not prevented the Chinese Government from falling back again on these banal accusations to give themselves yet another opportunity to indulge in their anti-Indian propaganda.

If the Chinese Government were prepared to face facts honestly, they would be compelled to admit that the vast majority of persons of Chinese origin living in India today are contented and law-abiding individuals, pursuing their usual avocations peacefully and happily. The very fact that they continue to reside and prosper in India exposes the emptiness of the charges of persecution levelled by the Chinese Government. As for the detention of a small number of persons of Chinese origin, who had engaged in anti-Indian activities, the Chinese Government cannot expect a sovereign State to leave such persons free to indulge in actions which threaten the security of the State.

It is equally ridiculous for the Chinese Government to link up such allegations with the claim that the Government of India is "deliberately continuing its policies of opposing China....in order to
meet the needs of its internal and external policies”. This is a description which fits with absolute precision the Chinese Government’s own attitude towards India. In view of all these facts, the Chinese Government’s charges are rejected as baseless, mischievous and propagandistic.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 21 September, 1966.

(66) Pu Ling Yi Fa Tzu No. 388.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the notes of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, dated December 27, 1965 and July 5, 1966, has the honour to state the following:

In its notes of October 20, 1965 and January 12, 1966, the Chinese Government cited numerous facts denouncing the Indian Government for its brutal persecution of Chinese nationals and unwarranted banning of The China Review, and demanded that the Indian Government immediately release the persecuted Chinese nationals who had long been held in detention and cancel its order banning The China Review. With a guilty conscience and devoid of any valid argument, the Indian Government resorted to prevarications by calling black white in its notes. On the one hand, it claimed unabashedly that Chinese nationals were getting “liberal and fair treatment” and “prospering” in India; on the other hand, unable to cover up the facts of its persecution and detention of large numbers of Chinese nationals, it again slanderously charged these Chinese with “anti-Indian” and “undesirable” activities. But such lies can in no way help the Indian Government. The fact is that hundreds of innocent Chinese nationals have been held in concentration camp or jails for several years now. Others who are not held in detention have been subjected to unreasonable restrictions and discrimination in matters of domicile, movement, livelihood and employment. Moreover, many peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals have been unreasonably ordered to leave India. Failing to produce any tenable argument or evidence in the face of these iron-clad facts, the Indian Government could only quibble and prevaricate by resorting to such hollow and worn-out allegations as “anti-Indian” and “undesirable” activities, which had long been completely refuted by the Chinese Government. This only reveals how hypocritical and unreasonable the Indian Government is when faced with the truth and facts. Like the bat dreading the sun, the Indian Government fears the exposure of the facts about its criminal persecution of Chinese nationals, and on February 19, 1966 it went so far as to arbitrarily prevent the Chinese Embassy from exercising its right of protecting Chinese nationals and refuse to let the Embassy send its personnel to Calcutta to visit the persecuted Chinese nationals in prison. However, these clumsy acts serve only
to further reveal before the people of the world the sinister features of the Indian Government in grossly trampling upon the principles guiding international relations and in opposing China.

The Indian Government also regarded as a thorn in its side The China Review, a newspaper published by Chinese nationals, which always advocated the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples, and it went to the length of imposing an unwarranted ban on the paper. In the meantime, the Indian Government has connived at and supported the anti-Chinese activities by The Chinese Journal of India run by the Chiang Kai-shek gang elements and shielded and colluded with these elements in using the said paper to stir up opposition to the Government of the People's Republic of China. Has this not fully revealed the pernicious design of the Indian Government in tailing after U.S. imperialism to create "two Chinas" and interfere in the internal affairs of China? It is utterly futile for the Indian Government to resort in its note to the sophistry that these are "matters which are within India's internal jurisdiction".

The Chinese Government firmly rejects the notes of the Indian Government and reiterates the demands raised by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in its notes of October 20, 1965 and January 12, 1966.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 3 October, 1966.**

No. C/15/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state the following with reference to the conversation Mr. Jen Yi-pei, Counsellor of the Embassy, had with the officers of the Ministry on September 29 and October 1, 1966.

In his conversation with Shri K. K. S. Rana, Under Secretary of the Ministry on September 29, Mr. Jen Yi-pei informed the Ministry that Mr. Sun Wei-kuo, a functionary of the Embassy had not returned to the Embassy since he went out on a morning walk at 6-30 A.M. on that day.

On receipt of this information, the Ministry of External Affairs caused immediate investigations to be made through the appropriate authorities to trace the whereabouts of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo. These investigations are being energetically pursued by the Government of India and this fact was conveyed to Mr. Jen Yi-pei on October 1, 1966 by Shri A. K. Damodaran, Deputy Secretary in this Ministry. Shri Damodaran also requested Mr. Jen Yi-pei that the Chinese Embassy give all possible cooperation to the investigating authorities of the Government of India who would be approaching them for fullest details concerning Mr. Sun Wei-kuo and the circumstances
of his disappearance as known to the Chinese Embassy. It is under-
stood that the Foreigners Regional Registration Officer, New Delhi,
had already contacted the Chinese Embassy on September 30 and
wished to meet an official of the Embassy for making enquiries in this
connection. The Ministry of External Affairs hope that the Chinese
Embassy will extend the necessary cooperation to the investigating
authorities who are taking all possible measures to trace the
whereabouts of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity
to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the
assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry
of External Affairs, New Delhi, 8 October, 1966.

No. M/381/66.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents
its compliments to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, and with
reference to the Ministry's note dated October 3, 1966, has the honour
to state the following in regard to the kidnapping of Mr. Sun Wei-
kuo, a staff member of the Chinese Embassy:

Mr. Sun Wei-kuo, a staff member of the Chinese Embassy, was
kidnapped at about 6-30 A.M. on September 29, 1966 outside the resi-
dence compound of the personnel of the Embassy at Chanakyapuri,
New Delhi, while taking a walk. The Embassy gave the relevant
information to the Ministry on the same day, pointed out that India
being a sovereign state, the Government of India had the respon-
sibility for protecting the safety of the personnel of foreign missions,
and demanded that the Indian Government should take immediate
measures to send back Mr. Sun Wei-kuo to the Embassy. On Octo-
ber 1, when receiving Counsellor Jen Yi-pei of the Embassy, Mr. A. K.
Damodaran, Deputy Secretary of the Indian Ministry of External
Affairs, requested the Embassy to cooperate in the so-called investi-
gation. Counsellor Jen Yi-pei clearly explained the position to the
Embassy. The Embassy would like to re-state as follows:

1. Mr. Sun Wei-kuo is a staff member of the Embassy, not an
ordinary foreign national. The kidnapping of him on the territory of
India, particularly in the Capital of India, is a very serious political
incident. It is known to all that the premises and personnel of the
Chinese Embassy have been under very strict surveillance of the
Indian police and intelligence agents day and night. For the inci-
dent of the kidnapping of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo, the Indian Government
has unshirkable responsibility.

2. The Embassy has already given the Indian Ministry of External
Affairs an account of the kidnapping of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo and other
relevant information. Nine days have elapsed since Mr. Sun Wei-kuo
was kidnapped. The Indian Government has not sent him back to
the Embassy up to now, but on the contrary, repeatedly demands the cooperation in the so-called investigation from the Embassy, which is obviously an excuse.

3. It is absolutely impermissible that the Indian Government tries to play for time and evade its responsibility under the name of the so-called investigation. The Embassy once again demands that the Indian Government should ensure the safety of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo and quickly send him back to the Embassy.

The Embassy avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 14 October, 1966.

The Chinese Embassy has learnt that on August 29, 1966, Madame Tsao Hsiu Chin and her husband Mr. Fong Chi Leong, who are in charge of the Chinese Primary School, Calcutta, were unjustifiably ordered to leave India within a short period. This is another act of persecution of the peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals by the Indian Government in disregard of the repeated representations and protests by the Chinese Government and the Chinese Embassy. The Embassy hereby lodges a protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs against this and demands that the Indian Government immediately stop all forms of persecution of the Chinese nationals in India.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 October, 1966.

No. C/17/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and has the honour to state the following in regard to the Embassy’s note No. 381/66, dated the 8th October, 1966:

The Ministry of External Affairs rejects categorically the various unproved allegations and statements in the note under reply about the disappearance of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo. The Ministry would like to remind the Embassy that ever since the 29th of September when the Embassy informed the Ministry that Mr. Sun Wei-kuo, a functionary of the Embassy, had not returned to the Embassy since he allegedly went out on a walk at 6.30 a.m. on that day, the Ministry has been repeatedly requesting the Embassy to furnish all available information about Mr. Sun Wei-kuo and also to cooperate fully with the investigating authorities so that the mystery of his disappearance could be solved. This request was made by Shri Damodaran, Deputy Secretary, in the Ministry of External Affairs to Mr. Jen Yi-pei, Counsellor of the Embassy on October 1, 1966. The request was again repeated in the Ministry's note No. C/15/66 of October 3. The Ministry regrets that in the Embassy note under reply, the Embassy has still not
promised this cooperation. The Embassy merely repeats that it "has already given the Indian Ministry of External Affairs an account of the 'kidnapping' of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo and other relevant information". We would like to remind the Embassy that no relevant information has been given either directly to the Ministry of External Affairs or to the investigating authorities concerned, except that on September 29 at 6-30 A.M. Mr. Sun went out for a walk and did not return to the Embassy thereafter.

In fact, when the Foreigners' Regional Registration Officer, Delhi contacted the Embassy on September 30, they refused to meet him. On October 4, the Superintendent of Police, South District, along with D.S.P., Tughlak Road and the Foreigners' Registration Officer went to the Chinese Embassy at Jind House and met the Counsellor Mr. Jen Yi-pei and the First Secretary Mr. Chen Lui-chih when they asked for some details about Mr. Sun Wei-kuo and the circumstances of his disappearance. Mr. Jen Yi-pei merely said that all the information had been conveyed to the Ministry of External Affairs and that the matter was a serious political case and that the Government of India should immediately return the "kidnapped official". Again on October 7, the Inspector of the Chanakyapuri Police Station visited the Chinese Embassy at Chanakyapuri and met the First Secretary Mr. Chen Lu-chih and wanted to make certain enquiries regarding the physical description of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo, the circumstances leading to his disappearance, etc. The Embassy again refused to furnish information or answer questions put by the Inspector of Police.

On October 10 when Mr. Chen Chao-yuan, Charge d'Affaires of the Embassy called on Shri K. R. Narayanan, Director in this Ministry, the latter impressed upon him the necessity of furnishing the investigating authorities with all possible information available to the Embassy about Mr. Sun Wei-kuo, his physical appearance, distinguishing marks, the dress he was wearing, whether he had any money or other belongings on him when he went out of the Embassy, whether on the morning of the 29th he went out for a walk alone or with another colleague, when he was last seen and by whom in the Embassy and whether he had any friends in Delhi whom he used to visit, etc. It was explained to the Charge d'Affaires that these and other items of information required by the police are essential and would give clues to our authorities for conducting effective investigation. The Charge d'Affaires was, however, not prepared to give any information whatsoever, and said that by these "so-called investigations" the Government of India were evading their responsibility and playing for time. It was pointed out to the Charge d'Affaires that the Indian Police were making every possible effort to trace Mr. Sun Wei-kuo but that the Chinese Embassy had also the responsibility of providing relevant information and co-operating with the Indian authorities in this matter. The Ministry of External Affairs would like to point out to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China that investigations into the disappearance of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo by the concerned authorities have been greatly hampered by the total non-cooperation of the Embassy. It has not been possible to ascertain basic facts such as whether he was living in Jind House or at Chanakyapuri, whether he had any cash on him; what clothes he was
wearing and what is missing, if anything, from his belongings, etc. The disappearance itself was reported to the Ministry of External Affairs by the Chinese Embassy over eight hours after the alleged incident.

The Chinese note has made the allegation that Mr. Sun Wei-kuo has been "kidnapped" and that it was "a serious political incident". There is absolutely no evidence to support this allegation and the investigations conducted so far do not also suggest that this is a case of kidnapping. Although a large number of persons are up and about in the streets in the Chanakyapuri area at about 6-30 A.M. at this time of the year, no witness has been found, even after the most thorough enquiries, who has seen Mr. Sun Wei-kuo go out for a walk in the morning of the 29th, not to speak of having seen him being kidnapped as alleged by the Chinese Embassy.

The Government of India consider it their duty and privilege to give protection to all foreign missions stationed in Delhi and their personnel. But the Government of India certainly do not consider it necessary for this purpose to keep the movements of foreign diplomats and members of foreign missions under continuous surveillance. The Ministry of External Affairs rejects the insinuation made in the note under reply that the "premises and personnel of the Chinese Embassy have been under very strict surveillance of the Indian police and intelligence agents day and night". Mr. Sun Wei-kuo like any other member of the Chinese Embassy or of any other Embassy in New Delhi was free to move about in the city or, for that matter, elsewhere in India.

As was stated in the Indian note of October 3, 1966, the moment the disappearance of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo was brought to the attention of the Government of India, investigations were immediately instituted. These investigations unfortunately have been handicapped by the total refusal of the Chinese Embassy to cooperate in the matter. The Government are, nevertheless, taking all possible steps to trace the whereabouts of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 December 1966.

Reference: Chinese Embassy’s Memorandum, dated October 14, 1966

It has been repeated several times to the Chinese Embassy that it is within the Sovereign competence of India to order foreign nationals found indulging in anti-Indian activities to leave the country. The persons referred to in the Chinese Embassy Memorandum were found guilty of indulging in anti-national activities. Hence, in
accordance with the laws prevailing in India they were served with a notice to leave the country. However, out of humanitarian considerations, they have been given sufficient time to enable them to complete necessary arrangements for their departure from India. The allegations made in the Memorandum are baseless and the Embassy's protest is, therefore, rejected.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 February, 1967.


This note of the Ministry of External Affairs to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi is in reply to the Chinese Government's note No. (66) Pu Ling Yi Fa Tzu No. 388 dated the September 21, 1966.

2. Though this Chinese note is claimed to be in answer to the Indian notes of December 27, 1965 and July 5, 1966 it is in fact a re-hash of imaginary grievances and allegations regarding the persons of Chinese origin in India, allegations which have been thoroughly refuted on several previous occasions. The great majority of the persons of Chinese origin continue to live in India as law-abiding individuals, happily pursuing their usual peaceful avocations. If the Chinese Government are interested in understanding the factual position, they are invited to refer once again to the Indian notes mentioned above. By holding brief for a small handful of unlawful elements in the Chinese community in India, the Chinese Government is interfering in the internal affairs of India and exposing its ill-will for the people and Government of India. It is futile for the Chinese Government to persist in repeating its false and baseless charges for the purpose of propaganda against India.
IV. TREATMENT OF INDIAN REPRESENTATIVES AND NATIONALS IN CHINA

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 11 April, 1966.

(66) Pu Ling Erh Fa Tzu No. 205.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India, dated November 2, 1965 as follows:

The handling of the case of the Indian national M. L. Das, who has committed rape in China, by the Chinese Government in accordance with Chinese law is entirely a judicial measure which a sovereign state is bound to take, and also in full conformity with international practice. Nevertheless, the Indian Government has repeatedly sent notes to haggle unreasonably and made a great fuss over this criminal case which is wholly within the sphere of Chinese sovereign rights. This can only reveal the ulterior purposes of the Indian Government, and the Chinese Government expresses its deep regret at it. If the Indian Government continues to send notes to haggle unreasonably over the case, the Chinese Government will pay no attention to them.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, 8 July, 1966.

No. C/10/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to their note dated the 11th April, 1966, has the honour to state as follows:

It is a matter of concern to the Government of India that while seeking refuge in meaningless generalities, Chinese authorities are continuing to persecute and detain in a jail in Shanghai, an Indian national named M. L. Das. As is evident from the note under reply, far from ending this unreasonable victimization of an Indian national, the Chinese Government have tried to justify it in terms of so-called “conformity with international practice” and “China's sovereign rights”. In fact, however, the Chinese Government have been unable to refute the cogent evidence which the Government of India had listed in proof of the fact that M. L. Das's imprisonment and maltreatment in jail, violates all well recognized principles of law and the ordinary cannons of humanity.
In their note of 11th April, 1966, the Chinese Government have claimed that they will “pay no attention” to any subsequent Indian protests on this subject. Such attempts to shirk responsibility are to be deplored. The Government of India reiterate their demand that the Chinese Government put an immediate end to the persecution of M. L. Das, review his case on the basis of universally accepted cannons of justice and law, and provide facilities to the Indian Embassy in Peking, to extend full consular protection to M. L. Das. Pending this, the Government of India continue to hold the Chinese authorities responsible for the safety and welfare of M. L. Das.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
V. MISCELLANEOUS

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 30 May, 1964.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy of China and, with reference to the Embassy's note of April 3, 1964, has the honour to state the following:

1. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs expresses its appreciation of the invitation delivered by the Embassy on behalf of the Organising Committee for the XXII International Geological Congress for the Government of the People's Republic of China to be represented at the Congress by official delegates. The Chinese Government has always actively favoured and participated in cultural and scientific interflow and friendly contacts between peoples of different countries, including the peoples of China and India. Proceeding from this spirit, the Chinese Government is ready to give favourable consideration to the above-mentioned invitation.

2. However, the Chinese Government has learned of the following:

(1) According to the Second Circular issued by the Organising Committee for the XXII International Geological Congress, at the same time of the Congress there will also take place a series of other professional international conferences and activities in the field of geological sciences, including activities of the International Union of Geological Sciences. It is learned that the XXII International Geological Congress is sponsored by the International Union of Geological Sciences of which the Chiang Kai-shek clique in Taiwan remains up to now a member.

(2) Chinese geological organisations in 1962 and 1963 twice inquired of Mr. B. C. Roy, Secretary General of the Organising Committee for the XXII International Geological Congress and Director of the Geological Survey of India whether the Chiang Kai-shek clique had been invited to the Congress. In his reply to the Secretary-General of the Geological Society of China dated August 31, 1963, Mr. B. C. Roy formally stated: "the Organising Committee is not in a position to refrain from inviting the geological institutions in Formosa".

As the Indian Government is aware, there is only one China in the world, namely the People's Republic of China. Taiwan is a province of China; the Chiang Kai-shek clique now entrenched in Taiwan is merely a group of political puppets fostered by U.S. Imperialism. Only the delegates of the People's Republic of China are entitled to represent China in any international conference or
international organisation or become their members; at no international conference should the question of inviting the Chiang clique in Taiwan arise at all. It is therefore obvious that both the retention of the Chiang clique to this day as a member of the International Union of Geological sciences and Mr. B. C. Roy's assertion that "the organising Committee is not in a position to refrain from inviting the geological institutions in Formosa" are wrong and they are firmly opposed by the Chinese Government and people.

3. In view of the above, the Chinese Government requests a clarification of the following three points by the Indian Government:

(1) Whether the Organising Committee for the XXII International Geological Congress has changed its stand of being "not in a position to refrain from inviting the geological institutions in Formosa" as stated by Mr. B. C. Roy in his reply to the Chinese organisation concerned;

(2) Whether the International Union of Geological Sciences has deprived the Chiang clique in Taiwan of membership; and

(3) Whether an invitation has been extended to the Chiang clique in Taiwan to attend any of the other international conferences and activities in the field of the geological sciences due to take place in New Delhi concurrently with the XXII International Geological Congress.

The Chinese Government expects a clear-cut answer from the Indian Government.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 28 July, 1964.

The Indian Embassy in China has the honour to say with reference to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China's note dated May 30, that the answer to the three queries in paragraph 3 of the note in question are as follows:

(1) No.
(2) No.
(3) Yes.

The Indian Embassy in Peking avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note: —Subsequent exchanges on this subject have been included in White Paper No. XI, pages 72—74 and 78—81.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 6 November, 1965.

No. M/779/65.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and has the honour to state as follows:

On October 10, 1965, Chiang Kai-shek clique elements K. C. Yap, Chang Chi-hua and others openly held a meeting in Calcutta to celebrate the so-called “national day of the Republic of China”. At the place of the meeting they hung reactionary placards, viciously attacking the Chinese leaders and propagandizing the overthrow of the People's Republic of China. A municipal councillor of Calcutta even participated in the meeting, shouting that time is ripe for Chiang Kai-shek to launch counter-attack against the mainland, and saying that K. C. Yap serves as a vehicle for the so-called “re-establishment of diplomatic relations between free China and India”.

It must be pointed out that the Chinese Government has more than once solemnly demanded that the Indian Government prevent the Chiang clique elements from frantically carrying out activities of slandering China and creating “two Chinas” in India. However, the Indian Government has not only failed to take any effective measures but gone from bad to worse by conniving at the collusion of the municipal councillor with the Chiang clique elements in wantonly celebrating the bogus national day, viciously attacking China, openly instigating the subversion of the Chinese Government, and clamouring for “the re-establishment of diplomatic relations” between India and the Chiang clique. This fact further exposes how unscrupulously the Indian Government has connived at and backed the anti-China activities by the Chiang clique elements, so as to intensify its efforts to deteriorate the relations between China and India and serve the U.S. imperialists' plot of creating “two China”. The Chinese Government expresses its great indignation at and lodges a strong protest against this serious act of the Indian Government, which violates the principles of international law and is perfidious, and firmly demands that the Indian Government take measures to stop immediately its connivance at any anti-China activities of councilors, prevent the Chiang clique elements from carrying out any such activities and give an unequivocal clarification on the above-said incident.

The Embassy avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2nd January, 1966.

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 036.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:
(1) Recently the Indian Government and U.S. imperialism working hand in glove, utilized the U.S.-controlled United Nations to discuss the so-called "question of Tibet" and adopt a resolution vilifying the Chinese people and interfering in China's internal affairs. In his speech the Indian delegate heaped malicious abuse upon China, slandering her as "ruthlessly" carrying out "atrocities" in Tibet which "surpass anything the colonialists have done in the past", and so on and so forth. A little earlier, the Indian Government had again made use of the Chinese traitor Dalai to conduct a whole series of anti-Chinese activities in India. The President and Prime Minister of India and other high-ranking officials of the Indian Government blatantly received this Chinese traitor and held so-called talks with him. The leaders of the Indian Government also took the opportunity to vilify China. Indian Minister of Education M. C. Chagla went to the length of saying that the time had come for the Indian Government to consider whether to recognize China's "suzerainty"—which should be read as sovereignty—over Tibet. Led by the Indian Information Service, the Indian official propaganda organ, the Indian press spread numerous lies and slanders about China over the question of Tibet. All this constitutes an open provocation against the Chinese people, a gross violation of the principles guiding international relations and a grave interference in China's internal affairs. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this.

(2) On the question of Tibet, the hypocrisy and expansionist designs of the Government of India have been exposed most clearly. The Indian Government sanctimoniously pledged to the Chinese Government that India recognized Tibet as part of China, that it had no political or territorial ambitions in Tibet, and that it would not permit elements of the traitorous Dalai clique to carry on anti-Chinese political activities in India. But the deeds of the Indian Government are just the opposite of its own words. As early as 1959, you were engaged in subversive activities in Tibet, instigating the reactionary serf-owners in Tibet to stage an armed rebellion. Later you supported and abetted elements of the traitorous Dalai clique in establishing a "Tibetan emigre government" in India and promulgating a so-called "Tibetan constitution". You repeatedly plotted to direct Dalai to go to some South East Asian countries for anti-Chinese political activities under the cloak of religion. Now you have, in conspiracy with U.S. imperialism, got the United Nations to discuss the so-called "question of Tibet", and violently slandered China. Your high-ranking government official has even bluntly stated the intention of considering refusal to recognize Tibet as part of China. By these actions you have completely torn off your veil of hypocrisy and fully revealed your true features as expansionists.

But your expansionist designs will never succeed. Earth-shaking changes have taken place in the Tibet region of China. The Tibetan people have won liberation and stood up as masters of their own destiny. They enjoy full democratic rights and freedom and are leading a happy life with ample food and clothing. The miserable days are gone for ever when they were oppressed and exploited and were suffering from hunger and cold. The formal inauguration of the Tibet Autonomous Region last September marked the birth of a new
Tibet. Life is buoyant and thriving throughout Tibet today. No one will be able to stop the Tibetan people from advancing together with the other nationalities of China along the bright road of socialism.

(3) It is not accidental that the Indian Government has recently redoubled its anti-Chinese clamour over the question of Tibet. This is a step in correspondence and coordination with your constant intrusions and provocations on the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim border, and is likewise designed to curry favour with and seek reward from the U.S. imperialists and their collaborators. But the more energetically you do so, the more you will reveal yourselves as spokesmen of the overthrown Tibetan feudal serf-owners and enable the peoples of China, India and the whole world to see your despicable aim of using the “question of Tibet” to vilify China, with the result that you will suffer still greater defeats.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 April, 1966.

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 246.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

Taking advantage of the opportunity of attending the U.N. Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East Conference in New Delhi, a so-called delegation headed by the bogus Minister of Economic Affairs K. T. Li and the bogus Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs C. Shen of the Chiang Kai-shek clique is now openly carrying out anti-Chinese activities in India. Indian political personalities have brazenly expressed welcome to these elements of the Chiang Kai-shek clique and repeatedly held receptions in their honour, providing them with opportunities for activities against the People's Republic of China. Both sides have loudly advocated "understanding" and "cooperation" between India and the Chiang clique in joint opposition to China. Kamaraj, Chairman of the ruling Indian National Congress, received C. Shen, and the latter invited him to visit Taiwan. The Indian press and news agencies have spared no effort in extolling these Chiang clique elements, published the statements they made against their motherland and openly called C. Shen "Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China". All these anti-Chinese activities have been conducted with the connivance and support of the Indian Government. This is another grave step taken by the Indian Government, which violates principles guiding international relations, crudely interferes in China's internal affairs and is calculated to undermine the relations between the two countries. It is also an open provocation to the Chinese people. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against it.
Actively following U.S. imperialism in carrying out the "two Chinas" plot, the Indian Government has long been in collusion with the Chiang Kai-shek clique entrenched in Taiwan. The Chinese Government has lodged repeated protests with the Indian Government against this. However, far from ceasing to collaborate with the Chiang Kai-shek clique, the Indian Government has become even more active and blatant in doing so. Late January this year, Mr. R. Velayudhan, former M.P. of India, went to Taiwan upon instructions for "talks" with chieftains of the Chiang clique and the advocacy of "normalisation of diplomatic relations" between India and the Chiang clique. He publicly admitted that his "visit" to Taiwan had the support of the Indian Prime Minister. In the meantime, the Indian Government allowed the Chiang Kai-shek clique's delegation headed by the so-called government representative Huang Chao-chin to take advantage of the opportunity of attending the conference of the Pacific Area Tourist Association in New Delhi to make anti-Chinese propaganda, such as the clamour for the "recovery of the Chinese mainland". The Indian President went so far as to ask them to convey his "regards" to Chiang Kai-shek, the common enemy of the Chinese people. And now the Indian Government has again allowed the bogus Minister of Economic Affairs and bogus Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Chiang Kai-shek clique to carry on wanton anti-Chinese activities in India. This shows that the Indian Government has become unscrupulous in ganging up with the Chiang Kai-shek clique against China.

The Indian Government is persisting in its complicity with the Chiang Kai-shek clique in Taiwan while well aware that the latter is a political corpse. Its object in so doing is obviously to further demonstrate to U.S. imperialism its stubborn hostility to China so as to get more hand-outs from the United States. However, the Chinese Government must warn the Indian Government: Your collusion with the Chiang Kai-shek clique in conducting activities against the People's Republic of China will only worsen the Sino-Indian relations which have already deteriorated. The Indian Government must bear full responsibility for this.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, 13 May, 1966.

No. C/7/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, and with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office notes dated November 6, 1965, and April 2, 1966, has the honour to state as follows:—

The Government of India in its notes of January 23, 1964, and December 8, 1964, in reply to similar protests lodged by the Chinese Embassy on January 6, 1964, and November 14, 1964, had made it clear that people in India enjoy the fullest freedom to assemble and hold
meetings as long as they do not infringe the laws of the land. The Government of India had nothing to do with the meeting reported to have been held at Calcutta on October 10, 1965 by some Chinese nationals and in which a Municipal Councillor of Calcutta is alleged to have participated. The Embassy ought to be aware that a Municipal Councillor in India is a non-official. It is absurd to suggest as has been done in the Chinese note of November 6, 1965, that the Government of India 'connived at' the so-called "collusion of the Municipal Councillor with Chiang clique elements". The Government of India reject this mischievous allegation and would like to say that it is impermissible and futile to try to interfere in the internal affairs of India by lodging uncalled for protests, couched in unbecoming language, against meetings held in India by private citizens in conformity with the laws of the land.

As regards the Chinese note of April 2, 1966, the Government of India reject it as completely unwarranted. It is the height of absurdity for the Chinese Government to speak of "collusion" between India and Taiwan, of "interference in China's internal affairs", and of "anti-China activities" being conducted in India "with the connivance and support of the Indian Government". The fact is that it is the Chinese Government and its organs of propaganda which have been carrying out a campaign of vilification and hatred against India and colluding with the Government of Pakistan, a military ally of the United States and a member of SEATO and CENTO, for the purpose of subverting the territorial integrity, the political unity and the national security of India. While such anti-Indian campaigns are being conducted by the Chinese Government at the highest level of its leadership, it is extraordinary that it should "protest" against visits of private Indian citizens to Taiwan and of Formosan delegations to India to attend conferences held under the auspices of the United Nations or its Specialised Agencies and of non-official international organisations of which Taiwan is a member. We have pointed out to the Chinese Government on several occasions in the past, that the Government of India hold no responsibility for the visits of private citizens to Taiwan. To protest against such visits is an interference in the internal affairs of India whose citizens unlike those of China are guaranteed freedom of travel, under the Constitution. As regards U.N. sponsored and other international conferences this is not the first time that delegates from Formosa have attended such conferences not only in India but in other countries which recognise the People's Republic of China and have diplomatic relations with it. To describe the extension of facilities to delegates from Taiwan to attend international conferences as "collusion with the Chiang Kai-shek clique" is fantastic and unreasonable.

The Government of India, in its note of February 12, 1965, had pointed out that there are many countries in Asia and Africa and elsewhere which, unlike India, have diplomatic relations with Taiwan and do not recognise the People's Republic of China. It was stated in the above-mentioned note that..."the Chinese Government carries on commercial and cultural contacts and has friendly relations with a number of countries who continue to recognise Taiwan. Indeed, some countries whose diplomatic Missions the Chinese Government have received in Peking still maintain Consular Offices in Taiwan.
And yet it is the Indian Government which has frequently been singled out by the Chinese Government for virulent attacks for alleged 'flirtations' with the Taiwan Government and for 'plotting to create two Chinas'. It is obvious that by making these charges and protests, the Chinese Government is merely adding grist to its propaganda mill, and also betraying its animus against the people and the Government of India". It may be further stated that China itself is trading vigorously with many countries, including South Africa and West Germany whose Governments it has not recognised, and with Japan with whom it has no diplomatic relations.

By continuing these meaningless protests and propaganda the Chinese Government are only exposing to the gaze of the world their unprincipled opportunism in politics as well as their profound hostility to India.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 May, 1966.

No. C/8/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in New Delhi, and with reference to the Chinese Government’s note dated the 2nd January 1966, has the honour to state that the Government of India categorically reject the several malicious and unfounded allegations made in that note.

2. The resolution on the conditions in Tibet, which was discussed by the United Nations General Assembly and passed on December 10, 1965, by a vote of 41 against 26 regarding the “continued violation of fundamental rights and freedoms of the people of Tibet”, and which the Indian delegation supported, is in complete conformity with the United Nations Charter to which India has subscribed. The Government of China should know that one of the many purposes of the United Nations Charter is the preservation of the dignity of the individual and the protection of human rights. The United Nations resolution specifically deplored “the continued violation of the fundamental rights and freedoms of the people of Tibet”, and reaffirmed “that respect for the principles of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is essential for the evolution of peaceful world order based on the rule of law”.

3. This U.N. resolution, to which the Government of China have taken objection, is the inevitable result of their own policy. Instead of taking conciliatory measures towards the people of Tibet, the Chinese Government have gradually and systematically destroyed Tibetan autonomy. His Holiness the Dalai Lama, who was once called a prisoner of “the Tibetan rebel clique”, is now the “Chinese traitor
Dalai”. The Panchen Lama, who was persuaded by the Chinese to act for the Dalai Lama in his absence as the Acting Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the Tibetan Autonomous Region, has also refused to cooperate any longer with the Chinese authorities, and has been hounded out from public life. These unfortunate developments, which were reluctantly admitted by the Chinese Government when it became too difficult to hide them, provide unmistakable evidence of the fact that human rights are being trampled in Tibet today. If it were true, as the Chinese Government’s note claims in terms of such sanctimonious hypocrisy, that the Tibetan people “enjoy full democratic rights and freedoms and are leading a happy life with ample food and clothing”, why is it that the Chinese Government have not had the courage to allow foreigners to visit Tibet and report upon the “heavenly” conditions pertaining there? If, what the Chinese Government claim, is true, why is it that the Chinese Government do not have the courage even now to publish in full either in Tibet or in China the full text of this U.N. resolution which aroused their wrath to such a degree, and which according to them misrepresents the situation in Tibet today?

4. The Chinese Government fully know the answers to these questions. It is not India which has interfered in the internal affairs of China, but China which has interfered in the internal affairs of India. It is the Chinese leaders who hypocritically and unscrupulously have gone back upon the Bandung Declaration to which they had subscribed and embarked on a policy of interference in the affairs of the Indian sub-continent by publicly calling for the “self-determination” of the people of Kashmir—a call, which is gross interference in India’s internal affairs since Jammu & Kashmir is an inseparable and integral part of India. Similarly, the Chinese Government’s massive anti-Indian propaganda and their attempt to capitalize on India’s temporary economic difficulties are yet another example of unwarranted interference in the affairs of a neighbouring state.

5. The Government of India, therefore, reject categorically the allegation that by supporting this U.N. resolution they have interfered in China’s internal affairs. The other unsubstantiated charges in the note under reply do not merit refutation. Government of India’s policy on this question is well-known and it is futile for the Chinese Government to indulge in hair-splitting. We would like to remind the Chinese Government, however, that we shall continue to give all facilities to the Tibetan refugees who have been forced to leave their homeland and to do our best to alleviate their sufferings and hardships. The Dalai Lama has been living in India for some years now and has been carrying on his religious and other humanitarian activities. We will continue to give him and his simple and peace-loving people these facilities.

6. The Government of India have had occasion recently to express to the Chinese Government their considered views on the unfortunate and tragic developments in Tibet over the last few years. In paragraph 4 of their note dated the 1st October, 1965, the Government of India had reminded the Chinese Government that they ought to be aware that “rebellions do not take place under enticement or coercion. Where there is oppression, there is rebellion. It is futile to blame India for the troubles in Tibet and for
large number of Tibetans being forced to leave their hearths and homes for refuge in other countries”. The Government of India have nothing to add to this.

7. The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, 28 July, 1966.

No. C/12/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and have the honour to state as following:—

The Government of India have received reports that since July 3, 1966, Chinese troops entrenched across the Sikkim-Tibet border at Nathu La have been making propaganda broadcasts through loudspeakers to the Indian defence forces on the Sikkim side of the border. During the last one week these broadcasts have become virulent, provocative and abusive. They malign the Government and the people of India and even called upon the officers and men of the Indian army to oppose the Government of India. The subversive purpose of this new kind of propaganda was started by the Chinese troops is proved by the following extracts from some of these broadcasts:— “Now the people of India are ready for revolution. Officers and men of the Indian army, you should also support the revolution and establish a true People's Republic”...... “Your Government is reactionary and supports colonialism”...... “You should not support the reactionary policies of your Government” etc. The meaning of this propaganda is obvious. This is a crude attempt at subversion and a gross interference in the internal affairs of India.

The Government of the People's Republic of China loudly claims that its relations with Asian-African countries are governed by the Bandung Principles and the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence, and that it never interferes in the internal affairs of other countries. The actions of the Chinese Government, however, speak to the contrary and demonstrate that these high principles and virtuous postures are intended to delude the world and are a cover for its imperialists and interventionist designs. More and more countries of Asia and Africa have seen through this Chinese game of deception and understood the true meaning of the slogan that Asia and Africa are “ripe for revolution”. The vain call across Nathu La to Indian defence forces ‘to support the revolution' and ‘to establish a People's Republic' in India is further proof of the policy of the present leaders of China to subvert the established Governments of neighbouring countries and to expand the sway of China beyond its boundaries in the name of spreading 'revolution'. It also proves that the root cause of the conflict between India and China is not
the border question but the refusal of the Chinese Government to accept the idea of co-existence with India and its attempt to impose its will and political conceptions on the Government and the people of India. It is time that the Chinese Government realized that neither the people of India nor the peoples of Asia and Africa will tolerate such attempts at interference and domination from outside. These tactics of the Chinese Government are doomed to failure.

In some of the Chinese broadcasts across Nathu La there are ominous references to the Chinese attack on India in the autumn of 1962. There are also threatening statements that “if there will be any incidents on this border area the responsibility will be that of the Indian Government”, and that “the Indian army is challenging us and will be punished for this”. Are the Chinese authorities issuing these threats and warnings for stepping up tension on the border and as a prelude to a repetition of its 1962 aggression against India?

The Government of India lodge the most emphatic protest with the Chinese Government against the latest and blatant interference in the internal affairs of India through the loudspeaker campaign across Nathu La by their authorities in Tibet and demand that this provocative and interventionist propaganda cease forthwith.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 28 July, 1966.

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 480.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated May 13, 1966:

In its note, the Indian Government tries hard to quibble over its scheming activities of tailing after U.S. imperialism in creating “two Chinas”. But the note constitutes in itself another big exposure of these scheming activities which Indian Government has been carrying out. Note repeatedly calls the elements of Chiang Kai-shek clique entrenched in Chinese province of Taiwan “Formosan delegations” and “delegates from Taiwan” and brazenly describes Taiwan as a so-called “Member” of International organisations. Obviously this constitutes an interference in China’s sovereignty and internal affairs, a flagrant attempt to create “one China and one Taiwan” and an attempt to legalise state in which elements of the Chiang Kai-shek gang continue their illegal occupation of China’s seat in the United Nations and other international organisations. According to news report, during her visit to the United States last March, the Indian Prime Minister Mrs. Gandhi openly spread the fallacy that Taiwan’s position “will have to be worked out” and the fallacy of “one China and one Taiwan”. In spreading these fallacies, Indian side is serving
U.S. imperialist scheme to create "two Chinas" or "one China and one Taiwan" so as to carve out Taiwan from China and legalize the perpetual and forcible occupation of Taiwan by United States. The Chinese Government lodges a strong protest with Indian Government against this and reiterates: Taiwan is an inalienable part of China's sacred territory and China's sovereignty over Taiwan absolutely brooks no outside interference. The Chinese Government firmly opposes the scheme of "two Chinas" in any form conducted by anyone at any time and in any circumstances.

2. It is entirely impossible for the Indian note to deny the host of facts about the Indian Government's collusion with the Chiang Kai-shek gang and its crude interference in China's internal affairs as cited in the Chinese Government notes of November 6, 1965 and April 2, 1966. But the Indian note prevaricated that they were "extension of facilities to delegates from Taiwan to attend international conferences", "visits of private Indian citizens to Taiwan", etc. This is utterly untenable.

The Facts are: Indian Government has tried hard to press forward with the "two Chinas" scheme by making use of international conferences and has connived at the open anti-Chinese activities of elements of Chiang Kai-shek gang in India; Indian side and the Chiang gang elements blatantly advocated "understanding" and "cooperation" between them in joint opposition to China; the Indian President, the Chairman of National Congress, the Minister of Railways and other high ranking leaders received the Chiang gang elements and even asked the latter to convey their regards to Chiang Kai-shek, the common enemy of Chinese people; the Indian Minister of External Affairs, the Minister of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation, the Vice Minister of Commerce and other high ranking officials respectively attended reception given by the Chiang gang elements and the ceremony held by them for presenting paddy to Indian side; Indian press and news agencies openly called a Chiang gang element "Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs of Republic of China". The fact that Indian Government has so audaciously lauded the Chiang gang elements as the representatives of a country and openly ganged up with them in joint opposition to China fully shows how frantic the Indian Government has been in accelerating its promotion of "Two Chinas" scheme.

As for the allegation of "visits of private citizens", it is still less worthy of refutation. With the support of Indian Prime Minister, former Indian M.P. R. Velayudhan went to Taiwan for "talks" with the chieftains of Chiang gang and advocated "normalization of diplomatic relations" between two sides. In the middle of last June, Raghunath Singh, General Secretary of the Congress Parliamentary Party, the ruling party of India, went to Taiwan at the invitation of C. Shen, the bogus Vice Foreign Minister of Chiang gang, to openly engineer joint opposition to China. All these are facts about the Indian Government's open collaboration with the Chiang gang, which cannot be denied by the Indian Government with allegation of "visits of private citizens".

It is most absurd for the Indian side again to use pretext of "freedom to assemble" to defend its connivance and collusion with
the Chiang gang elements in conducting such activities as blatant celebration of the Chiang gangs “National Day”. The Chiang gang elements have been engaged in activities against the People's Republic of China, which are criminal acts inciting subversion of the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government absolutely cannot tolerate fact that while maintaining diplomatic relations with China, the Indian Government should have connived at Chiang gang elements open anti-Chinese activities in India.

The above series of anti-Chinese activities conducted by the Indian side constitute a grave encroachment upon China's sovereignty and a gross interference in China's internal affairs. In its note, however, the Indian side makes false countercharge that China “interferes in internal affairs of India” by lodging protest with the Indian side. This is really presumptuous and unreasonable to the extreme. Is it your “internal affairs” to oppose China? How is it that whereas you are allowed to oppose China rabidly, the Chinese Government has not even right to lodge protest?

3. In order to explain away its crime for carrying out the “two Chinas” scheme, the Indian Government in its note has gone so far as to manufacture pretexts, asserting that “some countries whose diplomatic missions the Chinese Government have received in Peking still maintain Consular offices in Taiwan”, etc. Such sophistry can in no way help the Indian Government. As is well known, there is indeed an imperialist country which in words recognizes only the People's Republic of China but in practice is willingly serving as the accomplice of the United States in the scheme of creating “two Chinas” and “one China and one Taiwan”. For this very reason, China's diplomatic relations with that country have been prevented from being normalized for the past decade and more. Does the Indian Government find such a state of affairs enviable? Is it ready to imitate the past colonial ruler of India on this matter too?

It is entirely proper for China to develop popular trade and cultural exchanges with some countries with which she has not established diplomatic relations. This can in no way be mentioned in the same breath with the question of “two Chinas”. Indian Government has gone so far as to make wilful charges on this matter and, singing the same tune with modern revisionist, has concocted the rumour that China is trading with South Africa, in a vain attempt to sow discord in the relations between China and friendly Afro-Asian countries. It will never succeed in this despicable aim.

4. It must also be pointed out that, while working ever harder to promote the scheme of creating “two Chinas” in last few years, the Indian Government has subjected law abiding Chinese nationals in India to all kinds of discrimination and persecution, and hundreds of innocent Chinese nationals have long been detained in concentration camp and jails. The “China Review”, a paper run by overseas Chinese which was devoted to the promotion of Sino-Indian friendship, was ordered to stop publication, whereas the “Chinese journal of India” run by Chiang gang elements has been permitted to engage in open anti-Chinese propaganda. The facts over past few years show that despite the repeated protests lodged by the Chinese Government, the Indian Government, far from restraining itself, has gone
from bad to worse and become daily more undisguised in its activities of pushing forward the scheme of "two Chinas" and colluding with the Chiang Kai-shek gang in opposing China. These acts and deeds of the Indian Government have contradicted its repeated pledge that it recognizes only the People's Republic of China and its promise that it would "prevent any pro-Kuomintang meeting and demonstration" and would "not permit any activities designed to promote the idea of two Chinas. This fully exposes the hypocrisy and perfidy of the Indian Government.

5. The Chinese Government must warn the Indian Government in all seriousness: by so unscrupulously serving U.S. imperialism in creating "two Chinas" and willingly acting as the flunkey of imperialism and modern revisionism in opposing China, you will only further expose your ugly features. No anti-Chinese "hero" in the world will ever come to a good end and you are certainly no exception either.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 15 September, 1966.

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 609.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the note of the Indian Ministry for External Affairs dated July 28, 1966:

1. It is entirely within China's sovereign rights for the Chinese frontier guards stationing at Nathu La on the China-Sikkim boundary to make broadcasts on Chinese territory advocating the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples and setting forth the truth about the Sino-Indian boundary question, and no foreigner has any right to interfere in this. In its note the Indian Government describes the broadcasts of the Chinese side as an "attempt at subversion" and an "interference in the internal affairs of India". This is a slander against China. The note alleges that the Chinese broadcasts call upon the officers and men of the Indian army to "oppose the Government of India" and to "support the revolution and establish a true People's Republic", and so on and so forth. These are sheer lies and fabrications. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the unwarranted charge and protest of the Indian Government.

2. The allegations in the Indian note about subversion and expansionism by China against neighbouring countries are rubbish picked from the anti-China rumour storage of U.S. imperialism and are not worth refuting at all. China has always strictly abided by the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and devoted itself to the cause of Afro-Asian solidarity against imperialism, and has therefore been widely acclaimed by Afro-Asian countries and peoples. In contrast,
externally the Indian Government has hired itself out to U.S. imperialism, pursued a policy of toadying to the United States, allying with the Soviet Union and opposing China, bullied its neighbours and practised expansionism; domestically, it has carried out a policy against communism and the people and practised ruthless national oppression. The iniquitous conduct of the Indian Government runs diametrically counter to the interests of the Indian people, so much so that resenting voices are raised from all quarters and life becomes intolerable for the people at home, and on the international arena the Indian Government has meagre support because of its unjust cause and finds itself in unprecedented isolation. That the Indian people want to make revolution is their own affairs; it is the inevitable result of the reactionary domestic and foreign policies pursued by the Indian Government. How can others be held responsible for it? China is a socialist state which never interferes in the internal affairs of other countries. No amount of fabrication and slander by the Indian Government can sully in the least the brilliant image of socialist China.

3. The Indian Government has all along been hostile to the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples and has obstructed and sabotaged their friendly contacts and cultural exchange in every possible way. Fearing that the Indian people may come to know about China and the truth of the Sino-Indian boundary question, the Indian Government has regarded as a thorn in its side the Chinese broadcasts which are conducive to the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples, and it has hastily come out for crude interference. While unwarrantedly lodging a so-called protest with the Chinese Government, you have installed broadcasting machine on Sikkim territory along the China-Sikkim boundary to jam China's broadcasts and hurl venomous calumnies and abuses at the Chinese Government. The voice of truth, however, cannot be blocked. Your despicable performances can only expose yourselves and serve to prove once again that you are the disrupter of the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples and the creator of tension on the border.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, September 28, 1966.

No. 237.

The Embassy of India in China presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China and further to the discussion held on September 19, 1966, between Mr. Tien Tin, Deputy Section Chief of the Consular Department of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Mr. M. S. Rao, First Secretary in the Embassy of India in China, Peking, has the honour to state as follows:—

On September 16, when Mr. Shankar Rao, First Secretary of this Embassy, visited the Sikh Gurdwara in Tientsin, he saw clear evidence of the desecration of the Gurdwara by some unknown Chinese
nationals. Almost all the glass-panes of the Gurdwara were smashed, pictures of Hindu Gods were torn to pieces, the photograph of Guru Nanak, the venerated teacher of Sikhs was missing and the copy of the Granth Sahib which is the holy religious book of the Sikh community was torn to shreds and its pages scattered all over the room. The wooden platform where the Granth Sahib was kept was also damaged and the mattress on this platform was torn. Several cupboards in the Gurdwara were broken and the room was in much disorder. In his meeting with the Deputy Section Chief of the Consular Department on September 19, Mr. Shankar Rao produced a torn page of the Granth Sahib and a portion of the torn picture of Hanuman, a revered Hindu God, as concrete evidence of the damage caused to the Gurdwara.

According to the persons who have been enjoying the privilege of staying the Gurdwara premises, some unknown Chinese nationals, some of them wearing Red Arm Bands had entered the building and caused the damage referred to above. The desecration of the Sikh temple is thus an established fact. Hence, Mr. Rao requested the Deputy Section Chief of the Consular Department to inform the authorities in Tientsin to extend full protection to this Gurdwara, to guarantee against the perpetration of such acts of vandalism in future, fully investigate the matter of the desecration of the Tientsin Gurdwara, bring to book the culprits who are responsible for damaging the Gurdwara property, and to compensate fully for the damage done to the Gurdwara.

It is a matter of regret, however, that instead of acting on the basis of the incontrovertible facts presented to him, the Deputy Section Chief of the Consular Department summarily rejected the justified protest lodged by the Indian Embassy on September 19. Furthermore, the Deputy Section Chief of the Consular Department denied that any damage to the Sikh Temple had been caused while admitting that there was interference in the Gurdwara premises. He stated that the Red Guards had merely requested the Care-taker of the Sikh Temple to remove the sign-board and the photograph from inside the Temple. In the light of the concrete evidence of physical violation of the premises, the Embassy considers this explanation as totally unsatisfactory. What is even more inexplicable, is that instead of giving a guarantee that such events would not occur again and instead of taking appropriate action to investigate into the matter, the Deputy Section Chief of the Consular Department even went to the extent of justifying the vandalism perpetrated against the Gurdwara by describing it as "just and proper" action, to be considered "revolutionary" in the context of the Cultural Revolution and that there was "nothing to complain of" and that the verbal "protest" is unjust.

The Government of the People's Republic of China have often stated in the past that the policy of the Chinese Government is to guarantee the right and freedom of religious worship and protect the sanctity of the religious institutions. From the desecration of the Sikh Gurdwara, however, it is clear that the Chinese authorities
seemed to have failed to give protection to the premises of a non-Chinese religious institution and its possessions. From the explanations of the Deputy Section Chief of the Consular Department, it would appear that the Chinese Government even attempt to shirk their responsibility to make full enquiries into the matter and to find out who are the persons responsible for this act of vandalism when the matter was brought to their notice.

In view of the facts mentioned above, the Embassy of India in China would like to once again register a strong protest against the desecration of the Sikh temple at Tientsin. The Embassy deplores the fact that none of the legitimate requests put forward by Mr. Rao, First Secretary of this Embassy, in his meeting on September 19, have been given proper consideration.

The Embassy of India in China now demands that the Chinese Government should guarantee full protection to the religious possessions of the Sikh Gurdwara at Tientsin as well as all other Gurdwaras and religious institutions in China, fully investigate the matter of the desecration of the Tientsin Gurdwara, bring to book the culprits who are responsible for damaging the Gurdwara property and compensate for the damage done to the Gurdwara.

The Embassy of India in China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 August, 1966.

No. C/18/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Government's note of the 28th July, 1966, has the honour to state as follows:

1. The Government of India have noted that while the Chinese note under reply is lengthy and contains many slanders and thinly-veiled threats against India, it is, in fact, a repetition of out-worn arguments and the all-too-familiar tirade to the effect that India is "trailing after U.S. imperialists in creating 'two Chinas'". This note has strung together a miscellaneous collection of so-called evidence to try and substantiate this absurd allegation, notwithstanding the fact that this entire argument of the Chinese Government has been conclusively refuted on several occasions and most recently in the Indian note of the 13th May, 1966. Such monotonous harping upon baseless allegations does not merit a detailed refutation. The precise circumstances relating to visits to Taiwan (Formosa) by private Indian citizens, as members of a free society, as well as visits to India by Taiwanese individuals and delegations, have been clearly explained to the Chinese Government on earlier occasions. In case they are interested in a rational explanation, the Chinese Government are invited to refer to the Indian note of the 13th May, 1966.
2. What needs to be exposed is not the faulty arguments and reasoning contained in this latest Chinese note but rather the motives of the Chinese Government in continuing to use every occasion, even manufactured ones, to indulge in propaganda and vilification against the Government and the people of India. The Indian Government is treated with almost hysterical statements and notes from Peking even when a private citizen of India pays a visit to Taiwan. In contrast to this, the Chinese Government themselves have no qualms, political or emotional, in dealing with countries and Governments which maintain full diplomatic relations with Taiwan. There are several capitals where the Chinese trade offices happily co-exist with diplomatic missions from Taiwan. There are countries having diplomatic relations with Taiwan whose officials are entertained on official missions by the Government of China. Some of the countries with which China has the largest number of commercial, cultural and economic contacts have full diplomatic relations with Taiwan. There have been several other countries with which China has diplomatic relations and which have received Taiwan delegations as members of UN Conference or other international conferences like the World Buddhist Conference, for example. There have also been several other countries, not all of them "imperialist", having full diplomatic relations with Peking whose non-official citizens have visited Taiwan.

3. The Government of the People's Republic of China have, however, been able to bear all these examples of "collusion with the two-Chinas plot", with great fortitude. Not a single syllable of public protest has emanated from Peking. But when some private individual from India visits Taiwan the matter is blown up into a big issue by the Chinese Government. Are the Chinese Government so much obsessed with their hatred for India that they fail to see the double standard of their own behaviour?

4. There is no need for the Chinese Government to indulge any such mock heroics against India. It convinces no one and merely exposes their own malevolent hostility, like the proverbial Chinese stone which only crushes the toes of the ill-intentioned.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 November, 1966.

No. C/20/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and with reference to the Government of India's notes dated April 19, 1965 and January 4, 1966 regarding the two machines lying with K.T. Steel Industries Ltd., has the honour to request the Embassy for an early reply. It is now more than eighteen months since the matter is pending with the Embassy and the Ministry would like to have an early settlement of the problem.
The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 25 November, 1966.

No. C/21/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to its note No. (66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 609 of 15th September, 1966, has the honour to state as follows:—

The Chinese note has claimed that it is the 'sovereign right' of the Chinese troops stationed on the Tibetan side of Nathu La to make broadcasts to the Indian defence forces on the Sikkim side of the border and that these broadcasts advocate nothing but "friendship between the Indian and Chinese peoples". One can only say that the Chinese Government has a strange conception of friendship. It is a fact, and there is no use denying things which were broadcast through loudspeakers, that the Chinese troops have been calling upon the Indian defence forces to "oppose the Government of India" and to "support the revolution and establish a true People's Republic" in India. The broadcasts across Nathu La have gone unabated since they started on July 3, 1966, and, naturally, the Government of India had to take counter-measures against this foul breath of Chinese propaganda being exhaled across Nathu La. To argue that it is the "sovereign right" of the Chinese troops to indulge in such vile and instigatory propaganda amounts to claiming that subversion and interference in the internal affairs of other countries is part of the sovereign rights of China and shows the aggressive and interfering motive of the present regime in China in its true colours. The call for 'revolution' incessantly emanating from Peking proves this to the hilt. As pointed out in the Indian note of 28th July, 1966, more and more countries of Asia and Africa have seen through the Chinese game and understood the true meaning of the slogan that Asia and Africa are "ripe for revolution". It is time that the powers that be in China realized that their attempts to impose the Chinese pattern of thought and the Chinese methods of revolution on Afro-Asian countries is contrary to the concepts of peaceful co-existence, the equality and independence of nations, the solidarity of Asian-African countries and good neighbourliness among nations. It is also time they realized that such crude interference is bound to be rejected by the sovereign nations of Asia and Africa and must fail.

Owing to poverty of arguments the Chinese Government has, in its note, descended to the depths of abuse. It says that "India has hired itself out to U.S. imperialism", "allied" with the Soviet Union, "bullied its neighbours and practised expansionism", "carried out ruthless national oppression", "the Indian people want to make revolution", "the iniquitous conduct of the Indian Government runs
diametrically counter to the interests of the Indian people", etc. Anybody can see that all this is not only poisonous propaganda but intervention in India's internal affairs and is all of a piece with the loudspeaker campaign across Nathu La. Does the Chinese Government believe that this kind of abuse serves any good and is proper in diplomatic correspondence? The Indian people can look after themselves and it is not for the Chinese Government to pose as the judge and the custodian of their interests. Neither the people of India nor the people of any other country, will ever accept the Chinese claim to speak for their interests and to dictate to them the path they should take. Besides, there is no use pretending that everything is lovely in the Chinese garden. Everybody knows what is going on inside China. If there are anywhere national oppression, compulsion and violence against the ordinary citizens and even against its leaders, and desperate efforts by authority to suppress the truth and those who do not agree hundred per cent. with the powers that be, these exist in the China of today. The so-called "brilliant image of Socialist China" is for its neighbours a murky image today. The policies of the Chinese Government have resulted in China's isolation from the Afro-Asian as well as the Socialist countries.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, December 6, 1966.

The Embassy of the Republic of India in China presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows:—

1. Between November 23—25, 1966, Mr. M. Shankar Rao, First Secretary (Consular), accompanied by Mr. V. C. Khanna, Second Secretary of the Indian Embassy, visited Shanghai. During the course of their visit they took the opportunity to see the Parsi Prayer Hall, situated at 539, Fu Chou Lu in Shanghai. They found that the main entrance of the temple was closed and the building was occupied by some unauthorised occupants who had forcibly entered the premises. When the members of the Indian Embassy attempted to enter the building, they were refused entry by the occupants even though they made it known that they were acting on behalf of the Indian Embassy in Peking.

2. The Chinese Government is aware that the Parsi Prayer Hall situated at 539, Fu Chou Lu in Shanghai was constructed by the former Parsi community of Shanghai, and as such endowed with religious and sentimental sanctity. The Indian Embassy officials visited this temple in order to see for themselves in what state the temple premises were and to contact the Chinese citizen who was responsible for the care-taking of this temple on behalf of the Parsi Trust. In allowing the building to be occupied by unauthorised persons, there has been a desecration of the sanctity of this temple.
Further, the occupants who are in illegal occupation of the building obstructed Indian Embassy officials from proceeding inside the Parsi temple. The Indian Embassy is constrained to bring this unlawful occupation of a religious premise to the notice of the Chinese Foreign Office for assistance in evicting the illegal occupants and its restoration to the care-taker or to this Embassy who are authorised to look after the premises on behalf of the Parsi Trust.

3. It must be pointed out with regret that Indian religious institutions have of late been subjected to desecration in China. Apart from the clear case of desecration mentioned above relating to the Parsi Prayer Hall in Shanghai, the Indian Embassy had already brought to the attention of the Foreign Office both orally and in an aide memoire dated 28th September, 1966, the violation of the sanctity of the Sikh Gurdwara located at Tientsin. The Chinese Government has yet to satisfy the Indian Embassy that action has been taken to prevent the further desecration of the Tientsin Gurdwara.

4. The Government of the People's Republic of China has stated in the past that the policy of the Chinese Government is to guarantee right of religious worship and the freedom of religious institutions in China. In conformity with this statement it is hoped that the Chinese Government's assistance will be extended in clearing the building of the Parsi Prayer Hall of the illegal occupants. Further, the Indian Embassy officials should be allowed to visit the Parsi temple on their next visit to Shanghai, so that they could report on the state of the temple to the Parsi Trust.

The Embassy of India in China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 January, 1967.

No. C/1/67.

The attention of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China is drawn to Section 11-A of the Press and Registration of Books Act, 1867, according to which two copies of all publications published in the Union Territory of Delhi are required to be delivered at the office of the State Press Officer, Delhi, now designated as Assistant Director (Press), Delhi Administration, Delhi. It has been reported to this Ministry that no copies of the paper "Cheen ke Samachar" are being delivered at the office of the Assistant Director (Press) and that only one copy instead of two is being received in respect of the paper entitled "News from China". The failure on the part of the Chinese Embassy in regard to delivery of copies as required above is a violation of local laws. It is, therefore, requested that copies of the two papers mentioned above may be regularly delivered to the Assistant Director (Press), Delhi Administration, Delhi, in future.
Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 February, 1967.


On November 6, 1966, the Indian dak runner carrying mail to Chumbithang in Tibet under the existing ad hoc arrangement for the exchange of mail between the two countries, was met by a Chinese postal official about 50 yards on the Tibetan side of Nathu La and asked to exchange mail at that point. The dak runner insisted on proceeding to Chumbithang as usual but was prevented from doing so by the Chinese official whereupon he exchanged the mail at the point suggested by the Chinese official. However, on subsequent occasions on November 10, 13, 17 and 20, 1966, when the dak runner was again stopped by Chinese postal officials at the same point, he insisted upon his right under existing practice to proceed to Chumbithang and when he was not allowed to do so, he returned without exchanging the mail. It is obvious that the responsibility for the inconvenience caused by the non-exchange of mail on these occasions rests with the Chinese authorities who prevented the dak runner from proceeding to Chumbithang as usual.

2. On receiving reports of the obstruction caused by Chinese postal officials the Government of India, because of its desire to continue the postal exchange between India and Tibet, issued instructions to its dak runner to exchange mail at the point suggested by the Chinese officials on a provisional basis. Accordingly, since November 24, 1966, the Indian dak runner has been exchanging mail at a point 50 yards beyond Nathu La in Tibetan territory. The Government of India had hoped that if the Chinese Government of wished to change the place of exchange of mail by mutual consent the latter would have taken up the matter with the Indian authorities through diplomatic channels or directly with the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs of India. So far no such approach has been made by the Chinese side.

3. The Government of India would like to point out that the unilateral action of the Chinese authorities to prevent the dak runner from proceeding to Chumbithang is a violation of the existing practice and the ad hoc arrangement between the two countries to exchange mail at Chumbithang. On two occasions, viz. May 22 and August 15, 1963, spokesmen of the Chinese Ministry of Posts and Tele-Communications had claimed that the exchange of mail at Chumbithang was according to an agreement between China and India. The Hsinhua of August 16, 1963, reported as follows:

"He (the spokesman of the Chinese Ministry of Posts and Tele-Communications) said that the agreement on the exchange of mail between China's Tibet Region and India was reached in 1955 by the Representatives of the Chinese Foreign Ministry and the Indian Embassy in China through an exchange of letters. In 1960, an agreement was reached on the change of location for the exchange of mail by the Foreign Department of Tibet
Region and the Indian Consulate General in Lhasa after conferring with each other. According to the agreement China and India exchange mail at Chumbithang twice a week."

The stand taken by the Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs of the Government of India has been that the postal exchange at Chumbithang was being carried out on an ad hoc basis and not as a result of any agreement concluded between the two governmental authorities. In a press note issued on June 25, 1963, the Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs of India had explained that even though the Government of India had proposed to the Postal Administration of the People's Republic of China that an agreement between the two administrations be concluded, no such agreement could be finalised between the two Governments due to the lack of response from the Chinese Postal Administration and that consequently the exchange of correspondence between the two Administrations had to be carried out as before on an ad hoc basis. It is regrettable that the Chinese authorities are now preventing the exchange of mail at Chumbithang on the basis of this ad hoc arrangement even though they had argued in 1963 that the exchange at Chumbithang was on the basis of an agreement between the two Governments. It is obvious that the existing ad hoc arrangement for the exchange of mail at Chumbithang can be altered only by mutual consent and not by unilateral action by the Chinese authorities as has been taken since November 6, 1960.
VI. APPENDICES

Appendix I

Hsinhua Statement dated October 27, 1966

“In its note to the Chinese Government dated September 30, the Indian Government concocted stories about “intrusions” into Bhutanese territory by Chinese herdsmen and patrols and claiming to be acting on behalf of Bhutan, lodged a so-called protest with the Chinese Government. Following that, with much fanfare Indian Government set its propaganda machine in motion raising a hue and cry about “Chinese intrusions into Bhutan” and the Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi came out in person to conduct the campaign against China. In this connection Hsinhua News Agency is authorized to make the following statement:

1. The Indian Government's hue and cry about Chinese “intrusions” into Bhutanese territory is an out and out lie, a slander with ulterior motives.

2. The Dongnan grassland (referred to as “Doklham pasture” by the Indian side) where the Indian Government alleged that Chinese “intrusions” had taken place is located in the vicinity of the tri-junction of the boundaries of China, Bhutan and Sikkim and has always been under Chinese jurisdiction and Chinese herdsmen have grazed there for generations. According to practice, Bhutanese herdsmen who cross the border to graze on this grassland have to pay for the pasturage to the Chinese side. During the second half of 1965 Indian troops five times crossed the China-Sikkim boundary and intruded into the Dongnan grassland to carry out reconnaissance and harassment against which the Chinese Government protested to the Indian Government on August 27, 1965 and again on January 31, 1966. The Indian Government did not at that time deny the fact that this grassland belongs to China. Now the Indian Government has asserted that the Chinese side had “intruded” into China’s own territory, this is really ludicrous and not worth refutation.

3. China has consistently respected Bhutan's sovereignty and territorial integrity. China and Bhutan have all along been on friendly terms with each other without either side committing aggression against the other, and the border between the two countries has always been tranquil. The Bhutanese Government itself has refuted on many occasions the lies concocted by the Indian side about Chinese “threats” to and “intrusions” into Bhutan. It is true that the China-Bhutan boundary has never been formally delimited and if the Bhutanese side's understanding is not quite the same as that of the Chinese side as regards the alignment of the boundary between the two countries at certain specific points, a fair and reasonable solution can very well be found through consultations on an equal footing between the two sides on the basis of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation. China has successfully settled boundary questions left over by history with such neighbouring countries as Burma, Nepal, Pakistan and Afghanistan through friendly consultations. Nevertheless it must be explicitly pointed out that the
boundary question between China and Bhutan is a matter that concerns China and Bhutan alone and has nothing to do with the Indian Government which has no right whatsoever to intervene in it.

4. The King of Bhutan has long since solemnly declared that "Bhutan is an independent sovereign state and has the right to conduct her own foreign affairs". However blatantly claiming to be acting on Bhutan's behalf, the Indian Government lodged a so-called protest with China. This is a manifestation of downright big nation chauvinism. Inheriting the mantle of British imperialism the Indian Government has all along been pursuing an expansionist policy and bullying its neighbouring countries. It treats Sikkim as its "protectorate", encroaching upon Sikkim's independence and sovereignty. It tries hard to tighten its control over Bhutan and makes every effort to prevent the latter from attaining its due international status and even intends to send troops directly into Bhutanese territory and station them there. The "Indian Express" says undisguisedly in Editorial on October 6, 1966: "There is no formal defence treaty between India and Bhutan to back up the special relationship between the two countries. India cannot go to the assistance of Bhutan to deal with the border situation unless military assistance is specifically asked for by the Royal Bhutan Government. Whether such assistance will be invited is the big question". Following that, the Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi openly asserted at the Press Conference on October 7 that India was committed to protect Bhutan. It is thus quite clear that in slanderingly charging China with "intrusions" into Bhutan, the Indian Government not only wants to create a new pretext for opposing China and sow discord between China and Bhutan but also is vainly attempting to realize its sinister design of tightening its control over Bhutan under the guise of "protection". But these despicable schemes will not succeed. The Indian Government absolutely cannot cover up its ugly expansionist features by playing the trick of a thief crying "stop thief!"
Press Statement of 3rd October, 1966, issued on behalf of the Bhutan Government by its Trade Adviser in Calcutta

“The Government of Bhutan have, for some time, been concerned with reports received from its patrols of a number of intrusions by Tibetan graziers and Chinese troops in the Doklam pastures which are adjacent to the southern part of the Chumbi Valley. This area is traditionally part of Bhutan and no assertion has been made by the Government of the People's Republic of China disputing the traditional frontier which runs along recognizable natural features. In the area of the intrusion, the boundary runs along the water-parting along Batang La to Sinchel La. Local attempts were made to inform the graziers and the Chinese troops that they had strayed into Bhutanese territory but these have not been heeded.

In view of the succession of violations of the frontier, Bhutan Government urged the Government of India to represent to the Chinese Government so that Chinese nationals and troops refrained from entry into Bhutan in future"
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I. BORDER ISSUES AND INCIDENTS

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 16 January, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 17.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and, with regard to Indian intrusions in 1966 along the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim boundary, states the following:

1. In 1966, there were altogether 73 cases of Indian troops' intrusions into Chinese territory across the Line of actual control along the Sino-Indian border and across the China-Sikkim boundary (For details see Annex I). Indian planes intruded into China's airspace in 71 sorties (For details see Annex II). The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this.

2. In the past year, the Indian side made very frequent intrusions along the entire Sino-Indian border as well as the China-Sikkim boundary, and some were quite serious cases.

Along the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, the Indian side made as many as 24 ground intrusions into Sinkiang's Hot Springs area alone within the second half of last year; in some cases the intrusion lasted as long as five or six hours.

Along the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, apart from maintaining at Hsialinkung Terrace their military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the line of actual control between the two sides and carrying out frequent reconnaissance and harassment there, Indian troops made as many as 12 intrusions into the area of Hsiao alone north of the line of actual control.

Along the China-Sikkim boundary, during the eight months between last May and December, Indian troops made as many as 13 intrusions into Chinese territory from across Natu La for reconnaissance and harassment and repaired the wire entanglements left by Indian troops when they withdrew and fled from the place in September, 1965. Indian troops also repeatedly carried out provocative activities at Natu La and even fired at the Chinese sentries there. At Tagi La, the intruding Indian troops made threats against a local Chinese herdsman; at Dongnan grassland they burnt down a cattle-shed of Chinese herdsmen.

3. The above facts show that the Indian side has continued to create tension and tried to provoke border incidents. In its note of April 30, 1966, the Indian Government tried hard to deny the facts about its flagrant intrusions and provocations during the second half of 1965; of late it even falsely accused China of making "intrusions" in a number of its notes in order to camouflage its own proven
intrusions. But the facts are all there; in vainly trying to confuse the public by turning things upside down, the Indian Government is simply hoping to curry favour with imperialism and modern revisionism and find a way out of its difficult position both at home and abroad. But in the past year, far from improving its position, the Indian Government has made itself even more discredited abroad and has aroused even stronger opposition from the people at home. If the Indian Government still refuses to show repentence and if it insists on opposing China and continues to create tension by making provocative intrusions into China along the border, it will only sink deeper and deeper in the quagmire. As the great leader of the Chinese people Chairman Mao Tse-tung has pointed out, “Starting with the aim of injuring others only to end up by running oneself—such is the law of development which governs all reactionary policies.” The Indian Government’s anti-Chinese policy will inevitably be governed by this law.

---

**ANNEX 1**

**Intrusions into Chinese Territory by Indian Troops during 1966**

I. Intrusions into Sinkiang and Tibet, China, east of the 1959 line of actual control in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. At about 1230 hours on January 18, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet and conducted reconnaissance for about half an hour.

2. At about 1150 hours on February 16, four Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance and left Chinese territory at about 1230 hours.

3. At about 1630 hours on February 16, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet and conducted reconnoitring activities for as long as two and a half hours and did not leave Chinese territory until about 1900 hours.

4. At about 1620 hours and 1650 hours on February 21, two batches of Indian soldiers, two in each, successively intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnoitring activities.

5. At about 1650 hours on March 8, one Indian soldier intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet for reconnoitring activities.
6. At about 1220 hours on March 12, four Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnoitring activities.

7. At about 1150 hours on March 16, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet and conducted reconnaissance there for more than one hour.

8. At about 1200 hours on April 23, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance and did not leave until about 1320 hours.

9. At about 1700 hours on June 4, one Indian soldier driving a jeep intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet for reconnaissance.

10. At about 0930 hours on July 25, four Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities there for as long as six hours.

11. At about 1450 hours on July 30, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

12. At about 0945 hours on August 4, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities there for more than four hours.

13. At about 1230 hours on August 8, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance there for more than one hour.

14. At about 1015 hours on August 10, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance there for more than three hours.

15. At about 1040 hours on August 13, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities there for nearly four hours.

16. At about 1430 hours on August 17, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance for more than one hour.

17. At about 0840 hours on August 21, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities there for about three and a half hours.
18. At about 0900 hours on August 23, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities there for nearly three hours.

19. At about 0730 hours on August 25, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance and did not leave Chinese territory until about 1300 hours the same day.

20. At about 1100 hours on August 29, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance for nearly five hours.

21. At about 1050 hours on September 2, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance and did not leave Chinese territory until about 1245 hours.

22. At about 1145 hours on September 4, one Indian soldier intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance there for more than two hours.

23. At about 1420 hours on September 15, one Indian soldier intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities there for two hours.

24. At about 1210 hours on September 24, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance and did not leave Chinese territory until about 1340 hours.

25. At about 1630 hours on September 28, seven Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

26. At about 1330 hours on October 10, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

27. At about 0850 hours on October 13, 15 Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance there for more than six hours.

28. At about 1040 hours on October 17, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Kongka Pass in Tibet and conducted reconnoitring activities there for four hours.
29. At about 1250 hours on October 25, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

30. At about 1420 hours on October 28, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

31. At about 1230 hours on November 2, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

32. At about 1200 hours on November 3, seven Indian soldiers intruded into the Demchok area in Tibet and conducted reconnaissance there for two and a half hours.

33. At about 1100 hours on November 4, six Indian soldiers intruded into the Demchok area in Tibet and conducted reconnaissance there for as long as six hours.

34. At about 1450 hours on November 16, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

35. At about 1400 hours on November 24, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

36. At about 1350 hours on December 16, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance there for more than an hour.

II. Intrusions into Tibet, China, north of the 1959 line of actual control in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border:

During the summer of 1966, Indian military and administrative personnel again intruded into and stationed themselves at the Wuje area which China had vacated on its own initiative. On August 15, the intruding Indian troops detained a Chinese border inhabitant who had gone to Wuje for trade and who was allowed to return only after being held for a day and a night. On the morning of August 27, six intruding Indian soldiers chased a Chinese herdsman and fired a stream of five shots at him.

III. Intrusions into Tibet, China, north of the 1959 line of actual control in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. At Hsialinkung Terrace Indian troops still maintain their military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the line of actual control between the two sides and frequently crossed the line of
actual control for reconnaissance and harassment. There was one such incident in January involving four persons; one in February involving fifteen persons; one in April involving three persons; five in May involving ten persons; four in June involving 42 persons; six in July involving 29 persons; eight in August involving 30 persons; six in October involving 25 persons. Of these, the Indian troops that intruded in May also carried out such activities as building military works on the Chinese side of the line of actual control. Moreover, on September 17, Indian troops opened fire in provocation at Hsialinkung Terrace.

2. At about 1515 hours on February 11, two Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Le for reconnaissance.

3. At about 1420 hours on May 2, three Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao for reconnaissance.

4. At about 1700 hours on May 21, two Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao for reconnaissance.

5. At about 1330 hours on July 14, an Indian soldier intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao for reconnaissance.

6. At about 1430 hours on July 25, three Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao for reconnaissance.

7. At about 1510 hours on July 30, four Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao for reconnaissance.

8. At about 1530 hours on July 30, another two Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao for reconnaissance.

9. At about 1100 hours on September 3, an Indian soldier intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao for reconnaissance.

10. At about 1400 hours on September 27, three Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao for reconnaissance.

11. At about 1610 hours on September 30, an Indian soldier intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao for reconnaissance.
12. At about 1200 hours on November 4, five Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpoint at Hsiao and conducted reconnaissance there for nearly one hour.

13. At about 1600 hours on November 6, five Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Tsayul for reconnaissance.

14. At about 0950 hours on November 25, 11 Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpoint at Hsiao and conducted reconnaissance there for as long as six and a half hours.

15. At about 1000 hours on December 20, five Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpoint at Hsiao and conducted reconnaissance there for nearly four and a half hours.

IV. Intrusions into Tibet, China, along the China-Sikkim boundary:

1. At about 1130 hours and 1640 hours on May 3, four Indian soldiers in two batches intruded into Chinese territory from across Natu La for reconnaissance. On the same day, another group of 16 Indian soldiers intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La and repaired the wire entanglements left by Indian troops when they withdrew from the place and fled in September 1965.

2. At about 1130 hours on May 10, five Indian soldiers intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La and continued to repair the wire entanglements left by Indian troops when they withdrew and fled.

3. At about 0130 hours on May 15, an Indian soldier, under cover of darkness, intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La and threw tin cans at the Chinese sentry in provocation.

4. At about 1020 hours on June 3, two Indian soldiers intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La for reconnaissance.

5. At about 1315 hours on June 6, 22 Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory from across Tagi La for reconnaissance.

6. At about 1030 hours on June 8, more than 20 Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory and conducted reconnaissance for about an hour after crossing the boundary in the vicinity of Tagi La and made threats against a Chinese herdsman who was grazing cattle there.

7. At about 1300 hours on June 12, an Indian soldier intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La for reconnaissance.
8. At about 1400 hours on June 13, three Indian soldiers intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La and continued to repair the wire entanglements left by Indian troops when they withdrew and fled in 1965.

9. At about 2100 hours on July 20, eleven Indian soldiers intruded into Dongnan grassland within Chinese territory, where they burnt down a cattle-shed of Chinese herdsmen.

10. At about 1000 hours on July 29, three Indian soldiers crossed Toka La and intruded into Dongnan grassland for reconnoitring activities.

11. At about 1330 hours on August 7, five Indian soldiers crossed Toka La and intruded into Dongnan grassland where they conducted reconnaissance and harassment for three hours.

12. At about 1100 hours on August 24, more than ten Indian soldiers intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La and operated in the vicinity of the wire entanglements left over by the Indian side.

13. At about 2130 hours on September 6, six Indian soldiers intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La for reconnaissance.

14. At about 1200 hours on September 17, two Indian soldiers intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La for reconnaissance.

15. At about 1100 hours on October 26, seventeen Indian soldiers crossed Kailu La and intruded into Chinese territory for reconnaissance.

16. At about 1630 hours on October 29, 19 Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory in the vicinity of Kailu La and conducted reconnoitring activities there for about an hour.

17. At about 1150 hours on November 3, four Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory from across Natu La in an attempt to carry out sabotaging activities. They were immediately challenged by sentries of the Chinese frontier guards and ordered to leave Chinese territory. But they hung on there until 1210 hours when they were compelled to turn back.

18. At about 1140 hours on December 25, two Indian soldiers intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La for reconnaissance.

In addition to the above-mentioned intrusions, Indian troops at Natu La opened fire in provocation on Chinese sentries at 0650 hours on June 6 and again at 1755 hours on August 21.
ANNEX II

Intrusions into China's Airspace by Indian Aircraft during 1966

I. Intrusions into the airspace over Sinkiang and Tibet, China, east and north of the 1959 line of actual control in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. At 1320 hours on January 1, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Tienwentian and its vicinity in Sinkiang.

2. At 1235 hours on January 2, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Shenhsienwan and its vicinity in Sinkiang.

3. At 1510 hours on January 6, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Nyagzu in Tibet.

4. At 1205 hours on January 9, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Nyagzu in Tibet.

5. At 1015 hours on February 17, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of Yula and Sirijap in Tibet.

6. At 1012 hours on March 10, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs and Panlung in Sinkiang for reconnaissance. At 1220 hours on the same day, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of Kota Village north of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

7. At 1605 hours on April 12, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet.

8. At 1135 hours on April 25, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang.

9. At 1310 hours on May 2, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet.

10. At 0645 hours on June 3, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Tienwentiian in Sinkiang.
11. At 1120 hours on June 10, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang.

12. At 1048 hours on June 17, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet.

13. At 1139 hours on August 23, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang.

14. At 1150 hours on August 26, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and circled over there for reconnaissance.

15. At 1154 hours on September 13, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and circled over there for reconnaissance.

16. At 1211 hours on September 23, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Tienwentian in Sinkiang and circled over there for reconnaissance.

17. At 1146 hours on September 24, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and circled over there for reconnaissance.

18. At 1220 hours on October 17, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over Demchok and its vicinity in Tibet.

19. At 1150 hours on October 18, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Kongka Pass in Tibet.

20. At 1509 hours on October 19, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang.

21. At 1438 hours on October 24, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang, and circled over there for reconnaissance.

22. At 1118 hours on October 29, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace over the civilian checkpost at Spanggur and its vicinity in Tibet.

23. At 1212 hours on October 30, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet.

24. At 1153 hours on November 7, an Indian aircraft intruded into China’s airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Nyagzu in Tibet.
25. At 1020 hours on December 3, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Spanggur in Tibet.

26. At 1355 hours on December 8, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpoint at Tienwentedian and its vicinity in Sinkiang and circled over there for reconnaissance.

27. At 1228 hours on December 11, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Nyagzu in Tibet.

II. Intrusions into the airspace over Tibet, China, north of the 1959 line of actual control in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border:

At 1430 hours on December 30, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Pulan and its vicinity.

III. Intrusions into the airspace over Tibet, China, north of the 1959 line of actual control in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. At 0925 hours on January 9, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpoints at Sama and Tsayul and other places, and circled over there for reconnaissance.

2. At 1455 hours on January 22, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpoint at Budzong and its vicinity.

3. At 1235 hours on January 28, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpoint at Laiguo Bridge and its vicinity.

4. At 1035 hours on January 29, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpoints at Dergong and Titung, and over Meto and other places.

5. At 1305 hours on January 29, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Budzong.

6. At 1400 hours on January 30, two Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Janwu and the civilian checkpoint at Budzong and over other places, and repeatedly circled over there for reconnaissance. They did not leave until 1445 hours.

7. At 1311 hours and 1319 hours on January 31, Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Molo and other places in two batches and three sorties.

8. At 1318 hours on January 31, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpoint at Titung and over Ketang and other places.
9. On February 3, two Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Tsayul and its vicinity, one at 1300 hours and the other at 1340 hours.

10. At 1130 hours on February 4, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Tsayul and over Chikung and other places.

11. At 1238 hours on February 4, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkposts at Tsayul and Hsiachiang and other places.

12. At 1322 hours on February 6, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Tsayul.

13. At 1230 hours on February 7, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkposts at Gongna and Lung and over Milin and other places.

14. At 1100 hours on March 7, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao.

15. At 1121 hours on September 17, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Sama and circled over there for reconnaissance.

16. At 0735 hours on November 4, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Tsamu and its vicinity.

17. At 1130 hours on November 12, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Kata and its vicinity.

18. At 1200 hours on November 21, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Sama and its vicinity.

IV. Intrusions into the airspace over Tibet, China, along the China-Sikkim boundary:

1. At 2320 hours on January 10, an Indian aircraft flying across Jelep La intruded into China's airspace over Chumbitan, Yatung and other places.

2. At 1020 hours on April 20, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in Kungyangmi La and Tagi La areas.

3. At 1100 hours on June 8, an Indian aircraft flying across Kungyangmi La intruded into China's airspace, circled over Chago La for reconnaissance and then left Chinese territory through Tagi La.

4. At 1250 hours on June 9, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in Latuo La, Kailu La and Tagi La areas for reconnaissance.
5. At 0930 hours on June 16, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in Tagi La and Kailu La areas and circled over there for reconnaissance.

6. At 1350 hours on June 18, an Indian aircraft flying across Jelep La intruded into China's airspace circled in Natu La and Ya La areas for reconnaissance, and then turned back to Jelep La where it left Chinese territory.

7. At 1355 hours on June 18, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace from across Cho La.

8. At 0933 hours on June 21, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in Natu La and Jelep La areas.

9. At 0920 hours on June 23, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in Jelep La, Ringchhingong, Natu La and Tungchu La areas and other places for reconnaissance.

10. At 1245 hours on June 24, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace from across Kailu La.

11. At 0943 hours on June 25, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in Jelep La and Tungchu La areas.

12. At 0945 hours on September 3, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace from across Jelep La and continued to fly over the vicinity of Tungchu La and over Dongnan grassland, Ringchhingong and other places.

13. At 0910 hours on October 13, two Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the Kangpu area in Yatung.

14. At 1455 hours on October 13, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of Tagi La.

15. At 0900 hours on October 14, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the Kangpu area in Yatung.

16. At 1515 hours on October 14, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace from across Kailu La and left through Tagi La after carrying out reconnoitring activities.

17. On December 5, two Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace from across Natu La, one at 1015 hours and the other at 1025 hours.

18. At 1427 hours on December 8, an Indian aircraft flying across Tungchu La intruded into China's airspace and circled over Ringchhingong, Yatung and other places for reconnaissance.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the
Embassy of India in China, 11 April, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 145.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states
the following:—

1. Indian troops recently constructed seven stone piles, each over
a metre high, on the Chinese side of Kailu La on the China-Sikkim
boundary and demolished a Mani pile which was at Kailu La and
regarded as a customary boundary mark by the border inhabitants
of both countries. These seven stone piles surreptitiously erected
by the Indian troops lead from the west to the east and then turn
northwards, spreading out over a total length of more than two
thousand metres and going well beyond the original Mani pile into
Chinese territory. It is perfectly clear that this action of the Indian
troops is a vain attempt to unilaterally alter the China-Sikkim boun-
dary and thereby to create new tension along the border and sabotage
the friendship between China and Sikkim. The Chinese
Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against
this act of aggression and provocation by the Indian troops.

2. The boundary between China and Sikkim has long been formal-
ly delimited, and there is neither any discrepancy between the maps
nor any disputes in practice. This has been recognised by the Indian
Government as well. However, acting contrary to what it has said,
the Indian Government has continually made use of Sikkim territory
to commit acts of aggression against China, even to the extent of
sending troops across the China-Sikkim boundary to construct large
numbers of military structures for aggression on Chinese territory. In
September 1965, driven beyond the limits of forbearance, the
Chinese Government ordered the Indian side to dismantle these
military structures within a set time limit. Knowing that they were
in the wrong, the Indian troops hurriedly levelled part of the military
structures for aggression and scampered away. But now, only a year
and a half later, the Indian Government is reverting to its former
practice. It is conducting fresh aggression and provocation against
China by resorting to a new manoeuvre of surreptitiously erecting
boundary marks across the boundary on Chinese territory. What
is the purpose of this?

3. It is clear to the people throughout the world that the Indian
Government is finding it harder and harder to get along. It urgently
needs to divert the attention of the Indian people and to beg for alms
from U.S. imperialism and Soviet modern revisionism by further hir-
ing itself out to them. And now out of their fear and hatred of the
great Chinese proletarian cultural revolution, U.S. imperialism and
Soviet modern revisionism are plotting to stir up a new anti-Chinese
wave in the world. It is under these circumstances that the newly
formed Indian Congress Government raised an anti-Chinese hue and
cry as soon as it assumed office. On the second day after he took office,
Chagla, the Minister for External Affairs of the new Government, wantonly attacked China, saying that China "maintains" a "bellicose and threatening posture" towards India, and slanderously charged that China occupied "Indian territory". The Indian President Radhakrishnan also came out in slanderously asserting that China's "aggressive acts and postures" are "the major obstacles" to an improvement of the relations between the two countries. Since then the Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and the Indian Minister of Defence Swaran Singh have repeatedly vilified China. When these facts are viewed together, is it not clear what is the purpose of the recent provocative activities conducted by the Indian troops along the China-Sikkim border?

The Chinese Government must tell the Indian Government in all seriousness: You must draw lessons from your past experience, stop provocative activities along the China-Sikkim border and cease all your calumnies against China, otherwise you are bound to eat the bitter fruits of your own making.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China, 7 September, 1967

No. C/21/67

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this Note to the Embassy of People's Republic of China, New Delhi in order to bring to the attention of the Chinese Government the repeated intrusions committed by Chinese troops and personnel since the middle of May, 1967.

A few of the more flagrant examples of such intrusions are given below:

(i) On May 18th at about 1230 hours 6 persons dressed in black clothes intruded upto 300 yards into Sikkim in the area of Kongrala and withdrew on seeing the Indian patrol.

(ii) On June 9, at 2100 hours some 18 to 20 Chinese intruded into Indian territory about 1½ miles East South-east of Chushul in the Western Sector, and on being challenged, ran away.

(iii) Chinese troops and personnel are also persisting in regular intrusions into Indian territory in the vicinity of the Indian Check Post at Track Junction in North Ladakh.
On June 19, at about 1400 hours, 50 Chinese intruded up to points varying from 2 to 4 miles west of the so-called “line of actual control” in the Western Sector. One Chinese soldier advanced even further to a point E7759 N3519, one mile north of the Indian Check Post at Track Junction in the Daulat Beg Oldi area. On the same day at 1345 hours a group of 50 armed Chinese troops intruded into the area about 3 miles east of the same post. The intruders halted and took positions when they were approximately one mile east of the Indian Post and stayed there till 1600 hours.

(iv) On June 20, five armed Chinese soldiers with 3 ponies intruded into an area approximately 4 miles north of Chushul in the Western Sector. They took up firing positions and aimed at Indian vehicles in the area.

(v) On July 4, about 30 Chinese soldiers in khaki uniform carrying rifles intruded to a depth of about 100 yards south of the international border near Longju in the Eastern Sector. They remained in the area from 0700 to 1300 hours.

It should be noted that many of these intrusions represent fresh encroachments into Indian territory beyond the area which is under illegal occupation of Chinese troops as a result of massive aggression on Indian territory. The Government of India lodge a strong protest against these continued intrusions and deliberate acts of provocation and demand that the Chinese Government should take immediate steps to put a stop to such aggressive and illegal activities.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 10 September, 1967

No. (67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 570.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China addresses the present Note to the Indian Embassy in China and states the following:

Since the end of July the Indian troops have intruded many times into Chinese territory for reconnaissance at Natu La, Cho La and Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary; they planted iron rods, installed barbed-wire entanglements and even opened fire for provocation and abused Chinese border defence personnel. What is particularly serious is that at 0800 hours on September 7, over sixty Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory across NATU LA to install barbed-wire entanglements and in disregard of the repeated warnings of the Chinese border defence troops even wounded
two Chinese frontier guards with bayonets. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against such frantic provocation by the Indian troops.

It must be pointed out that these unbridled intrusions by the Indian troops are a component part of the world-wide anti-Chinese chorus currently struck up by U.S. imperialism and Soviet Revisionism in league with the Reactionaries of various countries. The Indian reactionaries have repeatedly appeared on the stage and given very energetic performances in this anti-Chinese chorus. However, they have employed a counter-revolutionary dual tactics by recently chanting the tune that they desire a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian dispute through negotiations and assuming a gesture of relaxation so as to deceive the Indian people and world opinion. Such clumsy tactics of the Indian reactionaries is shop-worn stuff. In trying to deceive people with the same stuff, it only reveals that they are at the end of their resources.

The Chinese peoples great leader Chairman Mao teaches us: "Make trouble, fail make trouble again, fail again.........till their doom: that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people's cause, and they will never go against this logic." The Indian reactionaries will never go against this logic either. The Chinese Government sternly warns the Indian Government: the Chinese Border Defence Troops are closely watching the development of the situation along the China-Sikkim boundary. Should the Indian troops continue to make provocative intrusions, the Indian Government must be held responsible for all the grave consequences.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China, 11 September, 1967

No. C/22/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this Note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in order to bring the following facts to the attention of the Chinese Government:

Since the first week of August, strong detachments of Chinese troops have repeatedly intruded into Sikkim territory across the international border between Sikkim and Tibet and have carried out a series of increasingly serious provocations culminating in an armed attack, with light weapons and heavy artillery on Indian troops in areas well within Sikkim territory.

In the Nathu La area, Chinese armed personnel have begun concentrating in large numbers on the border and crossing it. On August 17, Chinese troops constructed trenches which extended well into the Sikkim side of the water-shed that marks the international border. When warned by Indian defence personnel, 60 Chinese troops appeared on the border and adopted threatening postures. Later, on August 20 a party of 120 Chinese troops armed with light
machine guns and hand grenades took up positions against Indian troops who were engaged in laying wires well within Sikkim territory. This series of provocations has become particularly grave since September 6; on the morning of the September 6, an Indian patrol which was proceeding south of Nathu La on the Sikkim side of the international border was challenged by a group of armed Chinese soldiers, of whom 20 intruded across the border. On 7th September, when to prevent any further intrusions, Indian defence personnel began constructing a fence in this area well within Sikkim territory, a group of 60 Chinese soldiers armed with rifles intruded across the border and engaged in a scuffle with them. On 9th September, at 0940 hours, two Chinese military personnel intruded into Sikkim territory and stayed there for 20 minutes. Chinese troops also engaged in provocative broadcasts from loudspeakers located at Nathu La on the same day. On September 10, armed Chinese soldiers intruded on three separate occasions into Sikkim territory.

On September 11, at 0540 hours, Chinese soldiers suddenly opened fire with small arms and mortar on Indian defensive posts across the border. This firing continued and was augmented by heavy artillery fire from the direction of Chumbithang.

Similar provocations have been carried out by Chinese military personnel at Cho La. As early as July 29, a Chinese patrol intruded into Sikkim territory at an Indian defence post and threatened the sentry. Since then, Chinese troops have concentrated in increasingly large numbers on the Pass.

According to the latest information received by the Government of India, firing with heavy artillery across Nathu La by Chinese troops still continues and Indian defence forces have been compelled to take defensive action on the Sikkim side of the border.

The Chinese Government is well aware that the Sikkim-Tibet border is a well defined international border and has been recognized as such by China. By launching an armed attack the Chinese Government is seeking to build up tension at a point on the border which has never been in dispute. In order to reduce tension and prevent the situation assuming a very serious aspect, the Government of India suggest that both sides cease fire immediately and the two Sector Commanders of the respective forces meet at Nathu La.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 11 September, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 572.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states the following:

At 0740 hours on the morning of September 11, 1967, over sixty Indian aggressor troops intruded into Chinese territory by crossing the China-Sikkim boundary at Natu La. Under the cover of fierce
artillery fire, the Indian troops launched an attack on the Chinese frontier guards. Thereupon, they opened artillery fire on the Chinese frontier guards at Jelep La. Up till noon, the Indian aggressor troops already killed or wounded 25 Chinese frontier guards. They also destroyed Chinese civilian houses and temples. The attack of the Indian aggressor troops on Chinese frontier guards is still continuing now. The Chinese Government and people express their utmost indignation at this most serious criminal armed aggression solely engineered by the reactionary Indian government. The Chinese Government hereby lodges the most urgent and most serious protest with the Indian government.

The reactionary Indian government has never ceased its aggression and provocation against China on the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim boundary ever since its crushing defeat in its massive armed attack on China in 1962. Especially of late, under the insidious instigation of U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism, the Indian reactionaries have further intensified their military provocations against China and even blatantly launched armed attacks on the Chinese frontier guards. This is really the height of frenzy.

The Chinese Government hereby serves a serious warning on the reactionary Indian government: Do not misjudge the situation and repeat your mistake of 1962. For the defence of the sacred territory of their motherland, the great Chinese people and the Chinese People's Liberation Army will certainly deal crushing blows at any enemy that dares to invade us. The Indian government must immediately rein in before the precipice and stop all its aggression, provocation and military adventure against China. Otherwise, the Indian government must be held fully responsible for all the grave consequences arising therefrom.

The Chinese Government reserves the right to raise further demands.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 12 September, 1967


The Ministry of External Affairs in continuation of their Note No. C/22/67 of September 11, 1967 address this Note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and wish to draw the attention of the Chinese Government to the continuing tense situation on the Sikkim-Tibet border.

The Ministry of External Affairs had suggested in their Note of September 11, 1967 that both sides cease fire immediately. But the firing has continued. To stop this conflict at Nathu La and to reduce the tension the Government of India propose that:

(i) both sides cease fire with effect from 0530 hours I.S.T. on September 13, 1967 and

(ii) the Sector Commanders of both sides meet immediately thereafter at Nathu La.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 3 October, 1967


The Ministry of External Affairs draws the attention of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China to the unwarranted and brutal attack unleashed on Indian troops who were guarding Sikkim-Tibet border at Cho La on October 1, 1967.

Following a scuffle which was started by Chinese soldiers on a baseless claim to a part on the Sikkim side of the border in that area, the Chinese troops suddenly opened fire at 0930 hours IST October 1, 1967 on Indian defensive positions at Cho La with small arms, medium machine guns, recoilless guns and mortars. The surprise attack immediately caused casualties among Indian defence personnel. Consequently Indian troops were compelled to return fire in self defence against this unwarranted attack.

By launching another attack shortly after a similar one which was unleashed by Chinese troops at Nathu La on the 11th of September, the Chinese Government is seeking to build up tension at a border which has never been in dispute. The Government of India are resolved to repel any aggression against the frontiers, the guarding of which is the responsibility of the Indian Government. The Chinese Government are hereby asked to stop all provocative military adventures on the Tibet-Sikkim border.

The Government of India views the repeated provocations by the Chinese troops on the Tibet-Sikkim border with the utmost concern. The Chinese Government are well aware that the Tibet-Sikkim border is a well-defined international boundary and has been recognised as such by the People's Republic of China. Consequently, there is no justification for the Chinese troops to create such incidents out of baseless claims to areas on the Sikkimese side of the border and the Indian Government demands that Chinese troops are immediately ordered to refrain from indulging in such aggressive and provocative acts; otherwise, the Chinese Government will be responsible for all the consequences that may arise therefrom.

In order to reduce the tension, the Government of India had in connection with the Nathu La incident suggested a meeting of the sector commanders of the respective forces. But this constructive suggestion has evoked no response from the Chinese Government.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 23 October, 1967


The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and in reply to the
Chinese Government's note of January 16, 1967 states the following:—

In their note the Chinese Government have as usual made totally false and baseless allegations about so-called “intrusions into Chinese territory” by Indian personnel during 1966. The Government of India have, over the past three years, had occasion to be presented with similar catalogues of fabrications purporting to cover alleged Indian intrusions into so-called Chinese territory over an extended period; these charges were thoroughly and convincingly refuted by the Government of India in their various replies. That even after these repeated exposures of their dishonest and false allegations, the Chinese Government persist in this practice merely serves to underline the hollowness of the Chinese allegations.

Even a casual glance at the list of the alleged intrusions reveals at once that these allegations are a series of vague and repetitive charges unsubstantiated in many cases by details of time and place. Despite the considerable interval of time that has elapsed, during which the Chinese Government did not take note of these alleged series of incidents, the Government of India have carefully examined the allegations and found them to be wholly false and baseless.

The Chinese note under reply claims that there were 73 cases of intrusion across the border and the so-called “line of actual control” by Indian personnel and 71 intrusions by Indian aircraft. Of this total of 144 allegations, 111 are merely repetition of charges made on previous occasions and which are now, as then, completely fictitious. The remaining 33 allegations are also equally false. In particular, the Chinese note has listed 36 allegations of intrusions by Indian personnel across the so-called “line of actual control” in the Western sector (Annexure I Section I of the Chinese note). Even though all the places mentioned in this list are part of Indian territory now under illegal occupation by Chinese troops as a result of their aggression in 1962, the Government of India, following their acceptance of the Colombo Proposals, have shown great forbearance and have not sent their personnel into these areas. The Chinese Government, on the contrary, have systematically repudiated their own commitment and have unscrupulously encroached into the 20 km demilitarized zone. This she has done in utter disregard of the Colombo Proposals. It may be pointed out that in the case of Demchok (Annexure I, Section I, items 32 and 33), the place referred to is actually in undisputed Indian territory and is west of even the so-called “line of actual control” and has been shown accordingly even in Chinese maps.

The Chinese Government’s allegations of intrusions by Indian personnel on the Bhutan-Tibet boundary are totally absurd fabrications. Obviously, these allegations are made by the Chinese Government to cover their own intrusions into Bhutan which have already been revealed by the Indian Government in their note of the 30th September, 1966. The Chinese Government have sought to add length to their list of fabrications by alleging series of so-called air
“intrusions”. The Government of India consider all the charges made in the Chinese note under reply as absurd and only a figment of Chinese propaganda and consequently reject them categorically.

It is interesting to observe that this long list of allegations of so-called intrusions has been levelled at a time when Chinese Government have stepped up their hostile and malicious propaganda against the people and Government of India. It should be apparent to the Chinese Government by now that their propaganda artifices carry no conviction with anyone and only serve the Chinese purpose of keeping up tensions with various nations. Being concerned only with propaganda, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs has, as usual, in its note not confined itself to facts but referred to the “difficult position both at home and abroad” of the Indian Government. The internal situation of China as well as the standing of the Chinese Government among the nations of the world, more particularly its neighbours, require no comment.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, 20 February, 1968

No. C/4/68.

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to Note No. Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 145, dated the 11th April, 1967, of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, categorically rejects the allegation that the Indian troops had constructed stone-piles on the Tibetan side of the Tibet-Sikkim boundary at Kongra La, referred to in the note under reply as Kailu La. The further charge that Indian troops had demolished a Mani-pile, which was at Kongra La, is equally untrue.

2. In the note under reply the Chinese Government have stated “the boundary between China and Sikkim has long been formally delimited and there is neither any discrepancy between the maps nor any disputes in practice”. The Government of India have also pointed out to the Chinese Government on numerous occasions that the China-Sikkim boundary, which has been formally delimited by treaty and is clearly distinguishable by well marked natural features, has never been crossed by Indian troops. Hence the accusation that Indian troops attempted to unilaterally alter the China-Sikkim boundary is palpably false. The further allegation that Indian troops had surreptitiously erected stone-piles spreading out over a total length of more than 2,000 metres is to say the least absurd.

3. The Chinese note under reply goes on to refer to the events of September, 1965. The Chinese Government's attention is drawn to the Government of India's note dated 1st October, 1965, in which the fictitious charges made then by the Chinese Government were fully refuted. It is extraordinary that the Chinese Government have again sought to level wholly imaginary charges.
4. The note under reply goes on to refer to matters totally unrelated to the subject under issue merely in order to slander the Government of India, Indian leaders and other foreign Governments friendly to India. The Ministry of External Affairs sees no relevance in the polemical exercise contained in the latter half of the Chinese note. It would appear that the Chinese Government, following the pattern familiar to them, have invented baseless charges only in order to indulge in hollow propaganda.

5. The Ministry of External Affairs emphatically rejects the protest note of the Chinese Government.
II. TERRITORIAL AIR SPACE

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 July, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 393.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states the following:—

According to reports from Chinese frontier guards, Indian military aircraft in sixteen sorties intruded into the airspace over vast areas in China's Sinkiang and Tibet for wanton provocation from July 12 to 17, 1967. The details are as follows:—

(1) On July 12 at 1450 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the area of the Pangong Lake and the Spanggur Lake in Tibet and carried out reconnaissance and provocation over China's civilian checkpost at Spanggur and then flew east to Rudok and Shanho for harassment, penetrating a depth of about one hundred kilometres inside China.

(2) On July 12 at 1500 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the Chip Chap River Valley in Sinkiang and carried out reconnaissance over China's civilian checkpost at Tienwentian and then flew east to Chipchap La for further activities.

(3) On July 12 at 1512 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the area of Howeitan in Sinkiang and then flew to the area north of the Galwan River for reconnaissance and harassment.

(4) On July 12 at 1515 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the area of the Pangong Lake in Tibet.

(5) On July 12 at 1525 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs, Kota Village and Panlung in China, repeatedly circled over these places for prolonged reconnaissance and harassment and did not leave China's airspace until 1550 hours.

(6) On July 12 at 1605 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace from Kongka Pass and then flew east to the Lanak La area for reconnaissance and harassment, penetrating a depth of about 60 kilometres inside China.

(7) On July 12 at 1625 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the area south of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet and circled over the area for reconnaissance.
(8) On July 13 at 1545 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Tashigong and Gargunsa in Tibet and circled over these places for reconnaissance and provocation, penetrating a depth of about 80 kilometres inside China.

(9) On July 13 at 1630 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Sankang and the vast area to its northeast in Tibet and circled over there for reconnaissance.

(10) On July 13 at 1710 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the Poling and Toling area in Tibet and circled over the area for reconnaissance, penetrating a depth of about 90 kilometres inside China.

(11) On July 15 at 1235 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the Chip Chap River Valley in Sinkiang and repeatedly circled over China's civilian checkpost at Tienwentian for provocation.

(12) On July 15 at 1300 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Howeitan in Sinkiang and the area to its east for reconnaissance.

(13) On July 15 at 1315 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the area of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet for reconnaissance and provocation.

(14) On July 15 at 1330 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Sankang in Tibet and the area to its northeast for activities.

(15) On July 15 at 1355 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the area of Poling and Toling in Tibet and repeatedly circled over China's civilian checkpost in Poling for harassment.

(16) On July 17 at 1600 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the Chip Chap River Valley and Dapsang Terrace in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government against the above grave incidents in which Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace.

It must be pointed out that the Indian troops have never stopped their intrusion and provocation on the Sino-Indian and China-Sikkim borders since the beginning of this year. And now the Indian Government has become even more rampant in dispatching its planes to intrude into China's airspace sixteen times in succession within a few days and carried out military provocations on the entire middle and western sectors of the Sino-Indian border, deliberately creating tension on the borders. This is by no means accidental. It is another anti-Chinese incident engineered by the Indian Government in serving as an anti-Chinese pawn of U.S. imperialism and Soviet modern revisionism after its fascist atrocities of assaulting the Chinese Embassy in India and beating and wounding Chinese diplomatic personnel. This is another grave provocation against the
Chinese people and Government. The Chinese Government hereby warns the Indian Government in all seriousness; the sacred territory and airspace of the People's Republic of China brook no violation. In carrying out grave provocations in compliance with the will of U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism, the Indian Government will definitely meet with crushing blows by our people and the People's Liberation Army defending our frontier. The more frenziedly the Indian Government opposes China, the sooner it will meet its own doom. The Indian Government must immediately stop such military provocations. If the Indian Government persists in its perverse course, it must be held responsible for all the consequences arising therefrom.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 29 February, 1968

No. C/T/68.

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to note No. (67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 393 dated 19th July, 1967 given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to the Indian Embassy in Peking, states as follows:

After necessary investigation into the 16 allegations that Indian aircraft had crossed the so-called "line of actual control" in the Western sector and the India-China international border, the Ministry of External Affairs has come to the conclusion that these are nothing but fabrications concocted by the Chinese Foreign Ministry to suit their ulterior motives against India. Indian aircraft have, at no stage, crossed the India-China international border or the so-called "line of actual control" in the Western sector. It must be pointed out that even though India does not recognise the so-called "line of actual control" in the Western sector created by China through military aggression, out of self-restraint and out of a desire for a peaceful settlement of the India-China border question, Indian troops and Indian aircraft have at no stage crossed to the east of this line.

In spite of the fact that this position of the Government of India is well-known to the Chinese Government, the Chinese Foreign Office periodically indulges in making baseless allegations such as those contained in the note under reply while adding polemics to those allegations only in order to cover up the aggressive attitudes of the Chinese Government towards India.

Matters relating to Indian Government representatives, Indian nationals and their institutions in China and Chinese Government representatives, Chinese nationals and their institutions in India

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 25 December, 1965

The Chinese Embassy has learnt that of late Tang Shao-fang, the mother, and Tseng Tsai-tieh, the daughter, Chinese nationals in Calcutta, were unjustifiably ordered to leave India within a short period. This is another unlawful act of persecution of the peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals by the Indian Government, which once again proves that the Indian Government is deliberately worsening the relations between China and India. The Embassy hereby lodges a protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs against this and demands that the Indian Government immediately stop all forms of persecution of the Chinese nationals.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 May, 1967


2. The Chinese Embassy have tried to distort facts about the “Quit India” orders served on two Chinese nationals named Tang Shao-fang and Tseng Taai-tieh. It claimed that this is “another unlawful act of persecution” and that it “proves that the Indian Government is deliberately worsening the relations between India and China”. These are baseless allegations. The two individuals were found to be carrying out anti-Indian activities and were subsequently ordered to leave India. Their eviction is entirely justified and within the sovereign competence of India.

3. The Chinese Embassy’s protest is, therefore, categorically rejected.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 24 May, 1967

No. M/520/67

The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and states the following:

The Embassy has made repeated representations to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs on the unwarranted holding-up and con-
fiscation of the Embassy’s mails by the Indian authorities. However, these outrageous acts have not only gone unabated, but become intensified. For instance, of all the issues of the People’s Daily mailed daily from Peking to the Embassy by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the months of July and August, 1966, the Embassy has up to now received only five issues. The newspapers and other mails air-mailed from Hongkong for Mr. Chen Chao-yuan, Charge d’Affaires a.i. of the Embassy, have also been unwarrantedly held up and confiscated. Very few of them were received every month and these had been delayed for as long as three or four months. Some of the books and magazines mailed from Peking for the diplomatic officials of the Embassy have been held up even for more than a year. To cover up its crimes, the Indian side sometimes deliberately scrapped off the dates postmarked in Peking on the covers of the Embassy’s mails or did not put the postmark of the Indian post office. These evil acts have fully exposed the guilty conscience of the Indian side. The Embassy once again lodges a strong protest with the Ministry of External Affairs against the above-mentioned acts which outrageously violate international practice and seriously impede the normal functioning of the Embassy and the diplomatic personnel of the Embassy, and demands that the Indian Government immediately stop this unreasonable practice, ensure against recurrence of similar incidents in the future and immediately send to the Embassy all the mails which have still been unwarrantedly held up and forcibly confiscated.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 25 May, 1967


The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and states the following in regard to its demand for a visit to and release of Mr. Huang Kui-ting, a detained innocent Chinese national:

Mr. Huang Kui-ting, a Chinese national, has lived in India for nearly thirty years and has for a long time had an honest job as a cook. He was unwarrantedly arrested by the Indian Government on the New Year’s Day, 1963, and has been detained since then, experiencing already over four years of inhumane life in jail. His aged wife outside the jail, who has nobody to look after, has suffered a great deal mentally and physically. The Embassy has time and again made requests for the release of Mr. Huang and the visit to him in jail by the Embassy’s officials. However, the Indian Government has all the time resorted to equivocation and evaded clear replies. In his oral reply to Mr. Chou Ping-yi, Third Secretary of the Embassy, on May 5, 1967, Mr. K. K. S. Rana, Under Secretary of the Ministry, went so far as to reject under the pretext of so-called Defence of India Rules the just request of the Embassy for a visit to and release of Mr. Huang Kui-ting, saying absurdly that Mr. Huang
could be escorted to the exit port if the Embassy makes arrangements in advance for his repatriation to China. How unreasonable and ridiculous this is. As is known to all, the so-called Defence of India Rules, and the "national security" often preached by the Indian Government, are all excuses by the Indian Government to persecute willfully the peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals. These fascist acts only further expose the frantically anti-China ugly features of the Indian Government as the pawn of imperialism and modern revisionism. Since Mr. Huang has been unreasonably thrown into jail by the Indian Government, on what grounds should he be expelled from India under escort? The Embassy has the inviolable right to protect the Chinese nationals. The Indian Government has not only willfully deprived the Embassy of this right, but has also asked the Embassy to make arrangements to comply the unreasonable demand made by the Indian Government so that it could escort Mr. Huang to the exit port and may shirk the criminal responsibility for its frenzied persecution of the innocent Chinese nationals. This is indeed arrogance and unreasonableness in its extremity. We would like to tell the Indian Government plainly, you can never succeed in this. While categorically rejecting the wild request of the Indian Government, the Embassy lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned acts which trample underfoot the principles of international relations and illegally deprive the Embassy of its legitimate rights to protect the Chinese nationals, and once again demands that the Indian Government immediately arrange a visit to Mr. Huang in jail by the Embassy’s officials and release him.

It must be pointed out that Mr. Huang Kui-ting is one of the many Chinese nationals who are subjected to cruel persecution by the Indian Government. Today, many innocent Chinese nationals like Mr. Huang are still detained in the concentration camps or jails in India and are leading inhumane life. The great Chinese people can never tolerate this. The Embassy demands that the Indian Government immediately supply the names of the Chinese nationals still detained and release all the victimized Chinese nationals who are imprisoned unnecessarily.

The Embassy demands that the Indian Government speedily give responsible reply to the stern demand by the Embassy.

---

Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 5 June, 1967

The Indian Embassy addresses itself to the Chinese Foreign Office and states the following:

(1) Messrs. K. Raghunath, Second Secretary and P. Vijai, Third Secretary of the Indian Embassy, were proceeding in Mr. K. Raghunath’s car to the Western Hills towards the temple of the Sleeping Buddha at 1300 hours on 4th June. On the way to the temple of the Sleeping Buddha Mr. K. Raghunath stopped the car and took some
photographs inside a ruined temple which was on the left side of the road leading to the Temple of the Sleeping Buddha. While Mr. K. Raghunath was in the process of taking photographs of the ruins of the temple, an unidentified Chinese, accompanied by a few others, approached Mr. K. Raghunath and unwarrantedly accused him of taking photographs of a military installation, which was allegedly situated nearby. Further he unreasonably demanded the inspections of the Identity Cards of the Indian diplomats and what is even more reprehensible, without any authority, refused to return the Identity Cards, while repeating his earlier unfounded allegations that Mr. K. Raghunath was taking photographs of a military installation. Mr. K. Raghunath attempted to reason things out with him by telling him the truth, that he did not take any photographs of any military installations and that he was taking photographs of the ruins of the temple.

(2) After a considerable period of harassment, where the Chinese individuals concerned surrounded the car and tried to forcibly open the door of the car, and attempted to compel Mr. Raghunath to hand over his camera, the two Indian diplomats were forcibly taken to a nearby building. Here after a further period of waiting in the hot sun, they were asked to enter the building, on the arrival of a member of the Security Bureau.

(3) Here Mr. K. Raghunath gave the initial explanation to the responsible official of the Security Bureau, of the facts attending their presence in that area and put forward the reasonable demand that they should be allowed to get in touch with the Charge d'Affaires of the Indian Embassy. This reasonable demand was rejected out of hand and instead the unjustified demand was put forward that Mr. Raghunath should hand over the camera so that the film could be developed! Furthermore, the responsible officials of the Security Department asked the Chinese persons who had met the Indian diplomats at the temple to state their demands.

(4) The justified demands of the Indian officials to contact the Charge d'Affaires of the Indian Embassy were denied under pretexts that it was the Indian officials' own business to make arrangements to get in touch with their Embassy, that telephone lines did not connect from that location to Peking, that the only telephone there, was that of a military installation and could not be used, that they were not aware of the existence of any other telephone nearby etc. etc. Later on they were subjected to the pressure of surrendering the camera and the film with a guarantee that they would be allowed to contact the Embassy after the camera and film were given up. This so-called guarantee consisted in allowing them merely to telephone, but when it became clear that it would be necessary to try on more than one occasion, this was refused.

(5) After various kinds of harassment, which was made worse by the prolonged detention where the two Indian diplomats were not given an opportunity to take their lunch or other refreshments and prolonged interrogation by person after person and repeated threat that the anger of the masses would be turned against them, the two
Indian diplomats were finally allowed to leave the spot only around 9:30 P.M. after a total period of unlawful detention amounting to 8½ hours. Meanwhile, the camera and film were forcibly taken away from Mr. K. Raghunath and thereafter the absurd allegation was made that the processing of the film had shown that Mr. Raghunath had photographed prohibited objects. However, on questioning, they refused to clarify what these prohibited objects alleged to have been photographed were in fact. Further, a statement was prepared by the official of the Public Security Bureau which purported to be a factual record of the events and the threat was made that unless the statement was signed by Mr. Raghunath, he would not be permitted to leave and that he would be entirely responsible for the consequences of refusing to do so. Mr. Raghunath then pointed out that since it was claimed that the statement was a full record, it must include a reference to the period of detention and that it would be signed only after the reasonable demand already made, was met—namely that other responsible members of the Indian Embassy were also present on the scene. However, even these simple and legitimate requests were turned down and even more threats and pressures were brought to bear on them. It must also be pointed out that one of the Indian diplomats, Mr. Vijai who merely accompanied Mr. Raghunath and did not take any photographs, was also neither released from unlawful detention nor permitted to contact the Charge d'Affaires of the Indian Embassy. The two diplomats were permitted to leave the scene at 21:30 hours after detention for 8½ hours.

(6) Immediately on receipt of first information that the two Indian diplomats were under unlawful and unwarranted detention, the First Secretary of the Indian Embassy, Mr. C. V. Ranganathan, made telephonic contact with the Protocol Department of the Chinese Foreign Office and tried to explain the matter. The Protocol Department, however, refused to take the message on the three occasions that were tried but informed him to get directly in touch with the Foreign Security Bureau. He then approached the Foreign Security Bureau and was told that the matter would be handled by the officials and the masses in the locality where the reported incident took place.

(7) Upon receipt of this information Mr. C. V. Ranganathan, First Secretary, accompanied by Mr. M. S. Rao, another First Secretary in the Indian Embassy, went in search of the location which was in Hsiang Shan Nan Lu and reached there approximately at 9 P.M.

(8) Upon arrival, the vehicle of Mr. K. Raghunath was found parked on the road-side on the road leading to the Temple of the Sleeping Buddha in the Western Hills area. When Mr. Ranganathan and Mr. Rao attempted to enter the building next to the parked car in order to find out the reasons for the detention of Mr. K. Raghunath and Mr. P. Vijai they were informed that it was a restricted area where foreigners were not permitted to enter. A few representatives of the masses came forward and carried on discussions with Mr. C. V. Ranganathan. Mr. Ranganathan pointed out that as a responsible official from the Indian Embassy he would like to discuss the matter with the responsible Chinese officials in the locality and attempt to solve the matter. The representatives of the masses first denied the presence of Messrs. K. Raghunath and P. Vijai by saying that the
presence of the car did not mean that the persons in it were around and unreasonably refused to discuss the details of the incident and the manner of releasing Mr. K. Raghunath and Mr. P. Vijai. They categorically refused to allow Mr. C. V. Ranganathan to discuss the matter with the concerned official authorities on the spot. When he approached a person in uniform about further discussions on the matter, the latter pointed out to the representatives of the masses who were earlier discussing the matter with him that they were the responsible officials of the masses. Indeed the so-called representatives of the masses even stepped forward to confirm that they were entirely responsible for the conduct of the matter. They further insisted that unless the Foreign Ministry authorised Mr. Ranganathan through a letter that he was the responsible official to handle the matter further discussions would not be carried on with him. Finally they threateningly demanded of Mr. Ranganathan and Mr. Rao to leave the spot immediately on the pretext that they were in a “restricted” area despite the fact that the two diplomats were on the main highway. The representatives also made allegations that the Indian Embassy had deliberately instigated this incident and made several rude and abusive remarks in this connection.

(9) Failing to obtain any satisfactory reply at the spot where Mr. K. Raghunath and Mr. P. Vijai were detained and being prevented from making liaison either with the above two diplomats of the Indian Embassy or with any other responsible official in charge of the station where they were unlawfully detained, Mr. Ranganathan and Mr. Rao returned to the Indian Embassy. Mr. Ranganathan then tried once again to contact the Protocol Department of the Foreign Office around 10 P.M. He explained the urgency of the matter and requested that a responsible official at the Foreign Office must meet him immediately. Upon being refused an interview, he attempted to explain the matter over the telephone and requested the Foreign Office to intercede and obtain the immediate release of Mr. K. Raghunath and Mr. P. Vijai. However, the Protocol Department refused to take any action in the matter and insisted that the Indian Embassy must wait till the next day before obtaining an interview and abruptly terminated the telephonic conversation.

(10) The Indian Embassy strongly protests against the unwarranted and unlawful detention of the two Indian diplomats for more than a period of 84 hours from 1300 hours to 2130 hours in gross violation of their diplomatic privileges. This illegal action is further compounded by the fact that the responsible Chinese authorities on the spot did not permit the Indian diplomats to establish full contact with the Charge d’Affaires of the Indian Embassy.

(11) The Indian Embassy must further protest that no reasonable opportunity had been provided to either represent the matter personally or through the telephone with the Chinese Foreign Office. When an attempt was made to carry on a conversation with the concerned official of the Protocol Department of the Chinese Foreign Office, no cognizance was taken of the seriousness of the situation and no attempt was made either to obtain full facts or assist in the release of the two Indian diplomats. When failing to get any positive response from the Chinese Foreign Office or the Foreign Affairs
Section of the Public Security, responsible officials of the Indian Embassy proceeded to the scene, they were prevented from making contact with the unlawfully detained Indian diplomats and even from discussing the issue with responsible officials on the scene.

(12) The manner in which the whole incident was handled is, to say the least, most unsatisfactory and is a violation of established international practice and law. The Embassy also strongly protests against the intimidation and crude threats indulged in by the official from the Security Bureau in connection with the signing of a so-called statement. These actions of Security official came before the reasonable request of the Indian diplomats that they should get in touch with the Charge d'Affaires of the Indian Embassy, were met.

(13) The Indian Embassy demands that such unlawful detention of Indian diplomats and prolonged harassment does not recur again in the future.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 12 June, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 285

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses this note to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the espionage activities illegally carried out in Peking by members of the Embassy, states as follows:

On the afternoon of June 4, 1967 Second Secretary K. Raghunath and Third Secretary P. Vijai of the Indian Embassy drove to a place in the Western suburbs of Peking where, in brazen violation of China's laws and decrees known to all, they surreptitiously peered at and took photographs of a prohibited military area in the vicinity. Upon discovering them, soldiers of the Chinese People's Liberation Army guarding the area immediately urged them to desist and asked them to leave. K. Raghunath and P. Vijai, however, paid no heed whatsoever and continued to hang around and take photographs of the prohibited area stealthily. Finding the actions of these two men highly suspicious, the Chinese People's Liberation Army men detained them and sent them to an organ of public security for interrogations. The public security personnel ordered them to hand over the films, but they behaved in a most untoward manner and tried hard to play the fox and they were compelled to hand over the films only after they were severely rebuked by the public security personnel. After the films were developed on the spot, it was discovered that the ten and more photographs taken clearly constituted a complete topographical map of the prohibited area and adjacent areas. Caught red-handed with their spoils complete, K. Raghunath and P. Vijai could no longer deny their guilt and had to admit the facts and sign on the minutes of the interrogations.

Investigation has established that this was not the first time that K. Raghunath illegally engaged in espionage activities on Chinese territory. Since the beginning of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China, thinking that he could make use of this opportunity,
K. Raghunath has been collecting everywhere political and military intelligence about China in brazen violation of its laws and decrees, and his case is of a most serious nature. According to reports accusing K. Raghunath by revolutionary masses of Peking alone, K. Raghunath has sneaked into Chinese Higher Party and Government institutions several times and stolen into the reception centre of the cultural revolution group under the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party. In order to conceal his real identity, K. Raghunath has on more than one occasion most shamelessly pretended to be a staff member from the Embassy or a student of a friendly country like Pakistan or Nepal. In the course of stealing intelligence, K. Raghunath has on many occasions been caught by Red Guards, driven away by revolutionary masses or even taken to organs of public security where he admitted his mistakes. However, instead of reining in, K. Raghunath went still further and stole intelligence about a prohibited military area in flagrant disregard of intervention by the Chinese People's Liberation Army men. The facts have shown that K. Raghunath is an out and out spy under the cloak of a diplomat and has committed grave crimes against the Chinese people.

The Chinese Government is most indignant at such bare faced espionage activities by members of the Indian Embassy in China and lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government. The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs hereby solemnly notifies the Indian Embassy in China: the Chinese Government shall henceforth cease to recognize the diplomatic status of K. Raghunath, and K. Raghunath shall not be allowed to leave China before the Chinese judicial organs take sanctions against his crimes according to law.

Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 13 June, 1967

The Embassy of India in China addresses this note to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, and with reference to their Note Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 285 dated June 12th, 1967, handed over by the Deputy Director of the First Asian Department of the Chinese Foreign Office to the Charge d'Affaires of the Indian Embassy, would like to state as follows:

The Indian Embassy categorically rejects the allegations in the note that Mr. K. Raghunath, Second Secretary in the Embassy of India has ever indulged in espionage activities. The Indian Embassy further refuses to accept the unilateral action of the Chinese authorities in withdrawing the diplomatic status of Mr. Raghunath and will under no circumstance permit Chinese judicial organs to take so-called sanctions against him.

In the Indian Embassy note of June 5th, the full facts of the incident where Messrs Raghunath and Vijai happened to visit an ancient monument in the Western Hills area on Sunday the 4th June to take tourist photographs, their illegal detention for a period of 8½ hours where they were not permitted to make full contact with the Embassy.
and the violation of their diplomatic immunities were already pointed out. After Messrs Raghunath and Vijai were unjustifiably accosted by the masses who took objection to their taking photograph of a displaced lion in an ancient monument, Mr. Raghunath forthwith stopped taking any further photographs and Messrs Raghunath and Vijai attempted to proceed to their car to return to Peking. The statement in the Note of the Foreign Office, dated June 12th that soldiers of the Chinese People's Liberation Army guarding the area immediately "urged them to desist and asked them to leave and that in spite of this, Messrs. Raghunath and Vijai paid no heed whatsoever and continued to hang around and take photographs of the prohibited area stealthily" is a complete fabrication which is now being concocted by the Chinese authorities in an attempt to build up a story, for their own ulterior purposes. The truth of the matter is as pointed out above—namely that Messrs. Raghunath and Vijai, finding that the masses were sensitive to Mr. Raghunath's attempt at photographing a displaced statue of a lion found in the premises of an ancient monument in the Western Hills area, desisted from further photography and proceeded to Mr. Raghunath's car, with the intention of leaving the spot. However, on finding themselves surrounded, and what is worse, on having the identity card of Mr. K. Raghunath, snatched from his hand and unlawfully kept by members of the masses, they were forced to wait until the unlawful authorities of the People's Republic of China could present themselves on the spot and allow Messrs. Raghunath and Vijai to leave the location.

The facts of the incident which took place on the 4th of June have been stated clearly in the Note of the Indian Embassy of June 5th, but the Chinese Foreign Office refused to take these into consideration by returning the note immediately. The Chinese Foreign Office have now in the note under reply fabricated a tissue of lies in an attempt to sound convincing and have cooked up various charges against Indian diplomats who have always respected Chinese laws and whose conduct has been unimpeachable.

In his meeting with the Deputy Director of the First Asian Department of the Chinese Foreign Office on the 12th June, the Charge d'Affaires of the Indian Embassy exposed as complete lies the utterly fantastic contents of the charges made against Mr. K. Raghunath, namely, that he has "engaged in espionage activities on Chinese territory" and that "since the beginning of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China Mr. K. Raghunath has been collecting political and military intelligence about China in brazen violation of its laws and decrees". The Indian Embassy must categorically point out here that neither Mr. Raghunath, nor indeed, any other member of the Indian Embassy, has at any time carried out any espionage, nor violated any of the known and established Chinese laws. The charge that Mr. K. Raghunath has sneaked into Chinese Higher Party and Government institutions several times and stolen into the reception Centre of the Cultural Revolutionary Group under the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, is again, out and out a fabrication. The further ridiculous charge that Mr. Raghunath has on more than one occasion pretended to be a staff member of the Embassy or a student from a friendly country like Pakistan or Nepal is such a malicious lie that it is not even worth refuting.
One may ask the Chinese Government here, if it is considered illegal by the Chinese Government for a Chinese knowing foreign diplomat, to walk in the streets and read posters which are found everywhere in Peking city and also purchase such of those newspapers as are freely sold in the streets and made available to all persons who are willing to buy them? If such activities are illegal, then it is for the Chinese Foreign Office to issue an official notification to this effect which is duly circulated to all Embassies in Peking through the usual channels. The Chinese Press on numerous occasions and also high level Chinese leaders, have, on several occasions, referred to the world-wide significance of the Cultural Revolution and it is natural for anybody stationed in Peking to take an interest in happenings in China. On the other hand, the so-called 'revolutionary legality' where mass judgments are the only criterion for the legitimate activities of a diplomat is a novel circumstance prevailing in no other country except China. It is a well-known fact that the Chinese Government has restricted the rights of all diplomats stationed in Peking. Instances of this are too numerous to record but obviously the Chinese Government have gone to the utmost extent in singling out and victimising Mr. K. Raghunath, an Indian Diplomat.

If the Chinese Government is interested in the facts of the matter, the note of the Indian Embassy of June 5th has given a descriptive account of the circumstances surrounding the visit of Messrs Raghunath and Vijai to the Western Hills area. The innocent nature of their visit was established beyond all measure of doubt. Since Mr. Raghunath is due to leave China shortly, he was interested in taking a few photographs of the scenic spots in Peking. The fact that the Chinese Foreign Office refused to accept the note, and what is worse, have taken eight days to fabricate the tissue of lies of which the Note dated June 12th consists, shows that the Chinese side is intent on making a big issue out of nothing. Against the background of known Chinese hostility to India and the recent scurrilous barrage of propaganda against the Indian Government, it is clear that the Chinese Government are bent on taking further steps to worsen Sino-Indian relations. The Chinese Government alone is aware of their ulterior motives.

While refusing the absurd charges that Mr. K. Raghunath has indulged in espionage activities or that he has committed any crimes against the Chinese people, the Charge d’Affaires of the Indian Embassy offered a reasonable solution which is in keeping with acknowledged diplomatic practice. He suggested that since it is evident that the Chinese authorities have taken an objection to Mr. K. Raghunath, the Indian Embassy would like to expedite his immediate departure from Peking and he requested the Chinese Government to afford all reasonable facilities. Mr. Raghunath’s transfer from Peking was in any case due to take place towards the end of June. In reply to this reasonable request, the Deputy Director of the First Asian Department once again repeated the statement in the Note under reply that the Chinese Government no longer recognise the diplomatic status of Mr. Raghunath and once again put forward the illegal demand that Mr. Raghunath shall not be allowed to leave China before the Chinese judicial organs take sanctions against him in accordance with the law.
The Indian Embassy would like to make it quite clear here that—

(a) Mr. K. Raghunath continues to be the Second Secretary of the Indian Embassy and under international law and practice, he will retain his diplomatic status till the moment he leaves China.

(b) There is no question of Mr. Raghunath being subjected to the Chinese Judicial organs for "sanctions" against non-existent crimes.

(c) Since his transfer from Peking was already decided upon by the Government of India, he is expected to leave China shortly.

The Indian Embassy would like to point out, in all seriousness, to the Chinese Foreign Office that if the Chinese authorities persist in the course of action outlined in the Note of the Chinese Foreign Office and in the meeting between the Deputy Director of the First Asian Department and the Indian Charge d'Affaires, they would be violating all canons of international law while at the same time taking a grave step in further worsening Sino-Indian relations. The serious consequences resulting from this must be solely borne by the Chinese side.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 June, 1967

No. 465 (48)-DIII/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to advise that with immediate effect and until further intimation, no privileged and non-privileged member of the staff of the Embassy or their families is permitted to proceed outside the limits of the New Delhi Municipal Committee and Delhi Municipal Corporation without the prior permission of Ministry of External Affairs (Protocol Division).

The Ministry avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 June, 1967


The Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India that Chen Lu-chih, First Secretary in the Embassy, has been gathering military intelligence and indulging in objectionable activities of a subversive character, prejudicial to the security and national interests of India.
The Government of India takes a grave view of the conduct and activities of Chen Lu-chih and lodges the strongest protest with the Chinese Government against the activities of Chen Lu-chih which amount to a gross abuse of diplomatic privileges. The Ministry of External Affairs hereby notifies the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China that the Government of India shall henceforth cease to recognise the diplomatic status of Chen Lu-chih, First Secretary in the Embassy, and the said Chen Lu-chih shall not be allowed to leave India without the specific authorisation of the Government of India. As a consequence of the non-recognition of the diplomatic status of Chen Lu-chih, he becomes subject to the provisions of the Registration of Foreigners Rules, 1939. He is required to report himself immediately to the Foreigners Regional Registration Officer, Talkatora Barracks, New Delhi, for registration and such further instructions as may be given to him by that officer.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 June, 1967


The Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India that Chen Lu-chih, the former First Secretary has not complied with order to report himself to the Foreigners Regional Registration Officer, Talkatora Barracks, New Delhi, for registration and such further instructions as may be given to him by that officer. It has therefore been decided that he would be deported with immediate effect from the territory of India. The deportation order is enclosed which may be handed over to Chen Lu-chih, who it is understood is staying in the Embassy.

No. 14/61/67-F.VIII

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Ministry of Home Affairs

New Delhi, the 14th June, 1967.

ORDER

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the Foreigners Act, 1946 (31 of 1946), the Central Government is pleased to direct that the foreigner known as Mr. CHEN LU-CHIH—

(i) shall leave India immediately;
(ii) shall depart from India by air; and
(iii) shall not thereafter re-enter India.

By Order and in the Name of President.

Sd./- FATEH SINGH,
Joint Secy. to the Govt. of India.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, [14 June,] 1967

No. C/10/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India that Hsieh Cheng Hao, Third Secretary in the Embassy has been indulging in various subversive activities prejudicial to the security of India.

The Government of India takes a very serious view of the conduct and activities of Hsieh Cheng Hao and hereby declares Hsieh Cheng Hao persona non grata. Hsieh Cheng Hao should leave the territory of India within 72 hours after the receipt of this note.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 15 June, 1967


The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and, with reference to the Ministry's note dated June 13, 1967, states as follows:

The Indian Government has openly imposed unwarranted restrictions on the area of movements of the personnel of the Chinese Embassy. This is entirely a discriminative measure and a provocation against the Embassy in violation of international practice. The Embassy lodges a serious protest against it, refuses to accept it and demands that the Indian Government should immediately withdraw it.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 15 June, 1967

No. M/528/67.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and states as follows:

More than three hundred miscreants made harassments in front of the Chinese Embassy from 9-20 a.m. to 10-30 a.m. on June 14, 1967. They were shouting the extremely reactionary slogans vilifying Chairman Mao Tse-tung, the great leader of the Chinese people, and Premier Chou En-lai and wantonly made slanders against the diplomatic personnel of the Embassy. They put up reactionary placards on the wall of the Embassy's compound, broke the picture show-case of the Embassy with stone and threw stones into the compound of the Embassy.
This incident was obviously connived at and instigated by the Indian Government. The Indian Government has unshirkable responsibilities for this. The Embassy lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government against this serious action taken by the Indian Government for poisoning Sino-Indian relations. The Embassy demands that the Indian Government immediately punish the ring-leaders of the ruffians, compensate the losses of the Embassy and ensure against the recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 15 June, 1967


The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and states as follows:

Since the evening of June 13, 1967, the Indian Government has deployed policemen and plain-clothe agents tightly around the Embassy compound. They have posed threateningly in front of the Embassy's gate and kept a close watch on the Embassy. They stopped at will all diplomats and other staff members of the Embassy who entered and went out of the Embassy, and made interrogations and searches. The staff members of the Embassy going to the telegraph office with telegrams were also stopped. The normal functioning of the Embassy has been seriously hampered.

Diplomats of other countries who came to the Embassy were treated in the same way in complete disregard of the elementary diplomatic decorum.

What is particularly serious is that at 12:50 on June 15, when Mr. Feng Lieh-sun, Attache of the Embassy was carrying out his official duty at the gate of the Embassy, about ten plain-clothe agents and ruffians even surged forward and beat Mr. Feng on the head. At 11:40 on the same day, Mr. Chang Te-liang, Attache of the Embassy while driving out with two staff members of the Embassy, was stopped and encircled by thirty to forty Indian policemen and plain-clothe agents. The policemen drummed his car with lathies and the plain-clothe agents forced open the tail-cabin of the car. When Mr. Chang and his party alighted from the car to protest to the police, the plain-clothe agents threatened to beat him and his colleagues.

The series of frenziedly anti-China incidents as stated above have seriously encroached upon the diplomatic privileges of the Embassy, obstructed the normal functioning of the Embassy and directly threatened the safety of the diplomats and other staff members of the Embassy. This is the extremely serious provocation against the Chinese Embassy. The Indian Government should bear the full responsibility for all these incidents. The Embassy lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and demands that the Indian Government immediately punish the plain-clothe agents and ruffians who beat the Chinese diplomat, withdraw
various outrageous and unreasonable restrictions imposed on the Embassy and ensure against recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

The great leader of the Chinese people Chairman Mao Tse-tung has said: “we will not attack unless we are attacked; if we are attacked, we will certainly counter-attack.” The Chinese people are not to be trifled with. If the Indian Government persists in acting wilfully and arbitrarily, it will surely eat its own bitter fruit.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 16 June, 1967

(67) P:1 Yi Ya Tzu No. 311.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states the following:

According to report from the Chinese Embassy in India, the Indian Government has groundlessly fabricated charges against First Secretary Chen Lu-chih of the Chinese Embassy in India, accusing him of “gathering military intelligence and indulging in subversive activities in India”, declared that it would not recognize his diplomatic status and ordered him to leave India at once. It has also slanderously accused Third Secretary Hsieh Cheng-hao of the Chinese Embassy in India of engaging in so-called various subversive activities, declared him persona non grata and ordered him to leave India within 72 hours. This is a step of serious provocation taken by the Indian Government in deliberately worsening the relations between China and India still further. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this.

It must be pointed out that this unwarranted step on the part of the Indian Government is a mean reprisal against the recent handling of the Raghunath espionage case by the Chinese authorities concerned, the aim being to cover up the unseemly conduct of members of the Indian Embassy in China. But this is futile. There is conclusive evidence for the crimes of espionage committed by K. Raghunath in China, which are undeniable. It is entirely just and necessary for the Chinese authorities concerned to deal with this case. The so-called “crimes” imposed on the Chinese diplomats by the Indian Government are sheer fabrications. Under the just and reasoned questioning by the Charge d’Affaires a.i. of the Chinese Embassy in India, the official of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs was utterly unable to produce any factual evidence and thus landed himself in an awkward predicament. By this practice, the Indian Government only further discredits itself and cannot do the least harm to the reputation of the Chinese diplomatic personnel. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the trumped-up charges levelled by the Indian Government against First Secretary Chen Lu-chih and Third Secretary Hsieh Cheng-hao of the Chinese Embassy in India and its absurd
refusal to recognise the diplomatic status of First Secretary Chen Lu-chih. The Chinese Government has now decided to recall at once First Secretary Chen Lu-chih and Third Secretary Hsieh Cheng-hao. The Indian Government must effectively ensure their safety before their departure from India and must not on any pretext obstruct their normal diplomatic activities, otherwise it has to bear responsibility for all the serious consequences arising therefrom.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 16 June, 1967


The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, and has the honour to state that on the instruction of the Government of the People's Republic of China, Mr. Chen Lu-chih, First Secretary and Mr. Hsieh Cheng-hao, Third Secretary, of the Chinese Embassy, have been recalled back to China. They are going to leave New Delhi for China by air on June 17, 1967. It will be appreciated if the Ministry will render them necessary facilities at the earliest convenience. Their passports are enclosed herewith for action.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 17 June, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 314.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states the following:

According to foreign dispatches, a horde of Indian ruffians broke into the Chinese Embassy in India on June 16, wantonly beat the Embassy personnel, damaged buildings and set fire to vehicles. These ruffians flagrantly hauled down the dignified national flag of the People's Republic of China from the mast and tore it up, brutally beat the Chinese Embassy personnel who were defending the flag, and seriously wounded eight of them. What is even more intolerable is that the Indian ruffians had the impudence of insulting the great leader of the Chinese people Chairman Mao. This is a most serious provocation to the 700 million Chinese people. These grave outrages violating the principles guiding international relations were entirely engineered by the Indian Government and have aroused the greatest indignation among the Chinese people. The Chinese Government hereby serves a serious warning on and lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government.
It must be further pointed out that trampling under-foot even the most elementary principles guiding international relations, the Indian Government has unscrupulously cut off the tele-communication between the Chinese Embassy in India and the Chinese Government, as a result of which the Chinese Government has so far been unable to obtain any report from the Chinese Embassy on this incident. The Chinese Government reserves the right of making further representations and raising demands when it receives an official report.

The Chinese Government now deems it necessary to adopt the following emergency measure: Starting from this very moment, no person of Indian nationality in the Indian Embassy in China is allowed to leave the Embassy without the permission of the Chinese authorities concerned. Otherwise, the Indian side shall be held responsible for all the consequences.

---

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China, 18 June, 1967**


The Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi that the Indian Embassy in Peking has, since the 17th June, 1967, been surrounded and besieged by Chinese hooligans, and totally prevented from functioning as a diplomatic Mission. The Embassy personnel and their families are in a state of siege, virtually held as prisoners in the Embassy without access to the outside world. Thousands of Chinese are milling around the Embassy, throwing stones at it, and have smashed the windows and doors of the Embassy. The Indian Embassy cannot communicate with its own Government. There is no doubt that this situation has been engineered and organised by the Chinese Government. This is evident from the fact that the Chinese Government demanded and compelled the members of staff and their families to evacuate from their residential premises at short notice, and ordered them to congregate in the Indian Embassy compound in Peking. The Chinese Government further had the audacity to stipulate a time-limit for this wholly illegal and unjustifiable demand, which is in total violation of international law and practice. In the process of moving the families of the Indian personnel of the Embassy, they were subjected to calculated harassment. Such beleaguering of the Indian diplomatic mission by the People's Republic of China is reminiscent of practices which were adopted by the Chinese imperial regimes in the past.

2. The Ministry protests most emphatically against the actions of the Chinese Government and the Chinese ruffians who have besieged the Embassy obviously at the behest of the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government's behaviour in having the Indian Embassy besieged is a total negation of international law and diplomatic practice, in consonance with which alone can a diplomatic mission function. The Ministry demands that immediate steps be taken by the Government of the People's Republic of China, so that the siege of the Embassy is lifted, and all restrictions on movement in and out
of Indian personnel are lifted. Unless the Chinese Government withdraws all restrictions and takes steps to bring to an end the state of siege of the Embassy within 24 hours, the Government of India will be obliged to take appropriate counter-measures, for which the Chinese Government will have to bear the sole responsibility.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 June, 1967.

(G7) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 325.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states as follows:

According to report from the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, eight members of the Chinese Embassy were seriously wounded during the grave incident on the afternoon of June 16, in which large numbers of ruffians were organized by the Indian Government to attack the Chinese Embassy in India, and the wounded are up to now still in a state of danger. The Chinese Government now decides to immediately dispatch a special plane of the Civil Aviation Administration of China to New Delhi via Dacca to bring back the wounded personnel mentioned above, and asks the Indian Government to provide necessary facilities. As the matter is urgent, a prompt reply is expected from the Indian Government.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 June, 1967

No. C/12/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs has come to understand that the Charge d'Affaires of the Chinese Embassy has made some requests about the further treatment of the four Chinese personnel who have been treated in the hospital and discharged yesterday as they required no further hospitalisation. These requests have been carefully considered. In the opinion of the doctors in the hospital, the discharged Chinese personnel have recovered. If, however, there is any special reason for which these discharged personnel require medical attention, the Embassy may request the authorities at Willingdon Hospital who have been instructed to provide a doctor to attend to the patients.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 June, 1967


The Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India that Mr. Hsieh Cheng-hao, the former Third Secretary in the Chinese Embassy who had been declared persona non grata was permitted to stay beyond the original time-limit
because the Chinese Embassy made a special request on the ground that Mr. Hsieh Cheng-hao was not fit to travel. It is now considered that sufficient time has been given to him and the Chinese Embassy is, therefore, informed that Mr. Hsieh Cheng-hao should leave Indian territory within 48 hours of the receipt of this note; he should also communicate to the Ministry of External Affairs the route by which he intends to travel.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 June, 1967

No. C/14/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India that in view of the just indignation of the Indian people at the recent callous and uncivilised behaviour of the Chinese Government, the personal security of members of the Embassy cannot be guaranteed if they move out of the Embassy premises. All personnel of the Embassy are, therefore, required to stay within its premises until further advice from the Ministry of External Affairs. In case the Charge d'Affaires of the Chinese Embassy wishes to come to the Ministry of External Affairs in performance of his official functions, he will be provided with an escort; for this purpose, a request should be made to the Ministry on the telephone.

Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 19 June, 1967

The Indian Embassy in China addresses the present note to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China with reference to their Note (67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 325, dated the 18th June, 1967, and states as follows:

The request made by the Chinese Government in the said note to send a special plane of the Civil Aviation Administration of China to New Delhi will not even be considered unless the Chinese Government immediately lifts the present siege of the Indian Embassy and guarantees the restoration of the normal functioning of the Indian Embassy.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 June, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 327.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states as follows:

According to reports from the Chinese Embassy in India, at 1710 hours (New Delhi Time), June 16, 1967 over one thousand Indian ruffians surrounded the Chinese Embassy, carrying with them iron
bars, stones, etc., as murderous weapons and wildly shouting reactionary slogans insulting Chairman Mao, the great leader of the Chinese people. Half an hour later, these ruffians broke into the Embassy in batches by climbing over the wall or forcibly crashing open the gate and carried out wanton destruction. They smashed all the doors and windows of the Embassy buildings on the ground floor, destroyed the display cases of the Embassy and even blatantly went forward to haul down from the staff the national flag of the People's Republic of China. In order to defend the dignity of the national flag of the motherland, eight members of the Chinese Embassy, including diplomatic officials, put up a heroic resistance against this fascist outrage of the Indian ruffians. However, this bunch of inhuman Indian ruffians went to the length of savagely beating at will the above members of the Chinese Embassy who were defending the Chinese national flag, and seriously wounding First Secretary of the Embassy Chen Lu-chih, Attache Chang Teh-liang and the following working personnel of the Embassy Li Szu-heng, Liu Chung-fu, Wang Li-jen, Hung Chuan-chia, Shen Kan-p'ai and Li Chao-chien. Everyone of them was wounded in more than ten places and covered with blood. Some were even beaten unconscious. The ruffians then took this opportunity to snatch away the Chinese national flag and tore it to pieces. At the same time, the Indian ruffians set fire to the Embassy garage, burning four motorcars and one motorcycle. Not until 1850 hours did this bunch of ruffians leave the Embassy.

It needs to be pointed out in all gravity that before the Indian ruffians attacked the Chinese Embassy, large numbers of Indian policemen had already surrounded it and that when the ruffians were breaking through the Embassy gate, carrying out wilful destruction and committing wanton assault within the Embassy, the Indian policemen on the spot, instead of stopping them, directly commanded and joined in these atrocities. After the Indian ruffians committed arson, the Delhi fire brigade delayed its arrival. And when it finally arrived at the scene, it made no effort at all to put out the fire, but stole away after staying for only five minutes. What causes especial indignation is that when eight members of the Chinese Embassy had been seriously wounded and their lives were in peril and when the Embassy had made several representations to the Indian Ministry for External Affairs asking for medical personnel to render them first-aid treatment, the Indian side purposely held the matters up for as long as four hours.

It must be further pointed out that while the Indian ruffians were assaulting the Chinese Embassy, the Embassy several times telephoned the Acting Director of the East Asia Division of the Indian Ministry for External Affairs, the Secretary to the Minister and the Secretary to the Indian Prime Minister to lodge protests and demanded that the Indian Government take immediate measures to stop this outrage. However, they all turned to deaf ear to this. Up to now there are still gathered outside the Chinese Embassy large numbers of Indian troops, policemen, special agents and ruffians, and not only are the members of the Chinese Embassy deprived of the freedom of exit from the Embassy, the security of the Embassy and its personnel is still gravely threatened.
The whole series of facts mentioned above have fully proved that this grave incident of assaulting the Chinese Embassy was entirely planned and engineered by the Indian Government. This is a serious sanguinary crime committed by the Indian Government against the Chinese people and one more striking example of its flagrant transgression of international law and violation of the principles guiding international relations. This incident has completely revealed to the people of the whole world, the reactionary fascist features of the Indian Government. The Chinese Government and people must seriously warn the Indian Government: The 700 million Chinese people are not to be trifled with and the Chinese diplomatic personnel armed with Mao Tse-tung’s thought are not to be bullied. If you do not immediately rein in before the precipice but want to further aggravate the relations between the two countries, then come out with all the “prowess” you still have! We will certainly take you on and keep you company to the end.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government against the serious incident of June 16 in which Indian ruffians insulted the great leader of the Chinese people, assaulted the Chinese Embassy, tore up the national flag of the People’s Republic of China and brutally beat members of the Chinese Embassy. The Chinese Government demands that the Indian Government admit its mistake, make an open apology, immediately punish the culprits, compensate for all the losses, provide fully adequate medical facilities for the wounded Chinese personnel, and guarantee that no similar incidents will occur in the future. Furthermore, the Indian Government must bear entire responsibility for ensuring the security of the Chinese Embassy and all its personnel. Otherwise, the Indian Government will be held fully responsible for all the grave consequences arising therefrom.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 June, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Tzu No. 329.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states as follows:

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China already presented a note to the Indian Embassy in China on June 18, 1967, announcing the Chinese Government’s decision to send immediately a special plane of the Civil Aviation Administration of China to New Delhi to bring back the wounded personnel of the Chinese Embassy in India beaten by Indian ruffians on June 16. Now the Chinese Government has decided that the special plane of the CAAC is scheduled to take off from Kunming on June 21, and hereby notifies the Indian Government of the flight data concerning the Chinese special plane, the name list of the crew, the air route and the items calling for the assistance from the Indian authorities concerned. It is hoped that the Indian side will reply as soon as possible.
I. Data on the CAAC special plane

Type of plane: 11-18 passenger plane.
Number of plane: 220
Radio Telephone Call Signs: 220
Radio Telegraph Call Signs: BPFAX

Alternate plane
Number: 214
Radio Telephone Call Signs: 214
Radio Telegraph Call Signs: BPDNS

Markings of plane: The plane is silver white in colour, Painted with the national flag of the People's Republic of China the Chinese characters "Chong Guo Min Hang" and the number of the plane.

II. Name list of the crew of the CAAC special plane.
Head: Yuan Tao-yuan.
Captain: Chao Lu-tau.
Pilots: Li Chi-cheng, Li Chang-hsin.
Navigators: Wei Han-chang, Liu Wen-ming.
Radio-operators: Chao Chun, Tsui Tien-fu.
Mechanics: Chao Fa, Tai Hung-fu, Hu Yi-chou.

III. Route of the CAAC special plane.
The plane will take off from Kunming, overfly Lintsang, Lashio, Mandalay, Cox's Bazar and land at Dacca for refuelling; and then it will take off from Dacca, overfly Calcutta, Gaya, Varanasi, Lucknow and land at Palam Airport at Delhi.

The return flight will take the same route in the reverse direction.

IV. The Indian authorities concerned are requested to render assistance in the following:

(1) To keep in operation the tele-communication and navigational equipments at Palam Airport at Delhi and along the route during the flight.

(2) To provide the airports at Calcutta, Gaya and Lucknow as alternate airports.

(3) To provide the meteorological information of the airport for landing and the alternate airports mentioned above as well as that along the route.
(4) The Palam Airport at Delhi is requested to provide 15 tons of qualified JP-1 or TC-1 aviation kerosene and ground services for the IL-18 plane.

(5) To guarantee the safety of the plane during the flight in Indian air space and its stay at the airport at Delhi. The flight information will be transmitted by the radio station at Dacca Airport.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 June, 1967

No. C/15/67.


2. With reference to this request, Chinese Government's attention is drawn to the note presented by the Embassy of India in Peking to the Chinese Foreign Office on June 19, prior to the Chinese Government's note, in which it was made clear that the Government of India will not be prepared to consider the request for clearance for a Chinese civil aircraft until such time as the siege of the Indian Embassy is lifted and normal functioning of the Embassy is restored. The Government of India's position remains unchanged and, therefore, permission cannot be granted at present.

3. Once the siege of the Indian Embassy in Peking is lifted and the Government of India are satisfied that the Embassy is free to function in the normal manner, the Government of India will be prepared to consider the Chinese Government's request on a reciprocal basis; that is to say, that as a quid pro quo for the Chinese Government's sending an aircraft here, the Government of India will send an aircraft to Peking to evacuate some of their personnel. The movement etc. of the Chinese and Indian aircrafts must be synchronised and other prior arrangements in that connection made in mutual consultation.

4. The Chinese Government refers to a “decision” to send immediately a special ‘plane from Kunming on June 21, 1967, and "notifies" that Government of India of the flight data etc., concerning the Chinese special ‘plane'. The Government of India would like to inform the Government of the People's Republic of China that any aircraft transgressing into Indian territorial space will be subject to the treatment prescribed under Indian laws, consistent with the preservation of the sovereign rights of the Government of India. If a Chinese aircraft comes into India without Government of India's authorisation, the sole responsibility for the consequences thereof will be that of the Chinese Government.

1 E.A.—5.
5. The Government of India wish to inform the Government of the People's Republic of China that the Chinese injured personnel have made a steady recovery. Most of them have been discharged from the hospital. In any case, the best medical attention is being made available to the Chinese Embassy in Delhi.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 June, 1967

No. C/16/67.

In continuation of their note No. C/15/67 dated June 20, 1967, Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People's Republic of China that it is understood that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China informed the Indian Charge d'Affaires in Peking that with effect from 1630 hours (Peking Standard Time) on June 20, 1967, the restrictions imposed on the Embassy of India have been removed. Ministry of External Affairs wishes to inform the Chinese Embassy in Delhi that with effect from 0700 hours on June 21, 1967 the restrictions notified in the Embassy vide the Ministry's note No. C/14/67 of June 19, 1967 will be similarly removed.

2. Further in continuation of the note under reference the Government of India wish to inform the Chinese Government that they intend sending a special civil aircraft to Peking to airlift some of the Indian personnel in Peking. The details of the aircraft and its proposed schedule are indicated in the annexure to this note. The Chinese Government are requested to indicate immediately their agreement to the despatch of the Indian civil aircraft to Peking.

3. Subject to the Chinese Government so agreeing, the Government of India would have no objection to the Chinese Civil aircraft, whose details were given in the Chinese Embassy note No. (67) PU YI YA TZU No. 329 of June 19, 1967, coming to India to take back some members of the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi. The movements of the two aircraft must as far as possible be synchronized. The Chinese aircraft should arrive in Delhi on Friday, the 23rd June, 1967, along the route indicated in the Chinese note No. (67) PU YI YA TZU No. 329 of June 19, 1967. The two aircraft should leave the respective capitals on the forenoon of the 23rd June following the route of entry in reverse. The necessary facilities for the aircraft and authorisation for grant of the visas for the Indian crew may kindly be obtained.

4. On confirmation of above arrangements necessary authorisation and appropriate instructions will be issued by the Government of India.
Particulars of the special plane

Aircraft . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . DC-4 Skymaster
Markings . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . VTDIB
Sitting capacity . . . . . . . . . 60 passengers
Freight capacity . . . . . . . . . 6,000 pounds

Schedule of the flight (local time)

Dep. . . . . . . . . . . . . . 2200 hrs Calcutta
Arr. . . . . . . . . . . . . . 0500 hrs Bangkok
Dep. . . . . . . . . . . . . . 0600 hrs Bangkok
Arr. . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1430 hrs Hong Kong (Night-stop)

Dep. . . . . . . . . . . . . . 0300 hrs Hong Kong
Arr. . . . . . . . . . . . . . 0900 hrs Peking
Dep. . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1100 hrs Peking
Arr. . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1900 hrs Hong Kong

Details of the crew

(1) Capt. S. P. Jambuserwalla
(2) Capt. A. Sinha
(3) Capt. Savur
(4) Radio Officer: S. N. Bhattacharji
(5) Steward: H. D. Ganguly
(6) Hostess: Miss Symons
(7) Navigator: K. L. Dan Dona
(8) Flight Engineer: M. Chatterjee
(9) Another Flight Engineer: Mr. Kaneka.
Aviation fuel will be required at Peking. Other service facilities as asked for by the crew may also be rendered. Further information, if necessary, will be communicated before the date of the flight. The Chinese authorities are requested to guarantee the safety of the plane in Chinese air-space and during its stay at the airport in Peking.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 20 June, 1967


The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and has the honour to state that on the instruction of the Government of the People's Republic of China, Mr. Hsieh Cheng-hao, Third Secretary of the Embassy, has been recalled back to China. He is going to leave New Delhi for China by air on June 21, 1967. It will be appreciated if the Ministry will render the necessary facilities to him at the earliest convenience. His passport is enclosed herewith for action.

The Embassy takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 June, 1967


In continuation of the Note No. C/16/67, dated 20th June, 1967, the Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People's Republic of China that the Government of India had initiated all necessary arrangements for the reciprocal despatch of special planes between the two countries. These arrangements included the authorisation of necessary visas for the aircraft crew and other officials travelling in the plane and a request to the Chinese Government for navigational assistance, including the provision of the routing for the Flight from Hong Kong to Peking giving the full information for the tracks and distances, navigational and communication facilities, hold-down charts for Peking and alternates and also maps and charts covering Chinese territory, since this information is not available with the Indian aircraft crew. Specifically it was hoped that the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi would issue, or would instruct the concerned agencies of the Government of the People's Republic of China in Hong Kong to issue, entry visas to the members of the crew of the Indian aircraft.

2. We have now learned that the Indian Charge d'Affaires in Peking was informed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China this morning that it will not allow any
Indian aircraft to fly to Peking. Indeed, we understand that the enclosure to the Ministry's Note No. C/16/67, dated 20th June, 1967, was rejected by the Chinese Foreign Office. The Chinese Government have themselves, in their Note No. (67) PU YI YA TZU No. 329, dated 19th June, 1967, given similar details about their plane.

3. Since the Government of India had agreed to the despatch of a civil aircraft from each country to the other on a strictly reciprocal and synchronized basis and since the Chinese Government have now expressed their unwillingness to admit the Indian plane into the Chinese territory, no permission can be granted for the Chinese Civil aircraft to come to India for this purpose. In any case, the proposal made in our note No. C/16/67, dated 20th June 1967, for a Chinese aircraft to come to India on June 23, 1967, stands annulled.

4. If the Chinese Government revises its decision and still wishes to despatch a plane to Delhi to take back some of their Embassy personnel, the Government of India are willing to consider their proposal, if strictly reciprocal arrangements are agreed upon for rendering navigational assistance and the authorisation of visas to the aircraft crew concerned and also the synchronisation of the movement of both aircraft. Further, a minimum of 60 hours advance notice must be given before the date of the synchronised entry of the aircraft of the two countries to the Capital of the other.

5. Meanwhile, Government of India is not proceeding with arrangements for the flight of its own aircraft to enter China on 23rd June, 1967, and its conditional agreement to the flight of the Chinese civil aircraft to enter India on the same date stands withdrawn.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 21 June, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 335

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the two notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government to the Chinese Embassy in India transmitted by the Indian Embassy on June 20 and 21, 1967 respectively, replies as follows

It is entirely just and necessary for the Chinese Government to decide to send a special plane of the C.A.A.C. to New Delhi to bring back to China for medical treatment the personnel of the Chinese Embassy in India who had been brutally beaten and seriously wounded by Indian ruffians. However, the Indian Government has procrastinated and refrained from giving a direct answer. And now it has the impudence to create troubles by putting forward so-called "reciprocal" terms. This is indeed the height of absurdity. It is obviously an attempt to raise side issues and deliberately to obstruct the timely return of the wounded personnel of the Chinese Embass
to China for medical treatment. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against its presumptuous and unreasonable attitude.

As is known to all, eight members of the Chinese Embassy were seriously wounded as a result of the sanguinary atrocity in the assaults on the Chinese Embassy engineered entirely by the Indian Government on June 16. Every one of them received more than ten wounds, some were beaten unconscious and others sustained serious slits on the head, but the Indian Government procrastinated and refused to provide first-aid treatment for them. Later on, although the wounded personnel were taken to the hospital, the Indian side adopted various discriminatory measures against them, and even the Chinese Charge d'Affaires and one of his friends were unwarrantedly refused permission to visit the wounded personnel in the hospital. The wounded personnel were also hindered by the Indian side from telephoning the Embassy about their cases. As a result, some of the wounded personnel are in a critical state even now, while others, although out of the hospital, are still in need of medical attention. The Chinese people and the family members of the wounded are very much concerned about them. It was in these circumstances that the Chinese Government decided to send a special plane to bring back to China the wounded personnel of the Chinese Embassy for medical treatment. This is entirely necessary and reasonable. There is no reason whatsoever for the Indian Government to obstruct it.

The Indian Government is completely groundless in putting forward the so-called "reciprocal" terms. We would like to ask: has anything like the sanguinary atrocity in the assaults on the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi ever happened in Peking? Is there any member of the Indian Embassy in China who has been wounded like members of the Chinese Embassy and therefore needs to be sent back immediately for medical treatment? What ground is there to speak of "reciprocity"? It must be pointed out that although the sanguinary incident created by India has aroused extreme indignation among the Chinese people, the Chinese side has exercised the utmost restraint and has effectively ensured the security of all the members of the Indian Embassy. The Chinese side has given very lenient treatment even to K. Raghunath, a spy who committed grave crimes in China. If members of the Indian Embassy have any need to go back to their country, they can very well leave Peking by plane or train as usual. What ground do you have to send a special plane to China? To be blunt, all you want to put up some show in order to cover up your sanguinary crime of assaulting the Chinese Embassy, hoodwink the Indian people and fan up anti-Chinese feelings. The Chinese Government categorically rejects this unwarranted demand of the Indian Government. If the Indian Government clings to this despicable trick, it will only further reveal its ugly features before the people of the whole world.

The Chinese Government reiterates its reasonable demand for the immediate dispatch of a special plane to bring back the wounded personnel of the Chinese Embassy. The Indian Government must change its unreasonable attitude and give a prompt reply to the demand of the Chinese Government.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 22 June, 1967

No. C/18/67

The Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India that it has received the Chinese Note No. (67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu 335, dated June 21, 1967, which was transmitted to the Indian Embassy at 0130 hours on June 22, 1967.

The Government of India rejects the protest and the so-called 'demand' of the Chinese Government to unilaterally send a Chinese aircraft to Delhi.

The Chinese Government have already been informed through Government of India's Notes and in the conversations with the Chinese Charge d'Affaires that the best medical attention possible has been made available for the treatment of the Chinese personnel who received injuries on the 16th June. An offer for expert medical facilities was made to the Charge d'Affaires by a senior official of the Ministry of External Affairs soon after the incident occurred. The Charge d'Affaires had then stated that he would inform the Ministry if any Indian medical help or hospitalisation was necessary. Even before the request came from the Charge d'Affaires, on instructions from the Ministry of External Affairs, doctors with ambulance proceeded to the gate of the Chinese Embassy. The Chinese Interpreter himself has expressed satisfaction at the treatment given by the Indian medical authorities to the seven Chinese officials who were admitted to the Indian hospital. Four members of the Chinese Embassy were discharged from the Hospital on the 18th, two on the 20th June and the last patient has been sent back to the Chinese Embassy today, after the doctors certified that they had improved and required no further hospitalisation. It is evident that the Chinese personnel have received prompt and expert medical attention and those, who were sent to the Indian hospital, have improved, if not fully recovered. The offer to treat any other Chinese Embassy patient on this or any other occasion, with expert medical attention, has been made and is hereby reiterated. There is, therefore, no question of the Indian Government evading its responsibility.

The Government of India categorically deny the repetition of the insinuation that they engineered the incident of 16th June. The Foreign Minister of the Government of India, in his statement made in the Indian Parliament on the 17th June—to which the attention of the Chinese Charge d'Affaires has already been drawn—explained that the incident was due to the provocation caused by the entirely unjustifiable charge levelled and inhuman treatment meted out to the two Indian diplomats at Peking and on their way to the Chinese border. While responsibility for these provocations rests with the Chinese Government, the Foreign Minister has already deplored the intrusion into the Chinese Embassy and the fact that in this the Chinese Embassy officials should have suffered injuries.
There is clear evidence that the Chinese Government itself was behind the totally unjustifiable and extraordinary procedure of declaring a diplomat as a spy unilaterally depriving him of his diplomatic status and trying him in absentia in the so-called “People's Court, Peking” in contravention of international law and practice. It was also responsible for the harassment and indignities heaped on the Indian diplomats. It is clear that the Chinese Government have neither the intention nor the courage to condemn the unwarranted derogation from diplomatic usage, international law and propriety in their treatment of the two Indian diplomats in China.

The Chinese Government in its note has the presumptuousness to suggest that there is no need to send a special plane to bring back the personnel of the Indian Embassy, particularly the women and children who were subjected for four days to a seige and inhuman and uncivilised mental torture by the so-called ‘masses’ which surrounded and demonstrated outside the Indian Embassy. The families were given barely two hours’ notice to leave their homes and reach the Embassy quarters. The Chinese Government did not provide any transport for them and even prevented the Indian transport in the Embassy to go to the respective houses and bring them to the Embassy premises. The families which included women and small children, were subjected to the incessant blare of loudspeakers, stonethrowing and for a while refusal of all supplies. The Government of India was fully within its responsibility to decide to make special arrangements to evacuate the Indian personnel who had been subjected to these indignities by the despatch of an Indian aircraft to bring them back to India. The Government of India remain eager to send a special aircraft and are willing to make reciprocal concessions to the Chinese Government.

If, however, the Chinese Government cannot see its way to permit an Indian civil aircraft to proceed to Peking to evacuate the Indian personnel, the Government of India likewise are unable to agree to a Chinese civil aircraft flying to India. The Government of India has as much sovereign rights over its own territorial airspace as the Chinese Government exercises over her own territory. The Indian proposal for reciprocal and synchronised despatch of aircraft was a reasonable and satisfactory method for both Governments to meet the situation. Since the Chinese Government are not prepared to concede the Indian request, the Government of India have nothing more to add to the position already clarified in its note No. C/17/67, dated the 21st June, 1967. They are not prepared to accept the ‘demand’ of the Chinese Government to send a special plane to India on a unilateral basis.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 23 June, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 354.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the two notes of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs
to the Chinese Embassy in India, dated June 21 and 22, 1967, states the following:

The above two notes of the Indian Government fully prove that it has deliberately obstructed the sending of a Chinese special plane to New Delhi to bring back the personnel of the Chinese Embassy who were beaten and seriously wounded by Indian ruffians. In its notes, the Indian Government quibbles, beats about the bush and distorts the facts for the sole purpose of creating pretexts to refuse the Chinese special plane's flight to New Delhi and thus to cover up the sanguinary crime it has committed. The Chinese Government expresses utmost indignation at this unreasonable act of the Indian Government and lodges a strong protest against it.

It is very clear that from the very outset the Indian Government has been most afraid of China's despatch of a special plane to India to bring back the wounded personnel of the Chinese Embassy. Back on June 18, the Chinese side suggested the despatch of a special plane to New Delhi. On June 19, it informed the Indian side of the data of the time, flight route, etc. in connection with the despatch of the special plane. Failing to find any justification for rejection, the Indian Government resorted to a pretext for refusing to consider China's demand to despatch a special plane by unwarrantedly linking this despatch with the so-called lifting of the "siege" on the Indian Embassy in China, which are two entirely different things. In view of the fact that the Indian Government has restored the tele-communications between the Chinese Embassy in India and Peking, the Chinese side announced on June 20 the cancellation of the emergency measure taken against the Indian Embassy in China. In these circumstances, having failed in one trick, the Indian Government resorted to another by absurdly raising so-called "reciprocal" terms and asserting that it, too, would send a special plane to Peking to bring back part of the personnel of the Indian Embassy in China. Not a single member of the Indian Embassy in China has been wounded and the need for a special plane simply does not exist. This unreasonable demand of the Indian side has already been thoroughly refuted by the Chinese Government in its note of June 21. At the end of its tether, the Indian Government could only repeat its hackneyed tune and resort to sophistry on the question of the spy K. Raghunath and even went to the length of vainly trying to blame China for the Indian Government's crime of instigating ruffians to assault the Chinese Embassy in India. This is indeed a ridiculous deceptive trick. But it can fool no one.

In brazenly organising ruffians to assault the Embassy of a country and thus perpetrating fascist atrocities rarely found in the history of international relations, the Indian Government has already become utterly discredited before the world. And now it has further used the above-mentioned despicable means in rejecting China's demand to send a special plane to bring back the wounded personnel. In so doing the Indian Government fancies itself very clever, but actually it is just lifting a rock only to drop it on its own feet and has thus further revealed its own weaknesses and rascal nature and once again lost face before the world.
In view of the fact that the personnel of the Chinese Embassy beaten and wounded by Indian ruffians are in urgent need of going back to China for further medical treatment, while the Indian Government places endless obstacles in the way of China's reasonable demand for sending a special plane, the Chinese Government has decided that they leave India through regular air service as soon as possible. The Indian Government must ensure the safety of Chinese First Secretary Chen Lu-Chih and other wounded personnel and facilitate their travel and must not engage in any sabotage or obstruction. Otherwise, the Chinese side will adopt the necessary corresponding measures. Don't say you are not warned in advance.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 29 July, 1967

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India has learnt that Mr. Chu Chim Hsin, a Chinese teacher, and Mr. Shu Kuei, a Chinese dentist, both residents of Calcutta for a long time, have been unreasonably ordered to leave India by the Government of West Bengal, India.

Mr. Chu Chim Hsin has lived in India for over twenty years. He was detained and sentenced to rigorous imprisonment by the Indian local authorities on September 5, 1966 when he, due to poverty and ill-health, could not leave India as unwarrantedly demanded by the local Government. Not until February 28, 1967, was he released. After his release, the Government of West Bengal continued to persecute him and again ordered him to leave India in May last.

Mr. Shu Kuei has lived in India for more than thirty years and has been carrying on honest profession of dentistry. He was also unreasonably ordered in May last to leave India by the Government of West Bengal, India.

The Embassy lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against its persecution of the Chinese nationals and demands that the Indian Government immediately withdraw its expulsion order served to Mr. Chu Chim Hsin and Mr. Shu Kuei and stop all forms of persecution of Chinese nationals in India.

In disregard of repeated reasonable demands, representations and protests by the Chinese Government and the Chinese Embassy, the Indian Government, far from taking measures to stop its acts of trampling underfoot grossly the norms of international relations, is turning from bad to worse to unscrupulously persecute Chinese nationals. This fully shows that in order to sell itself out to U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism, the Indian Government has launched frenzied anti-China activities and is deliberately deteriorating the relations between the two countries. The Embassy hereby makes it clear to the Indian Government that the Chinese people armed with the great thought of Mao Tse-tung, and the great socialist China are not to be humiliated. By continuing to oppose China wildly and persecuting Chinese nationals, the Indian Government is surely lifting a rock only to drop it on its own feet and will come to no good end.
Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 15 August, 1967

(67) Pu Ling Yi Fa Tzu No. 178.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China notifies the Indian Embassy in China of the following:

Owing to the needs of the Municipal Administration of Peking, the Peking Municipal Real Estate Administrative Bureau has decided, in accordance with the pertinent articles in the land lease contract it signed with the Embassy on March 31st 1954, to withdraw the land which has been lent to the Embassy and which is situated at number 24 of the anti-imperialist road (formerly number 32 of Tung Jiao Min Hsiang). The Bureau asks the Embassy to leave the place and return the land to the Peking Municipal Real Estate Administrative Bureau within two months from the day the Embassy receives the present Note.

As for the buildings on the land mentioned above, the Peking Municipal Real Estate Administrative Bureau will purchase them at a price to be fixed by the two sides through consultation.

As for the Chancery of the Embassy, there are buildings available in the Embassy quarters in Peking. The Embassy can rent them by directly contacting the Peking Diplomatic Personnel Service Bureau.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 26 August, 1967


The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India and states the following:

After a short period of home leave, four staff members of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China came back to New Delhi on July 25, 1967. At Palam Airport, New Delhi, the Indian Customs, on instruction of the Indian Government, forcibly took away and detained unreasonably all the forty copies of Chairman Mao's works and other books which the above-mentioned personnel of the Embassy brought with them. Up till now twenty copies of Chairman Mao's works and other books are still being detained by the Indian Government without justification. Despite repeated representations with the Indian Government by the Embassy on this matter, the Indian Government has so far refused to return these books even though it has no reason to offer. This arbitrary and unreasonable act of the Indian Government openly and flagrantly violated the principles of international relations and international practice, thereby seriously affecting the study and work of the Embassy's personnel. For this, the Embassy lodges a strong protest with the Ministry of External Affairs.
The Indian Government's vicious act of detaining Chairman Mao's works is another grave matter following the large-scale anti-China bloody incident on June 16, 1967, in which Indian ruffians organized by the Indian Government wantonly insulted Chairman Mao, the great leader of the Chinese people, and assaulted the Chinese Embassy, and also the atrocities perpetrated by the Indian Government on June 24, 1967 in directing policemen and special agents to seize Mr. Chen Lu-Chih, First Secretary of the Embassy at Palam airport. This is another serious provocation of the Indian Government to the 700 million Chinese people.

It is by no means accidental that the Indian Government has been creating one anti-China incident after another. For a long time, especially since the launching of the great proletarian cultural revolution in China, the Indian Government mortally fears and intensely hates the fact that the Indian people warmly love Mao Tse-tung's thought. To cater to the needs of American imperialists and Soviet revisionists and to maintain its shaking rule, the Indian Government even at the cost of selling out the interests of the Indian people, repeatedly created ugly anti-China incidents in a vain attempt to check the rolling torrent of the Indian people who are marching forward to study and grasp Mao Tse-tung's thought, and the influence of the great proletarian cultural revolution in China. Now it even goes as far as to deprive the Embassy's personnel of their sacred right to study and spread Mao Tse-tung's thought. This only serves to expose fully your reactionary nature and ugly features. The spread of the ever radiant thought of Mao Tse-tung is irresistible. All evil remnants of society which try to prevent the advance of history will ultimately be crushed by the wheels of history.

The Embassy sternly demands that the Indian Government immediately return those copies of Chairman Mao's works and other books which are still being detained and ensure against any similar incident in future.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, to September, 1967

No. 465(48)DIII/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and in continuation of their Note No. 465(48)-DIII/67, dated the 13th June, 1967, requiring the Embassy personnel, privileged and non-privileged, and the members of their families, not to proceed outside the limits of the New Delhi Municipal Committee and the Delhi Municipal Corporation, without the prior permission of the Ministry of External Affairs (Protocol Division), have the honour to say that in view of the recent attempts on the part of the Embassy staff to travel outside the aforesaid limits without obtaining the requisite permit beforehand, the Embassy is further required to obtain prior permission of this Ministry for any member of their staff to proceed to any of the Railway Stations within the above-mentioned Municipal limits.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 10 September, 1967


The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India replies in refutation of the telephonic message from the Protocol Division of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, at 9 P.M. on September 9, 1967, regarding the travel to Calcutta of the Chinese Charge d'Affaires a.i. and party as follows:

On the matter of the travel of the Chinese Charge d'Affaires a.i. and party, the Embassy had given advance notice to the Ministry in normal manner. The Protocol Division of the Ministry should have, under pretext of so-called obtaining of prior permission for personnel of the Embassy to leave Delhi, unwarrantly restricted and obstructed them to carry out their official duties and should have declared that "the responsibility of the consequence of violating the restriction will be your own". This is sheer discrimination, harassment and threat to personnel of the Embassy, and is an act of wantonly trampling under foot the norms of international relations and intentionally further poisoning relations between China and India. The Embassy categorically refuses the said message and lodges a strong protest with the Ministry.

The Chinese Charge d'Affaires a.i. and party have the full right to leave Delhi to carry out their official duty in accordance with their plan. If the Indian Government insists on its unreasonable restriction to provoke and make trouble, it must be held responsible for all the serious consequences arising therefrom.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 September 1967.

C/24/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in order to bring the following facts to the attention of the Chinese Government.

The Government of India have received information from the Government of Nepal that the Chinese Government have demanded that the furniture in the building of the Indian Consulate General in Lhasa now under the care of the Nepalese Consulate General in Lhasa should be handed over to the Chinese authorities within 7 days. The Government of India register a strong protest against this illegal and arbitrary act and reserve their right to take necessary and appropriate action.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 September, 1967
Embassy and its personnel and in conformity with the practice followed by the Chinese Government vis-a-vis the Indian Embassy and its personnel in Peking, the Government of India have decided to observe the following procedure:

(1) All invitations issued by the Chinese Embassy and its personnel to persons other than Diplomats accredited to the Government of India should be sent to the Ministry of External Affairs, Protocol Department for scrutiny and necessary action.

(2) All the invitation cards together with lists of invitees with their full addresses, in quadruplicate, may be furnished to the Ministry of External Affairs not less than a week in advance of the date for which the invitation is intended.

(3) All non-China based employees of the Chinese Embassy will be required to obtain passes from the Ministry of External Affairs. Similarly, tradesmen and other persons having regular business with the Chinese Embassy will also be required to obtain passes from the Ministry of External Affairs.

(4) This procedure will come into force with immediate effect.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China is requested to submit the list of the names and addresses of their non-China based personnel and the tradesmen etc. visiting the Embassy, in quadruplicate, to the Protocol Department of this Ministry.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 September, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 614.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and makes the following reply in refutation of the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India dated September 20, 1967:

In its note the Indian Government unreasonably laid down the rule that all invitations issued by the Chinese Embassy in India must be sent to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs not less than a week in advance of the date for which the invitation is intended with lists of invitees in quadruplicate. The Indian Government also unreasonably decided that tradesmen and other persons having regular business with the Chinese Embassy must obtain passes from the Indian Ministry of External Affairs. This is another step of gross discrimination taken by the Indian Government on the heels of the recent series of its unreasonable measures against the Chinese Embassy, aimed at further obstructing and disrupting the normal diplomatic
functions of the Chinese Embassy and further worsening the relations between the two countries. This is another serious move in the Indian Government's intensified anti-Chinese activities. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government and firmly rejects its measures of discrimination. The Indian Government must immediately cancel all its unreasonable restrictions on the Chinese Embassy and ensure the normal performance of its diplomatic functions.

In its note, the Indian Government quibbled that it had decided to take those measures against the Chinese Embassy in conformity with the practice followed by the Chinese Government vis-a-vis the Indian Embassy in China. This is sheer fabrication. The Indian Embassy in China has always enjoyed the same treatment as all other diplomatic missions in Peking. The Chinese Government has not taken any measures of discrimination against the Indian Embassy, measures different from those vis-a-vis other diplomatic missions. This is clear to all. But the series of measures taken in close succession by the Indian Government are directed exclusively against the Chinese Embassy and constitute a discrimination against it. This contemptible practice on the part of the Indian Government has crudely violated the elementary principles guiding international relations.

In particular, it should be pointed out that the Indian Government has taken these measures of restriction under the pretext of protecting the "security" of the Chinese Embassy just at a time when the national day of the People's Republic of China is drawing near. This is obviously a plot of the Indian Government to sabotage the forthcoming national day reception by the Chinese Embassy and to create anti-Chinese incidents deliberately. This Chinese Government hereby serves a grave warning on the Indian Government: You must guarantee the smooth proceeding of the national day functions of the Chinese Embassy free from any harassment or sabotage. Otherwise, you must be held responsible for all the consequences.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 September, 1967


The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi, and with reference to the Chinese Government's note of August 15, states the following:

The Indian Embassy in Peking has been notified by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese Government that the land leased to the Indian Embassy and at present housing its premises is being withdrawn by the Chinese Government: it has been, moreover, demanded of the Indian Embassy in this note that it should return the land and move to new premises within two months of the receipt of the note. The Chinese Government are no doubt fully aware that the terms of the contract governing the lease of this plot of land
signed on 31st March, 1954, stipulate that at least 6 months prior notice should be given to the Lessee, should the Lessor wish to withdraw the plot. Attention of the Chinese Government is specially drawn to the relevant portion of Clause II(v) which states as follows:—

"If the demised premises shall, during the term of these presents, be required by the Lessor for any special purposes the Lessor shall be entitled by notice in writing to terminate the lease of the said premises on any date named, such notice not being less than six months from the date thereof."

The Chinese Government's demand, therefore, clearly contravenes the terms and conditions of a legal contract to which the Chinese Government are a party. The representatives of the Indian Embassy who discussed this matter with the Consular Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese Government on August the 16th and August the 18th, 1967 specifically drew the attention of the Chinese Government to this violation of the contract.

The lease contract governing the land housing the present premises of the Indian Embassy also carries a clear stipulation that "the Lessor at the time of service of notice to terminate the lease shall offer to the Lessee another plot or plots of land offering no less amenities for the purposes of the Embassy of India in Peking". It was indicated by Mr. Lao Lin of the Consular Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese Government in his meeting on August 18, 1967 with Mr. C. V. Ranganathan, First Secretary of the Indian Embassy in Peking, that the Chinese Government had withdrawn the plot of land earmarked for construction of the Indian Embassy in Peking. However, as the Indian Embassy has already communicated in its note of June 1st, 1967, addressed to the Diplomatic Personnel Services Bureau in Peking, that the Government of India are willing to consider relinquishing the lien on the present plot of land provided they can sign a lease contract for an alternative plot of land for construction of its Embassy buildings, subject to the conditions mentioned in the note of June 1 referred to above. Although it is almost four months since this note was addressed to the Chinese Government, no reply has so far been received. It is hoped that this matter will be finalised without any further delay in accordance with the proposals made in the Indian Embassy's note of June 1.

Since the Chinese Government are bent upon ejecting the Indian Embassy in Peking from its present premises, the Indian Government are asking the Indian Embassy in Peking to move under protest to the premises at No. 6 and No. 8 Kuang Hua Lu as soon as it is practicable. However, as it has already been conveyed to the Chinese Government, this decision is subject to the understanding that:

(a) the Chinese Government shall extend the lease for the buildings at No. 6 and 8 Kuang Hua Lu beyond February, 1968 (the date of expiry of the present lease), on the same basis as for those buildings located in the area which have been leased by other diplomatic missions;
(b) the Chinese Government shall provide alternative accommodation for the present occupants, members of the Indian Embassy, of the Kuang Hua Lu buildings;

(c) the Chinese Government shall carry out such necessary repairs and alterations in the Kuang Hua Lu buildings as to render them fit for use as Chancery and Residence;

(d) the Chinese Government shall pay compensation to the Government of India for the loss of its buildings on the present premises on a replacement basis, and

(e) the Chinese Government shall provide all necessary facilities for effecting these transfers, detailed arrangements of which will be worked out by the Indian Embassy in Peking with the local authorities.

The Government of India protest against the unilateral repudiation by the Chinese Government of their legal contractual obligations and reserve the right to take such further appropriate steps as might be necessary to protect their interests.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 7 October, 1967

No. C/27/67

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and returns the enclosed note from that Embassy. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China and the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi have made a habit of addressing notes to the Indian Embassy in Peking and to the Ministry of External Affairs in New Delhi respectively in language quite unfamiliar to international diplomacy. The enclosed note of the Chinese Embassy has transgressed the norms of diplomatic practice even further, and is not only couched in undiplomatic language but has even used invectives to make patently false and slanderous allegations. Consequently, the Ministry of External Affairs returns the note herewith.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 7 October, 1967

M/587/67

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India and, with regard to the visit of its Charge d'Affaires a.i. and party to Calcutta on official duty once again states as follows:

The Indian Government on two occasions on September 8 and 10, 1967 obstructed the Charge d'Affaires a.i. of the Chinese Embassy and party from visiting Calcutta to perform official duties, and sent a
note to the Embassy further restricting unreasonably the Embassy personnel to the extent that even for proceeding to any of the railway stations within Delhi they had to obtain prior permission. This is sheerly an act of rudely trampling under foot the norms of international relations and of deliberate worsening the relations of the two countries. For this, the Embassy lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government and sternly demands that the Indian Government immediately withdraw the discriminial restrictions on the Embassy personnel. The Embassy hereby affirms that it reserve the right for further representations.

Now, Mr. Chen Chao-quan, Charge d'Affaires a.i., Mme. Cheng Yu-shu, Second Secretary, Mr. Chou Ping-yi, Third Secretary and Mr. Chou Chin-ho, Staff Member, of the Embassy have again decided to proceed to Calcutta by air on October 14, 1967 to visit Chinese nationals there. The Indian Government is duty bound to guarantee the smooth proceeding of their visit to Calcutta to perform official duties, and give a prompt reply.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 12 October, 1967

In connection with the Chinese Embassy's note dated October 7, 1967 to the Indian External Affairs Ministry regarding the Chinese Charge d'Affaires a.i. and party to Calcutta on 14 instant to pay a visit, the Ministry made a telephone call on October 9, 1967 to the Embassy making further inquiries. The Embassy has to give its reply to the phone call in writing since the Duty Officer of the Ministry in the morning of 12 instant refused to take the message on the telephone.

It should be pointed out that the inquiries from the Ministry made on the telephone are sheer discrimination and harassment to the Embassy. The Charge d'Affaires a.i. and party are to go to Calcutta by air, and this has already been mentioned in the Embassy's note. They intend to stay there for about a week to ten days. Due to the harassment of the Indian Government, their intended address in Calcutta and means for their return journey are unable to be decided yet. Though the passport numbers of the Embassy members accompanying the Charge d'Affaires a.i. do not seem to have any connection with their travel within India, and these numbers are already with the Ministry, the Embassy furnishes with regret the same to the Ministry as desired:

(1) Mme, Cheng Yu-shu No. D. 001334
(2) Mr. Chou Ping-yi No. D. 001083
(3) Mr. Chou Chin-ho No. S. 002064

A reply to the note of the Embassy is expected before 14 instant, their departure date.
Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 12 October, 1967

No. M/590/67

The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, in refutation of the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated October 7, 1967 as follows:

The note dated October 6, 1967 sent to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India by the Chinese Embassy in India exposed with full facts the vicious practice in sabotaging the Embassy’s National Day reception by the Indian Government. Being inwardly guilty before the unrefutable facts, the Indian Government should have returned the above-mentioned note of the Embassy under the pretext of so-called matter of language. It is in vain that the Indian Government attempts in this way to evade the responsibility in sabotaging the Embassy’s National Day reception. While expressing its indignation over the above-mentioned behaviour of the Indian Government the Embassy reiterates its following four-point demands sternly raised in the above-mentioned note to the Indian Government:

(1) publicly apologize for its crime in sabotaging the Embassy’s National Day reception,
(2) cancel all discriminative restrictions on the Embassy,
(3) withdraw the secret agents, policemen and tents posted around the Embassy,
(4) ensure against any similar incident in the future.

The Indian Government should give a prompt reply to the demands of the Embassy.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 14 October, 1967

No. M/591/67

The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, and states as follows:

It is to impose entirely discriminative restrictions against the Chinese Embassy that the Indian Ministry of External Affairs has requested the Chinese Embassy to obtain passes for all its non-China based personnel from the Ministry. For several days since October 8, 1967, the Indian Government had further directed its secret agents posted at the Embassy’s gates to stop and ask the non-China based personnel of the Embassy to produce “passes” and interrogated them when they came to the Embassy to attend to their work or returned to their dormitories. Though all the non-China based personnel of
the Embassy are holding their identity cards issued by the Embassy, which fully established their identity, the Indian side still insisted in their holding passes issued by the Indian External Affairs Ministry. Such action apparently amounts to sheer harassment and deliberate hindrance to the Embassy’s normal functioning. For this, the Embassy lodges a strong protest with the Ministry and affirms that it reserves the right of making further representations. The list of the names and addresses of the non-China based personnel of the Embassy, in quadruplicate, is forwarded herewith. The Ministry should immediately hand over their passes to the Embassy.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 October, 1967

No. 465(48)-DIII/67

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and with reference to the Embassy’s note No. M/590/67, dated October the 12th 1967, draws the Embassy’s attention to the procedure indicated in the Ministry’s note No. 465(48)-DIII/67 of September the 20th, 1967. This procedure introduced in the interest of the security of the Chinese Embassy and its personnel was not observed by the Chinese Embassy, and invitations were sent out by the Embassy direct to persons other than diplomats accredited to the Government of India. The Government of India take a serious view of this failure on the part of the Chinese Embassy to comply with the procedure laid down by them.

2. Those invitees to the Chinese National Day reception who turned up were allowed to attend the function after verifying that they had been in fact invited. If the number of Indian invitees attending the function was insignificant, it was because the overwhelming number of the Indian invitees returned or declined the invitations. The allegation that the Government of India “sabotaged” the Chinese National Day function in New Delhi is patently false. The Ministry of External Affairs rejects the Chinese Embassy’s note of October the 12th and the absurd “demands” contained in it.

3. The Ministry of External Affairs expects the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi to co-operate in observing the procedure laid down in its note of September the 20th, referred to above. The Chinese Embassy alone will be held responsible for all the consequences of its failure to observe this procedure.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 October, 1967

No. 465(48)-DIII/67

The Ministry of External Affairs acknowledges Note No. M/591/67, dated October 14, 1967, from the Embassy of the People’s Republic of
China, enclosing a list in quadruplicate of non-China based personnel of the Chinese Embassy and states as follows:

The list enclosed with the Chinese Embassy's note under reference gives residential addresses of only the first ten persons. In the case of the remainder, evidently their occupational address, namely, 50-D, Shauitypath, Chanakyapuri, New Delhi-21, has been given. The Chinese Embassy are requested to intimate the permanent residential addresses of persons mentioned at Sl. Nos. 11 to 25 in the list to enable the concerned authorities of the Government of India to undertake necessary scrutiny and security check.

The persons mentioned at Sl. Nos. 1 to 10 in the list will be issued passes by the Protocol Division of the Ministry of External Affairs and should be advised to present themselves at the Ministry (South Block, Gate No. 5) on Monday November 6, 1967, between 1500 and 1700 hours, to complete the necessary formalities. The passes will have to be signed by the holders in the presence of the issuing authority. The ten persons under reference should also be advised to bring with them two passport size photographs of themselves as well as documentation to establish their identity.

---

Note* given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 October, 1967

No. C/29/67

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in reply to the Embassy's note No. M/520/67 of May 24, 1967, and states as follows:

The allegations made by the Chinese Embassy in its above note about the detention/confiscation of the mails addressed either to the Embassy or by name to the Charge d'Affaires of the Embassy from Peking and Hong Kong in the months of July and August, 1966, have been thoroughly investigated and found to be entirely baseless. The Ministry of External Affairs, therefore, rejects the note.

The Ministry would like to draw the attention of the Chinese Embassy to the Ministry's note of February 9, 1965, in which the regulations regarding transmission of publications or documents through ordinary mails from abroad to India have been stated very clearly. Mails sent through ordinary post are, in accordance with international practice, subject to normal checks. The Government of India are within their sovereign right to prohibit the entry into India of publications which interfere in India's internal affairs or which directly or indirectly question the territorial integrity of India or which slander India's friendly relations with a third country.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 October, 1967

No. 465 (48) - DIII/67

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and in continuation of the Ministry’s note No. 465 (48) - DIII/67, dated the 13th June, 1967, states as follows:

To enable the Ministry of External Affairs to process the requests of the Chinese Embassy and make necessary security arrangements in respect of visits by its members outside the municipal limits of Delhi and New Delhi, the Embassy is requested to invariably furnish the following details at least a week in advance of the intended date of travel:

(a) Full names of the members of the party along with their designations;

(b) Detailed itinerary indicating mode of travel and giving details of flight no., train no., etc., and

(c) Places and duration of halt outside Delhi with full addresses at which each member of the party proposes to stay.

Note given by Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 5 November, 1967

No. 606

The Embassy of India in Peking addresses the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China and with reference to the admission made by the Deputy Section Chief of the Consular Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in his interview with Mr. M. S. Rao, First Secretary of the Embassy on November 1, 1967 regarding the confiscation of Indian religious institutions in Shanghai and the expulsion of two Indian nationals Mr. Prem Singh and Mr. Kishan Singh from China, has to state as follows:

Indian religious institutions in China have been subjected to systematic trespass and desecration by hooligans since August, 1966, when the desecration of the Sikh Gurdwara temple in Tientsin was brought to the notice of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in this Embassy’s note No. 237 of September 28, 1966 which has remained unheeded. In November 1966 the Parsi Prayer Hall and Cemetery situated at 539 Fu Chou Lu, Shanghai, were occupied by unauthorised persons who refused entry to the representatives of the Indian Embassy who had gone there to investigate the matter. The Indian Embassy’s communication of December 6, 1966 protesting against the illegal occupation of the Parsi temple and cemetery was ignored by the Chinese Government. In January 1967 Gurdwaras in Shanghai were broken into by hooligans who smashed the windows and doors of the Gurdwaras and even went to the extent of forcibly seizing ceremonial swords and
kirpan from one of the locked rooms of the Gurdwara situated at Pao Shan Road. This matter was brought to the notice of the Foreign Affairs Bureau at Shanghai and the Consular Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Peking by Mr. M. S. Rao, First Secretary of the Indian Embassy, in January 1967 after he had visited Shanghai and personally ascertained the facts for himself. In his interviews with the representatives of the Chinese Government on both these occasions, Mr. Rao had demanded that full protection should be afforded to all religious institutions belonging to Indian nationals against their wanton desecration by hooligans.

If it is the declared policy of the Chinese Government to permit freedom of religious belief in China, the actions of the Chinese Government are at variance with their words. Not only have no steps been taken by the Chinese Government to provide the minimum protection to Indian religious institutions, but on the contrary, the representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs have tried to justify the vandalism of street mobs as “revolutionary actions” by the masses.

The Chinese Government have now gone further by confiscating all the three Gurdwaras in Shanghai and expelling Mr. Prem Singh and Mr. Kishan Singh who were office-bearers of the Gurdwara. In the meeting of November 1st, in a futile attempt to justify all the past illegal actions of the Chinese authorities, the Deputy Section Chief of the Consular Department, put forward the patently absurd explanation that the Gurdwaras were confiscated because holy swords, described as “military weapons” were found in them. The Chinese Government is surely aware of the fact that such swords are a part and parcel of the ceremonial and religious worship in Gurdwaras all over the world. Indeed, these have been in the Shanghai Gurdwaras ever since their inception. In describing the swords as “military weapons” the Chinese Government are making a pitiable attempt to white-wash their own hypocritical and illegal confiscation of the Gurdwara properties and expulsion of the two innocent Indian nationals.

As for the confiscation of the Parsi Temple and cemetery, the belated explanation given by the Deputy Section Chief of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is even more ridiculous. The Chinese authorities seem to make the discovery now at this late stage that the trustees of the Parsi Temple Hall were collecting intelligence about China. The fact of the matter is that the trustees of the Parsi Temple and Cemetery left China several years ago. This clearly proves the totally fictitious nature of the trumped-up charge that the Parsi Temple authorities were responsible for “collecting intelligence” about China.

The record of the Chinese Government’s action towards the Indian religious institutions in China over the last one year clearly proves that they have thrown to the winds their own declared policy and principles and out of ulterior political motives resorted to high-handed and arbitrary actions in confiscating the three Gurdwaras and the Parsi Temple and Cemetery in Shanghai. Their action in expelling the Indian nationals, Mr. Prem Singh and Mr. Kishan Singh, on the grounds that they were responsible for the swords found in the Gurdwaras is also marked by the same disregard of principles and
truth. By these actions, the Chinese Government stand unmasked before the bar of world opinion as a Government whose actions and words cannot be taken seriously. The Chinese Government will do well to take note of the fact that their unwarranted action against Indian nationals and Indian religious institutions in Shanghai have wounded the religious sentiments of the Sikh and Parsi communities and indeed incensed popular sentiments in India. The Chinese Government alone will be responsible for the consequences that will follow from their high-handed behaviour.

The Embassy of India registers a strong protest against the expulsion of the two Indian nationals, Mr. Prem Singh and Mr. Kishan Singh, on absurd and fabricated charges and against the confiscation of the three Sikh Gurdwaras and the Parsi Temple and Cemetery in Shanghai. The Indian Embassy further demands the restoration of these places of worship as well as the Parsi Cemetery for religious purposes along with the valuables and the movable properties confiscated and full compensation for the damage caused to these properties. The Indian Embassy reserves the right to raise further demands as and when more facts are made available.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 6 November, 1967

No. M/599/67

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, and with reference to the Ministry's note dated October 26, 1967 states as follows:

Though all the non-China based personnel of the Embassy are holding their identity cards issued by the Embassy, which fully establish their identity, the Indian Government still unreasonably insists in their holding passes issued by the Indian External Affairs Ministry. Such an action apparently amounts to sheer harassment and deliberate hinderance to the Embassy's normal functioning. For this, the Embassy in its note to the Ministry dated October 13, 1967 lodged a strong protest with the Ministry, while affirming that it reserved the right of making further representations, forwarded the list of names and addresses of the non-China based personnel of the Embassy and demanded of the Ministry to hand over immediately their passes to the Embassy. Up till now, the Ministry has not only delayed in issuing the passes, but also put up new conditions in its note of October 26, 1967. All this fully proves that the issuing of passes to the non-China based personnel of the Embassy by the Indian Government is absolutely not out of actual need, but is aimed at political discrimination and deliberate harassment to the Chinese Embassy. The Embassy reiterates its protest with the Indian Government and states once again that it reserves the right of making further representations. The Indian Government should issue the passes to the non-China based personnel of the Embassy without further delay, and not make unreasonable altercation any more to hinder the functioning of the Embassy.
Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 9 November, 1967

No. 610

The Embassy of India addresses itself to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China and has to state as follows:

It has come to the notice of the Indian Embassy that a document-film produced in China entitled “Seriously Punish the Indian Spy Raghunath” has been shown for public viewing in Peking.

The baseless nature of the charges concocted against Shri K. Raghunath, formerly Second Secretary of the Indian Embassy in Peking in pursuance of China’s anti-India policy and the series of illegal actions taken by the Chinese Government and authorities against him in contravention of international law and practice, have been exposed in the Indian Embassy’s notes of 5th and 13th June, 1967 and in the meetings held in the Chinese Foreign Office between the Indian Charge d’Affaires and the Deputy Director of the First Asia Division of the Chinese Foreign Office on June 12th, 1967 and in the two separate meetings between the Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs and the Chinese Charge d’Affaires in New Delhi on June 13th, 1967.

Now the Chinese authorities, going a step further, have produced a film which is nothing but a photographic record of China’s callous violation of international law and international practice in respect of Shri K. Raghunath, formerly Second Secretary of the Indian Embassy, and the official sanction behind the outrageous treatment given to him. The exhibition of the film is obviously a calculated attempt to further whip up anti-Indian feelings in China and to worsen relations with India and exposes China’s hostile behaviour and intentions towards India.

The Indian Embassy strongly protests against the production of this film and its exhibition and demands its immediate withdrawal from public screening.

Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 11 November, 1967

No. M/605/67

The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, in refutation of the Ministry’s note dated October 20, 1967 and states as follows:

The Indian Government wantonly sabotaged the National Day reception held by the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India on October 1, 1967. This is a reality which everyone can see, and is absolutely undeniable. It only amounts to absolute absurdity on the part of the Indian External Affairs Ministry to keep on talking
loosely in its note about the so-called steps taken “in the interest of the security of the Chinese Embassy and its personnel”. Does the Indian Government mean to say that in dispatching hundreds of policemen and secret agents to have the Embassy encircled, invitation cards snatched away from the guests attending the Embassy reception, and to have a number of these guests assaulted and wounded, it has acted “in the interest of the security of the Chinese Embassy and its personnel”? Right up to this day, the Indian secret agents are still posted around the Embassy with their tent pitched close to the Embassy’s main gate only at a distance of several metres. These Indian secret agents closely follow on the heels of the Embassy personnel whenever they go out and keep a watch on them, stop, interrogate, harass and abuse at will all kinds of visitors to the Embassy. They even beat up some children who came to the Embassy personnel for Chairman Mao’s badges. This is precisely the way the Indian Government is restricting and sealing off the Embassy by resorting to all unscrupulous means. Such behaviour of the Indian Government not only crudely violated all norms of international relations and deliberately further worsens the relations between China and India but also fully exposes its difficult internal and external situation and its weak nature. It is fully in accordance with unalterable principles that the Embassy has demanded sternly in its notes that the Indian Government should publicly apologise for its crime in sabotaging the Embassy’s National Day reception and ensure against any similar incident in the future. The Embassy asserts once again that the Indian Government must cancel all discriminative restrictions on the Embassy, and withdraw the secret agents, policemen and tents posted around the Embassy. Otherwise, the Indian Government must bear the full responsibility for further worsening of the relations between the two countries.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 November, 1967

No. C/30/67

The Ministry of External Affairs draws the attention of the Embassy of People’s Republic of China to its note No. M/521/67 of May 25, 1967, and states as follows:

The Embassy had already been informed on more than one occasion that Mr. Huang Kui-ting has been kept under detention for activities prejudicial to the security of India. However, since the Embassy of People’s Republic of China have approached the Ministry of External Affairs for Mr. Huang’s release, the Government of India are prepared to consider allowing him to leave the country along with his wife provided all arrangements for his departure from India are completed by the Embassy and a confirmation to this effect is received by the Ministry of External Affairs from them. Further necessary action for his release from the detention will be taken only after receipt of the confirmation from the Embassy about the completion of the arrangements for his departure and also the name of the port from which he will leave the country.
The above-mentioned decision has been already conveyed to Mr. Chou Ping-yi, Third Secretary of the Chinese Embassy on the 31st August, 1967 and a reply from the Chinese Embassy is still awaited. The responsibility for the continued detention of Mr. Huang Kuiting, therefore, devolves upon the Chinese Embassy. The Embassy’s protest of May 25 which is quite unwarranted is hereby rejected.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 November, 1967

No. 465 (48) DIII/67

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China and with reference to the Embassy’s note dated the 6th November, 1967, states as follows:

The Chinese Embassy in its note has levelled unwarranted allegations against the Government of India. The Ministry of External Affairs had, in its note No. 465 (48)-DIII/67 of the 26th October, 1967, indicated that passes would be issued on November 6, 1967, to the ten non-China based officials of the Chinese Embassy whose residential addresses had been forwarded to the Ministry along with the Embassy’s note of the 14th October. Nine of these persons came to the Ministry of External Affairs on the 6th November to complete the formalities and were issued requisite passes on that day. The tenth person, Mr. T. M. Pandurangan, however, did not report to the Ministry.

The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China was requested to intimate the full residential addresses of these non-China based personnel whose address in the list enclosed with the Embassy’s note of 14th October, 1967, was shown as “50-D, Shantipath, Chanakyapuri, New Delhi-21” which is the address of the Embassy. Instead of complying with this request and furnishing the relevant information, the Embassy apparently sent these people to the Ministry even though no appointment etc. had been made for them. Even so the concerned security authorities permitted them to complete the formalities but could not issue them passes until necessary verification etc. could be made for which their permanent residential addresses were essential. Had the Chinese Embassy either been consistent in giving the residential addresses of its employees or later co-operated in furnishing the required details, the security verification etc. could have been undertaken earlier. Consequently, the responsibility for any delay rests wholly on the Chinese Embassy.

In the absence of the Embassy’s co-operation the relevant information had to be ascertained from the persons concerned and this has been duly processed and checked. The remaining persons can now be issued passes and they may be advised to present themselves at the Ministry (South Block, Gate No. 5) on Tuesday, the 28th November, 1967, between 3 p.m. and 5 p.m.
(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 742.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's republic of China addresses this note to the Indian Embassy in China and makes the following reply in refutation of the Embassy's note No. 610 dated November 9, 1967:

K. Raghunath, former Second Secretary of the Indian Embassy, was a spy sentenced by the Peking Municipal Higher People's Court and expelled from China on June 15, 1967. In its note to the Indian Embassy dated as early as June 12, 1967, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs fully exposed and gave a detailed account of his espionage crimes in China, and this was made public before the world. Raghunath's espionage crimes have been fully established by iron-clad evidences and allow of no denial. It should be pointed out that in sending its diplomatic personnel to engage in such shameless espionage activities, the Indian Government has completely violated international law and practice. Yet the Indian Embassy slanderously counter-charged in its note that the Chinese Government was violating international law and practice. This is completely reversing right and wrong, like a thief crying "Stop thief!" and will come to no avail.

The documentary film "Severely Punish the Indian Spy Raghunath" has, in a just and factual manner, recorded Raghunath's espionage crimes in Peking and the Chinese people's perfectly justified indignation at his crimes. It is entirely China's internal affairs to produce and show publicly a film about a foreign spy's sabotage activities in China and the Indian Government has no right whatsoever to interfere in it. The Indian Embassy's attempt to prevent the showing of this documentary film and even to make use of the occasion to vilify the Chinese Government only serves to prove that the Indian Government, conscious of its guilt, fears that its dirty doings might be made public. For the above reasons, the Chinese Government categorically rejects the unwarranted protest and demand of the Indian Embassy.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24 November, 1967

No. C/31/67

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and returns the enclosed note received on the 23rd November, 1967 from that Embassy. The attention of the Chinese Embassy has been previously drawn to its use of language which did not conform with diplomatic practice. In the enclosed note again the Chinese Embassy has used phrases such as "the deceitful rubbish of the Indian Government". This note has moreover slandered the Indian Government as well as some other Governments friendly to India by attributing motives which,
apart from being patently false, are quite irrelevant to the context. Consequently, the Ministry of External Affairs returns the note herewith.

If the Chinese Embassy has any complaint or protest to make and expects the Government of India to take any cognizance of it, that Embassy is advised to address its communications in language recognised by diplomatic parlance.

---

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 November, 1967

(67) Pu Ling Yi Fa Tzu No. 410

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses this note to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note No. C/25/67 of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government to the Chinese Embassy in India, dated September 26, 1967, states as follows:

The question of the moving of the Indian Embassy has been dealt with entirely through consultations. The responsible official from the Consular Department has explained to the Embassy that the authorities concerned had taken note of the article concerning the giving of six months' advance notice. Owing to the needs of the Municipal administration and in view of the fact that there are buildings at two sites readily available in the Embassy quarters for the Embassy to choose from, the actual work of moving will not require much time, and it is, therefore, entirely practical and feasible to ask the Embassy to move within two months. The Charge d'Affaires of the Embassy Mr. R. D. Sathe stated that he was willing to co-operate and would not create obstacles. Later, the Embassy did not wish to lease the new premises and decided to move to No. 6 and No. 8 Kuang Hua Lu, and asked for eight flats to be arranged for the personnel of the Embassy and repairs to be made. The authorities concerned speedily met these requests and provided full facilities. The Embassy is fully aware of all this. However, the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government brazenly raised a protest in disregard of the above facts. This is totally unwarranted. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs rejects the protest of the Indian side and deeply regrets this creation of side issues to complicate the matter. A month has already passed since the expiration of the time limit for moving set by the authorities concerned, and yet the Embassy has not moved. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs hopes that the Embassy will adopt a correct attitude towards the various kinds of assistance and facilities provided by the authorities concerned of the Chinese side, and will move as soon as possible from the present premises and return the land.
As for the compensation for the buildings of the Embassy, it will be settled through consultations between the two sides in accordance with what was stated in the note dated August 15 of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

With regard to extending the lease for the buildings at Kuang Hua Lu and the land required for the construction of its new premises, the Embassy may contact the Service Bureau for Diplomatic Personnel.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 November, 1967 (67) Pu Ling Yi Tzu No. 412

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China addresses this note to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the Embassy’s note No. 606, dated November 5, 1967, states the following:

1. The persons in charge of the Indian Sikh temples in Shanghai have long kept in secret Japanese military swords, military sabres, a rifle bayonet, pistol cartridges and a portrait of the bandit Chiang Kai-shek, thus seriously violating China’s laws and decrees and jeopardizing public order. The Indian in charge of the Parsi temple and cemetery under cover of religion, collected military and economic intelligence and supported and provided shelter for a reactionary clique to carry out counter-revolutionary activities in the temple. The evidence for these criminal activities is well established and allows of no denial. It is therefore a matter of course for the Chinese local authorities to ban these unlawful religious institutions, and the judicial sanctions taken against those in charge of these institutions are due punishment meted out to them for their crimes. This is entirely the Chinese people’s internal affairs. But in its note the Indian Embassy still repeated its hypocritical arguments refuted long ago on many occasions, tried hard to distort the facts and viciously slandered the Chinese Government’s policies on religion. What is more, the note flaunted such words as “desecration” and “religious sentiments” in a vain attempt to deceive people and achieve the criminal aims of covering up the Indian nationals’ criminal acts against the law and of opposing China by inciting the religious sentiments of those believers who were ignorant of the actual facts. This is utterly futile. The protest raised by the Embassy on this matter cannot but be regarded as deliberate trouble-making. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs categorically rejects this protest.

2. As everybody knows, it has been the consistent policy of the Chinese Government to protect religion. The great numbers of Buddhists, Christians and Moslems all enjoy their freedom of religious belief in China, and their temples, churches or mosques have been duly protected. The Indian nationals’ Sikh temples in China have similarly been protected by the Chinese Government and have all along enjoyed the privilege of exemption from real estate taxation. In order to show consideration for the Sikhs’ religious life,
the Shanghai local authorities have provided extra supplies to the Sikh temples each month. Over a long period of time, the local authorities gave preferential treatment to the dairies run by the Sikhs, such as the purchase of their milk and cow-dung at a price higher than the market price and a higher supply quota of cattle fodder to the Sikhs than to the Chinese breeders, etc.

However, the Chinese Government absolutely will not allow anyone to carry out under cover of religion unlawful and criminal activities harmful to the Chinese people. In June, 1949 the Shanghai local authorities issued the decree of confiscating all illegal weapons. But the Sikh temples secretly kept Japanese military swords, military sabres, a rifle bayonet and pistol cartridges over a long period without reporting and handing them over to the authorities concerned. Hidden behind the glass frame holding a religious image was a portrait of Chiang Kai-shek, the public enemy of the Chinese people. The military swords and sabres found there all bear the mark of the Japanese army. Yet, you describe these weapons used by the Japanese militarists to slaughter the Chinese people during their aggression against China as "holy swords". This precisely reveals your ugly feature of acting as a cat's paw. The persons in charge of the Parsi temple and cemetery, in league with the social scum of China, carried on activities harmful to the Chinese people. All these are what the Chinese people absolutely will not tolerate.

3. The imperialists, the modern revisionists and all reactionaries have time and again struck up anti-China choruses, and the Indian Government has played a most ignominious role in such choruses. When the one million serfs in China's Tibet won liberation from the yoke of the darkest serfdom, the Indian Government set in motion all its propaganda machines wantonly slandering the Chinese Government as abolishing religion in Tibet and even repeatedly provoked armed conflicts on the border and supported the traitor Dalai in carrying on criminal activities against the Chinese people on Indian territory. And now to meet the needs of its domestic and foreign policies, the Indian Government is trying to make use of the unimpeachable act of the Shanghai local authorities in dealing with the case of violation of law by the Indian temples to make unbridled vilifications against the Chinese Government and stir up anti-Chinese sentiments so as to divert the attention of the people. By so doing, the Indian Government can gain nothing out of it, but can only prove that it has come to the end of its tether in opposing China. If the Indian Government goes on making troubles, it must bear full responsibility for all the consequences arising therefrom.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 December, 1967

No. C/32/67

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, New Delhi and with reference to the note No. (67) Pu Ling Yi Fa Tzu No. 410 of November 24,
1967 of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese Government states as follows:

2. The Chinese Government's claim that "the question of the moving of the Indian Embassy has been dealt with entirely through consultations" does not accord with facts. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese Government in their note No. (67) Pu Ling Yi Fa Tzu No. 178 of August 15, 1967 arbitrarily announced the withdrawal of the land leased to the Indian Embassy and thereby unilaterally repudiated the legal agreement governing the lease of the land occupied by the Indian Embassy in Peking. The Government of India had made their position abundantly clear in their note No. C/25/67 of September 26, 1967 that the Indian Embassy in Peking were compelled by the arbitrary action of the Chinese Government to shift from its premises at 24 Anti-Imperialist Street, Peking (formerly 32 Tung Chiao Ming Hsiang) and consequently did so under protest. It is, therefore, quite untenable for the Chinese Government to claim that the Indian Embassy has moved to its new premises "entirely through consultations".

3. It is quite extraordinary that in their note of November 24, under reply, the Chinese Government should acknowledge that "the authorities concerned had taken note of the article concerning the giving of six months advance notice" and then go on to admit that this contractual term was being unilaterally disregarded by them "owing to the needs of the Municipal Administration". It is also rather amazing that the same note should then talk about the expiration of the time limit of two months arbitrarily set by the Chinese authorities and yet maintain that it was all being done in 'Consultation' with the Indian Embassy in Peking.

4. The Indian Embassy in Peking has shifted to the new premises No. 6 and 8 Kuang Hua Lu as soon as it was practicable. Consequently the premises at 24-Anti-Imperialist Street, Peking, consisting of buildings and fixtures totalling 251 chiens including 195½ chiens of storeyed building with installed central heating equipment, 1 chien of tiled building, 2 chiens of building with cemented roof, 8 chiens of corridor, 13 chiens of garret and 6 chiens of basement together with equipment, etc. have been vacated under protest. The Chinese Government may take possession of these from the Embassy of India in Peking.

5. The Government of India once again draw the attention of the Chinese Government to Clause No. II (5) of the Lease Agreement signed on 31st March 1964 and hope that a suitable "plot or plots of land of no less amenities" will be offered to the Indian Embassy in Peking without further delay. It should be noted that the Indian Embassy in Peking had been asked to move to the new premises on certain clear understandings set out in the Ministry of External Affairs note of September 26, 1967 to the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi. It is, therefore, assumed that the Chinese Government will honour the understanding, particularly relating to the question of compensation for the property in question.
6. The Government of India once again reiterate that the Chinese Government have unilaterally repudiated their legal contractual obligations and reserve the right to take such further steps as might be necessary to protect their interests.

---

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 11 January, 1968

No. M/629/68

The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and states as follows:

The Chinese Embassy addressed a note to the Indian External Affairs Ministry on November 22, 1967 to make a representation with the Ministry regarding the most unreasonable action of the Indian Government in dispatching secret agents to encircle and keep a watch on the Embassy, thus making it unable to carry out its normal functions and in deliberately threatening its security. It was precisely because of finding itself devoid of all arguments before numerous irrefutable facts that the Ministry should have returned the Embassy’s note under the pretext of “language”. This act can only further expose that the Indian Government does not want to reduce its various unreasonable actions infringing upon the diplomatic privileges of the Chinese Embassy, but to deliberately intensify its sealing off and restrictions on the Embassy in an attempt to bring all the activities of the Embassy to a standstill so as to further worsen the relations of the two countries.

Turning facts upside down, and confusing black with white, in order to cover up its above vicious aim, the Indian Government even describes its various discriminative restrictions and unreasonable measures imposed on the Chinese Embassy as “protection”. It is actually the most queer language in the history of international relations. But no matter what excuse the Indian Government makes, facts can never be covered up. The Embassy, now gives only a few specific cases as follows:

1. On October 8, 1967, an Indian secret agent followed a non-China based personnel into the Embassy compound to interrogate him and thus violated the diplomatic privileges of the Embassy.

2. On October 27, 1967, a car of the Indian secret agents closely tailed the Embassy’s car to the Chelmsford Road and in an attempt to make provocation, dashed against the car of the Embassy deliberately. It seriously threatened the security of the personnel of the Embassy who were in the car.

3. On October 28 and 31, 1967, the Indian secret agents twice threatened and forcibly turned back from entering into the Embassy an Indian technician who had come to repair a duplicating machine of the Embassy, and thus hampered the concerned work of the Embassy for several days.
4. On October 31, 1967, a Chinese national and members of his family were called back, even after they had entered the gate of the Embassy in a taxi, by a blustering secret agent to be interrogated and harassed, and had their names, addresses and occupations etc. registered. It was only after some members of the Embassy intervened that they were allowed to enter the Embassy.

5. On October 31, 1967, three Indians with the connivance and co-operation of Indian secret agents broke into the Embassy to hand over a slanderous and threatening letter. When the letter was refused, these Indians, while leaving the Embassy, pulled their neckties slanting to one side and unbuttoned their shirts. An unidentified person at the gate of the Embassy took photographs for them just in time by a camera kept ready with a pre-plan to fabricate false evidence. They again conspired with the secret agents and then left. On the next day, Delhi newspapers carried the rumour that the Second Secretary of the Chinese Embassy had injured three Sikh leaders. It is quite obvious that the Indian secret agents actively engineered and engaged in this political scheme of circumventing the Embassy and whipping up anti-China sentiments.

6. On December 6, 1967, Indian Secret agents forcibly turned away a messenger of the telegraph office with an urgent telegram for the Embassy. When the man tried to come to the Embassy for the second time, he was harassed again by the secret agents and was thus disallowed to deliver the urgent telegram to the Embassy in time. This is a serious obstruction to the normal communication of the Embassy. When the personnel of the Embassy asked on the spot about the matter, the Indian secret agents openly replied that they were instructed to do so by the Indian External Affairs Ministry.

7. On December 6, 1967, when a Tibetan of China left the Embassy with Chairman Mao's badges and Chinese tea and cigarettes given by the Embassy, the Indian secret agents went as far as to make a personal search, to have torn up his clothes and snatched away from him the above-mentioned things. Furthermore, he was forcibly taken away by the secret agents when he demanded to have his things back.

8. On the New Year's Day of 1968, the secret agents forbade the driver of a three-wheeler scooter to drive away with two African students who left the Embassy after dropping in. They insisted on interrogating the students and searching the books taken from the Embassy, in the same manner as they treated other visitors of the Embassy. Only when the Embassy personnel intervened, the secret agents could not but let them go.

The above facts clearly show that for its internal and external needs, the Indian Government has sealed off the Chinese Embassy and makes trouble against it by hook or by crook and its actions have gone from bad to worse. It is seldom seen in the history of international relations that the Indian Government regardless of national dignity and diplomatic courtesy, should have assigned secret agents to sabotage and make trouble against a foreign mission in such a way. Against these actions of crudely trampling under
foot the international principles and of seriously infringing the diplomatic privileges of the Embassy, the Chinese Embassy lodges its strong protest with the Indian External Affairs Ministry and demands that the Indian Government:

1. immediately cancel all the discriminative restrictions on the Embassy, withdraw the secret agents posted around the Embassy, dismantle the secret agents' tents pitched around it, and guarantee the normal functioning of the Embassy;

2. make investigations on outrageous activities of the secret agents assigned by it in obstructing the normal functioning and threatening the security of the Embassy; especially, make investigations on the above-mentioned eight serious incidents, and ensure against recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 12 January, 1968

No. M/630/68

Calling on Mr. A. R. Deo, Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India on October 16, 1967, Madam Cheng Yu-shu, Second Secretary of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India demanded of the Indian Government to promptly handle the matter and give its reply regarding the following incident:

Mr. Chou Huai Yu, a Chinese national, has long been living at Balasore, Orissa, India, practising dentistry by profession. On September 25, 1967, fifty to sixty Indian ruffians suddenly broke into Mr. Chou's clinic, unwarrantedly beat him up savagely, damaged the medical instruments and equipments and broke open the door of the kitchen in his house. The ruffians threatened to drive out the Chinese, and kill Mr. Chou and all the members of his family.

After the incident, the local police station did nothing to check this atrocity, but on the contrary detained Mr. Chou for three hours. Afterwards the ruffians were still making provocations constantly in front of Mr. Chou's clinic, abusing and threatening him. Mr. Chou reported the case several times to the police station, but up till now, the police station has not handled this matter in an effective way.

In the conversation with the Deputy Secretary, the Second Secretary of this Embassy pointed out that the incident of Mr. Chou's being beaten is the result of the Indian Government's deliberately whipping up anti-China frenzy, and demanded of the Indian Government to immediately take effective measures to guarantee the personal security and the safety of the property of Mr. Chou and his family, punish in serious attitude the culprits, compensate Mr. Chou's losses and ensure against the recurrence of similar incidents. The Deputy Secretary promised to handle the case promptly and gave a reply to the Embassy. On December 19, 1967, the Second Secretary of this Embassy again called on Mr. T. K. George, Attache of the
Ministry and enquired about the case. However, up till now nothing has come out. At present, the safety of Mr. Chou and his family is still endangered by the ruffians. Now, the Embassy reiterates its above-mentioned demands and points out in all seriousness that should the Indian Government continue to delay this matter and not take effective measures promptly to restrain these anti-China incidents which endanger the Chinese nationals, the Indian Government must be held responsible for the consequences arising therefrom.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 January, 1968

No. C/1/68

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and in reply to the Chinese Foreign Ministry’s note No. 67 Pu Ya Tzu No. 742 of November 21, 1967 states the following:

2. The Chinese Government could not be unaware that the absurd charges levelled against Shri K. Raghunath have naturally and predictably failed to carry conviction with anyone and that the illegal and uncivilised behaviour of the Peking mobs acting under the instigation of the Chinese authorities has been deplored all over the world. The Chinese Government's persistence in peddling with this proved fabrication through the propagandist film they have brought out is only a futile effort to give some credibility to the preposterous charges made by them.

3. The Government of India have no anxiety on the score of such puerile propaganda exercises of the Chinese Government carrying any more credence than their earlier efforts. However, the people and Government of India cannot but view such actions as wilful attempt on the part of the Chinese Government to malign India and spread anti-Indian prejudice amongst the people of China. The Government of India once again point out that the Chinese Government alone will be responsible for the consequences arising therefrom.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 January, 1968

No. C/2/68

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Government's note No. (67) Pu Ling Yi Tzu No. 412 of November 24, 1967, states as follows:

2. The Chinese Government seeking to white-wash the acts of sacrilege by the Shanghai authorities have in their note under reply merely repeated the ridiculous allegations which have already been totally refuted. It would appear that being unable to substantiate
the allegations the Chinese Government have sought to garnish with flimsy details the so-called evidence which is patently concocted and absurd. The swords have been described as "military" and now even their origin has been allegedly traced to the Japanese Army!

3. It should be well known to the Chinese authorities that swords, kirpans, etc. are part of the Sikh religious worship and ceremonial. The Sikh Gurdwaras in Shanghai would undoubtedly have used swords, kirpans, etc. openly in the course of their religious worship. It is, therefore, quite incredible as to how these swords could have been "long kept in secret". To charge that pistol cartridges and a hidden portrait of General Chiang Kai-shek were kept in the Gurdwaras is a transparent fabrication. The Chinese note has not even been able to specify in which of the three Sikh Gurdwaras the so-called evidence was found.

4. The Chinese note under reply claims that "the person in charge of the Parsi temple and cemetery, in league with the social scum of China, carried on activities harmful to the Chinese people". It has already been pointed out to the Chinese Foreign Office that the Trustees of the Parsi temple and cemetery left China several years ago. Consequently, the Chinese allegation about the "person in charge of the Parsi temple and cemetery", who was not even in China, is to say the least fantastic. The Indian Embassy in Peking had some time ago brought to the notice of the Chinese Foreign Office the fact that the Parsi temple in Shanghai was illegally occupied by persons who had styled themselves as 'revolutionaries'. The Embassy had asked the Chinese Government to restore the temple but the Chinese Government had all along evaded this legitimate demand made on behalf of the Parsi community.

5. The note under reply makes the preposterous claim that the Shanghai authorities have given 'preferential treatment' to the Sikhs residing in Shanghai. The fact that their numbers have been dwindling over the recent years and more particularly as a result of the systematic persecution and expropriation some of them have been compelled to leave China bears testimony to the so-called 'preferential treatment'!

6. The Chinese note claims that "it has been the consistent policy of the Chinese Government to protect religion". Their record however in this matter is too well known to require any comment. The arbitrary and high-handed action taken against the Sikh and Parsi temples is in itself a confirmation of the Chinese Government's hypocritical pretensions as a protector of religion. It will be relevant to point out that not only unjustifiable and harsh action has been taken against the Presidents of the Sikh Gurdwaras, who have already been expelled from China, but that the Chinese authorities have gone to the extent of illegally confiscating these religious institutions, thereby depriving the members of these communities the use of these properties for their legitimate religious needs.
7. If the Chinese Government are at all keen to "protect religion" they should, without delay, restore the Sikh and Parsi religious institutions in Shanghai. This high-handed action of the Chinese authorities is an affront to the religious sentiments of the people of India and the Chinese Government alone will be responsible for any consequences that may arise therefrom. The Government of India reserve their right to take further appropriate action to protect the private and corporate interests of Indian nationals in China.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 20 January, 1968

No. M/634/68

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India has learnt that on December 12, 1967, the West Bengal Government of India unjustifiably ordered Mr. Ma Ming Tsai, a Chinese dentist in Calcutta, to leave India within one month.

Mr. Ma Ming Tsai has been living in Calcutta for more than thirty years and has always been carrying on an honest profession of dentistry. The Indian Government's forcible order to Mr. Ma to leave the territory of India is purely an unreasonable persecution against the Chinese national. The Chinese Embassy lodges its strong protest with the Indian Government against its rampant persecution of the Chinese national and its outrageous act of violating the norms of international relations and demands of the Indian Government to immediately withdraw its unreasonable decision of ordering Mr. Ma to leave India within the time limit.

It must be pointed out that in May last year, the West Bengal Government of India did the same in ordering a Chinese dentist, Mr. Shu Kuei to leave India. Regarding this, the Embassy, on July 29, 1967, lodged its protest with the Indian Government and demanded the withdrawal of the unjustifiable decision of the Indian Government to order Mr. Shu to leave India. Up till now, the Indian Government not only has not given any reply on Mr. Shu's case, but has again created the incident of unwarrantedly persecuting the Chinese national by ordering Mr. Ma Ming Tsai unreasonably to leave India. Since long, in disregard of the repeated representations and protests made by the Chinese Government and the Chinese Embassy, the Indian Government has become more unscrupulous in persecuting the innocent Chinese nationals in India. We want to ask the Indian Government: What is your real intention by so unscrupulously trampling under foot the norms of international relations and by worsening the relations between China and India?

The Embassy reiterates that the legitimate rights of the Chinese nationals must be safeguarded. The cruel actions of the Indian Government of persecuting the Chinese nationals must be stopped. If the Indian Government will wilfully and arbitrarily persist in persecuting the Chinese nationals, it must bear the responsibilities arising therefrom.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 February, 1968

No. C/5/68

Reference the Chinese Embassy Memoranda of July 29, 1967 and January 20, 1968, the Ministry of External Affairs in reply states as follows:—

In the communications under reference, the Chinese Embassy has presented entirely unjustified protests against actions taken by the Government of India in conformity with the laws prevalent in this country. The three persons referred to in the Chinese Embassy's Memoranda, Chu Chien Hsin, Shu Kuei and Ma Ming Tsai, had been found to be engaging in activities prejudicial to the security of India and it was entirely within the rights of the Indian Government to take appropriate legal action against them. Moreover, the three persons in question were given adequate time to prepare to leave this country and this time limit was further extended more than once on compassionate grounds. The protests of the Chinese Embassy are, therefore, wholly unreasonable and quite unjustified.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 February, 1968

No. C/7/68

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi is requested to refer to its Memorandum No. M/630/68, dated January 12, 1968. The Ministry of External Affairs reply is as follows:

2. The authorities concerned have conducted necessary investigations into the alleged incident referred to in the above-mentioned Memorandum. The facts are that Mr. Chou Huai-yu and his family have been repeatedly picking quarrels with the family of one Mr. S. L. Gupta who lives on the first floor of the building, the ground floor of which is occupied by Mr. Chou. Investigations have revealed that on September 25, 1967, at 9-30 A.M., Mrs. Chou picked up a quarrel with a member of Mr. Gupta's family when the latter legitimately complained about the annoyance caused by the smoke coming out from the movable hearth set-up by Mr. Chou on the ground floor. Some neighbours attempted to settle the dispute but Mr. Chou assaulted one of them. Immediately a mobile police party arrived on the scene and as it was apprehended that the quarrel could cause a breach of peace, local police authorities summoned both Mr. Chou and Mr. Gupta to the Police Station. As soon as the situation returned to normal, Mr. Chou and Mr. Gupta were allowed to proceed to their residences. The allegation that Mr. Chou was beaten or that medical instruments and equipment were broken is quite untrue. Since the nature of the dispute between the two parties appeared to be petty, efforts were made to reconcile them the next day. However, this reconciliation did not prove durable and consequently proceedings were instituted to bind both the parties in accordance with the relevant provisions of the law to prevent a breach of peace.
3. The local police authorities, it is quite evident, took prompt and adequate action to prevent the situation from deteriorating. It is also quite obvious that the local police authorities have dealt with this matter in an impartial manner as both Mr. Chou as well as Mr. Gupta had been restrained from aggravating the quarrel. As against this, it is quite extraordinary that the Chinese Embassy without verifying the veracity of Mr. Chou's complaint has not only adopted a partisan attitude in a private quarrel between two individuals but jumped to conclusions making baseless charges against local authorities and has hastily used the occasion to impugn motives and level familiar slanders against the Government of India. The Chinese Embassy should know that it is open to Mr. Chou to obtain redress to any grievance etc. in accordance with the laws of the country.

4. In view of the facts stated above, the Ministry of External Affairs categorically rejects the baseless and unwarranted charges levelled against the local authorities in Balasore and the Government of India.

---

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 7 March, 1968

No. C/9/68

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and with reference to the illegal detention of Police Constable Ghanisham Parshad on March 6, 1968, brings the following facts to the attention of the Chinese Embassy:

It has been reported to the Ministry of External Affairs that around 1500 hours a Police Constable of the Central Reserve Police had inadvertently strayed into the premises of the Chinese Embassy. After he came out, he was asked by the gateman of the Chinese Embassy to come inside the premises and thereupon escorted by several members of the Chinese Embassy and taken inside the building of the Chinese Embassy. When the local Security authorities and a local Sub Divisional Magistrate informed the Chinese Embassy that they would like to talk to officials of the Chinese Embassy about the detained constable, the Chinese Embassy refused to co-operate and took an obstinate attitude. The officials of the Chinese Embassy persisted in this stubborn attitude even after they had been contacted by telephone by the local Sub Divisional Magistrate. The Chinese Embassy was then advised by the Protocol Division of the Ministry of External Affairs to hand over the detained Police Constable to the Security officials in the locality of the Embassy. Mr. Chou Ping-Yi, Third Secretary of the Chinese Embassy, refused to do so and insisted that they would return the Constable in the presence of a Protocol official known to them, whereupon officials of the Protocol Division of the Ministry of External Affairs went to the Chinese Embassy at
For more than an hour after their arrival, Mr. Chou Ping-Yi, Third Secretary, and other personnel of the Chinese Embassy tried to argue and cover up the illegality of their action in kidnapping and wrongfully detaining the said constable and even demanded that the Protocol Division officials should sign a so-called receipt. When the C.R.P. constable was released at 7-30 p.m. as a result of an emphatic demand of the Ministry of External Affairs, it was learnt that the personnel of the Chinese Embassy, had even gone to the extent of making him write and sign a so-called statement.

The Ministry of External Affairs protests against the illegal detention of an Indian policeman in uniform and the high-handed action in interrogating him and extorting a statement from him, and the deliberate un-cooperative attitude of the personnel of the Chinese Embassy with the authorities of the Government of India. This action of the Chinese Embassy clearly violates the rights and jurisdiction of the Sovereign authority of the Government of India. The Chinese Embassy should know that it cannot arrogate to itself any authority to detain any person, least of all an official in uniform, on the premises of the Chinese Embassy. The Ministry deplores the non-cooperative attitude of the Chinese Embassy towards the local Security and Civil authorities.

The Ministry of External Affairs further wishes to point out that when the Charge d'Affaires of the Chinese Embassy was summoned to the Ministry of External Affairs at 7-45 p.m. the same evening, he expressed his inability to do so on the ground that he had another appointment. In view of this and as by then the Embassy had allowed the constable to leave the premises, the Ministry of External Affairs suggested that he could come to the Ministry next morning and two separate timings were suggested, both of which he declined. The Ministry of External Affairs had pointed out to the Charge d'Affaires that official business with the host Government usually takes precedence over all other business including the so-called engagements. The Ministry of External Affairs takes a very serious view of the total disregard by the Charge d'Affaires of the Chinese Embassy of normal diplomatic practice.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 March, 1968

(68) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 111

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states the following:

1. According to reports from the Chinese Embassy in India, on the afternoon of March 6, 1968 two unidentified Indians in Indian Police uniform illegally intruded into the compound of the Chinese Embassy. When they were discovered by personnel of the Chinese Embassy and were approached for questioning, one of them fled. The other one, after being questioned, confessed that he was an Indian Policeman and admitted that it was wrong to have illegally
intruded into the Embassy, but he refused to tell the real purpose of this illegal action. Having ascertained what had happened, the Chinese Embassy informed the Indian Ministry of External Affairs of this matter and asked the latter to send someone to the Embassy to bring back the said Policeman. The Indian Ministry of External Affairs sent to the Embassy B. S. Puri and another official of the Protocol Division who, after inspecting the scene and acquainting themselves with the facts, admitted that it was entirely wrong and constituted a grave incident for the Indian Policemen to intrude into the Embassy and guaranteed that no similar incident would recur. Subsequently, the two officials brought away with them the said Policeman. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the grave incident of the Indian Policemen's illegal intrusion into the Chinese Embassy and encroachment upon its diplomatic privileges.

2. The Indian Government bears an unshirkable responsibility for this grave incident of encroachment upon the diplomatic privileges of the Chinese Embassy. However, instead of seriously handling the incident, the Indian Government, using the tactics of the wicked accusing others first, delivered a so-called Note of Protest to the Chinese Embassy on March 7, in which it attempted to absolve itself of its own responsibility by fantastically countercharging the Chinese Embassy with "kidnapping and wrongfully detaining" an Indian Policeman who had intruded into the Embassy. This is indeed the height of absurdity. The Chinese Government categorically rejects such a totally unwarranted "Protest" of the Indian Government.

3. The Chinese Government holds that the grave incident of the Indian Policemen's illegal intrusion into the Chinese Embassy is by no means accidental. For a long time now the Chinese Embassy in India has been tightly besieged by large number of Indian policemen and special agents, who question and keep a register of anyone entering the Embassy. The round-the-clock surveillance by the Indian Police on the Chinese Embassy has not only obstructed the normal functioning of the Embassy, but also posed a direct threat to its safety; this constitutes in itself an infringement on diplomatic privileges in complete violation of international practice. What is more, uniformed Indian policemen have now gone still further by wilfully intruding into the Chinese Embassy; this is the crudest violation of international diplomatic practice.

It must be further pointed out that immediately following this grave incident, the Indian government set in motion its propaganda machine to spread lies and slanders against the Chinese Embassy, and the Indian Parliament also raised a hue and cry to whip up anti-Chinese sentiments. Then, the Indian Government hastily delivered a so-called Note of Protest, attempting to deceive public opinion and shirk its responsibility by resorting to its customary practice of making false countercharges. But this is utterly futile. The Chinese Government demands that the Indian Government seriously deal with this grave incident of encroachment on the diplomatic privileges of the Chinese Embassy and guarantee against the recurrence of similar incidents in the future.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 April, 1968

No. C/10/68.

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and, with reference to the Embassy's note No. M/629/68 of January 11, 1968, states as follows:

2. The Chinese Embassy, in the note under reference, has again repeated the familiar charge of so-called discriminatory restrictions said to have been imposed on the functioning of the Embassy. In order to lend credibility to this baseless charge, the Chinese Embassy has resorted to producing a catalogue of gross distortions and even complete fabrications. Notwithstanding the Chinese Embassy's known attitude in not conforming with simple matters of procedure in order to create unnecessary issues, the allegations contained in the note under reference have been carefully investigated by competent authorities. All the allegations have been found to be quite untrue and baseless.

3. The Chinese Embassy is reminded that certain security measures have been taken to afford special protection to that Embassy. Consequently, the identity of non-diplomatic personnel entering the Chinese Embassy is ascertained. This, as it happens, is in conformity with the practice followed by the Chinese Government vis-a-vis the Indian Embassy and its personnel in Peking and is entirely necessary for affording the required protection to the Chinese Embassy and its personnel in New Delhi. Similarly, the Chinese Embassy should be aware that various tradesmen and other persons who have regular business with the Embassy are required to obtain passes. The personnel posted outside the Chinese Embassy are performing their legitimate duty in ascertaining the identity of visitors and tradesmen proceeding to the Chinese Embassy. The Ministry of External Affairs, however, categorically rejects the charge that security personnel posted outside the Chinese Embassy have either entered the compound of the Chinese Embassy or prevented any bonafide visitor from entering the Embassy.

4. The catalogue of the trumped up charges includes a car accident alleged to have taken place on October 27, 1967 on Chelmsford Road. It is strange that no complaint appears to have been filed with any Police Station by or on behalf of the Chinese Embassy in regard to this “specific charge”. Evidently, this baseless allegation does not even indicate the registration number of the Embassy's car claimed to have been involved in the accident!

5. Similarly, the charge that on October 31, 1967, three Indians “broke into the Embassy” is an example of the kind of distortion resorted to by the Chinese Embassy. In fact, the three Indian nationals had legitimate cause to complain against the Chinese Embassy. The attention of the Chinese Charge d'Affaires has already been drawn to the undiplomatic behaviour of the personnel of the Chinese Embassy in manhandling three Indian nationals who had proceeded to the Chinese Embassy to hand over a legitimate representation.
6. The Ministry of External Affairs categorically rejects the note of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China under reference and advises that Embassy to comply with the various procedures laid down by the Government of India.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 9 April, 1968

No. M/660/68

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India and states the following:

On April 3, 1968, Indian policemen unjustifiably arrested Mr. Kafil Ahmed, an Indian driver and Mr. Veer Bahadur, a Nepalese gate-keeper of the Chinese Embassy. On that day around eight o'clock in the morning, when Mr. Kafil Ahmed drove the Embassy's car No. CD842 in performing official duty, at Panch Sheel Marg, a number of Indian armed policemen and police vans forcibly obstructed the car and coercively arrested Mr. Kafil Ahmed. The Embassy's car was left along Panch Sheel Marg. On the same day, Indian policemen without reason arrested Mr. Veer Bahadur, the gate-keeper of the Embassy at the bus-stop of Shanti Path.

It is seldom seen in the history of international relations that the Indian Government should have so crudely violated the diplomatic immunity of the Embassy, and persecuted its employees. For this, on April 3, the Charge d'Affaires a.i. of the Chinese Embassy lodged a strong protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs. However, until now, the Indian Government has still unwarrantedly kept the above-mentioned two employees of the Chinese Embassy under lock up and has carried out so-called "interrogation".

The Indian Government's persecution of the two employees of the Chinese Embassy is not accidental but a planned and premeditated action. As early as March 6 this year, two Indian policemen illegally intruded into the Chinese Embassy, thus committing a serious encroachment upon the diplomatic privileges of the Embassy and threatening its security. The Indian Government has not only not handled this grave incident seriously but, on the contrary, has fabricated lies and vehemently incited anti-China sentiments in its Parliament and aired out that it would carry out persecution against the employees of the Chinese Embassy. Now, the Indian Government has indeed taken this despicable action. This shows that the Indian Government is intentionally subjecting the Indian employees of the Chinese Embassy to political persecution. Its aim is entirely to undermine the conditions for the normal functioning of the Chinese Embassy. This is another serious provocation solely engineered by the Indian Government to the diplomatic privileges of the Chinese Embassy following the illegal intrusion by the Indian police into the Embassy with the connivance of the Indian Government. The Chinese Embassy hereby lodges its strong protest with the Indian
Government against this. The Indian Government must immediately stop its persecution of the employees of the Chinese Embassy and ensure the conditions for the normal functioning of the Embassy. The Chinese Embassy reserves its right for further representations.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 April, 1968

No. C/11/68

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and in reply to the Chinese Foreign Office Note No. (68) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 111, dated 18th March, 1968 and the Chinese Embassy's note No. M/660/68, dated 9th April, 1968, would like to state as follows:

2. The protest of the Chinese Embassy that two Central Reserve Police constables entered the Chinese Embassy premises on March the 6th, 1968, is already under investigation. Appropriate action will undoubtedly be taken against these two constables after the matter is thoroughly investigated. The Charge d'Affaires of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China was informed on the 3rd of April, 1968 by the Director of the East Asia Division in the Ministry of External Affairs of this.

3. However, the fact that constable Ghanisham Parshad was wrongfully confined in the Chinese Embassy for well over four hours cannot be overlooked. A complaint was lodged on the 6th of March, 1968 itself against this act. This complaint has naturally to be processed in accordance with the relevant procedure and provisions of the law.

4. It is quite clear that the Chinese Embassy has transgressed its diplomatic privilege in detaining constable Ghanisham Parshad. The Government of the People's Republic of China should be aware that no diplomatic mission accredited to a foreign government can take the law into its own hands as was done by the Chinese Embassy on the 6th of March, 1968. That Embassy should, as soon as it had come to know of an unauthorised person trespassing on its premises, have immediately brought the matter to the notice of the local Police authorities. Instead, the Embassy proceeded to conduct a so-called investigation which was to last for well over four hours. Further the Embassy refused to co-operate in the handling of the matter with the local authorities. During the period of detention, Chinese Embassy personnel even extorted a statement from the constable. These actions of the Chinese Embassy constitute a gross violation of the rights and jurisdiction of the host Government. Such high-handed behaviour on the part of a diplomatic mission has no precedent in international law or practice.

5. The Embassy of the People's Republic of China has sought to protest against the arrest of Shri Kafil Ahmed and Shri Vir Bahadur, chauffeur and gate-keeper respectively of the Chinese Embassy. When the Charge d'Affaires of the Chinese Embassy of the People's
Republic of China met the Director of the East Asia Division in the Ministry of External Affairs on 3rd April, 1968, it was made clear to the Charge d'Affaires that the action taken in respect of the two local employees of the Chinese Embassy arose out of the legal complaint lodged on the 6th of March against the wrongful confinement of constable Ghanisham Parshad. Since the matter was being dealt with in accordance with Indian laws, no interference from any quarter is permissible.

6. The Ministry of External Affairs emphatically reject the absurd charge that the Government of India have “violated the diplomatic immunity” of the Chinese Embassy and “persecuted” its Indian employees. In fact, it is the action of Chinese Embassy personnel in unwarrantedly and wrongfully confining constable Ghanisham Parshad which constitutes a blatant infringement of the sovereign authority of the host Government. As for the two local employees of the Chinese Embassy, it is clear to all that the matter is being processed in accordance with the laws of the country. It is equally absurd to charge that this legal action is a “planned and premeditated action”. The Government of India had clearly stated on March the 6th itself that the matter would be processed in accordance with the law of the land. It is quite obvious that the Chinese Embassy is now seeking to cover up the wrongful confinement of constable Ghanisham Parshad on the 6th of March, by levelling a number of frivolous and absurd charges.

7. The Ministry of External Affairs reiterate that the legal complaint against the wrongful confinement of constable Ghanisham Parshad is being determined by the competent legal court in accordance with the laws of the land. The Chinese Embassy cannot expect the authorities in India to refrain from enforcing Indian laws in the face of a specific legal complaint alleging the infringement of such laws. The Government of India have no desire to undermine the normal functioning of the Chinese Embassy. Obviously, such normal functioning cannot include the wrongful confinement of an Indian national in the Embassy premises and the diplomatic privileges of the Chinese Embassy cannot be used as a cover for high-handed action on the part of the Embassy’s personnel.

8. In the light of the above facts the two notes under reference are categorically rejected.
IV. ANTI-INDIA PROPAGANDA BY CHINA

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 July, 1967

No. C/19/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses the present note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India.

2. This Government's attention has been drawn to two extraordinary talks in the English language beamed towards India by the Peking Radio on June 28 and June 30 purporting to describe conditions in the West Bengal State of India but in effect openly instigating an armed struggle against the legally established and constitutional Government in this country. Both talks are venomous pieces of anti-Indian propaganda, which are diametrically opposite to the principles of normal international propriety and usage, as well as the principles of peaceful co-existence and the Bandung principles to which the representative of the People's Republic of China affixed his signature in 1955. A few choice examples of the present Chinese Government attitude towards the people and Government of India are given below from these broadcasts:

A phase of peasants' armed struggle led by the revolutionaries of the Indian Communist Party has been set up in the countryside in Darjeeling district of West Bengal State of India. This is the front paw of the revolutionary armed struggle launched by the Indian people under the guidance of Mao Tse-tung's thought. This represents the general orientation of the Indian revolution at the present times. The people of India, China and the rest of the world hail the emergence of this revolutionary armed struggle. (Broadcast on 28th June, 1967).

This red district, first established in early March, covers an area of over 270 square miles and includes a population of 80,000. Since its founding it has been standing majestically like a mountain for nearly four months in the encirclement of a White regime. (Broadcast on 28th June, 1967).

The emergence of this struggle in India, a big country which is colonial and semi-feudal with 500,000,000 population and an unbalanced political and economic development, signifies a new stage in the Indian people's surging struggle against reactionary rule. This forecasts the approach of a great people's revolution in India with armed struggle as its majority force. (Broadcast on 28th June, 1967).
The Congress Government, representing the Indian big landlords and big bourgeoisie, has always pursued a foreign policy of surrendering to imperialism and a domestic policy of brutally suppressing and exploiting the broad masses of labouring people, thus driving hundreds of millions of people to the brink of starvation and death. Under this counter-revolutionary rule the workers, peasants and other labouring people throughout the country are in a desperate situation. Only through revolution by violence can they maintain their existence. (Broadcast on 28th June, 1967).

The hurricane of the Indian people's great revolution will certainly come. (Broadcast on 28th June, 1967).

The revolutionary people in Darjeeling district answered the reactionary counter-revolutionary double-dealing with new offensives against police stations and against the landlords. The revolutionaries of Darjeeling are persisting in revolutionary armed struggle and have inspired peasant struggles in other places. (Broadcast on 30th June, 1967).

3. During the last three or four years and particularly during the last one year the Chinese Government have been increasing the intensity and volume of their propaganda against India. No attempt has been made to conceal in this propaganda that the declared aim of the group ruling China today is to subvert the Government of India as well as the Governments of other Asian States who do not bow to their changing whims and fancies. Since it is well-known that the present Chinese Government does not care to observe normal canons of international behaviour it was not considered necessary by this Government to protest in this matter. But these two broadcasts specifically aimed at the territorial dismemberment of India and subversion of its lawfully constituted Government by armed struggle with the assistance of a foreign power whose "front paw" it is claimed in the broadcasts is already in evidence in India go beyond even the standards of rudeness, discourtesy and subversion which the Chinese leaders have set themselves in their animosity towards India over the past several months. Far beyond anything said or written against India by the Chinese Government in recent years these broadcasts represent flagrant interference in India's internal affairs.

4. The Government of India protest in the strongest possible terms against this flagrant violation of international behaviour and interference in India's internal affairs. The Chinese Government has no right, and it is none of its business, to comment on and interfere with internal affairs. They should learn a lesson from the Government of India which has refrained from commenting on the confusion and lawlessness prevailing in China as a consequence of the so-called great cultural revolution. The Government of India demands that the Chinese Government cease forthwith these desperate activities obviously designed to distract the attention of the world from unsettled conditions in China brought about by their
own tyrannical and capricious acts. The Government of China even at this late moment should return to the paths of normal international behaviour. They should know that all their mischievous interference will amount to knocking their heads against a stone-wall and that the Indian people who are wide-awake to Chinese expansionist and subversive designs resolutely reject the Chinese Government’s machinations.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 July, 1967

No. C/20/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses the present note to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India, and states as follows:

2. The attention of the Government of India has been drawn to issues No. 40 and 42 of the ‘News from China’ published by the information office of the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi dated 15th June, 1967 and 26th June, 1967 respectively. The bulletin No. 40 contains a long description of the so-called “public trial” of Shri K. Raghunath in Peking. The bulletin does not attribute this highly imaginative piece of literature to any source. It is assumed, therefore, that this must have been written up by someone in the Embassy from Chinese News Agency Reports. The bulletin No. 42 contains a report which is called “a Hsinhua correspondent’s story” on “Chinese Embassy staff in New Delhi fight Indian violence”. Both these articles are full of lies and fabrications from the beginning to the end and are replete with anti-Indian propaganda. The Government of India protest against this misuse by the Chinese Embassy of the normal facilities granted to them for publishing material concerning developments in their country. The Government of India are taking suitable counter-measures.

3. Several times in the past, the Government of India have had occasion to remind the Chinese Embassy that they cannot permit a diplomatic mission accredited to the Government of India to publish or circulate material critical of the Government of India’s policies and actions. The Chinese Government have been till now trying to evade this by serving up unabashed anti-Indian propaganda in the guise of Government statements. On this occasion, however, they have cast off their hypocritical mask and published anti-Indian articles which can in no way be described as official statements. The Government of India would like to warn the Chinese Embassy that they will not be permitted to circulate in Indian territory any kind of anti-Indian material hostile to the Indian Government or to the Indian people under any excuse, and if there is a repetition of their violation of this rule, the Government of India will exercise their rights and take appropriate steps including a prohibition on the circulation of Chinese Embassy bulletins.
V. MISCELLANEOUS

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 March, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 121.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states the following:

1. On the morning of March 10, 1967, a gang of traitor bandits of Tibet, China, four or five hundred strong, who have been shielded and abetted by the Indian Government, carried out flagrant anti-Chinese activities before the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi. They not only shouted extremely reactionary anti-Chinese slogans and put up a great number of anti-Chinese posters on the compound wall of the Embassy, but rushed to the gate of the Embassy, climbed up the iron gate and, raising a hue and cry, tried to break in. They smashed the flower pots in front of the Embassy and threw the broken pieces, lumps of earth and other things into the Embassy compound, thus gravely menacing the Embassy's security. On the previous day, March 9, the traitor Dalai groomed by the Indian Government issued another so-called statement in which he venomously attacked and slandered the Chinese Government and people and once more vainly attempted to incite the Tibetan people of China to carry out rebellious activities. Obviously, both incidents were engineered entirely by the Indian Government, and they constitute another crude interference in China's internal affairs and a fresh deliberate provocation against the Chinese people by the Indian Government. Against this, the Chinese Government hereby lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government.

2. The Indian Government has done a great deal of evils against Tibet, China. In the period following the rebellion of the reactionary clique of the Tibetan upper strata, not to mention earlier periods, the Indian Government has come out into the open and backstage manoeuvring to engage in naked interference in China's internal affairs. It has given shelter to elements of the traitorous Dalai clique and a large number of traitor bandits, and openly helped them to establish in India a so-called government in exile and publish a so-called Tibetan constitution. What is more, the Indian Government has been blatantly giving military training to these traitor bandits. In recent years, the Indian Government has on many occasions made plans to have the traitor Dalai go to Southeast Asian countries for anti-Chinese activities, attempting thereby to sabotage the friendly relations between China and those countries. Like all reactionary forces the world over, the Indian Government mortally dreads and
bitterly hates the great proletarian cultural revolution now vigo-
rously going on in China. In addition to setting in motion its own
propaganda machine for anti-Chinese clamours, the Indian Govern-
ment has instigated the traitor Dalai to spread a host of lies and
slanders. All these are iron-clad facts known to all, which the Indian
Government will never be able to deny.

It must be solemnly pointed out that the Indian Government still
maintains diplomatic relations with China today. Nevertheless, the
Indian Government has accepted tens of thousands of Chinese citi-
zens who were brought to India under coercion by the traitor ban-
dits, and for eight years it has all along supported the Tibetan traitor
bandits in carrying out subversive activities against the Chinese Gov-
ernment. This is indeed something rarely found in the history of
world diplomacy. People cannot help asking: Does the Indian Gov-
ernment have the slightest regard for the principles guiding inter-
national relations?

3. It must also be pointed out that, while indulging in all these
evil doings, the Indian Government has pretended that India has
sympathy for Tibet “based on sentiment and humanitarian reasons,”
that India, has a “desire to maintain friendly relations with China,”
that India does not “permit the Tibetan refugees in India to indulge
in subversive political activities directed against the People’s Re-
public of China,” and so on and so forth. These are glaring lies and
the height of hypocrisy. In fact, not a single moment has passed
without the Indian Government revealing its true colours by its own
action. The sympathy of the Indian Government goes not to the
broad masses of the Tibetan people, but to the Tibetan serf-owners
who take to eating human hearts and gouging out people’s eyes.
What the Indian Government has been doing is not the maintenance
of friendly relations with China, but the fostering and training of
the Tibetan traitor bandits, who are living in exile in India, in the
fond hope that some day they could fight back to Tibet and restore
serfdom there. In the final analysis, the Indian Government’s pipe
dream is to drag the new Tibet which is becoming a joyful land of
socialism back to the old Tibet which was a hell on earth. This
will never come true.

4. In earlier days, the Indian Government inherited the mantle
of aggression from British imperialism, and it is now actively hiring
itself out to U.S. imperialism and Soviet modern revisionism. It is
by no means accidental that the Indian Government is becoming
ever more unscrupulous in making use of the so-called Tibet ques-
tion to oppose China. This is but a manifestation of the reactionary
domestic and foreign policies of the Indian Government. The Chinese
Government must tell the Indian Government in all seriousness that
if the latter clings to its anti-Chinese policy and continues to inter-
fere in China’s internal affairs by exploiting the so-called Tibet ques-
tion, it must be held responsible for the serious consequences arising
therefrom.
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 June, 1967

No. C/7/67.


2. The Chinese Government have lodged a so-called "protest" against a demonstration staged outside the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi on March 10, 1967 between 0815 and 0845 hours by about 400 Tibetan refugees. They have claimed that this demonstration was "shielded and abetted" by the Government of India and further that it constitutes "crude interference in China's internal affairs and a fresh deliberate provocation against the Chinese people". These are completely false and unfounded statements. On the morning of March 10, 1967, when Shri A. K. Damodaran, Deputy Secretary in the Ministry of External Affairs, received Mr. Chen Chao-yuan, Charge d'Affaires a.i., Embassy of China, at the latter's request, he clearly pointed out that the Government of India had nothing to do with the demonstration and that political demonstrations are permitted in India as long as they do not violate the ordinary law of the land. In spite of this clear denial, the Chinese Government have followed up the verbal "protest" with a note which goes to even greater lengths in utilising this minor demonstration as an occasion to vilify India. The Government of India have made the necessary investigations and are satisfied that this particular demonstration was on the whole orderly and peaceful. The demonstrators limited themselves to shouting slogans and carrying placards. The local police arrived on the scene immediately after the demonstration began and the demonstrators dispersed soon afterwards. The Chinese Government should understand that it is not the policy or practice of the Government of India to organise demonstrations or parades outside the premises of diplomatic missions located in India. The absurd charges contained in the Chinese Note under reply are, therefore, totally rejected.

3. The real purpose of the Chinese Government in exaggerating the incident and making a big issue out of it becomes clear when the Chinese note goes on to slander the internal and external policies of the Government of India, particularly with regard to Tibet. The Government of India condemn such crude interference in the internal affairs of India. The Chinese note has claimed that India's sympathy is not with the broad masses of the Tibetan people and that India wishes to "restore serfdom" in Tibet. In resorting to these untruths, the Chinese Government are obviously referring to India's strong humanitarian support for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the Tibetan people. The inhuman and chauvinistic policies that Chinese Government have been carrying out in Tibet are strongly deplored by the Government of India. The Government of India's note of May 30, 1966 contains a clear exposition of India's policy towards Tibet and there is little to add to this. In the meantime, the continuing flight into India by Tibetan refugees...
remains an eloquent commentary on the true nature of life in Tibet today—what the Chinese Government vain—gloriously call “a joyful land of socialism”.

4. The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 6 January, 1968

No. M/625/68.

The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India and has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India decides to dispose of the properties of its former Trade Agency at Kalimpong, including transference of the Trade Agency’s land and the sale of the building and all attachments thereon, and the furniture, etc. The Chinese Government requests the Indian Government to propose a price for the purchase.

Cheng Yu-shu, Second Secretary of the Chinese Embassy has conveyed under instructions the above-mentioned decision and request of the Chinese Government to Mr. T. K. George, Attache of the External Affairs Ministry on October 30, 1967, and has enquired about it with Mr. George on December 19, 1967. The Embassy requests the Ministry to give a reply at its earliest convenience.

The Embassy avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 22 January, 1968

No. M/635/68.

The Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, and states the following:

According to Indian newspapers and foreign news agencies’ report, the Chiang Kai-shek clique entrenched in the Chinese province of Taiwan is going to send a so-called delegation to attend the second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development which is scheduled to open on February 1, 1968 in India. Regarding this, the Chinese Embassy sternly reiterates that Taiwan is an inalienable part of the sacred territory of the People’s Republic of China. The Chiang Kai-shek clique entrenched in Taiwan is a political corpse fostered and used by US imperialism against China, and it has long been repudiated by the Chinese people. It has absolutely no right to take part in any international meetings. The Chinese Embassy demands
of the Indian Government to take effective measures to prevent any element of the Chiang Kai-shek clique from coming to India to attend the above-mentioned Conference of the United Nations on Trade and Development.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 12 February, 1968

No. C/3/68.

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi, in reply to the Embassy's note No. M/635/68 dated January 22, 1968, and states as follows:

The Government of the People's Republic of China are, doubtless, quite aware that conferences sponsored by the U.N. are open to all members irrespective of their venue. In accordance with the established practice, the Government of India have extended the usual facilities to the various members of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. The Embassy of the People's Republic of China should also be aware that this is not the first time that a delegation from Taiwan has attended a U.N. Conference not only in India but in many other countries who have diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China. However, the attitude of the Government of India in the matter of the membership to the U.N. of the People's Republic of China is too well known to require any reiteration.

In view of the foregoing, the note of the Chinese Embassy is quite unwarranted and is, therefore, rejected.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 February, 1968

No. C/6/68.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, and with reference to the Embassy's note No. M/625/68, dated January 6, 1968, states as follows:

The Ministry of External Affairs is not aware of the former Trade Agency of the People's Republic of China at Kalimpong having legal title to any immovable property in Kalimpong. It is, therefore, not understood as to how the Embassy of the People's Republic of China proposes to dispose of immovable property the ownership of which does not vest in the Chinese Government. The Chinese Embassy is, no doubt, aware of the correspondence on this subject. The Embassy's attention is particularly invited to this Ministry's notes of March 20 and September 9, 1964.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.
No. C/12/68

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in India and, with reference to the Press reports of a so-called agreement signed between Pakistan and China on October 21, 1967, regarding an overland trade route between the Gilgit Agency in the Indian territory of Kashmir illegally occupied by Pakistan and Sinkiang, and the continuing interference on the part of the Government of the People’s Republic of China with the sovereignty of India over the State of Jammu and Kashmir, states as follows:

2. It is common knowledge that Pakistan and the People’s Republic of China have no common border, the two countries being separated by the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. The presence of Pakistan in the northern part of Kashmir is based on aggression and illegal occupation and Pakistan has no locus standi whatsoever to enter into negotiations or to conclude any agreements with any country which would affect in any way Indian territory illegally occupied by Pakistan in this area.

3. The Government of India have previously pointed out to the Chinese Government “that any change, provisional or otherwise, in the status of the State of Jammu and Kashmir brought about by third parties which seeks to submit certain parts of Indian territory to foreign jurisdiction will not be binding on the Government of India” and that “the Government of India firmly repudiate any agreements, provisional or otherwise, regarding her own territories arrived at between third parties who have no legal or constitutional locus standi of any kind”.

4. The Chinese Government are persisting in their efforts to sow misunderstanding between India and Pakistan and have been using the situation arising out of the illegal occupation by Pakistan of a portion of the Indian territory in Kashmir, to their own ends. Earlier, in the case of the so-called border agreement signed between the Governments of the People’s Republic of China and Pakistan, the Chinese Government had taken the stand in 1963 that the so-called agreement was of a “provisional” nature. Now, even this tenuous pretext appears to have been dropped. It will be noted that Hsinhua, carrying a news item on the 25th of October, 1967, refers to the “territories of Gilgit and Baltistan on the Pakistan side”. This only confirms the contention of the Government of India that the Chinese Government are seeking to share the spoils of aggression with Pakistan in the Indian State of Kashmir.

5. By entering into a so-called agreement on a land route between Gilgit Agency and Baltistan in Kashmir and Sinkiang on the Chinese side, the Chinese Government have gone a step further in interfering in India’s internal affairs. It is noteworthy that no details have yet been published of this dubious deal. The Press statements released in Pakistan and China have sought to give the impression that the so-called agreement has only a commercial context. However, against
the known background of China's design to promote instability amongst her neighbours and her unabashed efforts to aggravate Indo-Pakistan relations, it is quite obvious that the so-called agreement is not quite as innocent as merely "to facilitate overland trade". No matter what pretence or purpose the so-called agreement may be for, the Government of India reiterate that they shall take no cognizance of it and that it will have no legal or constitutional validity whatsoever.

6. The Government of India hereby lodge an emphatic protest against the Chinese Government's illegal interference with regard to the territory of Jammu and Kashmir which is an inalienable part of India.
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Statement made by Foreign Minister in Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha on 13th June, 1967

The action of the Chinese Government in withdrawing recognition of the diplomatic status of Shri K. Raghunath, Second Secretary in our Embassy in Peking and declaring that he will not be allowed to leave China before “the Chinese judicial organs take sanctions against his crimes” is a flagrant violation of all known principles of international law and the norms of civilised behaviour among nations. The list of alleged spying activities of Shri Raghunath prepared by the Chinese Government is a tissue of lies hastily put together to defend themselves against the very reasonable and moderately worded protest note which has been sent by our Embassy to the Chinese Foreign Office on June 5th that is the day after the incident in which Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijay were unreasonably detained in a ruined temple in the Western Hills of Peking.

2. The details of this incident as conveyed to us by our Embassy in Peking are as follows:

3. At 1-30 p.m. on June 4th, Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijay, Third Secretary in the Embassy were driving towards the Western Hills area in Peking which is a well-known beauty spot, and which is open to foreigners. On their way there they stopped for a moment near a ruined temple and proceeded to take photographs of the temple. Then they were surrounded by some people who accused Raghunath of taking photographs of a military installation which was allegedly situated nearby. In spite of Raghunath’s protestation that he was merely photographing the ruined temple, the Chinese crowd forced the two diplomats to go to the nearby building where after some delay the officer of the Security Bureau arrived under whose orders the camera and films were forcibly taken away and the absurd allegation immediately made that the development of the film had shown that Shri Raghunath had photographed prohibited objects. Curiously enough, however, these so-called photographs were not shown to either of the diplomats. The Western Hills are not out of bounds to foreigners. It is an area covered over with Buddhist temples and has been one of the most popular tourist resorts within the reach of Peking. For the last 18 years diplomats of all nationalities have been allowed to go along the way and visit these spots and photograph the old temples. There is nothing unusual or extraordinary in the actions of Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijay.

4. In spite of the repeated requests the diplomats were allowed to telephone to the Embassy only at 5 p.m. when the Embassy
officials tried to get in touch with the Foreign Office and the Security Bureau. They were told that nothing could be done until the next day. Two officers of the Embassy reached the spot at about 9 p.m. and were not permitted to go into the building or see the diplomats and were asked to return since it was claimed to be a prohibited area, even though it was on the highway. Finally the diplomats were allowed to return at 9-30 p.m. after a detention for a period of 8½ hours. The Embassy made further efforts the same night to protest to the Protocol Department of the Foreign Office but could not get an appointment in spite of best efforts.

5. A note giving the details of this incident and protesting against the unlawful detention of both the diplomats, namely, Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijay, was sent to the Foreign Office the next day but was returned three hours later. It may be noted that Shri Vijay had not been concerned in the photographic incident. The note had also specially protested against the unhelpfulness of the Foreign Office in the matter.

6. This latest development by which the Chinese Foreign Office has gone to the unprecedented action of accusing Shri Raghunath of spying seems to indicate that the Chinese are not merely anxious to utilise this incident for propaganda purposes but have a guilty conscience and want to manufacture some excuses to still further damage relations with India.

7. The accusations against Shri Raghunath are trivial to the point of absurdity. The accusation against him of committing espionage is based on the filmsiest grounds, namely that he has been trying to collect political and military intelligence by attending gatherings of Red Guards etc. These are the usual Chinese lies to concoct a case against a diplomat. On the other hand, Shri Raghunath has, on more than one occasion, been the victim of Chinese harassment. Once, while buying Red Guard newspapers in a Peking street, he was taken by some Red Guards to a public Security Bureau. Such Red Guard newspapers have been sold in the streets all these months and purchased by foreigners without any objections. However, when Shri Raghunath was told that these newspapers were not to be read or purchased by foreigners, he readily agreed to abide by this new rule.

8. Shri Raghunath is a young and promising diplomat who has conformed to the best traditions of our diplomatic service. In making him a victim of its nefarious designs, the People's Republic of China no doubt wishes to tarnish the name of India and has deprived him of diplomatic immunities and privileges which is unprecedented in the history of diplomatic relations between nations. The Government of India have taken a very serious view of the Chinese action. The Chinese Charge d'Affaires, who was summoned to the External Affairs Ministry at 5.00 A.M. this morning was asked to convey to his Government our strong indignation at this malicious, unjust and illegal action. A protest has been made to the Charge d'Affaires against this totally unprecedented and gross violation of international law and practice. We have also demanded that no interference be made with the diplomatic status of Shri Raghunath, that
the false charges levelled against him be withdrawn, and that suitable amends be made by the Government of China. It has also been explained to the Charge d'Affaires that unless this is done, the Chinese Government will have to bear the consequences of their action, and the Government of India reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they deem fit and proper.

9. According to a message received this morning from our Embassy in Peking, the Embassy has been informed that a public trial has been arranged for Shri Raghunath at 2.30 p.m. (12 noon IST) today, and that he be produced before the Peking Branch of Supreme People's Court. This shows utter disregard of all norms of civilised international behaviour by the Chinese Government. The trial, of course, will be an absolute farce. We have every confidence that our Charge d'Affaires and his colleagues will react to this crisis with courage and dignity.
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Chinese Foreign Ministry Spokesman's Statement on espionage activities in Peking by Indian spy, 14 June, 1967

The spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China today made the following statement regarding the espionage activities in Peking by members of the Indian Embassy in China:

Ever since the beginning of the great proletarian cultural revolution in China, Second Secretary, K. Raghunath of the Indian Embassy in China has been constantly engaged in unbridled illegal activities of stealing political and military intelligence about China in violation of the laws and decrees of the People's Republic of China, and was on many occasions caught on the spot and warned by our young red guards and revolutionary masses. However, far from restraining himself, K. Raghunath went still further and on June 4, this year had the audacity of surreptitiously taking photographs of a Chinese prohibited military area together with the Indian Embassy's Third Secretary P. Vijai, and they were caught red-handed by the Chinese People's Liberation Army men. The facts have shown that K. Raghunath is an out-and-out spy under the cloak of a diplomat. The Chinese government is most indignant at such bare-faced espionage activities by members of the Indian Embassy in China and has lodged the strongest protest with the Indian government. The Chinese judicial organs have pronounced K. Raghunath guilty of espionage and had him promptly deported under escort. At the same time the Chinese Foreign Ministry has declared P. Vijay persona non grata and ordered him to leave China within a set time.

The intensified activities by members of the Indian Embassy in China to steal intelligence about China during our great proletarian cultural revolution are by no means accidental or isolated.

The earth-shaking great proletarian cultural revolution initiated and led personally by Chairman Mao, the great leader of the Chinese people, has not only smashed the pipe dream of imperialism and revisionism for restoring capitalism in China, but opened up a new epoch of the proletarian socialist world revolution. Imperialism headed by the United States, modern revisionism with the Soviet revisionist leading clique as its centre and all reactionaries sense the approaching of their doomsday. However, they are not reconciled to their defeat and will put up a desperate last-ditch struggle, whip up one anti-Chinese wave after another, and frenziedly oppose and viciously attack our great proletarian cultural revolution. For this purpose, they have directed the members of the missions and the correspondents of the imperialist, revisionist and reactionary countries in China to engage unscrupulously in all kinds of illegal activities, trying to steal by every means political, military and economic
intelligence about our country and to collect ammunition for anti-Chinese propaganda.

Out of their needs to oppose China, these foreign reactionaries are snooping around with ulterior motives surreptitiously photographing, copying and stealing big-character posters; resorting to all kinds of sinister methods to collect large numbers of such materials as papers, journals, pamphlets and leaflets put out by various Chinese revolutionary mass organisations; probing for inside information from our masses by posing as personnel from friendly countries; sneaking into our party and government departments, people’s organizations, schools and enterprises by posing as Chinese; and even illegally going beyond the limits allowed for the travel of foreigners and surreptitiously taking photographs of our prohibited areas, etc., such crimes are too numerous to cite.

Holding aloft the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung’s thought China’s young red guards and the broad revolutionary masses who are victoriously carrying on the great proletarian cultural revolution have on many occasions caught these sinister hands reaching out to steal intelligence about China and given stern warnings. But Chairman Mao teaches us: “Make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again….till their doom; that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people’s cause, and they will never go against this logic”. Instead of restraining themselves a little bit, the handful of foreign reactionaries are becoming more and more blatant in their activities of stealing intelligence about China. They are downright gamblers and will never give up before losing all their stakes.

We must sternly warn these foreign reactionaries: the Chinese Government and the broad revolutionary masses of China absolutely will not tolerate your activities on Chinese soil detrimental to our state interests. You must abide by China’s laws and decrees, respect China’s revolutionary order and stop all your illegal activities. Otherwise, you must bear the responsibility for all the grave consequences arising therefrom. The case of Second Secretary K. Raghunath and Third Secretary P. Vijay of the Indian Embassy in China serves as a warning to you.
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Statement by Foreign Minister in Lok Sabha, 15 June, 1967

Since I spoke to the House last, the whole world has been shocked by the news which have come from Peking about the humiliating treatment accorded to our diplomats by the Red Guards in Peking. At the airport Shri Raghunath was physically attacked and slapped. His glasses were broken and his face was stated to be bleeding. Shri Vijai who had only been declared persona non grata and who according to international law was entitled to all privileges of a diplomat until he left the territory of China was paraded round the airport for one hour and humiliated by a howling mob of Red Guards. Our First Secretary, Shri C. V. Ranganathan against whom no charges had been made was forced to bow his head by the Red Guards. That all this was done in no moment of frenzy but was the result of cold calculated and deliberate policy was shown by the fact that after this scene was enacted the Red Guards marched away in disciplined battle formation. We have just now begun to receive the direct report from our CDA in Peking. We hope that the full report will reach us by this evening or tomorrow morning. In the meantime information about their treatment in Canton has just arrived from our Charge d'Affaires. Raghunath was taken out of plane and paraded around the airport and town in an open truck. As anticipated he was separated from Mr. Rao, accompanying Officer and Vijai. Apart from subjecting him to verbal insults, Raghunath was subjected to the characteristic form of punishment inflicted on victims and beating with sticks small enough not to bruise or lacerate. There was however some consolation in the fact that Raghunath by being taken around in a van has perhaps been saved from any kind of brutal treatment by the masses. So far Vijay was not touched in Canton. Slogans against him however were raised.

We received information about three hours ago that both Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijai have arrived in Hongkong. The party seems to have left Canton by train this morning and arrived at the border by noon time. I understand that the Hong Kong authorities have given all assistance to the party on crossing over. About an hour ago we were able to talk on telephone with our Commission in Hong Kong and personally to Shri Raghunath himself. Both of them, though in poor physical shape, are in high spirits. At present they are staying with our Commissioner in Hong Kong and the tentative plans are that they will return to India on Saturday.

We are still awaiting the full report from our Embassy in Peking which should be with us this evening or tomorrow morning. All that we have heard, however, shows that the Chinese Government not only violated ordinary rules of diplomatic usage but also broken several promises made to our Charge d'Affaires. He had been assured.
that Raghunath would be allowed to be accompanied by an Indian officer. The accompanying officer Shri M. S. Rao, First Secretary was never allowed to communicate with Raghunath during the journey. He was also assured that Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijai would be taken across to the border yesterday evening. The overnight stay in Canton was deliberately planned to subject our officers to humiliation. Thus the Chinese Government have proved themselves not merely indifferent to all civilized norms but have shown themselves either unwilling or incapable of honouring their own pledged words.
Statement by the Minister of External Affairs in Rajya Sabha on Friday the 16th June, 1967, regarding treatment of Indian Diplomats in China.

Since I last spoke to the House, shocking news has come in from China about the shameful and barbarous treatment of our diplomats by the so-called Red Guards and 'masses' with the direct instigation and connivance of Chinese Government officials. We have now received a detailed report from our Embassy of these happenings. Immediately on their arrival at the airport, our officers were told that the Chinese would not honour the promise made by their Vice Foreign Minister to our Charge d'Affaires the previous evening that an Indian Embassy member could be present with Raghunath. The Embassy staff, therefore, formed a cordon of five around Raghunath to protect him and attempted to proceed to the aircraft. It was this cordon of officers led by our Military Attache, Col. Raina, who saved Raghunath from the first fury of attack of the Red Guards. The mob surged in fury round the cordon, which however refused to give way. Throughout the journey to the aircraft, there was complete chaos with the Red Guards raining blows on Raghunath and other Indian diplomats. It was only at the very end after walking half a mile and after some assurance was given that Raghunath would not be physically harmed that our officers gave up the cordon. While no serious injury seems to have been caused to anyone including Raghunath, only complete medical examination can reveal the full extent of the physical assaults on them. The worst treatment seems to have been meted out to Vijai on whom the rage of the crowd, frustrated in their attempt to harm Raghunath, was directed. Vijai's arms were twisted behind and he was made to bend very low while walking over a certain distance. The front of his shirt was completely torn thus exposing his entire chest. His spectacles were smashed and his shoes displaced. Shri C. V. Ranganathan, First Secretary, was forced to raise his hands and his head was forcibly thrust down from behind. The only two persons who escaped the attacks were the Indian Charge d'Affaires himself and Shri M. S. Rao, First Secretary.

Our Embassy reports that Vijai stood up to the treatment exceedingly well and was spirited enough to come to the edge of the tarmac and waved to all the diplomats who had come to see them off while assuring them that Raghunath was also in good condition. Among those present at the airport to see off our diplomats were representatives from the Polish, Finnish and Danish Embassies. There were also many members of the British Office, including the British Charge d'Affaires himself.
On his return from the airport incident, our Charge d’Affaires immediately sought an interview with the Foreign Office to protest against the violation of the earlier assurances about Raghunath and Vijai's immunity. In Vijai's case the Chinese utter disregard for diplomatic usage was particularly glaring because he was actually leaving within 12 hours out of the 72 hours grace granted to him to leave the country. The Foreign Office came out with a trumped-up excuse that the masses had been provoked by the insulting behaviour of the Indian Officers and rejected totally all our demands. This was a lame excuse for their having reneged on their promise of safe conduct given to our Charge d’Affaires by the Chinese Vice-Minister when the latter saw our Charge d’Affaires on June 13.

On the way to Hong Kong, in Canton Raghunath was publicly paraded at the airport in an open truck. Yesterday morning he was taken in a car from Canton to the border village to the Shumchun where again Raghunath had to face mob fury during a walk of at least one mile. Such barbarous and uncivilised behaviour towards Raghunath needs no comment.

News was received of the arrival yesterday of our two diplomats, Raghunath and Vijai, in Hong Kong. Senior officers of the Ministry talked with them on the telephone. They were in good spirits in spite of the rough treatment to which they had been subjected.

In the meantime, our authorities had carefully investigated the background and recent activities of the members of the Chinese Embassy here. As Hon'ble members are fully aware, during recent months the Chinese Government have been openly and shamelessly advocating armed struggle and revolution in India. Our investigation showed that one member of the Embassy, First Secretary Chen Lu-Chih had been guilty of gross abuse of diplomatic privileges by his collection of military intelligence and indulgence in subversive activities. It was decided that he should be stripped of his diplomatic status. This decision was conveyed to the Charge d'Affaires who said he would not abide by the decision of the Government of India. Another member of the Embassy who also has indulged in subversive activities, Mr. Hsieh Chen-Hao, Third Secretary, has been declared persona non grata. Since Mr. Chen Lu-Chih the former First Secretary has not abided by Indian law by reporting to the Foreigners Registration Office, a Deportation Order has been served on him at the Embassy. Until now these two Chinese diplomats have shown no signs of complying with our orders. In fact the behaviour of the Chinese Charge d'Affaires and the staff throughout the whole episode has been consistently unbecoming of a diplomat. They have refused to accept the diplomatic notes and communications addressed to the Embassy.

In view of the objectionable behaviour of the Chinese Embassy it has become necessary for us to impose strict surveillance on the Embassy. The Chinese Embassy has been notified that no member of the Embassy can leave the municipal limits of Delhi and New Delhi area without prior permission of the Ministry of External Affairs. I would like to inform the House that in China our diplomats are not allowed to leave the limits of Peking except for visits
to some picnic spots in the vicinity of Peking. We have also asked their cars to be checked to prevent any attempt by Chen Lu-Chih to escape and evade the processes of law.

Throughout this trying period I am happy to say that the members of our Embassy in Peking and their families have behaved with exemplary courage and dignity. I would like to pay a warm tribute to them for their devotion to duty and particularly for the comradery they showed in forming a cordon to protect Shri Raghunath from the wrath of the Chinese hooligans at the Peking Airport. I am sure that the House would wish me to convey their good wishes to our embassy personnel in Peking during this trying time.
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Statement by the Minister of External Affairs in the Rajya Sabha on Saturday, the 17th June, 1967, regarding the demonstration held in front of the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi

From 5 p.m. onwards on June 16, i.e. yesterday, crowds started gathering in front of the Chinese Embassy. A strong police force was guarding the Embassy from all sides including the main gate and the lawn in front of it at Shantipath. The demonstrators, shouting slogans, crossed the Shantipath and pressed towards the main gate. The demonstrators on the lawn in front of the main gate of the Chinese Embassy by then had increased to 2,500. The police held them back, preventing them from going towards the main gate. At that time, seven functionaries of the Chinese Embassy, who were standing behind the closed gate in the Embassy compound, started taking photographs of the crowd and shaking their fists. This was followed by an exchange of stone-throwing between some members of the crowd and members of the Chinese Embassy. About 20 demonstrators filtered through the police cordon and climbed over the Embassy compound wall. There was further exchange of stone-throwing in the course of which the Chinese hurled stones and flower pots at the demonstrators. The police went inside the compound and cleared it.

At 5.45 p.m. another group of demonstrators came with 25 donkeys carrying placards with slogans. Meanwhile, some of the demonstrators had managed to enter the Embassy premises from the rear and pressed forward towards the garage. The garage door was set on fire, one car is reported to have been damaged and three other cars received minor damage. The fire brigade unit soon reached the spot and brought the fire under control.

Meanwhile, the crowd at the main gate made a rush and overwhelmed the police force, some of whom were squeezed between the main gate and the surging crowd. In the scuffle that took place inside the Embassy compound, eight Chinese were injured. The police used a large number of tear-gas shells in order to disperse the crowd.

While the demonstrations were going on, the Chinese Charge d'Affaires was in the Ministry of External Affairs. He was informed of the demonstrations and, at his request, was escorted by a senior official of the Ministry back to the Embassy.

The Ministry of External Affairs did not receive any request from the Charge d'Affaires for medical attention to the injured people. The official of the Ministry of External Affairs accompanying the Charge d'Affaires offered to render necessary medical attention to the injured people and to summon a doctor. The Charge d'Affaires said he would let the Ministry know in case medical help was needed.
Even before that, we had given instructions for an ambulance and a doctor to proceed to the Chinese Embassy and await their summons for attending to the injured.

At 9 p.m., the Charge d’Affaires requested the Ministry of External Affairs for medical assistance. This was promptly complied with and doctors from the Willingdon Hospital went to the Embassy and rendered medical assistance. Seven members of the Chinese Embassy were admitted to the Willingdon Hospital where every attention is being given to them by the medical and nursing staff.

This morning, the Chief of Protocol and another senior official of the Ministry paid a visit to the Willingdon Hospital and saw the injured persons. A Chinese Embassy official was present at that time and told our officials that they were satisfied with the medical treatment received by the injured. It is understood that four of the injured can be discharged from the Hospital to-day or tomorrow while others are being kept under observation.

The Chinese Embassy have informed us that Mr. Chen Lu-chih, the former First Secretary, and Mr. Hsieh Chen-Hao, the Third Secretary, were injured in yesterday’s scuffle and will not, therefore, be able to leave India to-day. We have agreed to permit these persons to stay for some more days until they are fit to travel.

The incidents that took place at the Chinese Embassy are to be deplored and we are taking every possible step to prevent any violation of the Chinese Embassy premises. It is obvious that our people are deeply indignant at the humiliating treatment accorded to our diplomats, Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijai, as well as to other members of our Embassy in Peking. Their sense of indignation is all the greater because of a public trial against all rules of international law and practice, to which Shri Raghunath was subjected, even though the trial was held in absentia. The provocation given by the Chinese in Peking, Canton and Shumchun has been great. In Delhi, the incident of a Chinese official slapping a policeman and their throwing stones at the crowd and shouting abuses were, to say the least, provocative. Nevertheless, it must be realised that Embassy premises are inviolate under international law and practice and it is the duty of the Government to protect their inviolability. We have a tradition for correct diplomatic behaviour and we intend to continue this tradition. We hope that our people will co-operate with us in this matter and not do anything which might affect the fair name of India.
Appendix VI

Statement by Sardar Swaran Singh, Defence Minister in the Lok Sabha on Monday, the 19th June, 1967 on behalf of Shri M.C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, regarding developments around Indian Embassy, Peking

Hon. Members would be interested in the latest developments about the situation of our Embassy in Peking. We have now, after considerable delay received a full report from our Charge d’Affaires. Members will recall that at 11-00 A.M. on 17th June, the Chinese Foreign Ministry suddenly demanded the evacuation of all members and their families residing in different parts of Peking in the Embassy compound. A period of two hours was given for this operation but, by the time the Charge d’Affaires returned to the Embassy half hour had already passed. No cars which were already in the Embassy were permitted by the Chinese to be taken out of the Embassy compound to bring in the families. It was therefore necessary to bring in families living in about 15 to 20 flats about 3 miles away from the residence in one or two vehicles belonging to the Embassy and a number of cars and vans lent to us by some friendly Missions. By the concerted efforts of the Embassy personnel and these friendly Missions our staff managed to evacuate every single family before the expiry of the time limit that is within 90 minutes.

The total number of individuals in the Embassy today is 66 including 15 women and 23 children. One family left for India a day before the siege began. Mr. Rao who accompanied Shri Raghunath and Vijai to Hong Kong and the weekly courier who was in Hong Kong have been asked to stay back in Hong Kong, until the position becomes clear. Hon’ble Members will recall that even before the confinement of the whole Embassy personnel in the building, demonstrations by Red Guards in front of the Embassy had already gone on for several days. Since the actual siege began day before yesterday, Red Guards have prevented any access of vehicles to the Embassy by blocking up the whole street. The so-called ‘masses’ have smashed every window and door of the Embassy building facing the street, and the reception rooms which are adjacent to the street have been completely wrecked. So far there has been no attempt at forcing entrance into the Embassy premises, although a small back gate has been damaged. Our Embassy reports that hundreds of demonstrators stood on two sides of the Embassy compound and hurled stones and broken glass into the Embassy compound making it impossible for movements within the Embassy between the two wings. No injury has been caused to anybody yet but since windows in the reception and dining rooms of the residence and other sections of the Chancery face the road, there is at every moment the likelihood of stones falling into the building itself with a possibility of hurt being caused to women and children. Precautions are being taken against this eventuality. While all this was going on repeated attempts made by the
CDA to contact the Foreign Ministry were frustrated either by lines being cut off or by false excuses. Hon. Members should realise that the total area of the Embassy compound is not more than 1½ acres, divided into two buildings and a few outhouses. Friendly Missions were prevented from bringing provisions until this morning, when some provisions were finally permitted by two members of the Chinese staff of the Embassy. Ever since the siege began there has been a sustained campaign to terrorise the Embassy personnel. There have been continuous demonstrations, burning of effigies and deafening noises caused by at least 30 loudspeakers blaring away slogans day and night into this small Embassy area. Apart from the elementary physical problems this makes normal lives impossible for Embassy personnel. Hon'ble members can visualise the psychological torture to which our officers and staff in the Embassy of India, Peking and their families are being subjected to.

To put it briefly, our Embassy is besieged and the personnel of the Embassy are virtually held as prisoners. There have been similar sieges in Peking in the last one year in some other Embassies but what our people are now enduring is much worse mainly because our Embassy compound is comparatively small. Also, the only communications we are having with the outside world is the telephone and even in this case we are told that for full 8 hours on the day the siege began the Foreign Office refused to answer our telephone calls.

In spite of the almost unendurable strain that they are being subjected to, I am happy to announce that, in all his messages, our CDA has conveyed to us the determination of our Embassy personnel to go through this ordeal without flinching.

The Chinese CDA was summoned to the Ministry of External Affairs yesterday. A most emphatic protest was lodged regarding the totally unjustified and unwarranted siege of the Embassy premises.

The Embassy was informed that unless the restrictions on the movement of our officers and personnel were removed and provisions allowed to go through, within 24 hours, the Government of India would be obliged to take appropriate counter measures, for which the Chinese Government will be obliged to bear sole responsibility. The Embassy was also informed that, as regards Mr. Chen Lu Chih and Mr. Hsieh Cheng Hao the notes already communicated stand. However, on humanitarian grounds since it is alleged that they have received injuries, it is not being enforced immediately.

Hon. Members must have seen the reports in the Press about the unseemly behaviour of the Chinese personnel at the Willingdon Hospital where the seven injured Chinese have been receiving treatment. Expert attention has been given to these injured personnel, indeed Chinese Embassy officials expressed gratification to our officers at the medical facilities and attention given to them. The Chinese CDA during his conversation was also informed that if, as is alleged Mr. Chen Lu Chih has suffered injury he could also be sent to the Willingdon Hospital where he would receive the best treatment possible. Notwithstanding all the arrangements made yesterday the
Chinese Embassy personnel tried to interfere in the administration of the hospital. A Doctor of the Pakistan High Commission was also brought by the CDA as “a friend” to see the Chinese patients. The hospital authorities informed the Chinese CDA that he was welcome to see his colleagues, but the hospital could not permit foreign doctors to treat patients inside the Government hospitals. In the conversation with the Chinese CDA, it was also mentioned that, in Peking also, Embassy doctors are not allowed to treat patients inside Chinese government hospitals.

Subsequently, the Chinese Embassy personnel insisted on shouting slogans in Chinese and on having a portrait of Mao Tse Tung hung in the hospital where the patients were accommodated, obviously for propagandist purposes. Naturally the hospital removed the portrait and refused permission and insisted that this kind of behaviour in a hospital could not be permitted. Four of the patients were discharged by the Willingdon Hospital yesterday evening, the three others are improving steadily. There is no cause for anxiety but they are being kept under observation.

Late last night our Charge d’Affaires in Peking was asked to go to the Chinese Foreign Office. He agreed to go only after proper assurances had been given about his safe transit through the demonstrators. The Foreign Office demanded that the Government of India should permit the Chinese Government to send a civil aircraft to New Delhi to evacuate the Chinese Embassy personnel injured in the recent incident on June 16, 1967. We have already issued instructions to our Charge d’Affaires to inform the Chinese Government that unless and until the present siege of the Embassy is lifted, the Government of India is not prepared to consider such a request.

If the Chinese Government does not comply with the demands raised in our note within the specified time limit, appropriate counter measures will be taken.
Statement by Sardar Swaran Singh, Defence Minister in the Rajya Sabha on Tuesday, the 20th June, 1967 at 2.30 P.M. on behalf of Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs on developments regarding Indian Embassy

Hon. Members would be interested in the latest developments about the situation of our Embassy in Peking. We have now received further details including a report from our Charge d’Affaires. Members will recall that at 11-00 A.M. on 17th June, the Chinese Foreign Ministry suddenly demanded the evacuation of all members and their families residing in different parts of Peking in the Embassy compound. No cars which were already in the Embassy were permitted by the Chinese to be taken out of the Embassy compound to bring in the families. It was therefore necessary to bring in families living in about 15 to 20 flats about 3 miles away from the residence in one or two vehicles belonging to the Embassy and a number of cars and vans lent to us by some friendly Missions. We have, however, definite information that the British, Scandinavian, Indonesian, Yugoslav and other socialist countries have been actively trying to help us. By the concerted efforts of the Embassy personnel and these friendly Missions our staff managed to evacuate every single family before the expiry of the time limit that is within 90 minutes.

Hon. Members will recall that even before the confinement of the whole Embassy personnel in the building, demonstrations by Red Guards in front of the Embassy had already gone on for several days. Since the actual siege began day before yesterday, Red Guards have prevented any of our personnel from leaving the premises (except when the C.D.A. was required to proceed to the Foreign Office). Access of vehicles to the Embassy has been blocked. The so-called ‘masses’ have smashed every window and door of the Embassy building facing the street, and the reception rooms which are adjacent to the street have been completely wrecked. So far there has been no attempt at forcing entrance into the Embassy premises, although a small back gate entrance has been damaged.

Hon. Members should realize that the total area of the Embassy compound is not more than 1½ acres, divided into two buildings and a few outhouses. Ever since the siege began there has been a sustained campaign to terrorise the Embassy personnel by continuous demonstrations. Hon. Members can visualise the psychological torture to which our officers and staff in the Embassy of India, Peking, and their families are being subjected to. In spite of the almost unendurable strain that they are being subjected to, I am happy to announce that in all his messages, our C.D.A. has conveyed to us the determination of our Embassy personnel to go through this ordeal without flinching.
The Chinese Charge d’Affaires was summoned to the Ministry of External Affairs on June 18th and informed that unless the restrictions on the movement of our officers and personnel were removed and provisions allowed to go through, within 24 hours, Government of India would be obliged to take appropriate counter measures, for which the Chinese Government would be obliged to bear sole responsibility.

On the expiry of the time-limit, no information had come from the Chinese Government of the compliance with our request and the siege being lifted. A note was despatched at 6 p.m. after allowing reasonable time for a communication to reach Delhi, informing the Embassy that to protect the Embassy personnel from the just indignation of the Indian people about recent developments, it had been decided to restrict the movement of the Chinese personnel within the compound. If the C.D.A. wanted to come to the Foreign Office, he would be permitted to do so and provided with an escort.

We have still not received any information from our Embassy in Peking that the siege is being lifted. The Ministry of External Affairs were able to have a direct conversation on the telephone with Shri Sathe yesterday afternoon. Shri Sathe informed our Ministry that all the Embassy personnel were in high spirits.

During the interview of the 18th, the C.D.A. was also informed that as regards Mr. Chen Lu-Chih and Mr. Hsieh Cheng Hao the notice already communicated stand. The time limit, however, was extended, as it was alleged that these two former officials of the Chinese Embassy had suffered injuries. Since Mr. Hsieh, the former Third Secretary, was reported to have received only minor injuries, he was informed yesterday that he must make arrangements to leave India by 21st June, evening. Hon. Members must have seen the reports in the Press about the unseemly behaviour of the Chinese personnel at the Willingdon Hospital where the seven injured Chinese have been receiving treatment. The Chinese Embassy personnel insisted on shouting slogans in Chinese and on having portrait of Mao Tse-tung hung in the hospital where the patients were accommodated, obviously for propagandist purposes. Naturally the hospital removed the portrait and refused permission and insisted that this kind of behaviour in a hospital could not be permitted. Four of the patients were discharged by the Willingdon Hospital on Sunday; three others are improving steadily. There is no cause for anxiety but they are being kept under observation.

Unseemly behaviour by Chinese Government personnel does not seem to be limited to India. On Saturday June 17, a large number of Chinese Embassy personnel had turned up at Kathmandu airport to receive Mr. Chen Lu-Chih, former First Secretary and Mr. Hsieh Cheng-hao, former Third Secretary who were expected to arrive on that plane. When they learnt that the plane had been diverted, the Embassy personnel staged a noisy anti-Indian demonstration at Kathmandu airport. Our Ambassador in Kathmandu has already protested to the Nepalese Government against this flagrant abuse of Nepalese hospitality for anti-Indian propaganda.
Shri K. Raghunath, I am glad to inform you, has already joined the Ministry of External Affairs in the China Division. The House must be aware that on the evening of June 18 i.e. the day after Shri Raghunath returned to India he gave a Press Conference in which he gave an account of the incidents experienced by him from Peking to Hong Kong and answered questions from Foreign and Indian Press correspondents. The decision not to have Press Conference in Hong Kong by these two diplomats had been made by the Ministry of External Affairs after careful consideration. It was felt that Shri Raghunath should first report to the Government before he addressed a Press Conference.

Hon. Members have already heard about the Chinese request that the Government of India should permit the Chinese Government to send a civil aircraft to New Delhi to evacuate the Chinese Embassy personnel injured in the recent incident on June 16, 1967. We have immediately instructed our Charge d'Affaires to inform the Chinese Government that unless and until the present siege of the Embassy is lifted, the Government of India is not prepared to consider such a request.

We have this morning received further information from our Charge d'Affaires that the Chinese Government have, communicated their intention to send a Chinese civil aircraft to India on the 21st of June. They have given the details of the aircraft and the routes, etc. The Government of India are transmitting immediately a reply to the Chinese Government to this latest note. Our reply recalls what had already been communicated to the Chinese Government that the request for Chinese civilian aircraft can be considered after the siege of the Indian Embassy is lifted and normal functioning of the Embassy restored. We are further informing them that if this condition is satisfied, Government of India would be prepared to consider the Chinese request on a reciprocal basis; that is to say, as a quid pro quo to the Chinese Government sending an aircraft here, the Government of India would send an aircraft to Peking to evacuate some of their personnel. The flight of the two aircraft must be synchronised and prior arrangements made in that connection by mutual consultation.
Appendix VIII

Statement made by MMHA in the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha on 7-3-1968

We have been informed by the Delhi Administration that on March 6, 1968 constables Ghanisham Parshad and Ram Richpal Singh of 24th Bn. of the C.R.P. were returning at about 15-15 hours from beat duty in Railway Colony at Sardar Patel Marg to Police Station Chanakpur. They were in uniform. They took a short cut through the Chinese Embassy premises by entering from one of the gates on Nyaya Marg and emerged on the main gate on Shanti Path. When the two constables had come out of the main gate of the Embassy, they were called back by the gate-keeper Bir Bahadur of the Chinese Embassy. One of them, namely, Ghanisham Parshad complied and entered the room meant for the gate-keeper and forcibly detained him. Soon after this some Chinese and others came from the main Embassy building and took Ghanisham Parshad inside the main building.

2. At about 17.15 hours the Station House Officer told another Chowkidar of the Embassy, Suraj Bahadur, to inform the Chinese inside the main building that the Sub-Divisional Magistrate and the Sub-Divisional Police Officer would like to talk to them about the detained Constable. After sometime he returned and intimated that the Chinese would not talk to the local authorities but would deal only with the Ministry of External Affairs. After about 15 minutes the Sub-Divisional Magistrate spoke on telephone to the Chinese authorities in the Embassy and requested them to release the constable. His request was turned down and he was told that they would deal only with the Ministry of External Affairs.

3. Around 5-30 p.m. the Chinese Embassy informed the Protocol Department of the Ministry of External Affairs alleging that an intruder into the Embassy premises had been apprehended by them and that they would like to hand him over before Protocol Officer known to them. The Ministry of External Affairs, Protocol Department, advised the Chinese Embassy to release the Constable to the security personnel stationed outside the Embassy building. But on the instance of the Chinese Embassy that they would hand over the person concerned only to an official of the Ministry of External Affairs who is known to them, two Protocol Officers of the Ministry of External Affairs proceeded to the Chinese Embassy around 6 p.m. Since by 7 p.m. neither two Protocol Officers nor the detained Constable emerged from the Chinese premises, the Ministry of External Affairs put through a telephone call to the Chinese Embassy demanding that the Police Constable should be allowed to leave the Embassy immediately. Since the Chinese Embassy personnel prevaricated, the Ministry of External Affairs summoned the Chinese CDA to come to the Ministry forthwith. Thereupon the Chinese Embassy informed the Ministry that the Constable had left their premises.
4. The two constables have stated that they did not know that it was improper to go through the Embassy premises. Constable Ghansham Parshad has further stated that he was forcibly detained in the first instance by the chowkidars and later by the Chinese inside the main building. He was not allowed to go until he was prepared to give it in writing to the Chinese that he had come into the Chinese Embassy premises. He was made to write and sign a statement inside the Embassy.

5. A case under section 365 I.P.C. that is abducting a person with the intention to cause him to be secretly and wrongfully confined, has been registered on a complaint lodged by Constable Ram Richpal Singh.

6. The Government of India take a serious view of the illegal detention of an Indian national specially a policeman in uniform in the Chinese Embassy premises and in extorting a statement from him. The Chinese Embassy should have handed over the policeman to the local authorities immediately and taken up the matter with the Ministry of External Affairs in the normal course. A note has been sent to the Chinese Embassy strongly protesting against their high-handed and illegal action in detaining and extorting a statement from an Indian official.