



NOTES, MEMORANDA AND LETTERS EXCHANGED

BETWEEN

THE GOVERNMENTS OF INDIA AND CHINA

JULY 1963—JANUARY 1964

WHITE PAPER No. X

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

PRINTED IN INDIA BY THE GENERAL MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OF
INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI AND PUBLISHED BY THE MANAGER OF
PUBLICATIONS, DELHI, 1964.

On 16 August 1963, the Prime Minister presented to Parliament the Ninth White Paper containing the notes, memoranda and letters exchanged between the Government of India and the Government of the People's Republic of China for the period January 1963— July 1963. This White Paper contains the notes, memoranda and letters exchanged between the two Governments since July 1963. It also contains a few notes exchanged between April 1963 to June 1963 which had not been included in the previous White Paper.

Ministry of External Affairs,

New Delhi.

February 1964.

CONTENTS

India-China boundary dispute

1. Note of the Chinese Government, 20 April, 1963
2. Note of the Indian Government, 1 May, 1963
3. Memorandum of the Chinese Government, 21 July, 1963
4. Memorandum of the Indian Government, 30 July, 1963
5. Note of the Indian Government, 6 September, 1963.
6. Note of the Indian Government, 30 September, 1963.
7. Note of the Chinese Government, 9 October, 1963.
8. Note of the Indian Government, 16 October, 1963.

9. Border issues and incidents

10. Note of the Chinese Government, 25 June, 1963
11. Note of the Indian Government, 5 July, 1963
12. Note of the Chinese Government, 30 July, 1963
13. Note of the Chinese Government, 31 July, 1963
14. Note of the Chinese Government, 31 July, 1963
15. Note of the Indian Government, 8 August, 1963
16. Note of the Chinese Government, 13 August, 1963
17. Note of the Chinese Government, 26 August, 1963
18. Note of the Indian Government, 28 August, 1963
19. Note of the Chinese Government, 29 August, 1963
20. Note of the Indian Government, 31 August, 1963
21. Note of the Indian Government, 4 September, 1963
22. Note of the Chinese Government, 13 September, 1963
23. Note of the Indian Government, 14 September, 1963
24. Note of the Chinese Government, 18 September, 1963.
25. Note of the Chinese Government, 19 September, 1963
26. Note of the Indian Government, 19 September, 1963.
27. Note of the Indian Government, 1 October, 1963.
28. Note of the Chinese Government, 14 October, 1963.
29. Note of the Indian Government, 15 October, 1963
30. Note of the Indian Government, 22 October, 1963.

31. Note of the Indian Government, 2 November, 1963.
32. Note of the Indian Government, 12 November, 1963.
33. Note of the Chinese Government, 14 November, 1963.
34. Note of the Chinese Government, 30 November, 1963.
35. Note of the Indian Government, 11 December, 1963
36. Note of the Chinese Government, 26 December, 1963.
37. Note of the Indian Government, 22 January, 1964.
38. Note of the Indian Government, 23 January, 1964

Territorial Air Space

39. Note of the Chinese Government, 8 July, 1963
40. Note of the Chinese Government, 9 July, 1963.
41. Note of the Indian Government, 8 August, 1963.
42. Note of the Chinese Government, 13 August, 1963.
43. Note of the Chinese Government, 17 August, 1963.
44. Note of the Indian Government, 23 August, 1963.
45. Note of the Indian Government, 26 August, 1963.
46. Note of the Chinese Government, 16 October, 1963.
47. Note of the Chinese Government, 17 October, 1963.
48. Note of the Indian Government, 19 October, 1963.
49. Note of the Indian Government, 23 October, 1963.

Lapse of Agreement of 1954

49. Note of the Chinese Government, 24 October, 1963.
50. Note of the Indian Government, 3 January, 1964.

Alleged Ill-treatment of Chinese Representatives and Nationals in India

51. Note of the Chinese Government, 19 July, 1963.
52. Note of the Chinese Government, 23 July, 1963.
53. Note of the Chinese Government, 31 July, 1963.
54. Note of the Chinese Government, 3 August, 1963.
55. Note of the Indian Government, 8 August, 1963.
56. Note of the Indian Government, 10 August, 1963.
57. Note of the Chinese Government, 12 August, 1963.

58. Note of the Chinese Government, 14 August, 1963.
59. Note of the Chinese Government, 26 August, 1963
60. Note of the Indian Government, 28 August, 1963.
61. Note of the Chinese Government, 2 September, 1963
62. Note of the Indian Government, 3 September, 1963
63. Note of the Indian Government, 1 September, 1963.
64. Note of the Indian Government, 21 September, 1963.
65. Note of the Indian Government, 30 September, 1963.
66. Note of the Chinese Government, 7 October, 1963.
67. Note of the Indian Government, 9 October, 1963.
68. Note of the Indian Government, 5 November, 1963.
69. Note of the Chinese Government, 7 November, 1963.
70. Note of the Indian Government, 26 November, 1963
71. Note of the Chinese Government, 11 December, 1963.
72. Note of the Chinese Government, 25 December, 1963
73. Note of the Indian Government January, 1964.
74. Note of the Indian Government, 8 January, 1964.

Treatment of Indian Representatives and Nationals

75. Memorandum of the Chinese Government, 17 July, 1963
76. Memorandum of the Indian Government, 1 August, 1963
77. Note of the Indian Government, 7 August, 1963.
78. Memorandum of the Chinese Government, 13 August, 1963
79. Memorandum of the Indian Government, 14 August, 1963
80. Memorandum of the Chinese Government, 15 August, 1963
81. Memorandum of the Indian Government, 20 August, 1963
82. Memorandum of the Chinese Government, 20 August, 1963
83. Memorandum of the Chinese Government, 16 September,
1963
84. Memorandum of the Indian Government, 19 September, 1963
85. Memorandum of the Indian Government, 5 October, 1963
86. Note of the Chinese Government, 7 October 1963
87. Note of the Indian Government, 14 October, 1963

88. Note of the Chinese Government, 26 October, 1963
89. Note of the Indian Government, 30 October, 1963
90. Note of the Indian Government, 11 November, 1963
91. Memorandum of the Chinese Government, 13 November, 1963
92. Note of the Chinese Government, 13 November, 1963
93. Note of the Chinese Government, 23 November, 1963
94. Memorandum of the Chinese Government, 26 November, 1963
95. Note of the Chinese Government, 6 December, 1963
96. Note of the Indian Government, 6 December, 1963
97. Memorandum of the Indian Government, 7 December, 1963.
98. Note of the Indian Government, 31 December, 1963
99. Note of the Chinese Government, 7 January, 1964.
100. Memorandum of the Indian Government, 8 January, 1964.
101. Note of the Indian Government, 13 January, 1964
102. Note of the Indian Government, 18 January, 1964.
103. Note of the Indian Government, 21 January, 1964.

Closure of Consulates-General and Trade Agencies

104. Note of the Chinese Government, 21 August, 1963.
105. Note of the Indian Government, 4 September, 1963.
106. Note of the Chinese Government, 16 October, 1963.
107. Memorandum of the Chinese Government, November, 1963.
108. Memorandum of the Indian Government, 6 December, 1963.
109. Memorandum of the Chinese Government, 6 December, 1963.
110. Note of the Indian Government, 11 December, 1963.
111. Note of the Chinese Government, 19 December, 1963
112. Note of the Indian Government, 4 January, 1964.
113. Memorandum of the Indian Government, 9 January, 1964.

Miscellaneous

114. Note of the Chinese Government, 27 July, 1963.
115. Note of the Indian Government, 7 August, 1963.

116. Note of the Chinese Government, 19 September, 1963
117. Note of the Chinese Government, 4 October, 1963.
118. Note of the Chinese Government, 31 October, 1963.
119. Note of the Indian Government, 13 November, 1963
120. Memorandum of the Chinese Government, 14 November, 1963.
121. Memorandum of the Indian Government, 12 December, 1963.
122. Note of the Indian Government, 28 December, 1963.
123. Note of the Chinese Government, 6 January, 1964.
124. Note of the Indian Government, 8 January, 1964.
125. Note of the Indian Government, 9 January, 1964.
126. Note of the Indian Government, 23 January, 1964.

Appendices

127. Letter from Premier Chou En-lai to the Prime Minister of India, 2 August, 1963
128. Letter from the Prime Minister of India to Premier Chou En-lai, 14 August. 1963

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, middle 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 discussions 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(c) 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 circumstances 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 ceasefire 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 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".

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.

Text of Chinese Government note dated the 9th October, 1963 in reply to Government of India's notes dated the 3rd April, 1963 and the 6th September, 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 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 reminded 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, settlement 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 strategy 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 completed 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 recognised 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 cultural 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 question was raised. After the Agreement, the economic and cultural interests of India in Tibet safeguarded under the Agreement were progressively 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".

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 checkpoint 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 Hsialin- kung 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 cease fire 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, 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 military 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 extend 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 territory; 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 protest 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 Ambassador to India had visited Sino-Sikkim border. This unusual action took place at a time when India was stepping up its aggressive activities 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 defensive concern" with regard to China. How can the Chinese Government 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 Tung- mula. 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 Dichu in the Lohit Division of NEFA.

It would appear that the Chinese objective in making baseless charges is to cover up their reconnaissance 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, slanderously 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 checkpoint 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 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 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 at 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.

4. In the light of the above facts the Government of India emphatically reject the allegations contained in the Chinese Government's note of 26th August, 1963.

5. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of the 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 commemorates 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 considerable 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 vexatious 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 atmosphere of tension and conflict all along the India-China border, including 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 purposeful 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 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, 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.

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 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 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, 15 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 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 "Hsialinkung 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 Parigas and the village of Demchok, acknowledging Parigas 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 China 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 Tagi 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 Bam- chho 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 Chhaglon, 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, with 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 Pulamsumda 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 reference to the Indian Government's note of July 25, 1963, has the honour to state the following:

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 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 Chinese Foreign Office's Note dated July 8, 1963, has the honour to state as follows:-

The Government of India's protest of 26th June, 1963 against the violation of Indian air space by Chinese aircraft over Bameng and Koloriang in the North East Frontier Agency on May 27th and June 5th, 1963, was lodged only after careful verification of the facts. The denial of the Chinese Government in its note under reply, cannot alter the fact of air intrusions over Indian territory by Chinese aircraft. The Chinese Government admits that these two places are south of the McMahon line i.e. the international frontier in the Eastern sector and yet Chinese aircraft have been violating Indian air space in these areas.

The Chinese note has also denied again the violation of Indian air space over Chhaglon and Chaam. These violations took place on the 15th of March and the 6th of May, 1963, and protests were lodged with the Chinese Government in the

Government of India's notes dated 25th April, 1963, and 21st May, 1963. However, without making any attempt to verify these facts, the Chinese Government has gone to the absurd extent of taking shelter behind a statement made in the Indian Parliament on the 15th April while choosing to ignore another statement made in the Indian Parliament on 23rd April, 1963, where the full facts are to hand. By doing so the Chinese Government has only conformed to its usual practice of quoting public statements out of context to suit itself.

The Chinese Government is obviously discomfited by the public disclosure of its aggressive activities. Accordingly, while attempting to hide the violations of Indian air space by Chinese aircraft from the world at large, the Chinese Government has presumptuously alleged that the Government of India somehow requires to make these charges of air violations for the sake of its so-called "internal and external political requirements". But the Chinese Government cannot escape the consequences of its violation of India's territorial integrity so long as it does not desist from its aggressive activities.

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 wilfully circled over Chinese civilian checkpoints 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 Shannuhsi 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

I. 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 check- post 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 Shannuhsi of Yecheng, all in Sinkiang. Then it turned back and left China after flying over the Chip Chap River Valley and the Galwan River Valey 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.

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 over 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 check- post 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 Hsiang, Mr. Liu Ta-hsiang, Mr. Tu Hsi-chen, Mr. Liu Hsi-hsiang, Mr. Hsia Chungho, 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 shop-worn 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 consideration.

**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, subjected to all sorts of inhuman maltreatment and persecution and are leading a miserable life. The Chinese Government is greatly concerned 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 External 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 shipping back the interned Chinese nationals, the Indian authorities colluded 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 consideration to them. This cannot but arouse the indignation of the Chinese Government. The Chinese Embassy firmly opposes the Indian Government's detention of victimized Chinese under whatever pretext, and resolutely demands that the Indian Government allow all the interned 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 repated 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 Indiahave 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 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 in India 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 checkpost at Mordo, has the honour to state the following:

It is an established fact that the Indian checkpost at Mordo unlawfully detained, harassed and persecuted the Chinese border inhabitants Gago, Tsaipai 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 the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and, with reference to the Note No. 11/268, dated the 11th December, 1963, 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 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 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, 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 saying 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 checkpoints 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 proposals 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 Government 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 Government'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 Affairs dated June 10, 1963.

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 necessary 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 wilfully make use of its home legislation as a pretext for violating international practice. The unreasonable troublemaking 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.

**Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 16 September
1963**

Reference memorandum delivered to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India on August 20, 1963.

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**

Reference the memorandum of the Chinese Foreign Office dated the 20th August, 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 scurrilous 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 intruded 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 lie's 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.
4. Haji Abdul Kadir Malik, arrested on July 3, 1960, released on parole on December 10, 1960 and re-arrested on March 8, 1961.
5. Hamidulla Masle, arrested at Lhasa on March 21, 1959.

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

Reference Memorandum of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated October 5, 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 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 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 memoranda 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 India 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**

Rereference memorandum of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated September 19, 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**

Reference Memorandum No. 11/142, dated 13th November, 1963, of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic

of China to the Indian Embassy in Peking.

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 face 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 Anand 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, including 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 untenable. 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 complaint 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 fabrication 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 detained, that his statement was extorted, and so on and so forth. The assertions of the Indian Government are indeed very clumsy, preposterous 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 dated November 26, 1963.

It has been clearly established in previous notes of the

Government of India that the Indian Embassy in China has never carried an 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 upto 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.

In the light of the above facts, the Government of India cannot 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 Memorie 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 care takers 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 care takers to look after the buildings and the property they contain. It is, therefore, hoped that atleast now the Chinese Government will agree to the appointment of atleast one or two of the former local employees of the Agency as care takers 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 Government 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 buildings of the former Indian Trade Agency at Yatung would be kept in a good state of repair and that there would be care-takers to look after the buildings. In its reply of October 16, 1963 to the Indian 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 authorities concerned to render assistance in this connection and employ two or three care-takers 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 care-takers 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 nationality.

The above-listed care-takers 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. Hence-forth, the Embassy may keep direct contact with the care-takers in connection with the repair and maintenance 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 reappointed 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 care- takers 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.

Reference Chinese Government's Memorandum No. 11/296, dated the 6th December, 1963.

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 it 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."

Note Embassy of the given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the People's Republic of China in India, 7 August 1963

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 ever since 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 Shang 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 to the former Chinese Consulate-General at Bombay had 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 non-existent 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**

Reference memorandum of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated June 1, 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

Reference Chinese Government's Memorandum dated 14th November, 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 Malayasia.

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 diplomatic 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 forwarding it to this Government for onward transmission. The Government 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 channelled 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 assurances 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 of China. Certain representatives of the Indian press and the Moral 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.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 9 January 1964

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and, in continuation of this Ministry's Note dated 21st October, 1963, has the honour to state that the specific cases mentioned in paragraph 2 of the Embassy's Note No. M/194/63, dated the 4th October 1963, have been investigated. The Photostat copies of the envelopes have also been carefully examined by the authorities concerned and it has been confirmed that the wax seals on the envelopes and the envelopes themselves had been torn as a result of the long transit. If, as alleged by the Chinese Embassy, these envelopes had been opened and examined by the Indian censors, the envelopes would surely have carried the imprint of the censor's official stamp. In the absence of such imprint it is evident that these envelopes had never been opened and examined as alleged.

Diplomatic Mails intended for foreign missions in India are not subject to censorship and they are on the contrary despatched to the addressees with the utmost expedition. The Chinese Embassy's allegations are, therefore, utterly baseless and the Embassy's protest in this regard is 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, 23 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 Embassy's Note No. M/402/64, dated the 6th January 1964, has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Embassy is aware that the Constitution of India guarantees to every individual, inter alia. The right to assemble and hold meetings. While certain meetings may have been held in Calcutta and other places in India by some Chinese who do not subscribe to the policies of the People's Republic of China, the meetings were entirely of peaceful nature and cannot be considered to have infringed established laws.

The Chinese Note refers to the presents at these functions of members of the Indian Press and others belonging to the Moral Re-armament Group. Surely, the Chinese Government is aware that these persons could not have and did not have any connection with the Government of India. Hence the Embassy's charge that these meetings have been carried out "with the connivance of the Indian authorities" is completely baseless and is rejected by 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.

Letter from the Premier Chou En-lai, to the Prime Minister of India, 2 August 1963

Your Excellency,

The Chinese Government issued on July 31, 1963 a statement proposing a Conference of the Government heads of all countries of the world to discuss the question of complete, thorough, total and resolute prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons. The text of the proposal reads as follows:

“The Government of the People’s Republic of China hereby propose the following:

- 1) All countries in the world both nuclear and non-nuclear solemnly declare that they will prohibit and destroy nuclear weapons completely, thoroughly, totally and resolutely. Concretely speaking, they will not use nuclear weapons, nor export nor import nor manufacture nor test nor stockpile them and they will destroy all existing nuclear weapons and their means of delivery on the world and disband all existing establishments for the research, testing and manufacture of nuclear weapons in the world.
- 2) In order to fulfill the above undertakings sincerely by steps the following measures shall be adopted first:
 - a) Dismantle all ministry bases including nuclear bases on foreign soil and withdraw from abroad all nuclear weapons and their means of delivery.
 - b) Establish a nuclear weapon-free zone of the Asian and Pacific region including the U.S.A., the Soviet Union, China and Japan, a nuclear weapon-free zone of Central Europe, a

nuclear weapon-free zone of Africa and a nuclear weapon-free zone of Latin America. The countries possessing nuclear weapons shall undertake due obligations with regard to each of the nuclear weapon-free zones.

- c) Refrain from exporting and importing in any form nuclear weapons and technical data for their manufacture.
- d) Cease all nuclear tests including underground nuclear tests.

3. A Conference of the Government heads of all countries of the world shall be convened to discuss the question of the complete prohibition and through destruction of nuclear weapons and the question of taking the above mentioned 4 measures in order to realize step by step the complete prohibition and through destruction of nuclear weapons.”

In view of the urgent desire of the peoples of the world for the removal of the threat of nuclear war and for the safeguarding of the peace and security of the world the Chinese Government earnestly hopes that its proposal will receive the favourable consideration 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 Government 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 prohibition 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 international 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 complete 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 e 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, 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 nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons", the General Assembly has declared that the use of these weapons is contrary to the spirit, letter and aims of the United Nations and to the rules of international law and of humanity. The resolution also requested the Secretary-General to ascertain the possibility of convening a Special Conference for signing a Convention on the prohibition of the use of these weapons. This item is on the Agenda of the forthcoming session of the General Assembly. Article one of the Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament, on the text of which agreement has already been reached in the Disarmament Committee, provides, *inter alia*, for—

- i. Disbanding of all armed forces, dismantling of military establishments; cessation of the production of armaments as well as their liquidation or conversion to peaceful uses;

- ii. Elimination of all stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, biological and other weapons of mass destruction; cessation of the production of such weapons;
- iii. Elimination of all means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction and cessation of the production of such means of delivery;
- iv. Cessation of organisations and institutions designed to organize the military efforts of states, including war ministries, general staffs and their local agencies, and all other military and para-military organisations and institutions;
- v. Cessation of any kind of military conscription, military training and military obligations; and the closing of all military training institutions;
- vi. Discontinuance of all military expenditures;
- vii. Prohibition of the reconstitution of the foregoing armaments, forces, activities and facilities after their elimination, disbanding, cessation, dismantling, or conversion to peaceful use.

Then again, under its resolution 1652 (XVI), the General Assembly declared Africa as a denuclearized zone. The forthcoming session will similarly consider the Latin American proposal for a denuclearized zone for South America. Other proposals concerning the Scandinavian countries and the

Mediterranean are also before the Disarmament Committee in Geneva.

8. Three specific proposals by the People's Republic of China, namely (a) dismantling of all military bases, including nuclear bases on foreign soil and withdrawal from abroad of all nuclear weapons and their means of delivery (b) establishment of nuclear weapons and knowledge, are, as will be seen from the preceding paragraph, among the various matters that the Disarmament Committee is negotiating at present. Moreover, the last-named suggestion has been approved already by the General Assembly of the United Nations under its resolutions 1380 (XIV) and 1576 (XV).

9. The statement of the Government of the People's Republic of China also proposes cessation of all nuclear tests, including underground tests. This is a matter to which the Government of India have attached great importance. Your Excellency may be aware that India was one of the first countries to suggest as early as April 1954 that pending real progress towards prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons, all countries should cease, testing of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. Since 1959, India has also been inscribing on the agenda of the General Assembly of the United Nations an item on the cessation of nuclear weapon test explosions.

10. Stoppage of nuclear weapons tests is of immense benefit to the entire world. It limits development of new weapons of mass destructions and it prevents proliferation of weapons. Possession of weapons by an increasing number of countries increases the area of fear and the risk of war. An agreement

on a measure of arms limitation and control of this kind also reduces international tension and builds up mutual confidence. The tragedy of our times is principally that of fear and suspicion. Any measure which builds up confidence, therefore, deserves the support of all peace-loving nations.

11. There is another aspect of this problem which is of even greater concern to humanity. The radio-active fall-out resulting from nuclear test explosions has an exceedingly harmful effect on the health of the peoples of the world. It inflicts incalculable damage to the bones and tissues of all living beings and affects vegetation as well as animals. Scientists have estimated that the explosions conducted by various countries so far have already affected the health of millions of people. In fact, radio-active fall-out harms not only our present generation bringing in its wake dread diseases like leukemia and bone cancer but also the generations yet unborn. Pre-natal deaths and deformed and diseased babies are the legacy of these explosions. Continuance of nuclear weapon tests, therefore, is a crime against humanity.

12. Your Excellency is, no doubt, aware of the evil effects of nuclear explosions and I recollect that you signed the Bandung declaration which specially appealed to all Powers to reach an agreement to suspend experiments with such weapons pending the total prohibition of their manufacture. The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, which is being signed by a large number of countries, is an important first step though it does not cover underground tests which do not spread radio-active debris beyond the territorial limits of the countries concerned. This treaty, however, is of considerable significance, as it saves humanity from the death-dealing fall-out resulting from

explosions in the atmosphere. We hope that the existing prohibition will soon be extended to underground weapons tests as well.

13. The Government of the People's Republic of China have expressed their agreement with the universal desire for general and complete disarmament, although their present proposals relate only to nuclear disarmament. I also note that the Government of the People's Republic of China accept the proposition that disarmament should be achieved step by step. The international community is 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.