



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

FEBRUARY 1967-APRIL 1968

WHITE PAPER No. XIV

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

PRINTED BY THE GENERAL MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
PRESS, NEW DELHI AND PUBLISHED BY THE MANAGER OF
PUBLICATIONS, DELHI, 1967 On 3rd April 1967, the Foreign Minister

presented to Parliament the Thirteenth 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 February 1966-February 1967. This White Paper contains a few notes not included in the previous White Paper and some important official statements made on behalf of the Indian and Chinese Governments since February 1967.

Ministry of External Affairs,

New Delhi.

April, 1968.

I- BORDER ISSUES AND INCIDENTS

1. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 16 January, 1967
2. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 11 April, 1967
3. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China, 7 September, 1967
4. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 10 September, 1967
5. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China, 7 September, 1967
6. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 11 September, 1967
7. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China, 12 September, 1967
8. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 3 October, 1967.
9. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 23 October, 1967.
10. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, 20 February, 1968

TERRITORIAL AIR SPACE

11. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 July, 1967
12. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 29 February, 1968

Matters relating to Indian Government Representatives, Indian nationals and their Institutions in China and Chinese Government Representatives, Chinese nationals and their Institutions in India

13. Memorandum of the Chinese Government, 25 December, 1965

14. Memorandum of the Chinese Government, 15 May, 1967
15. Note given by the Embassy of China in, India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 24 May, 1967
16. Note given by the Embassy of China in, India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 25 May, 1967
17. Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 5 June, 1967
18. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 12 June, 1967
19. Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 13 June, 1967
20. Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 14 June, 1967
21. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 15 June, 1967
22. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 16 June, 1967
23. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 17 June, 1967
24. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 18 June, 1967
25. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 June, 1967
26. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 June, 1967
27. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 June, 1967
28. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 June, 1967
29. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 June, 1967

30. Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 21 June, 1967
31. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 21 June, 1967
32. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 22 June, 1967
33. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 23 June, 1967
34. Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 29 July, 1967
35. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 15 August, 1967
36. Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs,
New Delhi, 26 August, 1967
37. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 September, 1967
38. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 10 September, 1967
39. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 September 1967
40. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 September, 1967
41. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 September, 1967
42. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 September, 1967
43. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 7 October, 1967
44. Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 7 October, 1967
45. Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry

- of External Affairs, New Delhi, 12 October, 1967
46. Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 12 October, 1967
 47. Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 14 October, 1967
 48. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 October, 1967
 49. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 October, 1967
 50. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 October, 1967
 51. Note given by Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 5 November, 1967
 52. Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 6 November, 1967
 53. Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 9 November, 1967
 54. Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 11 November, 1967
 55. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 November, 1967
 56. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 November, 1967
 57. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 21 November, 1967
 58. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24 November, 1967
 59. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 November, 1967
 60. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 December, 1967
 61. Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry

- of External Affairs, New Delhi, 11 January, 1968
62. Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 12 January, 1968
63. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 January, 1968
64. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 January, 1968
65. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 January, 1968
66. Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 February, 1968
67. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 7 March, 1968
68. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 March, 1968
69. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 April, 1968
70. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 9 April, 1968
71. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 April, 1968

IV. ANTI-INDIA PROPAGANDA BY CHINA

72. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 July, 1967

V. MISCELLANEOUS

73. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 March, 1967
74. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 June, 1967
75. Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 22 January, 1968

76. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 12 February, 1968
77. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 February, 1968
78. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 April, 1968

Appendix I

79. Statement by Foreign Minister in Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha, 13 June, 1967.

Appendix II

80. Chinese Foreign Ministry Spokesman Statement, 14 June, 1967

Appendix III

81. Statement by Foreign Minister in Lok Sabha, 15 June, 1967

Appendix IV

82. Statement by the Minister of External Affairs in Rajya Sabha on Friday the 16th June, 1967, regarding treatment of Indian Diplomats in China

Appendix V

83. Statement by the Minister of External Affairs in the Rajya Sabha on Saturday, the 17th June, 1967, regarding the demonstration held in front of the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi

Appendix VI

84. Statement by Defence Minister in Lok Sabha, 19 June, 1967

Appendix: VII

85. Statement by Sardar Swaran Singh, Defence Minister in the Rajya Sabha on Tuesday, the 20th June, 1967 at 2.30 P.M. on behalf of Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs on developments regarding Indian Embassy

Appendix VIII

86. Statement made by MMHA in the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha on 7-3-1968

I- BORDER ISSUES AND INCIDENTS

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 16 January, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 17.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and, with regard to Indian intrusions in 1966 along the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim boundary, states the following :-

1. In 1966, there were altogether 73 cases of Indian troops' intrusions into Chinese territory across the Line of actual control along the Sino-Indian border and across the China-Sikkim boundary (For details see Annex. I). Indian planes intruded into China's airspace in 71 sorties (For details see Annex. II). The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this.

2. In the past year, the Indian side made very frequent intrusions along the entire Sino-Indian border as well as the China-Sikkim boundary, and some were quite serious cases.

Along the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, the Indian side made as many as 24 ground intrusions into Sinkiang's Hot Springs area alone within the second half of last year; in some cases the intrusion lasted as long as five or six hours.

Along the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, apart from maintaining at Hsialinkung Terrace their military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the line of actual control between the two sides and carrying out frequent reconnaissance and harassment there, Indian troops

made as many as 12 intrusions into the area of Hsiao alone north of the line of actual control.

Along the China-Sikkim boundary, during the eight months between last May and December, Indian troops made as many as 13 intrusions into Chinese territory from across Natu La for reconnaissance and harassment and repaired the wire entanglements left by Indian troops when they withdrew and fled from the place in September, 1965. Indian troops also repeatedly carried out provocative activities at Natu La and even fired at the Chinese sentries there. At Tagi La, the intruding Indian troops made threats against a local Chinese herdsman; at Dongnan grassland they burnt down a cattle-shed of Chinese herdsmen.

3. The above facts show that the Indian side has continued to create tension and tried to provoke border incidents. In its note of April 30, 1966, the Indian Government tried hard to deny the facts about its flagrant intrusions and provocations during the second half of 1965; of late it even falsely accused China of making "intrusions" in a number of its notes in order to camouflage its own proven intrusions. But the facts are all there; in vainly trying to confuse the public by turning things upside down, the Indian Government is simply hoping to curry favour with imperialism and modern revisionism and find a way out of its difficult position both at home and abroad. But in the past year, far from improving its position, the Indian Government has made itself even more discredited abroad and has aroused even stronger opposition from the people at home. If the Indian Government still refuses to show repentance and if it insists on opposing China and continues to create tension by making provocative intrusions into China along the border, it will only sink deeper and deeper in the quagmire. As the great leader of the Chinese people Chairman Mao Tse-tung has pointed out, "Starting with the aim of injuring others only to end up by running oneself—such is the law of development which governs all reactionary policies." The

Indian Government's anti-Chinese policy will inevitably be governed by this law.

ANNEX 1

Intrusions into Chinese Territory by Indian Troops during 1966

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

1. At about 1230 hours on January 18, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet and conducted reconnaissance for about half an hour.

2. At about 1150 hours on February 16, four Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance and left Chinese territory at about 12:30 hours.

3. At about 1630 hours on February 16, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet and conducted reconnoitring activities for as long as two and a half hours and did not leave Chinese territory until about 1900 hours.

4. At about 1620 hours and 1650 hours on February 21, two batches of Indian soldiers, two in each, successively intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnoitring activities.

5. At about 1650 hours on March 8, one Indian soldier intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost ut Spanggur in Tibet for reconnoitring

activities.

6. At about 1220 hours on March 12, four Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnoitring activities.

7. At about 1150 hours on March 16, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Spanggur in Tibet and conducted reconnaissance there for more than one hour.

8. At about 1200 hours on April 23, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance and did not leave until about 1320 hours.

9. At about 1700 hours on June 4, one Indian soldier driving a jeep intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Spanggur in Tibet for reconnaissance.

10. At about 0930 hours on July 25, four Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities there for as long as six hours.

11. At about 1450 hours on July 30, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

12. At about 0945 hours on August 4, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities there for more than four hours.

13. At about 1230 hours on August 8, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and

conducted reconnaissance there for more than one hour.

14. At about 1015 hours on August 10, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance there for more than three hours.

15. At about 1040 hours on August 13, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities there for nearly four hours.

16. At about 1430 hours on August 17 two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpot at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance for more than one hour.

17. At about 0840 hours on August 21, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities there for about three and a half hours.

18. At about 0900 hours on August 23, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities there for nearly three hours.

19. At about 0730 hours on August 25, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance and did not leave Chinese territory until about 1300 hours the same day.

20. At about 1100 hours on August 29, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance for nearly five hours.

21. At about 1050 hours on September 2, three Indian soldiers

intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance and did not leave Chinese territory until about 1245 hours.

22. At about 1145 hours on September 4, one Indian soldier intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance there for more than two hours.

23. At about 1420 hours on September 15, one Indian soldier intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnoitring activities there for two hours.

24. At about 1210 hours on September 24, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance and did not leave Chinese territory until about 1340 hours.

25. At about 1630 hours on September 28, seven Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

26. At about 1330 hours on October 10, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

27. At about 0850 hours on October 13, 15 Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance there for more than six hours.

28. At about 1040 hours on October 17, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Kongka Pass in Tibet and conducted reconnoitring activities there for four hours.

29. At about 1250 hours on October 25, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

30. At about 1420 hours on October 28, three Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

31. At about 1230 hours on November 2, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

32. At about 1200 hours on November 3, seven Indian soldiers intruded into the Demchok area in Tibet and conducted reconnaissance there for two and a half hours.

33. At about 1100 hours on November 4, six Indian soldiers intruded into the Demchok area in Tibet and conducted reconnaissance there for as long as six hours.

34. At about 1450 hours on November 16, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

35. At about 1400 hours on November 24, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

36. At about 1350 hours on December 16, two Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance there for more than an hour.

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

During the summer of 1966, Indian military and administrative personnel again intruded into and stationed themselves at the Wuje area which China had vacated on its own initiative. On August 15, the intruding Indian troops detained a Chinese border inhabitant who had gone to Wuje for trade and who was allowed to return only after being held for a day and a night. On the morning of August 27, six intruding Indian soldiers chased a Chinese herdsman and fired a stream of five shots at him.

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

1. At Hsialinkung Terrace Indian troops still maintain their military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the line of actual control between the two sides and frequently crossed the line of actual control for reconnaissance and harassment. There was one such incident in January involving four persons; one in February involving fifteen persons; one in April involving three persons; five in May involving ten persons; four in June involving 42 persons; six in July involving 29 persons; eight in August involving 30 persons; six in October involving 25 persons. Of these, the Indian troops that intruded in May also carried out such activities as building military works on the Chinese side of the line of actual control. Moreover, on September 17, Indian troops opened fire in provocation at Hsialinkung Terrace.

2. At about 1515 hours on February 11, two Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Le for reconnaissance.

3. At about 1420 hours on May 2, three Indian soldiers intruded into the

area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao for reconnaissance.

4. At about 1700 hours on May 21, two Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao for reconnaissance.

5. At about 1330 hours on July 14, an Indian soldier intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao for reconnaissance.

6. At about 1430 hours on July 25, three Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao for reconnaissance.

7. At about 1510 hours on July 30, four Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao for reconnaissance.

8. At about 1530 hours on July 30, another two Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao for reconnaissance.

9. At about 1100 hours on September 3, an Indian soldier intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao for reconnaissance.

10. At about 1400 hours on September 27, three Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao for reconnaissance.

11. At about 1610 hours on September 30, an Indian soldier intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao for reconnaissance.

12. At about 1200 hours on November 4, five Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao and conducted reconnaissance there for nearly one hour.

13. At about 1600 hours on November 6, five Indian soldiers intruded into the vicinity of the civilian check post at Tsayul for reconnaissance.

14. At about 0950 hours on November 25, 11 Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao and conducted reconnaissance there for as long as six and a half hours.

15. At about 1000 hours on December 20, five Indian soldiers intruded into the area south of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao and conducted reconnaissance there for nearly four and a half hours.

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

1. At about 1130 hours and 1640 hours on May 3, four Indian soldiers in two batches intruded into Chinese territory from across Natu La for reconnaissance. On the same day, another group of 16 Indian soldiers intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La and repaired the wire entanglements left by Indian troops when they withdrew from the place and fled in September 1965.

2. At about 1130 hours on May 10, five Indian soldiers intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La and continued to repair the wire entanglements left by Indian troops when they withdrew and fled.

3 At about 0130 hours on May 15, an Indian soldier, under cover of darkness, intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La and threw tin cans at the Chinese sentry in provocation.

4. At about 1020 hours on June 3, two Indian soldiers intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La for reconnaissance.

5 At about 1315 hours on June 6, 22 Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory from across Tagi La for reconnaissance.

6. At about 1030 hours on June 8, more than 20 Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory and conducted reconnaissance for about an hour after crossing the boundary in the vicinity of Tagi La and made threats against a Chinese herdsman who was grazing cattle there.
7. At about 1300 hours on June 12, an Indian soldier intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La for reconnaissance.
8. At about 1400 hours on June 13, three Indian soldiers intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La and continued to repair the wire entanglements left by Indian troops when they withdrew and fled in 1965.
9. At about 2100 hours on July 20, eleven Indian soldiers intruded into Dongnan grassland within Chinese territory, where they burnt down a cattle-shed of Chinese herdsman.
10. At about 1000 hours on July 29, three Indian soldiers crossed Toka La and intruded into Dongnan grassland for reconnoitring activities.
11. At about 1330 hours on August 7, five Indian soldiers crossed Toka La and intruded into Dongnan grassland where they conducted reconnaissance and harassment for three hours.
12. At about 1100 hours on August 24, more than ten Indian soldiers intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La and operated in the vicinity of the wire entanglements left over by the Indian side.
13. At about 2130 hours on September 6, six Indian soldiers intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La for reconnaissance.
14. At about 1200 hours on September 17, two, Indian soldiers intruded

into the Chinese side of Natu La for reconnaissance.

15. At about 1100 hours on October 26, seventeen Indian soldiers crossed Kailu La and intruded into Chinese territory for reconnaissance.

16. At about 1630 hours on October 29, 19 Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory in the vicinity of Kailu La and conducted reconnoitring activities there for about an hour.

17. At about 1150 hours on November 3, four Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory from across Natu La in an attempt to carry out sabotaging activities. They were immediately challenged by sentries of the Chinese frontier guards and ordered to leave Chinese territory. But they hung on there until 1210 hours when they were compelled to turn back.

18. At about 1140 hours on December 25, two Indian soldiers intruded into the Chinese side of Natu La for reconnaissance.

In addition to the above-mentioned intrusions, Indian troops at Natu La opened fire in provocation on Chinese sentries at 0650 hours on June 6 and again at 1755 hours on August 21.

ANNEX II

Intrusions into China's Airspace by Indian Aircraft during 1966

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

1. At 1320 hours on January 1, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Tienwentian and its vicinity in Sinkiang.
2. At 1235 hours on January 2, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Shenhsienwan and its vicinity in Sinkiang.
3. At 1510 hours on January 6, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Nyagzu in Tibet.
4. At 1205 hours on January 9, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Nyagzu in Tibet.
5. At 1015 hours on February 17, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of Yula and Sirijap in Tibet.
6. At 1012 hours on March 10, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs and Panlung in Sinkiang for reconnaissance. At 1220 hours on the same day, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of Kota Village north of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.
7. At 1605 hours on April 12, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet.
8. At 1135 hours on April 25, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang.
9. At 1310 hours on May 2, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's

airspace in the vicinity of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet.

10. At 0645 hours on June 3, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Tienwentian in Sinkiang.

11. At 1120 hours on June 10, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang.

12. At 1048 hours on June 17, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet.

13. At 1139 hours on August 23, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang.

14. At 1150 hours on August 26, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and circled over there for reconnaissance.

15. At 1154 hours on September 13, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and circled over there for reconnaissance.

16. At 1211 hours on September 23, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Tienwentian in Sinkiang and circled over there for reconnaissance.

17. At 1146 hours on September 24, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and circled over there for reconnaissance.

18. At 1220 hours on October 17, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Demchok and its vicinity in Tibet.

19. At 1150 hours on October 18, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Kongka Pass in Tibet.

20. At 1509 hours on October 19, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang.

21. At 1438 hours on October 24, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in Sinkiang, and circled over there for reconnaissance.

22. At 1118 hours on October 29, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Spanggur and its vicinity in Tibet.

23. At 1212 hours on October 30, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet.

24. At 1153 hours on November 7, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Nyagzu in Tibet.

25. At 1020 hours on December 3, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Tibet.

26. At 1355 hours on December 8, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Tienwentian and its vicinity in Sinkiang and circled over there for reconnaissance.

27. At 1228 hours on December 11, an Indian aircraft intruded into

China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Nyagzu in Tibet.

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

At 1430 hours on December 30, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Pulan and its vicinity.

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

1. At 0925 hours on January 9, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkposts at Sama and Tsayul and other places, and circled over there for reconnaissance.

2. At 1455 hours on January 22, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Budzong and its vicinity.

3. At 1235 hours on January 28, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Laiguo Bridge and its vicinity.

4. At 1035 hours on January 29, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkposts at Dergong and Titung, and over Meta and other places.

5. At 1305 hours on January 29, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Budzong.

6. At 1400 hours on January 30, two Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Janwu and the civilian checkpost at Budzong and over other places, and repeatedly circled over there for reconnaissance. They did not

leave until 1445 hours.

7. At 1311 hours and 1319 hours on January 31, Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Molo and other places in two batches and three sorties.

8. At 1318 hours on January 31, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Titung and over Ketang and other places.

9. On February 3, two Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Tsayul and its vicinity, one at 1300 hours and the other at 1340 hours.

10. At 1130 hours on February 4, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Tsayul and over Chikung and other places.

11. At 1238 hours on February 4, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkposts at Tsayul and Hsiachiang and other places.

12. At 1322 hours on February 6, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Tsayul.

13. At 1230 hours on February 7, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkposts at Gongna and Lung and over Milin and other places.

14. At 1100 hours on March 7, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hsiao.

15. At 1121 hours on September 17, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Sama and circled over there for reconnaissance.

16. At 0735 hours on November 4, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Tsamu and its vicinity.

17. At 1130 hours on November 12, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Kata and its vicinity.

18. At 1200 hours on November 21, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Sama and its vicinity.

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

1. At 2320 hours on January 10, an Indian aircraft flying across Jelep La intruded into China's airspace over Chumbitan, Yatung and other places.

2. At 1020 hours on April 20, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in Kungyangmi La and Tagi La areas.

3. At 1100 hours on June 8, an Indian aircraft flying across Kungyangmi La intruded into China's airspace, circled over Chago La for reconnaissance and then left Chinese territory through Tagi La.

4. At 1250 hours on June 9, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in Latuo La, Kailu La and Tagi La areas for reconnaissance.

5. At 0930 hours on June 16, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in Tagi La and Kailu La areas and circled over there for

reconnaissance.

6. At 1350 hours on June 18, an Indian aircraft flying across Jelep La intruded into China's airspace circled in Natu La and Ya La areas for reconnaissance, and then turned back to Jelep La where it left Chinese territory.

7. At 1355 hours on June 18, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace from across Cho La.

8. At 0933 hours on June 21, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in Natu La and Jelep La areas.

9. At 0920 hours on June 23, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in Jelep La, Ringchhingong, Natu La and Tungchu La areas and other places for reconnaissance.

10. At 1245 hours on June 24, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace from across Kailu La.

11. At 0943 hours on June 25, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace in Jelep La and Tungchu La areas.

12. At 0945 hours on September 3, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace from across Jelep La and continued to fly over the vicinity of Tungchu La and over Dongnan grassland, Ringchhingong and other places.

13. At 0910 hours on October 13, two Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the Kangpu area in Yatung.

14. At 1455 hours on October 13, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's

airspace in the vicinity of Tagi La.

15. At 0900 hours on October 14, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the Kangpu area in Yatung.

16. At 1515 hours on October 14, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace from across Kailu La and left through Tagi La after carrying out reconnoitring activities.

17. On December 5, two Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace from across Natu La, one at 1015 hours and the other at 1025 hours.

18. At 1427 hours on December 8, an Indian aircraft flying across Tungchu La intruded into China's airspace and circled over Ringchhingong, Yatung and other places for reconnaissance.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 11 April, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 145.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states the following :—

1. Indian troops recently constructed seven stone piles, each over a metre high, on the Chinese side of Kailu La on the China-Sikkim boundary and demolished a Mani pile which was at Kailu La and regarded as a customary boundary mark by the border inhabitants of both countries. These seven stone piles surreptitiously erected by the Indian troops lead from the west to the east and then turn northwards, spreading out over a

total length of more than two thousand metres and going well beyond the original Mani pile into Chinese territory. It is perfectly clear that this action of the Indian troops is a vain attempt to unilaterally alter the China-Sikkim boundary and thereby to create new tension along the border and sabotage the friendship between China and Sikkim. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this act of aggression and provocation by the Indian troops.

2. The boundary between China and Sikkim has long been formally delimited, and there is neither any discrepancy between the maps nor any disputes in practice. This has been recognised by the Indian Government as well. However, acting contrary to what it has said, the Indian Government has continually made use of Sikkim territory to commit acts of aggression against China, even to the extent of sending troops across the China-Sikkim boundary to construct large numbers of military structures for aggression on Chinese territory. In September 1965, driven beyond the limits of forbearance, the Chinese Government ordered the Indian side to dismantle these military structures within a set time limit. Knowing that they were in the wrong, the Indian troops hurriedly levelled part of the military structures for aggression and scampered away. But now, only a year and a half later, the Indian Government is reverting to its former practice. It is conducting fresh aggression and provocation against China by resorting to a new manoeuvre of surreptitiously erecting boundary marks across the boundary on Chinese territory. What is the purpose of this?

3. It is clear to the people throughout the world that the Indian Government is finding it harder and harder to get along. It urgently needs to divert the attention of the Indian people and to beg for alms from U.S. imperialism and Soviet modern revisionism by further hiring itself out to them. And now out of their fear and hatred of the great Chinese

proletarian cultural revolution, U.S. imperialism and Soviet modern revisionism are plotting to stir up a new anti-Chinese wave in the world. It is under these circumstances that the newly formed Indian Congress Government raised an anti-Chinese hue and cry as soon as it assumed office. On the second day after he took office, Chagla, the Minister for External Affairs of the new Government, wantonly attacked China, saying that China "maintains" a "bellicose and threatening posture" towards India, and slanderously charged that China occupied "Indian territory". The Indian President Radhakrishnan also came out in slanderously asserting that China's "aggressive acts and postures" are "the major obstacles" to an improvement of the relations between the two countries. Since then the Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and the Indian Minister of Defence Swaran Singh have repeatedly vilified China. When these facts are viewed together, is it not clear what is the purpose of the recent provocative activities conducted by the Indian troops along the China-Sikkim border?

The Chinese Government must tell the Indian Government in all seriousness: You must draw lessons from your past experience, stop provocative activities along the China-Sikkim border and cease all your calumnies against China, otherwise you are bound to eat the bitter fruits of your own making.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China, 7 September, 1967

No. C/21/67

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this Note to the Embassy of People's Republic of China, New Delhi in order to bring to the attention of the Chinese Government the repeated intrusions committed by Chinese

troops and personnel since the middle of May, 1967.

A few of the more flagrant examples of such intrusions are given below:—

(i) On May 18th at about 1230 hours 6 persons dressed in black clothes intruded upto 300 yards into Sikkim in the area of Kongrala and withdrew on seeing the Indian patrol.

(ii) On June 9, at 2100 hours some 18 to 20 Chinese intruded into Indian territory about 1 ½ miles East South-east of Chushul in the Western Sector, and on being challenged, ran away.

(iii) Chinese troops and personnel are also persisting in regular intrusions into Indian territory in the vicinity of the Indian Check Post at Track Junction in North Ladakh. On June 19, at about 1400 hours, 50 Chinese intruded upto points varying from 2 to 4 miles west of the so-called "line of actual control" in the Western Sector. One Chinese soldier advanced even further to a point E7759 N3519, one mile north of the Indian Check Post at Track Junction in the Daulat Beg Oldi area. On the same day at 1345 hours a group of 50 armed Chinese troops intruded into the area about 3 miles east of the same post. The intruders halted and took positions when they were approximately one mile east of the Indian Post and stayed there till 1600 hours.

(iv) On June 20, five armed Chinese soldiers with 3 ponies intruded into an area approximately 4 miles north of Chushul in the Western Sector. They took up firing positions and aimed at Indian vehicles in the area.

(v) On July 4, about 30 Chinese soldiers in khaki uniform carrying rifles intruded to a depth of about 100 yards south of the international border near Longju in the Eastern Sector. They remained in the area from 0700 to 1300 hours.

It should be noted that many of these intrusions represent fresh encroachments into Indian territory beyond the area which is under illegal occupation of Chinese troops as a result of massive aggression on Indian territory. The Government of India lodge a strong protest against these continued intrusions and deliberate acts of provocation and demand that the Chinese Government should take immediate steps to put a stop to such aggressive and illegal activities.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 10 September, 1967

No. (67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 570.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present Note to the Indian Embassy in China and states the following:

Since the end of July the Indian troops have intruded many times into Chinese territory for reconnaissance at Natu La, Cho La and Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary; they planted iron rods, installed barbed-wire entanglements and even opened fire for provocation and abused Chinese border defence personnel. What is particularly serious is that at 0800 hours on September 7, over sixty Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory across NATU LA to install barbed-wire entanglements and in disregard of the repeated warnings of the Chinese border defence troops even wounded two Chinese frontier guards with bayonets. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against such frantic provocation by the Indian troops.

It must be pointed out that these unbridled intrusions by the Indian

troops are a component part of the world-wide anti-Chinese chorus currently struck up by U.S. imperialism and Soviet Revisionism in league with the Reactionaries of various countries. The Indian reactionaries have repeatedly appeared on the stage and given very energetic performances in this anti-Chinese chorus. However, they have employed a counter-revolutionary dual tactics by recently chanting the tune that they desire a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian dispute through negotiations and assuming a gesture of relaxation so as to deceive the Indian people and world opinion. Such clumsy tactics of the Indian reactionaries is shop-worn stuff. In trying to deceive people with the same stuff, it only reveals that they are at the end of their resources.

The Chinese peoples great leader Chairman Mao teaches us: "Make trouble, fail make trouble again, fail againtill their doom: that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people's cause, and they will never go against this logic." The Indian reactionaries will never go against this logic either. The Chinese Government sternly warns the Indian Government: the Chinese Border Defence Troops are closely watching the development of the situation along the China-Sikkim boundary. Should the Indian troops continue to make provocative intrusions, the Indian Government must be held responsible for all the grave consequences.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China, 11 September, 1967

No. C/22/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this Note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in order to bring the following facts to the attention of the Chinese Government:-

Since the first week of August, strong detachments of Chinese troops have repeatedly intruded into Sikkim territory across the international border between Sikkim and Tibet and have carried out a series of increasingly serious provocations culminating in an armed attack, with light weapons and heavy artillery on Indian troops in areas well within Sikkim territory.

In the Nathu La area, Chinese armed personnel have begun concentrating in large numbers on the border and crossing it. On August 17, Chinese troops constructed trenches which extended well into the Sikkim side of the water-shed that marks the international border. When warned by Indian defence personnel, 60 Chinese troops appeared on the border and adopted threatening postures. Later, on August 20 a party of 120 Chinese troops armed with light machine guns and hand grenades took up positions against Indian troops who were engaged in laying wires well within Sikkim territory. This series of provocations has become particularly grave since September 6; on the morning of the September 6, an Indian patrol which was proceeding south of Nathu La on the Sikkim side of the international border was challenged by a group of armed Chinese soldiers, of whom 20 intruded across the border. On 7th September, when to prevent any further intrusions, Indian defence personnel began constructing a fence in this area well within Sikkim territory, a group of 60 Chinese soldiers armed with rifles intruded across the border and engaged in a scuffle with them. On 9th September, at 0940 hours, two Chinese military personnel intruded into Sikkim territory and stayed there for 20 minutes. Chinese troops also engaged in provocative broadcasts from loudspeakers located at Nathu La on the same day. On September 10, armed Chinese soldiers intruded on three separate occasions into Sikkim territory.

On September 11, at 0540 hours, Chinese soldiers suddenly opened

fire with small arms and mortar on Indian defensive posts across the border. This firing continued and was augmented by heavy artillery fire from the direction of Chumbithang.

Similar provocations have been carried out by Chinese military personnel at Cho La. As early as July 29, a Chinese patrol intruded into Sikkim territory at an Indian defence post and threatened the sentry. Since then, Chinese troops have concentrated in increasingly large numbers on the Pass.

According to the latest information received by the Government of India, firing with heavy artillery across Nathu La by Chinese troops still continues and Indian defence forces have been compelled to take defensive action on the Sikkim side of the border.

The Chinese Government is well aware that the Sikkim-Tibet border is a well defined international border and has been recognised as such by China. By launching an armed attack the Chinese Government is seeking to build up tension at a point on the border which has never been in dispute. In order to reduce tension and prevent the situation assuming a very serious aspect, the Government of India suggest that both sides cease fire immediately and the two Sector Commanders of the respective forces meet at Nathu La.

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 11 September, 1967
(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 572.**

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states the following:

At 0740 hours on the morning of September 11, 1967, over sixty Indian aggressor troops intruded into Chinese territory by crossing the China-Sikkim boundary at Natu La. Under the cover of fierce artillery fire, the Indian troops launched an attack on the Chinese frontier guards. Thereupon, they opened artillery fire on the Chinese frontier guards at Jelep La. Up till noon, the Indian aggressor troops already killed or wounded 25 Chinese frontier guards. They also destroyed Chinese civilian houses and temples. The attack of the Indian aggressor troops on Chinese frontier guards is still continuing now. The Chinese Government and people express their utmost indignation at this most serious criminal armed aggression solely engineered by the reactionary Indian government. The Chinese Government hereby lodges the most urgent and most serious protest with the Indian government.

The reactionary Indian government has never ceased its aggression and provocation against China on the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim boundary ever since its crushing defeat in its massive armed attack on China in 1962. Especially of late, under the insidious instigation of U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism, the Indian reactionaries have further intensified their military provocations against China and even blatantly launched armed attacks on the Chinese frontier guards. This is really the height of frenzy.

The Chinese Government hereby serves a serious warning on the reactionary Indian government: Do not misjudge the situation and repeat your mistake of 1962. For the defence of the sacred territory of their motherland, the great Chinese people and the Chinese People's Liberation Army will certainly deal crushing blows at any enemy that dares to invade us. The Indian government must immediately rein in before the precipice and stop all its aggression, provocation and military adventure against China. Otherwise, the Indian government must be held fully responsible

for all the grave consequences arising therefrom.

The Chinese Government reserves the right to raise further demands.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 12 September, 1967
No. C/23/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs in continuation of their Note No. C/22/67 of September 11, 1967 address this Note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and wish to draw the attention of the Chinese Government to the continuing tense situation on the Sikkim-Tibet border.

The Ministry of External Affairs had suggested in their Note of September 11, 1967 that both sides cease fire immediately. But the firing has continued. To stop this conflict at Nathu La and to reduce the tension the Government of India propose that:

(i) both sides cease fire with effect from 0530 hours I.S.T. on September 13, 1967 and

(ii) the Sector Commanders of both sides meet immediately thereafter at Nathu La.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 3 October, 1967.

No. C/26/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs draws the attention of the Embassy of

the People's Republic of China to the unwarranted and brutal attack unleashed on Indian troops who were guarding Sikkim- Tibet border at Cho La on October 1, 1967.

Following a scuffle which was started by Chinese soldiers on a baseless claim to a part on the Sikkim side of the border in that area, the Chinese troops suddenly opened fire at 0930 hours IST October 1, 1967 on Indian defensive positions at Cho La with small arms, medium machine guns, recoilless guns and mortars. The surprise attack immediately caused casualties among Indian defence personnel. Consequently Indian troops were compelled to return fire in self defence against this unwarranted attack.

By launching another attack shortly after a similar one which was unleashed by Chinese troops at Nathu La on the 11th of September, the Chinese Government is seeking to build up tension at a border which has never been in dispute. The Government of India are resolved to repel any aggression against the frontiers, the guarding of which is the responsibility of the Indian Government. The Chinese Government are hereby asked to stop all provocative military adventures on the Tibet-Sikkim border.

The Government of India views the repeated provocations by the Chinese troops on the Tibet-Sikkim border with the utmost concern. The Chinese Government are well aware that the Tibet- Sikkim border is a well-defined international boundary and has been recognised as such by the People's Republic of China. Consequently, there is no justification for the Chinese troops to create such incidents out of baseless claims to areas on the Sikkimese side of the border and the Indian Government demands that Chinese troops are immediately ordered to refrain from indulging in such aggressive and provocative acts; otherwise, the Chinese Government will be responsible for all the consequences that may arise

there-from.

In order to reduce the tension, the Government of India had in connection with the Nathu La incident suggested a meeting of the sector commanders of the respective forces. But this constructive suggestion has evoked no response from the Chinese Government.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 23 October, 1967

No. C/28/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and in reply to the Chinese Government's note of January 16, 1967 states the following:-

In their note the Chinese Government have as usual made totally false and baseless allegations about so-called "intrusions into Chinese territory" by Indian personnel during 1966. The Government of India have, over the past three years, had occasion to be presented with similar catalogues of fabrications purporting to cover alleged Indian intrusions into so-called Chinese territory over an extended period; these charges were thoroughly and convincingly refuted by the Government of India in their various replies. That even after these repeated exposures of their dishonest and false allegations, the Chinese Government persist in this practice merely serves to underline the hollowness of the Chinese allegations.

Even a casual glance at the list of the alleged intrusions reveals at once that these allegations are a series of vague and repetitive charges unsubstantiated in many cases by details of time and place. Despite the considerable interval of time that has elapsed, during which the Chinese Government did not take note of these alleged series of incidents, the

Government of India have carefully examined the allegations and found them to be wholly false and baseless.

The Chinese note under reply claims that there were 73 cases of intrusion across the border and the so-called "line of actual control" by Indian personnel and 71 intrusions by Indian aircraft. Of this total of 144 allegations, 111 are merely repetition of charges made on previous occasions and which are now, as then, completely fictitious. The remaining 33 allegations are also equally false. In particular, the Chinese note has listed 36 allegations of intrusions by Indian personnel across the so-called "line of actual control" in the Western sector (Annexure I Section I of the Chinese note). Even though all the places mentioned in this list are part of Indian territory now under illegal occupation by Chinese troops as a result of their aggression in 1962, the Government of India, following their acceptance of the Colombo Proposals, have shown great forbearance and have not sent their personnel into these areas. The Chinese Government, on the contrary, have systematically repudiated their own commitment and have unscrupulously encroached into the 20 km demilitarized zone. This she has done in utter disregard of the Colombo Proposals. It may be pointed out that in the case of Demchok (Annexure I, Section I, items 32 and 33), the place referred to is actually in undisputed Indian territory and is west of even the so-called "line of actual control" and has been shown accordingly even in Chinese maps.

The Chinese Government's allegations of intrusions by Indian personnel on the Bhutan-Tibet boundary are totally absurd fabrications. Obviously, these allegations are made by the Chinese Government to cover their own intrusions into Bhutan which have already been revealed by the Indian Government in their note of the 30th September, 1966. The Chinese Government have sought to add length to their list of fabrications by alleging series of so-called all "intrusions". The Government of India consider all the charges made in the Chinese note under reply as absurd

and only a figment of Chinese propaganda and consequently reject them categorically.

It is interesting to observe that this long list of allegations of so-called intrusions has been levelled at a time when Chinese Government have stepped up their hostile and malicious propaganda against the people and Government of India. It should be apparent to the Chinese Government by now that their propaganda artifices carry no conviction with anyone and only serve the Chinese purpose of keeping up tensions with various nations. Being concerned only with propaganda, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs has, as usual, in its note not confined itself to facts but referred to the "difficult position both at home and abroad" of the Indian Government. The internal situation of China as well as the standing of the Chinese Government among the nations of the world, more particularly its neighbours, require no comment.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, 20 February, 1968

No. C/4/68.

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to Note No. Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 145, dated the 11th April, 1967, of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, categorically rejects the allegation that the Indian troops had constructed stone-piles on the Tibetan side of the Tibet-Sikkim boundary at Kongra La, referred to in the note under reply as Kailu La. The further charge that Indian troops had demolished a Mani-pile, which was at Kongra La, is equally untrue.

2. In the note under reply the Chinese Government have stated "the boundary between China and Sikkim has long been formally delimited and there is neither any discrepancy between the maps nor any disputes in practice". The Government of India have also pointed out to the Chinese Government on numerous occasions that the China-Sikkim boundary, which has been formally delimited by treaty and is clearly distinguishable by well marked natural features, has never been crossed by Indian troops. Hence the accusation that Indian troops attempted to unilaterally alter the China- Sikkim boundary is palpably false. The further allegation that Indian troops had surreptitiously erected stone-piles spreading out over a total length of more than 2,000 metres is to say the least absurd.

3. The Chinese note under reply goes on to refer to the events of September, 1965. The Chinese Government's attention is drawn to the Government of India's note dated 1st October, 1965, in which the fictitious charges made then by the Chinese Government were fully refuted. It is extraordinary that the Chinese Government have again sought to level wholly imaginary charges.

4. The note under reply goes on to refer to matters totally unrelated to the subject under issue merely in order to slander the Government of India, Indian leaders and other foreign Governments friendly to India. The Ministry of External Affairs sees no relevance in the polemical exercise contained in the latter half of the Chinese note. It would appear that the Chinese Government, following the pattern familiar to them, have invented baseless charges only in order to indulge in hollow propaganda.

5. The Ministry of External Affairs emphatically rejects the protest note of the Chinese Government.

TERRITORIAL AIR SPACE

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 July, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 393.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states the following:-

According to reports from Chinese frontier guards, Indian military aircraft in sixteen sorties intruded into the airspace over vast areas in China's Sinkiang and Tibet for wanton provocation from July 12 to 17, 1967. The details are as follows:-

(1) On July 12 at 1450 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the area of the Pangong Lake and the Spanggur Lake in Tibet and carried out reconnaissance and provocation over China's civilian checkpost at Spanggur and then flew east to Rudok and Shanho for harassment, penetrating a depth of about one hundred kilometres inside China.

(2) On July 12 at 1500 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the Chip Chap River Valley in Sinkiang and carried out reconnaissance over China's civilian checkpost at Tienwentian and then flew east to Chipchap La for further activities.

(3) On July 12 at 1512 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the area of Howeitan in Sinkiang and then flew to the area north of the Galwan River for reconnaissance and harassment.

- (4) On July 12 at 1515 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the area of the Pangong Lake in Tibet.
- (5) On July 12 at 1525 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs, Kota Village and Panlung in China, repeatedly circled over these places for prolonged reconnaissance and harassment and did not leave China's airspace until 1550 hours.
- (6) On July 12 at 1605 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace from Kongka Pass and then flew east to the Lanak La area for reconnaissance and harassment, penetrating a depth of about 60 kilometres inside China.
- (7) On July 12 at 1625 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the area south of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet and circled over the area for reconnaissance.
- (8) On July 13 at 1545 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Tashingong and Gargunsa in Tibet and circled over these places for reconnaissance and provocation, penetrating a depth of about 80 kilometres inside China.
- (9) On July 13 at 1630 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Sankang and the vast area to its north-east in Tibet and circled over there for reconnaissance.
- (10) On July 13 at 1710 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the Poling and Toling area in Tibet and circled over the area for reconnaissance, penetrating a depth of about 90 kilometres inside China.

(11) On July 15 at 1235 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the Chip Chap River Valley in Sinkiang and repeatedly circled over China's civilian checkpoint at Tienwentian for provocation.

(12) On July 15 at 1300 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Howeitan in Sinkiang and the area to its east for reconnaissance.

(13) On July 15 at 1315 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the area of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet for reconnaissance and provocation.

(14) On July 15 at 1330 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Sankang in Tibet and the area to its northeast for activities.

(15) On July 15 at 1355 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the area of Poling and Toling in Tibet and repeatedly circled over China's civilian checkpoint in Poling for harassment.

(16) On July 17 at 1600 hours, one Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the Chip Chap River Valley and Dapsang Terrace in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government against the above grave incidents in which Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace.

It must be pointed out that the Indian troops have never stopped their intrusion and provocation on the Sino-Indian and China- Sikkim borders since the beginning of this year. And now the Indian Government has become even more rampant in dispatching its planes to intrude into China's airspace sixteen times in succession within a few days and carried

out military provocations on the entire middle and western sectors of the Sino-Indian border, deliberately creating tension on the borders. This is by no means accidental. It is another anti-Chinese incident engineered by the Indian Government in serving as an anti-Chinese pawn of U.S. imperialism and Soviet modern revisionism after its fascist atrocities of assaulting the Chinese Embassy in India and beating and wounding Chinese diplomatic personnel. This is another grave provocation against the Chinese people and Government. The Chinese Government hereby warns the Indian Government in all seriousness; the sacred territory and airspace of the People's Republic of China brook no violation. In carrying out grave provocations in compliance with the will of U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism, the Indian Government will definitely meet with crushing blows by our people and the People's Liberation Army defending our frontier. The more frenziedly the Indian Government opposes China, the sooner it will meet its own doom. The Indian Government must immediately stop such military provocations. If the Indian Government persists in its perverse course, it must be held responsible for all the consequences arising therefrom.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi; to the Embassy of China in India, 29 February, 1968

No. C/T/68.

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to note No. (67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 393 dated 19th July, 1967 given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to the Indian Embassy in Peking, states as follows:

After necessary investigation into the 16 allegations that Indian aircraft

had crossed the so-called "line of actual control" in the Western sector and the India-China international border, the Ministry of External Affairs has come to the conclusion that these are nothing but fabrications concocted by the Chinese Foreign Ministry to suit their ulterior motives against India. Indian aircraft have, at no stage, crossed the India-China international border or the so-called "line of actual control" in the Western sector. It must be pointed out that even though India does not recognise the so-called "line of actual control" in the Western sector created by China through military aggression, out of self-restraint and out of a desire for a peaceful settlement of the India-China border question, Indian troops and Indian aircraft have at no stage crossed to the east of this line.

In spite of the fact that this position of the Government of India is well-known to the Chinese Government, the Chinese Foreign Office periodically indulges in making baseless allegations such as those contained in the note under reply while adding polemics to those allegations only in order to cover up the aggressive attitudes of the Chinese Government towards India.

The Government of India categorically reject the protest note of the Chinese Government dated July 19, 1967.

III. MATTERS RELATING TO INDIAN GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES, INDIAN NATIONALS AND THEIR INSTITUTIONS IN CHINA AND CHINESE GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES, CHINESE NATIONALS AND THEIR INSTITUTIONS IN INDIA

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 25 December, 1965

The Chinese Embassy has learnt that of late Tang Shao-fang, the mother, and Tseng Tsai-tieh, the daughter, Chinese nationals in Calcutta, were unjustifiably ordered to leave India within a short period. This is another unlawful act of persecution of the peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals by the Indian Government, which once again proves that the Indian Government is deliberately worsening the relations between China and India. The Embassy hereby lodges a protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs against this and demands that the Indian Government immediately stop all forms of persecution of the Chinese nationals.

**Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 May, 1967
No. M/520/67.**

Reference Chinese Embassy's Memorandum dated December 25, 1965.

2. The Chinese Embassy have tried to distort facts about the "Quit India" orders served on two Chinese nationals named Tang Shao-fang and Tseng Taai-tieh. It claimed that this is "another unlawful act of persecution" and that it "proves that the Indian Government is deliberately worsening the relations between India and China". These are baseless allegations. The two individuals were found to be carrying out anti-Indian activities and were subsequently ordered to leave India. Their eviction is entirely justified and within the sovereign competence of India.

3. The Chinese Embassy's protest is, therefore categorically rejected.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 24 May, 1967

No. M/520/67

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and states the following:

The Embassy has made repeated representations to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs on the unwarranted holding-up and confiscation of the Embassy's mails by the Indian authorities. However, these outrageous acts have not only gone unabated, but become intensified. For instance, of all the issues of the People's Daily mailed daily from Peking to the Embassy by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the months of July and August, 1966, the Embassy has up to now received only five issues. The newspapers and other mails air-mailed from Hongkong for Mr. Chen Chao-yuan, Charge d'Affaires a.i. of the Embassy, have also been unwarrantedly held up and confiscated. Very few of them were received every month and these had been delayed for as long as three or four months. Some of the books and magazines mailed from Peking for the diplomatic officials of the Embassy have been held up even for more than a year. To cover up its crimes, the Indian side sometimes deliberately scrapped off the dates postmarked in Peking on the covers of the Embassy's mails or did not put the postmark of the Indian post office. These evil acts have fully exposed the guilty conscience of the Indian side. The Embassy once again lodges a strong protest with the Ministry of External Affairs against the above-mentioned acts which outrageously violate international practice and seriously impede the normal functioning of the Embassy and the diplomatic personnel of the Embassy, and demands that the Indian Government immediately stop this unreasonable practice, ensure against recurrence of similar incidents in the future and immediately send to the Embassy all the mails which have still been unwarrantedly held up and forcibly confiscated.

Note given by the Embassy of China in, India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 25 May, 1967

No. M/521/67.

The Embassy of the Peoples Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and states the following in regard to its demand for a visit to and release of Mr. Huang Kui-ting, a detained innocent Chinese national:

Mr. Huang Kui-ting, a Chinese national, has lived in India for nearly thirty years and has for a long time had an honest job as a cook. He was unwarrantedly arrested by the Indian Government on the New Year's Day, 1963, and has been detained since then, experiencing already over four years of inhumane life in jail. His aged wife outside the jail, who has nobody to look her after, has suffered a great deal mentally and physically. The Embassy has time and again made requests for the release of Mr. Huang and the visit to him in jail by the Embassy's officials. However, the Indian Government has all the time resorted to equivocation and evaded clear replies. In his oral reply to Mr. Chou Ping-yi, Third Secretary of the Embassy, on May 5, 1967, Mr. K. K. S. Rana, Under Secretary of the Ministry, went so far as to reject under the pretext of so-called Defence of India Rules the just request of the Embassy for a visit to and release of Mr. Huang Kui-ting, saying absurdly that Mr. Huang could be escorted to the exit port if the Embassy makes arrangements in advance for his repatriation to China. How unreasonable and ridiculous this is. As is known to all, the so-called Defence of India Rules, and the "national security" often preached by the Indian Government, are all excuses by the Indian Government to persecute wilfully the peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals. These fascist acts only further expose

the frantically anti-China ugly features of the Indian Government as the pawn of imperialism and modern revisionism. Since Mr. Huang has been unreasonably thrown into jail by the Indian Government, on what grounds should he be expelled from India under escort? The Embassy has the inviolable right to protect the Chinese nationals. The Indian Government has not only wilfully deprived the Embassy of this right, but has also asked the Embassy to make arrangements to comply the unreasonable demand made by the Indian Government so that it could escort Mr. Huang to the exit port and may shirk the criminal responsibility for its frenzied persecution of the innocent Chinese nationals. This is indeed arrogance and unreasonableness in its extremity. We would like to tell the Indian Government plainly, you can never succeed in this. While categorically rejecting the wild request of the Indian Government, the Embassy lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned acts which trample underfoot the principles of international relations and illegally deprive the Embassy of its legitimate rights to protect the Chinese nationals, and once again demands that the Indian Government immediately arrange a visit to Mr. Huang in jail by the Embassy's officials and release him.

It must be pointed out that Mr. Huang Kui-ting is one of the many Chinese nationals who are subjected to cruel persecution by the Indian Government. Today, many innocent Chinese nationals like Mr. Huang are still detained in the concentration camps or jails in India and are leading inhumane life. The great Chinese people can never tolerate this. The Embassy demands that the Indian Government immediately supply the names of the Chinese nationals still detained and release all the victimized Chinese nationals who are imprisoned unwarrantedly.

The Embassy demands that the Indian Government speedily give responsible reply to the stern demand by the Embassy.

Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 5 June, 1967

The Indian Embassy addresses itself to the Chinese Foreign Office and states the following: -

(1) Messrs. K. Raghunath, Second Secretary and P. Vijai, Third Secretary of the Indian Embassy, were proceeding in Mr. K. Raghunath's car to the Western Hills towards the temple of the Sleeping Buddha at 1300 hours on 4th June. On the way to the temple of the Sleeping Buddha Mr. K. Raghunath stopped the car and took some photographs inside a ruined temple which was on the left side of the road leading to the Temple of the Sleeping Buddha. While Mr. K. Raghunath was in the process of taking photographs of the ruins of the temple, an unidentified Chinese, accompanied by a few others, approached Mr. K. Raghunath and unwarrantedly accused him of taking photographs of a military installation, which was allegedly situated nearby. Further he unreasonably demanded the inspections of the Identity Cards of the Indian diplomats and what is even more reprehensible, without any authority, refused to return the Identity Cards, while repeating his earlier unfounded allegations that Mr. K. Raghunath was taking photographs of a military installation. Mr. K. Raghunath attempted to reason things out with him by telling him the truth, that he did not take any photographs of any military installations and that he was taking photographs of the ruins of the temple.

(2) After a considerable period of harassment, where the Chinese individuals concerned surrounded the car and tried to forcibly open the door of the car, and attempted to compel Mr. Raghunath to hand over his camera, the two Indian diplomats were forcibly taken to a nearby building. Here after a further period of waiting in the hot sun, they were asked to enter the building, on the arrival of a member of the Security

Bureau.

(3) Here Mr. K. Raghunath gave the initial explanation to the responsible official of the Security Bureau, of the facts attending their presence in that area and put forward the reasonable demand that they should be allowed to get in touch with the Charge d'Affaires of the Indian Embassy. This reasonable demand was rejected out of hand and instead the unjustified demand was put forward that Mr. Raghunath should hand over the camera so that the film could be developed! Furthermore, the responsible officials of the Security Department asked the Chinese persons who had met the Indian diplomats at the temple to state their demands.

(4) The justified demands of the Indian officials to contact the Charge d'Affaires of the Indian Embassy were denied under pretexts that it was the Indian officials' own business to make arrangements to get in touch with their Embassy, that telephone lines did not connect from that location to Peking, that the only telephone there, was that of a military installation and could not be used, that they were not aware of the existence of any other telephone nearby etc. etc. Later on they were subjected to the pressure of surrendering the camera and the film with a guarantee that they would be allowed to contact the Embassy after the camera and film were given up. This so-called guarantee consisted in allowing them merely to telephone, but when it became clear that it would be necessary to try on more than one occasion, this was refused.

(5) After various kinds of harassment, which was made worse by the prolonged detention where the two Indian diplomats were not given an opportunity to take their lunch or other refreshments and prolonged interrogation by person after person and repeated threat that the anger of the masses would be turned against them, the two Indian diplomats were finally allowed to leave the spot only around 9-30 P.M. after a total period

of unlawful detention amounting to 8 ½ hours. Meanwhile, the camera and film were forcibly taken away from Mr. K. Raghunath and thereafter the absurd allegation was made that the processing of the film had shown that Mr. Raghunath had photographed prohibited objects. However, on questioning, they refused to clarify what these prohibited objects alleged to have been photographed were in fact. Further, a statement was prepared by the official of the Public Security Bureau which purported to be a factual record of the events and the threat was made that unless the statement was signed by Mr. Raghunath, he would not be permitted to leave and that he would be entirely responsible for the consequences of refusing to do so. Mr. Raghunath then pointed out that since it was claimed that the statement was a full record, it must include a reference to the period of detention and that it would be signed only after the reasonable demand already made, was met— namely that other responsible members of the Indian Embassy were also present on the scene. However, even these simple and legitimate requests were turned down and even more threats and pressures were brought to bear on them. It must also be pointed out that one of the Indian diplomats, Mr. Vijai who merely accompanied Mr. Raghunath and did not take any photographs, was also neither released from unlawful detention nor permitted to contact the Charge d'Affaires of the Indian Embassy. The two diplomats were permitted to leave the scene at 21.30 hours after detention for 8 ½ hours.

(6) Immediately on receipt of first information that the two Indian diplomats were under unlawful and unwarranted detention, the First Secretary of the Indian Embassy, Mr. C. V. Ranganathan, made telephonic contact with the Protocol Department of the Chinese Foreign Office and tried to explain the matter. The Protocol Department, however, refused to take the message on the three occasions that were tried but informed him to get directly in touch with the Foreign Security Bureau. He then approached the Foreign Security Bureau and was told that the

matter would be handled by the officials and the masses in the locality where the reported incident took place.

(7) Upon receipt of this information Mr. C. V. Ranganathan, First Secretary, accompanied by Mr. M. S. Rao, another First Secretary in the Indian Embassy, went in search of the location which was in Hsiang Shan Nan Lu and reached there approximately at 9 P.M.

(8) Upon arrival, the vehicle of Mr. K. Raghunath was found parked on the road-side on the road leading to the Temple of the Sleeping Buddha in the Western Hills area. When Mr. Ranganathan and Mr. Rao attempted to enter the building next to the parked car in order to find out the reasons for the detention of Mr. K. Raghunath and Mr. P. Vijai they were informed that it was a restricted area where foreigners were not permitted to enter. A few representatives of the masses came forward and carried on discussions with Mr. C. V. Ranganathan. Mr. Ranganathan pointed out that as a responsible official from the Indian Embassy he would like to discuss the matter with the responsible Chinese officials in the locality and attempt to solve the matter. The representatives of the masses first denied the presence of Messrs. K. Raghunath and P. Vijai by saying that the presence of the car did not mean that the persons in it were around and unreasonably refused to discuss the details of the incident and the manner of releasing Mr. K. Raghunath and Mr. P. Vijai. They categorically refused to allow Mr. C. V. Ranganathan to discuss the matter with the concerned official authorities on the spot. When he approached a person in uniform about further discussions on the matter, the latter pointed out to the representatives of the masses who were earlier discussing the matter with him that they were the responsible officials of the masses. Indeed the so-called representatives of the masses even stepped forward to confirm that they were entirely responsible for the conduct of the matter. They further insisted that unless the Foreign Ministry authorised Mr. Ranganathan through a letter that he was the responsible official to

handle the matter further discussions would not be carried on with him. Finally they threateningly demanded of Mr. Ranganathan and Mr. Rao to leave the spot immediately on the pretext that they were in a "restricted" area despite the fact that the two diplomats were on the main highway. The representatives also made allegations that the Indian Embassy had deliberately instigated this incident and made several rude and abusive remarks in this connection.

(9) Failing to obtain any satisfactory reply at the spot where Mr. K. Raghunath and Mr. P. Vijai were detained and being prevented from making liaison either with the above two diplomats of the Indian Embassy or with any other responsible official in charge of the station where they were unlawfully detained, Mr. Ranganathan and Mr. Rao returned to the Indian Embassy. Mr. Ranganathan then tried once again to contact the Protocol Department of the Foreign Office around 10 P.M. He explained the urgency of the matter and requested that a responsible official at the Foreign Office must meet him immediately. Upon being refused an interview, he attempted to explain the matter over the telephone and requested the Foreign Office to intercede and obtain the immediate release of Mr. K. Raghunath and Mr. P. Vijai. However, the Protocol Department refused to take any action in the matter and insisted that the Indian Embassy must wait till the next day before obtaining an interview and abruptly terminated the telephonic conversation.

(10) The Indian Embassy strongly protests against the unwarranted and unlawful detention of the two Indian diplomats for more than a period of 8 ½ hours from 1300 hours to 2130 hours in gross violation of their diplomatic privileges. This illegal action is further compounded by the fact that the responsible Chinese authorities on the spot did not permit the Indian diplomats to establish full contact with the Charge d'Affaires of the Indian Embassy.

(11) The Indian Embassy must further protest that no reasonable opportunity had been provided to either represent the matter personally or through the telephone with the Chinese Foreign Office. When an attempt was made to carry on a conversation with the concerned official of the Protocol Department of the Chinese Foreign Office, no cognizance was taken of the seriousness of the situation and no attempt was made either to obtain full facts or assist in the release of the two Indian diplomats. When failing to get any positive response from the Chinese Foreign Office or the Foreign Affairs

Section of the Public Security, responsible officials of the Indian Embassy proceeded to the scene, they were prevented from making contact with the unlawfully detained Indian diplomats and even from discussing the issue with responsible officials on the scene.

(12) The manner in which the whole incident was handled is, to say the least, most unsatisfactory and is a violation of established international practice and law. The Embassy also strongly protests against the intimidation and crude threats indulged in by the official from the Security Bureau in connection with the signing of a so-called statement. These actions of Security official came before the reasonable request of the Indian diplomats that they should get in touch with the Charge d'Affaires of the Indian Embassy, were met.

(13) The Indian Embassy demands that such unlawful detention of Indian diplomats and prolonged harassment does not recur again in the future.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 12 June, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 285

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses this note to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the espionage activities illegally carried out in Peking by members of the Embassy, states as follows:

On the afternoon of June 4, 1967 Second Secretary K. Raghunath and Third Secretary P. Vijai of the Indian Embassy drove to a place in the Western suburbs of Peking where, in brazen violation of China's laws and decrees known to all, they surreptitiously peered at and took photographs of a prohibited military area in the vicinity. Upon discovering them, soldiers of the Chinese People's Liberation Army guarding the area immediately urged them to desist and asked them to leave. K. Raghunath and P. Vijai, however, paid no heed whatsoever and continued to hang around and take photographs of the prohibited area stealthily. Finding the actions of these two men highly suspicious, the Chinese People's Liberation Army men detained them and sent them to an organ of public security for interrogations. The public security personnel ordered them to hand over the films, but they behaved in a most untoward manner and tried hard to play the fox and they were compelled to hand over the films only after they were severely rebuked by the public security personnel. After the films were developed on the spot, it was discovered that the ten and more photographs taken clearly constituted a complete topographical map of the prohibited area and adjacent areas. Caught redhanded with their spoils complete, K. Raghunath and P. Vijai could no longer deny their guilt and had to admit the facts and sign on the minutes of the interrogations.

Investigation has established that this was not the first time that K. Raghunath illegally engaged in espionage activities on Chinese territory. Since the beginning of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China, thinking that he could make use of this opportunity, K. Raghunath has been collecting everywhere political and military intelligence about China

in brazen violation of its laws and decrees, and his case is of a most serious nature. According to reports accusing K. Raghunath by revolutionary masses of Peking alone, K. Raghunath has sneaked into Chinese Higher Party and Government institutions several times and stolen into the reception centre of the cultural revolution group under the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party. In order to conceal his real identity, K. Raghunath has on more than one occasion most shamelessly pretended to be a staff member from the Embassy or a student of a friendly country like Pakistan or Nepal. In the course of stealing intelligence, K. Raghunath has on many occasions been caught by Red Guards, driven away by revolutionary masses or even taken to organs of public security where he admitted his mistakes. However, instead of reining in, K. Raghunath went still further and stole intelligence about a prohibited military area in flagrant disregard of intervention by the Chinese People's Liberation Army men. The facts have shown that K. Raghunath is an out and out spy under the cloak of a diplomat and has committed grave crimes against the Chinese people.

The Chinese Government is most indignant at such bare faced espionage activities by members of the Indian Embassy in China and lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government. The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs hereby solemnly notifies the Indian Embassy in China: the Chinese Government shall henceforth cease to recognize the diplomatic status of K. Raghunath, and K. Raghunath shall not be allowed to leave China before the Chinese judicial organs take sanctions against his crimes according to law.

Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 13 June, 1967

The Embassy of India in China addresses this note to the Ministry of

Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, and with reference to their Note Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 285 dated June 12th, 1967, handed over by the Deputy Director of the First Asian Department of the Chinese Foreign Office to the Charge d'Affaires of the Indian Embassy, would like to state as follows:

The Indian Embassy categorically rejects the allegations in the note that Mr. K. Raghunath, Second Secretary in the Embassy of India has ever indulged in espionage activities. The Indian Embassy further refuses to accept the unilateral action of the Chinese authorities in withdrawing the diplomatic status of Mr. Raghunath and will under no circumstance permit Chinese judicial organs to take so-called sanctions against him.

In the Indian Embassy note of June 5th, the full facts of the incident where Messrs Raghunath and Vijai happened to visit an ancient monument in the Western Hills area on Sunday the 4th June to take tourist photographs, their illegal detention for a period of 8 ½ hours where they were not permitted to make full contact with the Embassy and the violation of their diplomatic immunities were already pointed out. After Messrs Raghunath and Vijai were unjustifiably accosted by the masses who took objection to their taking photograph of a displaced lion in an ancient monument, Mr. Raghunath forthwith stopped taking any further photographs and Messrs Raghunath and Vijai attempted to proceed to their car to return to Peking. The statement in the Note of the Foreign Office, dated June 12th that soldiers of the Chinese People's Liberation Army guarding the area immediately "urged them to desist and asked them to leave and that in spite of this, Messrs. Raghunath and Vijai paid no heed whatsoever and continued to hang around and take photographs of the prohibited area stealthily" is a complete fabrication which is now being concocted by the Chinese authorities in an attempt to build up a story, for their own ulterior purposes. The truth of the matter is as pointed out above-namely that Messrs. Raghunath and Vijai, finding

that the masses were sensitive to Mr. Raghunath's attempt at photographing a displaced statue of a lion found in the premises of an ancient monument in the Western Hills area, desisted from further photography and proceeded to Mr. Raghunath's car, with the intention of leaving the spot. However, on finding themselves surrounded, and what is worse, on having the identity card of Mr. K. Raghunath, snatched from his hand and unlawfully kept by members of the masses, they were forced to wait until the unlawful authorities of the People's Republic of China could present themselves on the spot and allow Messrs. Raghunath and Vijai to leave the location.

The facts of the incident which took place on the 4th of June have been stated clearly in the Note of the Indian Embassy of June 5th, but the Chinese Foreign Office refused to take these into consideration by returning the note immediately. The Chinese Foreign Office have now in the note under reply fabricated a tissue of lies in an attempt to sound convincing and have cooked up various charges against Indian diplomats who have always respected Chinese laws and whose conduct has been unimpeachable.

In his meeting with the Deputy Director of the First Asian Department of the Chinese Foreign Office on the 12th June, the Charge d'Affaires of the Indian Embassy exposed as complete lies the utterly fantastic contents of the charges made against Mr. K. Raghunath, namely, that he has "engaged in espionage activities on Chinese territory" and that "since the beginning of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China Mr. K. Raghunath has been collecting political and military intelligence about China in brazen violation of its laws and decrees". The Indian Embassy must categorically point out here that neither Mr. Raghunath, nor indeed, any other member of the Indian Embassy, has at any time carried out any espionage, nor violated any of the known and established Chinese laws. The charge that Mr. K. Raghunath has sneaked into Chinese Higher Party

and Government institutions several times and stolen into the reception Centre of the Cultural Revolutionary Group under the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, is again, out and out a fabrication. The further ridiculous charge that Mr. Raghunath has on more than one occasion pretended to be a staff member of the Embassy or a student from a friendly country like Pakistan or Nepal is such a malicious lie that it is not even worth refuting.

One may ask the Chinese Government here, if it is considered illegal by the Chinese Government for a Chinese knowing foreign diplomat, to walk in the streets and read posters which are found everywhere in Peking city and also purchase such of those newspapers as are freely sold in the streets and made available to all persons who are willing to buy them? If such activities are illegal, then it is for the Chinese Foreign Office to issue an official notification, to this effect which is duly circulated to all Embassies in Peking through the usual channels. The Chinese Press on numerous occasions, and also high level Chinese leaders, have, on several occasions, referred to the world-wide significance of the Cultural Revolution and it is natural for anybody stationed in Peking to take an interest in happenings in China. On the other hand, the so-called 'revolutionary legality' where mass judgments are the only criterion for the legitimate activities of a diplomat is a novel circumstance prevailing in no other country except China. It is a well-known fact that the Chinese Government has restricted the rights of all diplomats stationed in Peking. Instances of this are too numerous to record but obviously the Chinese Government have gone to the utmost extent in singling out and victimising Mr. K. Raghunath, an Indian Diplomat.

If the Chinese Government is interested in the facts of the matter, the note of the Indian Embassy of June 5th has given a descriptive account of the circumstances surrounding the visit of Messrs Raghunath and Vijai to the Western Hills area. The innocent nature of their visit was

established beyond all measure of doubt. Since Mr. Raghunath is due to leave China shortly, he was interested in taking a few photographs of the scenic spots in Peking. The fact that the Chinese Foreign Office refused to accept the note, and what is worse, have taken eight days to fabricate the tissue of lies of which the Note dated June 12th consists, shows that the Chinese side is intent on making a big issue out of nothing. Against the background of known Chinese hostility to India and the recent scurrilous barrage of propaganda against the Indian Government, it is clear that the Chinese Government are bent on taking further steps to worsen Sino-Indian relations. The Chinese Government alone is aware of their ulterior motives.

While refuting the absurd charges that Mr. K. Raghunath has indulged in espionage activities or that he has committed any crimes against the Chinese people, the Charge d'Affaires of the Indian Embassy offered a reasonable solution which is in keeping with acknowledged diplomatic practice. He suggested that since it is evident that the Chinese authorities have taken an objection to Mr. K. Raghunath, the Indian Embassy would like to expedite his immediate departure from Peking and he requested the Chinese Government to afford all reasonable facilities. Mr. Raghunath's transfer from Peking was in any case due to take place towards the end of June. In reply to this reasonable request, the Deputy Director of the First Asian Department once again repeated the statement in the Note under reply that the Chinese Government no longer recognise the diplomatic status of Mr. Raghunath and once again put forward the illegal demand that Mr. Raghunath shall not be allowed to leave China before the Chinese judicial organs take sanctions against him in accordance with the law.

The Indian Embassy would like to make it quite clear here that—

(a) Mr. K. Raghunath continues to be the Second Secretary of the

Indian Embassy and under international law and practice, he will retain his diplomatic status till the moment he leaves China.

(b) There is no question of Mr. Raghunath being subjected to the Chinese Judicial organs for "sanctions" against non-existent crimes.

(c) Since his transfer from Peking was already decided upon by the Government of India, he is expected to leave China shortly.

The Indian Embassy would like to point out, in all seriousness, to the Chinese Foreign Office that if the Chinese authorities persist in the course of action outlined in the Note of the Chinese Foreign Office and in the meeting between the Deputy Director of the First Asian Department and the Indian Charge d'Affaires, they would be violating all canons of international law while at the same time taking a grave step in further worsening Sino-Indian relations. The serious consequences resulting from this must be solely borne by the Chinese side.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 June, 1967

No. 465 (48) -DIII/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to advise that with immediate effect and until further intimation, no privileged and non-privileged member of the staff of the Embassy or their families is permitted to proceed outside the limits of the New Delhi Municipal Committee and Delhi Municipal Corporation without the prior permission of Ministry of External Affairs (Protocol Division).

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

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 June, 1967

No. C/8/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India that Chen Lu-chih, First Secretary in the Embassy, has been gathering military intelligence and indulging in objectionable activities of a subversive character, prejudicial to the security and national interests of India.

The Government of India takes a grave view of the conduct and activities of Chen Lu-chih and lodges the strongest protest with the Chinese Government against the activities of Chen Lu-chih which amount to a gross abuse of diplomatic privileges. The Ministry of External Affairs hereby notifies the Embassy of the People's Republic of China that the Government of India shall henceforth cease to recognise the diplomatic status of Chen Lu-chih, First Secretary in the Embassy, and the said Chen Lu-chih shall not be allowed to leave India without the specific authorisation of the Government of India. As a consequence of the non-recognition of the diplomatic status of Chen Lu-chih, he becomes subject to the provisions of the Registration of Foreigners Rules, 1939. He is required to report himself immediately to the Foreigners Regional Registration Officer, Talkatora Barracks, New Delhi, for registration and such further instructions as may be given to him by that officer.

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to
the Embassy of China in India, 14 June, 1967**

No. C/9/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India that Chen Lu-chih, the former First Secretary has not complied with order to report himself to the Foreigners Regional Registration Officer, Talkatora Barracks, New Delhi, for registration and such further instructions as may be given to him by that officer. It has therefore been decided that he would be deported with immediate effect from the territory of India. The deportation order is enclosed which may be handed over to Chen Lu-chih, who it is understood is staying in the Embassy.

No. 14/61/67-F.VIII

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Ministry of Home Affairs

New Delhi, the 14th June, 1967.

ORDER

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the Foreigners Act, 1946 (31 of 1946), the Central Government is pleased to direct that the foreigner known as Mr. CHEN LU- CHIH—

- (i) shall leave India immediately;
- (ii) shall depart from India by air; and
- (iii) shall not thereafter re-enter India.

By Order and in the Name of President.

Sd./- FATEH SINGH,

Joint Secy. to the Govt. of India.

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to
the Embassy of China in India, 14 June, 1967**

No. C/10/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India that Hsieh Cheng Hao, Third Secretary in the Embassy has been indulging in various subversive activities prejudicial to the security of India.

The Government of India takes a very serious view of the conduct and activities of Hsieh Cheng Hao and hereby declares Hsieh Cheng Hao persona non grata. Hsieh Cheng Hao should leave the territory of India within 72 hours after the receipt of this note.

**Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of
External Affairs, New Delhi, 15 June, 1967**

No. M/527/67.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and, with reference to the Ministry's note dated June 13, 1967, states as follows:

The Indian Government has openly imposed unwarranted restrictions on the area of movements of the personnel of the Chinese Embassy. This is entirely a discriminative measure and a provocation against the Embassy in violation of international practice. The Embassy lodges a serious protest against it, refuses to accept it and demands that the Indian Government should immediately withdraw it.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 15 June, 1967

No. M/528/67.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and states as follows:

More than three hundred miscreants made harassments in front of the Chinese Embassy from 9-20 a.m. to 10-30 a.m. on June 14, 1967. They were shouting the extremely reactionary slogans vilifying Chairman Mao Tse-tung, the great leader of the Chinese people, and Premier Chou En-lai and wantonly made slanders against the diplomatic personnel of the Embassy. They put up reactionary placards on the wall of the Embassy's compound, broke the picture show-case of the Embassy with stone and threw stones into the compound of the Embassy.

This incident was obviously connived at and instigated by the Indian Government. The Indian Government has unshirkable responsibilities for this. The Embassy lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government against this serious action taken by the Indian Government for poisoning Sino-Indian relations. The Embassy demands that the Indian Government immediately punish the ring-leaders of the ruffians, compensate the losses of the Embassy and ensure against the recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 15 June, 1967

No. M/529/67.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and states as follows:

Since the evening of June 13, 1967, the Indian Government has deployed policemen and plain-clothe agents tightly around the Embassy compound. They have posed threateningly in front of the Embassy's gate and kept a close watch on the Embassy. They stopped at will all diplomats and other staff members of the Embassy who entered and went out of the Embassy, and made interrogations and searches. The staff members of the Embassy going to the telegraph office with telegrams were also stopped. The normal functioning of the Embassy has been seriously hampered. Diplomats of other countries who came to the Embassy were treated in the same way in complete disregard of the elementary diplomatic decorum.

What is particularly serious is that at 12.50 on June 15, when Mr. Feng Lieh-sun, Attache of the Embassy was carrying out his official duty at the gate of the Embassy, about ten plain-clothe agents and ruffians even surged forward and beat Mr. Feng on the head. At 11.40 on the same day, Mr. Chang Te-liang, Attache of the Embassy while driving out with two staff members of the Embassy, was stopped and encircled by thirty to forty Indian policemen and plain-clothe agents. The policemen drummed his car with lathies and the plain-clothe agents forced open the tail-cabin of the car. When Mr. Chang and his party alighted from the car to protest to the police, the plain-clothe agents threatened to beat him and his colleagues.

The series of frenziedly anti-China incidents as stated above have seriously encroached upon the diplomatic privileges of the Embassy,

obstructed the normal functioning of the Embassy and directly threatened the safety of the diplomats and other staff members of the Embassy. This is the extremely serious provocation against the Chinese Embassy. The Indian Government should bear the full responsibility for all these incidents. The Embassy lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and demands that the Indian Government immediately punish the plain-clothe agents and ruffians who beat the Chinese diplomat, withdraw various outrageous and unreasonable restrictions imposed on the Embassy and ensure against recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

The great leader of the Chinese people Chairman Mao Tse-tung has said: "we will not attack unless we are attacked; if we are attacked, we will certainly counter-attack." The Chinese people are not to be trifled with. If the Indian Government persists in acting wilfully and arbitrarily, it will surely eat its own bitter fruit.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 16 June, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 311.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states the following:

According to report from the Chinese Embassy in India, the Indian Government has groundlessly fabricated charges against First Secretary Chen Lu-chih of the Chinese Embassy in India, accusing him of "gathering military intelligence and indulging in subversive activities in India",

declared that it would not recognize his diplomatic status and ordered him to leave India at once. It has also slanderously accused Third Secretary Hsieh Cheng-hao of the Chinese Embassy in India of engaging in so-called various subversive activities, declared him persona non grata and ordered him to leave India within 72 hours. This is a step of serious provocation taken by the Indian Government in deliberately worsening the relations between China and India still further. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this.

It must be pointed out that this unwarranted step on the part of the Indian Government is a mean reprisal against the recent handling of the Raghunath espionage case by the Chinese authorities concerned, the aim being to cover up the unseemly conduct of members of the Indian Embassy in China. But this is futile. There is conclusive evidence for the crimes of espionage committed by K. Raghunath in China, which are undeniable. It is entirely just and necessary for the Chinese authorities concerned to deal with this case. The so-called "crimes" imposed on the Chinese diplomats by the Indian Government are sheer fabrications. Under the just and reasoned questioning by the Charge d'Affaires a.i. of the Chinese Embassy in India, the official of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs was utterly unable to produce any factual evidence and thus landed himself in an awkward predicament. By this practice, the Indian Government only further discredits itself and cannot do the least harm to the reputation of the Chinese diplomatic personnel. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the trumped-up charges levelled by the Indian Government against First Secretary Chen Lu-chih and Third Secretary Hsieh Cheng-hao of the Chinese Embassy in India and its absurd refusal to recognise the diplomatic status of First Secretary Chen Lu-chih. The Chinese Government has now decided to recall at once First Secretary Chen Lu-chih and Third Secretary Hsieh Cheng-hao. The Indian Government must effectively ensure their safety before their departure from India and must not on any pretext obstruct their normal diplomatic

activities, otherwise it has to bear responsibility for all the serious consequences arising therefrom.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 16 June, 1967

No. M/531/67.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, and has the honour to state that on the instruction of the Government of the People's Republic of China, Mr. Chen Lu-chih, First Secretary and Mr. Hsieh Cheng-hao, Third Secretary, of the Chinese Embassy, have been recalled back to China. They are going to leave New Delhi for China by air on June 17, 1967. It will be appreciated if the Ministry will render them necessary facilities at the earliest convenience. Their passports are enclosed herewith for action.

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

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 17 June, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 314.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states the following:

According to foreign dispatches, a horde of Indian ruffians broke into the Chinese Embassy in India on June 16, wantonly beat the Embassy personnel, damaged buildings and set fire to vehicles. These ruffians flagrantly hauled down the dignified national flag of the People's Republic of China from the mast and tore it up, brutally beat the Chinese Embassy personnel who were defending the flag, and seriously wounded eight of them. What is even more intolerable is that the Indian ruffians had the impudence of insulting the great leader of the Chinese people Chairman Mao. This is a most serious provocation to the 700 million Chinese people. These grave outrages violating the principles guiding international relations were entirely engineered by the Indian Government and have aroused the greatest indignation among the Chinese people. The Chinese Government hereby serves a serious warning on and lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government.

It must be further pointed out that trampling under-foot even the most elementary principles guiding international relations, the Indian Government has unscrupulously cut off the telecommunication between the Chinese Embassy in India and the Chinese Government, as a result of which the Chinese Government has so far been unable to obtain any report from the Chinese Embassy on this incident. The Chinese Government reserves the right of making further representations and raising demands when it receives an official report.

The Chinese Government now deems it necessary to adopt the following emergency measure: Starting from this very moment, person of Indian nationality in the Indian Embassy in China is allowed to leave the Embassy without the permission of the Chinese authorities concerned. Otherwise, the Indian side shall be held responsible for all the consequences.

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to
the, Embassy of China, 18 June, 1967**

No. C/11/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi that the Indian Embassy in Peking has, since the 17th June, 1967, been surrounded and besieged by Chinese hooligans, and totally prevented from functioning as a diplomatic Mission. The Embassy personnel and their families are in a state of siege, virtually held as prisoners in the Embassy without access to the outside world. Thousands of Chinese are milling around the Embassy, throwing stones at it, and have smashed the windows and doors of the Embassy. The Indian Embassy cannot communicate with its own Government. There is no doubt that this situation has been engineered and organised by the Chinese Government. This is evident from the fact that the Chinese Government demanded and compelled the members of staff and their families to evacuate from their residential premises at short notice, and ordered them to congregate in the Indian Embassy compound in Peking. The Chinese Government further had the audacity to stipulate a time-limit for this wholly illegal and unjustifiable demand, which is in total violation of international law and practice. In the process of moving the families of the Indian personnel of the Embassy, they were subjected to calculated harassment. Such beleaguering of the Indian diplomatic mission by the People's Republic of China is reminiscent of practices which were adopted by the Chinese imperial regimes in the past.

2. The Ministry protests most emphatically against the actions of the Chinese Government and the Chinese ruffians who have besieged the Embassy obviously at the behest of the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government's behaviour in having the Indian Embassy besieged is a total negation of international law and diplomatic practice, in consonance with

which alone can a diplomatic mission function. The Ministry demands that immediate steps be taken by the Government of the People's Republic of China, so that the siege of the Embassy is lifted, and all restrictions on movement in and out of Indian personnel are lifted. Unless the Chinese Government withdraws all restrictions and takes steps to bring to an end the state of siege of the Embassy within 24 hours, the Government of India will be obliged to take appropriate counter-measures, for which the Chinese Government will have to bear the sole responsibility.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 June, 1967

(67) Pu i1 Ya Tzu No. 325.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states as follows:

According to report from the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, eight members of the Chinese Embassy were seriously wounded during the grave incident on the afternoon of June 16, in which large numbers of ruffians were organized by the Indian Government to attack the Chinese Embassy in India, and the wounded are up to now still in a state of danger. The Chinese Government now decides to immediately dispatch a special plane of the Civil Aviation Administration of China to New Delhi via Dacca to bring back the wounded personnel mentioned above, and asks the Indian Government to provide necessary facilities. As the matter is urgent, a prompt reply is expected from the Indian Government.

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

the Embassy of China in India, 19 June, 1967

No. C/12/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs has come to understand that the Charge d'Affaires of the Chinese Embassy has made some requests about the further treatment of the four Chinese personnel who have been treated in the hospital and discharged yesterday as they required no further hospitalisation. These requests have been carefully considered. In the opinion of the doctors in the hospital, the discharged Chinese personnel have recovered. If, however, there is any special reason for which these discharged personnel require medical attention, the Embassy may request the authorities at Willingdon Hospital who have been instructed to provide a doctor to attend to the patients.

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to
the
Embassy of China in India, 19 June, 1967**

No. C/13/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India that Mr. Hsieh Cheng-hao, the former Third Secretary in the Chinese Embassy who had been declared persona non grata was permitted to stay beyond the original time-limit because the Chinese Embassy made a special request on the ground that Mr. Hsieh Cheng-hao was not fit to travel. It is now considered that sufficient time has been given to him and the Chinese Embassy is, therefore, informed that Mr. Hsieh Cheng-hao should leave Indian territory within 48 hours of the receipt of this note; he should also communicate to the Ministry of

External Affairs the route by which he intends to travel.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 June, 1967

No. C/14/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India that in view of the just indignation of the Indian people at the recent callous and uncivilised behaviour of the Chinese Government, the personal security of members of the Embassy cannot be guaranteed if they move out of the Embassy premises. All personnel of the Embassy are, therefore, required to stay within its premises until further advice from the Ministry of External Affairs. In case the Charge d'Affaires of the Chinese Embassy wishes to come to the Ministry of External Affairs in performance of his official functions, he will be provided with an escort; for this purpose, a request should be made to the Ministry on the telephone.

Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 19 June, 1967

The Indian Embassy in China addresses the present note to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China with reference to their Note (67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 325, dated the 18th June, 1967, and states as follows:

The request made by the Chinese Government in the said note to send a special plane of the Civil Aviation Administration of China to New

Delhi will not even be considered unless the Chinese Government immediately lifts the present siege of the Indian Embassy and guarantees the restoration of the normal functioning of the Indian Embassy.

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 June, 1967
(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 327.**

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states as follows:

According to reports from the Chinese Embassy in India at 1710 hours (New Delhi Time), June 16, 1967 over one thousand Indian ruffians surrounded the Chinese Embassy, carrying with them iron, bars, stones, etc., as murderous weapons and wildly shouting reactionary slogans insulting Chairman Mao, the great leader of the Chinese people. Half an hour later, these ruffians broke into the Embassy in batches by climbing over the wall or forcibly crashing open the gate and carried out wanton destruction. They smashed all the doors and windows of the Embassy buildings on the ground floor, destroyed the display cases of the Embassy and even blatantly went forward to haul down from the staff the national flag of the People's Republic of China. In order to defend the dignity of the national flag of the motherland, eight members of the Chinese Embassy, including diplomatic officials, put up a heroic resistance against this fascist outrage of the Indian ruffians. However, this bunch of inhuman Indian ruffians went to the length of savagely beating at will the above members of the Chinese Embassy who were defending the Chinese national flag, and seriously wounding First Secretary of the Embassy Chen Lu-chih, Attache Chang Teh-liang and the following working personnel of

the Embassy Li Szu-heng, Liu Chung-fu, Wang Li-jen, Hung Chuan-chia, Shen Kan-pei and Li Chao-chien. Everyone of them was wounded in more than ten places and covered with blood. Some were even beaten unconscious. The ruffians then took this opportunity to snatch away the Chinese national flag and tore it to pieces. At the same time, the Indian ruffians set fire to the Embassy garage, burning four motorcars and one motorcycle. Not until 1850 hours did this bunch of ruffians leave the Embassy.

It needs to be pointed out in all gravity that before the Indian ruffians attacked the Chinese Embassy, large numbers of Indian policemen had already surrounded it and that when the ruffians were breaking through the Embassy gate, carrying out wilful destruction and committing wanton assault within the Embassy, the Indian policemen on the spot, instead of stopping them, directly commanded and joined in these atrocities. After the Indian ruffians committed arson, the Delhi fire brigade delayed its arrival. And when it finally arrived at the scene, it made no effort at all to put out the fire, but stole away after staying for only five minutes. What causes especial indignation is that when eight members of the Chinese Embassy had been seriously wounded and their lives were in peril and when the Embassy had made several representations to the Indian Ministry for External Affairs asking for medical personnel to render them first-aid treatment, the Indian side purposely held the matters up for as long as four hours.

It must be further pointed out that while the Indian ruffians were assaulting the Chinese Embassy, the Embassy several times telephoned the Acting Director of the East Asia Division of the Indian Ministry for External Affairs, the Secretary to the Minister and the Secretary to the Indian Prime Minister to lodge protests and demanded that the Indian Government take immediate measures to stop this outrage. However, they all turned to deaf ear to this. Up to now there are still gathered

outside the Chinese Embassy large numbers of Indian troops, policemen, special agents and ruffians, and not only are the members of the Chinese Embassy deprived of the freedom of exit from the Embassy; the security of the Embassy and its personnel is still gravely threatened.

The whole series of facts mentioned above have fully proved that this grave incident of assaulting the Chinese Embassy was entirely planned and engineered by the Indian Government. This is a serious sanguinary crime committed by the Indian Government against the Chinese people and one more striking example of its flagrant transgression of international law and violation of the principles guiding international relations. This incident has completely revealed to the people of the whole world, the reactionary fascist features of the Indian Government. The Chinese Government and people must seriously warn the Indian Government: The 700 million Chinese people are not to be trifled with and the Chinese diplomatic personnel armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought are not to be bullied. If you do not immediately rein in before the precipice but want to further aggravate the relations between the two countries, then come out with all the "prowess" you still have! We will certainly take you on and keep you company to the end.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government against the serious incident of June 16 in which Indian ruffians insulted the great leader of the Chinese people, assaulted the Chinese Embassy, tore up the national flag of the People's Republic of China and brutally beat members of the Chinese Embassy. The Chinese Government demands that the Indian Government admit its mistake, make an open apology, immediately punish the culprits, compensate for all the losses, provide fully adequate medical facilities for the wounded Chinese personnel, and guarantee that no similar incidents will occur in the future. Furthermore, the Indian Government must bear entire responsibility for ensuring the security of the Chinese Embassy and all its

personnel. Otherwise, the Indian Government will be held fully responsible for all the grave consequences arising therefrom.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 June, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Tzu No. 329.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states as follows:

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China already presented a note to the Indian Embassy in China on June 18, 1967, announcing the Chinese Government's decision to send immediately a special plane of the Civil Aviation Administration of China to New Delhi to bring back the wounded personnel of the Chinese Embassy in India beaten by Indian ruffians on June 16. Now the Chinese Government has decided that the special plane of the CAAC is scheduled to take off from Kunming on June 21, and hereby notifies the Indian Government of the flight data concerning the Chinese special plane, the name list of the crew, the air route and the items calling for the assistance from the Indian authorities concerned. It is hoped that the Indian side will reply as soon as possible.

Enclosure

I. Data on the CAAC special plane

Type of plane: 11-18 passenger plane.

Number of plane: 220

Radio Telephone Call Signs: 220
Radio Telegraph Call Signs: BPFAX

Alternate plane
Number: 214
Radio Telephone Call Signs: 214
Radio Telegraph Call Signs: BPDNS

Markings of plane: The plane is silver white in colour, Painted with the national flag of the People's Republic of China the Chinese characters "Chong Guo Min Hang" and the number of the plane.

II. Name list of the crew of the CAAC special plane.

	Head: Yuan Tao-yuan.
	Captain: Chao Lu-tau.
	Pilots: Li Chi-cheng, Li Chang- hsin.
	Navigators: Wei Han-chang, Liu Wen-ming.
	Radio-operators: Chao Chun, Tsui Tien-fu.
	Mechanics: Chao Fa, Tai Hung- fu, Hu Yi-chou.

Service

Personnel: Li Shih-yun, Li Te-ming, Wang Fu-ping, Tang Yung-ying.

III. Route of the CAAC special plane.

The plane will take off from Kunming, overfly Lintsang, Lashio, Mandalay, Cox's Bazar and land at Dacca for refuelling: and then it will take off from Dacca, overfly Calcutta, Gaya, Varanasi, Lucknow and land at Palam Airport at Delhi.

The return flight will take the same route in the reverse direction.

IV. The Indian authorities concerned are requested to render assistance in the following:

(1) To keep in operation the tele-communication and navigational equipments at Palam Airport at Delhi and along the route during the flight.

(2) To provide the airports at Calcutta, Gaya and Lucknow as alternate airports.

(3) To provide the meteorological information of the airport for landing and the alternate airports mentioned above as well as that along the route.

(4) The Palam Airport at Delhi is requested to provide 15 tons of qualified JP-1 or TC-1 aviation kerosene and ground services for the IL-18 plane.

(5) To guarantee the safety of the plane during the flight in Indian air space and its stay at the airport at Delhi. The flight information will be transmitted by the radio station at Dacca Airport.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 June, 1967

No. C/15/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People's Republic of China that it has received the Chinese Government note No. (67) PU YI YA TZU-329, dated June 19, 1967, regarding Chinese

Government's intention to send a Chinese civil aircraft to Delhi, leaving Kunming on June 21.

2. With reference to this request, Chinese Government's attention is drawn to the note presented by the Embassy of India in Peking to the Chinese Foreign Office on June 19, prior to the Chinese Government's note, in which it was made clear that the Government of India will not be prepared to consider the request for clearance for a Chinese civil aircraft until such time as the siege of the Indian Embassy is lifted and normal functioning of the Embassy is restored. The Government of India's position remains unchanged and, therefore, permission cannot be granted at present.

3. Once the siege of the Indian Embassy in Peking is lifted and the Government of India are satisfied that the Embassy is free to function in the normal manner, the Government of India will be prepared to consider the Chinese Government's request on a reciprocal basis; that is to say, that as a quid pro quo for the Chinese Government's sending an aircraft here, the Government of India will send an aircraft to Peking to evacuate some of their personnel. The movement etc. of the Chinese and Indian aircrafts must be synchronised and other prior arrangements in that connection made in mutual consultation.

4. The Chinese Government refers to a "decision" to send immediately a special 'plane from Kunming on June 21, 1967, and "notifies" that Government of India of the flight data etc., concerning the Chinese special 'plane'. The Government of India would like to inform the Government of the People's Republic of China that any aircraft transgressing into Indian territorial space will be subject to the treatment prescribed under Indian laws, consistent with the preservation of the sovereign rights of the Government of India. If a Chinese aircraft comes into India without Government of India's authorization, the sole

responsibility for the consequences thereof will be that of the Chinese Government.

5. The Government of India wish to inform the Government of the People's Republic of China that the Chinese injured personnel have made a steady recovery. Most of them have been discharged from the hospital. In any case, the best medical attention is being made available to the Chinese Embassy in Delhi.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 June, 1967

No. C/16/67.

In continuation of their note No. C/15/67 dated June 20, 1967, Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People's Republic of China that it is understood that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China informed the Indian Charge d'Affaires in Peking that with effect from 16:30 hours (Peking Standard Time) on June 20, 1967, the restrictions imposed on the Embassy of India have been removed. Ministry of External Affairs wishes to inform the Chinese Embassy in Delhi that with effect from 0700 hours on June 21, 1967 the restrictions notified in the Embassy vide the Ministry's note No. C/14/67 of June 19, 1967 will be similarly removed.

2. Further in continuation of the note under reference the Government of India wish to inform the Chinese Government that they intend sending a special civil aircraft to Peking to airlift some of the Indian personnel in Peking. The details of the aircraft and its proposed schedule are indicated in the annexure to this note. The Chinese Government are requested to indicate immediately their agreement to the despatch of the Indian civil aircraft to Peking.

3. Subject to the Chinese Government so agreeing, the Government of India would have no objection to the Chinese Civil aircraft, whose details were given in the Chinese Embassy note No. (67) PU YI YA TZU No. 329 of June 19, 1967, coming to India to take back some members of the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi. The movements of the two aircraft must as far as possible be synchronized. The Chinese aircraft should arrive in Delhi on Friday, the 23rd June, 1967, along the route indicated in the Chinese note No. (67) PU YI YA TZU No. 329 of June 19, 1967. The two aircraft should leave the respective capitals on the forenoon of the 23rd June following the route of entry in reverse. The necessary facilities for the aircraft and authorisation for grant of the visas for the Indian crew may kindly be obtained.

4. On confirmation of above arrangements necessary authorisation and appropriate instructions will be issued by the Government of India.

Particulars of the special plane

Aircraft	DC-4 Skymaster
Markings	VTDIB
Sitting capacity	60 passengers
Freight capacity	6,000 pounds

Schedule of the flight (local time)

Dep.	2200 hrs	Calcutta
Arr.	0500 hrs	Bangkok
Dep.	0600 hrs	Bangkok
Arr.	1430 hrs	Hong Kong
	(Night-stop)	
Dep.	0300 hrs	Hong Kong
Arr.	0900 hrs	Peking

Dep. 1100 hrs Peking
Arr. 1900 hrs Hong Kong

Details of the crew

- (1) Capt. S. P. Jambuserwalla
- (2) Capt. A. Sinha
- (3) Capt. Savur
- (4) Radio Officer: S. N. Bhattacharji
- (5) Steward: H. D. Ganguly
- (6) Hostess: Miss Symons
- (7) Navigator: K. L. Dan Dona
- (8) Flight Engineer: M. Chatterjee
- (9) Another Flight Engineer: Mr. Kaneka.

Aviation fuel will be required at Peking. Other service facilities as asked for by the crew may also be rendered. Further information, if necessary, will be communicated before the date of the flight. The Chinese authorities are requested to guarantee the safety of the plane in Chinese air-space and during its stay at the airport in Peking.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 20 June, 1967

No. M/532/67.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and has the honour to state that on the instruction of the Government of the People's Republic of China, Mr. Hsieh Cheng-hao, Third Secretary of the Embassy, has been recalled back to China. He is going to leave New Delhi for China by air on June 21, 1967. It will be appreciated if the Ministry will render the necessary facilities to him at the earliest convenience. His passport is enclosed herewith for action.

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

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 June, 1967

No. C/17/67.

In continuation of the Note No. C/16/67, dated 20th June, 1967, the Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People's Republic of China that the Government of India had initiated all necessary arrangements for the reciprocal despatch of special planes between the two countries. These arrangements included the authorisation of necessary visas for the aircraft crew and other officials travelling in the plane and a request to the Chinese Government for navigational assistance, including the provision of the routing for the Flight from Hong Kong to Peking giving the full information for the tracks and distances, navigational and communication facilities, led-down charts for Peking and alternates and also maps and charts covering Chinese territory, since this information is not available with the Indian aircraft crew. Specifically it was hoped that the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi would issue, or would instruct the concerned agencies of the Government of the People's

Republic of China in Hong Kong to issue, entry visas to the members of the crew of the Indian aircraft.

2. We have now learned that the Indian Charge d'Affaires in Peking was informed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China this morning that it will not allow any Indian aircraft to fly to Peking. Indeed, we understand that the enclosure to the Ministry's Note No. C/16/67, dated 20th June, 1967, was rejected by the Chinese Foreign Office. The Chinese Government have themselves, in their Note No. (67) PU YI YA TZU No. 329, dated 19th June, 1967, given similar details about their plane.

3. Since the Government of India had agreed to the despatch of a civil aircraft from each country to the other on a strictly reciprocal and synchronized basis and since the Chinese Government have now expressed their unwillingness to admit the Indian plane into the Chinese territory, no permission can be granted for the Chinese Civil aircraft to come to India for this purpose. In any case, the proposal made in our note No. C/16/67, dated 20th June 1967, for a Chinese aircraft to come to India on June 23, 1967, stands annulled.

4. If the Chinese Government revises its decision and still wishes to despatch a plane to Delhi to take back some of their Embassy personnel, the Government of India are willing to consider their proposal, if strictly reciprocal arrangements are agreed upon for rendering navigational assistance and the authorisation of visas to the aircraft crew concerned and also the synchronisation of the movement of both aircraft. Further, a minimum of 60 hours advance notice must be given before the date of the synchronised entry of the aircraft of the two countries to the Capital of the other.

5. Meanwhile, Government of India is not proceeding with arrangements for the flight of its own aircraft to enter China on 23rd

June, 1967, and its conditional agreement to the flight of the Chinese civil aircraft to enter India on the same date stands withdrawn.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 21 June, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 335

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the two notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government to the Chinese Embassy in India transmitted by the Indian Embassy on June 20 and 21, 1967 respectively, replies as follows

It is entirely just and necessary for the Chinese Government to decide to send a special plane of the C.A.A.C. to New Delhi to bring back to China for medical treatment the personnel of the Chinese Embassy in India who had been brutally beaten and seriously wounded by Indian ruffians. However, the Indian Government has procrastinated and refrained from giving a direct answer. And now it has the impudence to create troubles by putting forward so-called "reciprocal" terms. This is indeed the height of absurdity. It is obviously an attempt to raise side issues and deliberately to obstruct the timely return of the wounded personnel of the Chinese Embassy to China for medical treatment. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against its presumptuous and unreasonable attitude.

As is known to all, eight members of the Chinese Embassy were seriously wounded as a result of the sanguinary atrocity in the assaults on the Chinese Embassy engineered entirely by the Indian Government on June 16. Every one of them received more than ten wounds, some were beaten unconscious and others sustained serious slits on the head, but

the Indian Government procrastinated and refused to provide first-aid treatment for them. Later on, although the wounded personnel were taken to the hospital, the Indian side adopted various discriminatory measures against them, and even the Chinese Charge d'Affaires a.i. and one of his friends were unwarrantedly refused permission to visit the wounded personnel in the hospital. The wounded personnel were also hindered by the Indian side from telephoning the Embassy about their cases. As a result, some of the wounded personnel are in a critical state even now, while others, although out of the hospital, are still in need of medical attention. The Chinese people and the family members of the wounded are very much concerned about them. It was in these circumstances that the Chinese Government decided to send a special plane to bring back to China the wounded personnel of the Chinese Embassy for medical treatment. This is entirely necessary and reasonable. There is no reason whatsoever for the Indian Government to obstruct it.

The Indian Government is completely groundless in putting forward the so-called "reciprocal" terms. We would like to ask: has anything like the sanguinary atrocity in the assaults on the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi ever happened in Peking? Is there any member of the Indian Embassy in China who has been wounded like members of the Chinese Embassy and therefore needs to be sent back immediately for medical treatment? What ground is there to speak of "reciprocity"? It must be pointed out that although the sanguinary incident created by India has aroused extreme indignation among the Chinese people, the Chinese side has exercised the utmost restraint and has effectively ensured the security of all the members of the Indian Embassy. The Chinese side has given very lenient treatment even to K. Raghunath, a spy who committed grave crimes in China. If members of the Indian Embassy have any need to go back to their country, they can very well leave Peking by plane or train as usual. What ground do you have to send a special plane to China? To be blunt, all you want to put up some show in order to cover up your sanguinary

crime of assaulting the Chinese Embassy, hoodwink the Indian people and fan up anti-Chinese feelings. The Chinese Government categorically rejects this unwarranted demand of the Indian Government. If the Indian Government clings to this despicable trick, it will only further reveal its ugly features before the people of the whole world.

The Chinese Government reiterates its reasonable demand for the immediate dispatch of a special plane to bring back the wounded personnel of the Chinese Embassy. The Indian Government must change its unreasonable attitude and give a prompt reply to the demand of the Chinese Government.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 22 June, 1967

No. C/18/67

The Ministry of External Affairs informs the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India that it has received the Chinese Note No. (67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu 335, dated June 21, 1967, which was transmitted to the Indian Embassy at 0130 hours on June 22, 1967.

The Government of India rejects the protest and the so-called 'demand' of the Chinese Government to unilaterally send a Chinese aircraft to Delhi.

The Chinese Government have already been informed through Government of India's Notes and in the conversations with the Chinese Charge d'Affaires that the best medical attention possible has been made available for the treatment of the Chinese personnel who received injuries on the 16th June. An offer for expert medical facilities was made to the

Charge d'Affaires by a senior official of the Ministry of External Affairs soon after the incident occurred. The Charge d'Affaires had then stated that he would inform the Ministry if any Indian medical help or hospitalisation was necessary. Even before the request came from the Charge d'Affaires, on instructions from the Ministry of External Affairs, doctors with ambulance proceeded to the gate of the Chinese Embassy. The Chinese Interpreter himself has expressed satisfaction at the treatment given by the Indian medical authorities to the seven Chinese officials who were admitted to the Indian hospital. Four members of the Chinese Embassy were discharged from the Hospital on the 18th, two on the 20th June and the last patient has been sent back to the Chinese Embassy today, after the doctors certified that they had improved and required no further hospitalisation. It is evident that the Chinese personnel have received prompt and expert medical attention and those, who were sent to the Indian hospital, have improved, if not fully recovered. The offer to treat any other Chinese Embassy patient on this or any other occasion, with expert medical attention, has been made and is hereby reiterated. There is, therefore, no question of the Indian Government evading its responsibility.

The Government of India categorically deny the repetition of the insinuation that they engineered the incident of 16th June. The Foreign Minister of the Government of India, in his statement made in the Indian Parliament on the 17th June—to which the attention of the Chinese Charge d'Affaires has already been drawn—explained that the incident was due to the provocation caused by the entirely unjustifiable charge levelled and inhuman treatment meted out to the two Indian diplomats at Peking and on their way to the Chinese border. While responsibility for these provocations rests with the Chinese Government, the Foreign Minister has already deplored the intrusion into the Chinese Embassy and the fact that in this the Chinese Embassy officials should have suffered injuries.

There is clear evidence that the Chinese Government itself was behind the totally unjustifiable and extraordinary procedure of declaring a diplomat as a spy unilaterally depriving him of his diplomatic status and trying him in absentia in the so-called "People's Court, Peking" in contravention of international law and practice. It was also responsible for the harassment and indignities heaped on the Indian diplomats. It is clear that the Chinese Government have neither the intention nor the courage to condemn the unwarranted derogation from diplomatic usage, international law and propriety in their treatment of the two Indian diplomats in China.

The Chinese Government in its note has the presumptuousness to suggest that there is no need to send a special plane to bring back the personnel of the Indian Embassy, particularly the women and children who were subjected for four days to a siege and inhuman and uncivilised mental torture by the so-called 'masses' which surrounded and demonstrated outside the Indian Embassy. The families were given barely two hours' notice to leave their homes and reach the Embassy quarters. The Chinese Government did not provide any transport for them and even prevented the Indian transport in the Embassy to go to the respective houses and bring them to the Embassy premises. The families which included women and small children, were subjected to the incessant blare of loudspeakers, stone-throwing and for a while refusal of all supplies. The Government of India was fully within its responsibility to decide to make special arrangements to evacuate the Indian personnel who had been subjected to these indignities by the despatch of an Indian aircraft to bring them back to India. The Government of India remain eager to send a special aircraft and are willing to make reciprocal concessions to the Chinese Government.

If, however, the Chinese Government cannot see its way to permit an

Indian civil aircraft to proceed to Peking to evacuate the Indian personnel, the Government of India likewise are unable to agree to a Chinese civil aircraft flying to India. The Government of India has as much sovereign rights over its own territorial airspace as the Chinese Government exercises over her own territory. The Indian proposal for reciprocal and synchronised despatch of aircraft was a reasonable and satisfactory method for both Governments to meet the situation. Since the Chinese Government are not prepared to concede the Indian request, the Government of India have nothing more to add to the position already clarified in its note No. C/17/67, dated the 21st June, 1967. They are not prepared to accept the 'demand' of the Chinese Government to send a special plane to India on a unilateral basis.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 23 June, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 354.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the two notes of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India, dated June 21 and 22, 1967, states the following:

The above two notes of the Indian Government fully prove that it has deliberately obstructed the sending of a Chinese special plane to New Delhi to bring back the personnel of the Chinese Embassy who were beaten and seriously wounded by Indian ruffians. In its notes, the Indian Government quibbles, beats about the bush and distorts the facts for the sole purpose of creating pretexts to refuse the Chinese special plane's flight to New Delhi and thus to cover up the sanguinary crime it has

committed. The Chinese Government expresses utmost indignation at this unreasonable act of the Indian Government and lodges a strong protest against it.

It is very clear that from the very outset the Indian Government has been most afraid of China's despatch of a special plane to India to bring back the wounded personnel of the Chinese Embassy. Back on June 18, the Chinese side suggested the despatch of a special plane to New Delhi. On June 19, it informed the Indian side of the date of the time, night route, etc. in connection with the despatch of the special plane. Failing to find any justification for rejection, the Indian Government resorted to a pretext for refusing to consider China's demand to despatch a special plane by unwarrantedly linking this despatch with the so-called lifting of the "siege" on the Indian Embassy in China, which are two entirely different things. In view of the fact that the Indian Government has restored the tele-communications between the Chinese Embassy in India and Peking, the Chinese side announced on June 20 the cancellation of the emergency measure taken against the Indian Embassy in China. In these circumstances, having failed in one trick, the Indian Government resorted to another by absurdly raising so-called "reciprocal" terms and asserting that it, too, would send a special plane to Peking to bring back part of the personnel of the Indian Embassy in China. Not a single member of the Indian Embassy in China has been wounded and the need for a special plane simply does not exist. This unreasonable demand of the Indian side has already been thoroughly refuted by the Chinese Government in its note of June 21. At the end of its tether, the Indian Government could only repeat its hackneyed tune and resort to sophistry on the question of the spy K. Raghunath and even went to the length of vainly trying to blame China for the Indian Government's crime of instigating ruffians to assault the Chinese Embassy in India. This is indeed a ridiculous deceptive trick. But it can fool no one.

In brazenly organising ruffians to assault the Embassy of a country and thus perpetrating fascist atrocities rarely found in the history of international relations, the Indian Government has already become utterly discredited before the world. And now it has further used the above - mentioned despicable means in rejecting China's demand to send a special plane to bring back the wounded personnel. In so doing the Indian Government fancies itself very clever but actually it is just lifting a rock only to drop it on its own feet and has thus further revealed its own weaknesses and rascal nature and once again lost face before the world.

In view of the fact that the personnel of the Chinese Embassy beaten and wounded by Indian ruffians are in urgent need of going back to China for further medical treatment, while the Indian Government places endless obstacles in the way of China's reasonable demand for sending a special plane, the Chinese Government has decided that they leave India through regular air service as soon as possible. The Indian Government must ensure the safety of Chinese First Secretary Chen Lu-Chih and other wounded personnel and facilitate their travel and must not engage in any sabotage or obstruction. Otherwise, the Chinese side will adopt the necessary corresponding measures. Don't say you are not warned in advance.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 29 July, 1967

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India has learnt that Mr. Chu Chim Hsin, a Chinese teacher, and Mr. Shu Kuei, a Chinese dentist, both residents of Calcutta for a long time, have been unreasonably ordered to leave India by the Government of West Bengal, India.

Mr. Chu Chim Hsin has lived in India for over twenty years. He was detained and sentenced to rigorous imprisonment by the Indian local authorities on September 5, 1966 when he, due to poverty and ill-health, could not leave India as unwarrantedly demanded by the local Government. Not until February 28, 1967, was he released. After his release, the Government of West Bengal continued to persecute him and again ordered him to leave India in May last.

Mr. Shu Kuei has lived in India for more than thirty years and has been carrying on honest profession of dentistry. He was also unreasonably ordered in May last to leave India by the Government of West Bengal, India.

The Embassy lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against its persecution of the Chinese nationals and demands that the Indian Government immediately withdraw its expulsion order served to Mr. Chu Chim Hsin and Mr. Hhu Kuei and stop all forms of persecution of Chinese nationals in India.

In disregard of repeated reasonable demands, representations and protests by the Chinese Government and the Chinese Embassy, the Indian Government, far from taking measures to stop its acts of trampling underfoot grossly the norms of international relations, is turning from bad to worse to unscrupulously persecute Chinese nationals. This fully shows that in order to sell itself out to U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism, the Indian Government has launched frenzied anti-China activities and is deliberately deteriorating the relations between the two countries. The Embassy hereby makes it clear to the Indian Government that the Chinese people armed with the great thought of Mao Tse-tung, and the great socialist China are not to be humiliated. By continuing to oppose China wildly and persecuting Chinese nationals, the Indian Government is surely lifting a rock only to drop it on its own feet and will come to no

good end.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 15 August, 1967

(67) Pu Ling Yi Fa Tzu No. 178.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China notifies the Indian Embassy in China of the following:

Owing to the needs of the Municipal Administration of Peking, the Peking Municipal Real Estate Administrative Bureau has decided, in accordance with the pertinent articles in the land lease contract it signed with the Embassy on March 31st 1954, to withdraw the land which has been lent to the Embassy and which is situated at number 24 of the anti-imperialist road (formerly number 32 of Tung Jiao Min Hsiang). The Bureau asks the Embassy to leave the place and return the land to the Peking Municipal Real Estate Administrative Bureau within two months from the day the Embassy receives the present Note.

As for the buildings on the land mentioned above, the Peking Municipal Real Estate Administrative Bureau will purchase them at a price to be fixed by the two sides through consultation.

As for the Chancery of the Embassy, there are buildings available in the Embassy quarters in Peking. The Embassy can rent them by directly contacting the Peking Diplomatic Personnel Service Bureau.

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

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 26 August, 1967

No. M/557 /67.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India and states the following:

After a short period of home leave, four staff members of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China came back to New Delhi on July 25, 1967. At Palam Airport, New Delhi, the Indian Customs, on instruction of the Indian Government, forcibly took away and detained unreasonably all the forty copies of Chairman Mao's works and other books which the above-mentioned personnel of the Embassy brought with them. Up till now twenty copies of Chairman Mao's works and other books are still being detained by the Indian Government without justification. Despite repeated representations with the Indian Government by the Embassy on this matter, the Indian Government has so far refused to return these books even though it has no reason to offer. This arbitrary and unreasonable act of the Indian Government openly and flagrantly violated the principles of international relations and international practice, thereby seriously affecting the study and work of the Embassy's personnel. For this, the Embassy lodges a strong protest with the Ministry of External Affairs.

The Indian Government's vicious act of detaining Chairman Mao's works is another grave matter following the large-scale anti-China bloody incident on June 16, 1967, in which Indian ruffians organized by the Indian Government wantonly insulted Chairman Mao, the great leader of the Chinese people, and assaulted the Chinese Embassy, and also the atrocities perpetrated by the Indian Government on June 24, 1967 in directing policemen and special agents to seize Mr. Chen Lu-Chih, First Secretary of the Embassy at Palam airport. This is another

serious provocation of the Indian Government to the 700 million Chinese people.

It is by no means accidental that the Indian Government has been creating one anti-China incident after another. For a long time, especially since the launching of the great proletarian Cultural Revolution in China, the Indian Government mortally fears and intensely hates the fact that the Indian people warmly love Mao Tse-tung's thought. To cater to the needs of American imperialists and Soviet revisionists and to maintain its shaking rule, the Indian Government even at the cost of selling out the interests of the Indian people, repeatedly created ugly anti-China incidents in a vain attempt to check the rolling torrent of the Indian people who are marching forward to study and grasp Mao Tse-tung's thought, and the influence of the great proletarian cultural revolution in China. Now it even goes as far as to deprive the Embassy's personnel of their sacred right to study and spread Mao Tse-tung's thought. This only serves to expose fully your reactionary nature and ugly features. The spread of the ever radiant thought of Mao Tse-tung is irresistible. All evil remnants of society which try to prevent the advance of history will ultimately be crushed by the wheels of history.

The Embassy sternly demands that the Indian Government immediately return those copies of Chairman Mao's works and other books which are still being detained and ensure against any similar incident in future.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 September, 1967

No. 465(48) DIII/67

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the

Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and in continuation of their Note No. 465(48)-DIII/67, dated the 13th June. 1967, requiring the Embassy personnel, privileged and non-privileged and the members of their families, not to proceed outside the limits of the New Delhi Municipal Committee and the Delhi Municipal Corporation, without the prior permission of the Ministry of External Affairs (Protocol Division), have the honour to say that in view of the recent attempts on the part of the Embassy staff to travel outside the aforesaid limits without obtaining the requisite permit before-hand, the Embassy is further required to obtain prior permission of this Ministry for any member of their staff to proceed to any of the Railway Stations within the above-mentioned Municipal limits.

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

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 10 September, 1967

No. M/568/67.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India replies in refutation of the telephonic message from the Protocol Division of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, at 9 P.M. on September 9, 1967, regarding the travel to Calcutta of the Chinese Charge d'Affaires a.i. and party as follows:

On the matter of the travel of the Chinese Charge d'Affaires a.i. and party, the Embassy had given advance notice to the Ministry in normal manner. The Protocol Division of the Ministry should have, under pretext of so-called obtaining of prior permission for personnel of the Embassy to leave Delhi, unwarrantly restricted and obstructed them to carry out their official duties and should have declared that "the responsibility of the

consequence of violating the restriction will be your own". This is sheer discrimination, harassment and threat to personnel of the Embassy, and is an act of wantonly trampling under foot the norms of international relations and intentionally further poisoning relations between China and India. The Embassy categorically refuses the said message and lodges a strong protest with the Ministry.

The Chinese Charge d'Affaires a.i. and party have the full right to leave Delhi to carry out their official duty in accordance with their plan. If the Indian Government insists on its unreasonable restriction to provoke and make trouble, it must be held responsible for all the serious consequences arising therefrom.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 September 1967

C/24/67

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in order to bring the following facts to the attention of the Chinese Government.

The Government of India have received information from the Government of Nepal that the Chinese Government have demanded that the furniture in the building of the Indian Consulate General in Lhasa now under the care of the Nepalese Consulate General in Lhasa should be handed over to the Chinese authorities within 7 days. The Government of India register a strong protest against this illegal and arbitrary act and reserve their right to take necessary and appropriate action.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 September, 1967

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and has the honour to state that, in order to afford special protection to the Chinese Embassy and its personnel and in conformity with the practice followed by the Chinese Government vis-a-vis the Indian Embassy and its personnel in Peking, the Government of India have decided to observe the following procedure:

- (1) All invitations issued by the Chinese Embassy and its personnel to persons other than Diplomats accredited to the Government of India should be sent to the Ministry of External Affairs, Protocol Department for scrutiny and necessary action.
- (2) All the invitation cards together with lists of invitees with their full addresses, in quadruplicate, may be furnished to the Ministry of External Affairs not less than a week in advance of the date for which the invitation is intended.
- (3) All non-China based employees of the Chinese Embassy will be required to obtain passes from the Ministry of External Affairs. Similarly, tradesmen and other persons having regular business with the Chinese Embassy will also be required to obtain passes from the Ministry of External Affairs.
- (4) This procedure will come into force with immediate effect.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China is requested to submit the list of the names and addresses of their non-China based personnel and the tradesmen etc. visiting the Embassy, in quadruplicate, to the Protocol

Department of this Ministry.

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

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 September, 1967
(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 614.**

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and makes the following reply in refutation of the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India dated September 20, 1967:

In its note the Indian Government unreasonably laid down the rule that all invitations issued by the Chinese Embassy in India must be sent to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs not less than a week in advance of the date for which the invitation is intended with lists of invitees in quadruplicate. The Indian Government also unreasonably decided that tradesmen and other persons having regular business with the Chinese Embassy must obtain passes from the Indian Ministry of External Affairs. This is another step of gross discrimination taken by the Indian Government on the heels of the recent series of its unreasonable measures against the Chinese Embassy, aimed at further obstructing and disrupting the normal diplomatic functions of the Chinese Embassy and further worsening the relations between the two countries. This is another serious move in the Indian Government's intensified anti-Chinese activities. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government and firmly rejects its measures of discrimination. The Indian Government must immediately cancel all its unreasonable restrictions on the Chinese Embassy and ensure the normal performance

of its diplomatic functions.

In its note, the Indian Government quibbled that it had decided to take those measures against the Chinese Embassy in conformity with the practice followed by the Chinese Government vis-a-vis the Indian Embassy in China. This is sheer fabrication. The Indian Embassy in China has always enjoyed the same treatment as all other diplomatic missions in Peking. The Chinese Government has not taken any measures of discrimination against the Indian Embassy, measures different from those vis-a-vis other diplomatic missions. This is clear to all. But the series of measures taken in close succession by the Indian Government are directed exclusively against the Chinese Embassy and constitute a discrimination against it. This contemptible practice on the part of the Indian Government has crudely violated the elementary principles guiding international relations.

In particular, it should be pointed out that the Indian Government has taken these measures of restriction under the pretext of protecting the "security" of the Chinese Embassy just at a time when the national day of the People's Republic of China is drawing near. This is obviously a plot of the Indian Government to sabotage the forthcoming national day reception by the Chinese Embassy and to create anti-Chinese incidents deliberately. This Chinese Government hereby serves a grave warning on the Indian Government: You must guarantee the smooth proceeding of the national day functions of the Chinese Embassy free from any harassment or sabotage. Otherwise, you must be held responsible for all the consequences.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 September, 1967

No. C/25/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the

People's Republic of China in New Delhi, and with reference to the Chinese Government's note of August 15 states the following:

The Indian Embassy in Peking has been notified by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese Government that the land leased to the Indian Embassy and at present housing its premises is being withdrawn by the Chinese Government; it has been, moreover, demanded of the Indian Embassy in this note that it should return the land and move to new premises within two months of the receipt of the note. The Chinese Government are no doubt fully aware that the terms of the contract governing the lease of this plot of land signed on 31st March, 1954, stipulate that at least 6 months prior notice should be given to the Lessee, should the Lessor wish to withdraw the plot. Attention of the Chinese Government is specially drawn to the relevant portion of Clause II (v) which states as follows:-

"If the demised premises shall, during the term of these presents, be required by the Lessor for any special purposes the Lessor shall be entitled by notice in writing to terminate the lease of the said premises on any date named, such notice not being less than six months from the date thereof

The Chinese Government's demand, therefore, clearly contravenes the terms and conditions of a legal contract to which the Chinese Government are a party. The representatives of the Indian Embassy who discussed this matter with the Consular Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese Government on August the 16th and August the 18th, 1967 specifically drew the attention of the Chinese Government to this violation of the contract.

The lease contract governing the land housing the present premises of the Indian Embassy also carries a clear stipulation that "the Lessor at the

time of service of notice to terminate the lease shall offer to the Lessee another plot or plots of land offering no less amenities for the purposes of the Embassy of India in Peking". It was indicated by Mr. Lao Lin of the Consular Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese Government in his meeting on August 18, 1967 with Mr. C. V. Ranganathan, First Secretary of the Indian Embassy in Peking, that the Chinese Government had withdrawn the plot of land earmarked for construction of the Indian Embassy in Peking. However, as the Indian Embassy has already communicated in its note of June 1st, 1967, addressed to the Diplomatic Personnel Services Bureau in Peking, that the Government of India are willing to consider relinquishing the lien on the present plot of land provided they can sign a lease contract for an alternative plot of land for construction of its Embassy buildings, subject to the conditions mentioned in the note of June 1 referred to above. Although it is almost four months since this note was addressed to the Chinese Government, no reply has so far been received. It is hoped that this matter will be finalised without any further delay in accordance with the proposals made in the Indian Embassy's note of June 1.

Since the Chinese Government are bent upon ejecting the Indian Embassy in Peking from its present premises, the Indian Government are asking the Indian Embassy in Peking to move under protest to the premises at No. 6 and No. 8 Kuang Hua Lu as soon as it is practicable. However, as it has already been conveyed to the Chinese Government, this decision is subject to the understanding that:

(a) the Chinese Government shall extend the lease for the buildings at No. 6 and 8 Kuang Hua Lu beyond February, 1968 (the date of expiry of the present lease), on the same basis as for those buildings located in the area which have been leased by other diplomatic missions;

(b) the Chinese Government shall provide alternative accommodation for

the present occupants, members of the Indian Embassy, of the Kuang Hua Lu buildings;

(c) the Chinese Government shall carry out such necessary repairs and alternations in the Kuang Hua Lu buildings as to render them fit for use as Chancery and Residence;

(d) the Chinese Government shall pay compensation to the Government of India for the loss of its buildings on the present premises on a replacement basis, and

(e) the Chinese Government shall provide all necessary facilities for effecting these transfers, detailed arrangements of which will be worked out by the Indian Embassy in Peking with the local authorities.

The Government of India protest against the unilateral repudiation by the Chinese Government of their legal contractual obligations and reserve the right to take such further appropriate steps as might be necessary to protect their interests.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 7 October, 1967

No. C/27/67

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and returns the enclosed note from that Embassy. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China and the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi have made a habit of addressing notes to the Indian Embassy in Peking and to the Ministry of External Affairs in New Delhi respectively in language quite unfamiliar to international diplomacy. The enclosed note of the Chinese

Embassy has transgressed the norms of diplomatic practice even further, and is not only couched in undiplomatic language but has even used invectives to make patently false and slanderous allegations.

Consequently, the Ministry of External Affairs returns the note herewith.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 7 October, 1967

M/587/67

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India and, with regard to the visit of its Charge d'Affaires a.i. and party to Calcutta on official duty once again states as follows:

The Indian Government on two occasions on September 8 and 10, 1967 obstructed the Charge d'Affaires a.i. of the Chinese Embassy and party from visiting Calcutta to perform official duties, and sent a note to the Embassy further restricting unreasonably the Embassy personnel to the extent that even for proceeding to any of the railway stations within Delhi they had to obtain prior permission. This is sheerly an act of rudely trampling under foot the norms of international relations and of deliberate worsening the relations of the two countries. For this, the Embassy lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government and sternly demands that the Indian Government immediately withdraw the discriminatory restrictions on the Embassy personnel. The Embassy hereby affirms that it reserve the right for further representations.

Now, Mr. Chen Chao-quan, Charge d'Affaires a.i., Mme. Cheng Yu-shu, Second Secretary, Mr. Chou Ping-yi, Third Secretary and Mr. Chou Chin-ho, Staff Member, of the Embassy have again decided to proceed to Calcutta by air on October 14, 1967 to visit Chinese nationals there. The

Indian Government is duty bound to guarantee the smooth proceeding of their visit to Calcutta to perform official duties, and give a prompt reply.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 12 October, 1967

In connection with the Chinese Embassy's note dated October 7, 1967 to the Indian External Affairs Ministry regarding the Chinese Charge d'Affaires a.i. and party to Calcutta on 14 instant to pay a visit, the Ministry made a telephone call on October 9, 1967 to the Embassy making further inquiries. The Embassy has to give its reply to the phone call in writing since the Duty Officer of the Ministry in the morning of 12 instant refused to take the message on the telephone.

It should be pointed out that the inquiries from the Ministry made on the telephone are sheer discrimination and harassment to the Embassy. The Charge d'Affaires a.i. and party are to go to Calcutta by air, and this has already been mentioned in the Embassy's note. They intend to stay there for about a week to ten days. Due to the harassment of the Indian Government, their intended address in Calcutta and means for their return journey are unable to be decided yet. Though the passport numbers of the Embassy members accompanying the Charge d'Affaires a.i. do not seem to have any connection with their travel within India, and these numbers are already with the Ministry, the Embassy furnishes with regret the same to the Ministry as desired:

- (1) Mme, Cheng Yu-shu No. D. 001334 (2) Mr. Chou Ping-yi No. D. 001083
- (3) Mr. Chou Chin-ho No. S. 002064

A reply to the note of the Embassy is expected before 14 instant, their

departure date.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 12 October, 1967

No. M/590/67

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, in refutation of the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated October 7, 1967 as follows:

The note dated October 6, 1967 sent to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India by the Chinese Embassy in India exposed with full facts the vicious practice in sabotaging the Embassy's National Day reception by the Indian Government. Being inwardly guilty before the unrefutable facts, the Indian Government should have returned the above-mentioned note of the Embassy under the pretext of so-called matter of language. It is in vain that the Indian Government attempts in this way to evade the responsibility in sabotaging the Embassy's National Day reception. While expressing its indignation over the above-mentioned behaviour of the Indian Government the Embassy reiterates its following four-point demands sternly raised in the above-mentioned note to the Indian Government:

- (1) publicly apologize for its crime in sabotaging the Embassy's National Day reception,
- (2) cancel all discriminative restrictions on the Embassy,
- (3) withdraw the secret agents, policemen and tents posted around the Embassy,
- (4) ensure against any similar incident in the future.

The Indian Government should give a prompt reply to the demands of the Embassy.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 14 October, 1967

No. M/591/67

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, and states as follows:

It is to impose entirely discriminative restrictions against the Chinese Embassy that the Indian Ministry of External Affairs has requested the Chinese Embassy to obtain passes for all its non-China based personnel from the Ministry. For several days since October 8, 1967, the Indian Government had further directed its secret agents posted at the Embassy's gates to stop and ask the non-China based personnel of the Embassy to produce "passes" and interrogated them when they came to the Embassy to attend to their work or returned to their dormitories. Though all the non-China based personnel of the Embassy are holding their identity cards issued by the Embassy which fully established their identity, the Indian side still insisted in their holding passes issued by the Indian External Affairs Ministry. Such action apparently amounts to sheer harassment and deliberate hindrance to the Embassy's normal functioning. For this, the Embassy lodges a strong protest with the Ministry and affirms that it reserves the right of making further representations. The list of the names and addresses of the non-China based personnel of the Embassy, in quadruplicate, is forwarded herewith. The Ministry should immediately hand over their passes to the Embassy.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 October, 1967

No. 465 (48) -DIII/67

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Embassy's note No. M/590/67, dated October the 12th 1967, draws the Embassy's attention to the procedure indicated in the Ministry's note No. 465 (48) -DIII/67 of September the 20th, 1967. This procedure introduced in the interest of the security of the Chinese Embassy and its personnel was not observed by the Chinese Embassy, and invitations were sent out by the Embassy direct to persons other than diplomats accredited to the Government of India. The Government of India take a serious view of this failure on the part of the Chinese Embassy to comply with the procedure laid down by them.

2. Those invitees to the Chinese National Day reception who turned up were allowed to attend the function after verifying that they had been in fact invited. If the number of Indian invitees attending the function was insignificant, it was because the overwhelming number of the Indian invitees returned or declined the invitations. The allegation that the Government of India "sabotaged" the Chinese National Day function in New Delhi is patently false. The Ministry of External Affairs rejects the Chinese Embassy's note of October the 12th and the absurd "demands" contained in it.

3. The Ministry of External Affairs expects the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi to co-operate in observing the procedure laid down in its note of September the 20th, referred to above. The Chinese Embassy alone will

be held responsible for all the consequences of its failure to observe this procedure.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 October, 1967

No. 465 (48) -DIII/67

The Ministry of External Affairs acknowledges Note No. M/591/67, dated October 14, 1967, from the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, enclosing a list in quadruplicate of non-China based personnel of the Chinese Embassy and states as follows:

The list enclosed with the Chinese Embassy's note under reference gives residential addresses of only the first ten persons. In the case of the remainder, evidently their occupational address, namely, 50-D, Shantipath, Chanakyapuri, New Delhi-21, has been given. The Chinese Embassy are requested to intimate the permanent residential addresses of persons mentioned at Sl. Nos. 11 to 25 in the list to enable the concerned authorities of the Government of India to undertake necessary scrutiny and security check.

The persons mentioned at Sl. Nos. 1 to 10 in the list will be issued passes by the Protocol Division of the Ministry of External Affairs and should be advised to present themselves at the Ministry (South Block, Gate No. 5) on Monday November 6, 1967, between 1500 and 1700 hours, to complete the necessary formalities. The passes will have to be signed by the holders in the presence of the issuing authority. The ten persons under reference should also be advised to bring with them two passport size photographs of themselves as well as documentation to establish their identity.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 October, 1967

No. C/29/67

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in reply to the Embassy's note No. M/520/67 of May 24, 1967, and states as follows:

The allegations made by the Chinese Embassy in its above note about the detention/confiscation of the mails addressed either to the Embassy or by name to the Charge d'Affaires of the Embassy from Peking and Hong Kong in the months of July and August, 1966, have been thoroughly investigated and found to be entirely baseless. The Ministry of External Affairs, therefore, rejects the note.

The Ministry would like to draw the attention of the Chinese Embassy to the Ministry's note of February 9, 1965, in which the regulations regarding transmission of publications or documents through ordinary mails from abroad to India have been stated very clearly. Mails sent through ordinary post are, in accordance with international practice, subject to normal checks. The Government of India are within their sovereign right to prohibit the entry into India of publications which interfere in India's internal affairs or which directly or indirectly question the territorial integrity of India or which slander India's friendly relations with a third country.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 October, 1967

No. 465 (48) -DIII/67

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and in continuation of the Ministry's note No. 465 (48) -DIII/67, dated the 13th June, 1967, states as follows:

To enable the Ministry of External Affairs to process the requests of the Chinese Embassy and make necessary security arrangements in respect of visits by its members outside the municipal limits of Delhi and New Delhi, the Embassy is requested to invariably furnish the following details at least a week in advance of the intended date of travel:

- (a) Full names of the members of the party along with their designations;
- (b) Detailed itinerary indicating mode of travel and giving details of flight no., train no., etc., and
- (c) Places and duration of halt outside Delhi with full addresses at which each member of the party proposes to stay.

Note given by Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 5 November, 1967

No. 606

The Embassy of India in Peking addresses the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the admission made by the Deputy Section Chief of the Consular Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in his interview with Mr. M. S. Rao, First Secretary of the Embassy on November 1, 1967 regarding the confiscation of Indian religious institutions in Shanghai, and the expulsion of two Indian nationals Mr. Prem Singh and Mr. Kishan Singh from China, has to state as follows:

Indian religious institutions in China have been subjected to systematic trespass and desecration by hooligans since August, 1966, when the desecration of the Sikh Gurdwara temple in Tientsin was brought to the notice of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in this Embassy's note No. 237 of September 28, 1966 which has remained unheeded. In November 1966 the Parsi Prayer Hall and Cemetery situated at 539 Fu Chou Lu, Shanghai, were occupied by unauthorised persons who refused entry to the representatives of the Indian Embassy who had gone there to investigate the matter. The Indian Embassy's communication of December 6, 1966 protesting against the illegal occupation of the Parsi temple and cemetery was ignored by the Chinese Government. In January 1967 Gurdwaras in Shanghai were broken into by hooligans who smashed the windows and doors of the Gurdwaras and even went to the extent of forcibly seizing ceremonial swords and kirpan from one of the locked rooms of the Gurdwara situated at Pao Shan Road. This matter was brought to the notice of the Foreign Affairs Bureau at Shanghai and the Consular Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Peking by Mr. M. S. Rao, First Secretary of the Indian Embassy, in January 1967 after he had visited Shanghai and personally ascertained the facts for himself. In his interviews with the representatives of the Chinese Government on both these occasions, Mr. Rao had demanded that full protection should be afforded to all religious institutions belonging to Indian nationals against their wanton desecration by hooligans.

If it is the declared policy of the Chinese Government to permit freedom of religious belief in China, the actions of the Chinese Government are at variance with their words. Not only have no steps been taken by the Chinese Government to provide the minimum protection to Indian religious institutions, but on the contrary, the representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs have tried to justify the vandalism of street mobs as "revolutionary actions" by the masses.

The Chinese Government have now gone further by confiscating all the three Gurdwaras in Shanghai and expelling Mr. Prem Singh and Mr. Kishan Singh who were office-bearers of the Gurdwara. In the meeting of November 1st, in a futile attempt to justify all the past illegal actions of the Chinese authorities, the Deputy Section Chief of the Consular Department, put forward the patently absurd explanation that the Gurdwaras were confiscated because holy swords, described as "military weapons" were found in them. The Chinese Government is surely aware of the fact that such swords are a part and parcel of the ceremonial and religious worship in Gurdwaras all over the world. Indeed, these have been in the Shanghai Gurdwaras ever since their inception. In describing the swords as "military weapons" the Chinese Government are making a pitiable attempt to white-wash their own hypocritical and illegal confiscation of the Gurdwara properties and expulsion of the two innocent Indian nationals.

As for the confiscation of the Parsi Temple and cemetery, the belated explanation given by the Deputy Section Chief of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is even more ridiculous. The Chinese authorities seem to make the discovery now at this late stage that the trustees of the Parsi Temple Hall were collecting intelligence about China. The fact of the matter is that the trustees of the Parsi Temple and Cemetery left China several years ago. This clearly proves the totally fictitious nature of the trumped-up charge that the Parsi Temple authorities were responsible for "collecting intelligence" about China.

The record of the Chinese Government's action towards the Indian religious institutions in China over the last one year clearly proves that they have thrown to the winds their own declared policy and principles and out of ulterior political motives resorted to high-handed and arbitrary actions in confiscating the three Gurdwaras and the Parsi Temple and

Cemetery in Shanghai. Their action in expelling the Indian nationals, Mr. Prem Singh and Mr. Kishan Singh, on the grounds that they were responsible for the swords found in the Gurdwaras is also marked by the same disregard of principles and truth. By these actions, the Chinese Government stand unmasked before the bar of world opinion as a Government whose actions and words cannot be taken seriously. The Chinese Government will do well to take note of the fact that their unwarranted action against Indian nationals and Indian religious institutions in Shanghai have wounded the religious sentiments of the Sikh and Parsi communities and indeed incensed popular sentiments in India. The Chinese Government alone will be responsible for the consequences that will follow from their high-handed behaviour.

The Embassy of India registers a strong protest against the expulsion of the two Indian nationals, Mr. Prem Singh and Mr. Kishan Singh, on absurd and fabricated charges and against the confiscation of the three Sikh Gurdwaras and the Parsi Temple and Cemetery in Shanghai. The Indian Embassy further demands the restoration of these places of worship as well as the Parsi Cemetery for religious purposes along with the valuables and the movable properties confiscated and full compensation for the damage caused to these properties. The Indian Embassy reserves the right to raise further demands as and when more facts are made available.

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

No. M/599/67

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, and with reference to the Ministry's note dated October 26, 1967 states as follows:

Though all the non-China based personnel of the Embassy are holding their identity cards issued by the Embassy, which fully establish their identity, the Indian Government still unreasonably insists in their holding passes issued by the Indian External Affairs Ministry. Such an action apparently amounts to sheer harassment and deliberate hinderance to the Embassy's normal functioning. For this, the Embassy in its note to the Ministry dated October 13, 1967 lodged a strong protest with the Ministry, while affirming that it reserved the right of making further representations, forwarded the list of names and addresses of the non-China based personnel of the Embassy and demanded of the Ministry to hand over immediately their passes to the Embassy. Up till now, the Ministry has not only delayed in issuing the passes, but also put up new conditions in its note of October 26, 1967. All this fully proves that the issuing of passes to the non-China based personnel of the Embassy by the Indian Government is absolutely not out of actual need, but is aimed at political discrimination and deliberate harassment to the Chinese Embassy. The Embassy reiterates its protest with the Indian Government and states once again that it reserves the right of making further representations. The Indian Government should issue the passes to the non-China based personnel of the Embassy without further delay, and not make unreasonable altercation any more to hinder the functioning of the Embassy.

Note given by the Embassy of India in China, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, 9 November, 1967

No. 610

The Embassy of India addresses itself to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China and has to state as follows:

It has come to the notice of the Indian Embassy that a document- film

produced in China entitled "Seriously Punish the Indian Spy Raghunath" has been shown for public viewing in Peking.

The baseless nature of the charges concocted against Shri K. Raghunath, formerly Second Secretary of the Indian Embassy in Peking in pursuance of China's anti-India policy and the series of illegal actions taken by the Chinese Government and authorities against him in contravention of international law and practice, have been exposed in the Indian Embassy's notes of 5th and 13th June, 1967 and in the meetings held in the Chinese Foreign Office between the Indian Charge d'Affaires and the Deputy Director of the First Asia Division of the Chinese Foreign Office on June 12th, 1967 and in the two separate meetings between the Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs and the Chinese Charge d'Affaires in New Delhi on June 13th, 1967.

Now the Chinese authorities, going a step further, have produced a film which is nothing but a photographic record of China's callous violation of international law and international practice in respect of Shri K. Raghunath, formerly Second Secretary of the Indian Embassy, and the official sanction behind the outrageous treatment given to him. The exhibition of the film is obviously a calculated attempt to further whip up anti-Indian feelings in China and to worsen relations with India and exposes China's hostile behaviour and intentions towards India.

The Indian Embassy strongly protests against the production of this film and its exhibition and demands its immediate withdrawal from public screening.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 11 November, 1967

No. M/605/67

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, in refutation of the Ministry's note dated October 20, 1967 and states as follows:

The Indian Government wantonly sabotaged the National Day reception held by the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India on October 1, 1967. This is a reality which everyone can see and is absolutely undeniable. It only amounts to absolute absurdity on the part of the Indian External Affairs Ministry to keep on talking loosely in its note about the so-called steps taken "in the interest of the security of the Chinese Embassy and its personnel". Does the Indian Government mean to say that in dispatching hundreds of policemen and secret agents to have the Embassy encircled, invitation cards snatched away from the guests attending the Embassy reception, and to have a number of these guests assaulted and wounded, it has acted "in the interest of the security of the Chinese Embassy and its personnel"? Right upto this day, the Indian secret agents are still posted around the Embassy with their tent pitched close to the Embassy's main gate only at a distance of several metres. These Indian secret agents closely follow on the heels of the Embassy personnel whenever they go out and keep a watch on them, stop, interrogate, harass and abuse at will all kinds of visitors to the Embassy. They even beat up some children who came to the Embassy personnel for Chairman Mao's badges. This is precisely the way the Indian Government is restricting and sealing off the Embassy by resorting to all unscrupulous means. Such behaviour of the Indian Government not only crudely violated all norms of international relations and deliberately further worsens the relations between China and India but also fully exposes its difficult internal and external situation and its weak nature. It is fully in accordance with unalterable principles that the Embassy has demanded sternly in its notes that the Indian Government should publicly apologise

for its crime in sabotaging the Embassy's National Day reception and ensure against any similar incident in the future. The Embassy asserts once again that the Indian Government must cancel all discriminative restrictions on the Embassy, and withdraw the secret agents, policemen and tents posted around the Embassy. Otherwise, the Indian Government must bear the full responsibility for further worsening of the relations between the two countries.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 November, 1967

No. C/30/67

The Ministry of External Affairs draws the attention of the Embassy of People's Republic of China to its note No. M/521/67 of May 25, 1967, and states as follows:

The Embassy had already been informed on more than one occasion that Mr. Huang Kui-ting has been kept under detention for activities prejudicial to the security of India. However, since the Embassy of People's Republic of China have approached the Ministry of External Affairs for Mr. Huang's release, the Government of India are prepared to consider allowing him to leave the country along with his wife provided all arrangements for his departure from India are completed by the Embassy and a confirmation to this effect is received by the Ministry of External Affairs from them. Further necessary action for his release from the detention will be taken only after receipt of the confirmation from the Embassy about the completion of the arrangements for his departure and also the name of the port from which he will leave the country.

The above-mentioned decision has been already conveyed to Mr. Chou Ping-yi, Third Secretary of the Chinese Embassy on the 31st August, 1967 and a reply from the Chinese Embassy is still awaited. The responsibility

for the continued detention of Mr. Huang Kuiting, therefore, devolves upon the Chinese Embassy. The Embassy's protest of May 25 which is quite unwarranted is hereby rejected.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 November, 1967

No. 465 (48) DIII/67

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Embassy's note dated the 6th November, 1967, states as follows:

The Chinese Embassy in its note has levelled unwarranted allegations against the Government of India. The Ministry of External Affairs had, in its note No. 465 (48) -DIII/67 of the 26th October, 1967, indicated that passes would be issued on November 6, 1967, to the ten non-China based officials of the Chinese Embassy whose residential addresses had been forwarded to the Ministry along with the Embassy's note of the 14th October. Nine of these persons came to the Ministry of External Affairs on the 6th November to complete the formalities and were issued requisite passes on that day. The tenth person, Mr. T. M. Pandurangan, however, did not report to the Ministry.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China was requested to intimate the full residential addresses of these non-China based personnel whose address in the list enclosed with the Embassy's note of 14th October, 1967, was shown as "50-D, Shantipath, Chanakyapuri, New Delhi-21" which is the address of the Embassy. Instead of complying with this request and furnishing the relevant information, the Embassy apparently sent these people to the Ministry even though no appointment

etc. had been made for them. Even so the concerned security authorities permitted them to complete the formalities but could not issue them passes until necessary verification etc. could be made for which their permanent residential addresses were essential. Had the Chinese Embassy either been consistent in giving the residential addresses of its employees or later co-operated in furnishing the required details, the security verification etc. could have been undertaken earlier. Consequently, the responsibility for any delay rests wholly on the Chinese Embassy.

In the absence of the Embassy's co-operation the relevant information had to be ascertained from the persons concerned and this has been duly processed and checked. The remaining persons can now be issued passes and they may be advised to present themselves at the Ministry (South Block, Gate No. 5) on Tuesday, the 28th November, 1967, between 3 p.m. and 5 p.m.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 21 November, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 742.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's republic of China addresses this note to the Indian Embassy in China and makes the following reply in refutation of the Embassy's note No. 610 dated November 9, 1967:

K. Raghunath, former Second Secretary of the Indian Embassy, was a spy sentenced by the Peking Municipal Higher People's Court and expelled from China on June 15, 1967. In its note to the Indian Embassy dated as early as June 12, 1967, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs

fully exposed and gave a detailed account of his espionage crimes in China, and this was made public before the world. Raghunath's espionage crimes have been fully established by iron-clad evidences and allow of no denial. It should be pointed out that in sending its diplomatic personnel to engage in such shameless espionage activities, the Indian Government has completely violated international law and practice. Yet the Indian Embassy slanderously counter-charged in its note that the Chinese Government was violating international law and practice. This is completely reversing right and wrong, like a thief crying "Stop thief!" and will come to no avail.

The documentary film "Severely Punish the Indian Spy Raghunath" has, in a just and factual manner, recorded Raghunath's espionage crimes in Peking and the Chinese people's perfectly justified indignation at his crimes. It is entirely China's internal affairs to produce and show publicly a film about a foreign spy's sabotage activities in China and the Indian Government has no right whatsoever to interfere in it. The Indian Embassy's attempt to prevent the showing of this documentary film and even to make use of the occasion to vilify the Chinese Government only serves to prove that the Indian Government, conscious of its guilt, fears that its dirty doings might be made public. For the above reasons, the Chinese Government categorically rejects the unwarranted protest and demand of the Indian Embassy.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24 November, 1967

No. C/31/67

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and returns the enclosed note received on the 23rd November, 1967 from that Embassy. The attention of the

Chinese Embassy has been previously drawn to its use of language which did not conform with diplomatic practice. In the enclosed note again the Chinese Embassy has used phrases such as "the deceitful rubbish of the Indian Government". This note has moreover slandered the Indian Government as well as some other Governments friendly to India by attributing motives which, apart from being patently false, are quite irrelevant to the context. Consequently, the Ministry of External Affairs returns the note herewith.

If the Chinese Embassy has any complaint or protest to make and expects the Government of India to take any cognizance of it, that Embassy is advised to address its communications in language recognised by diplomatic parlance.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 November, 1967

(67) Pu Ling Yi Fa Tzu No. 410

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses this note to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note No. C/25/67 of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government to the Chinese Embassy in India, dated September 26, 1967, states as follows:

The question of the moving of the Indian Embassy has been dealt with entirely through consultations. The responsible official from the Consular Department has explained to the Embassy that the authorities concerned had taken note of the article concerning the giving of six months' advance notice. Owing to the needs of the Municipal administration and in view of the fact that there are buildings at two sites

readily available in the Embassy quarters for the Embassy to choose from, the actual work of moving will not require much time, and it is, therefore, entirely practical and feasible to ask the Embassy to move within two months. The Charge d'Affaires of the Embassy Mr. R. D. Sathe stated that he was willing to co-operate and would not create obstacles. Later, the Embassy did not wish to lease the new premises and decided to move to No. 6 and No. 8 Kuang Hua Lu, and asked for eight flats to be arranged for the personnel of the Embassy and a series of repairs to be made. The authorities concerned speedily met these requests and provided full facilities. The Embassy is fully aware of all this. However, the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government brazenly raised a protest in disregard of the above facts. This is totally unwarranted. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs rejects the protest of the Indian side and deeply regrets this creation of side issues to complicate the matter. A month has already passed since the expiration of the time limit for moving set by the authorities concerned, and yet the Embassy has not moved. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs hopes that the Embassy will adopt a correct attitude towards the various kinds of assistance and facilities provided by the authorities concerned of the Chinese side, and will move as soon as possible from the present premises and return the land.

As for the compensation for the buildings of the Embassy, it will be settled through consultations between the two sides in accordance with what was stated in the note dated August 15 of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

With regard to extending the lease for the buildings at Kuang Hua Lu and the land required for the construction of its new premises, the Embassy may contact the Service Bureau for Diplomatic Personnel.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 November, 1967

(67) Pu Ling Yi Tzu No. 412

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses this note to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the Embassy's note No. 606, dated November 5, 1967, states the following:

1. The persons in charge of the Indian Sikh temples in Shanghai have long kept in secret Japanese military swords, military sabres, a rifle bayonet, pistol cartridges and a portrait of the bandit Chiang Kai-shek, thus seriously violating China's laws and decrees and jeopardizing public order. The Indian in charge of the Parsi temple and cemetery under cover of religion, collected military and economic intelligence and supported and provided shelter for a reactionary clique to carry out counter-revolutionary activities in the temple. The evidence for these criminal activities is well established and allows of no denial. It is therefore a matter of course for the Chinese local authorities to ban these unlawful religious institutions, and the judicial sanctions taken against those in charge of these institutions are due punishment meted out to them for their crimes. This is entirely the Chinese people's internal affairs. But in its note the Indian Embassy still repeated its hypocritical arguments refuted long ago on many occasions, tried hard to distort the facts and viciously slandered the Chinese Government's policies on religion. What is more, the note flaunted such words as "desecration" and "religious sentiments" in a vain attempt to deceive people and achieve the criminal aims of covering up the Indian nationals' criminal acts against the law and of opposing China by inciting the religious sentiments of those believers who were ignorant of the actual facts. This is utterly futile. The protest raised by the Embassy on this matter cannot but be regarded as

deliberate trouble-making. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs categorically rejects this protest.

2. As everybody knows, it has been the consistent policy of the Chinese Government to protect religion. The great numbers of Buddhists, Christians and Moslems all enjoy their freedom of religious belief in China, and their temples, churches or mosques have been duly protected. The Indian nationals' Sikh temples in China have similarly been protected by the Chinese Government and have all along enjoyed the privilege of exemption from real estate taxation. In order to show consideration for the Sikhs' religious life, the Shanghai local authorities have provided extra supplies to the Sikh temples each month. Over a long period of time, the local authorities gave preferential treatment to the dairies run by the Sikhs, such as the purchase of their milk and cow-dung at a price higher than the market price and a higher supply quota of cattle fodder to the Sikhs than to the Chinese breeders, etc.

However, the Chinese Government absolutely will not allow anyone to carry out under cover of religion unlawful and criminal activities harmful to the Chinese people. In June, 1949 the Shanghai local authorities issued the decree of confiscating all illegal weapons. But the Sikh temples secretly kept Japanese military swords, military sabres, a rifle bayonet and pistol cartridges over a long period without reporting and handing them over to the authorities concerned. Hidden behind the glass frame holding a religious image was a portrait of Chiang Kai-shek, the public enemy of the Chinese people. The military swords and sabres found there all bear the mark of the Japanese army. Yet, you describe these weapons used by the Japanese militarists to slaughter the Chinese people during their aggression against China as "holy swords". This precisely reveals your ugly feature of acting as a cat's paw. The persons in charge of the Parsi temple and cemetery, in league with the social scum of China, carried on activities harmful to the Chinese people. All these are what the

Chinese people absolutely will not tolerate.

3. The imperialists, the modern revisionists and all reactionaries have time and again struck up anti-China choruses, and the Indian Government has played a most ignominious role in such choruses. When the one million serfs in China's Tibet won liberation from the yoke of the darkest serfdom, the Indian Government set in motion all its propaganda machines wantonly slandering the Chinese Government as abolishing religion in Tibet and even repeatedly provoked armed conflicts on the border and supported the traitor Dalai in carrying on criminal activities against the Chinese people on Indian territory. And now to meet the needs of its domestic and foreign policies, the Indian Government is trying to make use of the unimpeachable act of the Shanghai local authorities in dealing with the case of violation of law by the Indian temples to make unbridled vilifications against the Chinese Government and stir up anti-Chinese sentiments so as to divert the attention of the people. By so doing, the Indian Government can gain nothing out of it, but can only prove that it has come to the end of its tether in opposing China. If the Indian Government goes on making troubles, it must bear full responsibility for all the consequences arising therefrom.

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to
the Embassy of China in India, 14 December, 1967**

No. C/32/67

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, New Delhi and with reference to the note No. (67) Pu Ling Yi Fa Tzu No. 410 of November 24, 1967 of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese Government states as follows:

2. The Chinese Government's claim that "the question of the moving

of the Indian Embassy has been dealt with entirely through consultations" does not accord with facts. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese Government in their note No. (67) Pu Ling Yi Fa Tzu No. 178 of August 15, 1967 arbitrarily announced the withdrawal of the land leased to the Indian Embassy and thereby unilaterally repudiated the legal agreement governing the lease of the land occupied by the Indian Embassy in Peking. The Government of India had made their position abundantly clear in their note No. C/25/67 of September 26, 1967 that the Indian Embassy in Peking were compelled by the arbitrary action of the Chinese Government to shift from its premises at 24 Anti-Imperialist Street, Peking (formerly 32 Tung Chiao Ming Hsiang) and consequently did so under protest. It is, therefore, quite untenable for the Chinese Government to claim that the Indian Embassy has moved to its new premises "entirely through consultations".

3. It is quite extraordinary that in their note of November 24, under reply, the Chinese Government should acknowledge that "the authorities concerned had taken note of the article concerning the giving of six months advance notice" and then go on to admit that this contractual term was being unilaterally disregarded by them "owing to the needs of the Municipal Administration". It is also rather amazing that the same note should then talk about the expiration of the time limit of two months arbitrarily set by the Chinese authorities and yet maintain that it was all being done in 'Consultation' with the Indian Embassy in Peking.

4. The Indian Embassy in Peking has shifted to the new premises No. 6 and 8 Kuang Hua Lu as soon as it was practicable. Consequently the premises at 24-Anti-Imperialist Street, Peking, consisting of buildings and fixtures totalling 251 chens including 195 ½ chens of storeyed building with installed central heating equipment, 1 chien of tiled building, 2 chens of building with cemented roof, 8 chens of corridor, 13 chens of garret and 6 chens of basement together with equipment, etc. have been

vacated under protest. The Chinese Government may take possession of these from the Embassy of India in Peking.

5. The Government of India once again draw the attention of the Chinese Government to Clause No. II (5) of the Lease Agreement signed on 31st March 1964 and hope that a suitable "plot or plots of land of no less amenities" will be offered to the Indian Embassy in Peking without further delay. It should be noted that the Indian Embassy in Peking had been asked to move to the new premises on certain clear understandings set out in the Ministry of External Affairs note of September 26, 1967 to the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi. It is, therefore, assumed that the Chinese Government will honour the understanding, particularly relating to the question of compensation for the property in question.

6. The Government of India once again reiterate that the Chinese Government have unilaterally repudiated their legal contractual obligations and reserve the right to take such further steps as might be necessary to protect their interests.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 11 January, 1968

No. M/629/68

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and states as follows:

The Chinese Embassy addressed a note to the Indian External Affairs Ministry on November 22, 1967 to make a representation with the

Ministry regarding the most unreasonable action of the Indian Government in dispatching secret agents to encircle and keep a watch on the Embassy, thus making it unable to carry out its normal functions and in deliberately threatening its security. It was precisely because of finding itself devoid of all arguments before numerous irrefutable facts that the Ministry should have returned the Embassy's note under the pretext of "language". This act can only further expose that the Indian Government does not want to reduce its various unreasonable actions infringing upon the diplomatic privileges of the Chinese Embassy, but to deliberately intensify its sealing off and restrictions on the Embassy in an attempt to bring all the activities of the Embassy to a standstill so as to further worsen the relations of the two countries.

Turning facts upside down, and confusing black with white, in order to cover up its above vicious aim, the Indian Government even describes its various discriminative restrictions and unreasonable measures imposed on the Chinese Embassy as "protection". It is actually the most queer language in the history of international relations. But no matter what excuse the Indian Government makes, facts can never be covered up. The Embassy, now gives only a few specific cases as follows:

1. On October 8, 1967, an Indian secret agent followed a non- China based personnel into the Embassy compound to interrogate him and thus violated the diplomatic privileges of the Embassy.

2. On October 27, 1967, a car of the Indian secret agents closely tailed the Embassy's car to the Chelmsford Road and in an attempt to make provocation, dashed against the car of the Embassy deliberately. It seriously threatened the security of the personnel of the Embassy who were in the car.

3. On October 28 and 31, 1967, the Indian secret agents twice

threatened and forcibly turned back from entering into the Embassy an Indian technician who had come to repair a duplicating machine of the Embassy, and thus hampered the concerned work of the Embassy for several days.

4. On October 31, 1967, a Chinese national and members of his family were called back, even after they had entered the gate of the Embassy in a taxi, by a blustering secret agent to be interrogated and harassed, and had their names, addresses and occupations etc. registered. It was only after some members of the Embassy intervened that they were allowed to enter the Embassy.

5. On October 31, 1967, three Indians with the connivance and co-operation of Indian secret agents broke into the Embassy to hand over a slanderous and threatening letter. When the letter was refused, these Indians, while leaving the Embassy, pulled their neckties slanting to one side and unbuttoned their shirts. An unidentified person at the gate of the Embassy took photographs for them just in time by a camera kept ready with a pre-plan to fabricate false evidence. They again conspired with the secret agents and then left. On the next day, Delhi newspapers carried the rumour that the Second Secretary of the Chinese Embassy had injured three Sikh leaders. It is quite obvious that the Indian secret agents actively engineered and engaged in this political scheme of circumventing the Embassy and whipping up anti-China sentiments.

6. On December 6, 1967, Indian Secret agents forcibly turned away a messenger of the telegraph office with an urgent telegram for the Embassy. When the man tried to come to the Embassy for the second time, he was harassed again by the secret agents and was thus disallowed to deliver the urgent telegram to the Embassy in time. This is a serious obstruction to the normal communication of the Embassy. When the personnel of the Embassy asked on the spot about the matter, the

Indian secret agents openly replied that they were instructed to do so by the Indian External Affairs Ministry.

7. On December 6, 1967, when a Tibetan of China left the Embassy with Chairman Mao's badges and Chinese tea and cigarettes given by the Embassy, the Indian secret agents went as far as to make a personal search, to have torn up his clothes and snatched away from him the above-mentioned things. Furthermore, he was forcibly taken away by the secret agents when he demanded to have his things back.

8. On the New Year's Day of 1968, the secret agents forbade the driver of a three-wheeler scooter to drive away with two African students who left the Embassy after dropping in. They insisted on interrogating the students and searching the books taken from the Embassy, in the same manner as they treated other visitors of the Embassy. Only when the Embassy personnel intervened, the secret agents could not but let them go.

The above facts clearly show that for its internal and external needs, the Indian Government has sealed off the Chinese Embassy and makes trouble against it by hook or by crook and its actions have gone from bad to worse. It is seldom seen in the history of international relations that the Indian Government regardless of national dignity and diplomatic courtesy, should have assigned secret agents to sabotage and make trouble against a foreign mission in such a way. Against these actions of crudely trampling underfoot the international principles and of seriously infringing the diplomatic privileges of the Embassy, the Chinese Embassy lodges its strong protest with the Indian External Affairs Ministry and demands that the Indian Government:

1. immediately cancel all the discriminative restrictions on the Embassy, withdraw the secret agents posted around the Embassy,

dismantle the secret agents' tents pitched around it, and guarantee the normal functioning of the Embassy;

2. make investigations on outrageous activities of the secret agents assigned by it in obstructing the normal functioning and threatening the security of the Embassy; especially, make investigations on the above-mentioned eight serious incidents, and ensure against recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 12 January, 1968

No. M/630/68

Calling on Mr. A. R. Deo, Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India on October 16, 1967, Madam Cheng Yu-shu, Second Secretary of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India demanded of the Indian Government to promptly handle the matter and give its reply regarding the following incident:

Mr. Chou Huai Yu, a Chinese national, has long been living at Balasore, Orissa, India, practising dentistry by profession. On September 25, 1967, fifty to sixty Indian ruffians suddenly broke into Mr. Chou's clinic, unwarrantedly beat him up savagely, damaged the medical instruments and equipments and broke open the door of the kitchen in his house. The ruffians threatened to drive out the Chinese, and kill Mr. Chou and all the members of his family.

After the incident, the local police station did nothing to check this atrocity, but on the contrary detained Mr. Chou for three hours. Afterwards the ruffians were still making provocations constantly in front of Mr. Chou's clinic, abusing and threatening him. Mr. Chou reported the

case several times to the police station, but up till now, the police station has not handled this matter in an effective way.

In the conversation with the Deputy Secretary, the Second Secretary of this Embassy pointed out that the incident of Mr. Chou's being beaten is the result of the Indian Government's deliberately whipping up anti-China frenzy, and demanded of the Indian Government to immediately take effective measures to guarantee the personal security and the safety of the property of Mr. Chou and his family, punish in serious attitude the culprits, compensate Mr. Chou's losses and ensure against the recurrence of similar incidents. The Deputy Secretary promised to handle the case promptly and gave a reply to the Embassy. On December 19, 1967, the Second Secretary of this Embassy again called on Mr. T. K. George, Attache of the Ministry and enquired about the case. However, up till now nothing has come out. At present, the safety of Mr. Chou and his family is still endangered by the ruffians. Now, the Embassy reiterates its above-mentioned demands and points out in all seriousness that should the Indian Government continue to delay this matter and not take effective measures promptly to restrain these anti-China incidents which endanger the Chinese nationals, the Indian Government must be held responsible for the consequences arising therefrom.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 January, 1968

No. C/1/68

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and in reply to the Chinese Foreign Ministry note No. 67 Pu Ya Tzu No. 742 of November 21, 1967 states the following:

2. The Chinese Government could not be unaware that the absurd charges levelled against Shri K. Raghunath have naturally and predictably failed to carry conviction with anyone and that the illegal and uncivilised behaviour of the Peking mobs acting under the instigation of the Chinese authorities has been deplored all over the world. The Chinese Government's persistence in peddling with this proved fabrication through the propagandist film they have brought out is only a futile effort to give some credibility to the preposterous charges made by them.

3. The Government of India have no anxiety on the score of such puerile propaganda exercises of the Chinese Government carrying any more credence than their earlier efforts. However, the people and Government of India cannot but view such actions as wilful attempt on the part of the Chinese Government to malign India and spread anti-Indian prejudice amongst the people of China. The Government of India once again point out that the Chinese Government alone will be responsible for the consequences arising therefrom.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 16 January, 1968

No. C /2/68

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Government's note No. (67) Pu Ling Yi Tzu No. 412 of November 24, 1967, states as follows:

2. The Chinese Government seeking to white-wash the acts of sacrilege by the Shanghai authorities have in their note under reply

merely repeated the ridiculous allegations which have already been totally refuted. It would appear that being unable to substantiate the allegations the Chinese Government have sought to garnish with flimsy details the so-called evidence which is patently concocted and absurd. The swords have been described as "military" and now even their origin has been allegedly traced to the Japanese Army!

3. It should be well known to the Chinese authorities that swords, kirpans, etc. are part of the Sikh religious worship and ceremonial. The Sikh Gurdwaras in Shanghai would undoubtedly have used swords, kirpans, etc. openly in the course of their religious worship. It is, therefore, quite incredible as to how these swords could have been "long kept in secret". To charge that pistol cartridges and a hidden portrait of General Chiang Kai-shek were kept in the Gurdwaras is a transparent fabrication. The Chinese note has not even been able to specify in which of the three Sikh Gurdwaras the so-called evidence was found.

4. The Chinese note under reply claims that "the person in charge of the Parsi temple and cemetery, in league with the social scum of China, carried on activities harmful to the Chinese people". It has already been pointed out to the Chinese Foreign Office that the Trustees of the Parsi temple and cemetery left China several years ago. Consequently, the Chinese allegation about the "person in charge of the Parsi temple and cemetery", who was not even in China, is to say the least fantastic. The Indian Embassy in Peking had some time ago brought to the notice of the Chinese Foreign Office the fact that the Parsi temple in Shanghai was illegally occupied by persons who had styled themselves as 'revolutionaries'. The Embassy had asked the Chinese Government to restore the temple but the Chinese Government had all along evaded this legitimate demand made on behalf of the Parsi community.

5. The note under reply makes the preposterous claim that the

Shanghai authorities have given 'preferential treatment' to the Sikhs residing in Shanghai. The fact that their numbers have been dwindling over the recent years and more particularly as a result of the systematic persecution and expropriation some of them have been compelled to leave China bears testimony to the so-called 'preferential treatment'!

6. The Chinese note claims that "it has been the consistent policy of the Chinese Government to protect religion". Their record however in this matter is too well known to require any comment. The arbitrary and high-handed action taken against the Sikh and Parsi temples is in itself a confirmation of the Chinese Government's hypocritical pretensions as a protector of religion. It will be relevant to point out that not only unjustifiable and harsh action has been taken against the Presidents of the Sikh Gurdwaras, who have already been expelled from China, but that the Chinese authorities have gone to the extent of illegally confiscating these religious institutions, thereby depriving the members of these communities the use of these properties for their legitimate religious needs.

7. If the Chinese Government are at all keen to "protect religion" they should, without delay, restore the Sikh and Parsi religious institutions in Shanghai. This high-handed action of the Chinese authorities is an affront to the religious sentiments of the people of India and the Chinese Government alone will be responsible for any consequences that may arise therefrom. The Government of India reserve their right to take further appropriate action to protect the private and corporate interests of Indian nationals in China.

Memorandum given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 20 January, 1968

No. M/634/68

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India has learnt that on December 12, 1967, the West Bengal Government of India unjustifiably ordered Mr. Ma Ming Tsai, a Chinese dentist in Calcutta, to leave India within one month.

Mr. Ma Ming Tsai has been living in Calcutta for more than thirty years and has always been carrying on an honest profession of dentistry. The Indian Government's forcible order to Mr. Ma to leave the territory of India is purely an unreasonable persecution against the Chinese national. The Chinese Embassy lodges its strong protest with the Indian Government against its rampant persecution of the Chinese national and its outrageous act of violating the norms of international relations and demands of the Indian Government to immediately withdraw its unreasonable decision of ordering Mr. Ma to leave India within the time limit.

It must be pointed out that in May last year, the West Bengal Government of India did the same in ordering a Chinese dentist, Mr. Shu Kuei to leave India. Regarding this, the Embassy, on July 29, 1967, lodged its protest with the Indian Government and demanded the withdrawal of the unjustifiable decision of the Indian Government to order Mr. Shu to leave India. Up till now, the Indian Government not only has not given any reply on Mr. Shu's case, but has again created the incident of unwarrantedly persecuting the Chinese national by ordering Mr. Ma Ming Tsai unreasonably to leave India. Since long, in disregard of the repeated representations and protests made by the Chinese Government and the Chinese Embassy, the Indian Government has become more unscrupulous in persecuting the innocent Chinese nationals in India. We want to ask the Indian Government: What is your real intention by so unscrupulously trampling under foot the norms of international relations

and by worsening the relations between China and India?

The Embassy reiterates that the legitimate rights of the Chinese nationals must be safeguarded, the cruel actions of the Indian Government of persecuting the Chinese nationals must be stopped. If the Indian Government will wilfully and arbitrarily persist in persecuting the Chinese nationals, it must bear the responsibilities arising therefrom.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 February, 1968

No. C/5/68

Reference the Chinese Embassy Memoranda of July 29, 1967 and January 20, 1968, the Ministry of External Affairs in reply states as follows:--

In the communications under reference, the Chinese Embassy has presented entirely unjustified protests against actions taken by the Government of India in conformity with the laws prevalent in this country. The three persons referred to in the Chinese Embassy's Memoranda, Chu Chien Hsin, Shu Kuei and Ma Ming Tsai, had been found to be engaging in activities prejudicial to the security of India and it was entirely within the rights of the Indian Government to take appropriate legal action against them. Moreover, the three persons in question were given adequate time to prepare to leave this country and this time limit was further extended more than once on compassionate grounds. The protests of the Chinese Embassy are, therefore, wholly unreasonable and quite unjustified.

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

to the Embassy of China in India, 21 February, 1968

No. C/7 /68

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi is requested to refer to its Memorandum No. M/630/68, dated January 12, 1968. The Ministry of External Affairs reply is as follows:

2. The authorities concerned have conducted necessary investigations into the alleged incident referred to in the above-mentioned Memorandum. The facts are that Mr. Chou Huai-yu and his family have been repeatedly picking quarrels with the family of one Mr. S. L. Gupta who lives on the first floor of the building, the ground floor of which is occupied by Mr. Chou. Investigations have revealed that on September 25, 1967, at 9-30 A.M., Mrs. Chou picked up a quarrel with a member of Mr. Gupta's family when the latter legitimately complained about the annoyance caused by the smoke coming out from the movable hearth set-up by Mr. Chou on the ground floor. Some neighbours attempted to settle the dispute but Mr. Chou assaulted one of them. Immediately a mobile police party arrived on the scene and as it was apprehended that the quarrel could cause a breach of peace, local police authorities summoned both Mr. Chou and Mr. Gupta to the Police Station. As soon as the situation returned to normal, Mr. Chou and Mr. Gupta were allowed to proceed to their residences. The allegation that Mr. Chou was beaten or that medical instruments and equipment were broken is quite untrue. Since the nature of the dispute between the two parties appeared to be petty, efforts were made to reconcile them the next day. However, this reconciliation did not prove durable and consequently proceedings were instituted to bind both the parties in accordance with the relevant provisions of the law to prevent a breach of peace.

3. The local police authorities, it is quite evident, took prompt and

adequate action to prevent the situation from deteriorating. It is also quite obvious that the local police authorities have dealt with this matter in an impartial manner as both Mr. Chou as well as Mr. Gupta had been restrained from aggravating the quarrel. As against this, it is quite extraordinary that the Chinese Embassy without verifying the veracity of Mr. Chou's complaint has not only adopted a partisan attitude in a private quarrel between two individuals but jumped to conclusions making baseless charges against local authorities and has hastily used the occasion to impute motives and level familiar slanders against the Government of India. The Chinese Embassy should know that it is open to Mr. Chou to obtain redress to any grievance etc. in accordance with the laws of the country.

4. In view of the facts stated above, the Ministry of External Affairs categorically rejects the baseless and unwarranted charges levelled against the local authorities in Balasore and the Government of India.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 7 March, 1968

No. C/9/68

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and with reference to the illegal detention of Police Constable Ghanisham Parshad on March 6, 1968, brings the following facts to the attention of the Chinese Embassy:

It has been reported to the Ministry of External Affairs that around 1500 hours a Police Constable of the Central Reserve Police had inadvertently strayed into the premises of the Chinese Embassy. After he came out, he was asked by the gateman of the Chinese Embassy to come

inside the premises and thereupon escorted by several members of the Chinese Embassy and taken inside the building of the Chinese Embassy. When the local Security authorities and a local Sub Divisional Magistrate informed the Chinese Embassy through the gateman of the Embassy that they would like to talk to officials of the Chinese Embassy about the detained constable, the Chinese Embassy refused to co-operate and took an obstinate attitude. The officials of the Chinese Embassy persisted in this stubborn attitude even after they had been contacted by telephone by the local Sub Divisional Magistrate. The Chinese Embassy was then advised by the Protocol Division of the Ministry of External Affairs to hand over the detained Police Constable to the Security officials in the locality of the Embassy. Mr. Chou Ping-Yi, Third Secretary of the Chinese Embassy, refused to do so and insisted that they would return the Constable in the presence of a Protocol official known to them, whereupon officials of the Protocol Division of the Ministry of External Affairs went to the Chinese Embassy at 6 p.m. For more than an hour after their arrival, Mr. Chou Ping-Yi, Third Secretary, and other personnel of the Chinese Embassy tried to argue and cover up the illegality of their action in kidnapping and wrongfully detaining the said constable and even demanded that the Protocol Division officials should sign a so-called receipt. When the C.R.P. constable was released at 7-30 p.m. as a result of an emphatic demand of the Ministry of External Affairs, it was learnt that the personnel of the Chinese Embassy, had even gone to the extent of making him write and sign a so-called statement.

The Ministry of External Affairs protests against the illegal detention of an Indian policeman in uniform and the high-handed action in interrogating him and extorting a statement from him, and the deliberate un-cooperative attitude of the personnel of the Chinese Embassy with the authorities of the Government of India. This action of the Chinese Embassy clearly violates the rights and jurisdiction of the Sovereign authority of the Government of India. The Chinese Embassy should know

that it cannot arrogate to itself any authority to detain any person, least of all an official in uniform, on the premises of the Chinese Embassy. The Ministry deploras the non-cooperative attitude of the Chinese Embassy towards the local Security and Civil authorities.

The Ministry of External Affairs further wishes to point out that when the Charge d'Affaires of the Chinese Embassy was summoned to the Ministry of External Affairs at 7-45 p.m. the same evening, he expressed his inability to do so on the ground that he had another appointment. In view of this and as by then the Embassy had allowed the constable to leave the premises, the Ministry of External Affairs suggested that he could come to the Ministry next morning and two separate timings were suggested, both of which he declined. The Ministry of External Affairs had pointed out to the Charge d'Affaires that official business with the host Government usually takes precedence over all other business including the so-called engagements. The Ministry of External Affairs takes a very serious view of the total disregard by the Charge d'Affaires of the Chinese Embassy of normal diplomatic practice.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 March, 1968

(68) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 111

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states the following:-

1. According to reports from the Chinese Embassy in India, on the afternoon of March 6, 1968 two unidentified Indians in Indian Police uniform illegally intruded into the compound of the Chinese Embassy. When they were discovered by personnel of the Chinese Embassy and

were approached for questioning, one of them fled. The other one, after being questioned, confessed that he was an Indian Policeman and admitted that it was wrong to have illegally intruded into the Embassy, but he refused to tell the real purpose of this illegal action. Having ascertained what had happened, the Chinese Embassy informed the Indian Ministry of External Affairs of this matter and asked the latter to send someone to the Embassy to bring back the said Policeman. The Indian Ministry of External Affairs sent to the Embassy B. S. Puri and another official of the Protocol Division who, after inspecting the scene and acquainting themselves with the facts, admitted that it was entirely wrong and constituted a grave incident for the Indian Policemen to intrude into the Embassy and guaranteed that no similar incident would recur. Subsequently, the two officials brought away with them the said Policeman. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the grave incident of the Indian Policemen's illegal intrusion into the Chinese Embassy and encroachment upon its diplomatic privileges.

2. The Indian Government bears an unshirkable responsibility for this grave incident of encroachment upon the diplomatic privileges of the Chinese Embassy. However, instead of seriously handling the incident, the Indian Government, using the tactics of the wicked accusing others first, delivered a so-called Note of Protest to the Chinese Embassy on March 7, in which it attempted to absolve itself of its own responsibility by fantastically countercharging the Chinese Embassy with "kidnapping and wrongfully detaining" an Indian Policeman who had intruded into the Embassy. This is indeed the height of absurdity. The Chinese Government categorically rejects such a totally unwarranted "Protest" of the Indian Government.

3. The Chinese Government holds that the grave incident of the Indian Policemen's illegal intrusion into the Chinese Embassy is by no means

accidental. For a long time now the Chinese Embassy in India has been tightly besieged by large number of Indian policemen and special agents, who question and keep a register of anyone entering the Embassy. The round-the-clock surveillance by the Indian Police on the Chinese Embassy has not only obstructed the normal functioning of the Embassy, but also posed a direct threat to its safety; this constitutes in itself an infringement on diplomatic privileges in complete violation of international practice. What is more, uniformed Indian policemen have now gone still further by wilfully intruding into the Chinese Embassy; this is the crudest violation of international diplomatic practice.

It must be further pointed out that immediately following this grave incident, the Indian government set in motion its propaganda Machine to spread lies and slanders against the Chinese Embassy, and the Indian Parliament also raised a hue and cry to whip up anti- Chinese sentiments. Then, the Indian Government hastily delivered a so-called Note of Protest, attempting to deceive public opinion and shirk its responsibility by resorting to its customary practice of making false countercharges. But this is utterly futile. The Chinese Government demands that the Indian Government seriously deal with this grave incident of encroachment on the diplomatic privileges of the Chinese Embassy and guarantee against the recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 April, 1968

No. C/10/68.

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and, with reference to the Embassy's note No. M/629/68 of January 11, 1968, states as follows:

2. The Chinese Embassy, in the note under reference, has again repeated the familiar charge of so-called discriminatory restrictions said to have been imposed on the functioning of the Embassy. In order to lend credibility to this baseless charge, the Chinese Embassy has resorted to producing a catalogue of gross distortions and even complete fabrications. Notwithstanding the Chinese Embassy's known attitude in not conforming with simple matters of procedure in order to create unnecessary issues, the allegations contained in the note under reference have been carefully investigated by competent authorities. All the allegations have been found to be quite untrue and baseless.

3. The Chinese Embassy is reminded that certain security measures have been taken to afford special protection to that Embassy. Consequently, the identity of non-diplomatic personnel entering the Chinese Embassy is ascertained. This, as it happens, is in conformity with the practice followed by the Chinese Government vis-a- vis the Indian Embassy and its personnel in Peking and is entirely necessary for affording the required protection to the Chinese Embassy and its personnel in New Delhi. Similarly, the Chinese Embassy should be aware that various tradesmen and other persons who have regular business with the Embassy are required to obtain passes. The personnel posted outside the Chinese Embassy are performing their legitimate duty in ascertaining the identity of visitors and tradesmen proceeding to the Chinese Embassy. The Ministry of External Affairs, however, categorically rejects the charge that security personnel posted outside the Chinese Embassy have either entered the compound of the Chinese Embassy or prevented any bonafide visitor from entering the Embassy.

4. The catalogue of the trumped up charges includes a car accident alleged to have taken place on October 27, 1967 on Chelmsford Road. It is strange that no complaint appears to have been filed with any Police

Station by or on behalf of the Chinese Embassy in regard to this "specific charge". Evidently, this baseless allegation does not even indicate the registration number of the Embassy's car claimed to have been involved in the accident!

5. Similarly, the charge that on October 31, 1967, three Indians "broke into the Embassy" is an example of the kind of distortion resorted to by the Chinese Embassy. In fact, the three Indian nationals had legitimate cause to complain against the Chinese Embassy. The attention of the Chinese Charge d'Affaires has already been drawn to the undiplomatic behaviour of the personnel of the Chinese Embassy in manhandling three Indian nationals who had proceeded to the Chinese Embassy to hand over a legitimate representation.

6. The Ministry of External Affairs categorically rejects the note of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China under reference and advises that Embassy to comply with the various procedures laid down by the Government of India.

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 9 April, 1968

No. M/660/68

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India and states the following:

On April 3, 1968, Indian policemen unjustifiably arrested Mr. Kafil Ahmed, an Indian driver and Mr. Veer Bahadur, a Nepalese gate- keeper

of the Chinese Embassy. On that day around eight o'clock in the morning, when Mr. Kafil Ahmed drove the Embassy's car No. CD842 in performing official duty, at Panch Sheel Marg, a number of Indian armed policemen and police vans forcibly obstructed the car and coercively arrested Mr. Kafil Ahmed. The Embassy's car was left along Panch Sheel Marg. On the same day, Indian policemen without reason arrested Mr. Veer Bahadur, the gate-keeper of the Embassy at the bus-stop of Shanti Path.

It is seldom seen in the history of international relations that the Indian Government should have so crudely violated the diplomatic immunity of the Embassy, and persecuted its employees. For this, on April 3, the Charge d'Affaires a.i. of the Chinese Embassy lodged a strong protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs. However, upto now, the Indian Government has still unwarrantedly kept the above-mentioned two employees of the Chinese Embassy under lock up and has carried out so-called "interrogation".

The Indian Government's persecution of the two employees of the Chinese Embassy is not accidental but a planned and premeditated action. As early as March 6 this year, two Indian policemen illegally intruded into the Chinese Embassy, thus committing a serious encroachment upon the diplomatic privileges of the Embassy and threatening its security. The Indian Government has not only not handled this grave incident seriously but, on the contrary, has fabricated lies and vehemently incited anti-China sentiments in its Parliament and aired out that it would carry out persecution against the employees of the Chinese Embassy. Now, the Indian Government has indeed taken this despicable action. This shows that the Indian Government is intentionally subjecting the Indian employees of the Chinese Embassy to political persecution. Its aim is entirely to undermine the conditions for the normal functioning of the Chinese Embassy. This is another serious provocation solely engineered by the Indian Government to the diplomatic privileges of the Chinese

Embassy following the illegal intrusion by the Indian police into the Embassy with the connivance of the Indian Government. The Chinese Embassy hereby lodges its strong protest with the Indian Government against this. The Indian Government must immediately stop its persecution of the employees of the Chinese Embassy and ensure the conditions for the normal functioning of the Embassy. The Chinese Embassy reserves its right for further representations.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 April, 1968

No. C/11/68

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi and in reply to the Chinese Foreign Office Note No. (68) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 111, dated 18th March, 1968 and the Chinese Embassy's note No. M/660/68, dated 9th April, 1968, would like to state as follows:

2. The protest of the Chinese Embassy that two Central Reserve Police constables entered the Chinese Embassy premises on March the 6th, 1968, is already under investigation. Appropriate action will undoubtedly be taken against these two constables after the matter is thoroughly investigated. The Charge d'Affaires of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China was informed on the 3rd of April, 1968 by the Director of the East Asia Division in the Ministry of External Affairs of this.

3. However, the fact that constable Ghanisham Parshad was wrongfully confined in the Chinese Embassy for well over four hours cannot be overlooked. A complaint was lodged on the 6th of March, 1968 itself against this act. This complaint has naturally to be processed in

accordance with the relevant procedure and provisions of the law.

4. It is quite clear that the Chinese Embassy has transgressed its diplomatic privilege in detaining Constable Ghanisham Parshad. The Government of the People's Republic of China should be aware that no diplomatic mission accredited to a foreign government can take the law into its own hands as was done by the Chinese Embassy on the 6th of March, 1968. That Embassy should, as soon as it had come to know of an unauthorised person trespassing on its premises, have immediately brought the matter to the notice of the local Police authorities. Instead the Embassy proceeded to conduct a so-called investigation which was to last for well over four hours. Further the Embassy refused to co-operate in the handling of the matter with the local authorities. During the period of detention, Chinese Embassy personnel even extorted a statement from the constable. These actions of the Chinese Embassy constitute a gross violation of the rights and jurisdiction of the host Government. Such high-handed behaviour on the part of a diplomatic mission has no precedent in international law or practice.

5. The Embassy of the People's Republic of China has sought to protest against the arrest of Shri Kafil Ahmed and Shri Vir Bahadur, chauffeur and gate-keeper respectively of the Chinese Embassy. When the Charge d'Affaires of the Chinese Embassy of the People's Republic of China met the Director of the East Asia Division in the Ministry of External Affairs on 3rd April, 1968, it was made clear to the Charge d'Affaires that the action taken in respect of the two local employees of the Chinese Embassy arose out of the legal complaint lodged on the 6th of March against the wrongful confinement of constable Ghanisham Parshad. Since the matter was being dealt with in accordance with Indian laws, no interference from any quarter is permissible.

6. The Ministry of External Affairs emphatically reject the absurd

charge that the Government of India have "violated the diplomatic immunity" of the Chinese Embassy and "persecuted" its Indian employees. In fact, it is the action of Chinese Embassy personnel in unwarrantedly and wrongfully confining Constable Ghanisham Parshad which constitutes a blatant infringement of the sovereign authority of the host Government. As for the two local employees of the Chinese Embassy, it is clear to all that the matter is being processed in accordance with the laws of the country. It is equally absurd to charge that this legal action is a "planned and premeditated action". The Government of India had clearly stated on March the 6th itself that the matter would be processed in accordance with the law of the land. It is quite obvious that the Chinese Embassy is now seeking to cover up the wrongful confinement of Constable Ghanisham Parshad on the 6th of March, by levelling a number of frivolous and absurd charges.

7. The Ministry of External Affairs reiterate that the legal complaint against the wrongful confinement of constable Ghanisham Parshad is being determined by the competent legal court in accordance with the laws of the land. The Chinese Embassy cannot expect the authorities in India to refrain from enforcing Indian laws in the face of a specific legal complaint alleging the infringement of such laws.

The Government of India have no desire to undermine the normal functioning of the Chinese Embassy. Obviously, such normal functioning cannot include the wrongful confinement of an Indian national in the Embassy premises and the diplomatic privileges of the Chinese Embassy cannot be used as a cover for high-handed action on the part of the Embassy's personnel.

8. In the light of the above facts the two notes under reference are categorically rejected.

IV. ANTI-INDIA PROPAGANDA BY CHINA

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 July, 1967

No. C/19/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses the present note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India.

2. This Government's attention has been drawn to two extraordinary talks in the English language beamed towards India by the Peking Radio on June 28 and June 30 purporting to describe conditions in the West Bengal State of India but in effect openly instigating an armed struggle against the legally established and constitutional Government in this country. Both talks are venomous pieces of anti-Indian propaganda, which are diametrically opposite to the principles of normal international propriety and usage, as well as the principles of peaceful co-existence and the Bandung principles to which the representative of the People's Republic of China affixed his signature in 1955. A few choice examples of the present Chinese Government attitude towards the people and Government of India are given below from these broadcasts:

A phase of peasants' armed struggle led by the revolutionaries of the Indian Communist Party has been set up in the countryside in Darjeeling district of West Bengal State of India. This is the front paw of the revolutionary armed struggle launched by the Indian people under the guidance of Mao Tse-tung's thought. This represents the general orientation of the Indian revolution at the present times. The people of India, China and the rest of the world hail the emergence of this revolutionary armed struggle. (Broadcast on 28th June, 1967).

This red district, first established in early March, covers an area of over 270 square miles and includes a population of 80,000. Since its founding it has been standing majestically like a mountain for nearly four months in the encirclement of a White regime. (Broadcast on 28th June 1967).

The emergence of this struggle in India, a big country which is colonial and semi-feudal with 500,000,000 population and an unbalanced political and economic development, signifies a new stage in the Indian people's surging struggle against reactionary rule. This forecasts the approach of a great people's revolution in India with armed struggle as its majority force. (Broadcast on 28th June, 1967).

The Congress Government, representing the Indian big landlords and big bourgeoisie, has always pursued a foreign policy of surrendering to imperialism and a domestic policy of brutally suppressing and exploiting the broad masses of labouring people, thus driving hundreds of millions of people to the brink of starvation and death. Under this counter-revolutionary rule the workers, peasants and other labouring people throughout the country are in a desperate situation. Only through revolution by violence can they maintain their existence. (Broadcast on 28th June, 1967).

The hurricane of the Indian people's great revolution will certainly come. (Broadcast on 28th June, 1967).

The revolutionary people in Darjeeling district answered the reactionary counter-revolutionary double-dealing with new offensives against police stations and against the landlords. The revolutionaries of Darjeeling are persisting in revolutionary armed struggle and have inspired peasant struggles in other places. (Broadcast on 30th June, 1967).

3. During the last three or four years and particularly during the last

one year the Chinese Government have been increasing the intensity and volume of their propaganda against India. No attempt has been made to conceal in this propaganda that the declared aim of the group ruling China today is to subvert the Government of India as well as the Governments of other Asian States who do not kow-tow to their changing whims and fancies. Since it is well-known that the present Chinese Government does not care to observe normal canons of international behaviour it was not considered necessary by this Government to protest in this matter. But these two broadcasts specifically aimed at the territorial dismemberment of India and subversion of its lawfully constituted Government by armed struggle with the assistance of a foreign power whose "front paw" it is claimed in the broadcasts is already in evidence in India go beyond even the standards of rudeness, discourtesy and subversion which the Chinese leaders have set themselves in their animosity towards India over the past several months. Far beyond anything said or written against India by the Chinese Government in recent years these broadcasts represent flagrant interference in India's internal affairs.

4. The Government of India protest in the strongest possible terms against this flagrant violation of international behaviour and interference in India's internal affairs. The Chinese Government has no right, and it is none of its business, to comment on and interfere with internal affairs. They should learn a lesson from the Government of India which has refrained from commenting on the confusion and lawlessness prevailing in China as a consequence of the so-called great Cultural Revolution. The Government of India demands that the Chinese Government cease forthwith these desperate activities obviously designed to distract the attention of the world from unsettled conditions in China brought about by their own tyrannical and capricious acts. The Government of China even at this late moment should return to the paths of normal international behaviour. They should know that all their mischievous interference will amount to knocking their heads against a stone-wall and that the Indian

people who are wide-awake to Chinese expansionist and subversive designs resolutely reject the Chinese Government's machinations.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 5 July, 1967

No. C/20/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses the present note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, and states as follows:

2. The attention of the Government of India has been drawn to issues No. 40 and 42 of the 'News from China' published by the information office of the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi dated 15th June, 1967 and 26th June, 1967 respectively. The bulletin No. 40 contains a long description of the so-called "public trial" of Shri K. Raghunath in Peking. The bulletin does not attribute this highly imaginative piece of literature to any source. It is assumed therefore, that this must have been written up by someone in the Embassy from Chinese News Agency Reports. The bulletin No. 42 contains a report which is called "a Hsinhua correspondent's story" on "Chinese Embassy staff in New Delhi fight Indian violence". Both these articles are full of lies and fabrications from the beginning to the end and are replete with anti-Indian propaganda. The Government of India protest against this misuse by the Chinese Embassy of the normal facilities granted to them for publishing material concerning developments in their country. The Government of India are taking suitable counter-measures.

3. Several times in the past, the Government of India have had occasion to remind the Chinese Embassy that they cannot permit a diplomatic mission accredited to the Government of India to publish or circulate material critical of the Government of India's policies and

actions. The Chinese Government have been till now trying to evade this by serving up unabashed anti-Indian propaganda in the guise of Government statements. On this occasion, however, they have cast off their hypocritical mask and published anti-Indian articles which can in no way be described as official statements. The Government of India would like to warn the Chinese Embassy that they will not be permitted to circulate in Indian territory any kind of anti-Indian material hostile to the Indian Government or to the Indian people under any excuse, and if there is a repetition of their violation of this rule, the Government of India will exercise their rights and take appropriate steps including a prohibition on the circulation of Chinese Embassy bulletins.

V. MISCELLANEOUS

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 March, 1967

(67) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 121.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China addresses the present note to the Indian Embassy in China and states the following:

1. On the morning of March 10, 1967, a gang of traitor bandits of Tibet, China, four or five hundred strong, who have been shielded and abetted by the Indian Government, carried out flagrant anti-Chinese activities before the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi. They not only shouted extremely reactionary anti-Chinese slogans and put up a great number of anti-Chinese posters on the compound wall of the Embassy, but rushed to the gate of the Embassy, climbed up the iron gate and,

raising a hue and cry, tried to break in. They smashed the flower pots in front of the Embassy and threw the broken pieces, lumps of earth and other things into the Embassy compound, thus gravely menacing the Embassy's security. On the previous day, March 9, the traitor Dalai groomed by the Indian Government issued another so-called statement in which he venomously attacked and slandered the Chinese Government and people and once more vainly attempted to incite the Tibetan people of China to carry out rebellious activities. Obviously, both incidents were engineered entirely by the Indian Government, and they constitute another crude interference in China's internal affairs and a fresh deliberate provocation against the Chinese people by the Indian Government. Against this, the Chinese Government hereby lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government.

2. The Indian Government has done a great deal of evils against Tibet, China. In the period following the rebellion of the reactionary clique of the Tibetan upper strata, not to mention earlier periods, the Indian Government has come out into the open and backstage manoeuvring to engage in naked interference in China's internal affairs. It has given shelter to elements of the traitorous Dalai clique and a large number of traitor bandits, and openly helped them to establish in India a so-called government in exile and publish a so-called Tibetan constitution. What is more, the Indian Government has been blatantly giving military training to these traitor bandits. In recent years, the Indian Government has on many occasions made plans to have the traitor Dalai go to Southeast Asian countries for anti-Chinese activities, attempting thereby to sabotage the friendly relations between China and those countries. Like all reactionary forces the world over, the Indian Government mortally dreads and bitterly hates the great proletarian Cultural Revolution now vigorously going on in China. In addition to setting in motion its own propaganda machine for anti-Chinese clamours, the Indian Government has instigated the traitor Dalai to spread a host of lies and slanders. All these are iron-

clad facts known to all, which the Indian Government will never be able to deny.

It must be solemnly pointed out that the Indian Government still maintains diplomatic relations with China today. Nevertheless, the Indian Government has accepted tens of thousands of Chinese citizens who were brought to India under coercion by the traitor bandits, and for eight years it has all along supported the Tibetan traitor bandits in carrying out subversive activities against the Chinese Government. This is indeed something rarely found in the history of world diplomacy. People cannot help asking: Does the Indian Government have the slightest regard for the principles guiding international relations?

3. It must also be pointed out that, while indulging in all these evil doings, the Indian Government has pretended that India has sympathy for Tibet "based on sentiment and humanitarian reasons," that India, has a "desire to maintain friendly relations with China," that India does not "permit the Tibetan refugees in India to indulge in subversive political activities directed against the People's Republic of China," and so on and so forth. These are glaring lies and the height of hypocrisy. In fact, not a single moment has passed without the Indian Government revealing its true colours by its own action. The sympathy of the Indian Government goes not to the broad masses of the Tibetan people, but to the Tibetan serf-owners who take to eating human hearts and gouging out people's eyes. What the Indian Government has been doing is not the maintenance of friendly relations with China, but the fostering and training of the Tibetan traitor bandits, who are living in exile in India, in the fond hope that some day they could fight back to Tibet and restore serfdom there. In the final analysis, the Indian Government's pipe dream is to drag the new Tibet which is becoming a joyful land of socialism back to the old Tibet which was a hell on earth. This will never come true.

4. In earlier days, the Indian Government inherited the mantle of aggression from British imperialism, and it is now actively hiring itself out to U.S. imperialism and Soviet modern revisionism. It is by no means accidental that the Indian Government is becoming ever more unscrupulous in making use of the so-called Tibet question to oppose China. This is but a manifestation of the reactionary domestic and foreign policies of the Indian Government. The Chinese Government must tell the Indian Government in all seriousness that if the latter clings to its anti-Chinese policy and continues to interfere in China's internal affairs by exploiting the so-called Tibet question, it must be held responsible for the serious consequences arising therefrom.

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

No. C/7/67.

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India, addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India in reply to the Chinese Government's Note dated March 20, 1967.

2. The Chinese Government have lodged a so-called "protest" against a demonstration staged outside the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi on March 10, 1967 between 0815 and 0845 hours by about 400 Tibetan refugees. They have claimed that this demonstration was "shielded and abetted" by the Government of India and further that it constitutes "crude interference in China's internal affairs and a fresh deliberate provocation against the Chinese people". These are completely false and unfounded statements. On the morning of March 10, 1967, when Shri A. K. Damodaran, Deputy Secretary in the Ministry of External Affairs, received Mr. Chen Chao-yuan, Charge d'Affaires a.i., Embassy of China, at the

latter's request, he clearly pointed out that the Government of India had nothing to do with the demonstration and that political demonstrations are permitted in India as long as they do not violate the ordinary law of the land. In spite of this clear denial, the Chinese Government have followed up the verbal "protest" with a note which goes to even greater lengths in utilising this minor demonstration as an occasion to vilify India. The Government of India have made the necessary investigations and are satisfied that this particular demonstration was on the whole orderly and peaceful. The demonstrators limited themselves to shouting slogans and carrying placards. The local police arrived on the scene immediately after the demonstration began and the demonstrators dispersed soon afterwards. The Chinese Government should understand that it is not the policy or practice of the Government of India to organise demonstrations or parades outside the premises of diplomatic missions located in India. The absurd charges contained in the Chinese Note under reply are, therefore, totally rejected.

3. The real purpose of the Chinese Government in exaggerating the incident and making a big issue out of it becomes clear when the Chinese note goes on to slander the internal and external policies of the Government of India, particularly with regard to Tibet. The Government of India condemn such crude interference in the internal affairs of India. The Chinese note has claimed that India's sympathy is not with the broad masses of the Tibetan people and that India wishes to "restore serfdom" in Tibet. In resorting to these untruths, the Chinese Government are obviously referring to India's strong humanitarian support for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the Tibetan people. The inhuman and chauvinistic policies that Chinese Government have been carrying out in Tibet are strongly deplored by the Government of India. The Government of India's note of May 30, 1966 contains a clear exposition of India's policy towards Tibet and there is little to add to this. In the meantime, the

continuing flight into India by Tibetan refugees remains an eloquent commentary on the true nature of life in Tibet today—what the Chinese Government vain—gloriously call "a joyful land of socialism".

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

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 6 January, 1968

No. M/625/68.

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

The Government of India decides to dispose of the properties of its former Trade Agency at Kalimpong, including transference of the Trade Agency's land and the sale of the building and all attachments thereon, and the furniture, etc. The Chinese Government requests the Indian Government to propose a price for the purchase.

Cheng Yu-shu, Second Secretary of the Chinese Embassy has conveyed under instructions the above-mentioned decision and request of the Chinese Government to Mr. T. K. George, Attache of the External Affairs Ministry on October 30, 1967, and has enquired about it with Mr. George on December 19, 1967. The Embassy requests the Ministry to give a reply at its earliest convenience.

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

Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 22 January, 1968

No. M/635/68.

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India addresses the present note to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, and states the following:

According to Indian newspapers and foreign news agencies' report, the Chiang Kai-shek clique entrenched in the Chinese province of Taiwan is going to send a so-called delegation to attend the second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development which is scheduled to open on February 1, 1968 in India. Regarding this, the Chinese Embassy sternly reiterates that Taiwan is an inalienable part of the sacred territory of the People's Republic of China. The Chiang Kai-shek clique entrenched in Taiwan is a political corpse fostered and used by US imperialism against China, and it has long been repudiated by the Chinese people. It has absolutely no right to take part in any international meetings. The Chinese Embassy demands of the Indian Government to take effective measures to prevent any element of the Chiang Kai-shek clique from coming to India to attend the above-mentioned Conference of the United Nations on Trade and Development.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 12 February, 1968

No. C/3/68.

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi, in reply to the Embassy's note No. M/635/68 dated January 22, 1968, and states as follows:

The Government of the People's Republic of China are, doubtless, quite aware that conferences sponsored by the U.N. are open to all members irrespective of their venue. In accordance with the established practice, the Government of India have extended the usual facilities to the various members of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. The Embassy of the Peoples Republic of China should also be aware that this is not the first time that a delegation from Taiwan has attended a U.N. Conference not only in India but in many other countries who have diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China. However, the attitude of the Government of India in the matter of the membership to the U.N. of the People's Republic of China is too well known to require any reiteration.

In view of the foregoing, the note of the Chinese Embassy is quite unwarranted and is, therefore, rejected.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 February, 1968

No. C/6/68.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, and with reference to the Embassy's note No. M/625/68, dated January 6, 1968, states as follows:

The Ministry of External Affairs is not aware of the former Trade Agency of the People's Republic of China at Kalimpong having legal title to any immovable property in Kalimpong. It is, therefore, not understood as to how the Embassy of the People's Republic of China proposes to dispose of immovable property the ownership of which does not vest in the Chinese Government. The Chinese Embassy is, no doubt, aware of the

correspondence on this subject. The Embassy's attention is particularly invited to this Ministry's notes of March 20 and September 9, 1964.

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

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 April, 1968

No. C/12/68

The Ministry of External Affairs addresses this note to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and, with reference to the Press reports of a so-called agreement signed between Pakistan and China on October 21, 1967, regarding an overland trade route between the Gilgit Agency in the Indian territory of Kashmir illegally occupied by Pakistan and Sinkiang, and the continuing interference on the part of the Government of the People's Republic of China with the sovereignty of India over the State of Jammu and Kashmir, states as follows:

2. It is common knowledge that Pakistan and the Peoples Republic of China have no common border, the two countries being separated by the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. The presence of Pakistan in the northern part of Kashmir is based on aggression and illegal occupation and Pakistan has no locus standi whatsoever to enter into negotiations or to conclude any agreements with any country which would affect in any way Indian territory illegally occupied by Pakistan in this area.

3. The Government of India have previously pointed out to the Chinese Government "that any change, provisional or otherwise, in the status of

the State of Jammu and Kashmir brought about by third parties which seeks to submit certain parts of Indian territory to foreign jurisdiction will not be binding on the Government of India" and that "the Government of India firmly repudiate any agreements, provisional or otherwise, regarding her own territories arrived at between third parties who have no legal or constitutional locus standi of any kind".

4. The Chinese Government are persisting in their efforts to sow misunderstanding between India and Pakistan and have been using the situation arising out of the illegal occupation by Pakistan of a portion of the Indian territory in Kashmir, to their own ends. Earlier, in the case of the so-called border agreement signed between the Governments of the People's Republic of China and Pakistan, the Chinese Government had taken the stand in 1963 that the so-called agreement was of a "provisional" nature. Now, even this tenuous pretext appears to have been dropped. It will be noted that Hsinhua, carrying a news item on the 25th of October, 1967, refers to the "territories of Gilgit and Baltistan on the Pakistan side". This only confirms the contention of the Government of India that the Chinese Government are seeking to share the spoils of aggression with Pakistan in the Indian State of Kashmir.

5. By entering into a so-called agreement on a land route between Gilgit Agency and Baltistan in Kashmir and Sinkiang on the Chinese side, the Chinese Government have gone a step further in interfering in India's internal affairs. It is noteworthy that no details have yet been published of this dubious deal. The Press statements released in Pakistan and China have sought to give the impression that the so-called agreement has only a commercial context. However, against the known background of China's design to promote instability amongst her neighbours and her unabashed efforts to aggravate Indo- Pakistan relations, it is quite obvious that the so-called agreement is not quite as innocent as merely "to facilitate overland trade". No matter what pretence or purpose the so-called

agreement may be for, the Government of India reiterate that they shall take no cognizance of it and that it will have no legal or constitutional validity whatsoever.

6. The Government of India hereby lodge an emphatic protest against the Chinese Government's illegal interference with regard to the territory of Jammu and Kashmir which is an inalienable part of India.

Statement made by Foreign Minister in Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha on 13th June, 1967

The action of the Chinese Government in withdrawing recognition of the diplomatic status of Shri K. Raghunath, Second Secretary in our Embassy in Peking and declaring that he will not be allowed to leave China before "the Chinese judicial organs take sanctions against his crimes" is a flagrant violation of all known principles of international law and the norms of civilised behaviour among nations. The list of alleged spying activities of Shri Raghunath prepared by the Chinese Government is a tissue of lies hastily put together to defend themselves against the very reasonable and moderately worded protest note which has been sent by our Embassy to the Chinese Foreign Office on June 5th that is the day after the incident in which Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijay were unreasonably detained in a ruined temple in the Western Hills of Peking.

2. The details of this incident as conveyed to us by our Embassy in Peking are as follows:

3. At 1-30 p.m. on June 4th, Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijay, Third Secretary in the Embassy were driving towards the Western Hills area in Peking which is a well-known beauty spot, and which is open to foreigners. On their way there they stopped for a moment near a ruined temple and proceeded to take photographs of the temple. Then they were surrounded by some people who accused Raghunath of taking

photographs of a military installation which was allegedly situated nearby. In spite of Raghunath's protestation that he was merely photographing the ruined temple, the Chinese crowd forced the two diplomats to go to the nearby building where after some delay the officer of the Security Bureau arrived under whose orders the camera and films were forcibly taken away and the absurd allegation immediately made that the development of the film had shown that Shri Raghunath had photographed prohibited objects. Curiously enough, however, these so-called photographs were not shown to either of the diplomats. The Western Hills are not out of bounds to foreigners. It is an area covered over with Buddhist temples and has been one of the most popular tourist resorts within the reach of Peking. For the last 18 years diplomats of all nationalities have been allowed to go along the way and visit these spots and photograph the old temples. There is nothing unusual or extraordinary in the actions of Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijay.

4. In spite of the repeated requests the diplomats were allowed to telephone to the Embassy only at 5 p.m. when the Embassy officials tried to get in touch with the Foreign Office and the Security Bureau. They were told that nothing could be done until the next day. Two officers of the Embassy reached the spot at about 9 p.m. and were not permitted to go into the building or see the diplomats and were asked to return since it was claimed to be a prohibited area, even though it was on the highway. Finally the diplomats were allowed to return at 9-30 p.m. after a detention for a period of 8 ½ hours. The Embassy made further efforts the same night to protest to the Protocol Department of the Foreign Office but could not get an appointment in spite of best efforts.

5. A note giving the details of this incident and protesting against the unlawful detention of both the diplomats, namely, Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijay, was sent to the Foreign Office the next day but was returned three hours later. It may be noted that Shri Vijay had not been concerned

in the photographic incident. The note had also specially protested against the unhelpfulness of the Foreign Office in the matter.

6. This latest development by which the Chinese Foreign Office has gone to the unprecedented action of accusing Shri Raghunath of spying seems to indicate that the Chinese are not merely anxious to utilise this incident for propaganda purposes but have a guilty conscience and want to manufacture some excuses to still further damage relations with India.

7. The accusations against Shri Raghunath are trivial to the point of absurdity. The accusation against him of committing espionage is based on the filsiest grounds, namely that he has been trying to collect political and military intelligence by attending gatherings of Red Guards etc. These are the usual Chinese lies to concoct a case against a diplomat. On the other hand, Shri Raghunath has, on more than one occasion, been the victim of Chinese harassment. Once, while buying Red Guard newspapers in a Peking street, he was taken by some Red Guards to a public Security Bureau. Such Red Guard newspapers have been sold in the streets all these months and purchased by foreigners without any objections. However, when Shri Raghunath was told that these newspapers were not to be read or purchased by foreigners, he readily agreed to abide by this new rule.

8. Shri Raghunath is a young and promising diplomat who has conformed to the best traditions of our diplomatic service. In making him a victim of its nefarious designs, the People's Republic of China no doubt wishes to tarnish the name of India and has deprived him of diplomatic immunities and privileges which is unprecedented in the history of diplomatic relations between nations. The Government of India have taken a very serious view of the Chinese action. The Chinese Charge d'Affaires, who was summoned to the External Affairs Ministry at 5.00 A.M. this morning, was asked to convey to his Government our strong

indignation at this malicious, unjust and illegal action. A protest has been made to the Charge d'Affaires against this totally unprecedented and gross violation of international law and practice. We have also demanded that no interference be made with the diplomatic status of Shri Raghunath, that the false charges levelled against him be withdrawn, and that suitable amends be made by the Government of China. It has also been explained to the Charge d'Affaires that unless this is done, the Chinese Government will have to bear the consequences of their action, and the Government of India reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they deem fit and proper.

9. According to a message received this morning from our Embassy in Peking, the Embassy has been informed that a public trial has been arranged for Shri Raghunath at 2.30 P.M. (12 noon IST) today, and that he be produced before the Peking Branch of Supreme People's Court. This shows utter disregard of all norms of civilised international behaviour by the Chinese Government. The trial, of course, will be an absolute farce. We have every confidence that our Charge d'Affaires and his colleagues will react to this crisis with courage and dignity.

Appendix II

Chinese Foreign Ministry Spokesman's Statement on espionage activities in Peking by Indian spy, 14 June, 1967

The spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China today made the following statement regarding the espionage activities in Peking by members of the Indian Embassy in China:

Ever since the beginning of the great proletarian cultural revolution in China, Second Secretary, K. Raghunath of the Indian Embassy in China

has been constantly engaged in unbridled illegal activities of stealing political and military intelligence about China in violation of the laws and decrees of the People's Republic of China, and was on many occasions caught on the spot and warned by our young red guards and revolutionary masses. However, far from restraining himself, K. Raghunath went still further and on June 4, this year had the audacity of surreptitiously taking photographs of a Chinese prohibited military area together with the Indian Embassy's Third Secretary P. Vijai, and they were caught red-handed by the Chinese People's Liberation Army men. The facts have shown that K. Raghunath is an out-and-out spy under the cloak of a diplomat. The Chinese government is most indignant at such bare-faced espionage activities by members of the Indian Embassy in China and has lodged the strongest protest with the Indian government. The Chinese judicial organs have pronounced K. Raghunath guilty of espionage and had him promptly deported under escort. At the same time the Chinese Foreign Ministry has declared P. Vijay persona non grata and ordered him to leave China within a set time.

The intensified activities by members of the Indian Embassy in China to steal intelligence about China during our great proletarian cultural revolution are by no means accidental or isolated.

The earth-shaking great proletarian cultural revolution initiated and led personally by Chairman Mao, the great leader of the Chinese people, has not only smashed the pipe dream of imperialism and revisionism for restoring capitalism in China, but opened up a new epoch of the proletarian socialist world revolution. Imperialism headed by the United States, modern revisionism with the Soviet revisionist leading clique as its centre and all reactionaries sense the approaching of their doomsday. However, they are not reconciled to their defeat and will put up a desperate last-ditch struggle, whip up one anti-Chinese wave after another, and frenziedly oppose and viciously attack our great proletarian

cultural revolution. For this purpose, they have directed the members of the missions and the correspondents of the imperialist, revisionist and reactionary countries in China to engage unscrupulously in all kinds of illegal activities, trying to steal by every means political, military and economic intelligence about our country and to collect ammunition for anti- Chinese propaganda.

Out of their needs to oppose China, these foreign reactionaries are snooping around with ulterior, motives surreptitiously photographing, copying and stealing big-character posters; resorting to all kinds of sinister methods to collect large numbers of such materials as papers, journals, pamphlets and leaflets put out by various Chinese revolutionary mass organisations; probing for inside information from our masses by posing as personnel from friendly countries; sneaking into our party and government departments, people's organizations, schools and enterprises by posing as Chinese; and even illegally going beyond the limits allowed for the travel of foreigners and surreptitiously taking photographs of our prohibited areas, etc., such crimes are too numerous to cite.

Holding aloft the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought China's young red guards and the broad revolutionary masses who are victoriously carrying on the great proletarian cultural revolution have on many occasions caught these sinister hands reaching out to steal intelligence about China and given stern warnings. But Chairman Mao teaches us: "Make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again till their doom; that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people's cause, and they will never go against this logic". Instead of restraining themselves a little bit, the handful of foreign reactionaries are becoming more and more blatant in their activities of stealing intelligence about China. They are downright gamblers and will never give up before losing all their stakes.

We must sternly warn these foreign reactionaries: the Chinese Government and the broad revolutionary masses of China absolutely will not tolerate your activities on Chinese soil detrimental to our state interests. You must abide by China's laws and decrees, respect China's revolutionary order and stop all your illegal activities. Otherwise, you must bear the responsibility for all the grave consequences arising therefrom. The case of Second Secretary K. Raghunath and Third Secretary P. Vijay of the Indian Embassy in China serves as a warning to you.

Appendix III

Statement by Foreign Minister in Lok Sabha, 15 June, 1967

Since I spoke to the House last, the whole world has been shocked by the news which have come from Peking about the humiliating treatment accorded to our diplomats by the Red Guards in Peking. At the airport Shri Raghunath was physically attacked and slapped. His glasses were broken and his face was stated to be bleeding. Shri Vijai who had only been declared persona non grata and who according to international law was entitled to all privileges of a diplomat until he left the territory of China was paraded round the airport for one hour and humiliated by a howling mob of Red Guards. Our First Secretary, Shri C. V. Ranganathan against whom no charges had been made was forced to bow his head by the Red Guards. That all this was done in no moment of frenzy but was the result of cold calculated and deliberate policy was shown by the fact that after this scene was enacted the Red Guards marched away in disciplined battle formation. We have just now begun to receive the direct report from our CDA in Peking. We hope that the full report will reach us by this evening or tomorrow morning. In the meantime information about their treatment in Canton has just arrived from our Charge

d'Affaires. Raghunath was taken out of plane and paraded around the airport and town in an open truck. As anticipated he was separated from Mr. Rao, accompanying Officer and Vijai. Apart from subjecting him to verbal insults, Raghunath was subjected to the characteristic form of punishment inflicted on victims and beating with sticks small enough not to bruise or lacerate. There was however some consolation in the fact that Raghunath by being taken around in a van has perhaps been saved from any kind of brutal treatment by the masses. So far Vijai was not touched in Canton. Slogans against him however were raised.

We received information about three hours ago that both Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijai have arrived in Hongkong. The party seems to have left Canton by train this morning and arrived at the border by noon time. I understand that the Hong Kong authorities have given all assistance to the party on crossing over. About an hour ago we were able to talk on telephone with our Commission in Hong Kong and personally to Shri Raghunath himself. Both of them, though in poor physical shape, are in high spirits. At present they are staying with our Commissioner in Hong Kong and the tentative plans are that they will return to India on Saturday.

We are still awaiting the full report from our Embassy in Peking which should be with us this evening or tomorrow morning. All that we have heard, however, shows that the Chinese Government not only violated ordinary rules of diplomatic usage but also broken several promises made to our Charge d'Affaires. He had been assured that Raghunath would be allowed to be accompanied by an Indian officer. The accompanying officer Shri M. S. Rao, First Secretary was never allowed to communicate with Raghunath during the journey. He was also assured that Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijai would be taken across to the border yesterday evening. The overnight stay in Canton was deliberately planned to subject our officers to humiliation. Thus the Chinese Government have proved themselves not

merely indifferent to all civilized norms but have shown themselves either unwilling or incapable of honouring their own pledged words.

Appendix IV

Statement by the Minister of External Affairs in Rajya Sabha on Friday the 16th June, 1967, regarding treatment of Indian Diplomats in China

Since I last spoke to the House, shocking news has come in from China about the shameful and barbarous treatment of our diplomats by the so-called Red Guards and 'masses' with the direct instigation and connivance of Chinese Government officials. We have now received a detailed report from our Embassy of these happenings. Immediately on their arrival at the airport, our officers were told that the Chinese would not honour the promise made by their Vice Foreign Minister to our Charge d'Affaires the previous evening that an Indian Embassy member could be present with Raghunath. The Embassy staff, therefore, formed a cordon of five around Raghunath to protect him and attempted to proceed to the aircraft. It was this cordon of officers led by our Military Attache, Col. Raina, who saved Raghunath from the first fury of attack of the Red Guards. The mob surged in fury round the cordon, which however refused to give way. Throughout the journey to the aircraft, there was complete chaos with the Red Guards raining blows on Raghunath and other Indian diplomats. It was only at the very end after walking half a mile and after some assurance was given that Raghunath would not be physically harmed that our officers gave up the cordon. While no serious injury seems to have been caused to anyone including Raghunath, only complete medical examination can reveal the full extent of the physical assaults on them. The worst treatment seems to have been meted out to Vijai on whom the rage of the crowd, frustrated in their attempt to harm

Ragunath, was directed. Vijai's arms were twisted behind and he was made to bend very low while walking over a certain distance. The front of his shirt was completely torn thus exposing his entire chest. His spectacles were smashed and his shoes displaced. Shri C. V. Ranganathan, First Secretary, was forced to raise his hands and his head was forcibly thrust down from behind. The only two persons who escaped the attacks were the Indian Charge d'Affaires himself and Shri M. S. Rao, First Secretary.

Our Embassy reports that Vijai stood up to the treatment exceedingly well and was spirited enough to come to the edge of the tarmac and waved to all the diplomats who had come to see them off while assuring them that Raghunath was also in good condition. Among those present at the airport to see off our diplomats were representatives from the Polish, Finnish and Danish Embassies. There were also many members of the British Office, including the British Charge d'Affaires himself.

On his return from the airport incident, our Charge d'Affaires immediately sought an interview with the Foreign Office to protest against the violation of the earlier assurances about Raghunath and Vijai's immunity. In Vijai's case the Chinese utter disregard for diplomatic usage was particularly glaring because he was actually leaving within 12 hours out of the 72 hours grace granted to him to leave the country. The Foreign Office came out with a trumped-up excuse that the masses had been provoked by the insulting behaviour of the Indian Officers and rejected totally all our demands. This was a lame excuse for their having reneged on their promise of safe conduct given to our Charge d'Affaires by the Chinese Vice-Minister when the latter saw our Charge d'Affaires on June 13.

On the way to Hong Kong, in Canton Raghunath was publicly paraded at the airport in an open truck. Yesterday morning he was taken in a car

from Canton to the border village to the Shumchun where again Raghunath had to face mob fury during a walk of at least one mile. Such barbarous and uncivilised behaviour towards Raghunath needs no comment.

News was received of the arrival yesterday of our two diplomats, Raghunath and Vijai, in Hong Kong. Senior officers of the Ministry talked with them on the telephone. They were in good spirits in spite of the rough treatment to which they had been subjected.

In the meantime, our authorities had carefully investigated the background and recent activities of the members of the Chinese Embassy here. As Hon'ble members are fully aware, during recent months the Chinese Government have been openly and shamelessly advocating armed struggle and revolution in India. Our investigation showed that one member of the Embassy, First Secretary Chen Lu-Chih had been guilty of gross abuse of diplomatic privileges by his collection of military intelligence and indulgence in subversive activities. It was decided that he should be stripped of his diplomatic status. This decision was conveyed to the Charge d'Affaires who said he would not abide by the decision of the Government of India. Another member of the Embassy who also has indulged in subversive activities, Mr. Hsieh Chen-Hao, Third Secretary, has been declared persona non grata. Since Mr. Chen Lu-Chih the former First Secretary has not abided by Indian law by reporting to the Foreigners Registration Office, a Deportation Order has been served on him at the Embassy. Until now these two Chinese diplomats have shown no signs of complying with our orders. In fact the behaviour of the Chinese Charge d'Affaires and the staff throughout the whole episode has been consistently unbecoming of a diplomat. They have refused to accept the diplomatic notes and communications addressed to the Embassy.

In view of the objectionable behaviour of the Chinese Embassy it has

become necessary for us to impose strict surveillance on the Embassy. The Chinese Embassy has been notified that no member of the Embassy can leave the municipal limits of Delhi and New Delhi area without prior permission of the Ministry of External Affairs. I would like to inform the House that in China our diplomats are not allowed to leave the limits of Peking except for visits to some picnic spots in the vicinity of Peking. We have also asked their cars to be checked to prevent any attempt by Chen Lu-Chih to escape and evade the processes of law.

Throughout this trying period I am happy to say that the members of our Embassy in Peking and their families have behaved with exemplary courage and dignity. I would like to pay a warm tribute to them for their devotion to duty and particularly for the comaraderie they showed in forming a cordon to protect Shri Raghunath from the wrath of the Chinese hooligans at the Peking Airport. I am sure that the House would wish me to convey their good wishes to our embassy personnel in Peking during this trying time.

Appendix V

Statement by the Minister of External Affairs in the Rajya Sabha on Saturday, the 17th June, 1967, regarding the demonstration held in front of the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi

From 5 P.M. onwards on June 16, i.e. yesterday, crowds started gathering in front of the Chinese Embassy. A strong police force was guarding the Embassy from all sides including the main gate and the lawn in front of it at Shantipath. The demonstrators, shouting slogans, crossed the Shantipath and pressed towards the main gate. The demonstrators on the lawn in front of the main gate of the Chinese Embassy by then had increased to 2,500. The police held them back, preventing them from going towards the main gate. At that time, seven functionaries of the

Chinese Embassy, who were standing behind the closed gate in the Embassy compound, started taking photographs of the crowd and shaking their fists. This was followed by an exchange of stone-throwing between some members of the crowd and members of the Chinese Embassy. About 20 demonstrators filtered through the police cordon and climbed over the Embassy compound wall. There was further exchange of stone-throwing in the course of which the Chinese hurled stones and flower pots at the demonstrators. The police went inside the compound and cleared it.

At 5-45 p.m. another group of demonstrators came with 25 donkeys carrying placards with slogans. Meanwhile, some of the demonstrators had managed to enter the Embassy premises from the rear and pressed forward towards the garage. The garage door was set on fire, one car is reported to have been damaged and three other cars received minor damage. The fire brigade unit soon reached the spot and brought the fire under control.

Meanwhile, the crowd at the main gate made a rush and overwhelmed the police force, some of whom were squeezed between the main gate and the surging crowd. In the scuffle that took place inside the Embassy compound, eight Chinese were injured. The police used a large number of tear-gas shells in order to disperse the crowd.

While the demonstrations were going on, the Chinese Charge d' Affaires was in the Ministry of External Affairs. He was informed of the demonstrations and, at his request, was escorted by a senior official of the Ministry back to the Embassy.

The Ministry of External Affairs did not receive any request from the Charge d'Affaires for medical attention to the injured people. The official of the Ministry of External Affairs accompanying the Charge d'Affaires

offered to render necessary medical attention to the injured people and to summon a doctor. The Charge d'Affaires said he would let the Ministry know in case medical help was needed. Even before that, we had given instructions for an ambulance and a doctor to proceed to the Chinese Embassy and await their summons for attending to the injured.

At 9 p.m., the Charge d'Affaires requested the Ministry of External Affairs for medical assistance. This was promptly complied with and doctors from the Willingdon Hospital went to the Embassy and rendered medical assistance. Seven members of the Chinese Embassy were admitted to the Willingdon Hospital where every attention is being given to them by the medical and nursing staff.

This morning, the Chief of Protocol and another senior official of the Ministry paid a visit to the Willingdon Hospital and saw the injured persons. A Chinese Embassy official was present at that time and told our officials that they were satisfied with the medical treatment received by the injured. It is understood that four of the injured can be discharged from the Hospital to-day or tomorrow while others are being kept under observation.

The Chinese Embassy have informed us that Mr. Chen Lu-chih, the former First Secretary, and Mr. Hsieh Chen-Hao, the Third Secretary, were injured in yesterday's scuffle and will not, therefore, be able to leave India to-day. We have agreed to permit these persons to stay for some more days until they are fit to travel.

The incidents that took place at the Chinese Embassy are to be deplored and we are taking every possible step to prevent any violation of the Chinese Embassy premises. It is obvious that our people are deeply indignant at the humiliating treatment accorded to our diplomats, Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijai, as well as to other members of our Embassy in

Peking. Their sense of indignation is all the greater because of a public trial against all rules of international law and practice, to which Shri Raghunath was subjected, even though the trial was held in absentia. The provocation given by the Chinese in Peking, Canton and Shumchun has been great. In Delhi, the incident of a Chinese official slapping a policeman and their throwing stones at the crowd and shouting abuses were, to say the least, provocative. Nevertheless, it must be realised that Embassy premises are inviolate under international law and practice and it is the duty of the Government to protect their inviolability. We have a tradition for correct diplomatic behaviour and we intend to continue this tradition. We hope that our people will co-operate with us in this matter and not do anything which might affect the fair name of India.

Appendix VI

Statement by Sardar Swaran Singh, Defence Minister in the Lok Sabha on Monday, the 19th June, 1967 on behalf of Shri M.C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, regarding developments around Indian Embassy, Peking

Hon. Members would be interested in the latest developments about the situation of our Embassy in Peking. We have now, after considerable delay received a full report from our Charge d'Affaires. Members will recall that at 11.00 A.M. on 17th June, the Chinese Foreign Ministry suddenly demanded the evacuation of all members and their families residing in different parts of Peking in the Embassy compound. A period of two hours was given for this operation but, by the time the Charge d'Affaires returned to the Embassy half hour had already passed. No cars which were already in the Embassy were permitted by the Chinese to be taken out of the Embassy compound to bring in the families. It was therefore necessary to bring in families living in about 15 to 20 flats about 3 miles away from the residence in one or two vehicles belonging to the Embassy

and a number of cars and vans lent to us by some friendly Missions. By the concerted efforts of the Embassy personnel and these friendly Missions our staff managed to evacuate every single family before the expiry of the time limit that is within 90 minutes.

The total number of individuals in the Embassy today is 66 including 15 women and 23 children. One family left for India a day before the siege began. Mr. Rao who accompanied Shri Raghunath and Vijai to Hong Kong and the weekly courier who was in Hong Kong have been asked to stay back in Hong Kong, until the position becomes clear. Hon'ble Members will recall that even before the confinement of the whole Embassy personnel in the building, demonstrations by Red Guards in front of the Embassy had already gone on for several days. Since the actual siege began day before yesterday, Red Guards have prevented any access of vehicles to the Embassy by blocking up the whole street. The so-called 'masses have smashed every window and door of the Embassy building facing the street, and the reception rooms which are adjacent to the street have been completely wrecked. So far there has been no attempt at forcing entrance into the Embassy premises, although a small back gate has been damaged. Our Embassy reports that hundreds of demonstrators stood on two sides of the Embassy compound and hurled stones and broken glass into the Embassy compound making it impossible for movements within the Embassy between the two wings. No injury has been caused to anybody yet but since windows in the reception and dining rooms of the residence and other sections of the Chancery face the road, there is at every moment the likelihood of stones falling into the building itself with a possibility of hurt being caused to women and children. Precautions are being taken against this eventuality. While all this was going on repeated attempts made by the CDA to contact the Foreign Ministry were frustrated either by lines being cut off or by false excuses. Hon. Members should realise that the total area of the Embassy compound is not more than 1 ½ acres, divided into two buildings and a

few outhouses. Friendly Missions were prevented from bringing provisions until this morning, when some provisions were finally permitted by two members of the Chinese staff of the Embassy. Ever since the siege began there has been a sustained campaign to terrorise the Embassy personnel. There have been continuous demonstrations, burning of effigies and deafening noises caused by at least 30 loudspeakers blaring away slogans day and night into this small Embassy area. Apart from the elementary physical problems this makes normal lives impossible for Embassy personnel. Hon'ble members can visualise the psychological torture to which our officers and staff in the Embassy of India, Peking and their families are being subjected to.

To put it briefly, our Embassy is besieged and the personnel of the Embassy are virtually held as prisoners. There have been similar sieges in Peking in the last one year in some other Embassies but what our people are now enduring is much worse mainly because our Embassy compound is comparatively small. Also, the only communications we are having with the outside world is the telephone and even in this case we are told that for full 8 hours on the day the siege began the Foreign Office refused to answer our telephone calls.

In spite of the almost unendurable strain that they are being subjected to, I am happy to announce that, in all his messages, our CDA has conveyed to us the determination of our Embassy personnel to go through this ordeal without flinching.

The Chinese CDA was summoned to the Ministry of External Affairs yesterday. A most emphatic protest was lodged regarding the totally unjustified and unwarranted siege of the Embassy premises.

The Embassy was informed that unless the restrictions on the movement of our officers and personnel were removed and provision as

allowed to go through, within 24 hours, the Government of India would be obliged to take appropriate counter measures, for which the Chinese Government will be obliged to bear sole responsibility. The Embassy was also informed that, as regards Mr. Chen Lu Chih and Mr. Hsieh Cheng Hao the notes already communicated stand. However, on humanitarian grounds since it is alleged that they have received injuries, it is not being enforced immediately.

Hon. Members must have seen the reports in the Press about the unseemly behaviour of the Chinese personnel at the Willingdon Hospital where the seven injured Chinese have been receiving treatment. Expert attention has been given to these injured personnel, indeed Chinese Embassy officials expressed gratification to our officers at the medical facilities and attention given to them. The Chinese CDA during his conversation was also informed that if, as is alleged Mr. Chen Lu Chih has suffered injury he could also be sent to the Willingdon Hospital where he would receive the best treatment possible. Notwithstanding all the arrangements made yesterday the Chinese Embassy personnel tried to interfere in the administration of the hospital. A Doctor of the Pakistan High Commission was also brought by the CDA as "a friend" to see the Chinese patients. The hospital authorities informed the Chinese CDA that he was welcome to see his colleagues, but the hospital could not permit foreign doctors to treat patients inside the Government hospitals. In the conversation with the Chinese CDA, it was also mentioned that, in Peking also, Embassy doctors are not allowed to treat patients inside Chinese government hospitals.

Subsequently, the Chinese Embassy personnel insisted on shouting slogans in Chinese and on having a portrait of Mao Tse Tung hung in the hospital where the patients were accommodated, obviously for propagandist purposes. Naturally the hospital removed the portrait and refused permission and insisted that this kind of behaviour in a hospital

could not be permitted. Four of the patients were discharged by the Willingdon Hospital yesterday evening, the three others are improving steadily. There is no cause for anxiety but they are being kept under observation.

Late last night our Charge d'Affaires in Peking was asked to go to the Chinese Foreign Office. He agreed to go only after proper assurances had been given about his safe transit through the demonstrators. The Foreign Office demanded that the Government of India should permit the Chinese Government to send a civil aircraft to New Delhi to evacuate the Chinese Embassy personnel injured in the recent incident on June 16, 1967. We have already issued instructions to our Charge d'Affaires to inform the Chinese Government that unless and until the present siege of the Embassy is lifted, the Government of India is not prepared to consider such a request.

If the Chinese Government does not comply with the demands raised in our note within the specified time limit, appropriate counter measures will be taken.

Appendix: VII

Statement by Sardar Swaran Singh, Defence Minister in the Rajya Sabha on Tuesday, the 20th June, 1967 at 2.30 P.M. on behalf of Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs on developments regarding Indian Embassy

Hon. Members would be interested in the latest developments about the situation of our Embassy in Peking. We have now received further details including a report from our Charge d'Affaires. Members will recall that at 11-00 A.M. on 17th June, the Chinese Foreign Ministry suddenly

demanded the evacuation of all members and their families residing in different parts of Peking in the Embassy compound. No cars which were already in the Embassy were permitted by the Chinese to be taken out of the Embassy compound to bring in the families. It was therefore necessary to bring in families living in about 15 to 20 flats about 3 miles away from the residence in one or two vehicles belonging to the Embassy and a number of cars and vans lent to us by some friendly Missions. We have, however, definite information that the British, Scandinavian, Indonesian, Yugo- slav and other socialist countries have been actively trying to help us. By the concerted efforts of the Embassy personnel and these friendly Missions our staff managed to evacuate every single family before the expiry of the time limit that is within 90 minutes.

Hon. Members will recall that even before the confinement of the whole Embassy personnel in the building, demonstrations by Red Guards in front of the Embassy had already gone on for several days. Since the actual siege began day before yesterday, Red Guards have prevented any of our personnel from leaving the premises (except when the C.D.A. was required to proceed to the Foreign Office). Access of vehicles to the Embassy has been blocked. The so-called 'masses' have smashed every window and door of the Embassy building facing the street, and the reception rooms which are adjacent to the street have been completely wrecked. So far there has been no attempt at forcing entrance into the Embassy premises, although a small back gate entrance has been damaged.

Hon. Members should realize that the total area of the Embassy compound is not more than 1 ½ acres, divided into two buildings and a few outhouses. Ever since the siege began there has been a sustained campaign to terrorise the Embassy personnel by continuous demonstrations. Hon. Members can visualise the psychological torture to which our officers and staff in the Embassy of India, Peking, and their

families are being subjected to. In spite of the almost unendurable strain that they are being subjected to, I am happy to announce that, in all his messages, our C.D.A. has conveyed to us the determination of our Embassy personnel to go through this ordeal without flinching.

The Chinese Charge d'Affaires was summoned to the Ministry of External Affairs on June 18th and informed that unless the restrictions on the movement of our officers and personnel were removed and provisions allowed to go through, within 24 hours, Government of India would be obliged to take appropriate counter measures, for which the Chinese Government would be obliged to bear sole responsibility.

On the expiry of the time-limit, no information had come from the Chinese Government of the compliance with our request and the siege being lifted. A note was despatched at 6 P.M. after allowing reasonable time for a communication to reach Delhi, informing the Embassy that to protect the Embassy personnel from the just indignation of the Indian people about recent developments, it had been decided to restrict the movement of the Chinese personnel within the compound. If the C.D.A. wanted to come to the Foreign Office, he would be permitted to do so and provided with an escort.

We have still not received any information from our Embassy in Peking that the siege is being lifted. The Ministry of External Affairs were able to have a direct conversation on the telephone with Shri Sathe yesterday afternoon. Shri Sathe informed our Ministry that all the Embassy personnel were in high spirits.

During the interview of the 18th, the C.D.A. was also informed that as regards Mr. Chen Lu-Chih and Mr. Hsieh Cheng Hao the notice already communicated stand. The time limit, however, was extended, as it was alleged that these two former officials of the Chinese Embassy had

suffered injuries. Since Mr. Hsieh, the former Third Secretary, was reported to have received only minor injuries, he was informed yesterday that he must make arrangements to leave India by 21st June, evening. Hon. Members must have seen the reports in the Press about the unseemly behaviour of the Chinese personnel at the Willingdon Hospital where the seven injured Chinese have been receiving treatment. The Chinese Embassy personnel insisted on shouting slogans in Chinese and on having portrait of Mao Tse-tung hung in the hospital where the patients were accommodated, obviously for propagandist purposes. Naturally the hospital removed the portrait and refused permission and insisted that this kind of behaviour in a hospital could not be permitted. Four of the patients were discharged by the Willingdon Hospital on Sunday: three others are improving steadily. There is no cause for anxiety but they are being kept under observation.

Unseemly behaviour by Chinese Government personnel does not seem to be limited to India. On Saturday June 17, a large number of Chinese Embassy personnel had turned up at Kathmandu airport to receive Mr. Chen Lu-Chih, former First Secretary and Mr. Hsieh Cheng-hao, former Third Secretary who were expected to arrive on that plane. When they learnt that the plane had been diverted, the Embassy personnel staged a noisy anti-Indian demonstration at Kathmandu airport. Our Ambassador in Kathmandu has already protested to the Nepalese Government against this flagrant abuse of Nepalese hospitality for anti-Indian propaganda.

Shri K. Raghunath, I am glad to inform you, has already joined the Ministry of External Affairs in the China Division. The House must be aware that on the evening of June 18 i.e. the day after Shri Raghunath returned to India he gave a Press Conference in which he gave an account of the incidents experienced by him from Peking to Hong Kong and answered questions from Foreign and Indian Press correspondents. The decision not to have Press Conference in Hong Kong by these two

diplomats had been made by the Ministry of External Affairs after careful consideration. It was felt that Shri Raghunath should first report to the Government before he addressed a Press Conference.

Hon. Members have already heard about the Chinese request that the Government of India should permit the Chinese Government to send a civil aircraft to New Delhi to evacuate the Chinese Embassy personnel injured in the recent incident on June 16, 1967. We have immediately instructed our Charge d'Affaires to inform the Chinese Government that unless and until the present siege of the Embassy is lifted, the Government of India is not prepared to consider such a request.

We have this morning received further information from our Charge d'Affaires that the Chinese Government have, communicated their intention to send a Chinese civil aircraft to India on the 21st of June. They have given the details of the aircraft and the routes, etc. The Government of India are transmitting immediately a reply to the Chinese Government to this latest note. Our reply recalls what had already been communicated to the Chinese Government that the request for Chinese civilian aircraft can be considered after the siege of the Indian Embassy is lifted and normal functioning of the Embassy restored. We are further informing them that if this condition is satisfied, Government of India would be prepared to consider the Chinese request on a reciprocal basis; that is to say, as a quid pro quo to the Chinese Government sending an aircraft here, the Government of India would send an aircraft to Peking to evacuate some of their personnel. The flight of the two aircraft must be synchronised and prior arrangements made in that connection by mutual consultation.

Appendix VIII

Statement made by MMHA in the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha on 7-3-1968

We have been informed by the Delhi Administration that on March 6, 1968 constables Ghanisham Parshad and Ram Richpal Singh of 24th Btn. of the C.R.P. were returning at about 15-15 hours from beat duty in Railway Colony at Sardar Patel Marg to Police Station Chanakpuri. They were in uniform. They took a short cut through the Chinese Embassy premises by entering from one of the gates on Nyaya Marg and emerged on the main gate on Shanti Path. When the two constables had come out of the main gate of the Embassy, they were called back by the gate-keeper Bir Bahadur of the Chinese Embassy. One of them, namely, Ghanisham Parshad complied and entered the gate. Bir Bahadur caught hold of him and took him inside the room meant for the gate-keeper and forcibly detained him. Soon after this some Chinese and others came from the main Embassy building and took Ghanisham Parshad inside the main building.

2. At about 17.15 hours the Station House Officer told another Chowkidar of the Embassy, Suraj Bahadur, to inform the Chinese inside the main building that the Sub-Divisional Magistrate and the Sub-Divisional Police Officer would like to talk to them about the detained Constable. After sometime he returned and intimated that the Chinese would not talk to the local authorities but would deal only with the Ministry of External Affairs. After about 15 minutes the Sub-Divisional Magistrate spoke on telephone to the Chinese authorities in the Embassy and requested them to release the constable. His request was turned down and he was told that they would deal only with the Ministry of External Affairs.

3. Around 5-30 p.m. the Chinese Embassy informed the Protocol Department of the Ministry of External Affairs alleging that an intruder

into the Embassy premises had been apprehended by them and that they would like to hand him over before Protocol Officer known to them. The Ministry of External Affairs, Protocol Department, advised the Chinese Embassy to release the Constable to the security personnel stationed outside the Embassy building. But on the instance of the Chinese Embassy that they would hand over the person concerned only to an official of the Ministry of External Affairs who is known to them, two Protocol Officers of the Ministry of External Affairs proceeded to the Chinese Embassy around 6 P.M. Since by 7 P.M. neither two Protocol Officers nor the detained Constable emerged from the Chinese premises, the Ministry of External Affairs put through a telephone call to the Chinese Embassy demanding that the Police Constable should be allowed to leave the Embassy immediately. Since the Chinese Embassy personnel prevaricated, the Ministry of External Affairs summoned the Chinese CDA to come to the Ministry forthwith. Thereupon the Chinese Embassy informed the Ministry that the Constable had left their premises.

4. The two constables have stated that they did not know that it was improper to go through the Embassy premises. Constable Ghanisham Parshad has further stated that he was forcibly detained in the first instance by the chowkidars and later by the Chinese inside the main building. He was not allowed to go until he was prepared to give it in writing to the Chinese that he had come into the Chinese Embassy premises. He was made to write and sign a statement inside the Embassy.

5. A case under section 365 I.P.C. that is abducting a person with the intention to cause him to be secretly and wrongfully confined, has been registered on a complaint lodged by Constable Ram Richpal Singh.

6. The Government of India take a serious view of the illegal detention

of an Indian national specially a policeman in uniform in the Chinese Embassy premises and in extorting a statement from him. The Chinese Embassy should have handed over the policeman to the local authorities immediately and taken up the matter with the Ministry of External Affairs in the normal course. A note has been sent to the Chinese Embassy strongly protesting against their highhanded and illegal action in detaining and extorting a statement from an Indian official.
