



**NOTES, MEMORANDA AND LETTERS EXCHANGED BETWEEN
THE GOVERNMENTS OF INDIA AND CHINA**

FEBRUARY 1966-FEBRUARY 1967

WHITE PAPER No. XIII

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

PRINTED IN INDIA BY THE GENERAL MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OF
INDIA PRESS, MINTO ROAD, NEW DELHI AND PUBLISHED BY THE
MANAGER OF PUBLICATIONS, DELHI, 1967 On 22nd March 1966, the

Foreign Minister presented to Parliament the Twelfth 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 1965-February 1966. This White Paper contains the notes, memoranda and letters exchanged between the two Governments since February 1966. It also contains a few notes not included in the previous White Paper.

Ministry of External Affairs,

New Delhi.

13th March, 1967.

CONTENTS

Border Issues and Incidents

1. Note of the Chinese Government, 27 January, 1966.
2. Note of the Chinese Government, 31 January, 1966.
3. Note of the Indian Government, 10 March, 1966.
4. Note of the Indian Government, 30 April, 1966.
5. Note of the Chinese Government, 4 May, 1966.
6. Note of the Indian Government, 21 July, 1966.
7. Note of the Indian Government, 11 August, 1966.
8. Note of the Chinese Government, 5 September, 1966.
9. Note of the Indian Government, 30 September, 1966.
10. Note of the Indian Government, 15 October, 1966.
11. Note of the Indian Government, 4 November, 1966.
12. Note of the Chinese Government, 24 December, 1966.
13. Note of the Indian Government, 2 February, 1967.
14. Note of the Indian Government, 8 March, 1967.

Territorial Air Space

15. Note of the Indian Government, 26 November, 1966.

Alleged Ill-Treatment of Chinese Representatives and Nationals in India

16. Note of the Chinese Government, 12 January, 1966.
17. Note of the Indian Government, 5 July, 1966.
18. Note of the Chinese Government, 21 September, 1966.
19. Note of the Indian Government, 3 October, 1966.
20. Note of the Chinese Government, 8 October, 1966.
21. Memorandum of the Chinese Government, 14 October, 1966.
22. Note of the Indian Government, 26 October, 1966.
23. Memorandum of the Indian Government, 14 December, 1966.
24. Note of the Indian Government, 6 February, 1967.

Treatment of Indian Representatives and Nationals in China

25. Note of the Chinese Government, 11 April, 1966.

26. Note of the Indian Government, 8 July, 1966.

Miscellaneous

27. Note of the Chinese Government, 30 May, 1964.

28. Note of the Indian Government, 28 July, 1964.

29. Note of the Chinese Government, 6 November, 1965

30. Note of the Chinese Government, 2 January, 1966.

31- Note of the Chinese Government, 2 April, 1966.

32. Note of the Indian Government, 13 May, 1966.

33. Note of the Indian Government, 30 May, 1966.

34. Note of the Indian Government, 28 July, 1966.

35. Note of the Chinese Government, 28 July, 1966.

36. Note of the Chinese Government, 15 September, 1966.

37. Note of the Indian Government, 28 September, 1966.

38. Note of the Indian Government, 28 October, 1966.

39. Note of the Indian Government, 21 November, 1966.

40. Note of the Indian Government, 25 November, 1966.

41. Note of the Indian Government, 6 December, 1966.

42. Note OF the Indian Government, 6 January, 1967.

43. Note of the Indian Government, 15 February, 1967

Appendices

APPENDIX I

Text of Hsinhua Statement, 27 October, 1966.

APPENDIX II

Press statement of 3rd October, 1966 issued on behalf of
Bhutan Government by its Trade Adviser in Calcutta.

I. BORDER ISSUES AND INCIDENTS

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 27 January, 1966

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 051.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian embassy in China and with reference to the three notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India, dated November 26 and 27, and December 14, 1965, has the honour to state the following:

In the last few months the Indian side has intensified its intrusions into China and repeatedly provoked armed conflicts. The three most outstanding cases took place respectively at Dumchele in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, in the Laigu Bridge area in the eastern sector, and at Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary. The Chinese Government successively lodged strong protests with the Indian Government against the three armed conflicts. But the Indian Government, instead of admitting its mistakes sent the Chinese Government notes in which it tried hard to turn the truth upside down and lodged counter-protests to China. The Chinese Government expresses its indignation at this and hereby replies in refutation of the Indian notes as follows:

(1) Regarding the conflict of September 19, 1965 at Dumchele in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, it was clearly Indian troops that intruded into Chinese territory and launched an attack on Chinese civilian personnel. Yet the Indian Government asserted that Indian soldiers had been "kidnapped and killed" by the Chinese side, a story which was thoroughly refuted by the Chinese Government early in its note of

October 2, 1965. And it was most absurd of the Indian side, in its note of November 26, 1965, to repeat its old tune and further to reserve its so-called right to demand compensation. Being the aggressor, the Indian Government must bear full responsibility for all the consequences of its acts of aggression. What qualification has it to ask for compensation? On the other hand, the Chinese Government has every right to demand that the Indian Government compensate it for all the losses caused by the Indian intrusions and provocations against China. The Indian Government can in no way repudiate these debts, which have all been placed on record.

(2) The armed conflict of November 24, 1965 in the Laigu Bridge area in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border was provoked by Indian troops trespassing the line of actual control between the two sides. Regarding this conflict, in its note of November 27, 1965 the Indian Government copied the same lie it had told about the conflict at Dumchele in its attempt to hoodwink the world, alleging that Indian troops were "kidnapped and killed" by the Chinese side. This is a shabby trick worth no refutation. Moreover, in its note the Indian Government again mixed up the illegal "McMahon line" with the boundary between China and India in an attempt to legalize this illegal line. This is an idle dream which will never come true.

(3) Regarding the armed conflict of December 12, 1965 at Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary, the indisputable fact was that more than thirty Indian soldiers intruded into the Chinese side of Tagi La and launched a frantic attack on seven Chinese frontier guards who were on duty there. But they were routed by the Chinese frontier guards and had to flee helter-skelter. Five of the Indian soldiers were killed within Chinese territory to a depth of between 100 and 500 metres. Three were captured within Chinese territory. Moreover, the Indian troops left behind on Chinese territory a large amount of weapons and ammunition as well as

many craters. All these are conclusive evidence of the Indian troops intrusion. In its note of December 14, 1965 the Indian Government counter-charged Chinese troops with "intruding into Sikkim territory" and "firing" at the Indian side. This can deceive no one. The Indian side further told the fantastic tale to the effect that there were some 200 or 300 Chinese troops, that 30 of them were killed and that their bodies were carried back "under the cover of darkness", and so on and so forth. This was an attempt to present its shame as a cause for self-glorification, an act of self-delusion and deception. The Indian side will only add to its own shame by trying to cover up the miserable failure of its provocation with such lies.

(4) In its note of December 14, 1965 the Indian side trumped up two cases of so-called "provocation", falsely accusing Chinese soldiers of entering "the area north-west of Bom Cho in the north Sikkim" on December 10, 1965 and firing at the Indian side in the Natu La area on the night of December 10-11. These are sheer fabrications designed to confuse the public.

The series of facts listed above show that the Indian side deliberately made intrusions and provocations against China, but suffered one defeat after another and left behind numerous evidences of its crimes. And that was why it hastily cooked up lies in a vain attempt to shirk responsibility for its criminal aggression and hoodwink world opinion. To put it plainly, these tricks of the Indian side have long been exposed. If the Indian Government continues its senseless haggling about the above-mentioned conflicts, the Chinese Government will pay no attention to it.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 31 January, 1966

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 071.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with regard to Indian intrusions along the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim boundary in the latter half of 1965, has the honour to state the following:

1. In the latter half of 1965, there were altogether 39 cases of Indian troops' intrusions into Chinese territory across the line of actual control along the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim boundary and of their provocations (For details see Annex I). Some intruding Indian troops carried on reconnaissance and harassment in Chinese territory for as long as four days; others penetrated Chinese territory to a depth of 18 kilometres; and still others even made incursions into the vicinity of Hsiasima of Yatung, an important county of Tibet. Particularly serious is the fact that in the western and eastern sectors of the Sino-Indian border and along the China-Sikkim boundary Indian troops carried out armed provocations and engineered clashes on five occasions, killing one Chinese frontier guard and wounding another. Along the China-Sikkim boundary, Indian troops also fired six times with rifles and artillery from the Sikkim side at Chinese frontier guards within Chinese territory.

In the latter half of 1965, Indian planes flew altogether 41 sorties across the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border and across the China-Sikkim boundary and intruded into China's airspace (For details see Annex II). The farthest point of these intrusions was about 150 kilometres from the line of actual control.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the

Indian Government against the above serious intrusions and provocations by the Indian side.

2. The latter half of 1965 was a period in which intrusions by Indian troops into Chinese territory were most numerous and most serious since the Indian side provoked the massive conflict on the Sino-Indian border in 1962. Indian air intrusions into China in the same period were also more frequent than any other period in the last two years. This was by no means accidental. In the latter half of 1965, the Indian Government intensified its arms expansion and war operation and unleashed a war of aggression, and India was internally beset with financial difficulties and a food crisis, which became unprecedentedly serious. In these circumstances, it was obviously for the purpose of currying favour with the U.S. imperialists and the modern revisionists and thereby obtaining more grain, arms and money from them that India intensified her intrusions into China, provoked armed conflicts and created tension. However, in eking out a living by opposing China like this, the Indian Government cannot improve its position of being hard pressed both at home and abroad, but will only come to a grievous end.

3. The Chinese Government has lodged protests with the Indian Government against the Indian intrusions into China's territory and airspace during the first half of 1965. In its note of October 21, 1965, the Indian Government tried hard to deny these facts. This was a futile attempt. The facts of Indian intrusions listed by the Chinese Government had all been repeatedly checked, and each of these intrusions is well established. The military works for aggression built on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary, which Indian troops failed to dismantle entirely are still there; the Chinese border inhabitants and cattle kidnapped by Indian troops who intruded into Chinese territory have not yet been returned. All these are iron-clad facts, which the Indian side cannot possibly obliterate.

4. The Chinese Government hereby warns the Indian Government once again that the Indian side must stop all its ground and air intrusions and provocations against China, otherwise it must bear full responsibility for the consequences that may arise therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

ANNEX I

Intrusions into Chinese Territory by Indian Troops During the Latter Half of 1965

I. Intrusions into Sinkiang and Tibet, China, east of the 1959 line of actual control in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. On August 1, at about 1630 hours, four Indian soldiers on horseback intruded into Tibet in the vicinity of Kongka Pass and detoured to the flank and rear of the Chinese civilian checkpost for reconnaissance and provocation lasting more than three hours. The intruding Indian troops penetrated into Chinese territory for a depth of about 18 kilometres.

2. On August 2, at about 1620 hours, six Indian soldiers on horseback intruded into the vicinity of the Chinese civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted activities there for more than three hours. The intruding Indian troops pressed to a point within some 500 metres of the Chinese civilian checkpost for reconnaissance and map-making there.

3. On August 17, at about 1120 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into an area southeast of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities there for more than two hours.

4. On August 21, at about 1320 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities there for nearly an hour.

5. On August 25, at about 1110 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities there for nearly an hour.

6. On September 11, at about 1200 hours, four Indian soldiers on horseback intruded along the Changlung River to the south and southeast of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance and harassing raids for nearly seven hours, penetrating into Chinese territory for a depth of about three kilometres.

7. On September 16, at about 1120 hours, three Indian soldiers penetrated into Chinese territory for a depth of about three kilometres, intruded along the Changlung River to the southeast of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance for more than one and half hours.

8. On September 18, at about 1300 hours, three Indian soldiers crossed the Demchok River from Parigas, a Tibetan area which was under India's illegal occupation, and intruded into the vicinity of Demchok village on the Chinese side of the line of actual control, and conducted reconnaissance and harassing raids there.

9. On September 19, at 1450 hours, a group of Indian soldiers intruded into an area about four kilometres east of Dumchele, Tibet and brazenly made an attack by firing on the Chinese civilian personnel who were on duty there. After serving warnings without avail, the Chinese civilian personnel had to strike back, killing three Indian soldiers.

10. On September 22, at about 0820 hours, three Indian soldiers crossed the Demchok River from Parigas and intruded into the vicinity of Demchok village, Tibet for reconnaissance.

11. On October 4, at about 1200 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance and left Chinese territory at about 1320 hours.

12. On October 13, at about 1900 hours, five Indian soldiers on horseback intruded along the Changlung River to the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities for nearly an hour.

13. On October 14, at about 1130 hours, four Indian soldiers on horseback intruded into an area to the west of the civilian checkpost at Tienwentian in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance and harassing raids for about two hours, penetrating into Chinese territory for a depth of about six kilometres.

14. On November 10, at about 1215 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

15. On November 25, at about 1330 hours, four Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur, Tibet for reconnaissance.

16. On December 10, at about 1340 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur, Tibet and conducted reconnoitring activities there for nearly two hours.

17. On December 14, at about 1550 hours, four Indian soldiers

intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur, Tibet for reconnaissance.

II. Intrusions into Tibet, China, north of the 1959 line of actual control in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border:

During the summer of 1965, Indian military and administrative personnel again intruded into the Wuje area of China and stationed themselves there.

III. Intrusions into Tibet, China north of the 1959 line of actual control in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. On November 24, at 1030 hours, three Indian soldiers crossed Tungmu La on the line of actual control and intruded into the area of Laiguo Bridge for armed provocation. Instead of heeding the warning for withdrawal served by the Chinese personnel of a civilian checkpost, they opened fire at the Chinese personnel. The three intruding Indian soldiers were all killed in the exchange of fire.

2. At Hsialinkung Terrace, Indian troops have so far failed to dismantle their military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the line of actual control, but have frequently crossed the line of actual control for reconnaissance and harassment.

IV. Intrusions into Tibet, China along the China-Sikkim boundary:

1. On July 2, at about 1100 hours, two Indian soldiers crossed Latuo La and intruded into Chinese territory for reconnaissance.

2. On July 3, at about 1900 hours, five Indian soldiers crossed the China-Sikkim boundary and intruded into Dongnan grassland in Tibet,

China. They carried out reconnaissance and harassing raids for as long as four days within Chinese territory before leaving China near Tungcha La around 1300 hours on July 7.

3. On July 10, at about 1800 hours, an Indian soldier crossed the boundary near Tagi La and opened fire at a Chinese shepherd called Trashe Tsewang.

4. On the afternoon of July 22, nine Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory from a point north of Cho La. They pitched a tent at the Riwujig pasture and prowled hither and thither for reconnaissance, harassment and the gathering of information and even seized things from Chinese herdsmen. On July 23, two of the Indian soldiers sneaked as far as the vicinity of Hsiasima of Yatung, an important county of Tibet, penetrating into Chinese territory for a depth of about 12 kilometres. It was not until the noon of July 24 after the nine intruding Indian soldiers had illegally stayed on Chinese territory for two days and nights that they left the territory.

5. On September 26, at 1630 hours, three Indian soldiers crossed Tungchu La and intruded into Chinese territory for reconnaissance and provocation. They were arrested on the spot by Chinese defence troops.

6. On September 30, at about 1530 hours, four Indian soldiers crossed Toka La and intruded into Tunglang pasture in Dongnan grassland, and with their weapons intimidated Chinese herdsmen who were grazing cattle there.

7. On October 2, at about 1100 hours, 15 Indian soldiers crossed Toka La and intruded into Shu pasture in Dongnan grassland. They conducted reconnaissance and harassing raids for as long as five hours.

8. On October 2, at about 1130 hours, a group of Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory through Ya La and opened heavy fire on Chinese frontier guards who were on duty there, firing more than 200 rounds and wounding a Chinese frontier guard.

9. On October 20, at 1250 hours, 25 Indian soldiers occupied Toka La, eighteen of whom openly crossed the Pass and intruded into Dongnan grassland within Chinese territory for provocation against the Chinese frontier guards who were on duty there. The intruding Indian soldiers illegally stayed within Chinese territory until 1740 hours when they withdrew.

10. On November 13, at 0730 hours, more than a hundred Indian soldiers at Tungchu La started a fierce attack with light and heavy machine-guns on Chinese frontier guards who were on duty within Chinese territory. In the meantime, more than ten Indian soldiers crossed the boundary and outflanked and attacked the Chinese frontier guards. Under cross-fire, an Indian soldier, after being wounded, crawled back to the Sikkim side and died there.

11. On December 11, at about 1130 hours, seven Indian soldiers crossed Toka La and intruded into Dongnan grassland for reconnaissance and harassment. After being discovered by the Chinese frontier guards, this group of intruding Indian soldiers fled helter-skelter in the same direction from which they had made their intrusion.

12. On December 12, at 1435 hours, more than 30 Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory through Tagi La and opened heavy fire with rifles and artillery on the Chinese frontier guards who were on patrol duty there, killing one of them. The Chinese side was compelled to fire back, and three Indian soldiers were captured and five killed under cross-fire.

13. During the latter half of 1965, Indian troops continued to maintain a large number of military works for aggression on the Chinese side of Natu La, Tungchu La, Jelep La and Cho La, and illegally entrenched themselves there. It was not until the Chinese Government set a time-limit in its note of September 16, 1965 for the Indian side to dismantle these military works that the Indian side was compelled to demolish part of them and withdrew helter-skelter.

14. During the latter half of 1965, apart from making incessant intrusions by crossing the China-Sikkim boundary, Indian troops repeatedly opened rifle and artillery fire on the border at Chinese frontier guards within Chinese territory.

(1) On September 20, at 1830 hours and 1900 hours, Indian troops twice fired from a place near Natu La at Chinese frontier guards.

(2) On September 20, at 2000 hours, Indian troops fired from a place near Jelep La at Chinese frontier guards.

(3) On October 4, between 1030 and 1230 hours, a group of Indian soldiers in the vicinity of Ya La opened fire on two successive occasions with light and heavy machine-guns and mortars upon the Chinese frontier guards who were on duty there.

(4) On October 9, at 1727 hours, Indian troops at Natu La fired six rounds at a sentry post of Chinese defence troops.

(5) On October 16, at 1530 hours, Indian troops at Ya La opened machine-gun fire on the positions of the Chinese defence troops.

(6) On November 24, at 1707 hours, a group of Indian soldiers at Tagi La

fired two shells at the Chinese frontier guards on patrol duty.

ANNEX II

Intrusions into China's Airspace by Indian Aircraft During the Latter Half of 1965

I. Intrusions into the airspace over Sinkiang and Tibet, China, east of the 1959 line of actual control in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. On August 13, at 1150 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang.

2. On September 30, at 1156 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Kongka Pass in Tibet, the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang, and other places.

3. On September 30, at 1200 hours, an Indian aircraft flew over Ane Pass and intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Nyagzu and its vicinity in Tibet.

4. On October 24, at about 1300 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang.

5. On November 3, at 1033 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs and its vicinity in Sinkiang.

6. On November 3, at about 1300 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Nyagzu and its vicinity in Tibet.

7. On November 18, at 1310 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Kongka Pass and its vicinity in Tibet, and circled over there for reconnaissance.

8. On November 19, at 1050 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the Galwan River Valley and Panlung and its vicinity in Sinkiang.

9. On November 23, at 1115 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Yula and other places on the southern bank of Pangong Lake in Tibet, and circled over there for reconnaissance.

10. On November 27, at 1025 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the Galwan River Valley, Panlung and other places in Sinkiang.

11. On December 2, at 1202 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet.

12. On December 6, at 1201 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet.

13. On December 12, at 0631 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Chiakang, Jara Pass and other places in Tibet.

14. On December 13, at 1520 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the area of Pangong Lake in Tibet.

15. On December 19, at 1205 hours, an Indian aircraft flew over Kongka Pass and intruded into China's airspace.

16. On December 29, at 1150 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Height 5651 metres and other places in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Tienwentian in Sinkiang, and circled over there for reconnaissance.

II. Intrusions into the airspace over Tibet, China, east of the 1959 line of actual control in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border:

On September 24, at 1100 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Mtsoreb (Churup) and its vicinity east of the area of Chuva and Chuje.

III. Intrusions into the airspace over Tibet, China, north of the 1959 line of actual control in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. On September 12, at 1101 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Sanachulin and other places.

2. On September 22, at 1120 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Milin. Linchih and other places.

3. On September 23, at about 2000 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Pangta and other places in Chamdo area, penetrating China's territory to a depth of about 150 kilometres.

4. On September 24, at 0715 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Chikung and its vicinity northeast of Tsayul.

5. On September 27, at 2117 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Pangta and its vicinity, penetrating China's territory to a depth of about 150 kilometres.

6. On October 4, at 1010 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Sama and its vicinity.

7. On October 5, at 1320 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Jihung Chuwakan and other places each of Tsayul.

8. On October 8, at 0548 hours, two Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Janwu and other places in Chamdo area, and circled over there for reconnaissance for about half an hour.

9. On October 16, at 0755 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the Nu River Bridge and its vicinity in Chamdo area, and circled over there for reconnaissance, penetrating China's territory to a depth of about 130 kilometres.

10. On November 27, at 1005 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Le and its vicinity, and circled over there for reconnaissance.

11. On November 30, at 1251 hours, two Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Molo, Tamaden and other places.

12. On December 11, at 1607 hours, two Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Che Dong area north of the 1959 line of actual control.

13. On December 11, at 1615 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Tsona and its vicinity.

14. On December 12, at 1425 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over an area west of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao.

IV. Intrusions into the airspace over Tibet, China along the China-Sikkim boundary:

1. On September 23, at 0805 hours, an Indian aircraft flew over Tungchu La and intruded into China's airspace.

2. On September 30, at 1025 hours, an Indian aircraft flew over Cho La and intruded into China's airspace.

3. On October 15, at 1237 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace through Ya La and circled over China's territory for reconnaissance at Natu La, Jelep La and Tungchu La. Then it returned to Ya La and penetrated deep into the airspace over Ring- chhingong, Yatung and other places for reconnaissance and harassment.

4. On October 26, at 0955 hours, an Indian aircraft flew over Ya La and intruded into China's airspace.

5. On October 26, at 1108 hours, an Indian aircraft flew over Yaw La and intruded into China's airspace.

6. On November 23, at 1319 hours, an Indian aircraft flew over Ya La and intruded into China's airspace.

7. On December 14, at 1015 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the Shigatse area from above Tagi La and brazenly circled over Chago La, Tui La, Phari, Linghsi La, Khala and other places in this area for reconnaissance and harassment; it was not until 1050 hours that the

aircraft flew back to Sikkim territory through the Kungyangmila Pass. This Indian aircraft penetrated China's territory to a depth of over 60 kilometres.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 March, 1966

No. C/5/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Government's Note of the 27th January, 1966, has the honour to state as follows:

Since September last year Chinese troops had been indulging in armed provocations and creating a series of incidents across the border. The Government of India's protests against these incidents were based on verified and irrefutable facts. It is, therefore, of no avail for the Chinese Government to evade responsibility for their actions by bland denials and false counter-charges.

Detailed information pertaining to the incident of September 19, 1965, in Ladakh, the incident of 24th November, 1965, in NEFA and the armed clash of 12th December, 1965, in North Sikkim as well as the incidents of the 10th and 10-11th December, 1965, has been provided in the relevant protest notes of the Government of India. It is a fact that on September 19, 1965, Chinese troops crossed the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector and kidnapped and killed three Indian personnel in the vicinity of Tsaskur. It is also a fact that on 24th November, 1965, Chinese troops crossed the international border in the Eastern Sector near Domla Pass and ambushed, kidnapped and killed three Indian personnel who were on routine patrol in Indian territory. Again, on December 12,

1965, Chinese troops intruded into Sikkim and attacked an Indian patrol. In the encounter six Indian personnel and 30 intruding Chinese troops were killed. The Government of India reserve the right to demand compensation for damage to Indian life and property perpetrated by intruding Chinese troops.

The facts of Chinese provocations and violations cannot be brushed aside by calling them a 'shabby trick' and 'self-glorification' by India. As a matter of fact, it is the Chinese Government which is playing such 'tricks' and making vain-glorious claims about the aggressive prowess of their armed forces.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, 30 April, 1966.

No. C/6/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, and with reference to the Chinese Government's note of 31st January 1966, has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government has, in its note under reply, produced a consolidated list of so-called "intrusions into Chinese territory" by Indian troops and aircraft in the latter half of 1965. These allegations are totally false and have been concocted to malign India and to provide a justification for the aggressive actions of Chinese troops across the border in the latter half of 1965. Out of the 39 land "intrusions" listed in the

Chinese note not less than 23 are a repetition of old charges which have already been investigated, found absolutely baseless and rejected by the Government of India in several of its earlier notes. The remaining 16 allegations are new but equally false. As regards the allegations of so-called "Air-intrusions", they are nothing but a fabrication. Thorough investigations conducted by the Government of India into these have conclusively proved that there has been not even a single instance in which Indian troops or aircraft had crossed the international border or the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector. The Government of India, therefore, reject the Chinese note and the allegations contained therein.

It is well-known that in the latter half of 1965 it was the Chinese Government who precipitated a war-like situation on the border. Taking advantage of the unfortunate conflict between India and Pakistan, they staged a series of military intrusions and incidents all along the border, and threatened India with a crude and impudent ultimatum. It is extraordinary that the Chinese Government should still harp upon the sheep and the yaks and the so-called "kidnapped" border inhabitants and try to maintain the fictitious charge that "the military works on the Chinese side of the China- Sikkim boundary which Indian troops failed to dismantle entirely are still there...." All these charges have been effectively disproved by the Government of India.

The Chinese Government have tried to give a propagandist twist and an ideological colouring to its protest note by saying that India is "eking out a living by opposing China", and is "currying favour with the U.S. imperialists and the modern revisionists thereby obtaining more grain, arms and money from them". The Government of India reject with contempt these impertinent remarks. If proof were needed that what lies behind these unceasing Chinese protests, allegations, threats and intrusions, is not so much the border question as the obsessive hostility of

the Chinese Government towards India, these slanderous aspersions prove it.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 4 May, 1966

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 309.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the three notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated February 2, 3 and 8, 1966:

After the Chinese Government's comprehensive protest of January 31, 1966 against India's intrusions into Chinese territory and airspace in the second half of last year, the Indian Government delivered three successive notes in which it groundlessly counter-charged China with intrusions and even repeated the lies which had been thoroughly refuted by the Chinese Government seven or eight months earlier. Apparently, this was a vain attempt to confuse public opinion and cover up the facts of Indian intrusions. The Chinese Government has no intention to refute India's fabrications and platitudes point by point but only wishes, in all seriousness, to make the following points:

(1) In its notes under reference, the Indian side repeatedly asserted that China had sent her troops into the 20-kilometre zone on her side of

the line of actual control along the Sino-Indian border and into the Longju, Che Dong and other areas which she had vacated on her own initiative and where she had refrained from establishing civilian checkpoints, and that she had broken her promise and violated the provisions of the Colombo proposals. This assertion is utterly absurd.

The said 20-kilometre zone and Longju, Che Dong and other areas are all Chinese territory. It was to seek relaxation of the border situation that, after repulsing the armed Indian attack in the winter of 1962, China took the initiative to withdraw her frontier guards 20 kilometres behind the line of actual control between the Chinese and Indian sides and decided not to establish even civilian check-posts in Longju, Che Dong, Wuje and the areas in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, where there was a dispute about the cease-fire arrangement. This fully testified to China's sincerity in seeking a peaceful settlement of the boundary question. The statements and documents issued at the time by the Chinese Government and its leaders, which were quoted in the Indian notes, precisely constitute a convincing proof of this sincerity.

But China's above action in no way meant relinquishment of sovereignty over her territory or of the right to take precautionary and self-defence measures against Indian intrusions and provocations. While withdrawing and taking other steps as mentioned above, the Chinese Government sternly demanded that India "refrain from making provocations again and from re-entering the four areas where there is a dispute about the cease-fire arrangement" and that she "correctly understand China's effort for peace and respond to it favourably". (See the statement by the spokesman of the Chinese Ministry of National Defence dated March 1, 1963 and the note of the Chinese Government to the Indian Government dated March 2, 1963). Moreover, the Chinese Government solemnly declared that, should India continue to make intrusions and provocations in disregard of the efforts made by China on

her own initiative, "China reserves the right to strike back in self-defence, and the Indian Government will be held completely responsible for all the grave consequences arising therefrom". (See the statement of the Chinese Government dated November 21, 1962). The Chinese Government "hopes that history will not be repeated. If unfortunately it should be repeated, the Chinese Government believes that the whole world will be able to see even more clearly than before who should be held responsible for the tension along the Sino-Indian border". (See Premier Chou En-lai's letter to Prime Minister Nehru dated March 3, 1963). These words of the Chinese Government are perfectly clear and unequivocal.

In the past three years, India has not only failed to make any positive response to China's initiative measures but has kept up her intrusions and provocations on the Sino-Indian and China-Sikkim borders, violated the 20-kilometre demilitarized zone on the Chinese side of the line of actual control along the Sino-Indian border, and even repeatedly intruded into Longju, Che Dong, Wuje and other areas where China had on her own initiative refrained from establishing any civilian checkpoints. (See the notes of the Chinese Government dated July 7, 1964, January 31, 1966, etc.). There were as many as 374 Indian ground and air intrusions during the three years from late 1962 to the end of 1965. What was more serious, in the latter half of 1965 the intruding Indian troops provoked several armed clashes. In the face of such a grave situation, it was only natural for the Chinese Government to adopt the necessary precautionary and self-defence measures. Such is what the Chinese Government has said and also what it has done. The Indian Government will never succeed in its attempt to misrepresent China's initiative measure of withdrawal and to make China put up with its expansionist and aggressive policy indefinitely without checking it.

(2) As for the charge that China has violated the Colombo Proposals,

it is even more absurd. In the first place, since the Colombo proposals are mere proposals, the question of violation or non-violation simply does not arise. Next, it must be pointed out that it was when China had taken a whole series of measures on her own initiative that the Colombo proposals came into being. China's concrete steps of withdrawing her frontier guards to 20 kilometres behind the entire line of actual control and refraining from establishing civilian checkpoints in Longju, Che Dong and two other areas far exceeded the proposals of the Colombo Conference. On the other hand, the Indian Government, while prating about its acceptance of the Colombo proposals, in fact made no positive response whatsoever. On the contrary, by her intrusions India demonstrated that she had altogether cast the Colombo proposals to the winds. Obviously, India is using the Colombo proposals merely as a tool to compel China to make unilateral concessions, hoping that China will tolerate India's renewed and unbridled intrusions and provocations. It is a great irony for India to continue to harp on the Colombo proposals in these circumstances.

(3) As for the line of actual control between the two sides along the Sino-Indian border, it must be pointed out once again that the discrepancy between it and the Sino-Indian traditional customary boundary is entirely due to the fact that India has invaded and occupied large tracts of Chinese territory. It is an objective and undeniable fact that in the western sector it roughly coincides with the traditional customary boundary. In the eastern sector, the so-called McMahon Line has become the line of actual control between the two sides because the Chinese side, proceeding from the desire to maintain the status quo pending a settlement of the boundary question, decided not to cross it. But this has in no way altered the illegal nature of the "McMahon Line". On her part, India first seized 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory south of that line and then occupied China Khinzemane north of the line; later on she did not scruple to provoke two armed conflicts in

order to invade and occupy the Longju and Che Dong areas north of the line. Now in its note the Indian Government further alleged that the junction of Nyamjang Chu and Sumdorong Chu north of Khinzemane is also to the south of the line. No sovereign state can tolerate these ever-growing and un-bounded territorial ambitions. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the Indian Government's unwarranted allegations and wishes to point out that India will never be able to realize her ambitions of perpetuating her illegal occupation of Chinese territory.

(4) As for the China-Sikkim boundary, clearly the question now is that India has not only stationed large numbers of troops in Sikkim, but has constantly crossed the delimited China-Sikkim boundary to intrude into Chinese territory and provoke conflict. It is preposterous to assert that China attempts to "spoil the special and cordial relations which exist between India and Sikkim" and "to apply military pressure on Sikkim." What are the "special and cordial relations" between India and Sikkim? To put it bluntly, they are the protectorship imposed on the people of Sikkim by the Indian Government which has inherited the mantle of aggression from British imperialism. Frankly speaking, such unequal relationship in which a big country bullies a small one and encroaches upon its sovereignty, has long been spurned by the people of the world, and especially by the awakened Afro-Asian peoples. It is most unseemly for India to try her utmost to maintain this relationship. Talking about "military pressure on Sikkim, It is not China that applies it, but precisely India, who is tightening her military control over Sikkim on the pretext of "defence". Is not this the plain fact?

(5) As the Chinese Government has repeatedly pointed out, India's purpose, both in conducting border intrusions and in making slanderous counter-charges against China is to meet the needs of its domestic and foreign policies. Although the Indian Government has flatly denied this, its denial cannot alter the objective fact. In order to ask for food and money

from the U.S. imperialists and the modern revisionists to solve the grave famine and economic difficulties at home, the Indian Prime Minister has recently not hesitated to repeatedly slander China as a "threat", cry that "China must be contained" and even boast about India's "contribution" along the Sino- Indian border, in the hope of receiving more "notice" and "thanks." This only enables the whole world to see more clearly the role the Indian Government is now playing in the international arena. We would like to tell the Indian Government that, as the Government of an Asian country, it will bring no good to its country by continuing to collaborate with imperialism and its accomplices and even hiring itself out and serving as their pawn, and that attempts at expansionism and aggression against its neighbours will bring nothing except more and more disasters to its people.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 July, 1966

No. C/11/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and have the honour to state that since the middle of May 1966 Chinese troops have made the following intrusions into Indian territory:

(i) On May 19, 1966, a Chinese patrol from Migyitun in Tibet intruded across the international boundary in the Eastern Sector into the Alubari area about a mile south of Longju in the Subansiri District of India's North East Frontier Agency. The Chinese patrol returned to Migyitun on the same day.

(ii) On July 9, 1966, a Chinese patrol party was observed three miles inside Indian territory across the border in the vicinity of Muling La in the Middle Sector of the India- Tibet boundary.

(iii) On July 16, 1966, a Chinese patrol party crossed the so- called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector and intruded into a depth of about two miles into Indian territory near the Track Junction in the Daulet Beg Oldi area and indulged in reconnaissance activities. The Chinese Government are fully aware that the Track Junction is west of 'the line of actual control' and is in Indian territory which has never been disputed by China.

2. The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Embassy of the People's Republic of China against these fresh instances of violation by Chinese troops of the 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector and the international boundary in the Middle and Eastern Sector of the border.

3. The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the people's Republic of China the assurance of their highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 August, 1966

No. C/13/66

The Ministry of External Affairs present its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:-

On 25th July, 1966, a Chinese military party intruded approximately one mile west of the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector

near the Track Junction in the Daulet Beg Oldi area. Further intrusions were made by Chinese military personnel into the same area on July 31, August 2 and August 4, 1966. The Government of India lodge a strong protest against these violations of Indian territory by Chinese military personnel. The Chinese Government are aware that the Daulet Beg Oldi area is west of the 'line of actual control' and is in Indian territory which has never been disputed by China.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of India in China, 5 September, 1966

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 604.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the notes of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated July 21 and August 11, 1966.

In its notes under reference, the Indian Government talked the nonsense that Chinese patrols and military personnel made 'intrusions into Indian territory' on seven occasions. This is an out-and-out lie. Neither in the western sector, nor in the middle and eastern sectors the Sino-Indian boundary have the Chinese frontier guards and civilian personnel ever crossed the line of actual control between the two sides. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the the Indian side's unwarranted protests which are based on sheer fabrications.

In its note the Indian Government also asserts that Chinese patrols intruded across "the international boundary in the eastern sector" into an area one mile south of Longju and across "the India-Tibet boundary" into the vicinity of Muling La. As is well-known, the traditional customary boundary in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border is as far as more than one hundred kilometres south of Longju, and even according to the line of actual control between the two sides Longju is within the Chinese side; the traditional customary boundary in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border is also far west of Muling La. The Indian Government's wild attempt to claim these places which have always belonged to China as "Indian territory" once again reveals its expansionist design over Chinese territory. What is particularly absurd is that in its note the Indian side went to the length of referring once again to the so-called "Indian-Tibet boundary". Tibet is an autonomous region of China and is an inalienable part of Chinese territory. Obviously, the called "India-Tibet boundary". Tibet is an autonomous region of fusing the public by putting Tibet on a par with state in its note under reference.

Of late, the Indian Government has addressed a succession of notes vilifying and slandering China; the Indian Prime Minister, Minister for External Affairs and the Defence Minister have also made repeated anti-Chinese outcries in the Parliament, and a spokesman of the Indian Government even made the sensational assertion that China could "launch an attack" on India. Depending constantly on opposing China for a living, the Indian Government whips up an anti-Chinese hysteria each time its Parliament is in session. This has very often been the case. But it is completely futile for the Indian Government to try to extricate itself from its predicament both at home and abroad by vilifying China.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to
the Embassy of China in India, 30 September, 1966**

No. C/14/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to state that the Government of Bhutan have requested the Government of India to draw the attention of the Chinese Government to a series of intrusions in the Doklan pasture area which lies south of the traditional boundary between Bhutan and the Tibet region of China in the southern Chumbi area.

It is reported that on the 13th of April 1966, a patrol of the Royal Bhutanese Army observed that a Chinese patrol of 13 men had intruded about three miles south-west of Sinchel La. On the 28th July 1966, another Bhutanese patrol found a party of 5 Tibetans with approximately 300 yaks encamped about two miles south of Sinchel La. The Tibetan graziers were informed by the Bhutanese patrol that they were in Bhutanese territory and asked to withdraw.

Again on the 8th of September 1966, a Bhutanese patrol found Tibetan graziers in the area in question. It was further discovered that two heaps of loose stones had recently been set up in the area with a view presumably to establishing a claim south of the traditional frontier.

Again on the 13th of September 1966, a Bhutanese patrol found not only that the graziers from the Tibet region of China were continuing to use these pastures but a part of Chinese troops had also intruded into the same area and had dug fresh trenches.

In view of the persistence of these intrusions by Chinese troops and nationals and the increasing strength of the intruders, the Government of Bhutan could no longer dismiss the incidents as accidental transgression of the frontier.

The traditional frontier in this segment runs from a point east of Batang La along the ridge which forms the northern water parting of the Torsa stream up to Sinchel La and thence to height 4421 metres.

The Government of India, on behalf of the Royal Bhutan Government, protest against these intrusions and urge that the Chinese personnel and troops should be withdrawn from Bhutanese territory and should refrain from future violations of this well-defined and traditional Bhutanese frontier.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 October, 1966

No. C/16/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, and in continuation of their note dated the 11th August, 1966, has the honour to bring to the notice of the Chinese Government the following fresh instances of intrusions by Chinese troops:

(1) On September 2, 1966, at 1225 hours, two armed Chinese soldiers visited a point about 2 miles west of the so-called "line of actual control" in Spanggur Gap in Ladakh. The Chinese soldiers returned to their post at Spanggur after staying in Indian territory for about 15 minutes.

(2) On September 10, 1966, at 1200 hours, three Chinese soldiers intruded approximately 1 mile inside Sikkim, south-east of Kangra La. The intruding personnel came approximately 1000 yards north-east of the Indian observation post and retreated into Tibetan territory on being detected.

(3) On September 12, 1966, at 1300 hours, two Chinese soldiers intruded into Indian territory about 1 mile west of the "line of actual control", about 4 miles north-east of the Indian checkpost at Track Junction. They withdrew after a stay of about 5 hours.

(4) On September 13, 1966, at about 1100 hours, a Chinese military party consisting of 10 soldiers again intruded into Indian territory at the same spot about 4 miles north-east of the Indian checkpost at Track Junction and withdrew after a short while.

(5) On September 20, 1966, at 1245 hours, a party of 5 mounted Chinese soldiers intruded three miles beyond the "line of actual control" and visited several points north-east of the Indian checkpost at Track Junction, before returning to their base.

(6) On September 21, 1966, at 1700 hours, four Chinese soldiers intruded to a depth of 2 1/2 miles beyond the "line of actual control" opposite the Indian Track Junction checkpost and returned to their base.

(7) On September 23, 1966, at 1030 hours, four armed Chinese

soldiers intruded to a depth of about three miles beyond the so-called "line of actual control" north-east of the Track Junction checkpost and withdrew after some time. Later, on the same day, at about 1300 hours, six Chinese soldiers again intruded two miles beyond the "line of actual control" and visited a hill feature near the Indian checkpost before returning to their base.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest against these repeated intrusions by Chinese troops and urge the Chinese Government to order their troops to stop their aggressive activities.

The Government of India have also noted that the Chinese Government in its note of September 5, 1966, has sought to deny the facts of intrusions by Chinese troops mentioned in the Indian notes of July 21 and August 11, 1966, by using the stock argument that these are "nonsense" and "out-and-out lies". Such bland and unreasoned denials fail to carry conviction and can never alter facts.

In the above mentioned note the Chinese Government has once again put forward its expansionist claim to the North East Frontier Agency of India and has also argued that Longju falls on the Tibetan said of the "line of actual control". These claims are baseless and preposterous and have already been conclusively refuted by the Government of India. The Chinese Government has also sought to slander India by saying that India is "depending constantly on opposing China for a living" and that "it is completely futile for the Indian Government to try to extricate itself from its predicament both at home and abroad by vilifying China". The whole world knows that it is China and not India which is taking up aggressive postures and vilifying other countries for extricating itself from its all-too-obvious predicament both at home and abroad.

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of

China the assurances of its highest consideration.

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to
the Embassy of China in India, 4 November, 1966**

No. C/19/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

On October 24, 1966 at 1115 hours, approximately 150 men in blue uniforms intruded to a depth of 500 yards in Sikkim territory across Kongra La in four groups, along with four herds of sheep. They withdrew into Tibetan territory at 1310 hours.

On October 25, 1966 at 0930 hours about 50 persons in blue uniforms intruded to a depth of 200 yards across the international boundary in the Kongra La area, withdrawing into Tibet at 1410 hours.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest against these continuing acts of harassment and intrusion into Sikkim territory. It is a well-known fact and one recognised by the Chinese Government that the Sikkim-Tibet boundary has been formally delimited and is marked by clear natural features. These repeated Chinese intrusions cannot but be seen as wilful provocations intended to create tension on the border.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 December, 1966

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 781.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China, and replies as follows in refutation of the Notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government, dated October 15, November 4 and 26, 1966.

The so-called "intrusions" by Chinese personnel and aircraft referred to in the Indian Government's Notes under reference are all out-and-out fabrications. Neither along the Sino-Indian border nor along the China-Sikkim boundary did the Chinese side cross the line of actual control between the two sides or the boundary.

The Indian side failed to give any name for the places of "intrusion" in five of the seven charges contained in its note of October 15; it even failed to mention the nationality and identity of the "intruders" in the two charges contained in its note of November 4. This shows how clumsy the Indian Government's tricks are in making fabrications. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the unreasonable protest made by the Indian side on the basis of its own lies.

What is worth pointing out is that, always relying on opposing China to beg for foreign aid for making a living, the Indian Government is vainly attempting to extricate itself from its difficult position both at home and abroad by vilifying China, but this will only result in daily aggravating its own difficulties. Such has been the case in the past, and so will it be in the future.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 February, 1967

No. C/2/67.

This note of the Ministry of External Affairs to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India is in reply to the Chinese Government's note No. (66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 309, dated 4th May 1966.

The Government of India in its note of February 8, 1966 had proved conclusively that both under the Colombo Proposals and the Chinese Government's unilateral declaration of November 21, 1962 as well as other official statements, China was committed, amongst other things, (i) not to cross the so-called 'line of actual control', (ii) to maintain the 20 Km demilitarized zone in the Western Sector under the Colombo Proposals, and under the Chinese declaration, in all the three sectors of the border, and (iii) not to send its troops to the "disputed" areas of Thagla Ridge, Longju etc. It was also proved in that note that the Chinese Government had dishonoured all the three commitments undertaken by it solemnly and unequivocally in public statements as well as in communications addressed to the Government of India. The Chinese note under reply does not attempt to deny this fact. On the contrary what it seeks to do is to advance, feebly and unconvincingly, a justification for the dis-honouring of these commitments and for the intrusions across 'the line of actual control' and the induction of Chinese troops into the "disputed" areas of Thagla Ridge and Longju on the fantastic pretext that these were "the necessary precautionary and self-defence measures" against alleged Indian violations and provocations on the border. These allegations were all pure fabrications and the Government of India had refuted and rejected them in no uncertain terms. It is obvious that the Chinese Government had to fabricate such false allegations against India

in order to make the theory of 'self-defence' appear plausible. The whole knows that "striking back in self-defence" is a grim Chinese euphemism for aggression.

The Chinese Government has maintained in its note under reply that in its statement of November 21, 1962 China had reserved "the right to strike back in self-defence" and that Premier Chou En-lai in his letter of March 3, 1963 to the late Prime Minister Nehru had darkly hinted about the "history" of the events of 1962 being "repeated". The Government of India have not been unaware of, these threatening clauses attached to the so-called "unconditional" and "unilateral" "initiative measures" announced by the Chinese Government after its attack on India. Indeed, the late Prime Minister Nehru in his letter of December 1, 1962 to Premier Chou En-lai had pointed out the "contradictory" nature of these Chinese statements. The threatening clauses in these statements now being invoked by the Chinese Government demonstrate that there was a dark and hypocritical side to China's unilateral declaration of cease- fire and withdrawal and that the Chinese Government had always maintained its intention to resort to force, whenever circumstances suited it, in the pursuit of its expansionist territorial claims against India. Far from providing proof of "China's sincerity in seeking a peaceful settlement of the boundary question" these showed up China's unwillingness to tread the path of peace and conciliation and its tragic and mistaken faith in the methods of force and aggression. China's negative attitude to the constructive and impartial proposals made by the Colombo Conference of Afro-Asian nations was striking evidence of this unwillingness of the Chinese Government to seek a peaceful settlement of the border question.

In regard to the Colombo Proposals the Chinese note asserts that as they are "mere proposals, the question of violation or non-violation simply does not arise". This pooh-poohing of the proposals made by the Colombo

Conference of Afro-Asian countries as 'mere proposals' has not, however, deterred the Chinese Government from accusing India for making "no positive response whatsoever" to the Colombo Proposals and for "casting the Colombo Proposals to the winds". It would appear that the Chinese side is not aware of the contradiction in dismissing the recommendations of the Colombo Conference as "mere proposals" and at the same time trying to make out that India has discarded these proposals. The facts of the matter are well-known. The six Afro-Asian countries which met at Colombo had formulated these proposals for acceptance and implementation by India and China. Indeed the text of the proposals had stated very clearly that "The Conference believes that these proposals, which could help in consolidating the cease-fire, once implemented, should pave the way for discussions between representatives of both parties for the purpose of solving the problems entailed in the cease-fire position". The discussions envisaged by the Colombo Conference could not take place because the Chinese Government refused to accept these proposals as a basis for talks. "This is the plain fact of the matter and all the deceit and duplicity of Chinese diplomacy has not succeeded in convincing anybody to the contrary.

The note of the Chinese Government contains an unabashed reassertion of China's expansionist territorial claims against India. The Government of India has pointed out on several occasions that the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector is really the line of Chinese aggression, and that it is in vain to pretend that this line reached during the massive Chinese attack of 1962 is "the traditional customary boundary" between India and China. 'The line of actual control' claimed by China in the Western Sector is neither traditional nor customary nor a boundary, but merely the line reached by Chinese forces in their massive attack in 1962. It is futile for the Chinese Government to pretend that this is the boundary and that the 14,500 sq. miles of Indian territory in Ladakh illegally occupied by Chinese troops belongs to China. In regard to

the Eastern Sector the Chinese Government has once again raked up its expansionist dream of claiming the vast areas of India's North East Frontier Agency. The Chinese note has hinted that India cannot perpetuate "the occupation" of its own sovereign territory. It has also claimed areas like the Thagla Ridge, Longju and the junction of Namjang Chu and the Sumdorong Chu as lying north of the McMahon Line. These claims and pretensions of the Chinese have been conclusively refuted and rejected by the Government of India in the past. The reassertion of these vast claims now together with the argument of "striking back in self-defence" is clear indication of China's aggressive and malevolent designs against India.

The tirade contained in the Chinese note against the relations between India and Sikkim is evidence of China's mischievous attempt to spoil these special and cordial relations. It is a fact that China is using military pressure through its troop concentration in the Chumbi Valley and intrusions across the border for the same nefarious purpose. Nobody is taken in by the Chinese Government's professions of friendship and equality in its relations with neighbouring countries. The brutal suppression of the autonomy of Tibet and the betrayal of even those Tibetan leaders who collaborated with China is an outstanding example of Chinese policy. As for India having "inherited the mantle of aggression from British imperialism", it is really the present rulers of China who have donned the imperial mantle of the Manchus and have conjured up dreams of hegemony in Asia.

Indulging in plain slander the Chinese note has said that India has "hired itself out" to the "imperialists" and "the revisionists" and is following "anti-China" policies in order to "meet the needs of its domestic and foreign policies". This kind of slander together with blatant interference in India's internal affairs has now become the monotonous stock-in-trade of Chinese propaganda. Such propaganda is, obviously, intended to divert

the attention of the Chinese people and of the world from the ruthless and naked struggle for power and the disorder and violence raging in China today making life intolerable for millions of the good and decent citizens of China.

Note given by Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 March 1967

No. C/5/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India address this note to the Embassy of People's Republic of China in New Delhi in refutation of the Chinese Government's note, dated 24th December, 1966.

2. It is an indisputable fact that, as stated in the Indian notes of 15th October, 4th November and 26th November, 1966, during the months of September, October and November last year Chinese troops repeatedly intruded across the boundary into India and Sikkim and also crossed the so-called "line of actual control" in Ladakh. Neither sophistry about the "nationality" of the intruders nor slander about "begging foreign aid" can camouflage the aggressive nature of the border violations by Chinese troops.

3. In this context Government of India wish to bring to the notice of the Chinese Government a further act of intrusion by Chinese troops which occurred on the 28th November last year. On that date between 0800 and 1800 hours, ten armed Chinese soldiers intruded to a depth of about one mile south of the international border at Longju in the Eastern Sector. It was yet another instance of China's defiance of the Colombo proposals and the Chinese Government's own statements and assurances regarding Longju. The Government of India lodge a strong protest against this

violation.

II. TERRITORIAL AIR SPACE

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 November, 1966

No. C/22/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows:

On 5th November, 1966, a Chinese jet aircraft intruded into Indian airspace in the Ladakh area. It flew from the east towards Darbuk (3407 N /7806 E) penetrating 26 nautical miles beyond the so-called 'line of actual control'. It then turned south-east and flew to Tangtse (3401 N /7811 E) which is 23 nautical miles beyond the so-called "line of actual control". Thereafter, the aircraft returned to the east and disappeared.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest against this latest violation of Indian airspace by Chinese aircraft.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

III. ALLEGED ILL-TREATMENT OF CHINESE REPRESENTATIVES AND NATIONALS IN INDIA

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 12 January, 1966

(66) Pu Ling Yi Fa Tzu No. 12.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

Since October 1962, the Indian Government has arrested large numbers of innocent Chinese nationals and thrown them into a concentration camp and jails in various places; at the same time, it has subjected the other Chinese nationals to persecution of various kinds. The Chinese Government has repeatedly demanded that the Indian Government release these victimized Chinese nationals and stop all persecution of Chinese nationals, but the Indian Government has always made quibbles in an attempt to shirk responsibility.

In August 1963, the Indian Government unreasonably rejected the proper demand of the Chinese Government for continuing to send its ship to bring back the victimized Chinese nationals. After the Chinese Government's stern refutation and its repeated demand that the Indian Government release all the detained Chinese nationals. The Indian Government, finding itself devoid of any valid argument, pretended in its notes of September 4, 1963 and January 8, 1964 that it was taking necessary steps for the Welfare and rehabilitation "of the detained victimized Chinese nationals and that they were being released and rehabilitated". However, the facts in the last two years and more have demonstrated that these statements of the Indian Government are utterly false.

At present, several hundred innocent Chinese nationals are still

being detained in the concentration camp and the jails in various places of India. They have long been deprived of their personal freedom, they are being subjected to all sorts of inhuman maltreatment and persecution in the concentration camp and the jails; and even their property has been placed under custody as "enemy property". Moreover, in the last few years the Indian Government has constantly ordered peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals to leave India within a set time-limit and subjected them to all sorts of discrimination and persecution. All this fully reveals that the Indian Government is deliberately continuing its policies of opposing China and discriminating against Chinese nationals, and worsening Sino-Indian relations in order to meet the needs of its internal and external policies. For more than three years the Indian Government has been unscrupulously detaining and maltreating large numbers of peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals. These crimes which grossly trample upon the principles of international law are rare in the history of international relations. In this connection, the Chinese Government lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government and reiterates the demands that the Indian Government: (1) Immediately release all the victimized Chinese nationals detained in the concentration camp and the jails in the various places, return their property and compensate them for their losses, (2) immediately stop all discrimination against and persecution of Chinese nationals in India and effectively guarantee their personal freedom and the safety of their life and property.

The Chinese Government demands a speedy and definite reply from the Indian Government

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 July, 1966

No. C/9/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

In their note of 12th January 1966, the Chinese Government have leveled a number of allegations about the "ill-treatment" of and "discrimination" against persons of Chinese origin residing in India. They have even gone to the extent of talking of "persecution", "mal-treatment" and "throwing them in a concentration camp". The fact that the Government of India have on numerous occasions demonstrated these charges to be patently false, has not prevented the Chinese Government from falling back again on these banal accusations to give themselves yet another opportunity to indulge in their anti-Indian propaganda.

If the Chinese Government were prepared to face facts honestly, they would be compelled to admit that the vast majority of persons of Chinese origin living in India today are contented and law-abiding individuals, pursuing their usual avocations peacefully and happily. The very fact that they continue to reside and prosper in India exposes the emptiness of the charges of persecution levelled by the Chinese Government. As for the detention of a small number of persons of Chinese origin, who had engaged in anti-Indian activities, the Chinese Government cannot expect a sovereign State to leave such persons indulge in actions which threaten the security of the State.

It is equally ridiculous for the Chinese Government to link up such allegations with the claim that the Government of India is "deliberately

continuing its policies of opposing China..... in order to meet the needs of its internal and external policies". This is a description which fits with absolute precision the Chinese Government's own attitude towards India. In view of all these facts, the Chinese Government's charges are rejected as baseless, mischievous and propagandistic.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 21 September, 1966

(66) Pu Ling Yi Fa Tzu No. 388.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the notes of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, dated December 27, 1965 and July 5, 1966, has the honour to state the following:

In its notes of October 20, 1965 and January 12, 1966, the Chinese Government cited numerous facts denouncing the Indian Government for its brutal persecution of Chinese nationals and unwarranted banning of *The China Review*, and demanded that the Indian Government immediately release the persecuted Chinese nationals who had long been held in detention and cancel its order banning *The China Review*. With a guilty conscience and devoid of any valid argument, the Indian Government resorted to prevarications by calling black white in its notes. On the one hand, it claimed unabashedly that Chinese nationals were getting "liberal and fair treatment" and "prospering" in India; on the other hand, unable to cover up the facts of its persecution and detention of

large numbers of Chinese nationals, it again slanderously charged these Chinese with "anti-Indian" and "undesirable" activities. But such lies can in no way help the Indian Government. The fact is that hundreds of innocent Chinese nationals have been held in concentration camp or jails for several years now. Others who are not held in detention have been subjected to unreasonable restrictions and discrimination in matters of domicile, movement, livelihood and employment. Moreover, many peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals have been unreasonably ordered to leave India. Failing to produce any tenable argument or evidence in the face of these iron-clad facts, the Indian Government could only quibble and prevaricate by resorting to such hollow and worn-out allegations as "anti-Indian" and "undesirable" activities, which had long been completely refuted by the Chinese Government. This only reveals how hypocritical and unreasonable the Indian Government is when faced with the truth and facts. Like the bat dreading the sun, the Indian Government fears the exposure of the facts about its criminal persecution of Chinese nationals, and on February 19, 1966 it went so far as to arbitrarily prevent the Chinese Embassy from exercising its right of protecting Chinese nationals and refuse to let the Embassy send its personnel to Calcutta to visit the persecuted Chinese nationals in prison. However, these clumsy acts serve only to further reveal before the people of the world the sinister features of the Indian Government in grossly trampling upon the principles guiding international relations and in opposing China.

The Indian Government also regarded as a thorn in its side *The China Review*, a newspaper published by Chinese nationals, which always advocated the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples, and it went to the length of imposing an unwarranted ban on the paper. In the meantime, the Indian Government has connived at and supported the anti-Chinese activities by *The Chinese Journal of India* run by the Chiang Kai-shek gang elements and shielded and colluded with these elements in

using the said paper to stir up opposition to the Government of the People's Republic of China. Has this not fully revealed the pernicious design of the Indian Government in tailing after U.S. imperialism to create "two Chinas" and interfere in the internal affairs of China? It is utterly futile for the Indian Government to resort in its note to the sophistry that these are "matters which are within India's internal jurisdiction".

The Chinese Government firmly rejects the notes of the Indian Government and reiterates the demands raised by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in its notes of October 20, 1965 and January 12, 1966.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 3 October, 1966

No. C/15/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state the following with reference to the conversation Mr. Jen Yi-pei, Counsellor of the Embassy, had with the officers of the Ministry on September 29 and October 1, 1966.

In his conversation with Shri K. K. S. Rana, Under Secretary of the Ministry on September 29, Mr. Jen Yi-pei informed the Ministry that Mr. Sun Wei-kuo, a functionary of the Embassy had not returned to the Embassy since he went out on a morning walk at 6.30 A.M. on that day.

On receipt of this information, the Ministry of External Affairs

caused immediate investigations to be made through the appropriate authorities to trace the whereabouts of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo. These investigations are being energetically pursued by the Government of India and this fact was conveyed to Mr. Jen Yi-pei on October 1, 1966 by Shri A. K. Damodaran, Deputy Secretary in this Ministry. Shri Damodaran also requested Mr. Jen Yi-pei that the Chinese Embassy give all possible cooperation to the investigating authorities of the Government of India who would be approaching them for fullest details concerning Mr. Sun Wei-kuo and the circumstances of his disappearance as known to the Chinese Embassy. It is understood that the Foreigners Regional Registration Officer, New Delhi, had already contacted the Chinese Embassy on September 30 and wished to meet an official of the Embassy for making enquiries in this connection. The Ministry of External Affairs hope that the Chinese Embassy will extend the necessary cooperation to the investigating authorities who are taking all possible measures to trace the whereabouts of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 8 October, 1966

No. M/381/66.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, and with reference to the Ministry's note dated October 3, 1966, has the honour to state the following in regard to the kidnapping of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo, a staff member of the Chinese Embassy:

Mr. Sun Wei-kuo, a staff member of the Chinese Embassy, was kidnapped at about 6-30 A.M. on September 29, 1966 outside the residence compound of the personnel of the Embassy at Chanakyapuri, New Delhi, while taking a walk. The Embassy gave the relevant information to the Ministry on the same day, pointed out that India being a sovereign state, the Government of India had the responsibility for protecting the safety of the personnel of foreign missions, and demanded that the Indian Government should take immediate measures to send back Mr. Sun Wei-kuo to the Embassy. On October 1, when receiving Counsellor Jen Yi-pei of the Embassy, Mr. A. K. Damodaran, Deputy Secretary of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, requested the Embassy to cooperate in the so-called investigation. Counsellor Jen Yi-pei clearly explained the position to the Embassy. The Embassy would like to re-state as follows:

1. Mr. Sun Wei-kuo is a staff member of the Embassy, not an ordinary foreign national. The kidnapping of him on the territory of India, particularly in the Capital of India, is a very serious political incident. It is known to all that the premises and personnel of the Chinese Embassy have been under very strict surveillance of the Indian police and intelligence agents day and night. For the incident of the kidnapping of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo, the Indian Government has unshirkable responsibility.

2. The Embassy has already given the Indian Ministry of External Affairs an account of the kidnapping of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo and other relevant information. Nine days have elapsed since Mr. Sun Wei-kuo was kidnapped. The Indian Government has not sent him back to the Embassy up to now, but on the contrary, repeatedly demands the cooperation in the so-called investigation from the Embassy, which is obviously an excuse.

3. It is absolutely impermissible that the Indian Government tries to play

for time and evade its responsibility under the name of the so-called investigation. The Embassy once again demands that the Indian Government should ensure the safety of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo and quickly send him back to the Embassy.

The Embassy avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 14 October, 1966

The Chinese Embassy has learnt that on August 29, 1966, Madame Tsao Hsiu Chin and her husband Mr. Fong Chi Leong, who are in charge of the Chinese Primary School, Calcutta, were unjustifiably ordered to leave India within a short period. This is another act of persecution of the peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals by the Indian Government in disregard of the repeated representations and protests by the Chinese Government and the Chinese Embassy. The Embassy hereby lodges a protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs against this and demands that the Indian Government immediately stop all forms of persecution of the Chinese nationals in India.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 October, 1966

No. C/17 /66.

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state the following in regard to the Embassy's note

No. 381/66, dated the 8th October, 1966:

The Ministry of External Affairs rejects categorically the various unproved allegations and statements in the note under reply about the disappearance of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo. The Ministry would like to remind the Embassy that ever since the 29th of September when the Embassy informed the Ministry that Mr. Sun Wei-kuo, a functionary of the Embassy, had not returned to the Embassy since he allegedly went out on a walk at 6-30 A.M. on that day, the Ministry has been repeatedly requesting the Embassy to furnish all available information about Mr. Sun Wei-kuo and also to cooperate fully with the investigating authorities so that the mystery of his disappearance could be solved. This request was made by Shri Damodaran, Deputy Secretary, in the Ministry of External Affairs to Mr. Jen Yi-pei, Counsellor of the Embassy on October 1, 1966. The request was again repeated in the Ministry's note No. C/15/66 of October 3. The Ministry regrets that in the Embassy note under reply, the Embassy has still not promised this cooperation. The Embassy merely repeats that it "has already given the Indian Ministry of External Affairs an account of the 'kidnapping' of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo and other relevant information". We would like to remind the Embassy that no relevant information has been given either directly to the Ministry of External Affairs or to the investigating authorities concerned, except that on September 29 at 6-30 A.M. Mr. Sun went out for a walk and did not return to the Embassy thereafter.

In fact, when the Foreigners' Regional Registration Officer, Delhi contacted the Embassy on September 30, they refused to meet him. On October 4, the Superintendent of Police, South District along with D.S.P., Tughlak Road and the Foreigners' Registration Officer went to the Chinese Embassy at Jind House and met the Counsellor Mr. Jen Yi-pei and the First Secretary Mr. Chen Lui-chih when they asked for some details about Mr. Sun Wei-kuo and the circumstances of his disappearance. Mr. Jen Yi-

pei merely said that all the information had been conveyed to the Ministry of External Affairs and that the matter was a serious political case and that the Government of India should immediately return the "kidnapped official". Again on October 7, the Inspector of the Chanakyapuri Police Station visited the Chinese Embassy at Chanakyapuri and met the First Secretary Mr. Chen Lu-chih and wanted to make certain enquiries regarding the physical description of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo, the circumstances leading to his disappearance, etc. The Embassy again refused to furnish information or answer questions put by the Inspector of Police.

On October 10 when Mr. Chen Chao-yuan, Charge d'Affaires of the Embassy called on Shri K. R. Narayanan, Director in this Ministry, the latter impressed upon him the necessity of furnishing the investigating authorities with all possible information available to the Embassy about Mr. Sun Wei-kuo, his physical appearance, distinguishing marks, the dress he was wearing, whether he had any money or other belongings on him when he went out of the Embassy, whether on the morning of the 29th he went out for a walk alone or with another colleague, when he was last seen and by whom in the Embassy and whether he had any friends in Delhi whom he used to visit, etc. It was explained to the Charge d'Affaires that these and other items of information required by the police are essential and would give clues to our authorities for conducting effective investigation. The Charge d'Affaires, was, however, not prepared to give any information whatsoever, and said that by these "so-called investigations" the Government of India were evading their responsibility and playing for time. It was pointed out to the Charge d'Affaires that the Indian Police were making every possible effort to trace Mr. Sun Wei-kuo but that the Chinese Embassy had also the responsibility of providing relevant information and co-operating with the Indian authorities in this matter. The Ministry of External Affairs would like to point out to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China that investigations into the disappearance of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo by the concerned authorities have

been greatly hampered by the total non-cooperation of the Embassy. It has not been possible to ascertain basic facts such as whether he was living in Jind House or at Chanakyapuri, whether he had any cash on him; what clothes he was wearing and what is missing, if anything, from his belongings, etc. The disappearance itself was reported to the Ministry of External Affairs by the Chinese Embassy over eight hours after the alleged incident.

The Chinese note has made the allegation that Mr. Sun Wei-kuo has been "kidnapped" and that it was "a serious political incident". There is absolutely no evidence to support this allegation and the investigations conducted so far do not also suggest that this is a case of kidnapping. Although a large number of persons are up and about in the streets in the Chanakyapuri area at about 6-30 A.M. at this time of the year, no witness has been found, even after the most thorough enquiries, who has seen Mr. Sun Wei-kuo go out for a walk in the morning of the 29th, not to speak of having seen him being kidnapped as alleged by the Chinese Embassy.

The Government of India consider it their duty and privilege to give protection to all foreign missions stationed in Delhi and their personnel. But the Government of India certainly do not consider it necessary for this purpose to keep the movements of foreign diplomats and members of foreign missions under continuous surveillance. The Ministry of External Affairs rejects the insinuation made in the note under reply that the "premises and personnel of the Chinese Embassy have been under very strict surveillance of the Indian police and intelligence agents day and night". Mr. Sun Wei-kuo like any other member of the Chinese Embassy or of any other Embassy in New Delhi was free to move about in the city or, for that matter, elsewhere in India.

As was stated in the Indian note of October 3, 1966, the moment the

disappearance of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo was brought to the attention of the Government of India, investigations were immediately instituted. These investigations unfortunately have been handicapped by the total refusal of the Chinese Embassy to cooperate in the matter. The Government are, nevertheless, taking all possible steps to trace the whereabouts of Mr. Sun Wei-kuo.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 December 1966

No. C/23/66.

Reference: Chinese Embassy's Memorandum, dated October 14, 1966

It has been repeated several times to the Chinese Embassy that it is within the Sovereign competence of India to order foreign nationals found indulging in anti-Indian activities to leave the country. The persons referred to in the Chinese Embassy Memorandum were found guilty of indulging in anti-national activities. Hence, in accordance with the laws prevailing in India they were served with a notice to leave the country. However, out of humanitarian considerations they have been given sufficient time to enable them to complete necessary arrangements for their departure from India.

The allegations made in the Memorandum are baseless and the Embassy's protest is, therefore, rejected.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 February, 1967

No. C/3/67.

This note of the Ministry of External Affairs to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi is in reply to the Chinese Government's note No. (66) Pu Ling Yi Fa Tzu No. 388 dated the September 21, 1966.

2. Though this Chinese note is claimed to be in answer to the Indian notes of December 27, 1965 and July 5, 1966 it is in fact a re-hash of imaginary grievances and allegations regarding the persons of Chinese origin in India, allegations which have been thoroughly refuted on several previous occasions. The great majority of the persons of Chinese origin continue to live in India as law-abiding individuals, happily pursuing their usual peaceful avocations. If the Chinese Government are interested in understanding the factual position, they are invited to refer once again to the Indian notes mentioned above. By holding brief for a small handful of unlawful elements in the Chinese community in India, the Chinese Government is interfering in the internal affairs of India and exposing its ill-will for the people and Government of India. It is futile for the Chinese Government to persist in repeating its false and baseless charges for the purpose of propaganda against India.

IV. TREATMENT OF INDIAN REPRESENTATIVES AND NATIONALS IN CHINA

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 11 April, 1966

(66) Pu Ling Erh Fa Tzu No. 205.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply to the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India, dated November 2, 1965 as follows:

The handling of the case of the Indian national M. L. Das, who has committed rape in China, by the Chinese Government in accordance with Chinese law is entirely a judicial measure which a sovereign state is bound to take, and also in full conformity with international practice. Nevertheless, the Indian Government has repeatedly sent notes to haggle unreasonably and made a great fuss over this criminal case which is wholly within the sphere of Chinese sovereign rights. This can only reveal the ulterior purposes of the Indian Government, and the Chinese Government expresses its deep regret at it. If the Indian Government continues to send notes to haggle unreasonably over the case, the Chinese Government will pay no attention to them.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, 8 July, 1966.

No. C/10/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to their note dated the 11th April, 1966, has the honour to state as follows:

It is a matter of concern to the Government of India that while seeking refuge in meaningless generalities, Chinese authorities are continuing to persecute and detain in a jail in Shanghai, an Indian national named M. L. Das. As is evident from the note under reply, far from ending this unreasonable victimization of an Indian national, the Chinese Government have tried to justify it in terms of so-called "conformity with international practice" and "China's sovereign rights". In fact, however, the Chinese Government have been unable to refute the cogent evidence which the Government of India had listed in proof of the fact that M. L. Das's imprisonment and maltreatment in jail, violates all well recognized principles of law and the ordinary canons of humanity. In their note of 11th April, 1966, the Chinese Government have claimed that they will "pay no attention" to any subsequent Indian protests on this subject. Such attempts to shirk responsibility are to be deplored. The Government of India reiterate their demand that the Chinese Government put an immediate end to the persecution of M. L. Das, review his case on the basis of universally accepted canons of justice and law, and provide facilities to the Indian Embassy in Peking, to extend full consular protection to M. L. Das. Pending this, the Government of India continue to hold the Chinese authorities responsible for the safety and welfare of M. L. Das.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

V. MISCELLANEOUS

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 30 May, 1964

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy of China and, with reference to the Embassy's note of April 3, 1964, has the honour to state the following:

1. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs expresses its appreciation of the invitation delivered by the Embassy on behalf of the Organising Committee for the XXII International Geological Congress for the Government of the People's Republic of China to be represented at the Congress by official delegates. The Chinese Government has always actively favoured and participated in cultural and scientific interflow and friendly contacts between peoples of different countries, including the peoples of China and India. Proceeding from this spirit, the Chinese Government is ready to give favourable consideration to the above-mentioned invitation.

2. However, the Chinese Government has learned of the following:

(1) According to the Second Circular issued by the Organising Committee for the XXII International Geological Congress, at the same time of the Congress there will also take place a series of other professional international conferences and activities in the field of geological sciences, including activities of the International Union of Geological Sciences. It is learned that the XXII International Geological Congress is sponsored by the International Union of Geological Sciences of which the Chiang Kai-shek clique in Taiwan remains up to now a member.

(2) Chinese geological organisations in 1962 and 1963 twice inquired of Mr. B. C. Roy, Secretary General of the Organising Committee for the XXII International Geological Congress and Director of the Geological Survey of India whether the Chiang Kai-shek clique had been

invited to the Congress. In his reply to the Secretary-General of the Geological Society of China dated August 31, 1963, Mr. B. C. Roy formally stated: "the Organising Committee is not in a position to refrain from inviting the geological institutions in Formosa".

As the Indian Government is aware, there is only one China in the world, namely the People's Republic of China. Taiwan is a province of China; the Chiang Kai-shek clique now entrenched in Taiwan is merely a group of political puppets fostered by U.S. Imperialism. Only the delegates of the People's Republic of China are entitled to represent China in any international conference or international organisation or become their members; at no international conference should the question of inviting the Chiang clique in Taiwan arise at all. It is therefore obvious that both the retention of the Chiang clique to this day as a member of the International Union of Geological sciences and Mr. B. C. Roy's assertion that "the organizing Committee is not in a position to refrain from inviting the geological institutions in Formosa" are wrong and they are firmly opposed by the Chinese Government and people.

3. In view of the above, the Chinese Government requests a clarification of the following three points by the Indian Government:

- 1) Whether the Organising Committee for the XXII International Geological Congress has changed its stand of being "not in a position to refrain from inviting the geological institutions in Formosa" as stated by Mr. B. C. Roy in his reply to the Chinese organisation concerned;
- 2) Whether the International Union of Geological Sciences has deprived the Chiang clique in Taiwan of membership; and
- 3) Whether an invitation has been extended to the Chiang clique in Taiwan to attend any of the other international conferences and activities

in the field of the geological sciences due to take place in New Delhi concurrently with the XXII International Geological Congress.

The Chinese Government expects a clear-cut answer from the Indian Government.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 28 July, 1964

The Indian Embassy in China has the honour to say with reference to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China's note dated May 30 that the answer to the three queries in paragraph 3 of the note in question are as follows:-

- (1) No.
- (2) No.
- (3) Yes.

The Indian Embassy in Peking avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note: — Subsequent exchanges on this subject have been included in White Paper No. XI, pages 72-74 and 78-81.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 6 November, 1965

No. M/779/65.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and has the honour to state as follows:-

On October 10, 1965, Chiang Kai-shek clique elements K. C. Yap, Chang Chi-hua and others openly held a meeting in Calcutta to celebrate the so-called "national day of the Republic of China". At the place of the meeting they hung reactionary placards, viciously attacking the Chinese leaders and propagandizing the overthrow of the People's Republic of China. A municipal councillor of Calcutta even participated in the meeting, shouting that time is ripe for Chiang Kai-shek to launch counter-attack against the mainland, and saying that K. C. Yap serves as a vehicle for the so-called "re-establishment of diplomatic relations between free China and India".

It must be pointed out that the Chinese Government has more than once solemnly demanded that the Indian Government prevent the Chiang clique elements from frantically carrying out activities of slandering China and creating "two Chinas" in India. However, the Indian Government has not only failed to take any effective measures but gone from bad to worse by conniving at the collusion of the municipal councillor with the Chiang clique elements in wantonly celebrating the bogus national day, viciously attacking China, openly instigating the subversion of the Chinese Government, and clamouring for "the re-establishment of diplomatic relations" between India and the Chiang clique. This fact further exposes how unscrupulously the Indian Government has connived at and backed the anti-China activities by the Chiang clique elements, so as to intensify its efforts to deteriorate the relations between China and India and serve the U.S. imperialists' plot of creating "two China". The Chinese Government expresses its great indignation at and lodges a strong protest against this serious act of the Indian Government, which violates the

principles of international law and is perfidious, and firmly demands that the Indian Government take measures to stop immediately its connivance at any anti-China activities of councillors, prevent the Chiang clique elements from carrying out any such activities and give an unequivocal clarification on the above-said incident.

The Embassy avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2nd January, 1966

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 036.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following:

(1) Recently the Indian Government and U.S. imperialism working hand in glove, utilized the U.S.-controlled United Nations to discuss the so-called "question of Tibet" and adopt a resolution vilifying the Chinese people and interfering in China's internal affairs. In his speech the Indian delegate heaped malicious abuse upon China, slandering her as "ruthlessly" carrying out "atrocities" in Tibet which "surpass anything the colonialists have done in the past", and so on and so forth. A little earlier, the Indian Government had again made use of the Chinese traitor Dalai to conduct a whole series of anti-Chinese activities in India. The President and Prime Minister of India and other high-ranking officials of the Indian Government blatantly received this Chinese traitor and held so-called talks with him. The leaders of the Indian Government also took the opportunity to vilify China. Indian Minister of Education M. C. Chagla went to the length of saying that the time had come for the Indian Government

to consider whether to recognize China's "suzerainty"—which should be read as sovereignty—over Tibet. Led by the Indian Information Service, the Indian official propaganda organ, the Indian press spread numerous lies and slanders about China over the question of Tibet. All this constitutes an open provocation against the Chinese people, a gross violation of the principles guiding international relations and a grave interference in China's internal affairs. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this.

(2) On the question of Tibet, the hypocrisy and expansionist designs of the Government of India have been exposed most clearly. The Indian Government sanctimoniously pledged to the Chinese Government that India recognized Tibet as part of China, that it had no political or territorial ambitions in Tibet, and that it would not permit elements of the traitorous Dalai clique to carry on anti-Chinese political activities in India. But the deeds of the Indian Government are just the opposite of its own words. As early as 1959, you were engaged in subversive activities in Tibet, instigating the reactionary serf-owners in Tibet to stage an armed rebellion. Later you supported and abetted elements of the traitorous Dalai clique in establishing a "Tibetan emigre government" in India and promulgating a so-called "Tibetan constitution". You repeatedly plotted to direct Dalai to go to some South East Asian countries for anti-Chinese political activities under the cloak of religion. Now you have, in conspiracy with U.S. imperialism, got the United Nations to discuss the so-called "question of Tibet", and violently slandered China. Your high-ranking government official has even blatantly stated the intention of considering refusal to recognize Tibet as part of China. By these actions you have completely torn off your veil of hypocrisy and fully revealed your true features as expansionists.

But your expansionist designs will never succeed. Earth-shaking changes have taken place in the Tibet region of China. The Tibetan people have

won liberation and stood up as masters of their own destiny. They enjoy full democratic rights and freedom and are leading a happy life with ample food and clothing. The miserable days are gone for ever when they were oppressed and exploited and were suffering from hunger and cold. The formal inauguration of the Tibet Autonomous Region last September marked the birth of a new Tibet. Life is buoyant and thriving throughout Tibet today. No one will be able to stop the Tibetan people from advancing together with the other nationalities of China along the bright road of socialism.

(3) It is not accidental that the Indian Government has recently redoubled its anti-Chinese clamour over the question of Tibet. This is a step in correspondence and coordination with your constant intrusions and provocations on the Sino-Indian border and the China- Sikkim border, and is likewise designed to curry favour with and seek reward from the U.S. imperialists and their collaborators. But the more energetically you do so, the more you will reveal yourselves as spokesmen of the overthrown Tibetan feudal serf-owners and enable the peoples of China, India and the whole world to see your despicable aim of using the "question of Tibet" to vilify China, with the result that you will suffer still greater defeats.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 April, 1966

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 246.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the

honour to state the following:

Taking advantage of the opportunity of attending the U.N. Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East Conference in New Delhi, a so-called delegation headed by the bogus Minister of Economic Affairs K. T. Li and the bogus Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs C. Shen of the Chiang Kai-shek clique is now openly carrying out anti-Chinese activities in India. Indian political personalities have brazenly expressed welcome to these elements of the Chiang Kai-shek clique and repeatedly held receptions in their honour, providing them with opportunities for activities against the People's Republic of China. Both sides have loudly advocated "understanding" and "cooperation" between India and the Chiang clique in joint opposition to China. Kamaraj, Chairman of the ruling Indian National Congress, received C. Shen, and the latter invited him to visit Taiwan. The Indian press and news agencies have spared no effort in extolling these Chiang clique elements, published the statements they made against their motherland and openly called C. Shen "Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China". All these anti-Chinese activities have been conducted with the connivance and support of the Indian Government. This is another grave step taken by the Indian Government, which violates principles guiding international relations, crudely interferes in China's internal affairs and is calculated to undermine the relations between the two countries. It is also an open provocation to the Chinese people. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against it.

Actively following U.S. imperialism in carrying out the "two Chinas" plot, the Indian Government has long been in collusion with the Chiang Kai-shek clique entrenched in Taiwan. The Chinese Government has lodged repeated protests with the Indian Government against this. However, far from ceasing to collaborate with the Chiang Kai-shek clique, the Indian Government has become even more active and blatant in doing so. Late January this year, Mr. R. Velayudhan, former M.P. of India, went

to Taiwan upon instructions for "talks" with chieftains of the Chiang clique and the advocacy of "normalisation of diplomatic relations" between India and the Chiang clique. He publicly admitted that his "visit" to Taiwan had the support of the Indian Prime Minister. In the meantime, the Indian Government allowed the Chiang Kai-shek clique's delegation headed by the so-called government representative Huang Chao-chin to take advantage of the opportunity of attending the conference of the Pacific Area Tourist Association in New Delhi to make anti-Chinese propaganda, such as the clamour for the "recovery of the Chinese mainland". The Indian President went so far as to ask them to convey his "regards" to 'Chiang Kai-shek, the common enemy of the Chinese people. And now the Indian Government has again allowed the bogus Minister of Economic Affairs and bogus Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Chiang Kai-shek clique to carry on wanton anti-Chinese activities in India. This shows that the Indian Government has become unscrupulous in ganging up with the Chiang Kai-shek clique against China.

The Indian Government is persisting in its complicity with the Chiang Kai-shek clique in Taiwan while well aware that the latter is a political corpse. Its object in so doing is obviously to further demonstrate to U.S. imperialism its stubborn hostility to China so as to get more hand-outs from the United States. However, the Chinese Government must warn the Indian Government: Your collusion with the Chiang Kai-shek clique in conducting activities against the People's Republic of China will only worsen the Sino-Indian relations which have already deteriorated. The Indian Government must bear full responsibility for this.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to

the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, 13 May, 1966.

No. C/7 /66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, and with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office notes dated November 6 1965 and April 2, 1966, has the honour to state as follows:-

The Government of India in its notes of January 23, 1964 and December 8, 1964, in reply to similar protests lodged by the Chinese Embassy on January 6, 1964, and November 14, 1964, had made it clear that people in India enjoy the fullest freedom to assemble and hold meetings as long as they do not infringe the laws of the land. The Government of India had nothing to do with the meeting reported to have been held at Calcutta on October 10, 1965 by some Chinese nationals and in which a Municipal Councillor of Calcutta is alleged to have participated. The Embassy ought to be aware that a Municipal Councillor in India is a non-official. It is absurd to suggest as has been done in the Chinese note of November 6, 1965 that the Government of India 'connived at' the so-called "collusion of the Municipal Councillor with Chiang clique elements". The Government of India reject this mischievous allegation and would like to say that it is impermissible and futile to try to interfere in the internal affairs of India by lodging uncalled for protests, couched in unbecoming language, against meetings held in India by private citizens in conformity with the laws of the land.

As regards the Chinese note of April 2, 1966, the Government of India reject it as completely unwarranted. It is the height of absurdity for the Chinese Government to speak of "collusion" between India and Taiwan, of "interference in China's internal affairs", and of "anti-China

activities" being conducted in India "with the connivance and support of the Indian Government". The fact is that it is the Chinese Government and its organs of propaganda which have been carrying out a campaign of vilification and hatred against India and colluding with the Government of Pakistan, a military ally of the United States and a member of SEATO and CENTO, for the purpose of subverting the territorial integrity, the political unity and the national security of India. While such anti-Indian campaigns are being conducted by the Chinese Government at the highest level of its leadership, it is extraordinary that it should "protest" against visits of private Indian citizens to Taiwan and of Formosan delegations to India to attend conferences held under the auspices of the United Nations or its Specialised Agencies and of non-official international organisations of which Taiwan is a member. We have pointed out to the Chinese Government on several occasions in the past, that the Government of India hold no responsibility for the visits of private citizens to Taiwan. To protest against such visits is an interference in the internal affairs of India whose citizens unlike those of China are guaranteed freedom of travel, under the Constitution. As regards U.N. sponsored and other international conferences this is not the first time that delegates from Formosa have attended such conferences not only in India but in other countries which recognise the People's Republic of China and have diplomatic relations with it. To describe the extension of facilities to delegates from Taiwan to attend international conferences as "collusion with the Chiang Kai-shek clique" is fantastic and unreasonable.

The Government of India, in its note of February 12, 1965, had pointed out that there are many countries in Asia and Africa and elsewhere which, unlike India, have diplomatic relations with Taiwan and do not recognise the People's Republic of China. It was stated in the above -mentioned note that..."the Chinese Government carries on commercial and cultural contacts and has friendly relations with a number of countries who continue to recognise Taiwan. Indeed, some countries

whose diplomatic Missions the Chinese Government have received in Peking still maintain Consular Offices in Taiwan.

And yet it is the Indian Government which has frequently been singled out by the Chinese Government for virulent attacks for alleged 'flirtations' with the Taiwan Government and for 'plotting to create two Chinas'. It is obvious that by making these charges and protests, the Chinese Government is merely adding grist to its propaganda mill, and also betraying its animus against the people and the Government of India". It may be further stated that China itself is trading vigorously with many countries, including South Africa and West Germany whose Governments it has not recognised, and with Japan with whom it has no diplomatic relations.

By continuing these meaningless protests and propaganda the Chinese Government are only exposing to the gaze of the world their unprincipled opportunism in politics as well as their profound hostility to India.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 May, 1966

No. C/8/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi, and with reference to the Chinese Government's note dated the 2nd January 1966,

has the honour to state that the Government of India categorically reject the several malicious and unfounded allegations made in that note.

2. The resolution on the conditions in Tibet, which was discussed by the United Nations General Assembly and passed on December 10, 1965, by a vote of 41 against 26 regarding the "continued violation of fundamental rights and freedoms of the people of Tibet", and which the Indian delegation supported, is in complete conformity with the United Nations Charter to which India has subscribed. The Government of China should know that one of the many purposes of the United Nations Charter is the preservation of the dignity of the individual and the protection of human rights. The United Nations resolution specifically deplored "the continued violation of the fundamental rights and freedoms of the people of Tibet", and reaffirmed "that respect for the principles of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is essential for the evolution of peaceful world order based on the rule of law".

3. This U.N. resolution, to which the Government of China have taken objection, is the inevitable result of their own policy. Instead of taking conciliatory measures towards the people of Tibet, the Chinese Government have gradually and systematically destroyed Tibetan autonomy. His Holiness the Dalai Lama, who was once called a prisoner of "the Tibetan rebel clique", is now the "Chinese traitor Dalai". The Panchen Lama, who was persuaded by the Chinese to act for the Dalai Lama in his absence as the Acting Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the Tibetan Autonomous Region, has also refused to cooperate any longer with the Chinese authorities, and has been hounded out from public life. These unfortunate developments, which were reluctantly admitted by the Chinese Government when it became too difficult to hide them, provide unmistakable evidence of the fact that human rights are being trampled in Tibet today. If it were true, as the Chinese Government's note claims in terms of such sanctimonious hypocrisy, that the Tibetan people "enjoy full

democratic rights and freedoms and are leading a happy life with ample food and clothing", why is it that the Chinese Government have not had the courage to allow foreigners to visit Tibet and report upon the "heavenly" conditions pertaining there? If, what the Chinese Government claim, is true, why is it that the Chinese Government do not have the courage even now to publish in full either in Tibet or in China the full text of this U.N. resolution which aroused their wrath to such a degree, and which according to them misrepresents the situation in Tibet today?

4. The Chinese Government fully know the answers to these questions. It is not India which has interfered in the internal affairs of China, but China which has interfered in the internal affairs of India. It is the Chinese leaders who hypocritically and unscrupulously have gone back upon the Bandung Declaration to which they had subscribed and embarked on a policy of interference in the affairs of the Indian sub-continent by publicly calling for the "self-determination" of the people of Kashmir—a call, which is gross interference in India's internal affairs since Jammu & Kashmir is an inseparable and integral part of India. Similarly, the Chinese Government's massive anti-Indian propaganda and their attempt to capitalize on India's temporary economic difficulties are yet another example of unwarranted interference in the affairs of a neighbouring state.

5. The Government of India, therefore, reject categorically the allegation that by supporting this U.N. resolution they have interfered in China's internal affairs. The other unsubstantiated charges in the note under reply do not merit refutation. Government of India's policy on this question is well-known and it is futile for the Chinese Government to indulge in hair-splitting. We would like to remind the Chinese Government, however, that we shall continue to give all facilities to the Tibetan refugees who have been forced to leave their homeland and to do our best to alleviate their sufferings and hardships. The Dalai Lama has

been living in India for some years now and has been carrying on his religious and other humanitarian activities. We will continue to give him and his simple and peace-loving people these facilities.

6. The Government of India have had occasion recently to express to the Chinese Government their considered views on the unfortunate and tragic developments in Tibet over the last few years. In paragraph 4 of their note dated the 1st October, 1965, the Government of India had reminded the Chinese Government that they ought to be aware that "rebellions do not take place under enticement or coercion. Where there is oppression, there is rebellion. It is futile to blame India for the troubles in Tibet and for large number of Tibetans being forced to leave their hearths and homes for refuge in other countries". The Government of India have nothing to add to this.

7. The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, 28 July, 1966.

No. C/12/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and have the honour to state as following:-

The Government of India have received reports that since July 3, 1966, Chinese troops entrenched across the Sikkim-Tibet border at Nathu La have been making propaganda broadcasts through loudspeakers to the

Indian defence forces on the Sikkim side of the border. During the last one week these broadcasts have become virulent, provocative and abusive. They malign the Government and the people of India and even called upon the officers and men of the Indian army to oppose the Government of India. The subversive purpose of this new kind of propaganda was started by the Chinese troops is proved by the following extracts from some of these broadcasts:— "Now the people of India are ready for revolution. Officers and men of the Indian army, you should also support the revolution and establish a true People's Republic"..... "Your Government is reactionary and supports colonialism". "You should not support the reactionary policies of your Government" etc. The meaning of this propaganda is obvious. This is a crude attempt at subversion and a gross interference in the internal affairs of India.

The Government of the People's Republic of China loudly claims that its relations with Asian-African countries are governed by the Bandung Principles and the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence, and that it never interferes in the internal affairs of other countries. The actions of the Chinese Government, however, speak to the contrary and demonstrate that these high principles and virtuous postures are intended to delude the world and are a cover for its imperialists and interventionist designs. More and more countries of Asia and Africa have seen through this Chinese game of deception and understood the true meaning of the slogan that Asia and Africa are "ripe for revolution". The vain call across Nathu La to Indian defence forces 'to support the revolution' and 'to establish a People's Republic' in India is further proof of the policy of the present leaders of china to subvert the established Governments of neighbouring countries and to expand the sway of China beyond its boundaries in the name of spreading 'revolution'. It also proves that the root cause of the conflict between India and China is not the border question but the refusal of the Chinese Government to accept the idea of co-existence with India and its attempt to impose its will and political

conceptions on the Government and the people of India. It is time that the Chinese Government realized that neither the people of India nor the peoples of Asia and Africa will tolerate such attempts at interference and domination from outside. These tactics of the Chinese Government are doomed to failure.

In some of the Chinese broadcasts across Nathu La there are ominous references to the Chinese attack on India in the autumn of 1962. There are also threatening statements that "if there will be any incidents on this border area the responsibility will be that of the Indian Government", and that "the Indian army is challenging us and will be punished for this". Are the Chinese authorities issuing these threats and warnings for stepping up tension on the border and as a prelude to a repetition of its 1962 aggression against India?

The Government of India lodge the most emphatic protest with the Chinese Government against the latest and blatant interference in the internal affairs of India through the loudspeaker campaign across Nathu La by their authorities in Tibet and demand that this provocative and interventionist propaganda cease forthwith.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 28 July, 1966

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 480.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China

presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated May 13, 1966:-

In its note, the Indian Government tries hard to quibble over its scheming activities of tailing after U.S. imperialism in creating "two Chinas". But the note constitutes in itself another big exposure of these scheming activities which Indian Government has been carrying out. Note repeatedly calls the elements of Chiang Kai-shek clique entrenched in Chinese province of Taiwan "Formosan delegations" and "delegates from Taiwan" and brazenly describes Taiwan as a so-called "Member" of International organisations. Obviously this constitutes an interference in China's sovereignty and internal affairs, a flagrant attempt to create "one China and one Taiwan" and an attempt to legalise state in which elements of the Chiang Kai-shek gang continue their illegal occupation of China's seat in the United Nations and other international organisations. According to news report, during, her visit to the United States last March, the Indian Prime Minister Mrs. Gandhi openly spread the fallacy that Taiwan's position "will have to be worked out" and the fallacy of "one China and one Taiwan". In spreading these fallacies, Indian side is serving U.S. imperialist scheme to create "two Chinas" or "one China and one Taiwan" so as to carve out Taiwan from China and legalize the perpetual and forcible occupation of Taiwan by United States. The Chinese Government lodges a strong protest with Indian Government against this and reiterates: Taiwan is an inalienable part of China's sacred territory and China's sovereignty over Taiwan absolutely brooks no outside interference. The Chinese Government firmly opposes the scheme of "two Chinas" in any form conducted by anyone at any time and in any circumstances.

2. It is entirely impossible for the Indian note to deny the host of facts about the Indian Government's collusion with the Chiang Kai-shek

gang and its crude interference in China's internal affairs as cited in the Chinese Government notes of November 6, 1965 and April 2, 1966. But the Indian note prevaricated that they were "extension of facilities to delegates from Taiwan to attend international conferences", "visits of private Indian citizens to Taiwan", etc. This is utterly untenable.

The Facts are: Indian Government has tried hard to press forward with the "two Chinas" scheme by making use of international conferences and has connived at the open anti-Chinese activities of elements of Chiang Kai-shek gang in India; Indian side and the Chiang gang elements blatantly advocated "understanding" and "cooperation" between them in joint opposition to China; the Indian President, the Chairman of National Congress, the Minister of Railways and other high ranking leaders received the Chiang gang elements and even asked the latter to convey their regards to Chiang Kai-shek, the common enemy of Chinese people; the Indian Minister of External Affairs, the Minister of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation, the Vice Minister of Commerce and other high ranking officials respectively attended reception given by the Chiang gang elements and the ceremony held by them for presenting paddy to Indian side; Indian press and news agencies openly called a Chiang gang element "Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs of Republic of China". The fact that Indian Government has so audaciously lauded the Chiang gang elements as the representatives of a country and openly ganged up with them in joint opposition to China fully shows how frantic the Indian Government has been in accelerating its promotion of "Two Chinas" scheme.

As for the allegation of "visits of private citizens", it is still less worthy of refutation. With the support of Indian Prime Minister, former Indian M.P. R. Velayudhan went to Taiwan for "talks" with the chieftains of Chiang gang and advocated "normalization of diplomatic relations" between two sides. In the middle of last, June, Raghunath Singh, General

Secretary of the Congress Parliamentary Party, the ruling party of India, went to Taiwan at the invitation of C. Shen, the bogus Vice Foreign Minister of Chiang gang, to openly engineer joint opposition to China. All these are facts about the Indian Government's open collaboration with the Chiang gang, which cannot be denied by the Indian Government with allegation of "visits of private citizens".

It is most absurd for the Indian side again to use pretext of "freedom to assemble" to defend its connivance and collusion with the Chiang gang elements in conducting such activities as blatant celebration of the Chiang gangs "National Day". The Chiang gang elements have been engaged in activities against the People's Republic of China, which are criminal acts inciting subversion of the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government absolutely cannot tolerate fact that while maintaining diplomatic relations with China, the Indian Government should have connived at Chiang gang elements open anti-Chinese activities in India.

The above series of anti-Chinese activities conducted by the Indian side constitute a grave encroachment upon China's sovereignty and a gross interference in China's internal affairs. In its note, however, the Indian side makes false countercharge that China "interferes in internal affairs of India" by lodging protest with the Indian side. This is really presumptuous and unreasonable to the extreme. Is it your "internal affairs" to oppose China? How is it that whereas you are allowed to oppose China rabidly, the Chinese Government has not even right to lodge protest?

3. In order to explain away its crime for carrying out the "two Chinas" scheme, the Indian Government in its note has gone so far as to manufacture pretexts, asserting that "some countries whose diplomatic missions the Chinese Government have received in Peking still maintain Consular offices in Taiwan", etc. Such sophistry can in no way help the

Indian Government. As is well known, there is indeed an imperialist country which in words recognizes only the People's Republic of China but in practice is willingly serving as the accomplice of the United States in the scheme of creating "two Chinas" and "one China and one Taiwan". For this very reason, China's diplomatic relations with that country have been prevented from being normalized for the past decade and more. Does the Indian Government find such a state of affairs enviable? Is it ready to imitate the past colonial ruler of India on this matter too?

It is entirely proper for China to develop popular trade and cultural exchanges with some countries with which she has not established diplomatic relations. This can in no way be mentioned in the same breath with the question of "two Chinas". Indian Government has gone so far as to make wilful charges on this matter and, singing the same tune with modern revisionist, has concocted the rumour that China is trading with South Africa, in a vain attempt to sow discord in the relations between China and friendly Afro-Asian countries . It will never succeed in this despicable aim.

4. It must also be pointed out that, while working ever harder to promote the scheme of creating "two Chinas" in last few years, the Indian Government has subjected law abiding Chinese nationals in India to all kinds of discrimination and persecution, and hundreds of innocent Chinese nationals have long been detained in concentration camp and jails. The "China Review", a paper run by overseas Chinese which was devoted to the promotion of Sino-Indian friendship, was ordered to stop publication, whereas the "Chinese journal of India" run by Chiang gang elements has been permitted to engage in open anti-Chinese propaganda. The facts over past few years show that despite the repeated protests lodged by the Chinese Government, the Indian Government, far from restraining itself, has gone from bad to worse and become daily more undisguised in its activities of pushing forward the scheme of "two Chinas" and colluding

with the Chiang Kai-shek gang in opposing China. These acts and deeds of the Indian Government have contradicted its repeated pledge that it recognizes only the People's Republic of China and its promise that it would "prevent any pro-Kuomintang meeting and demonstration" and would "no permit any activities designed to promote the idea of two Chinas. This fully exposes the hypocrisy and perfidy of the Indian Government.

5. The Chinese Government must warn the Indian Government in all seriousness: by so unscrupulously serving U.S. imperialism in creating "two Chinas" and willingly acting as the flunkey of imperialism and modern revisionism in opposing China, you will only further expose your ugly features. No anti-Chinese "hero" in the world will ever come to a good end and you are certainly no exception either.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 15 September, 1966

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 609.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honor to reply as follows in refutation of the note of the Indian Ministry for External Affairs dated July 28, 1966:

1. It is entirely within China's sovereign rights for the Chinese frontier guards stationing at Nathu La on the China-Sikkim boundary to make

broadcasts on Chinese territory advocating the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples and setting forth the truth about the Sino-Indian boundary question, and no foreigner has any right to interfere in this. In its note the Indian Government describes the broadcasts of the Chinese side as an "attempt at subversion" and an "interference in the internal affairs of India". This is a slander against China. The note alleges that the Chinese broadcasts call upon the officers and men of the Indian army to "oppose the Government of India" and to "support the revolution and establish a true People's Republic", and so on and so forth. These are sheer lies and fabrications. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the unwarranted charge and protest of the Indian Government.

2. The allegations in the Indian note about subversion and expansionism by China against neighbouring countries are rubbish picked from the anti-China rumour storage of U.S. imperialism and are not worth refuting at all. China has always strictly abided by the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and devoted itself to the cause of Afro-Asian solidarity against imperialism, and has therefore been widely acclaimed by Afro-Asian countries and peoples. In contrast externally the Indian Government has hired itself out to U.S. imperialism, pursued a policy of toadying to the United States, allying with the Soviet Union and opposing China, bullied its neighbours and practised expansionism; domestically, it has carried out a policy against communism and the people and practised ruthless national oppression. The iniquitous conduct of the Indian Government runs diametrically counter to the interests of the Indian people, so much so that resenting voices are raised from all quarters and life becomes intolerable for the people at home, and on the international arena the Indian Government has meagre support because of its unjust cause and finds itself in unprecedented isolation. That the Indian people want to make revolution is their own affairs; it is the inevitable result of the reactionary domestic and foreign policies pursued by the Indian Government. How can others be held responsible for it? China is a

socialist state which never interferes in the internal affairs of other countries. No amount of fabrication and slander by the Indian Government can sully in the least the brilliant image of socialist China.

3. The Indian Government has all along been hostile to the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples and has obstructed and sabotaged their friendly contacts and cultural exchange in every possible way. Fearing that the Indian people may come to know about China and the truth of the Sino-Indian boundary question, the Indian Government has regarded as a thorn in its side the Chinese broadcasts which are conducive to the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples, and it has hastily come out for crude interference. While unwarrantedly lodging a so-called protest with the Chinese Government, you have installed broadcasting machine on Sikkim territory along the China-Sikkim boundary to jam China's broadcasts and hurl venomous calumnies and abuses at the Chinese Government. The voice of truth, however, cannot be blocked. Your despicable performances can only expose yourselves and serve to prove once again that you are the disrupter of the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples and the creator of tension on the border.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, September 28, 1966

No. 237.

The Embassy of India in China presents its compliments to the

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China and further to the discussion held on September 19, 1966, between Mr. Tien Tin, Deputy Section Chief of the Consular Department of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Mr. M. S. Rao, First Secretary in the Embassy of India in China, Peking, has the honour to state as follows:-

On September 16, when Mr. Shankar Rao, First Secretary of this Embassy, visited the Sikh Gurdwara in Tientsin, he saw clear evidence of the desecration of the Gurdwara by some unknown Chinese nationals. Almost all the glass-panes of the Gurdwara were smashed, pictures of Hindu Gods were torn to pieces, the photograph of Guru Nanak, the venerated teacher of Sikhs was missing and the copy of the Granth Sahib which is the holy religious book of the Sikh community was torn to shreds and its pages scattered all over the room. The wooden platform where the Granth Sahib was kept was also damaged and the mattress on this platform was torn. Several cup-boards in the Gurdwara were broken and the room was in much disorder. In his meeting with the Deputy Section Chief of the Consular Department on September 19, Mr. Shankar Rao produced a torn page of the Granth Sahib and a portion of the torn picture of Hanuman, a revered Hindu God, as concrete evidence of the damage caused to the Gurdwara.

According to the persons who have been enjoying the privilege of staying the Gurdwara premises, some unknown Chinese nationals, some of them wearing Red Arm Bands had entered the building and caused the damage referred to above. The desecration of the Sikh temple is thus an established fact. Hence, Mr. Rao requested the Deputy Section Chief of the Consular Department to inform the authorities in Tientsin to extend full protection to this Gurdwara, to guarantee against the perpetration of such acts of vandalism in future, fully investigate the matter of the desecration of the Tientsin Gurdwara, bring to book the culprits who are responsible for damaging the Gurdwara property, and to compensate fully for the damage done to the Gurdwara.

It is a matter of regret, however, that instead of acting on the basis of the incontrovertible facts presented to him, the Deputy Section Chief of the Consular Department summarily rejected the justified protest lodged by the Indian Embassy on September 19. Furthermore, the Deputy Section Chief of the Consular Department denied that any damage to the Sikh Temple had been caused while admitting that there was interference in the Gurdwara premises. He stated that the Red Guards had merely requested the Care-taker of the Sikh Temple to remove the sign-board and the photograph from inside the Temple. In the light of the concrete evidence of physical violation of the premises, the Embassy considers this explanation as totally unsatisfactory. What is even more inexplicable, is that instead of giving a guarantee that such events would not occur again and instead of taking appropriate action to investigate into the matter, the Deputy Section Chief of the Consular Department even went to the extent of justifying the vandalism perpetrated against the Gurdwara by describing it as "just and proper" action, to be considered "revolutionary" in the context of the Cultural Revolution and that there was "nothing to complain of" and that the verbal "protest" is unjust.

The Government of the People's Republic of China have often stated in the past that the policy of the Chinese Government is to guarantee the right and freedom of religious Worship and protect the sanctity of the religious institutions. From the desecration of the Sikh Gurdwara, however, it is clear that the Chinese authorities seemed to have failed to give protection to the premises of a non- Chinese religious institution and its possessions. From the explanations of the Deputy Section Chief of the Consular Department, it would appear that the Chinese Government even attempt to shirk their responsibility to make full enquiries into the matter and to find out who are the persons responsible for this act of vandalism when the matter was brought to their notice.

In view of the facts mentioned above, the Embassy of India in China would like to once again register a strong protest against the desecration of the Sikh temple at Tientsin. The Embassy deplors the fact that none of the legitimate requests put forward by Mr. Rao. First Secretary of this Embassy, in his meeting on September 19, have been given proper consideration.

The Embassy of India in China now demands that the Chinese Government should guarantee full protection to the religious possessions of the Sikh Gurdwara at Tientsin as well as all other Gurdwaras and religious institutions in China, fully investigate the matter of the desecration of the Tientsin Gurdwara, bring to book the culprits who are responsible for damaging the Gurdwara property and compensate for the damage done to the Gurdwara.

The Embassy of India in China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 August, 1966

No. C/18/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Government's note of the 28th July, 1966, has the honour to state as follows:

1. The Government of India have noted that while the Chinese note under reply is lengthy and contains many slanders and thinly- veiled

threats against India, it is, in fact, a repetition of out-worn arguments and the all-too-familiar tirade to the effect that India is "trailing after U.S. imperialists in creating 'two Chinas'". This note has strung together a miscellaneous collection of so-called evidence to try and substantiate this absurd allegation, notwithstanding the fact that this entire argument of the Chinese Government has been conclusively refuted on several occasions and most recently in "the Indian note of the 13th May, 1966. Such monotonous harping upon baseless allegations does not merit a detailed refutation. The precise circumstances relating to visits to Taiwan (Formosa) by private Indian citizens, as members of a free society, as well as visits to India by Taiwanese individuals and delegations, have been clearly explained to the Chinese Government on earlier occasions. In case they are interested in a rational explanation, the Chinese Government are invited to refer to the Indian note of the 13th May, 1966.

2. What needs to be exposed is not the faulty arguments and reasoning contained in this latest Chinese note but rather the motives of the Chinese Government in continuing to use every occasion, even manufactured ones, to indulge in propaganda and vilification against the Government and the people of India. The Indian Government is treated with almost hysterical statements and notes from Peking even when a private citizen of India pays a visit to Taiwan. In contrast to this, the Chinese Government themselves have no qualms, political or emotional, in dealing with countries and Governments which maintain full diplomatic relations with Taiwan. There are several capitals where the Chinese trade offices happily co-exist with diplomatic missions from Taiwan. There are countries having diplomatic relations with Taiwan whose officials are entertained on official missions by the Government of China. Some of the countries with which China has the largest number of commercial, cultural and economic contacts have full diplomatic relations with Taiwan. There have been several other countries with which China has diplomatic relations and which have received Taiwan delegations as members of UN Conference or other international conferences like the World Buddhist

Conference, for example. There have also been several other countries, not all of them "imperialist", having full diplomatic relations with Peking whose non-official citizens have visited Taiwan.

3. The Government of the People's Republic of China have, however, been able to bear all these examples of "collusion with the two-China plot", with great fortitude. Not a single syllable of public protest has emanated from Peking. But when some private individual from India visits Taiwan the matter is blown up into a big issue by the Chinese Government. Are the Chinese Government so much obsessed with their hatred for India that they fail to see the double standard of their own behaviour?

4. There is no need for the Chinese Government to indulge any such mock heroics against India. It convinces no one and merely exposes their own malevolent hostility, like the proverbial Chinese stone which only crushes the toes of the ill-intentioned.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 November, 1966

No. C/20/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and with reference to the Government of India's notes dated April 19, 1965 and January 4, 1966 regarding the two machines lying with K.T. Steel

Industries Ltd., has the honour to request the Embassy for an early reply. It is now more than eighteen months since the matter is pending with the Embassy and the Ministry would like to have an early settlement of the problem.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 25 November, 1966

No. C/21/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to its note No. (66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 609 of 15th September, 1966, has the honour to state as follows:-

The Chinese note has claimed that it is the 'sovereign right' of the Chinese troops stationed on the Tibetan side of Nathu La to make broadcasts to the Indian defence forces on the Sikkim side of the border and that these broadcasts advocate nothing but "friendship between the Indian and Chinese peoples". One can only say that the Chinese Government has a strange conception of friendship. It is a fact, and there is no use denying things which were broadcast through loudspeakers, that the Chinese troops have been calling upon the Indian defence forces to "oppose the Government of India" and to "support the revolution and establish a true People's Republic" in India. The broadcasts across Nathu La have gone unabated since they started on July 3, 1966, and, naturally, the Government of India had to take counter-measures against this foul

breath of Chinese propaganda being exhaled across Nathu La. To argue that it is the "sovereign right" of the Chinese troops to indulge in such vile and instigatory propaganda amounts to claiming that subversion and interference in the internal affairs of other countries is part of the sovereign rights of China and shows the aggressive and interfering motive of the present regime in China in its true colours. The call for 'revolution' incessantly emanating from Peking proves this to the hilt. As pointed out in the Indian note of 28th July, 1966, more and more countries of Asia and Africa have seen through the Chinese game and understood the true meaning of the slogan that Asia and Africa are "ripe for revolution". It is time that the powers that be in China realized that their attempts to impose the Chinese pattern of thought and the Chinese methods of revolution on Afro-Asian countries is contrary to the concepts of peaceful co-existence, the equality and independence of nations, the solidarity of Asian-African countries and good neighbourliness among nations. It is also time they realized that such crude interference is bound to be rejected by the sovereign nations of Asia and Africa and must fail.

Owing to poverty of arguments the Chinese Government has, in its note, descended to the depths of abuse. It says that "India has hired itself out to U.S. imperialism", "allied" with the Soviet Union, "bullied its neighbours and practised expansionism", "carried out ruthless national oppression", "the Indian people want to make revolution", "the iniquitous conduct of the Indian Government runs diametrically counter to the interests of the Indian people", etc. Anybody can see that all this is not only poisonous propaganda but intervention in India's internal affairs and is all of a piece with the loudspeaker campaign across Nathu La. Does the Chinese Government believe that this kind of abuse serves any good and is proper in diplomatic correspondence? The Indian people can look after themselves and it is not for the Chinese Government to pose as the judge and the custodian of their interests. Neither the people of India nor the people of any other country, will ever accept the Chinese claim to speak

for their interests and to dictate to them the path they should take. Besides, there is no use pretending that everything is lovely in the Chinese garden. Everybody knows what is going on inside China. If there are anywhere national oppression, compulsion and violence against the ordinary citizens and even against its leaders, and desperate efforts by authority to suppress the truth and those who do not agree hundred per cent with the powers that be, these exist in the China of today. The so-called "brilliant image of Socialist China" is for its neighbours a murky image today. The policies of the Chinese Government have resulted in China's isolation from the Afro-Asian as well as the Socialist countries.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, December 6, 1966

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

1. Between November 23—25, 1966, Mr. M. Shankar Rao, First Secretary (Consular), accompanied by Mr. V. C. Khanna, Second Secretary of the Indian Embassy, visited Shanghai. During the course of their visit they took the opportunity to see the Parsi Prayer Hall, situated at 539, Fu Chou Lu in Shanghai. They found that the main entrance of the temple was closed and the building was occupied by some unauthorised occupants who had forcibly entered the premises. When the members of the Indian Embassy attempted to enter the building, they were refused

entry by the occupants even though they made it known that they were acting on behalf of the Indian Embassy in Peking.

2. The Chinese Government is aware that the Parsi Prayer Hall situated at 539, Fu Chou Lu in Shanghai was constructed by the former Parsi community of Shanghai, and as such endowed with religious and sentimental sanctity. The Indian Embassy officials visited this temple in order to see for themselves in what state the temple premises were and to contact the Chinese citizen who was responsible for the care-taking of this temple on behalf of the Parsi Trust. In allowing the building to be occupied by unauthorised persons, there has been a desecration of the sanctity of this temple. Further, the occupants who are in illegal occupation of the building obstructed Indian Embassy officials from proceeding inside the Parsi temple. The Indian Embassy is constrained to bring this unlawful occupation of a religious premise to the notice of the Chinese Foreign Office for assistance in evicting the illegal occupants and its restoration to the care-taker or to this Embassy who are authorised to look after the premises on behalf of the Parsi Trust.

3. It must be pointed out with regret that Indian religious institutions have of late been subjected to desecration in China. Apart from the clear case of desecration mentioned above relating to the Parsi Prayer Hall in Shanghai, the Indian Embassy had already brought to the attention of the Foreign Office both orally and in an aide memoire dated 28th September, 1966, the violation of the sanctity of the Sikh Gurdwara located at Tientsin. The Chinese Government has yet to satisfy the Indian Embassy that action has been taken to prevent the further desecration of the Tientsin Gurdwara.

4. The Government of the People's Republic of China has stated in the past that the policy of the Chinese Government is to guarantee right of religious worship and the freedom of religious institutions in China. In

conformity with this statement it is hoped that the Chinese Government's assistance will be extended in clearing the building of the Parsi Prayer Hall of the illegal occupants. Further, the Indian Embassy officials should be allowed to visit the Parsi temple on their next visit to Shanghai, so that they could report on the state of the temple to the Parsi Trust.

The Embassy of India in China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 January, 1967

No. C/1/67.

The attention of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China is drawn to Section 11-A of the Press and Registration of Books Act, 1867, according to which two copies of all publications published in the Union Territory of Delhi are required to be delivered at the office of the State Press Officer, Delhi, now designated as Assistant Director (Press), Delhi Administration, Delhi. It has been reported to this Ministry that no copies of the paper "Cheen ke Samachar" are being delivered at the office of the Assistant Director (Press) and that only one copy instead of two is being received in respect of the paper entitled "News from China". The failure on the part of the Chinese Embassy in regard to delivery of copies as required above is a violation of local laws. It is, therefore, requested that copies of the two papers mentioned above may be regularly delivered to the Assistant Director (Press), Delhi Administration, Delhi, in future.

Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi,

to the Embassy of China in India, 15 February, 1967

No. C/4/67.

On November 6, 1966, the Indian dak runner carrying mail to Chumbithang in Tibet under the existing ad hoc arrangement for the exchange of mail between the two countries, was met by a Chinese postal official about 50 yards on the Tibetan side of Nathu La and asked to exchange mail at that point. The dak runner insisted on proceeding to Chumbithang as usual but was prevented from doing so by the Chinese official whereupon he exchanged the mail at the point suggested by the Chinese official. However, on subsequent occasions on November 10, 13, 17 and 20, 1966, when the dak runner was again stopped by Chinese postal officials at the same point, he insisted upon his right under existing practice to proceed to Chumbithang and when he was not allowed to do so, he returned without exchanging the mail. It is obvious that the responsibility for the inconvenience caused by the non-exchange of mail on these occasions rests with the Chinese authorities who prevented the dak runner from proceeding to Chumbithang as usual.

2. On receiving reports of the obstruction caused by Chinese postal officials the Government of India, because of its desire to continue the postal exchange between India and Tibet, issued instructions to its dak runner to exchange mail at the point suggested by the Chinese officials on a provisional basis. Accordingly, since November 24, 1966, the Indian dak runner has been exchanging mail at a point 50 yards beyond Nathu La in Tibetan territory. The Government of India had hoped that if the Chinese Government wished to change the place of exchange of mail by mutual consent the latter would have taken up the matter with the Indian authorities through diplomatic channels or directly with the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs of India. So far no such approach has been made by the Chinese side.

3. The Government of India would like to point out that the unilateral action of the Chinese authorities to prevent the dak runner from proceeding to Chumbithang is a violation of the existing practice and the ad hoc arrangement between the two countries to exchange mail at Chumpithang. On two occasions, viz. May 22 and August 15, 1963, spokesmen of the Chinese Ministry of Posts and Tele-Communications had claimed that the exchange of mail at Chumbithang was according to an agreement between China and India. The Hsinhua of August 16, 1963, reported as follows:

"He (the spokesman of the Chinese Ministry of Posts and Tele-Communications) said that the agreement on the exchange of mail between China's Tibet Region and India was reached in 1955 by the Representatives of the Chinese Foreign Ministry and the Indian Embassy in China through an exchange of letters. In 1960, an agreement was reached on the change of location for the exchange of mail by the Foreign Department of Tibet Region and the Indian Consulate General in Lhasa after conferring with each other. According to the agreement China and India exchange mail at Chumbithang twice a week."

The stand taken by the Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs of the Government of India has been that the postal exchange at Chumbithang was being carried out on an ad hoc basis and not as a result of any agreement concluded between the two governmental authorities. In a press note issued on June 25, 1963, the Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs of India had explained that even though the Government of India had proposed to the Postal Administration of the People's Republic of China that an agreement between the two Administrations be concluded, no such agreement could be finalised between the two Governments due to the lack of response from the Chinese Postal Administration and that consequently the exchange of correspondence

between the two Administrations had to be carried out as before on an ad hoc basis. It is regrettable that the Chinese authorities are now preventing the exchange of mail at Chumbithang on the basis of this ad hoc arrangement even though they had argued in 1963 that the exchange at Chumbithang was on the basis of an agreement between the two Governments. It is obvious that the existing ad hoc arrangement for the exchange of mail at Chumbithang can be altered only by mutual consent and not by unilateral action by the Chinese authorities as has been taken since November 6, 1966.

VI. APPENDICES

Appendix I

Hsinhua Statement dated October 27, 1966

"In its note to the Chinese Government dated September 30, the Indian Government concocted stories about "intrusions" into Bhutanese territory by Chinese herdsmen and patrols and claiming to be acting on behalf of Bhutan, lodged a so-called protest with the Chinese Government. Following that, with much fanfare Indian Government set its propaganda machine in motion raising a hue and cry about "Chinese intrusions into Bhutan" and the Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi came out in person to conduct the campaign against China. In this connection Hsinhua News Agency is authorized to make the following statement:

1. The Indian Government's hue and cry about Chinese "intrusions" into Bhutanese territory is an out and out lie, a slander with ulterior motives.

2. The Dongnan grassland (referred to as "Doklam pasture" by the Indian side) where the Indian Government alleged that Chinese "intrusions" had taken place is located in the vicinity of the tri- junction of

the boundaries of China, Bhutan and Sikkim and has always been under Chinese jurisdiction and Chinese herdsmen have grazed there for generations. According to practice, Bhutanese herdsmen who cross the border to graze on this grassland have to pay for the pasturage to the Chinese side. During the second half of 1965 Indian troops five times crossed the China-Sikkim boundary and intruded into the Dongnan grassland to carry out reconnaissance and harassment against which the Chinese Government protested to the Indian Government on August 27, 1965 and again on January 31, 1966. The Indian Government did not at that time deny the fact that this grassland belongs to China. Now the Indian Government has asserted that the Chinese side had "intruded" into China's own territory, this is really ludicrous and not worth refutation.

3. China has consistently respected Bhutan's sovereignty and territorial integrity. China and Bhutan have all along been on friendly terms with each other without either side committing aggression against the other, and the border between the two countries has always been tranquil. The Bhutanese Government itself has refuted on many occasions the lies concocted by the Indian side about Chinese "threats" to and "intrusions" into Bhutan. It is true that the China-Bhutan boundary has never been formally delimited and if the Bhutanese sides understanding is not quite the same as that of the Chinese side as regards the alignment of the boundary between the two countries at certain specific points, a fair and reasonable solution can very well be found through consultations on an equal footing between the two sides on the basis of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation. China has successfully settled boundary questions left over by history with such neighbouring countries as Burma, Nepal, Pakistan and Afghanistan through friendly consultations. Nevertheless it must be explicitly pointed out that the boundary question between China and Bhutan is a matter that concerns China and Bhutan alone and has nothing to do with the Indian Government which has no right whatsoever to intervene in it.

4. The King of Bhutan has long since solemnly declared that "Bhutan is an independent sovereign state and has the right to conduct her own foreign affairs". However blatantly claiming to be acting on Bhutan's behalf, the Indian Government lodged a so-called protest with China. This is a manifestation of downright big nation chauvinism. Inheriting the mantle of British imperialism the Indian Government has all along been pursuing an expansionist policy and bullying its neighbouring countries. It treats Sikkim as its "protectorate", encroaching upon Sikkim's independence and sovereignty. It tries hard to tighten its control over Bhutan and makes every effort to prevent the latter from attaining its due international status and even intends to send troops directly into Bhutanese territory and station them there. The "Indian Express" says undisguisedly in Editorial on October 6, 1966: "There is no formal defence treaty between India and Bhutan to back up the special relationship between the two countries. India cannot go to the assistance of Bhutan to deal with the border situation unless military assistance is specifically asked for by the Royal Bhutan Government. Whether such assistance will be invited is the big question". Following that, the Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi openly asserted at the Press Conference on October 7 that India was committed to protect Bhutan. It is thus quite clear that in slanderously charging China with "intrusions" into Bhutan, the Indian Government not only wants to create a new pretext for opposing China and sow discord between China and Bhutan but also is vainly attempting to realize its sinister design of tightening its control over Bhutan under the guise of "protection". But these despicable schemes will not succeed. The Indian Government absolutely can not cover up its ugly expansionist features by playing the trick of a thief crying "stop thief!"

Appendix II

**Press Statement or 3rd October, 1966, issued on behalf of the
Bhutan Government by its Trade Adviser in Calcutta**

"The Government of Bhutan have, for some time, been concerned with reports received from its patrols of a number of intrusions by Tibetan graziers and Chinese troops in the Doklam pastures which are adjacent to the southern part of the Chumbi Valley. This area is traditionally part of Bhutan and no assertion has been made by the Government of the People's Republic of China disputing the traditional frontier which runs along recognizable natural features. In the area of the intrusion, the boundary runs along the water-parting along Batang La to Sinchel La. Local attempts were made to inform the graziers and the Chinese troops that they had strayed into Bhutanese territory but these have not been heeded.

In view of the succession of violations of the frontier, Bhutan Government urged the Government of India to represent to the Chinese Government so that Chinese nationals and troops refrained from entry into Bhutan in future".
