

**Notes, Memoranda and letters Exchanged and Agreements  
signed between The Governments of India and China 1954 –  
1959**

**WHITE PAPER I**

**Extracts (1959)**

**Ministry of External Affairs  
Government of India**

**Informal note given by the Ministry of External Affairs to the  
Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy in India, 17 January 1959.**

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

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

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

NEW DELHI;

January 16, 1959.

\* \* \*

**Note given by the Foreign Office of China to the Indian  
Counsellor in Peking, 23 June 1959**

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

According to well-founded report received by the Chinese Government, the Migyitun area in the south eastern part of the Tibetan region of China was intruded, shelled (and) occupied by over 200 Indian troops.

These Indian troops, equipped with radio stations and weapons of various types, were building military work around Migyitun. What is particularly serious, they even went to the length of entering into collusion with the Tibetan rebel bandits to carry out illegal activities.

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

The Chinese Government must point out solemnly that the above-mentioned Migyitun, Samgar Sanpo and other places are indisputably territories always belonging to China. And the brazen intrusion and occupation of Chinese territory by batches of Indian troops numbering

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

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

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

\* \* \*

**Note of the Government of India, 26 June 1959**

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

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

3. The Government of India have scrupulously observed the traditional border between India and Tibet region of China along the entire Indo-Chinese frontier. This traditional International frontier coincides with the so-called Macmahon line. According to this line Migyitun is within Chinese territory in Tibet and so are Samgu Sampo, Molo and Gyala. The Government of India emphatically repudiate any suggestion that their forces violated the international frontier and occupied these places which are admittedly part of Chinese territory. The Government of India regret that the Government of the People's Republic of China should have believed the allegations that their forces could any way be in collusion with Tibetan rebels. The Chinese Government are aware of the circumstances in which a large number of people from Tibet have sought refuge in Indian territory. The Government of India while giving refuge

to these people in accordance with accepted International usage, made it clear to them that they could not use Indian territory for hostile action against China, The refugees were disarmed as soon as they entered Indian territory and those who wished to stay in India were moved south away from the frontier. The Government of India have scrupulously enforced these measures and there could be no question of their encouraging, far less acting in collusion with, the refugees in violating Chinese territory. The Government of India have no information about any rebel activities in this area, and if there are any, they are in no way responsible for them.

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

5. The Government of India place great value on the maintenance of friendly and good neighbourly relations with China and stand firmly by the Five principles of co-existence or Panch Sheel. They can only believe

that the note of the Chinese Government must be based on wrong information received by them. The Government of India have already asked the officers in charge of their outposts in this area to place themselves in friendly contact with the Chinese officers on the other side and will be grateful if similar instructions are issued by the Chinese Government to the officers on their side of the frontier.

6. The Embassy of India renews to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

\* \* \*

**Informal Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Chinese Counsellor in India, 4 July 1959**

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

2. The Chinese authorities were good enough to inform the Government of India before conducting the survey of the Sino-Burmese and Indian borders in the winter of 1958 and the Government of India wish to do likewise.

\* \* \*

## **Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Counsellor of China in India, 30 July 1959**

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

On the 28<sup>th</sup> July at about 10-45A.M. (IST) an Indian Police Party engaged on reconnaissance within Indian territory came across a Chinese armed detachment of nearly 25 persons at a point approximately 33.39 N and 78.46 E. The Officer commanding of the Indian party along with five constables approached the Chinese party with a view to explain that the Chinese detachment had transgressed into Indian territory and that it should withdraw immediately beyond the International frontier. The Indian Patrol party of six persons had still not reported to its headquarters by the evening of 29<sup>th</sup> July, 1959, and there is reason to believe that the Indian party has been taken into custody by the Chinese detachment. It is also reported that the Chinese detachment has established a camp at Spanggur 33.34 N and 78.48 E.

The places mentioned lie well within the Indian frontier as notified in official maps. In fact, on an earlier occasion, when information had been received of a Chinese patrol having visited Khurnak Fort, latitude 33.47 N longitude 79 E the Ministry had drawn attention of the Chinese Embassy to the violation of the Indian frontier in a note presented on the 2<sup>nd</sup> July 1958. In the same note, advance intimation of the intention



of the Government of India to send a reconnaissance party to the Khurnak Fort had been conveyed to the Chinese Government.

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

\* \* \*

**Note given by the Foreign Office of China to the Counsellor of India, 6 August 1959**

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to acknowledge receipt of the latest note handed over on 30<sup>th</sup> July 1959 to Counsellor Yeh Cheng-Chang of the Chinese Embassy in India by Mr.

K.L. Mehta of the Ministry of External Affairs of India and states in reply as follow:

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

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

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

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

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

\* \* \*

**Note given to the Foreign Office of China by the Ambassador of India, 11 August 1959.**

On 7<sup>th</sup> August armed Chinese patrol strength approximately 200 committed violation of our border at Khinzemane longitude 91.46 'E latitude 27.46'N. When encountered by our own patrol who requested the Chinese Patrol to withdraw to their territory, our patrol was pushed back to the bridge at Drokung Samba longitude 91.47' E latitude 27.46'N. These places are admittedly within Indian territory and we have been in continuous possession of it. Traditionally as well as

according to Treaty Map the boundary runs along Thagla Ridge north of Mankha Chuthangmu valley and this position has been accepted in the past.

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

\* \* \*

**Note given by the Embassy of India to the Foreign Office of China, 13 August 1959**

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

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

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

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

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

5. The Embassy of India avails itself of this opportunity to express to the Foreign Office of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

\* \* \*

**Note given by the Foreign Office of China to the Counsellor of India, 27 August 1959**

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

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

\* \* \*

**Note given to the Foreign Office of China by the Indian  
Ambassador, 28 August 1959**

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

2. Another serious instance of violation of the Indian border and unlawful trespass into Indian territory by Chinese forces has just been brought to the notice of the Government of India. On the 25<sup>th</sup> August a strong Chinese detachment crossed into Indian territory south of Migyitun on the NEFA border and fired without notice on an Indian forward picket. They arrested the entire picket which was twelve strong but eight Indian personnel somehow managed to escape. Thereafter the Chinese detachment outflanked the Indian outpost at Longju and opened fire on it from a distance of about 800 yards.

Their object clearly was to overpower our outpost which was well within our territory about two miles south of the international border. There could be no doubt about the international frontier in this area and this is a case of deliberate aggression on Indian territory. The Government of India take very serious notice of this latest incident which' as we have said above, is one of a number a recent weeks.

3. The Government of India strongly protest against these repeated violations of Indian territory by Chinese armed forces. Until now Government have observed discreet reticence about these incidents although there is good deal of concern among the Indian public and in Parliament about the security arrangements on India's northern frontier. The Government of India would urge once more that the Chinese authorities should issue immediate instructions to their frontier forces not to violate Indian territory. The Government of India have issued instructions to their frontier posts to maintain their territorial integrity and use force on the trespassers if necessary. It occurs to them that all his show of force is entirely uncalled for. If the Chinese Government have any dispute about any point on the international frontier, it should be possible to resolve the dispute by negotiations between two friendly governments rather than by the unilateral application of force by one side against the other. The Government of India strongly urge the Chinese Government to adopt this peaceful approach. It is possible that the Central Government of China is not aware of the illegal activities of their forces in the region of the international frontier. The Government of India suggest that they should issue immediate instructions to all concerned against the use of force in assertion of supposed claims.

4. The Government of India are now informed that on the 26<sup>th</sup> August Chinese forces encircled the post at Longju and opened heavy fire on it. Our personnel had therefore to abandon the post. We have no exact information as to their whereabouts. This is very serious matter which bound to rouse popular feelings in India. The Government of India reiterate once more their emphatic protest against the enforcement of



claims by the unilateral application of force. The question of Chinese claim to Indian frontier areas as indicated in official Chinese maps was dealt with in detail by the Prime Minister in his letter of the 22<sup>nd</sup> March 1959 to the Chinese Prime Minister. The Prime Minister agreed "that the position as it was before the recent disputes arose should be respected by both sides and neither sides should try to take unilateral action in exercise of what it conceives to be its right. Further, if any possession has been secured recently, the position should be rectified". The Prime Minister has not yet received any reply to this letter. The Government of India reiterate the suggestion and urge that the Chinese troops withdraw immediately from the area at Longju which they have forcibly occupied.

\* \* \*

**Letter from the Prime Minister of China to the Prime Minister of India, 23 January 1959.**

PEKING

January 23, 1959

Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

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

Thank you for the credit you give the achievements of our country in economic construction. It is true that, through the joint efforts of the entire Chinese people, our country made in industrial and agricultural

production in 1958 an advance which we describe as an "great leap forward". However, as we started from a very poor economic foundation, our present level of development in production is still very low. It will take us a number of years more of hard work in order to bring about a relatively big change in the economic picture of our country.

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

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

In your letter you have taken much space to discuss the question of Sino-Indian boundary and thus enabled us to understand better the

Indian Government's stand on the question. I would also like now to set forth the views and stand of the Chinese Government.

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

It was true that the border question was not raised in 1954 when negotiations were being held between the Chinese and Indian sides for the Agreement on Trade and Intercourse between the Tibet Region of China and India. This was because conditions were not yet ripe for its settlement and the Chinese side, on its part, had had no time to study the question. The Chinese Government has always held that the existence of the border question absolutely should not affect the development of Sino-Indian friendly relations. We believe that, following proper Preparations, this question which has been carried over from the

past can certainly be settled reasonably on the basis of the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence through friendly talks. To this end, the Chinese Government has now proceeded to take certain steps in making preparations.

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

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

In recent years, there occurred between China and India some minor border incidents which are probably difficult to avoid pending the formal delimitation of the boundary. In order to avoid such incidents so far as possible before the boundary is formally delimited, our government would like to propose to the Indian Government that, as a provisional measure, the two sides temporarily maintain the status-quo, that is to say, each side keep for the time being to the border areas at present under its jurisdiction and not go beyond them. For the differences between the two sides, naturally a solution may be sought through

consultations like those held on the Wu-Je (Hoti) question. As to the negotiations regarding Wu-Je, we also regret very much that no agreement has yet been reached, as we formerly thought a solution would not be difficult to achieve through negotiations and on-the-spot investigations. We still believe that this small question can be settled satisfactorily through the continued efforts of our two sides. The Chinese Government hopes that the above proposal about temporary maintenance of the present state of the boundary between the two sides will be approved of by the Indian Government.

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

With sincere regards,

(Sd) CHOU EN-LAI,  
Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China.

\* \* \*

**Letter from the Prime Minister of India to the Prime Minister of  
China, 22 March 1959**

New Delhi

22<sup>nd</sup> March, 1959

DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER,

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

2. I am grateful to you for the facilities which your Government accorded to our small delegation which visited China to study your water conservancy methods and programme.

Two more delegations –one to study methods for improving agricultural yield and the other to study your iron and steel programme –will shortly be reaching China. I have no doubt that they will benefit from this opportunity of studying the remarkable progress which your country has achieved in these fields.

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

4. On receipt of your letter I have again examined the basis of the determination of the frontier between India and the Tibet Region of China. It is true that this frontier has not been demarcated on the ground in all the sectors but I am somewhat surprised to know that this

frontier was not accepted at any time by the Government of China. The traditional frontier, as you may be aware, follows the geographical principle of watershed on the crest of the High Himalayan Range, but apart from this, in most parts it has the sanction of specific international agreements between the then Governments of India and the Central Government of China. It may perhaps be useful if I draw your attention to some of these agreements:

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

(ii) The Ladakh Region of the State of Jammu and Kashmir- A treaty of 1842 between Kashmir on the one hand and the Emperor of China and Lama Guru of Lhasa on the other, mentions the India-China boundary in the Ladakh region. In 1847 the Chinese Government admitted that this boundary was sufficiently and distinctly fixed. The area now claimed by China has always been depicted as part of India on official maps, has been surveyed by Indian officials and even a Chinese map of shows it as Indian territory.

(iii) The MacMahon Line-As you are aware, the so-called MacMahon Line runs eastwards from the eastern borders of Bhutan and defines the boundary of China on the one hand and on the India and Burma on the other. Contrary to what has been reported to you, this line was, in fact, drawn at a Tripartite Conference held at Simla in 1913-1914 between the Plenipotentiaries of the



Governments of China, Tibet and India. At the time of acceptance of the delineation of this frontier, Lonchen Shatra, the Tibetan Plenipotentiary, in letters exchanged, stated explicitly that he had received orders from Lhasa to agree to the boundary as marked on the map appended to the Convention. The Line was drawn After full discussion and was confirmed subsequently by formal exchange of letters; and there is nothing to indicate that the Tibetan authorities were in any way dissatisfied with the agreed boundary. Moreover, although the Chinese Plenipotentiary at the conference objected to the boundaries between Inner and Outer Tibet and between Tibet and China, there is no mention of any Chinese reservation in respect of the India-Tibet frontier either during the discussions or at the time of their initialling the Convention. This line has the incidental advantage of running along the crest of the High Himalayan Range which forms the natural dividing line between the Tibetan plateau in the north and the sub-montane region in the south. In our previous discussions and particularly during your visit to India in January 1957, we were gratified to note that you were prepared to accept this line as representing the frontier between China and India in this region and I hope that we shall reach an understanding on this basis.

5. Thus, in these three different sectors covering such the larger part of our boundary with China, there is sufficient authority based on geography, tradition as well as treaties for the boundary as shown in our published maps. The remaining sector from the tri-junction of the Nepal, India and Tibet boundary up to Ladakh is also traditional and follows well defined watersheds between the river systems in the south and the

west on the one hand and north and east on the other. This delineation is confirmed by old revenue records and maps and by the exercise of Indian administrative authority up to the boundary line for decades.

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

7. I do hope that a study of the foregoing paragraphs will convince you that not only is the delineation of our frontier, as published in our maps, based on natural and geographical features but that it also coincides with tradition and over a large part is confirmed by international agreements. I need hardly add that independent India would be the last country to make any encroachments beyond its well-established frontiers. It was in the confidence that the general question of our

common frontier was settled to the satisfaction of both sides that I declared publicly and in Parliament on several occasions that there is no room for doubt about our frontiers as shown in the published maps. We thought that our position was clearly understood and accepted by your Government. However, as unfortunately there is some difference of views between our two Governments in regard to the delineation of the frontier at some places, I agree that the position as it was before the recent disputes arose should be respected by both sides and that neither side should try to take unilateral action in exercise of what it conceives to be its right. Further, if any possession has been secured recently, the position should be rectified.

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

With kind regards,

Yours Sincerely,  
(Sd.) JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

\* \* \*

## **Note of Chinese Government given to the Counsellor of India, 12 January 1959**

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

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

At the same time, the Chinese Government would like to inform the Indian Government of the following facts: During 1958, particularly during October and November 1958, the Chinese Government repeatedly received reports to the effect that foreign aircraft intruding

into Chinese air space were observed at Gargunsa, Gartok, Gyanima and other places in the western part of the Tibet Region of China. Some of these aircraft flew from the direction of India while other flew towards India. Foreign aircraft intruding into Chinese air space were also discovered in other parts of the Tibet region of China, in the area of Yatung, Phari and Gyantse and in the vicinity of Chayul. The Chinese border troops were not able to identify the nationality of these planes; however considering the direction of their flights and the fact that the places where they appeared are close to India, the Chinese Government, in the spirit of friendship and co-operation between China and India, would like to draw the attention of the Indian Government to the above-mentioned circumstances. If these are Indian planes, it is hoped that the Indian Government would take necessary measures to prevent recurrence of such incidents. If these are not Indian planes, it is also hoped that these incidents would arouse the common vigilance of the Indian Government as well as the Chinese Government.

\* \* \*

**Statement made by Foreign Secretary to the Chinese  
Ambassador, 26 April 1959**

On the 3<sup>rd</sup> April the Foreign Secretary informed His Excellency the Ambassador that the Dalai Lama with a small party had entered Indian territory on the 31<sup>st</sup> March. The Dalai Lama had earlier sent a message to the Government of India asking for Political asylum in India. The Government of India had, in accordance with international usage, allowed the Dalai Lama and his party to cross into Indian territory and

stay in India. The Dalai Lama has since moved with his entourage to Mussoorie where necessary arrangements have been made by the Government of India for his residence.

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

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

4. The Government of India have now seen recent reports of speeches delivered in the current session of the National People's Congress in Peking. They have read these reports with regret as they contain unbecoming and unjustified attacks on the Government of India and their officials and certain allegations which are patently untrue. Thus, it is stated that the Dalai Lama continues to be under duress and that the statements made by him are imposed on him by foreigners. Reference

has also been made to so-called "Indian reactionaries" who are supposed to be "working in the footsteps of the of the British imperialists and have been harbouring expansionist ambitions towards Tibet."

The Government of India are distressed to see these reports and to notice that a furious and unworthy campaign has been stated in the press and the radio in Peking, the effect which can only be to do incalculable damage to the friendly relations between India and China. The Government of India would like to state categorically that the statements by the Dalai Lama are entirely his own and no official of theirs was in any way responsible for them. The Dalai Lama was allowed to enter India at his own request; he is acting entirely on his own and is free to return to his country any time he wishes to do so. If the Chinese Government want to satisfy themselves on this point, they are welcome to send their Ambassador in India or any other emissary to meet the Dalai Lama and necessary facilities will be given to the emissary to discuss with him and ascertain his wishes.

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

6. It is well –known that India has had long standing religious and cultural contacts with the people of Tibet and the people of India are

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

7. The Prime Minister has declared in Parliament that the Dalai Lama will be accorded respectful treatment in India, but he is not expected to carry on any political activities from this country. The Government of India consider it most unfortunate that the fact of their having given asylum to the Dalai Lama, in exercise of their sovereignty and in accordance with well-known international usage, should have led responsible persons in China to make serious allegations which are unbecoming and entirely void of substance.

\* \* \*

**Note of the Government of China, 27 April 1959 to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi**

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the



Ministry of External Affairs of the Republic of India, and hereby lodges the following serious protest with the Ministry regarding the occurrence in Bombay of Indians insulting the head of state of the People's Republic of China.

At about 4:40 on the afternoon of the 20<sup>th</sup> April, 1959, in Bombay there were about 80 Indians claiming themselves to be members of the Socialist Party, came to the Consulate General of the People's Republic of China at Bombay, demonstrated and shouted slogans

In front of the Consulate-General and some of them made speeches.

They branded China's putting down of the rebellion in her own territory, the Tibet Region, as imperialists action and made all sorts of slanders.

What is more serious is that they pasted up a portrait of Mao Tse -Tung, Chairman of the People's Republic of China, on the wall of the Chinese Consulate-General and carried out wanton insult by throwing tomatoes and rotten eggs at it. While these ruffians were insulting the portrait, the Indian Policemen stood by without interfering with them, and pulled off the encircling spectators for the correspondents to take photographs of it. After the ruffians had left, the police officer once again allowed people to take photographs of the portrait and then tore it down and took it away.

Such an act pasting up the portrait of the Chairman of the People's Republic of China on the wall of the Chinese Consulate- General and throwing tomatoes and rotten eggs at it is huge insult to the head of state of the People's Republic of China and the respected and beloved leader of the Chinese people. And while the ruffians were insulting the portrait of the Chairman of the People's Republic of China, the policemen of the Bombay local authorities not only didn't interfere but pulled off the encircling spectators for correspondents to take a photographs of it.

After the ruffians had left the Police officer once again allowed people to take photographs of the portrait and then it tore it down and took it away. It is evidently an act of connivance. For this the Chinese Government cannot but express its indignation and hereby lodges a serious protest. The Chinese Government requests that the Government of India speedily deals with the matter of insult to the head of the state of the People's Republic of China and makes a speedy reply. Such a matter of huge insult to the head of state of the People's Republic of China is what the masses of the six hundred and fifty million Chinese people absolutely cannot tolerate, and it must be reasonably settled, otherwise the Chinese people cannot come to a stop with regard to the matter. In case the reply from the Indian Government is not satisfactory, the Embassy is instructed to make it clear that the Chinese Government will again raise this matter to the Indian Government, and the Chinese side will never come to a stop if without a satisfactory settlement of the matter, that is to say, never stop even for one hundred years.

\* \* \*

### **Note of the Government of India, 30 April 1959**

The Embassy of India, Peking, present their compliments to the Foreign Office of the Government of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the note no. M/129/59 presented to the Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India on April 27 by the Chinese Embassy, New Delhi, have the honour to state that investigations have been made

into the facts relating to the incident referred to in the note. These facts, which are not wholly as stated in the note of the Embassy, are given below.

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

3 As a result of the full investigations made by them, the Government of India are satisfied that the Police did not connive at the deplorable behaviour of some of the demonstrators. On the contrary, they intervene immediately the particular incident came to their notice and sought to stop further mischief. It is not a fact that the Police cleared the way for photographers to take photographs of the picture of Chairman Mao Tse-Tung.

As the Chinese Government are probably aware, the Chinese Consulate is situated at one of the busiest traffic corners in Bombay. In fact, since the demonstrators were obstructing the traffic, the police endeavoured to clear the way and many of the demonstrators were pushed to the opposite side of the road.

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

Type 72 para 5

6. Whatever the circumstances and facts, the Government of India deeply regret that discourtesy was shown to a picture of Chairman Mao

Tse-Tung, the respected head of a State with which India has ties of friendship. The incident is undoubtedly deplorable, but as stated above, it is the act of a few persons and there was no question of connivance of the Police or Government.

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

8. The Government of India would like to add that while they can understand and appreciate the resentment of the Chinese Government at such an incident, they regret the language used in the Chinese Embassy's memorandum.

\* \* \*

**Statement made by the Chinese Ambassador to the Foreign Secretary, 16 May 1959**

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

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

The above –said is self evident and undeniable. Nevertheless, there appeared in India, before and after the outbreak of the rebellion in Tibet, large quantities of words and deeds slandering China and interfering in China's internal affairs. Responsible persons of many Indian Political Parties, including the National Congress, and not a few Indian publications openly called Tibet a "country", slandered the Chinese Government's putting down the rebellion in Tibet as "practising banditry and imperialism", demanded that the Tibet question be submitted to the United Nations and even proposed the holding of a tripartite conference of India, China and Tibet to settle the Tibet question which can only be handled by the Chinese Government. Most of the political parties in India went so far as to form organisations in support of the Tibetan rebels. Groups of ruffians were allowed to make

provocations and disturbances in front of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates –General in India, and there even occurred the grave incident of insulting the head of state of China. These words and deeds were in the nature of serious interference in China's internal affairs and sabotage of Sino-Indian friendship, and this can not be alerted by recourse to any pretext, whether "freedom of speech" or any other "freedoms", even less can be the "feeling of kinship derived from long-established religious and cultural contacts with the Tibetan people" be a pretext for these words and deeds. It is obvious that the Chinese people likewise have a "feeling of kinship derived from long –established religious and cultural contacts" towards the Indian people, but China has never used this as a pretext to interfere in India's internal affairs, and will never do so.

The Indian Government has recognised the Tibet region as a part of China's territory and has repeatedly declared that it has no desire to interfere in China's internal affairs. This was worthy of welcome.

Nevertheless, responsible members of the Indian Government, though they could not possibly be better acquainted with the situation in Tibet than the Chinese Government openly expressed doubts about documents published by China officially, refused to accept the Chinese Government's account of the facts, and asserted that the basis of the rebellion in Tibet "must have been a strong feeling of nationalism" and that the upper strata reactionaries in Tibet were not solely responsible for the rebellion. They even charged that "agreement between Tibet and China on the autonomous status of Tibet and the assurance given to India had not been kept by the Chinese Government, and described the Chinese Government's putting down the rebellion in Tibet as "armed intervention" and as "oppressing and suppressing" the Tibetan people.

The Indian Government announced that it had granted political asylum to the Dalai Lama in accordance with international practice and stated that the "Dalai Lama was not expected" to engage in any political activities in India. This would not have caused any dispute. But on April 18 and 22, two statements advocating "independence of Tibet" and directing Wanton attacks on the Chinese Government were issued respectively in Tezpur and Mussoorie in the name of the Dalai Lama. What was particularly surprising, the so-called "statement of the Dalai Lama" of April 18 was not only distributed by an official of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs but also carried on official bulletins of Indian Embassies abroad. Such an line of action on the part of Indian Government could hardly be considered conformable to well-known international practice. The Indian Government insisted that the Dalai Lama was entirely responsible for the two traitorous statements issued by in his name. In that case, did not the impressive welcome extended to the Dalai Lama by the Indian Government and the talks Prime Minister himself held with him mean giving a welcome to a Chinese rebel and holding a meeting with him? All these statements and actions of the Indian Government, no matter what the subjective intention might be, undoubtedly played an objective role of encouraging the Tibetan rebels. The facts themselves have completely overthrown the allegation that there is no Indian interference in China's internal affairs. The Chinese Government and the people, having regard for the overall Sino-Indian friendship, for quite a long time exercised utmost forbearance in the hope that the words and deeds occurring in India interfering in China's internal affairs and detrimental to Sino-Indian friendship would end. To the contrary, however, the words and deeds against China and interfering in China's internal affairs coming from the Indian side went



from bad to worse and developed to an intolerable extent. Only then did the Chinese people give the reply that was due, in order to safeguard their state sovereignty and oppose outside interference, and also to uphold the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and Sino-Indian friendship. The Chinese People's is in the nature of reasoning and is well grounded on fact. All those who have the opportunity of reading a full report of the opinions of the Chinese People will arrive at this conclusion. It is unjustifiable that the Indian Government should have tried in various ways to defend the words and deeds of the Indian side interfering in China's internal affairs and impairing Sino-Indian friendship, while making charges against the proper reply of the Chinese People.

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

In its relation with India, China has consistently adhered to the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and worked for the development of

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

On the whole, India is friend of China, this has been so in the past thousand and more years, and we believe will certainly continue to be so in one thousand and more years to come. The enemy of the Chinese people lies in the East-the U.S. imperialists have many military based in Taiwan, in South Korea, Japan and in the Philippines which are all directed against China. China's main attention and policy to struggle are directed to the east, to the west Pacific region, to the vicious and aggressive U.S. imperialism, and not to India or any other country in the southeast Asia and South Asia. Although the Philippines, Thailand and Pakistan have joined the SEATO which is designed to oppose China, we have not treated those three countries as our principal enemy; our principal enemy is U.S. imperialism. India has not taken part in the Southeast Asia Treaty; it is not an opponent, but a friend to our country. China will not be so foolish as to antagonize India in the west. The

putting down of the rebellion and the carrying out of democratic reform in Tibet will not in the least endanger India. You can wait and see. As the Chinese proverb goes " the strength of a horse is borne out by the distance travelled, and the heart of a person is seen with the lapse of time". You will ultimately see whether relations between the Tibet region of China and India are friendly or hostile by watching three, five, ten, twenty, a hundred years. We cannot have two centres of attention, nor can we take friend for foe. This is our state policy. The quarrel between our two countries in the past few years, particularly in the last three months, is but an interlude in the course of thousands upon thousands of years of friendships between the two countries and does not warrant a big fuss on the part of the broad masses and the Government authorities of our countries. The principles, position and distinctions between right and wrong as set forth in the foregoing paragraphs have to be set forth; otherwise the current difference between our countries cannot be resolved. But so far as the extent of the implication of those words is concerned, it is only temporary and local; that is to say, they refer only to a temporary difference between our two countries and concern solely the region of Tibet. Our Indian friends! What is your mind? Will you be agreeing to our thinking regarding the view that China can only concentrate its main attention eastward of China, but not south-westwards of China, nor is it necessary for it to do so. Chairman Mao-Tse Tung, the leader of our country, talked on many occasions with Mr. R.K. Nehru, former Indian Ambassador to China, who could well understand and appreciate it. We do not know whether the former Indian Ambassador conveyed this to the Indian authorities. Friends! it seems to us that you too cannot have two fronts. Is it not so? If it is, here then lies the meeting point of our

two sides. Will you please think it over? Allow me to take this opportunity to extend my best regards to Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, the leader of India.

\* \* \*

**Statement of the Foreign Secretary to the Chinese Ambassador,  
23 May 1959**

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

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

2- We have no desire to enter into a lengthy argument about facts or opinions, much less about the discourteous language used in the statement made on behalf of the Chinese Government. It has been the consistent practice of the Government of India to treat

other countries with courtesy and friendliness, even though any country might express opinion opposed to theirs. With China they have endeavoured to maintain and develop friendly relations, and they propose to continue to do so in spite of the discourtesy shown to them by the Chinese Government. This is in consonance with India's past culture and background and Mahatma Gandhi's teachings.

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

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

Government of China should understand that this is a sovereign Parliament of a sovereign country and it does not submit to any dictation from any outside authority.

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

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

\* \* \*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese  
Counsellor in India, 24 July 1959**

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

2. The 'Lhasa Daily' in Tibetan language, on 23<sup>rd</sup> June, published an article entitled "Gyantse in the history of imperialist design in Tibet". The article gives details of the invasion of Gyantse by British troops in 1904, and proceeds to state as follows: -

"The Place immediately near to the British Imperial Cemetery is the cantonment of Indian Army stationed at Gyantse. The 1954 Agreement between India and China on trade and intercourse specified the withdrawal of the Indian troops from Gyantse. The People of Gyantse could clearly see that the legacy of British imperialism in Tibet was inherited by the Indian expansionist element. During the course of their stay at Gyantse, the Indian army forcibly took foodgrains and fodder from the people of Gyantse. The people were forced to do corvee work for them, they had to provide supply transport, firewood, servants, etc, in return for nothing to the Indian army. The Indian troops were fond of riding military horse, and they rode rough shod the green fields of the people and thus destroying the autumn harvest. Officers and men of the Indian troops visited the traitor Phala and held parties and games of Majong. These evil deeds of the Indian Army are very much resented by the people of Gyantse. And though the fire

of their anger was burning in the stomach, there was no opportunity for the smoke to come out of the mouth.”

3. Similarly an article about Chumbi valley appeared on the 15<sup>th</sup> June which inter alia stated as follows: -

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

4. The extracts quoted above are factually and historically incorrect. They are obviously intended to damage the friendly relations between the people of India and nationals of the People’s Republic of China. The Government of India emphatically protest against such articles being published in areas where the press is officially controlled and would request that steps be taken to stop such deliberately hostile propaganda against India.

\* \* \*

**Aide Mémoire given to the Embassy of China in India, 23 March 1959**

Under Article 1(2) of the 1954 Agreement between India and China pertaining to the Tibet Region, the Government of the People’s Republic of China agreed inter alia to the establishment of an Indian Trade



Agency at Gyantse. Further, according to the letters exchanged in pursuance of this Agreement, the Government of India were permitted to retain the buildings and the right to lease land within the bounds of the existing Agencies.

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

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

4. As stated above, the letters exchanged recognise the right of the Government of India to continue to lease and retain the buildings on the existing premises. Notwithstanding this fact, only towards the end of 1957 the Consul-General in Lhasa was informed that the existing lease which was valid upto 1971 could not be accepted by the Chinese authorities since it was concluded with the previous regime. Although

our legal advice confirmed the continuing validity of the lease held by the Government of India, in deference to the wishes of the local authorities we agreed to execute a new lease deed with the owner of the land.

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

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

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

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

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

of 14,000 feet, inadequate housing facilities inevitably cause great hardship to our staff.

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

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

embankments and the commencement of building of the Agency during the coming working season authorised.

\* \* \*

**Aide Mémoire given to the Embassy of China in India, 23 March 1959**

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

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

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

\* \* \*

**Letter from the Consul-General of India in Lhasa to the Foreign Bureau in Tibet, 13 May 1959.**

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

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

The former local Government of Tibet always treated the Muslims of Kashmir origin as foreigners and as distinct from their own nationals. These Kashmiri Muslims never declared themselves as Tibetan or

deliberately renounced their Indian nationality. In fact these Kashmiris selected their own headmen who is called Khachi Ponpo, literally meaning Kashmiri Officer. The former local Government had no hand in the selection of this officer; nor was the Khachi Ponpo treated as an official of the Tibetan Government or paid any remuneration by them. Khachi Ponpo, with the help of the few representatives of the community, settled the disputes between the Kashmiri Muslims. The Tibetan Government was only brought into the picture in case of a dispute between a Kashmiri Muslim and a Tibetan but any fine imposed on the Kashmiri Muslim used to be returned to the Khachi Ponpo. The position of the Kashmiri Muslims was similar to that of Nepalis trading in Tibet. In both categories the menfolk paid no taxes to the former local Government nor did they enjoy the right to own immovable property in Tibet. These people came and resided in Tibet only for the purpose of pursuing their trade and commerce.

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

The Agreement of 1954 does not specify any procedure in respect of the nationals of one country who had been residing in the other country prior to the Agreement. Thus it was for the Government of such country to prescribe the procedure to regularise the stay in their country of the

nationals of the other country. To the knowledge of the Government of India no notification or declaration was made by the local authorities in the Tibet region of China requiring the persons of India origin residing in the Tibet region to obtain registration or traders certificates if they were not actually travelling across the border.

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

In view of the facts explained above, the Government of India urge that Ladakhi and Kashmiri Muslims and other Indians living in Lhasa and



Shigatse should be treated as Indian nationals and their registration recorded accordingly.

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

\* \* \*

**Informal Note given by the Government of India to the Chinese Counsellor in India, 8 July 1959**

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

2. Similarly Chinese nationals, other than officials, are permitted freedom of movement, facilities to take up employment, own property, ply their

transport and indulge in trade between India and Tibet region as well as maintain shops and undertake petty commerce in India.

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

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

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

(ii) Gartok: The lease deed has been agreed to but the actual construction deferred pending arrival of our Trade Agent. The Trade Agent's arrival has been delayed because he is being diverted at Chinese request through Lipuleh Pass. Initial construction must start immediately

and we, therefore, wish the engineering personnel to enter the Tibet region and commence construction before the loss of this season.

(iii) Lhasa: The Consulate General in Lhasa is also short of accommodation and has been wanting additional office and residential accommodation.

*(b) Restrictions on movements.*

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

*(c) Repair and maintenance work.*

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

placing such restrictions and unnecessarily making the carrying out of simple repairs to our property so difficult.

(d) *Registration of arms*

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

4. *Indian traders and nationals have similarly been suffering considerable difficulties-*

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

Indian traders and pilgrims have recently been checked when proceeding or returning from their legitimate business or pilgrimage. In one case in Yatung a trader's shop was locked to and the owner denied

access to his possession. Two other shop –keepers were threatened in Phari but no redress was given by local authorities. An Indian Pilgrim to Kailash has harassed because he carried some medicines for himself. Two cobblers from Shigatse have been held up in Yatung for the last 3 weeks and prevented from returning to India. It is also reported that traders are not being permitted to travel between Yatung and Gyantse which are recognised marts under the Agreement.

*5. Indian nationals in the Tibet region of China-*

The Government of India have already drawn attention in Delhi and through the Consulate General Lhasa to obtain protection for Indian nationals residing in the Tibet region of China. We specially bring to the notice of the Chinese authorities the case of Indians of Ladakhi origin who were trading or residing in Lhasa prior to 1954 Agreement was concluded. It is requested that impediments in their registering with the Consulate General or leaving the Tibet region if they so wish should not be placed.

We have also repeatedly drawn attention through the Consulate General to the case of the *family of Shri Shahabir Dival* which has been under arrest since 5<sup>th</sup> of April, 1959. No reason for their arrest has been given and despite request no steps taken to set them free.

Similarly, *Tromo Geshe Rinpoche* of Donkar Monastery, an Indian protected person, is understood to be still held by the Chinese authorities.

Government of India are anxious that the provisions of the 1954 Agreement should be strictly and mutually respected and therefore draw

the attention of the Embassy to these difficulties which have been placed at the local level in the Tibet region of China. Just as full facilities and adequate help and protection are afforded to the Chinese officials and Chinese nationals in India, it is hoped that legitimate help and courtesy and support from the authorities will be given to Indian officials and Indian nationals who are serving, working in or visiting the Tibet region of China.

\* \* \*

**Letter from the Director of the Foreign Bureau in Tibet to the Consul-General of India in Lhasa, 17 July 1959**

Your letter of 13<sup>th</sup> May 1959 duly received. In your letter you have referred to Kachis who for generations, have lived in Lhasa, Shigatse and other places and have long become Chinese nationals, as Indian national; and you described the well-known facts that they had, at all times, been subjected to the jurisdiction of the local Government of Tibet of our country as: the former local Government of Tibet of China always treated the Muslims of Kashmir as foreigners. These assertions are opposed to the historical facts and I cannot agree with them.

As everybody knows, among the inhabitants in Tibet of our country, there are a number of people of Islamic faith. Besides the Huis from such provinces as Yunan and Szechuan, these are some whom we call Kachis. Although their forefathers were from Kashmir, yet as early as the 17<sup>th</sup> century, during the time of the 5<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama, their forefathers had already chosen the Chinese nationality and had thus become a

component part of the Tibetan people of China. In a report submitted to the former local Government by their headmen during the time of the 13<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama there is such a passage which serves as a powerful evidence: "at the time of the 5<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama, we, the subjects, had chosen him to be our own king, and, in return, he the king, also loved us as his own subjects. And it was such a great gracious kindness he bestowed on us, by allotting to us land for maintenance". Thereafter, from generation to generation, they had, at all times, been under the administration of the local Government. With the exception of some minor disputes, which were allowed to be settled by themselves under the guidance of their headmen, as was the case with the Huis also, all their civil and criminal cases, irrespective of dispute between Kachis and Tibetans or between themselves, had to be referred to former local Government. With the exception of some minor disputes, which were allowed to be settled by themselves under the guidance of their headmen, as was the case with the Huis also, all their civil and criminal cases, irrespective of a dispute between Kachis and Tibetans or between Kachis themselves, had to be referred to former the local Government for judgement. And it was by no means like what Mr. Chhibber had alleged, that "the Tibetan Government was only brought into the picture, in case of a dispute between a Kashmiri Muslim and a Tibetan" to say nothing about that "the position of the Kashmiri Muslim was similar to that of Nepalese trading in Tibet" as asserted by Mr Chhibber. In addition they are entitled to the right of purchase of immovable property, and they also had the obligations of doing Corvee for the formal local Government and of serving the military service, etc. All these facts fully prove that they are Tibetan people of China.

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

However one could not help feel surprised that Mr. Chhibber should have raised with us the problem that they are Indian nationals, at a time when our troops had put down the rebellion unleashed by the former local Government and the reactionaries of the upper strata in Tibet. As mentioned above, there has never been any question with regard to them as Chinese nationals. To my knowledge, only after the talks between Mr. Chhibber and the "headmen" of these Kachis, in April of this year, did such things happen, that that "headmen" taking advantage of a prayer meeting announced to all the Kachis that they all must fill revised "applications" for registration as citizens of India, which were distributed by the Consulate-General of India. I am of the view that this occurrence is not fortuitous. This is unfriendly act of instigating the Chinese people to break with China by means of external forces. Therefore we consider it to be highly improper and an act of interference in the internal affairs of our country, that Mr. Chhibber, without obtaining any consent from our Bureau whatsoever, went so far as to utilize the former official of the former local



Government ( the so-called "Kachi Ponpo") to carry out the activities, among our people, instigating them to break off with their mother-land, after we openly ordered the dissolution of the former local Government and after the dismissal of all its former officials. We regret this and hope that these activities are stopped forthwith.

\* \* \*

**Informal Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, India, to the Chinese Counsellor in India, 24 July 1959**

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

In the conversation on the 3<sup>rd</sup> June, a special request was made for facilities for Shri Bhupendra Singh who was proceeding to Lhasa to be given privileges as a diplomatic courier. Shri Bhupendra Singh carries a diplomatic passport and a laissez- passer. Even though prior intimation was given and official Chinese visa has been granted, Shri Bhupendra Singh has been held up in Yatung for the last several weeks because no official transport has been provided for his onward journey to Lhasa. As in the case of the normal Dak Service, it is of the utmost importance that Shri Bhupendra Singh should reach Lhasa within the next few days. *Immediate* instructions are solicited so that necessary transport and security arrangements can be made from Yatung to Lhasa.

\* \* \*

**Note given to the Foreign Office of China by the Ambassador of India, 25 July 1959**

1. Article 1 of the Agreement between India and China on Trade and Intercourse between Tibet Region of China and India provides for the establishment of Indian Trade Agencies at Yatung, Gyantse and Gartok and Chinese Trade Agencies at New Delhi, Calcutta and Kalimpong. In terms of this article and the letters exchanged between the two Governments the Trade Agencies of both parties are guaranteed the same status and the same treatment. They are also guaranteed privileges and immunities for couriers, mail bags and communications in code.

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

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

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

difficulties are being placed in the way of the Agency staff continuing to occupy the accommodation which they already have.

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

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

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

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

(vi) *Protective works at Gyantse-* Chinese authorities both in Lhasa and Gyantse had agreed in principle to the construction of protective works on the Agency site on our assurance that these

would not damage the bridge and the highway further down the stream. Despite this assurance, the authorities summarily started to demolish a spur along the Indian property and ordered the complete stoppage of essential protective works which are intended to prevent further damage to the land of the Trade Agency.

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

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

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

7. The Government of India take a serious view of the facts mentioned in the previous paragraphs. They are deeply concerned at the generally unhelpful and unfriendly attitude of the local authorities towards Indian officials and Indian nationals in the Tibet region of China. It is obvious that the Trade Agencies cannot discharge their normal functions unless customary privileges and immunities for themselves and for their couriers, mailbags and communications are fully guaranteed. They must also have suitable accommodation locally so that they can function with dignity and self-respect. So far as the Government of India are concerned, they have given in the past and continue to give the fullest facilities and privileges to the Chinese Trade Agencies in India in accordance with Article 1 of the 1954 Agreement. Unfortunately, repeated representations for reciprocal facilities to the Indian Trade Agencies in the Tibet region of China have produced no results. The Government of India have, therefore, begun to entertain serious doubts as to whether the Chinese Government really wish the Indian Trade Agencies in the Tibet region to continue to function. Not only are the facilities laid down in the 1954 Agreement not provided for them but even the normal courtesies given to foreign representatives and missions are being denied. From this it would appear that the Chinese Government do not wish these Trade Agencies to continue to function.

For their functioning depends on full facilities and courtesies being provided to them by the Chinese authorities. The Government of India would like to have a clear and early answer conveying the wishes of the Chinese Government in regard to this, as the continued functioning of the Trade Agencies in China and India on a reciprocal basis will depend on that answer.

\* \* \*

### **Note given to the Foreign Office of China, 19 August 1959**

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

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

3. Recently the local Chinese authorities have seized all arms, ammunition and ponies belonging to the Bhutan officers who were in charge of these enclaves at village Tarchen.

No reasons have been given for this seizure. The Government of Bhutan consider this action on the part of the local Chinese authorities as a



violation of the traditional Bhutanese right and authority. The Government of India would urge that immediate instruction should be issued by the Government of the People's Republic of China for the return of the articles and the animals and for ensuring respect in the future by the local authorities for Bhutan's jurisdiction over these villages.

\* \* \*

**Note given to the Foreign Office of China, 20 August 1959**

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

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

\* \* \*