

## **Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru**

*Series 2, Volume 77*

*June 1- July 19, 1962*

### **CHINA**

Question: How do you distinguish between India's charges of aggression against China and against Pakistan? Could you elucidate on that? What was the distinction between the two forms of aggression?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The differences are obvious. Pakistan committed aggression on us and there was a local war for sometime and ultimately there was a ceasefire. And broadly speaking, the ceasefire line is a line of division between the part occupied by Pakistan and us. On the other side, China has committed aggression. It has crept across Ladakh a good deal, without the slightest justification. And you will see that the whole background, the whole historical sequence and the facts are different. I can understand China saying that the frontier in one particular place is not quite clear, let us clarify it. But we do not talk about this kind of frontier. Frontier may mean half a mile this way or half mile that way. But you do not consider this frontier dispute where hundred miles forward is concerned. It is quite absurd. It is not a frontier dispute; it becomes a dispute about large sections of territory. You will remember that repeatedly both in writing and orally we complained to the Chinese Government about their maps. And every time their answer was that these maps were old maps and that they would see to it that they were rectified and we will settle it peacefully. But even that answer can fit in with the rectification of the border-half a mile this way or that way or some such petty things. But how does it fit in with 150 miles of march across the border? So, it is patent that our position in regard to the frontier was dead clear. We have put it before them. We have absolutely clear maps which we have put before them with latitudes and longitudes

etc. marked. They knew that we possessed these lands and claimed them. They could not have come there under any mistake. They might have said that your claim to it is less than ours. That was a different matter. But knowing that, they came over there and took possession of them. I find it very difficult to understand this. And then those officials —the Chinese and Indian officials who considered this question brought out a big report or two reports.<sup>1</sup> I think anyone who reads those reports will find quite enough justification for the Indian stand. In fact, after the officials' reports the next step should have been a consideration by the two Governments of those reports. Unfortunately, that has not taken place; it may take place in future. That would be a proper way of considering this problem.

Question: Mr Chou En-lai's complaint against you is that the officials' report was not followed by a meeting between the Heads of two Governments.

Jawaharlal Nehru: He did not quite say that, although he did mention something to that effect. It is not that; the Heads of two Governments can meet but they cannot sit down and consider the report of a thousand pages. In fact, that report was not published in China till recently.

Question: On the Chinese border discussion, in the earlier stages of negotiations did you get the impression at any time that the Chinese were thinking in terms of any final settlement or just a provisional settlement. Did they have any mental reservations on this subject?

Jawaharlal Nehru: We have not discussed this matter with them, rather we have discussed very little except when Premier Chou En-lai came here. We sent long letters and communications to each other. That is not the way to discuss anything. Naturally letters and communications on either side are

---

<sup>1</sup> SWJN/SS/66/Supplement.

couched in a strong language and all that. It is difficult to say about what one has at the back of one's mind, but I do think the impression I have got is that the Chinese Government would like a settlement with India. What the settlement may be, I cannot say. But they are not happy over our present relations.<sup>2</sup>

### **CHINESE ATTITUDE TO KASHMIR QUESTION**

Question: Did they recognise dispute between India and Pakistan in regard to Kashmir and it is the border territory that is concerned, that whatever agreement they reach with us, if they desire one at all, can only be provisional.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Their attitude in regard to Kashmir, although we have taken strong exception to it as we have every right to- has not varied much. I mean to say that even some years back - it was not put very clearly-there

---

<sup>2</sup> On this issue, a meeting of the Consultative Committee of Parliament on External Affairs on 15 June 1962 was reported thus: "Prime Minister Nehru is understood to have told members of the Consultative Committee of Parliament attached to the External Affairs Ministry today that the Chinese did not seem to like the present relations with India because the Chinese reputation had been 'injured'.

Pandit Nehru was replying to questions by members who wanted to know how he got the impression as stated at his recent press conference that China would like a border settlement with India and that the Chinese were not happy with the present ties. When members drew his attention to the strongly worded notes of China, the Prime Minister is reported to have told them that even behind the strongly worded notes there was another line of thinking.

Analysing the background of his impression, the Prime Minister is reported to have referred to the general economic recession in China, increase in population, and lack of food. He is reported to have stated that India was much better placed on the border than two years ago. That did not mean that India was posing for a war, he is reported to have said. The meeting which lasted one hour also discussed the political aspects of the European Common Market, and the implication of the settlement arrived at between the three princes in Laos with particular reference to the situation in the entire south- east Asia region." See the *National Herald*, 16 June 1962, p.1 .

was always a loophole in it. It was quite different from the Soviet attitude, which is quite clear. It did give us the impression at the time that they were supporting our case on Kashmir, but on later examination, we found that there was always a loophole.

## **TIBET**

Question: What was the value of the trade with Tibet before you withdrew the Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet?<sup>3</sup>

Jawaharlal Nehru: The value of trade in the last few months has been very considerable, because realising that trade was going to stop, all the merchants and others rushed to do what they could do within these months. But previous to that the trade was lessening, dwindling, because of restrictions put upon it.

Question: What is the position of places of pilgrimage in Tibet like Kailash, Manasarovar and others, whether Indian pilgrims would be allowed to go and under what conditions?

Jawaharlal Nehru: We do not recommend people to go there, but it is up to the Chinese authorities to give them facilities or not.

Question: They will go there, but will they come back?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Pilgrims are a hardy race. They go and come back. They should be compared to people who try to go up these high mountains. Thousands have gone this year and have come back.

## **INDO-NEPAL RELATIONS**

Question: Would you say something about Indo-Nepal relations in the

---

<sup>3</sup> See also item 387.

light of your discussion with the King?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I made it clear to him that we had no desire to interfere at all with his internal happenings, nor do we want Indian territory to be used for any kind of attack on Nepal, raids on Nepal. But according to our laws, peaceful agitation could be carried on here.<sup>4</sup> It is a little difficult for people to understand a rule of law in a country. Some people do not understand that. For instance, it is very difficult for us to explain to China that there is a rule of law and that the Press is free to say what they like. In the same way, in Nepal, although totally different, there was this difficulty to understand this. I think that, to some extent, they understand our bona fides in this matter.

---

<sup>4</sup> For Nehru's talk with Mahendra, see SWJN/SS/76/item 472.

## **To Chief Ministers (type fn)**

[China and Pakistan]

17. This element of the cold war is already very much in evidence in our relations with China and Pakistan. With China, there has been a spate of strongly-worded statements on both sides; with Pakistan also our present relations are greatly strained. Believing as we do that we are completely right in our attitudes towards China and Pakistan, I am convinced that we should avoid the language of cold war in dealing with them. In no event does that help and we have to take special care about this matter. After all, the only sensible thing to aim at is for a solution of our problems with these countries and peaceful relations. We may get angry occasionally on what they do to us. But still we have to keep the ultimate objective in view. We have to strengthen our military position when they threaten us. Even so, we must realise that it will be a tragedy for us to have military operations against each other. While we keep our powder dry and are ready for emergencies, we should strive for a peaceful settlement. Anything else with Pakistan would be a tragedy not only for the two countries but for the peoples of these countries who are so closely allied to each other. With China, our contacts are not great, but the consequences of our conflict are very far-reaching.

18. But apart from these considerations, I think that the policy we have pursued or attempted to pursue is essentially based on always trying for peaceful solutions and of avoidance of war. Peaceful solutions are not furthered by the language of war which is embodied in what is called the cold war. We have seen this on a much larger scale on the world's stage. It is the cold war which has bedevilled every attempt to find a solution of world problems. Behind the cold war lie fear, suspicion, distrust and anger. We must try not to fall a victim to these emotions and passions while, at the same time, doing everything to protect our national interests. Even from the point of view of national interests, a peaceful approach is obviously

desirable.

19. We have recently seen in our relations with Pakistan how one bad act leads to another from the other side and something much worse happens. This again leads to excitement on our side and something undesirable happens which produces its own reactions in Pakistan. If this kind of thing is allowed to continue, then the situation might well get out of hand on both sides of the Indo-Pakistan frontier and produce disastrous results. A special responsibility, therefore, lies on political and other leaders as well as newspapers to prevent these deplorable happenings and developments and to realise that there can be no such thing as reprisals against innocent people.

20. On our frontier with China-Tibet, we have gradually been building up our position and increasing our outposts in Ladakh etc. The building of mountain roads, which is still going on, has helped us. The result is that we are in a somewhat more advantageous position than we were a year or two ago. Even so, it would be unwise for us to indulge in any action. The Chinese Government, realising that we are strengthening our position and weakening theirs, has lately become more aggressive in tone in its statements made to us. I do not know what this signifies, and we have to be wide awake and careful.

21. But I would repeat that, apart from any high morality, it is the strictest practical good sense for us not to fall into the trap of cold war in regard to Pakistan and China. Even if Governments are, we must not think that the people are our enemies.

22. In Pakistan, strange things are happening. The coming up of the new Constitution, very limited as it is, has opened the flood gates of criticism and agitation. A military rule and such agitations are not compatible. The position is, therefore, essentially a fluid one. In East Pakistan, more

especially, there is discontent. Some authorities there want to turn people's minds to anger and hatred against India in order to lessen this discontent against themselves. We must not fall into this trap and act in a way which creates ill will between peoples.

23. Looking round to our neighbours, we should feel thankful that we have escaped many of their troubles. We have a Constitutional Democratic Government functioning with a large measure of success. We have plans for development which already have produced good results and which promise greater results in the future inspite of the difficulties that face us. This can hardly be said about our neighbours. We have goodwill for these neighbour countries of ours and wish them progress. Our progress certainly is not dependent on their remaining backward.

24. Meanwhile, it should be remembered that the most important question of all is that of disarmament. Unless some effective results are achieved by the Disarmament Committee at Geneva, the outlook for the world is bleak indeed. Thus far the only success achieved is in drafting a preamble which, as far as it goes, is satisfactory. But obviously much more is needed. Peace congresses are held and I suppose they do some good work. But there appears to be an attempt in them to gain a political advantage and the quest for peace is often connected with warlike language. Yet we must hope that peace will triumph in the end.

Yours sincerely,  
Jawaharlal Nehru

#### **54. In the Lok Sabha: Tibetan Refugees<sup>5</sup>**

---

<sup>5</sup> Oral Answers, 19 June 1962. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Third Series, Vol. V, 8 June to 22 June 1962, 1st Session, cols 11577-11582.

Question:<sup>6</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) the total number of Tibetan refugees in India at present;
- (b) the efforts and arrangements made by Government for providing them relief, employment and educational facilities; and
- (c) the contribution, financial and otherwise made by the Dalai Lama himself towards the rehabilitation of these refugees?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Dinesh Singh):

- (a) Approximately 32,300.
- (b) Government of India is providing food, clothing, accommodation and other necessities to all Tibetan refugees. About 8,000 persons have been or are in the process of being permanently rehabilitated on land. The majority of the remaining able-bodied workers are employed on road works. Residential and Day Schools have been opened for the children according to requirements.
- (c) The Dalai Lama has made some contribution towards some of the welfare activities for Tibetan Refugees.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: How many refugee camps are there all over the country, and could we know the names of the places where they are situated?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Jawaharlal Nehru): I could not give all the names of the camps, but the permanent rehabilitations are in Mysore—a camp of about 3,000 now but it is expected to have more. That is a regular colony of Tibetan refugees established there. It is proposed to have some more colonies, perhaps one in Orissa, perhaps one in Uttar Pradesh. We have to be careful about the climate of the place because a very hot climate will not suit the Tibetans. Then in NEFA there is a camp. The Dalai Lama himself lives in Dalhousie, and a fairly large number of Tibetan children have gathered round him, that

---

<sup>6</sup> By Hari Vishnu Kamath of PSP and Krishna Deo Tripathi of Congress.

is, the parents leave them there feeling rather assured that the Dalai Lama would look after them. The burden is rather heavy. It is now proposed to have a children's village somewhat after the fashion of the Swiss children's village, which they had after the war, Pestalozzi<sup>7</sup> I think. That is being thought of. And then there are a number of people in Ladakh, and there are people working, young Tibetans working on roads, in various places.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Have any reports reached Government that in the past some Chinese spies or agents have infiltrated along with the Tibetan refugees into India, and if so, has there been any screening on the part of Government before refugees are admitted into India?

Jawaharlal Nehru: There is some attempted screening. I am not sure it is always wholly successful, but there has been screening and some people have been separated from others.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: On grounds stated by me?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes.

Indrajit Gupta:<sup>8</sup> Is it the intention of the Government that these rehabilitation measures should be carried out in such a way that these refugees are to gradually become Indian citizens?

Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no attempt to make them Indian citizens. They may, of course, if they fulfill the qualifications, become Indian citizens, but the main object is to treat them as Tibetans with Tibetan language, Tibetan culture, Tibetan religion etc. In addition, of course, they learn Hindi, and

---

<sup>7</sup> The Pestalozzi Children's Village, founded in 1946 in Switzerland for European war orphans, followed the concepts of Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746-1827), Swiss educational reformer.

<sup>8</sup> CPI.

sometimes, maybe, a little English.

M.S. Aney:<sup>9</sup> Are they required to live in specified colonies, or are they permitted to go anywhere they like?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not quite know. In a sense, it is open to them to go anywhere they like, but it is very difficult for them to do so because of the difficulty of language and other things. They just cannot do it.

Hem Barua:<sup>10</sup> May I know whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to the fact of China launching a systematic campaign through cinema slides, lectures, and radio broadcasts...

Speaker:<sup>11</sup> He ought to come to the question.

Hem Barua: ... depicting the so-called horrid conditions of life and the hard work to which the Tibetan refugees in this country are supposed to be subjected to and...

Speaker: He should come straight to the question.

Hem Barua: Yes, Sir. If so whether the Government has launched a counter- campaign to nail this Chinese lie to the coffin?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry it is difficult to grasp the hon. Member's questions; the preamble is too long. We have started no such campaign here.

Hem Barua: My question was whether Government was aware of it.

---

<sup>9</sup> Independent.

<sup>10</sup> PSP

<sup>11</sup> Hukam Singh.

Speaker: No counter-campaign has been launched; answer has been given.

Ramchandra Bade:<sup>12</sup> Is there any autonomous society by which education is given to the Tibetan students and of which the President is the Education Minister and if so, what is the amount spent by the society for the Tibetan students?

Jawaharlal Nehru: What society?

Ramchandra Bade: It is a non-Government institution. It is said here that an autonomous society registered under the Societies Registration Act has been formed to arrange for the provision of educational facilities for the children of displaced Tibetans. I am asking: what is the amount spent and what is the grant to the society?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I know only of one society: Tibetan Refugees Aid Society, of which, I think, Acharya Kripalani is the Chairman; I do not know of any other.

Ramchandra Bade: It is written here that the Education Minister<sup>13</sup> is the Chairman of the Society. Dalai Lama is a member.

Speaker: Is any aid given to it.

Jawaharlal Nehru: In regard to students, we have been particularly anxious to provide schools for the children and the Educational Minister is always consulted; in fact, he decides a great deal about it. I do not know if some special or sub-committee is there and where he is a member of that

---

<sup>12</sup> Ramachandran Vithal Bade, Jan Sangh.

<sup>13</sup> K.L. Shrimati.

committee for this purpose.

But the Tibetan Refugees Aid Society has nothing to do with Government except that it is in touch with Government.

Nath Pai:<sup>14</sup> Is any aid being received from any country abroad for the rehabilitation of these refugees and, if so, the name of the countries and the amount of aid? Secondly, is it the policy of Government to allow Tibetan children to be adopted by foreign parents?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot give the exact figures of the sum of aid received by the Government. The Government of New Zealand is aiding and the Government of Australia also gave some amount. Switzerland sent some thing, as also, I believe, the United Kingdom Government. From the United States, I believe they have helped the unofficial committee and to some extent, medicines and other things have been sent.

Nath Pai: Is Government encouraging the adoption of Tibetan children by foreign parents and, if so, how many such children have gone so far?

Jawaharlal Nehru: We have not encouraged any such adoption. About twenty or so children were taken away with some of their parents to Switzerland by some organisation in Switzerland. Perhaps they are in the children's village there. I have not heard anything about adoption.

---

<sup>14</sup> PSP.

## USSR

### **384. To Subimal Dutt: Condolences**<sup>15</sup>

I am deeply grieved to learn of your son's death.<sup>16</sup> You have all our sympathy and affection. You can certainly take leave.

## China

### **385. To Chintamani Panigrahi: Vinoba and Border Dispute**<sup>17</sup>

June 2, 1962

Dear Shri Panigrahi,

I have your letter of the 30th May. I do not think it will be right or really helpful to burden Vinobaji with the task of trying to settle our border dispute with China.

Yours sincerely,

[Jawaharlal Nehru]

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

### **386. In the Lok Sabha: China on Longju**<sup>18</sup>

Question:<sup>19</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that China has recently lodged a protest with the Government of India alleging violation of Chinese territorial integrity at Longju in NEFA; and

---

<sup>15</sup> Telegram to the Ambassador in Moscow, 16 June 1962.

<sup>16</sup> Nineteen-year old Sujit Dutt on 16 June 1962 in Moscow.

<sup>17</sup> Letter to former Lok Sabha MP, CPI; address: Ganesh Kuteer, Cuttack 2, Orissa.

<sup>18</sup> Oral Answers, 6 June 1962. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Third Series, Vol. IV, May 26 to June 7, 1962, cols 9100-9106.

<sup>19</sup> By PSP MP Hem Barua and Congress MP P.C. Borooah.

(b) if so, how far this allegation is corroborated by facts?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Dinesh Singh):

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Chinese allegation is entirely without foundation. The Chinese note of 19th May, 1962<sup>20</sup> and our reply thereto dated 28th May, 1962<sup>21</sup> are placed on the table of the House.

Hem Barua: May I know whether the Chinese allegations about Longju in NEFA are a part of the calculated design on the part of China to dislodge the McMahon Line, which she proposed to do during November 1961 and which she has been repeating now? If so, has this position been examined by our Government?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Jawaharlal Nehru): Whether it is design or not is a matter of opinion.

Hem Barua: I could not follow, Sir.

Speaker:<sup>22</sup> It is a matter of opinion whether it is a calculated design or not.

Hem Barua: I have linked it with the Chinese threat held out during November 1961 to dislodge the McMahon Line. Therefore, I want to know ....

Speaker: He should put some question.

Hem Barua: Some other question, Sir?

Speaker: Yes.

---

<sup>20</sup> See *White Paper VI*, p. 46 and in this volume appendix 5(a).

<sup>21</sup> See *White Paper VI*, pp. 52-53 and in this volume appendix 5(b).

<sup>22</sup> Hukam Singh.

Hem Barua: May I know whether it is a fact that China has built up or installed a network of transmission centres, at least 15 in number, along the McMahon Line and has been carrying on regular slanderous propaganda against India which could be heard even at places like Digboi and Naharkatiya in distant Assam? If so, may I know what steps Government have taken to counteract this?

Speaker: That also is not allowed. Has he any other question?

Hem Barua: I do not understand why it is not allowed.

Speaker: It covers such a wide range that the question does not warrant that.

Hem Barua: It is in connection with NEFA.

Speaker: There are so many connections between one and the other that sometimes we have to travel a long distance to have that connection.

Hem Barua: It has been a very serious matter of late; and they are indulging in hostile propaganda.

Speaker: A discussion can be raised on it, questions are there to elicit information. He may put a question if he wants.

Hem Barua: May I know whether it is a fact that when Shri Chou En-lai met our Prime Minister last time he gave an impression that the eastern sector of our Sino-Indian border would be left severely alone and if so, whether these actions do not show a tendency on the part of China to go

back on her assurance?<sup>23</sup>

Speaker: Then again, tendency has to be interpreted.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Hon. Member is introducing questions on the whole border on the eastern side.

Hem Barua: I come from there.

Speaker: Therefore, the whole border should also come here?

Jawaharlal Nehru: We cannot answer these questions. They have been dealt with in the course of the numerous debates as to what happened and what impressions one gathered two years ago or six years ago when Shri Chou En- lai came or somebody else came.

P.K. Deo:<sup>24</sup> Even though we know that our troops have withdrawn from Longju since 1959 from this correspondence we find that false allegations are made against our Government. May I know if these allegations are linked with our defensive action in the western sector, that is, Ladakh?

Jawaharlal Nehru: They are linked not in the minds of somebody else. So far as Longju is concerned it is verging on the border and according to us it is on this side of the McMahon Line. The Chinese have said, quite apart from their refusal to recognise the McMahon Line, that it is on their side of the McMahon Line. That is a factual difference of opinion. Whether their agitation or their propaganda is due to something that happens in the west, I do not know. It is all part of the same thing and the propaganda goes up

---

<sup>23</sup> For Nehru-Chou meeting in April 1960, see SWJN/SS/60/items 9-10, 14, 16, 24, 27 and 30.

<sup>24</sup> Swatantra Party.

and down.

S.N. Chaturvedi:<sup>25</sup> Have the Chinese taken up any position south of Longju in a village called Rouya or in any other place?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know, Sir. I cannot give more information than stating that the posts are within a short distance of the border?

D.C. Sharma:<sup>26</sup> In the note that our Government sent to the Chinese Government, it is said:

"If the Chinese Government have any doubt about the precise alignment of the border in this area, the Government of India would be glad to discuss the matter with them and clarify their doubt."

Jawaharlal Nehru: At Longju?

Speaker: In the note sent to them it is said that if they have any doubts about it the Government of India would clarify it.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Is it about Longju?

D.C. Sharma: Yes; the last few lines of the last but one paragraph of our note to China. May I know if they have shown any desire to discuss this matter so that the doubts may be clarified?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Not yet; not to my knowledge.

Hari Vishnu Kamath:<sup>27</sup> In the words used by the Government in one of their notes to China, is it the Government's policy to merely pile

---

<sup>25</sup> Congress

<sup>26</sup> Congress

<sup>27</sup> PSP

protests on protests while China mounts aggression on aggression?  
Has the Government administered so far a warning, apart from  
protests to China against aggression?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think that requires any reply. This is a wider  
question which has been dealt with.

Speaker: They want to know whether any warning has been given.

Jawaharlal Nehru: On what?

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Against the Chinese aggression on India.

Hem Barua: China has warned us already.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Well, hon. Members have heard many times the  
statements on the subject. [Interruption]

Hari Vishnu Kamath: There is a difference between warning and protest.  
China has not been warned yet.

Speaker: Order, order. He may frame a question if he wants to put one.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Has the Government administered, up to this day,  
a warning to China against any aggressive or subversive activity against  
India? That is the question; it is a simple question.

Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member must have taken the trouble to read  
what he calls protest after protest that we have made. I do not know what  
he considers a warning to be, unless the warning is that we shall go to war  
with China.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Not at all. He has misunderstood the question.

Hem Harua: rose—

Speaker: Order, order, Hon. Members should not stand all at one time.  
Warning to do what? If that is not given, how can any answer be given?

Hari Vishnu Kamath: The warning is just this—I had quoted an example, in the House, a few days ago, namely, a warning was administered by President Nasser to the Chinese Mission in Cairo two years ago, against subversive activity, on pain of the Mission being closed down. I mean some such step, not that very step.

Speaker: Then it come to this: a warning must have something that would follow.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: A warning to desist from the activity on pain of something happening. [Interruption]

Surendranath Dwivedy: Not necessarily war.

Jawaharlal Nehru: The question appears to be a suggestion that we should warn them, that we should cut off diplomatic relations.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: No, not quite.

Some Hon. Members: rose—

Speaker: Order, order. Unless a warning has been issued, that is, if this is not conceded, then another thing, namely, breaking, I should say, of diplomatic intercourse or other steps should be taken. That is what he means.

Jawaharlal Nehru: That is what I said.

Speaker: We have not given any warning.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Certainly not. We do not propose to, till we decide on breaking or other steps.

Hem Barua: The question has been misunderstood. The point is this.

Speaker: He might put a question.

Hem Barua: In view of the fact that China has mounted up her allegations against India during recent days, and, at the same time, she has bolstered up her claims by slow and steady military occupation also, may I know whether our Government consider that to be a step towards further aggression or a total war on us by China?

Speaker: That goes too far. Is there any answer to be given to it?

Jawaharlal Nehru: This is a question of opinion; I do not think any total war is a prospect in view.

### **387. In the Lok Sabha: Expiry of Indo-Tibetan Agreement<sup>28</sup>**

Mohsin (Dharwar South):<sup>29</sup> Sir, under rule 197, I beg to call the attention of the hon. Prime Minister to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

"The expiry of the Indo-Tibetan Agreement 1954 with China and the

---

<sup>28</sup> Calling Attention, 6 June 1962. Lok Sabha Debates, Third Series, Vol. IV, May 26 to June 7, 1962, cols 9165-9168.

Nehru's statement is also available in [MEA], Agreement between India and China on Trade and Intercourse between India and Tibet region of China 1954—Decision against Renewal 1962, (File No. F. 12/458/NGO/61) pp. 19-20.

<sup>29</sup> F.H. Mohsin, Congress.

closing of Chinese trade missions in India."

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Jawaharlal Nehru): As the House is aware, we have, since the beginning of December 1961, been in correspondence with the Government of People's Republic of China to find a dependable basis for negotiations between the two Governments in order to reach a new agreement in place of the Sino- Indian Agreement of 1954 which was due to expire on the 3rd June 1962. In our correspondence we urged upon the Chinese Government the necessity of laying a proper foundation and creating a favourable atmosphere for fresh negotiations between the two countries and suggested that, as a first step, the Chinese Government should, with a view to creating the proper atmosphere, withdraw their forces from Indian territory and restore the territorial status quo as it existed at the time of the signing of the 1954 Agreement. While these exchanges were continuing, the Chinese Government informed us on the 23rd May, through their Charge d'Affaires in Delhi, of their decision to recall their Trade Agencies in Calcutta and Kalimpong and asked for requisite facilities for the withdrawal of these Agencies. The Foreign Secretary<sup>30</sup> assured the Chinese Charge d' Affaires that necessary facilities will be accorded. Foreign Secretary also added that the Government of India will be taking a decision on the winding up of Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet on a reciprocal basis and will request the Chinese Government to give necessary facilities.

We received a report that the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong had started moving out on the 27th May. A later report indicated that the official of the Chinese Trade Agencies at Calcutta and Kalimpong had left India on the 1st June. The Chinese Embassy had informed us some time back that they had only two Trade Agencies at Kalimpong and Calcutta and there was no Trade Agency in New Delhi. The Chinese Embassy informed us after the withdrawal of the Agency at Kalimpong that the property and buildings of

---

<sup>30</sup> M.J. Desai.

the Trade Agency at Kalimpong have been placed in charge of their Consul-General at Calcutta.

We informed the Chinese Charge d'Affaires on the 30th May, of our decision on withdrawing our Trade Agency at Gyantse by 10th June and our Trade Agency at Yatung by the 15th June, and asked for facilities for the Trade Agencies to pack, crate and transfer records and stores. As regards the third Trade Agent who used to visit Gartok, we asked for facilities for him to visit Western Tibet as soon as the Lipulekh Pass was open so that he could wind up his Mission. We told the Charge d' Affaires that none of our Trade Agents will be functioning as such with effect from the 3rd June, but they will take some time to move out with their records and stores and asked that certain administrative facilities be given to the Trade Agents till the date of withdrawal. We also informed the Chinese Charge d'Affaires that we intended to place our property and buildings at Yatung in charge of our Consul General at Lhasa who would keep a small maintenance staff there and convert the place into a hostel for the use of our countries and officials proceeding to or returning from Lhasa. The Chinese Government have asked that the withdrawal of the Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet should be completed within a month. They have also stated that reasonable facilities will be guaranteed for such withdrawal. They have, however, regretted their inability to grant certain administrative facilities, like communications in cypher, with the Government of India until the date of the withdrawal of the Trade Agencies.

Apart from the withdrawal of the Trade Agencies of the two countries provided in the 1954 Agreement, the immediate consequence of the termination of the 1954 Agreement will be the termination of the facilities provided in the Agreement for trade and intercourse between India and the Tibet region of China. Such trade and intercourse in future will, to the extent permitted by each side, be regulated by national laws and regulations of the countries concerned.

Mohsin: What will be the effect of the closure of these trade agencies in both the countries on our trade and commerce specially in regard to

exports and imports of our country?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Obviously, the effect will be that such small trade as was carried on will be reduced still further.

P.K. Deo (Kalahandi):<sup>31</sup> Consequent upon the expiry of the Indo-Tibetan Agreement of 1954, it is learnt, Indian traders in Tibet are winding up their business. May I know if the Governments are taking steps for the transfer of their assets to this country?

Jawaharlal Nehru: There has been some correspondence about that. The House would have noticed, when I read out, certain facilities for withdrawal etc. That will be part of those facilities that we have asked for.

S.N. Chaturvedi (Firozabad):<sup>32</sup> Will our other Trade Missions in China continue to function?

Speaker: No, the statement makes that clear.

Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad):<sup>33</sup> In view of the fact that the 1954 Agreement had an Appendix embodying what has since come to be known as the doctrine of Panchsheel in international relations, it having been enunciated for the first time in that context in modern history, may I ask whether the scrapping of this 1954 Trade Agreement will entail, as a regrettable consequence thereof, the snapping of the Panchsheel tie between India and China as well?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Those principles embodied in what is called the Panchsheel agreement are basic principles which remain, whether anybody

---

<sup>31</sup> Swantatra Party.

<sup>32</sup> Congress

<sup>33</sup> PSP.

breaks them or not. So far as we are concerned, we shall try to abide by them in the changed circumstances. I do not know how far it will be possible altogether to act up to them. But we do not propose to contravene them unless we are compelled to do so.

### **388. In the Lok Sabha: China Border<sup>34</sup>**

#### Settlement of Sino-Indian Border Dispute

Question:<sup>35</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) the details of the latest offer made to China for settlement of the border dispute;
- (b) whether in the event of its acceptance by China, India will have to withdraw from a much larger area than the other party will have to; and
- (c) the area of "No man's land" which will be another consequence thereof?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon):

(a) In our Note dated 14th May 1962<sup>36</sup> we have repeated the offer made in the Prime Minister's letter of 16th November 1959 to Premier Chou En-lai.<sup>37</sup> There it had been proposed, as an interim measure, so as to relax tensions and to avoid possible clashes, that in the Ladakh region the Government of India should withdraw their personnel to the west of the line shown in the 1956 Chinese map and the Government of China should withdraw their personnel to the east of the international boundary shown in the Indian official maps. This withdrawal would apply

---

<sup>34</sup> Oral Answers, 11 June 1962. *Lok Sabha Debates*, 3rd Series, Vol. V, 8 June to 22 June 1962, 1st Session, cols 9924-9927.

<sup>35</sup> By one PSP MP, one Swatantra Party MP and two Congress MPs.

<sup>36</sup> See *White Paper VI*, pp. 41-43 and in this volume appendix 4.

<sup>37</sup> See SWJN/SS/54/item 154.

not only to armed but also to unarmed and administrative personnel and the entire area between the boundaries claimed by the two sides would be left unoccupied.

In the same Note, we had also expressed our willingness, in the interest of a peaceful settlement of the boundary question, to permit the continued use of the Aksai Chin Road for Chinese civilian traffic, pending negotiations.

Copies of the relevant correspondence are placed on the Table of the House. (Placed in Library. See No. LT-188/62)

(b) No, Sir,

(c) The area of No-man's land envisaged in our note would be approximately 11,300 square miles.

Hari Vishnu Kamath:<sup>38</sup> How can this latest offer be reconciled with the earlier stand of the Government to which they have adhered consistently over many months to the effect that there can be no talks or negotiations with the Chinese unless and until they vacate their aggression completely or is it now the stand of the Government that they desire only a token vacation of aggression?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Jawaharlal Nehru): This is not only completely, in keeping with what has been said, but it has been the consistent line adopted throughout. The hon. Member must have misunderstood some statement if he thinks otherwise. This offer was made in 1959 November, and although we have not repeated the exact offer several times, the general statements made are in line with it. In accordance with this offer, the Chinese Government would actually vacate the aggression from the past. The only difference is, we do not occupy that area for the time being and that creates conditions for us to negotiate after they have vacated. That is what we have said.

---

<sup>38</sup> PSP.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: With regard to the No-man's, land which will be as large as 11,330 square miles, if I heard her aright...

[Mahavir] Tyagi:<sup>39</sup> It is ours.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: May I know whether India will exercise any kind of jurisdiction or authority over that area at all or it is completely no-man's and godforsaken also?

Jawaharlal Nehru: This offer is made for a temporary period while negotiations take place about these matters. During that temporary period, the idea is that no country-neither of the countries would exercise any administrative authority there apart from military.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Who will look after the people?

Speaker:<sup>40</sup> Shri Hem Barua.<sup>41</sup>

Hem Barua: In view of the fact that recently Chinese allegations are mounting up and even China has held out threat of consequences, bloody conflicts and all that and charged the Government with chauvinism, may I know whether the Government propose to take drastic action which does not naturally mean war but might mean severance of diplomatic connection with China?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member suggests that we should live up to the charges made by China against us.

Hem Barua: No. I do not mean that. China has been making these

---

<sup>39</sup> Mahavir Tyagi, Congress.

<sup>40</sup> Hukam Singh.

<sup>41</sup> PSP.

charges and of late, as the notes exhibit, the charges have mounted up in their intensity. What does the Government propose to do in the face of the charges? Sending notes only?

Jawaharlal Nehru: As far as I can see, he wants us to do something, which will justify the charges made against us.

S.M. Banerjee:<sup>42</sup> I want to know whether it is the intention of the Government, when we withdraw and when the Chinese also withdraw, that the further negotiations will be at the official level only or at the ministerial level. I want to know what will be the sort of negotiations.

Jawaharlal Nehru: It is a matter, which, when the question arises, will be decided. If that takes place and the road is open for negotiation, whether it should be at the official level first and at the ministerial level afterwards or straight off at the ministerial level, is a matter, which can be easily decided.<sup>43</sup>

P.K. Deo:<sup>44</sup> This offer may be a fine piece of diplomacy. May I know if this creation or a No-man's land does not virtually amount to surrender of Indian Territory?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I would suggest to the hon. Member reading the letters and then concluding in his own mind.

### **389. For Y.D. Gundevia: Foreign Governments Publishing**

---

<sup>42</sup> Independent.

<sup>43</sup> For China's reply to the Indian Government's note, see *White Paper VI*, pp. 56-58 and in this volume appendix 3 (b).

<sup>44</sup> Swantantra Party.

## **Statements<sup>45</sup>**

The attention of the Speaker<sup>46</sup> might be drawn to this matter. It should be pointed out that our policy is that official statements of Government are allowed to be published in the bulletin which they may issue in Delhi. This was the case in regard to the document circulated by the Consul General of the DRV<sup>47</sup> in New Delhi.

In the case of China, objection was taken by us because they did not give the official statement as a whole, but gave parts of it and comments.!"

It might be pointed out further that the reports made by the Chairman of the International Commission have not been given publicity yet.

### **390. In the Lok Sabha: Chinese in North Ladakh<sup>48</sup>**

- (i) Reported Movement of Chinese Tanks and Armoured Vehicles in Occupied Indian Territory in Northern Ladakh

P.C. Borooah (Sibsagar):<sup>49</sup> Sir, under Rule 197, I beg to call the

---

<sup>45</sup> Hukam Singh.

<sup>46</sup> Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

<sup>47</sup> See Nehru's intervention in the Lok Sabha on 15 June 1962, item 391.

<sup>48</sup> Calling Attention, 13 June 1962. Lok Sabha Debates, Third Series, Vol. V, 8 June to 22 June, 1962, 1st Session, cols 10563-10576.

Three issues were discussed in this meeting (i) Reported Movement of Chinese Tanks and Armoured Vehicles in Occupied Indian Territory in Northern Ladakh, (ii) Reported Admonition of some senior Army officers posted in NEFA, (iii) Scarcity of Filtered Water in West Vinay Nagar, Delhi. This item covers the first part, the second part is covered in item 174, and the third one does not have any intervention by Nehru.

<sup>49</sup> Note, 13 June 1962, for the Commonwealth Secretary, regarding Calling Attention Notice of 13 June 1962 by Ramchander Bade (Jan Sangh), Brij Raj Singh (Jan Sangh), and Brahmajit Singh (Jan Sangh).

Congress.

attention of the Minister of Defence to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

"The reported movement of Chinese tanks and armoured vehicles in occupied Indian territory in Northern Ladakh and sighting of long convoys of Chinese Military vehicles in Southern Sinkiang and Quizil Jilga in occupied Aksai Chin."<sup>50</sup>

The Minister of Defence (Krishna Menon): Mr Speaker, Sir, Government have no information regarding the reported—that is, in the Press—movement of Chinese tanks and armoured vehicles in the Indian territory in Northern Ladakh, parts of which are under the occupation of the Chinese. Vehicles belonging to the Chinese have, however, been plying in Quizil Jilga area for some time. The terrain also lends itself to easy construction of tracks in this area on which vehicles can ply. These tracks have been used by vehicles for some of the posts which have been illegally set up by the Chinese.

P.C. Borooah: May I know whether it is construed that the storm of allegations and charges of provocation launched by China against India in recent months was to cover their sinister design of further aggression against India?

Krishna Menon: I could not follow the question.

Speaker:<sup>51</sup> He wants to know whether these aggressive acts construed as a design for further aggression into the Indian territory. Is that the question?

P.C. Borooah: Yes, Sir.

---

<sup>50</sup> This refers to a news item in *The Times of India*, 10 June 1962, p. 1 cols 6, 7, 8 with the heading "China brings tanks and armoured vans in Ladakh."

<sup>51</sup> Hukam Singh.

Krishna Menon: We know nothing about these tanks or anything.

Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad):<sup>52</sup> Sir, the Minister has been pleased to say that the Government has no information about this particular matter, that is to say, the movement of convoys, tanks and vehicles in occupied Ladakh area. But may I ask Sir, whether Government has received reports that China has moved not merely such convoys and vehicles to western Tibet on the edge of the occupied Ladakh area but has also flown Soviet MIG planes and jet fighters as well as Ilyushin bombers and other transport planes to western Tibet from Sinkiang on the edge of the boundary of Ladakh; and, if so, when China alongside a lying propaganda offensive is also preparing or threatening to launch a military operation...

Speaker: How long is the question?

Hari Vishnu Kamath: My question further is, is it, Sir, in the defence interests of the country that the Minister for Defence should prepare to fly to New York at this moment of near crisis and thereby...

Speaker: Order, order. It is not relevant here.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Why not here? At this moment of near crisis the Defence Minister is flying to New York.

Speaker: What has his flying to New York to do with this?

Hari Vishnu Kamath: He should be a whole-time Defence Minister and he should be in the country at the time of crisis.

---

<sup>52</sup> PSP.

Speaker: That is a wider question and cannot be discussed here. Has he any question to put or not?

Hari Vishnu Kamath: My first question may be answered, my question about MIG fighters in western Tibet on the edge of Ladakh border.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Jawaharlal Nehru): We have no information about these various statements that the hon. Member has made, about MIG fighters and tanks in western Tibet. Naturally, it is not easy to get information from there. Anyhow, I think much of this information that sometimes appears in the Press, we have found, has little justification or basis.

Nath Pai (Rajapur):<sup>53</sup> Is it a fact that the Chinese defence forces or, rather, aggressive forces are logistically so placed that they have a definite advantage over us and they are in a position to haul their lighter weapons from their bases in Sinkiang through the Aksai Chin road; and, if so, do we take note of the fact which is emerging from their latest note, an increasingly menacing note which has appeared, where they accuse "India is determined to encroach on Chinese territory and to this end does not scruple to provoke even if bloody conflict...." In the face of the combination of these two facts - their superior advantage over us and their new menacing tone, what do we propose to do?

Speaker: Order, order. There is one thing that I must bring to the notice of hon. Members. Calling Attention Notice is on a matter of urgent public importance. There is one thing to which the whole attention is to be directed. But hon. Members open out the whole controversy of the border.

Nath Pai: It is strictly relevant. With the increasing forces that they have

---

<sup>53</sup> PSP.

got whether they can bring equipment with ease...

Speaker: The matter that we have before us is:

"The reported movement of Chinese tanks and armoured vehicles in occupied Indian territory in Northern Ladakh and sighting of long convoys of Chinese military vehicles in Southern Sinkiang and Quizil Jilga in occupied Aksai Chin."

Nath Pai: May I ask in all humility; is it not most logical if we ask that if they are not already placed there whether they can place them there with considerable speed?

Speaker: Logic would certainly take us too far. [Interruptions] Order, order.

Nath Pai: Let us see what the reply is.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: No reply.

Krishna Menon: I can only answer for military equipment on the Indian territory. As the Prime Minister has already stated, we have no such information, as most of these reports, particularly about military equipments on the Himalayas, are not based on facts.

Nath Pai: He did not answer the question. We want to be assured on this question, and that is why we have raised it; we have refrained from raising it in any other form following your guidance in this matter. If they have any advantage over us in logistics, then they can bring their dangerous weapons so quickly to that area, which is a matter of great concern to us. We would like to be assured by the Defence Minister, before he leaves the country, or the Prime Minister, that they do not enjoy any such advantage and were being prepared for any such eventuality. That particular report may be false, but this fact cannot be

ignored lightly that we are not in possession of information. Certainly, we are in possession of information of what you are doing. Do not disclose your military secrets, but what about the points which I am repeatedly seeking clarification of?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member should realise that even if we have some idea about the logistic position, it is not desirable to disclose it; it does not help us. We know the fact and it may help the other party. It is well known that, to some extent, logistically, it is easier to transport things from the plateau of Tibet and then go forward into Ladakh than to transport things across the Himalayas. It is a well-known fact. But to draw inferences from that may not be justified.

Hem Barua (Gauhati):<sup>54</sup> The way that China has been shifting up her position about the border since 1959 shows that China might not have any qualms of conscience in yielding up...

Speaker: Order, order. Again I have to request that some attention at least be paid to my rulings. I have suggested only just now that direct and relevant questions should be put.

Hem Barua : I am just now coming to that.

Speaker: He will come after travelling long distances.

Hem Barua: No, Sir. The whole thought layer...

Speaker: Some relevant question should be put, and that too precisely.

Hem Barua: I will do so.

---

<sup>54</sup> PSP.

Mahavir Tyagi (Dehra Dun):<sup>55</sup> He is in Chinese strategy.

Hem Barua: I will be quite relevant. This is very positive. China has been shifting her position along the border...

Speaker: What is the question?

Hem Barua: I am coming to that. Since 1949 China has been shifting..

Speaker: I wish he came to that question directly.

Hem Barua: I will come to that directly. To be very straight, whether the implementation, the unilateral implementation, of Panchsheel ethics as the Prime Minister stated the other day, is possible against background of this sort. That is what I want to know from the Prime Minister.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Panchsheel is like, well, King Charles's head. It comes up again and again. Panchsheel is civilised behaviour. Does he want us to say that we will not follow civilised behaviour because somebody else does not do so?

Hem Barua: I said "unilateral implementation". Is it possible?

Jawaharlal Nehru: What does implementation of civilised behaviour mean? To the extent implementation of civilised behaviour is possible, we will do it, whether the other party does it or not. It has nothing to do with the defence or non-defence. Defence is looked upon from the point of view of defence.

Hem Barua: It is ethically all right, but, in practice, it does not yield results.

---

<sup>55</sup> Congress.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am afraid, the hon. Member has not understood what, Panchsheel means.

Hem Barua: I have.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Then I would like to advise him to read it again a little more carefully. I would like to know what part of it he wants to object to. Which part does he want us not to accept?

Hem Barua: What about peaceful coexistence with China? A lamb cannot coexist with a lion until it is in the lion's belly.

Speaker: It is becoming difficult for me. Coexistence is becoming difficult even inside the House. How can I coexist with all these things? There ought to be some limit, but I find the discussion is going on.

[Translation begins:

Ramchandra Bade:<sup>56</sup> Every newspaper has published a report that China has collected trucks and military forces on the other side of the Chip Chap river. Besides, she is establishing new posts in the Indian territory. Is it not clear to the administration by this attitude of China that she is getting ready for fresh aggression on this country.

Speaker: Answer to this has been given.

Ramchandra Bade: This has not been answered.

Speaker: Just now the Minister has said that we don't have information about it. Honourable Member is repeating that it is published in newspapers.

---

<sup>56</sup> See fn 132 in this section.

Lahri Singh (Rohtak):<sup>57</sup> Has the Government tried to find out the source of the news published in the newspapers.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Honourable Member should ask the newspapermen. They have strange ways.

Translation ends]

Speaker: The hon. Member's question is whether Government have cared to find out the sources of the paper from which they published that news.

Jawaharlal Nehru: It will not be proper if we have to use our intelligence operations. It will not perhaps be liked to put the intelligence on newspapers to find out what their sources are.

Speaker: Does Shri Harish Chandra Mathur<sup>58</sup> want to ask any question?

Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): No, Sir.

Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara):<sup>59</sup> The hon. Defence Minister says that he has no information about this reported movement, but he does not deny that the Chinese vehicles may be moving in that area. Since China in its note of the 2nd June<sup>60</sup> has already hinted that there may be a border clash at any moment....

An Hon. Member: Bloody clash.

Hem Barua: Bloody conflict.

---

<sup>57</sup> See fn 133 in this section.

<sup>58</sup> Congress.

<sup>59</sup> PSP.

<sup>60</sup> See *White Paper VI*, pp. 56-58 and in this volume appendix 3 (b).

Surendranath Dwivedy: They have said ....

Speaker: Quotations need not be read.

Surendranath Dwivedy: They have accused India and have said that India is carrying on intrusion so that a border clash may be touched off at any moment which indicates that most probably China is preparing for some eventuality. In view of this, may I know whether the Government is thinking of any emergency measures not only at Defence level but at the popular level also to build up the morale of the country to meet any emergency?

Jawaharlal Nehru: To build up the morale of the country?

Krishna Menon: At civil level also.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I suppose the hon. Members are helping in not building it up. [Interruption]

Surendranath Dwivedy: I said at popular level. [Interruption]

Speaker: Order, order,

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do maintain, Sir, that the kind of questions that have been asked are not helpful in building up the morale of the country....  
[Interruption]

Hari Vishnu Kamath rose-

Hem Barua: On a point of order, Sir .... [Interruption]

Nath Pai rose -

Hem Barua: On a point of order, Sir .... [Interruption]

Surendranath Dwivedy rose –

Speaker: Order, order.

Ramchandra Bade rose-

Speaker: Order, order. Will he kindly resume his seat? Let them say one by one what they have to say. Shri Nath Pai.

Nath Pai: Mr Speaker, Sir. [Interruption]

Speaker: Order, order. Can we proceed in this manner?

Nath Pai: It is indeed a great pity that every time we try to exercise our legitimate elementary duty which alone justifies our presence in this House, that is, of calling attention to what we regard as a matter of concern, the hon. Prime Minister instead of trying to guide and tell the facts is irritated. I must say this. The two recent accusations are firstly, that we are indulging in war-mongering when all we say is, "Are we from the defence point of view fully prepared?" And, secondly, now comes this even worse allegation. I ask whether it is fair for him when we ask for simple information to level such a serious charge that we are interested in weakening the morale of the country. Does it lie well in the mouth of the hon. Prime Minister? .... [Interruption]

Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is unworthy of the hon. Prime Minister, the good democrat that he is .... [Interruption]

Surendranath Dwivedy: He should not take advantage of his position .... [Interruption]

Speaker: Order, order,

Ramchandra Bade: He should take those words back. ... [Interruption]

Speaker: Order, order. Can we go on in this manner? Even if one is provoked and agitated, at least there must be some method in our proceedings.

Surendranath Dwivedy: It is a serious matter, Sir, if the hon. Prime Minister says like that. [Interruption]

Speaker: How can I deal with it unless hon. Members allow me to do so? They do not allow anybody to speak. How can I deal with it if all of them stand up simultaneously and speak?

Nath Pai: It pains .... [Interruption]

An Hon. Member: They are standing up in fours and fives.

Nath Pai: I will not be bowed down like this. May I say in conclusion that it pains us to see the Hon. Prime Minister losing his temper every time we try to raise a matter in the House which we regard as a legitimate one .... [Interruption]

Ansar Harvani<sup>61</sup> rose-

Nath Pai: These tactics will not bow me down .... [Interruption]

Speaker: Order, order. All hon. Members should help me in maintaining discipline and decorum in the House. It is very regrettable.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: We are at your service, Sir.

---

<sup>61</sup> Congress.

Nath Pai: Let not Shri Harvani be more loyal than the king ....

[Interruption]

Speaker: Order, order. I will request that hon. Members to remain silent unless I require their assistance. I would ask for that assistance if I require it. They should just keep silent and listen. One hon. Member is on his legs; let us hear him.

Nath Pai rose -[Interruptions]

Speaker: Order, order.

Nath Pai: This is a very serious charge, Sir. Here is a responsible journal, a national journal. Either the journals are indulging in panic-mongering, or they are discharging their duties.

Speaker: What is the journal?

Nath Pai: This is the *Times of India* of Sunday.<sup>62</sup> We think they are doing a very vital national service. We can only know such information as the national papers give and ask Government which have better sources for clarification. When we ask such a question if a danger is looming large on the horizon are we doing something wrong. Is it betraying the country, or helping the Prime Minister? How does he combine the two, Sir?

Jawaharlal Nehru: May I repeat, Sir, that I do not wish to hurt anybody. But I am surprised at the kind of questions hon. Members ask. When the Hon. Member talked about the lion and the lamb, it does not increase the morale of the country.

---

<sup>62</sup> Sunday, 10 June 1962, datelined 9 June.

Hem Barua: Since the reference is to me, may I say ....

[Interruptions]

An Hon. Member: Sit down!

Speaker: Order, order.

Hem Barua: You cannot cow me down. I will not be cowed down like this. [Interruptions]

Speaker: I would ask Mr Hem Barua to address the Chair.

Hem Barua: Why should they shout like this? They are howling.

[Interruption]

Speaker: Order, order. Would he resume his seat? If someone shouts he can draw my attention to it. I will ask him to keep silent. Not that he should enter into a duel with him directly and settle the matter. Shall I be a silent witness to all this? Can we carry on the proceedings of the House in this manner? I have appealed to hon. Members again and again that they should maintain at least some minimum decorum. Let us hear the hon. Member.

Surendranath Dwivedy: The Prime Minister while replying to my question said that by putting such questions we are not building the morale of the country. It may be his opinion. He is surrendering the country to the Chinese and others. But I want to know what his answer is to the first part of my question. I asked whether they are thinking of any emergency measures at the Defence level. Is there any reply to that question, I want to know.

Jawaharlal Nehru: May I Know, Sir, if this is the proper way of putting it

-that I am surrendering the country to China. I think it is a scandalous charge to make. [Interruptions]

Speaker: Order, order. No more questions I would allow. Perhaps, hon. Members who felt agitated have satisfied themselves with these charges.

Surendranath Dwivedy: He cannot accuse us of betrayal of this country - it is too much.

Speaker: I cannot allow every hon. Member to go on like this. I have allowed so many questions. Only one is permitted; but so many questions have been put.

Hem Barua: Will you let me clarify my position? I had not completed my idea, when I was interrupted by hon. Members.

Speaker: Order, order. His leader asked him to sit down, because he wanted to put a question himself. How can I help that?

Hem Barua: The reference with regard to the lion and the lamb was to me ....

Speaker: Order, order, now.

Hem Barua: This will have a bad effect.

Speaker: What more does he want now?

Hem Barua: I have to vindicate my position. When I referred to the lion and the lamb, I had my own arguments to offer.

Speaker: He may have his arguments; others also have their own arguments. The Treasury Benches have their arguments. They have expressed their opinion; he has expressed his. Where is the trouble now?

Hem Barua: The Prime Minister has made certain remarks.

Speaker: Order, order. He has said that reference to these things does not improve the morale of the country. Can't he hold that opinion? Why should there be a quarrel about it - calling one country as a lion and the other as a lamb, he says does not improve the morale of the country. Should I give the hon. Member opportunity to go on making a lecture?

Hem Barua: I did not say one country is a lion and the other country is a lamb. May I submit that I had never completed my statement? My statement has been completely distorted.

I would be the last man to call my country a lamb, we are interested in defending the morale of this country, defending the boundaries of our country and the frontiers of this country and if a call comes tomorrow, we shall be the first to go to the battlefield with guns in our hands. But what pains us is this, that the Prime Minister has tried to distort our statement. I said that by the very policy of weakness that the Prime Minister or the Government is following towards China we are made to look like lambs....

Speaker: Order, order. I would ask the hon. Member to resume his seat.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: One question.

Speaker: I have allowed them so many questions. There have been more than enough.

Nath Pai: Sir, just one word.

Speaker: If they want to raise a discussion they might do it in some other manner. I have always allowed it.

Nath Pai: May I say just one sentence regarding this lion and lamb?

Vivekananda told the whole of India, "Ye lions, shed off the delusion that you are lambs". And there was no insult meant to India when he said so.

Hem Barua: I did not want to mean any insult.

Jawaharlal Nehru: When he said that we are surrendering to the Chinese, that was of course a mild statement to make!

Hem Barua: But you provoked us.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, yes, we have had enough of this kind of things.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: When he talked of our not helping to build up the morale of the country, do his statements .... [Interruptions]

Speaker: Order, order, would there be an end to it? Shri Mohsin.<sup>63</sup>

Mahavir Tyagi: I move, Sir, that the question may now be closed and we take up the next item.

### **391. In the Lok Sabha: China Protests Confiscation of *China Today***<sup>64</sup>

Protest Note from China Re:

Confiscation of "*China Today*"

---

<sup>63</sup> F.H. Mohsin, Congress.

<sup>64</sup> Oral Answers, 15 June 1962. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Third Series, Vol. V, 8 June to 22 June 1962, 1st Session, cols 10768-10773.

D.C. Sharma:<sup>65</sup> will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether China has protested to India against the confiscation of issues of the news bulletin *China Today* which its Embassy published in New Delhi;
- (b) whether China has also counter-charged India with reprinting in its Embassy's news bulletin "materials from unofficial sources slandering the Chinese Government," and
- (c) if so, the details of the reply sent to the Chinese Government, if any?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) Yes, Sir.
- (b) The Government of China have charged that Indian Embassy bulletins published in Peking have reproduced documents and statements attacking China, including a summary of the *Officials' Report*<sup>66</sup> and the AICC Resolution on National Integrity (published in *India News* of 1-1-1961). Our Embassy's fortnightly bulletin is by and large innocuous. It has a limited circulation in the diplomatic corps of Peking. Moreover our Embassy has been very careful in observing international norms as well as the laws and regulations of the People's Republic of China in putting out this bulletin. There is, therefore, not much substance in the Chinese Government's counter allegations.
- (c) The Chinese note has just been received and is under study.

D.C. Sharma: May I know whether there are unofficial sources prevailing in China? I think all the sources in China are official. If there are unofficial sources, do they refer to the Indian sources or the sources which are available in China?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Jawaharlal Nehru): Undoubtedly there must be many unofficial

---

<sup>65</sup> Congress.

<sup>66</sup> Republished as SWJN/SS/66/Supplement.

sources but they are not known.

Hem Barua:<sup>67</sup> In the Chinese note of May 11,<sup>68</sup> published in *China Today*, it is said that "the Aksai-Chin area has always been Chinese territory", and subsequently in the Chinese note of 2nd June,<sup>69</sup> the Prime Minister's offer to allow the Aksai-Chin road to be used for civilian traffic by China is described as an absurdity. In the context of it, may I know whether the Prime Minister's offer still holds any validity?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The offer is very good, very reasonable, very logical and very valid. The fact that it is not admitted does not make it unreasonable.

Hem Barua: Then why did they point out in the reply that it is not accepted.

Speaker:<sup>70</sup> Order, order.

Jawaharlal Nehru: If it is not accepted, it is not accepted. There the matter ends.

Nath Pai:<sup>71</sup> The charges and counter-charges, the allegations and counter- allegations, do not seem to get abated in anyway. May we, therefore, know from the Prime Minister, what makes him think, as he said the other day, that China is unhappy with her relations with us and would like settlement?

Jawaharlal Nehru: It is rather difficult to analyse certain feelings that are

---

<sup>67</sup> PSP.

<sup>68</sup> See *White Paper VI*, p. 40 and in this volume appendix 3 (a).

<sup>69</sup> See *White Paper VI*, pp. 56-58 and in this volume appendix 3 (b).

<sup>70</sup> Hukam Singh.

<sup>71</sup> PSP.

derived from a multitude of sources, and it may not be wholly justified. I do not know; but I did say so. That does not mean that anything special is in view at the present moment. I did say that various factors led me to it.

Nath Pai: No grounds on which it may be based...

Speaker: Order, order.

Hari Vishnu Kamath:<sup>72</sup> Is it not a fact that the Chinese Stalinists who are in power have mastered the Nazi Goebbelsian technique of repeating lies ad nauseam ...

Speaker: Why go so far?

Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is about China.

Speaker: He is saying so many things and making imputations.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is a fact; it is against China and not against India.

Speaker: Against China also we should be careful.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is about the lying propaganda; it is admitted by the Government also. In view of this and together with the corollary-the bigger the lie, the better for Chou En-lai-may I know what is the attitude of the Government to the New Age Press owned, so far as I know, by the Communist Party of India, which is abetting this anti-national propaganda in this country? *China Today* is printed at the New Age Press.

---

<sup>72</sup> PSP.

Speaker: He should confine himself to the question instead of saying so many things.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: The question is concerned with *China Today*.

Speaker: The Communist Party of India does not come here. If he wants to put any question about the charges or counter-charges made in that publication, he might put it.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: All right, Sir. Is it not a fact that the charges contained in *China Today* against India and in the other documents referred to by my friend, Shri Hem Barua, have been made in this country since the last six months or more or even longer than that, and is it a fact that the New Age Press has had a hand in propagating these charges, the lying propaganda, inside India—the New Age Press is owned by the Communist Party of India—and what action has been taken by the Government in this connection?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member has such an abundance of things in his mind that he is wholly confusing. I am confused what he is after. I remember a string of words and phrases, but I do not quite follow his logical arguments. He said something about the Stalinists in China. I do not understand. [Interruptions]

Speaker: Order, order.

Jawaharlal Nehru: These are emotional and evocative phrases.

Renu Chakravarty:<sup>73</sup> Please ask him to repeat what he said he should withdraw it.

---

<sup>73</sup> CPI.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: You provoked me.

Speaker: These private conversations should not continue. A supplementary has been asked and the Prime Minister is answering that. Meanwhile, private conversations are going on and the same charges and countercharges are being levelled there.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: She started the game.

Speaker: Whoever might have done it, both were unauthorised. I do not allow that.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not quite know what is the question. He ended by asking what action has been taken against the Communist Party of India or the *New Age*.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: New Age Press.

Jawaharlal Nehru: All the rest was a confusing preamble which has nothing to do with this.

The position is, according to the international practice, any official documents are allowed to be circulated in another country. That is, if we send a message to the Chinese authorities, we have the right to publish that in any paper that we may issue in Peking or elsewhere. If *China Today* publishes Chinese messages, they have a right to do it. We are not going to object to it, even though it may be highly offensive to us.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Anti-Indian; it has been confiscated.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Let him try to understand a little and not be confused in his own circles of thought. If an official message or a statement of a

Government is published, whether a speech or a letter to us, it is perfectly right, even though it might be offensive to us. We allow such things to be printed. But where selections from it giving a particular point are brought out and comments are made, then it is different. Then it becomes difficult. In *China Today*, something of this kind was done. It was not purely an official statement. If it had been their official statement, we would have taken no action, however offensive it might have been, because that is a statement that is sent by one Government to our Government. If a statement is sent by our Government to China, we claim the same right of publicity for that. But where it is changed and one-sided extracts are printed, then it becomes pure propaganda and not an official statement being reproduced. The hon. Member referred to the *New Age* and said that the *New Age* have been the publishers of it.<sup>74</sup>

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Printers.

Surendranath Dwivedy:<sup>75</sup> They are the printers of *China Today* which has been proscribed.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Being printers—somewhat less than being publishers. [Interruption] If they do anything against the law, then we do proceed against them. They naturally will suffer if they go against the law, but from the mere fact that they are printing a document which occasionally offends us for some reason and which we forfeit, it does not necessarily follow that we proceed against them on this basis; otherwise we might.

### **392. To M.J. Desai: On a Draft<sup>76</sup>**

---

<sup>74</sup> See item 389.

<sup>75</sup> PSP.

<sup>76</sup> Note to FS, 18 June 1962.

I have glanced through these papers. As far as I have seen after hurried view, there is no reference in them to the talks we had with the Chinese authorities in Delhi and probably in Peking also about Barahoti or some other places in UP. The Chinese representative was in Delhi for many weeks then. I think this should be included.

I think also that the date of the Dalai Lama entering India to seek refuge should also be given.

### **393. In the Lok Sabha: India in Chinese Territory<sup>77</sup>**

#### Alleged Indian Intrusion into Chinese Territory

Question:<sup>78</sup> will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) Whether the Chinese Government in their protest note dated the 28th May, 1962<sup>79</sup> have accused India with further intrusions and provocations in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border; and
- (b) If so, the reaction of the Government thereto?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) Yes, Sir. The Chinese Government in their note have baselessly alleged that India has set up a military post 35 18' North 78 05' 30" East, 8 kilometres west by south of the Chinese post at 35° 19' N 78 12'E. The Chinese Government have named this place Hongshantou. There is no such place as Hongshantou on the map and the area referred to is Indian territory.

(c) The Chinese note dated 28th May, 1962 has just been received and is

---

<sup>77</sup> Written Answers, 19 June 1962. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Third Series, Vol. V, 8 June to 22 June 1962, 1st Session, col. 11650.

<sup>78</sup> By two Congress MPs D.C. Sharma and P.C. Borooah.

<sup>79</sup> See *White Paper VI*, pp. 54-55 and in this volume appendix 7 (a).

under study.<sup>80</sup>

### **394. In the Lok Sabha: Development in NEFA<sup>81</sup>**

P.C. Borooah:<sup>82</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Foreign Secretary<sup>83</sup> visited Shillong to discuss various problems relating to the development of NEFA region with the Governor of Assam and Senior Officers of NEFA in the 1st week of June, 1962;

(a) If so, what particular matters were discussed during his visit; and

(b) what decisions, if any, were taken in consultation with the Foreign Secretary for the development of the NEFA region?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) The Foreign Secretary paid a visit to Shillong from 31st May to 2nd June. A conference of senior officers of the NEFA commenced at Shillong on 1st June and the Foreign Secretary sat in at one or two sessions of this conference to acquaint himself with the administrative and other problems which the NEFA Administration has to deal with and give necessary guidance and assistance in dealing with these problems.

(b) The Foreign Secretary took advantage of this visit to discuss logistic and other problems facing the NEFA Administration and the Assam Rifles, with the Governor<sup>84</sup> and also met some of the Assam Ministers and Chief

---

<sup>80</sup> For India's reply of 22 June 1962, see *White Paper VI*, pp. 68-70 and in this volume appendix 7 (b).

<sup>81</sup> Written answer, 19 June 1962. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Third Series, Vol. V, 8 June to 22 June 1962, 1st Session, cols 11665-66.

<sup>82</sup> Congress.

<sup>83</sup> M.J. Desai.

<sup>84</sup> S.M. Shrinagesh.

Secretary of Assam.<sup>85</sup> He also met a number of officers of the Indian Frontier Administrative Service serving in NEFA to acquaint himself with the conditions in the various regions of NEFA and discuss the difficulties experienced by these officers in their day to day work. Besides, the Foreign Secretary presided over a meeting of the Association of Indian Frontier Administrative Service Officers, where certain proposals regarding improvement of the service conditions were discussed.

(c) No decisions were taken on any major questions. As a result of the consultations, which took place however, some of the difficulties and problems were adjusted by internal re-arrangements and guidance was given as to the lines on which other problems including development proposals should be processed and sent up to the Government of India. It might be added that such consultations between the Governor and the officers of the NEFA Administration go on continuously when the Governor or Senior NEFA Officers visit Delhi and occasionally when the Foreign Secretary visits Shillong.

### **395. In the Lok Sabha: Chinese Incursions into Indian Territory<sup>86</sup>**

Speaker:<sup>87</sup> I have received notice of an adjournment motion by Shri Hem Barua, This is based on the correspondence that was placed on the Table of the House yesterday. The news that has appeared in the papers rather confuses the reader. Will the hon. Prime Minister like to say anything about it?

The Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Jawaharlal Nehru): We have placed, as usual, the full correspondence on the Table of the House. The reports appearing in the

---

<sup>85</sup> A.N. Kidwai.

<sup>86</sup> Motion for Adjournment, 20 June 1962. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Third Series, Vol. V, 8 June to 22 June 1962, 1st Session, cols 11934-36.

<sup>87</sup> Hukam Singh.

press give rather a wrong impression by picking out a phrase here and there.

The fact of the matter is that in this area all kinds of movements are taking place by us as well as by the Chinese authorities. Because of our movements, sometimes going behind the Chinese posts, some apprehension has been created in the minds of the Chinese, and they have also moved. These movements are confined to a small area. To call them fresh incursions is hardly correct, though it may be in an area of half a mile or two miles or something like that that has taken place.

It is not very proper for me to discuss these matters publicly. But I can assure the House that the position, as it is, is more advantageous to India than it was previously, and the advantage is growing as our roads are being made and other facilities of communication are being established. That is the chief drawback. Our Army is good enough, but that is not enough. The Army has to get there and has to be fed and supplied. That is the chief drawback, and we are making good that lack. I do not say that the position is 100 per cent satisfactory. It is not. But it is getting better and better.

Hem Barua (Gauhati)<sup>88</sup> rose...

Speaker: If I need it, I will certainly request him to give me some information. I just requested the Prime Minister to make a statement, seeing that the headlines given in the papers create an impression that there have been some recent incursions and fresh encroachments. The House only needs to be assured on this point.

Jawaharlal Nehru: The recent encroachments are referred to in the notes. The headlines have taken extracts of some phrases here and there from the notes. There have been movements, patrols coming, our movements and theirs. Naturally, our movements are not referred to. Theirs are referred to

---

<sup>88</sup> PSP.

in our notes to the Chinese Government. But broadly speaking, there has been no real advance. They may have moved a few hundred yards this way or that. This is manoeuvring for better positions.

Speaker: In view of the statement made by the Prime Minister ...

Hem Barua: I want to congratulate the Prime Minister ...

Speaker: I will make this request to the hon. Member. In view of what has been stated, probably he would be better advised in not pursuing it further.

Hem Barua: I just want to congratulate the Prime Minister on giving us the information that the situation is improving. This is a great thing for the country.

Speaker: In view of the statement made by the Prime Minister, I do not feel called upon to give my consent to the adjournment motion.

### **396. In the Rajya Sabha: Chinese Incursions in the North<sup>89</sup>**

A.B. Vajpayee:<sup>90</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether there have been any fresh Chinese incursions on the Northern border; and

(b) if so, whether a statement giving the details of these incursions will be laid on the Table of the House?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon):

(a) Yes, Sir. Subsequent to our protest note dated 15th April, 1962<sup>91</sup> regarding the Chinese post established at a point 6 miles west of Sumdo,

---

<sup>89</sup> Oral Answers, 20 June 1962. *Rajya Sabha Debates*, Vol. XXXIX, No.6, cols 862-871.

<sup>90</sup> Jan Sangh MP from Uttar Pradesh.

<sup>91</sup> See *White Paper VI*, p. 26 and in this volume appendix 1(a).

Chinese troops have set up another post on Indian territory at 78. 52.30' East 33.30' North, approximately 8 to 10 miles South- East of Spanggur. This new post set up on Indian Territory has been fortuitously admitted by the Chinese in their note dated the 11th May 1962.<sup>92</sup>

(b) Copies of the Chinese note and our reply<sup>93</sup> thereto; are placed on the Table of the House.

[Though China's Note of 11 May and India's Note of 21 May form part of the Debates, these are given in appendices in this volume.]

A.B. Vajpayee: Am I to understand that no fresh Chinese incursions have taken place apart from what has been stated by the Minister?

Lakshmi Menon: It is obvious from the admission by the Chinese themselves.

A.B. Vajpayee: Sir, May I draw your attention to part (b) of the question? I asked for a statement giving the details of fresh Chinese incursions but what we have been supplied with are copies of the Notes that have been exchanged between India and China, and there is no mention about the entry of the Chinese personnel into the village Roi, half a mile south of Longju. Am I to understand that it is not a case of Chinese incursion?

Jawaharlal Nehru: This question deals with Ladakh. It does not deal with Longju because it has nothing to deal with there. Longju is of the least relevance to this question. Longju is situated actually on the border and there is an argument as to which part of Longju is on this side or that side of the so-called McMahon line. I do not think that there has been any movement on this side of that line. The argument is as to which part of Longju is on that side of the border or on this side of the border. But still,

---

<sup>92</sup> See *White Paper VI*, p. 40 and in this volume appendix 1 (b).

<sup>93</sup> See *White Paper VI*, pp. 49-50 and in this volume appendix 1 (c).

apart from it, the Chinese had occupied Longju long ago. It is that part that is discussed, not any other village to the south of Longju.

As for the other matters about Ladakh about which the answer has been given, the correspondence itself states the position. It should be realised that there is a peculiar position where we are making certain advances, small advances-patrol posts and others and the Chinese are advancing. It is a game of military chess that is going on in the wide expanses and a few persons, about a dozen or so, come and make a patrol post as it is called or our people go and make a post endangering their positions. In fact, this is largely due to the movements on our side, which have induced the Chinese to make some movements on their side to protect themselves. Not all these things are said in public but since the hon. Member is going on asking me, I cannot go on saying "No". These things are never given out in public, when there is a delicate situation as to what we are doing to inconvenience them. It is well known in knowledgeable circles in the world who follow this that the position in these areas has changed to our advantage somewhat. That does not mean any final thing. That is a continual thing to our advantage and the Chinese themselves are rather concerned about it and are trying to protect their posts because the new posts are to their disadvantage.

A.B. Vajpayee: On a point of personal explanation, may I submit that I did not ask for any information that might go to help the Chinese? But it is surprising indeed that when it is a question of sending protest notes to the Chinese, the Government takes one position and when it is a question of replying to supplementary put by hon. Members, the position taken by the Government is quite different. I fail to understand how these two positions can be reconciled.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not understood where the difference is.

A.B. Vajpayee: I put a specific question whether the entry of the Chinese

troops in the village Roi, half a mile south of Longju, is a case of Chinese incursion or not.

Jawaharlal Nehru: If it is not south of Longju, how can it be an incursion because north of Longju is Chinese territory?

A.B. Vajpayee: Longju is not Chinese territory.

Chairman:<sup>94</sup> Half a mile north of Longju is Chinese territory, he said.

A.B. Vajpayee: In our protest note, we have said that this village is situated well within Indian Territory and that is what we have protested against. Now the Prime Minister says that it is not Indian Territory.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry I do not know anything about the village. I have forgotten the names. There are plenty of small villages.

A.B. Vajpayee: Sir, he should come here prepared.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Territory north of Longju is Chinese territory.

A.B. Vajpayee: I have a copy of the protest note, which says that the Chinese have made a fresh incursion in this village. This is well within our territory.

Lakshmi Menon: This village Roi or Ruyu, as the Chinese call it, is a place with two households, one and a half miles south of Longju. There was no incursion at all. It was discovered that two officers, a patrol leader and some other Chinese, strayed into the village and went back. You would not call this intrusion or invasion.

---

<sup>94</sup> Zakir Husain.

A.B. Vajpayee: I have never called it invasion or intrusion, but it is incursion. There may be no dispute about it and we have protested against this.

Lakshmi Menon: Certainly.

Chairman: You have got the replies.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, the point is that it is a most trivial occurrence and there is nothing to get excited about it.

A.B. Vajpayee: May I put a supplementary, Sir? In our note sent on the 6th of June,<sup>95</sup> we have protested against the setting up of five military bases by the Chinese on our territory. But, on the 13th June at a New Delhi Press Conference, the Prime Minister was pleased to state that China is eager for a settlement.<sup>96</sup> May I know, Sir, how China can be eager for a settlement when military preparations are being made like this?

Jawaharlal Nehru: We are making military preparations too but we would like a settlement.

A.B. Vajpayee: Not on Chinese territory. We are not making military preparations on Chinese territory.

Jawaharlal Nehru: That is what the Chinese say, that we are making military preparations on Chinese territory.

A.B. Vajpayee: Are we to go by what the Chinese say?

---

<sup>95</sup> See *White Paper VI*, pp. 60-61 and in this volume appendix 1 (d).

<sup>96</sup> See item I.

Jawaharlal Nehru: We say something and the Chinese say something else. They say it is Sinkiang territory. It may be immaterial. But they are wrong. The two are mutually contradictory. In fact, one helps the other in order to make a settlement. But one wants to make one's position as strong as possible. However, what I said there was not based on any precise fact but an impression I had got that the Chinese would like a settlement. That does not help very much because the kind of settlement that they may like maybe completely objectionable to us. That is a different matter. But I guessed that the mood of the Chinese was in favour of a settlement, which would not involve too considerable a loss of face to them.

Niranjan Singh:<sup>97</sup> Yesterday it had been published that about five posts have been set up by the Chinese and they are constructing new roads in the south. May I know, Sir how far they are away from the Indian Army posts or near about or whether they have entered the Indian area, which has Indian posts.

Syed Ahmad:<sup>98</sup> My friend's supplementary does not arise out of this question.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know what the hon. Member means by the Indian border. The Chinese are far inside the Indian border.

Niranjan Singh: If they are far inside the Indian border, may I know, Sir, whether they have crossed the Indian bases.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I suppose the straight answer would be to say "No". But the whole thing is so crooked not straight, because in some places we are behind the Chinese posts, in some places they are in front. It is a zigzag

---

<sup>97</sup> PSP.

<sup>98</sup> Congress.

thing, which has developed. Therefore, to say whether they are beyond or not is not very accurate.

Chairman: It is not a static situation; it is a moving situation. We are moving and they are moving. It is very difficult to state the position at a certain point of time.

Bhupesh Gupta:<sup>99</sup> PSP and Jan Sangh are also moving.

### **397. In the Lok Sabha: China's Note of 31 May 1962<sup>100</sup>**

Question:<sup>101</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attention of Government has been drawn to the reference to Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan in Chinese note dated the 31st May, 1962<sup>102</sup> replying to India's note regarding proposed Sino-Pak border talks dated the 10th May, 1962;<sup>103</sup> and

(b) the reaction of Government thereto?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Dinesh Singh):

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) In our protest note of 10th May 1962, we drew the attention of the Government of China to the fact that China had no common border with Pakistan whether in the West or in the East, and cited the two terminal points of our border to prove it. It was not meant to be a complete description but enough to show that China and Pakistan had no common

---

<sup>99</sup> CPI.

<sup>100</sup> Oral Answers, 22 June 1962. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Third Series, Vol. V, 8 June to 22 June 1962, 1st Session, pp. 12407-12.

<sup>101</sup> By PSP MPs Hari Vishnu Kamath, Hem Barua and Congress MPs Shree Narayan Das, Bhakt Darshan.

<sup>102</sup> See *White Paper VI*, pp. 99-102 and in this volume appendix 8 (a).

<sup>103</sup> See *White Paper VI*, pp. 96-97 and in this volume appendix 8 (b).

border. The Government of China in their reply gave this description a meaning which our note did not seek to convey, and drew certain conclusions there from which are calculated to affect our relations with Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan.

It is needless to reiterate that we have close and enduring relations with Nepal based on mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty.

In regard to Bhutan, we have special treaty obligations and, at the request of the Government of Bhutan, we have at various times taken up with the Government of China matters such as Chinese cartographic aggression on Bhutan, the violation of Bhutan's air space by Chinese aircraft and the protection of Bhutan's interests in Tibet. As to Sikkim, our position is clear. The Government of India are entirely responsible for the defence and external relations of Sikkim and no foreign power has any right to interfere in Sikkim.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: China in its note replying to India's note of the 10th May says that Nepal does not exist, Sikkim does not exist and Bhutan does not exist. Is it clear evidence of China's mala fides and has Government got any other information in its possession to show that these expressions are an outward sign of an inward design to liberate these territories in the Chinese meaning of the word "liberation" and, if so, what is Government's reaction to that?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Jawaharlal Nehru): Government's immediate reaction is that the question is too complicated to be understood, further all the inferences the hon. Member has drawn have no justification. I do not know or remember where this phrase occurs in the Chinese note that there is no Nepal, no Bhutan and no Sikkim.

Speaker.<sup>104</sup> Some newspapers gave this report and put the interpretation that Bhutan etc. do not exist according to China.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know where this occurs. In some newspapers? I do not read all the newspapers. It is patently absurd for anybody to say either for China, or for the newspapers or the hon. Member opposite, whoever it may be. It is quite absurd. They have come to a treaty with Nepal.<sup>105</sup> Did they have a treaty with something that does not exist?

Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Prime Minister has misunderstood my question. May I make it clear that the Chinese in their reply to India's note say, according to press reports, that it, Nepal, does not exist, Bhutan does not exist and Sikkim does not exist. Is it not clear evidence of intention on their part to liberate these territories in the Chinese meaning of the word "liberation" and then incorporate them into the vast Chinese Communist empire?

Speaker: How can our Government say about that?

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Is there any information in their possession to show....

Speaker: Order, order. Whether China had that design or not, how could the Prime Minister say that?

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Have they any information or reports in their possession to show that?

Jawaharlal Nehru: What China has stated in its note is that, according to

---

<sup>104</sup> Hukam Singh.

<sup>105</sup> In 1960.

India, because India has only stated the nodal points and not the middle, therefore, India apparently thinks that Nepal does not exist. They have negatively accused us of forgetting the existence of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim. Of course, it has no meaning. I do not know who drafted the note of China.

Speaker: Shri Hem Barua.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: I have put only one question.

Hem Barua: In view of the fact that China used or inserted the word "proper" before "relations" in the Chinese official version of Mr Chou En-lai's press conference on 25th April, 1960 at Delhi,<sup>106</sup> may I know whether Government would not proceed on the assumption that here was China bent upon introducing new dimensions to the problem of Sikkim and Bhutan?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The Chinese language is a difficult language to translate. I do not know what word he used in Chinese.

Hera Barua: But this was made clear from the tape recorder.

Jawaharlal Nehru: But anyhow our experience of the Chinese statements is that they usually are very carefully drafted which may mean more than one thing. They are not precise. It may mean something else. What the word "proper" means I do not know. So far as our relations are concerned, they are patent, that is, with Bhutan and Sikkim, and on other occasions the Chinese Government have assured us that the authority recognised our relations with Bhutan and Sikkim.

---

<sup>106</sup> See SWJN/SS/60/item 34.

Hem Barua: In this latest note they have described our relations with Sikkim and Bhutan as power chauvinism.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Does Government still stand by the hon. Prime Minister's declaration which he made a couple of years ago that any aggression against Bhutan or Nepal, or Sikkim also included perhaps, will be regarded as aggression against India and dealt with as such?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, Sir; the position in regard to Nepal and Bhutan is different. Obviously, we would regard any aggression in Nepal, if not directly, indirectly against India. But it is for the Nepal Government to decide what should be done in the circumstances. We cannot take action against the wishes of the Nepal Government. But Bhutan, as I stated in reply to this question, has constantly asked us to state their case to China, They recognise our great interest in the defence of Bhutan.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sikkim?

Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh:<sup>107</sup> May I know whether it is a fact that the recent mention of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim in the latest Chinese note arises from the Chinese anxiety to recognise Indo-Chinese border dispute as a border dispute between China on the one hand and Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim on the other?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The question is not clear to me. What does Indo-China mean? Does it mean the region in South-East Asia?

Hem Barua: India-China.

---

<sup>107</sup> Congress.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not understand the question.

Speaker: Will he kindly repeat the question?

Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: May I know whether this latest reference to Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim in the Chinese note arises out of the Chinese anxiety to refer to the Indo-Chinese border dispute and the border dispute between China and Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Please do not call it Indo-China. Indo-China is an area in South-East Asia.

Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: India and China.

Some Hon. Members: Sino-Indian.

Speaker: What he wants to know is rather an opinion on that and how it arises. It is not a direct attempt to elicit information.

### **398. In the Lok Sabha: India's Offer to China<sup>108</sup>**

Hari Vishnu Kamath:<sup>109</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 1401 on the 11th June, 1962<sup>110</sup> and state:

(a) who actually exercises administrative authority at present over the area of "no man's land" envisaged in the latest offer made to

---

<sup>108</sup> Oral Answers, 22 June 1962. *Lok Sabha Debates*. Third Series, Vol. V, 8 June to 22 June 1962, 1st Session, cols 12426-12428.

<sup>109</sup> PSP.

<sup>110</sup> See item 388.

China for settlement of the border dispute; and  
(b) the Chinese Government's reaction to the offer?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Dinesh Singh):

(a) The area in the western sector from which the two sides should withdraw, as proposed in our note of the 14th May 1962,<sup>111</sup> is for the most part under the military occupation of the Chinese except for certain portions in the south which are under our jurisdiction and control.

There is no administration as such in this area as it is largely uninhabited.

(b) In their reply dated 2nd June 1962<sup>112</sup> the Chinese Government have stated that our offer is as unacceptable to them now as it was before (in 1959). They would consider our proposal only if it is applied equally to the eastern sector of the border as well. In other words, they want India to withdraw simultaneously from the area south of the Macmahon [McMahon] Line up to the foothills, which are claimed by China.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: When the Government in its offer made to China for settlement of the border dispute offers to withdraw to the western line in Ladakh shown in the Chinese maps, is it not tantamount to admission on the Government's part of the Chinese charge against India that India has committed aggression on Chinese territory?

Dinesh Singh: No, Sir.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Jawaharlal Nehru): If it is Chinese territory then it is an admission. But when we do not admit that it is Chinese territory, it ceases to be an admission.

---

<sup>111</sup> See *White Paper VI*, pp. 41-43 and in this volume appendix 4.

<sup>112</sup> See *White Paper VI*, pp. 56-58 and in this volume appendix 3 (b).

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Now that the Chinese Government has rejected the offer and has not accepted the offer made by the Government, does the offer still stand or has it been withdrawn?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The offer is there; it stands.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Still it is there?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes.

U.M. Trivedi:<sup>113</sup> In view of one fact that we have ourselves admitted the existence of no man's land will it not make a sort of an estoppel against us because this land rightfully belongs to us?

Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir.

Hem Barua:<sup>114</sup> In view of the fact that China has unilaterally fixed the extent of her territory on our northern border on the basis of which she is threatening action against India, may I know what is the sense in pursuing this policy of making offers?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Because the offers are to our advantage.

### **399. In the Lok Sabha: Reported Chinese Occupation of Indian Territory in NEFA<sup>115</sup>**

---

<sup>113</sup> Jan Sangh.

<sup>114</sup> PSP.

<sup>115</sup> Calling attention to matters of urgent Public importance, 22 June 1962. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Third Series, Vol. 5, 8 June to 22 June 1962, 1st Session, cols 12494-98.

Ramchandra Bade (Kharagone):<sup>116</sup> Sir, under rule 197, I beg to call the attention of the hon. Prime Minister to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon: The reported occupation by China of about 500 square mile of Indian territory in NEFA.

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Dinesh Singh): Although the Chinese have maintained that they do not recognise the MacMahon [McMahon] Line they have not committed any serious intrusions or attempted to set up check-posts in this sector except in the case of Longju which they occupied in August 1959 and then vacated sometime in 1961.<sup>117</sup> The last minor intrusion which occurred in the NEFA area related to some Chinese officers who visited the village Roi, half a mile south of Longju, about which we protested to the Chinese in our note dated 18th April, 1962.<sup>118</sup>

The statement made in the *Free Press Journal* report datelined New Delhi June 17th,<sup>119</sup> that the Chinese soldiers have advanced in the NEFA area is not correct nor is it true to say that the Government of India have lodged a protest with Peking in respect of any such advance, other than the minor incident I have already referred to in respect of village Roi, half a mile south of Longju. The press report refers to the Chinese army having traversed an area of about 500 square miles between the Indian territory and Tibet, hitherto unoccupied by them. We have no definite information about Chinese activities in areas of Tibet to the north of the MacMahon [McMahon] Line but some 50 Tibetan refugees have arrived at one of our border check-posts in the NEFA on June 17th, from the Pemako area of Tibet. This area is to the north of the MacMahon [McMahon] Line on the eastern extremity of Siang Frontier Division of

---

<sup>116</sup> Ramchandra Vithal Bade, Jan Sangh.

<sup>117</sup> See SWJN/SS/51/item 193 and SWJN/SS/65/items 210, 216 and appendix 5.

<sup>118</sup> See *White Paper VI*, p. 27 and in this volume appendix 2.

<sup>119</sup> In *Free Press Journal* on 18 June 1962, p.1 cols 1 & 2.

NEFA.

[Translation begins:

Ramchandra Bade: It is reported in the newspapers of 19 June that the Prime Minister had stated in the Lok Sabha that Under Secretary<sup>120</sup> Shri Desai and Chief Minister of Assam had gone to NEFA.<sup>121</sup> And it was also stated that they went there in regard to the problems of Assam Rifles. It is true that China has set up new checkposts there for inspection and for this reason Under Secretary Shri Desai and Chief Minister, Assam had gone there?

Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Jawaharlal Nehru): The question initially hinted that the Chinese forces had come and crossed the McMahon Line. The answer to this is no, all this is wrong. If they move their forces in Tibet, I cannot answer that correctly. But nobody crossed McMahon Line. This is the answer. Now you say Under Secretary went. Probably you mean Foreign Secretary, Foreign Secretary went there. He went there because he had to clear a few things. So instead of corresponding with them, he thought of talking to them.

Speaker:<sup>122</sup> His accusation is that he went there because the Chinese forces had occupied the area.

Jawaharlal Nehru: The Chinese have not occupied it so how can it be related to that?

Ramchandra Bade: The question is that he went there not because of discontent in Assam Rifles but because China has established check posts for inspection.

---

<sup>120</sup> See fn 198 in this section.

<sup>121</sup> See fn 199 in this section.

<sup>122</sup> See fn 200 in this section.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Your question is whether that was occupied or not. The answer is "no". Nobody has occupied it, there is no indication of that, no mention of that, not even in dreams.

Priya Gupta (Katihar): Simply took possession.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Foreign Secretary had gone there to attend a number of issues. There was a meeting of the Frontier Services in connection with Nagaland, he had gone to meet and discuss with them. He had to meet the Governor. So, there were a number of things to address like these.

Translation ends]

Speaker: Any question by any of the Members who have sponsored this?

Jashwant Mehta (Bhavnagar)<sup>123</sup> The Deputy Minister has stated that some portion of our land was taken by them in 1959 in the NEFA area. May I know what was the position in 1961, what was the land taken into possession by the Chinese in 1961?

Speaker: The hon. Member wants to know what was the position in 1961 and whether some of our territory was taken into their possession by the Chinese in 1961.

Dinesh Singh: No, Sir. I read out a statement just now saying that apart from Longju itself there was no other territory taken by them.

Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad):<sup>124</sup> The statement said "no serious intrusion". Minor things might have been there?

---

<sup>123</sup> Jaswantraj Mehta, Congress.

<sup>124</sup> PSP.

Hem Barua (Gauhati):<sup>125</sup> They came to the village Roi.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: What is the difference between serious intrusion and ordinary intrusion. That may be explained.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Four or five of them speak at time. It is difficult to distinguish. [Interruptions] Again two of them are speaking.

Nath Pai (Rajapur):<sup>126</sup> Sir, if we have not been heard we will make it clear.

Speaker: If four Members stand up and speak at the same time...

Nath Pai: Now only one is standing, Sir.

Speaker: I am referring to the difficulty that is always experienced by me as well as by any Minister when four Members stand up and at once start speaking.

Nath Pai: We are sorry for any inconvenience caused in hearing. The hon. the Deputy Minister stated that no serious type of event has taken place.

It implied by its very nature that there was something which was not very serious. May we, therefore, know what it meant?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The answer is perfectly clear. In the NEFA area there has not been a single incursion etc., except for the fact that two years ago or three years ago there was this Longju incident, and except for the fact that two officers - not a force - came down half a mile to that village Roi. Except

---

<sup>125</sup> PSP.

<sup>126</sup> PSP.

for these two there has been no attempt, to our knowledge, of any incursion anywhere on the whole MacMahon [McMahon] line.

**400. To Chintamani Panigrahi: Vinoba Bhave Invitation to China<sup>127</sup>**

June 26, 1962

Dear Shri Panigrahi,

I have your letter of the 20th June. In this you ask me if I have any objection if any organisation of China invites Vinobaji. That is a question which should be addressed to Vinobaji himself. If he wishes to go anywhere, he is free to do so. We will not raise any difficulties. I rather doubt, however, if he will agree to do so.

Yours sincerely,  
[Jawaharlal Nehru]

**401. In New Delhi: To Presspersons<sup>128</sup>**

PM: Chinese will have to end Encirclement

Only way to avoid Armed clash

New Delhi, July 12.

Prime Minister Nehru said here today that no conflict had occurred so far between the Indian and Chinese personnel at the Galwan outpost in Ladakh.<sup>129</sup>

He told pressmen at the Palam airport that some time or the other the

---

<sup>127</sup> Letter to former Lok Sabha MP, CPI; address: Ganesh Kuteer, Cuttack 2.

<sup>128</sup> At Palam airport on arrival from Srinagar, 12 July 1962. Report from the *National Herald*, 13 July 1962, p.1.

<sup>129</sup> According to a spokesman of the MEA on 11 July, "There has been no change in the situation caused by encircled Indian post in the Galwan river valley in Ladakh by Chinese intruders since morning." See the *National Herald*, 12 July 1962, p. 1 cols 1 & 2.

Chinese would have to end their encirclement of the Indian outpost to avoid an armed clash.

Pandit Nehru returned here by a special plane from Kashmir after a week's holiday. He was accompanied by Mrs Indira Gandhi, Mrs Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit and his two grandsons. The Prime Minister was looking better after the rest. He was cheerful and in good humour.

When correspondents surrounded him after he had alighted from the plane to inquire about the latest situation in regard to the Chinese encirclement, Pandit Nehru laughingly asked: "Are you now encircling me?"

A correspondent: "There is no hostile intention".

Pandit Nehru said that he had just come back and he wanted to find out the position. "I have had some information and I want to know more", he said. Asked whether the situation was serious Pandit Nehru replied: "I do not know".

A correspondent pointed out that the Indian note made it appear that the situation was serious.

Pandit Nehru: "Yes. The notes on both sides are serious.<sup>130</sup> They are pitched in a high key. Anyhow, so far as I know nothing has happened: no conflict has occurred."

Asked whether he would say that the Chinese would have to end the encirclement to avoid a clash, Pandit Nehru replied: "Some time or the other they will have to."

Asked whether in view of the Chinese action he proposed to cancel his holiday at Nandi Hills (Mysore) Pandit Nehru said that he was not going to Bangalore for holiday. "I have got business to do there", he said.

---

<sup>130</sup> Perhaps this refers to the Indian and Chinese notes, both dated 10 July 1962, published in *White Paper VI*, pp. 79-82.

The Prime Minister was received at the airport by his Cabinet colleagues, including Mr Lal Bahadur Shastri and Mr Krishna Menon, the Congress President Mr D. Sanjivayya, and others.

Asked by correspondents how he had enjoyed his holiday, Pandit Nehru said: "I enjoyed it thoroughly". PTI

#### **402. In New Delhi: To Presspersons**<sup>131</sup>

India must be ready

Nehru admits risk of clash

New Delhi, July 14 - Mr Nehru expressed the view this morning that, while there was a risk of clash between Indian and Chinese forces at Galwan post in Ladakh, he did not think there would be any major clash.<sup>132</sup>

Mr Nehru was speaking to Pressmen at Palam airport before he left for Bangalore by the IAF plane *Raj Hunsa*.

Question: What do you expect will happen now in Ladakh? The Chinese are now accusing us of never having been there and the tone of the notes is steadily getting worse.

"Mr Nehru" has been replaced by "Jawaharlal Nehru".

Jawaharlal Nehru: Well, they accuse us and we accuse them. It is very difficult to say what will happen. But we have to be prepared.

Question: Will there be a major clash in Ladakh?

Jawaharlal Nehru: There is a risk of a clash but not a major one.

---

<sup>131</sup> At Palam airport before departure for Bangalore, 14 July 1962. Report from *The Hindu*, July 15, 1962, p.1.

<sup>132</sup> The Chinese forces, who had come up to fifteen yards of the Indian post in Galwan, withdrew by about two hundred yards from the post on 14 July, reported the *National Herald* on 15 July 1962, p. 1 cols 1 & 2.

The Prime Minister said that there was no significance in his lunch to the retiring Chinese Ambassador in New Delhi Mr Pan Tzu-li. The engagement had been fixed a long way back.

**403. To V.K. Krishna Menon: Cabinet Defence Committee Meeting<sup>133</sup>**

July 16, 1962

My dear Krishna,

I have just received your letter of the 15th July. I suppose you have to go to Geneva for the Laos Conference, although the Ladakh situation would indicate your staying on here.<sup>134</sup> I see that the Chinese Foreign Minister<sup>135</sup> is also going to Geneva.

I suppose you will come back soon from Geneva as the meeting is not likely to last long after the signature. You will thus be away from Delhi about four or five days. The sooner you come back, the better.

As for the meeting of the DCC,<sup>136</sup> I do not like the idea of our showing any kind of panic. I do not think a few days' delay should make any difference. We are all responsible. I should like to meet the delegation that has come back from London before the Defence Committee meeting.<sup>137</sup> That means, at the earliest, on the 20th late afternoon. The delegation that it is proposed to send to Moscow might also meet me then. If it is possible for you to be present then, I shall be glad.

It will thus be difficult to hold the Defence Committee meeting on the 20th. If you like, the meeting fixed for the 21st may be postponed by a few days

---

<sup>133</sup> Letter to the Defence Minister. Sent from Nandi Hills, Mysore State.

<sup>134</sup> See items 401-402.

<sup>135</sup> Chen Yi.

<sup>136</sup> Defence Committee of Cabinet.

<sup>137</sup> This was regarding purchase of MIG.

pending your return from Geneva. Or it may be held so that the members of the Defence Committee might hear the report of the delegation that had gone to London.

As you will be leaving Delhi on the 20th evening, we might meet and also see the delegation at 5 p.m. that day.

Yours affectionately,  
[Jawaharlal Nehru]

## Tibet

### 404. In the Lok Sabha: Indian Trade Agency Employees<sup>138</sup>

Employees of the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung

Hari Vishnu Kamath:<sup>139</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) Whether the Chinese authorities in Tibet have arrested some persons employed in the Indian Trade Agency at Yatung;
- (b) If so, how many; and
- (c) The reasons therefor?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) Yes, Sir.
- (b) The following arrests were made by the Chinese at Yatung on the night of 4th June 1962:
  - (1) 2 local employees of our Trade Agency at Yatung and 4 members of their families;
  - (2) Wives of 2 other local employees at Yatung;
  - (3) Tibetan wife of an India protected person (Sikkimese) employed at Yatung.
- (d) It seems that the persons mentioned were arrested as they were

---

<sup>138</sup> Oral Answers, 19 June 1962. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Third Series, Vol. 5, 8 June to 22 June 1962, 1st Session, cols 11611-15.

<sup>139</sup> PSP.

trying to escape to India.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Have all the three trade agencies of India, at Yatung, Gyantse and Gartok, had been closed since the 1954 trade agreement lapsed?

Lakshmi Menon: Yes.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: is it a fact that there was a large number of Tibetan employees in the three Indian trade agencies at Yatung, Gyantse and Gartok? If so, is it a fact that most of the Tibetan employees have been arrested and deported to unknown destinations and Indians among the employees have been insulted and humiliated beyond measures by the Chinese authorities in Tibet?

The Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Jawaharlal Nehru): I have not heard of any particular insult being offered to Indian employees....

Hari Vishnu Kamath: It was in the papers.

Jawaharlal Nehru: As the Tibetan employees were being considered as Chinese citizens, possibly pressure was brought to bear upon them, a number of them disappeared from the Indian Missions at Gyantse and ....

Hari Vishnu kamath: Gartok.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Not Gartok, but Yatung. In Gartok, there was no permanent Mission. It was wandering.

Nath Pai:<sup>140</sup> Disappeared or kidnapped?

Jawaharlal Nehru: A number of them disappeared. The Chinese authorities demanded an explanation from the Indian Mission as to where they had gone. It is evident, or one can presume, that they had disappeared because they wanted to escape possibly to India or any other place. We know nothing about it. They simply disappeared. One, I am reminded by my hon. colleague, committed suicide. That is what happened.

In regard to the wives of the other employees, they also, according to Chinese law, are Chinese citizens. It is possible that they might be allowed to come to India with their husbands, but, according to Chinese again, only after they have admitted that they are Chinese, and had got the requisite papers etc. and taken permission. They do not automatically accompany their husbands.

Nath Pai: Is it not a well-established international convention that when such missions— are closed, their staff, whatever the nationality, are accorded safe conduct to destinations of their choice? If so, has not China violated that convention in arresting these personnel?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know who they have arrested yet, but I am not sure about the international convention about people of same nationality. I am not sure of that at all. Of course, people ought to be accorded every facility to go away, but where the people belong to the country where the mission is situated, they are of that nationality, then it is doubtful what the rights and wrongs are.

Hem Barua:<sup>141</sup> May I know whether Government have lodged any protest with China over these unhappy incidents; if so, whether the

---

<sup>140</sup> PSP.

<sup>141</sup> PSP.

Government expect a reply from China calling us liars.

Speaker: Order, order.

Hem Barua: They will call us liars.

Speaker: They may call that, but this is not the question.

Hem barua: In "*China Today*" in the 24th issue they have done so.

Speaker: Unnecessarily, he is putting in some adjectives and making inferences that are not warranted. During the question Hour at least that should not be done.

Nath Pai: May I ask one thing, arising out of the reply he gave? It is quite true that a country has the right to arrest its own nationals, but it is customary to hand over a list of persons whom we regard as part of the staff and in that case they are covered by immunity too. May I know from the Prime Minister whether these persons were covered by such immunity or not?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think all of them were covered. Usually there are two or three lists. One is that of diplomatic immunity. In any country, all our staff is not covered by immunity. Out of the Indian staff, some have diplomatic immunity, the others are just staff, they do not have diplomatic immunity. Thirdly, local people who are engaged are not covered at all by any immunity.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Has Government received any report, or is there any evidence to show, that the action taken by the Chinese authorities in Tibet is part of a set policy on their part to liquidate Tibetan friends of India and squeeze the last Indian out of Tibet?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Which action does the hon. member refer to?

Hari Vishnu Kamath: These arrests made.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know if a single arrest has been made. I do not know if any arrests have been made.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: That is what I had asked in the previous question, whether there had been any arrests.

Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. member repeatedly refers to arrests. I do not know of any arrests in this connection.

Hem Barua: On a point of personal explanation, Sir.

Speaker: I am sorry.<sup>142</sup>

#### **405. In the Lok Sabha: Tibetan Refugee Camps<sup>143</sup>**

Hari Vishnu Kamath:<sup>144</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Tibetan refugee camps at Buxa and Dalhousie are the exclusive responsibility of Government;
- (b) whether any person has suggested through medium of the International Buddhist News Forum, Rangoon, that those camps are centres of the Tibetan Friendships Group, New Delhi, and appealed in the name of that Group, and funds; and
- (c) if so, the action taken by Government in the matter in order to

---

<sup>142</sup> See also item 406.

<sup>143</sup> Written Answers, 22 June 1962. Lok Sabha *Debates*, Third Series, Vol. 5, 8 June to 22 June 1962, 1st Session, col. 12491.

<sup>144</sup> PSP.

check such undesirable and fraudulent activity?

The Prime Minister and Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Jawaharlal Nehru):

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Government have seen the article referred to, which gives a misleading impression about the control of these camps.

(c) The writer of the article in question was warned not to send out such misleading reports in future.<sup>145</sup>

#### **406. In the Lok Sabha: Tibetan Wives of Agency Employees<sup>146</sup>**

Tibetan Wives of the Employees of Indian Trade Agencies in Tibet

P.C. Borooah:<sup>147</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Chinese authorities in Tibet have refused to permit the Tibetan wives and children of several Indian and Sikkimese employees of the Indian Trade Agencies to accompany their husbands and fathers to India;

(b) if so, how many persons have been so denied permission; and

(c) what action has been taken by Government in the matter?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Dinesh Singh):

(a) No, Sir. The Chinese authorities insist that the Tibetan wives of Indian and Sikkimese employees of our Trade Agencies in Tibet are Chinese citizens. As such they should hold Chinese passports and observe formalities required under Chinese immigration laws before they are permitted to accompany their husbands who are returning to India. There is no clear indication yet whether these Tibetan wives will be

---

<sup>145</sup> This seems to refer to George Patterson, see item 176.

<sup>146</sup> Oral Answers, 22 June 1962. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Third Series, Vol. 5, 8 June to 22 June 1962, 1st Session, cols 12422-25.

<sup>147</sup> Congress.

permitted to leave for India.

(b) Six Tibetan women are involved.

(c) We had requested the Chinese Government to permit these women to accompany their husbands to India on compassionate grounds. A further approach to the Chinese Government will be made in this behalf if necessary.

P.C. Borooah: How many total families have been affected by this decision of the Chinese authorities and how many have returned to India without their wives?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not aware of the wives being arrested, nor have the Chinese definitely said that they cannot accompany their husbands. All that they have said is that they are Chinese nationals, that they must abide by Chinese regulations. It may be that after they have got their passports etc. they may be permitted to come, or it may be that they may not be allowed to come. It cannot be definitely said either way.

As to who has been arrested and when, I confess I cannot straightway say anything about that. But my impression is that in this particular case, very few arrests have been made.

Priya Gupta.?" Will the hon. Prime Minister kindly state if in such stations or before marriage the credentials of the brides will be obtained from the Governments of the countries where they are posted?

Speaker: It is a suggestion.

P.C. Borooah: Have Government a proposal to assure the Chinese Government that these wives when they are brought here would be allowed to continue their Chinese nationality.

Dinesh Singh: That question does not arise. The Chinese treat them as their citizens and they will continue to be so treated till they change their

nationality.

Speaker:<sup>148</sup> It has been answered. None has returned.

L.M. Singhvi:<sup>149</sup> Are Government in agreement with the view that this constitutes a violation of the human rights of these husbands whose wives have been denied to them? If so, what do they intend to do to establish these human rights for these husbands?

Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Jawaharlal Nehru): I am not aware that this is mentioned in the Human Rights Charter specifically.

Hari Vishnu Kamath:<sup>150</sup> the Prime Minister answering a question in the House on the 19th of this month - I am reading from the transcript - said that he does not know of any arrests of Tibetan employees in these trade agencies, while earlier on the same day his colleague, the Minister of State, Shrimati Lakshmi Menon, detailed five arrests of Tibetan employees including one of the wives of the employees.<sup>151</sup> Which would be correct?

Speaker: About this question?

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Because they refer to Tibetan employees.

Speaker: Only the wives are not allowed to accompany their husbands.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Because they have been arrested, they cannot

---

<sup>148</sup> Hukam Singh.

<sup>149</sup> Independent.

<sup>150</sup> PSP.

<sup>151</sup> See item 404.

accompany their husbands.

Speaker: He wants to know whether the wives have been arrested?

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Yes.

Speaker: That is not answered.

Hari Vishnu Kamath: Because she was arrested, therefore, she could not accompany her husband.

### **Appendices**

1. **(a) From MEA<sup>152</sup>**  
**[Refer to item 396]**

#### **Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 15 April 1962**

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to draw the attention of the Embassy to yet another instance of Chinese violation of India's territorial integrity resulting from the setting up of a new Chinese Military post at MR 7834 E 3501 N, 6 miles west of Sumdo. This Chinese post has obviously been developed recently and constitutes, needless to say, a flagrant breach of the repeated assurances extended by the Chinese Government regarding maintenance of the status quo in the area.

The Government of India, in their note dated 31<sup>st</sup> October 1961, have already drawn the attention of the Government of the People's Republic of China to three new Chinese Military checkpoints established on Indian

---

<sup>152</sup> Note, 15 April 1962. White Paper No. VI, p.26.

territory between 1960 and 1961 and to the numerous other instances of intrusion by Chinese Military patrols and survey parties into Indian territory. The Government of China, however, have continued to make the untenable claim that these posts so set up are within Chinese territory although such an assertion cannot be sustained for a moment when examined on the basis of available facts.

It is a matter of deep concern to the Government of India that the Government of the People's Republic of China should continue in this manner to persist in their systematic and deliberate encroachments into Indian territory without proper regard to the grave consequences that these may entail.

While lodging a strong protest against the establishment of this latest Chinese post on Indian territory at MR 7834 E 3501 N the Government of India express the hope that the Chinese Government will take immediate action to withdraw from this new position that they have occupied.

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

\* \* \*

### **1.(b) From the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, China<sup>153</sup>**

---

<sup>153</sup> Note, 11 May 1962. White Paper No. VI, p.40. This and appendix © formed part of the Rajya Sabha debate but for the sake of convenience have been placed as appendices. The following was prefixed to the note from China tabled in the Rajya Sabha on 20 June 1962. "Correspondence Exchanged Between the Governments of India and China Regarding a Military Post Near Spanggur  
20 June 1962.

Copy of English translation of the Note from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China handed over to Dr P.K. Banerjee, Charge' d'Affairs of India in China, on 11<sup>th</sup> May, 1962 by Deputy Director Chang Chang Tung of the Asian Department regarding alleged intrusion into Chinese territory by Indian troops.

(62) Pu Yi Tzu No. 406."

**[Refer to item 396]**

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 11 May 1962**

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and with reference to another recent case of intrusion and provocation by Indian troops in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, has the honour to state as follows: Recently, Indian troops, about twenty in number, again intruded into Chinese territory in the area south of the Spanggur Lake in western Tibet, China. On May 2, 1962, they pressed forward to a place (approximately 33° 28' 30" N, 78° 50' 30" E) only about four kilometres from the Chinese outpost at Jechiung, and there they set up a military post and constructed fortifications in preparation for prolonged entrenchment. Moreover, on May 5, 1962, two of the above-mentioned Indian military men continued to sneak deeper into Chinese territory for about 600 metres and from there fired three shots at the Chinese outpost (two shots were fired at 12:11 hours and the third at 12:23 hours). If the Chinese frontier guards had not put themselves on the alert in time and firmly maintained an attitude of cool-headedness and self-restraint, the aforesaid unwarranted provocative firing by the Indian troops would have led to very serious consequences. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned intrusion and provocative activities of the Indian troops and demands that India immediately withdraws its aggressive post and put an end to all its intrusions and provocations. As the Chinese Government pointed out in its note of April 30, 1962, India's encroachment on the border of Sinkiang and its provocations against a Chinese post there has already created a very grave situation on the border between the two countries. And now the Indian Government, in disregard of the warning of the Chinese Government, has further-more stepped up its encroaching and provocative activities in western Tibet, threatening the security of another Chinese outpost. This shows that the Indian Government has set its mind on aggravating tension in the entire

western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary and does not scruple to create incidents of bloodshed. The Chinese Government hereby reiterates, if India does not withdraw its aggressive posts and intruding troops from Chinese territory and continues to carry out provocative activities, the Chinese frontier guards will have to defend themselves, and the Indian side will be held wholly responsible for all the consequences arising therefrom. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

\* \* \*

**1. (c) From MEA<sup>154</sup>**

**[Refer to item 396]**

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 May 1962**

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the note handed over by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Indian Embassy in Peking on May 11, 1962.

The note, under reference, contains certain totally unjustified and baseless allegations.

These are: -

1. That on 2<sup>nd</sup> May 20 Indian troops intruded into a place at 33° 28:30' N, 78° 50:30' E about 4 kms. from a new Chinese military post set up at Jechitung;
2. that intruding Indian troops have set up a military outpost in the area; and
3. that on 5<sup>th</sup> May 2 Indian soldiers advanced 600 metres deeper into the area and fired three rounds at a Chinese post.

---

<sup>154</sup> Note, 21 May 1962. White Paper No. VI, pp. 49-50.

The Government of India firmly repudiate these allegations. Indian troops did not enter the area on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> May as alleged in the Chinese note. Nor have they established any fresh post. On the contrary, Chinese troops moved down south from their post at Spanggur and established a new post at 78° 52:30' E 33° 30' N approximately 8/10 miles south-east of Spanggur on Indian territory. This has been fortuitously admitted in the Chinese note. Furthermore, as the Government of China are aware, Chinese troops are digging in at this new post and are constructing fortifications. As to the allegation on 5<sup>th</sup> May, this again is untrue. A similar allegation about firing by Indian troops made in the Chinese note of August 12, 1961, was categorically repudiated in the Government of India's reply dated October 31, 1961 (vide under Allegation I).

In the face of the aggressive activities being systematically pursued by Chinese forces on Indian territory, it is incongruous for the Government of China to bring up charges against India of "aggravating tension" and "creating incidents of bloodshed". There can be no doubt in any quarter that the Government of China are resorting to these allegations as they had done in the past in order to cover up their fresh sets of aggression on Indian territory.

As the Government of China are aware, the international boundary in this sector of the border cuts across the eastern part of Spanggur lake and follows the northern and eastern water-shed of the Indus. The setting up of the new Chinese military post at 78° 52:30' E 33° 30' N about 6/10 miles south-east of Spanggur constitutes a further serious violation of Indian territory and an act of grave provocation.

The Government of India lodge an emphatic protest with the Government of China for thus continuing their aggressive activities and establishing fresh posts on Indian territory and accusing the Government of India of sending troops to intrude into what is indisputably Indian territory. If the Government of China are at all interested in maintaining the status quo and the peace on the border, they would be well-advised to restrain their forces and desist from constantly pushing forward and setting up new military

posts on Indian territory. If any breach of the peace results from the unabated pursuit of aggressive ends by China, the responsibility rests solely with the Government of the People's Republic of China. Allegations against the Government of India, totally devoid of any substance whatever, only add to the mischief of aggression, which China, conducts continually. The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.

\* \* \*

**1. (d) From MEA<sup>155</sup>**

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 June 1962**

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Note dated the 21<sup>st</sup> April 1962 from the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The Note makes two entirely unwarranted allegations: (1) That on 11<sup>th</sup> April 1962 at about 1200 hours, about 25 Indian soldiers penetrated 10 Kms. into Chinese territory, reached a point approximately 35° 20' North, 78° 07' East for reconnaissance".

Indian troops are in certain areas of Ladakh to defend Indian territory. If these Indian troops move about inside Indian territory, it should not be a matter of any concern to the Government of China.

However since the Government of China made certain specific allegations, these were carefully investigated and it was found that no Indian soldier had been at either of the places at the time cited in the Chinese Note. Therefore, it is clear that the Government of China preferred these charges and assumed the right to protest about so-called intrusions by Indian troops without any basis at all. Under the circumstances, the Government of India

---

<sup>155</sup> Note, 6 June 1962. From White Paper VI, pp. 60-61.

reject these protests which not only have no basis in fact but constitute unjustifiable interference in the internal affairs of India.

It has been noticed that the Government of China are increasingly taking recourse to such baseless allegations against the Government of India at a time when Chinese forces are themselves making fresh encroachments into Indian territory.

Such Chinese military activity has been noticed particularly in the vicinity of the Chinese Military Base illegally set up at  $78^{\circ} 12'$  East  $35^{\circ} 10'$  North, and at point  $78^{\circ} 13'$  East  $35^{\circ} 15'$  North.

Carefully verified reports from other sectors of Ladakh also show that Chinese troops are daily intruding into Indian territory, pushing forward on trucks and jeeps, blasting the mountainside with heavy explosives, constructing new military bases and extending military bases already set up.

It is on record that since 1969-61 Chinese intruders have set up no less than five new military bases on Indian territory at Nyagzu, Dambuguru, at point  $78^{\circ} 12'$  E,  $35^{\circ} 19'$  N on the Chip Chap river, at a point six miles west of Sumdo, and at  $78^{\circ} 52' 30''$  E,  $33^{\circ} 30'$  N about 8/10 miles south-east of Spanggur.

Against this record of territorial aggression by Chinese forces, there is not even single case to show that Indian troops intruded into Chinese territory or set up a post there.

It seems clear that the Government of China are spreading rumours about the so-called "news reports disseminated from New Delhi" to prove that "Indian troops are preparing to make armed provocations against China when the thaw comes to the border areas" to cover up their aggressive activities. The Government of India have no wish to embroil themselves in hostilities with any country, far less to invade Chinese territory. They are, however, bound to do all they can to preserve the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Republic of India.

The Government of India lodge and emphatic protest with the Government of China for the fresh encroachments into Indian territory by Chinese

intruders and urge the Government of China to put an end to such dangerous and illegitimate activities.

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

\* \* \*

**From MEA<sup>156</sup>**

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 18 April 1962**

[Refer to item 399]

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state that another instance of Chinese intrusion into Indian territory in the Eastern Sector of the border took place in the second week of January 1962. Two Chinese officials of Migyitun accompanied by an interpreter and two platoon commanders crossed the Sino-Indian border near Longju and visited the village of Roi, which is about half a mile South of Longju.

The Government of India have taken serious notice of this unlawful intrusion into Indian territory which is contrary to the repeated assertions of the Government of China that their personnel have never violated the Sino-Indian border in the Eastern Sector. The Government of India regret that despite these solemn assertions Chinese personnel have again intruded into Indian territory and caused fear and tension among the local inhabitants.

In lodging a firm protest with the Government of China in regard to this illegal activity on the part of Chinese personnel in the Tibet region, the Government of India hope that appropriate steps will be taken by the

---

<sup>156</sup> Note, 18 April 1962. From White Paper VI, p.27.

Government of China to ensure that similar intrusions into Indian territory do not occur in future.

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

\* \* \*

**2. (a) From the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, China<sup>157</sup>**

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 11 May 1962**

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and with reference to another recent case of intrusion and provocation by Indian troops in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, has the honour to state as follows:

Recently, Indian troops, about twenty in number, again intruded into Chinese territory in the area south of the Spanggur Lake in western Tibet, China. ON May 2, 1962, they pressed forward to a place (approximately 33° 28' 30" N, 78° 50' 30" E) only about four kilometres from the Chinese outpost at Jechiung, and there they set up a military post and constructed fortifications in preparation for prolonged entrenchment. Moreover, on May 5, 1962, two of the above-mentioned Indian military men continued to sneak deeper into Chinese territory for about 600 metres and from there fired three shots at the Chinese outpost (two shots were fired at 12:11 hours and the third at 12:23 hours). If the Chinese frontier guards had not put themselves on the alert in time and firmly would have led to very serious consequences.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned intrusion and provocative activities of the Indian troops and demands that India immediately

---

<sup>157</sup> Note, 11 May 1962. From White Paper VI, p.40

withdraw its aggressive post and put an end to all its intrusions and provocations. As the Chinese Government pointed out in its note of April 30, 1962, India's encroachment on the border of Sinkiang and its provocations against a Chinese post there has already created a very grave situation on the border between the two countries. And now the Indian Government, in disregard of the warning of the Chinese Government, has further-more stepped up its encroaching and provocative activities in western Tibet, threatening the security of another Chinese outpost. This shows that the Indian Government has set its mind on aggravating tension in the entire western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary and does not scruple to create incidents of bloodshed. The Chinese Government hereby reiterates, if India does not withdraw its aggressive posts and intruding troops from Chinese territory and continues to carry out provocative activities, the Chinese frontier guards will have to defend themselves, and the Indian side will be held wholly responsible for all the consequences arising therefrom. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

\* \* \*

**3. (b) From the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, China<sup>158</sup>**

**[Refer to items 388, 390, 391 & 398]**

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 June 1962**

1. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to acknowledge that the Chinese Government has received the Indian Government's note of May 14, 1962 in reply to the Chinese Government's note of April 30, 1962.

---

<sup>158</sup> Note, 2 June 1962. From White Paper Vi, pp.56-58

2. The Indian Government in its note not only refuses to withdraw its military strong points and intruding troops, but fraudulently contents that it is responsible for the protection of the areas it has intruded. This further shows that India is determined to encroach on Chinese territory and, to this end, does not scruple to provoke bloody conflicts. The Chinese Government cannot but express its utmost regret at this.

3. The Indian note again repeats the fallacy that large tracts of territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, which always belong to China, are part of Indian territory. The Chinese Government in its previous related notes has refuted in detail this completely groundless platitude. A lie is after all a lie and a truth a truth. A lie can never be turned into truth no matter how often the Indian Government repeats it. As a matter of fact, India admits in its reply note that it has set up strong points at approximately  $35^{\circ} 21' N$ ,  $78^{\circ} 02' E$  and carried out activities around them, thus testifying to nothing but India's encroachment on Chinese territory. In order to cover up its own intrusions, the Indian Government slanderously counter-charges that the Chinese post at  $35^{\circ} 19' N$ ,  $78^{\circ} 12' E$ , which was set up by China years ago, is a newly established one and describes the normal patrols by Chinese frontier guards as aggressive patrolling intended for encircling Indian soldiers. This is entirely a distortion of the fact and a reversal of right and wrong; it is like the trick of a thief calling "stop thief", which serves all the more to reveal the offence he intends to cover up.

4- The Indian Government in its reply note reiterates its proposal made in 1959 that, in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary the Indian Government should withdraw its personnel to the west of the line shown on Chinese maps and the Chinese Government should withdraw its personnel to the east of the line claimed by India as shown on Indian official maps. The note further states that the Indian Government is prepared, in the interest of a peaceful settlement, to permit, pending negotiations and settlement of the boundary question, the continued use of the Aksai Chin road for Chinese civilian traffic. Why should China need to ask India's permission for using its

own road on its own territory? What an absurdity! As for the Indian Government's old proposal made in 1959, Premier Chou En-lai already pointed out in his letter to Prime Minister Nehru dated December 17, 1959 that it is unfair and that, though "equitable" it may appear, it in fact would require China to make a one-sided withdrawal. The Indian Government knows this only too well. Prime Minister Nehru said in Parliament on May 14, 1962 that this proposal "applies entirely to the Ladakh area and not the eastern area at all, because we are not going to withdraw in the east. In the Ladakh area, it meant a very small withdrawal for us—a few villages—and it meant a large withdrawal for them". That is to say, this "very fair" proposal bragged of by India means from large tracts of Chinese territory, measuring more than 33,000 square kilometres, which have always belonged to China in exchange for the Indian side's withdrawal from a few points, which always the Indian side continues to occupy, exactly as before, Chinese territories in the eastern and middle sectors of the Sino-Indian boundary. This is of course unacceptable to the Chinese Government, unacceptable now as before.

5- There is reason to believe that the Indian Government is not serious in making the above-mentioned proposal. If it truly wishes the Chinese Government to give earnest consideration to its proposal, it should be prepared to apply the principle embodied in the proposal equally to the eastern section of the border, that is to say, to require both the Chinese and Indian sides to withdraw all their personnel from the area between the so-called McMahon Line and the section of the Sino-Indian boundary as shown on Chinese maps. However, judging from Prime Minister Nehru's May 14 speech in the Indian Parliament, the Indian Government has renewed this proposal on the pre-condition of not doing that. How can one assume that the missive terms? Is China a defeated country? It is clear that the Indian Government, in making the proposal, did not expect earnest consideration from the Chinese Government. It is evident that, in doing so, it only attempted to divert people's attention.

6- But people's attention can in no way be diverted. The most urgent problem in the current Sino-Indian border situation is that the Indian side persists in changing by force the status quo of the Sino-Indian boundary and setting up military strong points on Chinese territory and is carrying on provocations, so that a border clash may touch off at any moment. As China pointed out in its note of May 28, since China lodged its protest on April 30, Indian troops have set up another new military strong point inside Sinkiang, China, and have continued their intrusions and provocations in Sinkiang and the Ari district. Facts speak louder than words. They show that what the Indian Government now seeks is to provoke bloody conflicts, occupy China's territory and change the status quo of the boundary regardless of consequences, and not at all to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question peacefully through negotiations.

7- The Chinese Government consistently stands for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question through negotiations. Even now when the Sino-Indian border situation has become so tense owing to Indian aggression and provocation, the door for negotiations is still open so far as the Chinese side is concerned. However, China will never submit before any threat of force. What is imperative now is for the Indian Government to stop its military provocations and withdraw Indian military strong points and troops from Chinese territory. The Chinese Government renews its protest and demand made on April 30 and May 28. This is a serious test as to whether the Indian Government has the sincerity to settle peacefully the Sino-Indian boundary question and improve Sino-Indian relations.

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

\* \* \*

#### 4. From MEA<sup>159</sup>

##### **Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 May 1962**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the note handed over by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Indian Embassy in Peking on 30<sup>th</sup> April 1962.

2- It is obvious that the allegations made in the Chinese note are misconceived and are based on an erroneous notion of the territorial boundary of the Sinkiang and Tibet regions of China. The Government of India have repeatedly tried to correct this erroneous notion but their patient and repeated efforts in this regard seem to have had no effect on the Chinese Government.

3- It is an indisputable fact that, by stages, since 1957, the Government of China have occupied unlawfully a large area of Ladakh which has always been part of India. It is in this process of enlarging their occupation of Indian territory that the Chinese post on the Chip Chap river was established at 35° 19' N, 78° 12' E in 1961. The Government of India had, in their note dated 31<sup>st</sup> October, 1961, drawn the attention of the Government of China to the fact of the establishment of this new post and had urged the Government of China to withdraw the post from Indian territory. This protest, like many others before and after it, has gone unheeded, and meantime, a further gradual change has been brought about in territorial status quo in this region of the Sino-Indian border.

4- It is strange that in spite of this deep advance into Indian territory, the establishment of military strong points and the construction of roads through Indian territory linking these military strong points with rear bases, the Government of China continue to affirm "that they have stopped sending patrols within 20 kms. on their side of the boundary". This claim, as the Government of India's earlier notes have shown, is patently false and,

---

<sup>159</sup> Note, 14 May 1962. From White Paper VI. Pp.41-43.

in the context of further inroads into Indian territory pointed out in the various notes of the Government of India, absolutely meaningless.

5- The Chinese note alleges that the Government of India have set up two posts at  $35^{\circ} 16' N$ ,  $78^{\circ} 8' E$  and at  $35^{\circ} 22' N$ ,  $78^{\circ} 5' E$ . No post at these points has been established by the Government of India although the Government of India have had posts at approximately  $78^{\circ} 06' E$ ,  $35^{\circ} 17' N$  and at  $78^{\circ} 02' E$ ,  $35^{\circ} 21' N$ . These latter posts which are well inside Indian territory have been in existence for some time.

6- The Chinese note cites 18 cases of alleged intrusions from April 11 to 27. This entire area into which Indian troops are alleged to have intruded is part of Indian territory and the Government of India are responsible for the protection of this territory. In compliance with this defence responsibility, the Government of India have certain posts in the area and men at these posts have been going out occasionally for essential purposes. These posts have been established there to defend Indian territory from further inroads. They are not there to attack anybody or for any aggressive activity as alleged in the Chinese note.

7- The Government of China are doubtless aware of the aggressive patrolling which Chinese troops in the Chip Chap river area have been carrying out. A few recent examples of such patrolling are cited below: -

a- On 16<sup>th</sup> April 1962, 11 Chinese soldiers reached a point at approximately  $78^{\circ} 14' E$ ,  $35^{\circ} 15' N$  and tried to encircle 4 Indian soldiers at  $78^{\circ} 13' E$ ,  $35^{\circ} 15' N$ .

b- On 21<sup>st</sup> April 1962, 20 Chinese soldiers with 7 horses reached a point 2,000 yards to the north of the Indian post at  $78^{\circ} 11' E$ ,  $35^{\circ} 16' N$  for reconnaissance.

c- On 22<sup>nd</sup> April 1962, approximately 70 to 80 Chinese soldiers debussed from three 3-tons lorries immediately to the north of the Indian post at  $78^{\circ} 11' E$ ,  $35^{\circ} 16' N$ . These men moved forward and occupied a hill feature at  $78^{\circ} 12' E$ ,  $35^{\circ} 15' N$ , approximately 3,000 yards southeast of the Indian post.

d- On 6<sup>th</sup> May 1962, at 0930 hours, approximately 20 Chinese soldiers came within 150 yards of the Indian post at 78° 07' E, 35° 28' N. They were supported by a party of another 100 Chinese soldiers, who were approximately 1,000 yards away. When the 20 Chinese soldiers moved up closer to the Indian post, the Indian post commander walked up to within 100 yards of the Chinese party and asked them to withdraw.

The examples cited above show which of the two sides is pursuing an aggressive course in the area. The fact is that not only have Chinese soldiers been carrying on aggressive patrolling deep inside Indian territory and systematically violating India's territorial integrity and security but the Government of China have themselves been constantly threatening to extend these activities along the entire Sino-Indian boundary. Such threats and aggressive activities are not indicative of peaceful intentions.

In the context of the position stated in paras 3, 4 and 7 above, the Government of India must point out that the order which has now been issued by the Chinese Government to their frontier guards to resume patrolling in the sector from Karakoram pass to Kongkala and the further threat that Chinese troops in certain contingencies will resume patrolling along the entire border can only mean that far from maintaining "tranquillity on the border" the Chinese Government propose to adopt further aggressive measures and precipitate clashes. The Government of India hope that the Chinese authorities will consider the grave consequences of what they have threatened to do and act with circumspection.

9. The Prime Minister of India stated in Parliament on 2<sup>nd</sup> May 1962, "India does not want, and dislikes very much, a war with China. But that is not within India's control". The Government of India hope that the Government of China are earnest about maintaining peace. If so, the two Governments should take necessary steps to prevent armed clashes on the border, ease the tension now existing in the northern sector of Ladakh and lay a proper foundation for peaceful negotiations on the boundary question between the two Governments. In this connection, the Government of India would urge the Chinese Government to give serious consideration to the offer made in

the Indian Prime Minister's letter dated 16<sup>th</sup> November 1959 to Premier Chou En-Lai, which inter alia proposed India should withdraw their personnel to the west of the line shown in the 1956 Chinese map and the Government of China should withdraw their personnel to the east of the international boundary shown to unarmed and administrative personnel which should be withdrawn and the entire area between the boundaries claimed by the two sides left unoccupied. The adoption of this suggestion will lead to the relaxation of tension in this border region and create problem by negotiations and discussions. The Government of India are prepared, in the interest of a peaceful settlement, to permit, pending negotiations and settlement of the boundary question, the continued use of the Aksai Chin road for Chinese civilian traffic. In renewing the Prime Minister of India's offer of 16<sup>th</sup> November 1959 and also providing for the continued use of the Aksai Chin road, pending negotiations and settlement, the Government of India are solely motivated by their earnest desire to settle the boundary question by peaceful methods. The Government of India hope that the Chinese Government will give serious consideration to this proposal and avoid threatening and aggressive postures, which solve no problem but only create a climate of conflict.

#### **5. (a) From the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, China<sup>160</sup>**

*[Refer to item 386]*

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 May 1962

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

At noon-time on April 28, 1962, ten fully armed Indian military personnel

---

<sup>160</sup> Note, 19 May 1962. From *White Paper VI*, p. 46.

intruded into Chinese territory at Longju and disseminated the information that they would come for a prolonged stay; and they did not leave till they had carried out military reconnaissance there. Having made repeated verifications, the Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned act of provocation by the Indian troops which constitutes a grave violation of Chinese territory. Just as predicted by the Chinese Government, the slanderous charge made by the Indian Government on April 18, 1962 to the effect that Chinese personnel had gone south of Longju was indeed a foretoken of India's further encroachment on Chinese territory in that area. The Chinese Government already pointed out in its note of May 15, 1962 that the Indian side had recently been intensifying its military activities directed against China in the area unlawfully occupied by India close to Longju. The aforesaid new action of Indian troops was obviously taken to pave the way for their renewed occupation of Longju and precipitation of new armed clashes; and at the same time it clearly indicates that India intends to disrupt the status quo of the boundary and create tension not only in the western sector but also in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary. The Chinese Government demands that the Indian Government desist immediately from its intrusion into Longju; otherwise the Chinese Government will not stand idly by seeing its territory once again unlawfully invaded and occupied and the Indian Government must bear the responsibility for all the grave consequences arising therefrom. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy in China the assurances of its highest consideration.

#### **5. (b) From MEA<sup>161</sup>**

---

<sup>161</sup> Note, 28 May 1962. From *White Paper VI*, pp. 52-53.

*[Refer to item 386]*

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 28 May 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to Note dated 19th May, 1962, of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China.

It is apparent from the note that the Government of China are again wanting to create disturbance in the Eastern Sector of the border which has been peaceful since 26th August 1959 when Chinese troops crossed the international border and dislodged the Indian post from Longju by force. Since then, except for occasional intrusions by Chinese personnel, the international border in the Eastern Sector has been quiet although the Government of China in their recent notes dated 30th November 1961 and 30th April 1962 have held out the threat of extensive military action in the Eastern Sector in the event of the Government of India adopting measures for the defence of their territories in the Western Sector of the border. In their note dated 18th April 1962, the Government of India have drawn the attention of the Government of China to the intrusion by Chinese officials and army personnel into the village of Roy (Ruyu), half a mile south of Longju on the 2nd week of January 1962. In the face of threats held out by the Government of China and the aggressive activities pursued by their personnel on the border it is absurd for the Government of China to make false allegations of planning aggression in the Eastern Sector against the Government of India.

As to Longju, the past facts would bear reiteration. Longju which is south of the McMahon Line has always been a part of Indian territory. It is about two miles south of the international border and at about the same distance south of the Tibetan village of Migyitun.

Longju has always been under the administrative jurisdiction of India and the Government of India maintained a border check post there. As the Chinese Government are aware, in July 1959, the officer-in-charge of the

Indian Checkpost at Longju fell seriously ill. The Government of India informed the Government of China on 24th July 1959 in a note verbale that they proposed to paradrop a doctor at the post. While communicating this information to the Government of China, the Government of India gave the Grid Reference of the post. This was done as Longju was near the border, and lest the pilot of the aircraft by error of judgment intruded into Chinese airspace. There was no objection from the Chinese Government.

Yet, on the 25th August 1959, a strong Chinese detachment crossed into Indian territory south of Migyitun and fired without notice on an Indian picket. They arrested the entire picket. Thereafter on the 26th August 1959, Chinese forces encircled the post at Longju and opened heavy fire on it. The Indian personnel at Longju had in the circumstances, to abandon the post. The Government of India lodged a strong protest with the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 28th August 1959. In their note dated 10th September 1959, the Government of India had offered to discuss with the Chinese Government the exact alignment of the McMahon Line at Khinzemane, Longju and Tamaden areas on condition that the status quo was maintained at all these places. As far as Longju was concerned, the Government of India had expressed their willingness not to send their personnel back to the area provided the Chinese also withdrew their forces from Longju. This meant that neither side would have their personnel at Longju pending discussions.

Thereafter, the Prime Minister of India had reiterated this proposal, and although there was news that the Chinese personnel at Longju had withdrawn sometime in 1961, the Government of India made no attempt to re-enter Longju.

The specific allegation made in the Chinese note that 10 armed Indian soldiers had intruded into Longju on 28th April 1962 is completely false. There are Indian checkposts in the area adjoining Longju but in accordance with the directive given by the Prime Minister, Indian forces have not re-entered Longju since 26th August 1959.

The Chinese note under reference suggests that Chinese troops have again

trespassed into Longju and their forward patrols are engaged in reconnaissance around Longju. The Government of India register an emphatic protest against these aggressive activities on the part of Chinese troops in Indian territory. It should be clear to the Government of China that Longju is in Indian territory and that the Government of India will not allow any foreign aggression in Longju. If the Chinese Government have any doubt about the precise alignment of the border in this area, the Government of India would be glad to discuss the matter with them and clarify their doubt.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurance of their highest consideration.

5. **From Humayun Kabir: An Academy of Sciences for India**<sup>162</sup>

*[Refer to item 348J]*

May 27, 1962

My dear Jawaharlalji,

Thanks to your vision and enlightened leadership, Indian science has in the last few years received a degree of encouragement and support which is perhaps without parallel so far as State action is concerned. This has led to remarkable achievements in many fields, but in spite of your unprecedented support, many, especially among the younger scientists, complain that they do not find a congenial atmosphere for work.

I have been thinking for some time why such complaints should at all be made. The reason seems to be the existence of a kind of hierarchy in the world of science. Seniority, rather than merit and present achievement often determines status, and those in higher positions do not always give

---

<sup>162</sup> Letter from the Minister for Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs. PMO, File No. 17(504) 62-66-PMS, Sr. No. 1-A.

the necessary encouragement to their younger colleagues. In fact, a certain absence of sympathy between older and younger scientists is one of the banes of Indian science. Another reason is the tendency to build up close preserves and keep scientific enquiry and research confined among one's own associates or protégés. Lack of adequate discussion and assessment by one's compeers tends to flourish under such an arrangement.

One manifestation of these divisions is seen in our failure to develop a scientific society for India more or less on the lines of the Royal society in London or the Soviet Academy. There is of course the National Institute of Science which was intended to serve the purpose. It has not been able to do so fully, even though it is perhaps the most representative scientific organisation we have today. There is, in addition, the Indian Academy of Science at Allahabad, but neither of these can claim even the representative character which the Institute has. The Science Congress cannot perform these functions, as it must be, from the nature of the case, more a forum than a scientific society.

I have been thinking of the matter and have come to the conclusion that none of the existing institutions can be developed into the national organisation. We could however make a new beginning if we can get together a select body of representative scientists from the recognized All India Associations, Universities and the various Government sponsored organisations into a small conference where we may be able to evolve a scheme which will give us the desired body.

I am therefore planning to call a small conference of scientists where I propose to invite ten distinguished scientists like Professor Raman, Dr Bhabha, Prof. Mahalanobis, Dr Kothari, Prof Satyen Bose and others in their personal capacity, three representatives each from the established All India Associations and two representatives each from Universities and Government organisations. I am enclosing a list which gives the scheme of invitation I have in view.

I feel that such a conference of about 40 outstanding scientists of India would enable us to frame proposals which would ensure the development of

Indian science on the lines desired by you. Perhaps these forty could be the Foundation Members of the proposed body, and help to break the barriers which now exist between different organisations. My view, subject to what the conference may decide, is that the proposed body should have a limited membership, not exceeding a hundred, but there should be provision for Associate Members and Corresponding Members to bring in a larger number of promising scientists.

Obviously, such a body could not be set up without your blessing and we feel that the strongest guarantee of its success would be if you would kindly agree to inaugurate the proposed conference. Subject to your approval, I would like to call the conference towards the end of September, preferably in some place away from Delhi. If you are going on a holiday to Kashmir or Manali, I wonder if we could come and take one morning out of your vacation.

Yours sincerely,  
Humayun Kabir

6. **(a) From the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, China**<sup>163</sup> [*Refer to item 393*]

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 28 May 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and with reference to India's establishment of a new military strong point in Chinese territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary and further intrusions and provocations there, has the honour to state as follow:

1. India not only gave no heed to China's protests and refused to evacuate its new aggressive strong point in the Chip Chap River Valley area in

---

<sup>163</sup> Note, 28 May 1962. From *White Paper VI*, pp. 54-55.

Sinkiang, China, but has recently set up another military strong point at Hongshantou (approximately 35° 18'N, 78°, 05' 30' E), which is barely some eight kilometers west by south of the Chinese post (approximately 35° 19' N, 78° 12' E) in that area, and built fortifications there. In addition, Indian troops have repeatedly intruded into the areas west, northwest and southwest of the Chinese post for harassment. It has been established through repeated check-ups that in the period from April 28 to May 17, 1962 alone, 18 such cases involving 131 person- times occurred. What is more, the intruding Indian troops and aircraft have kept on conducting reconnaissance and making provocations against the said Chinese post. For instance, at about 18:30 hours on May 1, 1962, 11 Indian military men intruded into the area around height 5,500 metres in proximity to the Chinese post and conducted reconnaissance for as long as over 40 minutes; at 9:15 hours on May 10 an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over the Chinese post, flying audaciously at such a low altitude as no more than 400 metres from the ground, and circled there for reconnaissance for as long as 30 minutes or so.

2. In the Ari district in Tibet, China, Indian troops have continued to make intrusions and made another provocative firing. Here are the outstanding cases:

(1) At about 14:00 hours on May 7, 1962, five Indian military men, three of whom were mounted, intruded into the area around 34° 16' N, 79° 01' E, that is, the place where Indian troops had provoked the Kongka Pass incident of bloodshed in October, 1959, and carried out armed reconnaissance there. On the same day, another group of Indian military men numbering about 20 intruded into the area at 34° 18' , 79° 01' E for illegal activities there.

(2) At about 17:30 hours on May 9, 1962, Indian troops again fired three shots at the Chinese post at Jechiung from the Indian military strong point only about 4 kilometres away, which was set up recently in Chinese territory at a place south

of the Spanggur Lake. This is another serious armed provocation by Indian troops since their firing at the same Chinese post on May 5.

(3) On May 3, 1962, four mounted Indian soldiers intruded deep into Chinese territory and even went beyond the boundary line claimed by the Indian side itself for about four kilometers and arrived at Goro (approximately 32° 38' N, 79° 34' E) in Tibet and conducted reconnaissance for quite some time.

The Indian Government, having remained indifferent to the repeated protests of the Chinese Government, has not only refused to withdraw its aggressive strong point newly set up on Chinese territory and put an end to its intrusions and provocations, but even set up new aggressive strong points on Chinese territory, expanded the scope of its encroachments and continued its intrusions and provocations. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against these actions, and demands that the Indian Government, in the interest of peace, evacuate immediately its military strong points set up recently in Chinese territory and put an end to all its unlawful intrusions into China. Otherwise the Indian side must bear the responsibility for the consequences of such intrusions.

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

**7. (b) From MEA<sup>164</sup>**

*[Refer to item 393]*

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India 22 June 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the Chinese

---

<sup>164</sup> Note, 22 June 1962. From *White Paper VI*, pp. 68-70.

Government note dated the 28th May 1962.

The Government of India have not established any strong points in any part of Chinese territory. It is the Chinese who have unlawfully established various posts in Indian territory and violated India's territorial integrity. If the Government of India have, in the light of these Chinese intrusions, taken measures to prevent further intrusion by the Chinese, this is what any sovereign government would and must do in the exercise of its responsibility for maintaining the integrity of its territory. It is preposterous, therefore, for the Government of China to allege that not only Indian territories which have been illegally occupied by the Chinese forces in Ladakh are part of Chinese territory but some Indian areas beyond these are also Chinese territory. There seems to be no limit to Chinese expansionist aims.

The specific instances of alleged intrusions cited in the Chinese note are dealt with seriatim below:

**Allegation (1):**

India has recently set up another military strong point at approximately 35° 18' N 78° 05' 30" E, 8 Kms. west by south of the Chinese post at 35° 19' N 78° 12' E on the Chip Chap river.

*Comments:*

This is a repetition of an allegation made earlier in the Chinese note of 30th April 1962. It was then alleged that India had set up a new military post at 35° 16' N 78° 08' E. The Government of India in their note of 14th May 1962 had pointed out that there was no post as alleged at 35° 16' N 78' 06 E. It was made clear then that this Indian post which was well inside Indian territory had been in existence for some time. Nevertheless the allegation, already refuted, has reappeared in the Chinese note under reference with a new Chinese name given to the location and with a small change in the map reference of the post.

This allegation of intrusion into Chinese territory is entirely baseless.

**Allegation (2):**

Between 28th April and 17th May Indian troops repeatedly intruded into

this area. There were 18 cases of such intrusions.

*Comments:*

The Chinese note of 30th April 1962 carried more or less the same allegations, viz, that in 17 days Indian troops had intruded 18 times into the area. This time the number of intrusions remains the same although the period during which they took place has been extended by 3 days. In refuting the earlier allegation, Government of India had observed in their note of 14th May 1962 that "the entire area into which Indian troops are alleged to have intruded is part of Indian territory and the Government of India are responsible for the protection of this territory. In compliance with this defence responsibility, the Government of India have certain posts in the area and men at these posts go out occasionally for essential purposes. These posts have been established there to defend Indian territory from further inroads. They are not there to attack anybody or for any aggressive activity as alleged in the Chinese note".

This allegation of intrusion into Chinese territory is not only baseless but is merely a repetition of an earlier allegation which had been dealt with fully. Introduction of phrases like "131 persons - times"<sup>165</sup> does not alter the fact that it is a baseless repetition.

The two specific instances of intrusion cited in the Chinese note to illustrate the general allegation, viz., (1) that on 1st May 1962 11 Indian soldiers had gone to the area near Height 5500 metres and (2) that on 10th May 1962 at 9: 15 hours Indian aircraft flew over the Chinese post unlawfully set up in Indian territory at 35° 19' 78° 12' E are both unfounded.

The truth behind these Chinese allegations is that

- (1) Chinese troops are illegally posted in this area where they have no right to be;
- (2) They have built a strong military base with fortifications in the area which is Indian territory;

---

<sup>165</sup> As in the original.

(3) They are extending this fortified area and

(4) Strong patrols from this Chinese military base are threatening the adjoining areas and the Indian posts located there.

**Allegation (3):**

On 7th May 1962 at about 14:00 hours, five Indian soldiers intruded into the area at  $34^{\circ} 16' N 79^{\circ} 01' E$ . On the same day another 20 men intruded into the area at  $34^{\circ} 18' N 79^{\circ} 01' E$ .

*Comments:*

Although both the locations are inside Indian territory there is no truth in the Chinese allegation that Indian soldiers had been there on the 7th May 1962. On the contrary on the 7th May 1962, 20 Chinese soldiers had intruded into this very area at 15:20 hours. What is more, there is evidence to show that Chinese troops are daily intruding into this area and are carrying out various illegal activities.

**Allegation (4):**

On 9th May 1962 at 17:30 hours Indian soldiers again fired 3 shot at the Chinese post at Jechiung.

*Comments:*

A similar allegation was made in the Chinese note dated 11th May 1962 which said that on 5th May 1962 Indian soldiers had reached the same location and fired 3 shots at the Chinese outpost. That allegation as pointed out in the Government of India's note dated 21st May 1962 was untrue. An earlier allegation about firing by Indian troops made in the Chinese note of 12th August 1961 had also proved unfounded. The present allegation about firing at the Chinese post on 9th May 1962 has been checked, and it has been found to be untrue. The fact is that Chinese intruders have set up a new military base at 'Jechiung' in Indian territory and are covering this up by resorting to baseless allegations against Indian troops.

**Allegation (5):**

On 3rd May 1962, 4 mounted Indian soldiers intruded into Gore at  $32^{\circ} 38' N 79^{\circ} 34' E$  for carrying out reconnaissance.

*Comments:*

The Government of India firmly repudiate this entirely baseless allegation.

Indian soldiers did not visit Gore on 3rd May 1962 or on any other day. Unlike Chinese intruders, Indian soldiers are strictly forbidden to cross the international frontier. The Government of India are fully satisfied that there has been no case where Indian soldiers trespassed into Chinese territory across the international border.

The Government of India are constrained to observe that these and other baseless allegations are being repeated by the Chinese Government as part of their planned propaganda against India to further Chinese expansionist aims and to lay fresh claims to Indian territory and to divert attention from the unlawful activities which are being ceaselessly pursued by Chinese forces in Indian territory. The Government of India, therefore, cannot but reject the Government of China's protest note based on these false allegations.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurance of their highest consideration.

**8. (a) From Ministry of Foreign Affairs, China<sup>166</sup> [Refer to item 397]**

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 31 May 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of India dated May 10, 1962, has the honour to state the following:

1. The Indian Government in its note has gone to the length of lodging

---

<sup>166</sup> Note, 31 May 1962. From *White Paper VI*, pp. 99-102.

a protest with the Chinese Government against Sino-Pakistan negotiations for a provisional boundary agreement and want only slandering and intimidating China. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the unjustifiable protest of the Indian Government and, from the Indian Government's completely unreasonable attitude of imposing its will on others, cannot but draw with regret the conclusion that the Indian Government is bent on making use of the Sino-Pakistan negotiations to whip up anti-Chinese sentiments and aggravate the tension between China and India.

2. The Indian note alleges that the Chinese Government accepted without reservation the position that Kashmir is under Indian sovereignty, that there is no common boundary between China and Pakistan, and that therefore China has no right to conduct boundary negotiations with Pakistan. This allegation is totally untenable. When did the Chinese Government accept without any reservation the position that Kashmir is under Indian sovereignty? The Indian Government could not cite any official Chinese document to prove this arbitrary contention but, basing itself solely on the guesswork and impression of Indian diplomatic officials who have been to China, insisted that Chinese Government authorities had made statements to that effect. This is not only a unilateral misrepresentation of the fact but a conclusion imposed on others, to which the Chinese Government categorically objects. There is a boundary of several hundred kilometers between China's Sinkiang and the areas the defence of which is under the control of Pakistan, and it has never been formally delimited and demarcated. If one does not shut his eyes to the facts, how can he assert that there is no common boundary between China and Pakistan? Since both China and Pakistan are sovereign states, why cannot China conduct negotiations with Pakistan to settle the question of the actually existing common boundary so as to maintain tranquillity on the border and amity between the two countries? Long before it agreed with the

Government of Pakistan to negotiate the boundary question, the Chinese Government had repeatedly proposed, and now still proposes, to conduct negotiations with the Indian Government for the settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. But the Indian Government has again and again turned down China's proposal, consequently the Sino-Indian boundary question remains unsettled and the situation on the Sino-Indian border becomes increasingly tense. How the Indian Government not only refuses itself to negotiate a settlement of the boundary question with China, but object to China's negotiating a boundary settlement with Pakistan. Does it mean that the Indian Government, after creating the Sino-Indian boundary-dispute, wishes to see a similar dispute arise between China and Pakistan?

3. The boundary negotiations between China and Pakistan do not at all involve the question of the ownership of Kashmir. The agreement between the Governments of China and Pakistan made it crystal clear that after the settlement of the dispute between Pakistan and India over Kashmir, the sovereign authorities concerned shall reopen negotiations with the Chinese Government on the question of the Kashmir boundary so as to conclude a formal boundary treaty to replace the provisional agreement to be signed after the Sino-Pakistan negotiations. The signing of such an agreement will only help maintain tranquillity on the existing boundary between China and Pakistan, and will in no way prejudice a peaceful settlement of the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan. The Indian Government is wholly unjustified in objecting to boundary negotiations between China and Pakistan on the pretext of the Kashmir dispute.

4. With regard to the Kashmir dispute, it has been the consistent position of the Chinese Government to be impartial and to wish that India and Pakistan will reach a peaceful settlement. This has been and still is the Chinese position. The Indian Government is clearly aware

of this. Suffice it to point out the fact that Premier Chou En-lai declared at a press conference in Calcutta on December 9, 1956, that the Chinese Government considered the Kashmir question "an outstanding issue between India and Pakistan". Furthermore, Premier Chou En-lai, together with the late Prime Minister Bandaranaike of Ceylon, made an appeal in their joint statement issued on February 5, 1957, to India and Pakistan to strive further for a peaceful settlement of the Kashmir question. This attitude of the Chinese Government of never getting involved in the dispute over Kashmir can in no way be distorted and is well-known throughout the world.

5. The Chinese Government has always refrained from making any remarks on the historical background of the Kashmir question. Nevertheless, the Kashmir question is after all a dispute between two legal governments, those of India and of Pakistan. China has diplomatic relations with India and also with Pakistan, and India, too, has diplomatic relations with Pakistan. The Chinese Government only hope that this dispute between India and Pakistan will be settled by them peacefully, and has always been against anyone taking advantage of it to sow discord in the relations between the two countries. So far as China is concerned, nothing would be better than a peaceful settlement of this dispute by India and Pakistan through negotiation. However, more than ten years have passed and despite the best wishes and expectations all along cherished by China, this dispute between India and Pakistan remain unsettled. In these circumstances, anyone with common sense can understand that the Chinese Government cannot leave unsettled indefinitely its boundary of several hundred kilometres with the areas the defence of which is under the control of Pakistan merely because there is a dispute between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. It is entirely necessary, proper, legitimate and in accordance with international practice for the Chinese Government to agree with the Government of Pakistan to

negotiate a provisional agreement concerning this boundary pending a final settlement of the Kashmir question. What fault can be found with this? Yet in the note the Indian Government rudely slanders the Chinese Government's agreeing to open negotiations with Pakistan as taking advantage of the difference between India and Pakistan and committing aggression against India. But unreasonable assertions can never hold water. The fact, on the contrary, is that the Indian Government itself is seeking to make use of the boundary question to sow discord in the relations between China and Pakistan. On May 7, 1962, Prime Minister Nehru openly admitted in the Indian Parliament that "we treated the Pakistan Government in a friendly way in these matters because we thought that any action which they might take should be in line with the action we were taking in regard to this border and should not conflict".<sup>167</sup>

Small wonder that the Indian Government should get so excited about Sino-Pakistan negotiations. Its scheme to sow discord in the relations between China and Pakistan has failed.

6. The excitement of the Indian Government will only bring results contrary to its expectations. Anyone in the world with common sense will ask: Since the Burmese and Nepalese Governments can settle their boundary questions with China in a friendly way through negotiations and since the Government of Pakistan has also agreed with the Chinese Government to negotiate a boundary settlement, why is it that the Indian Government cannot negotiate and settle its boundary question with the Chinese Government? Such a commonsense query is indeed rather embarrassing. But it is useless to get furious with China. As in the past, the Chinese Government still stands for a friendly settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question through peaceful negotiations. The Indian Government's unenviable situation on this matter is of its own making. For example, the Indian

---

<sup>167</sup> See SWJN/SS/76/item 460 p.501.

Government's note says:

"It is the India-China boundary which starts from the tri-junction of the boundaries of India, China and Afghanistan..... and runs eastward upto the tri-junction of the boundaries of India, Burma and China". Pray, what kind of an assertion is that? Not only are the areas the defence of which is under the control of Pakistan negated, but even Nepal no longer exists, Sikkim no longer exists, and Bhutan no longer exists. This is out-and-out great-power chauvinism. The Indian Government should realise that it is now in the sixties of the 20th century and that the cursed era in which great powers controlled everything has gone forever. Anyone who persists in an attitude of great-power chauvinism in international affairs will always knock his head against a stone wall.

7. The Chinese Government is deeply convinced that it is a good thing to hold boundary negotiations between China and Pakistan, which are in the interests of both friendship among Asian countries and peace in Asia. O slander of any kind can ever distort this fact the position of the Chinese Government is not difficult for any reasonable person to understand. One who tries to make use of Sino-Pakistan negotiations to whip up anti-Chinese sentiments will only be lifting a rock to crush his own toes in the end. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will coolly think it over: Would it not be better to make some earnest effort towards a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, rather than wasting its strength in such fruitless quarrel?

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

## **8. (b) From MEA<sup>168</sup>**

*[Refer to item 397]*

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 May 1962

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to state that according to a communiqué issued by the Governments of China and Pakistan have entered into an agreement "to locate and align their common border".

As the Government of China are aware there is no common border between Pakistan and the People's Republic of China. It is the India-China boundary which starts from the tri-junction of the boundaries of India, China and Afghanistan at approximately long 74° 34' E and Lat. 37° 3' N and runs eastward upto the tri-junction of the boundaries of India, Burma and China. There has never been any doubt that the sovereignty over the entire State of Jammu and Kashmir including that part which is under Pakistan's unlawful occupation vests solely in the Indian Union. The Government of India had so far believed that the Government of the People's Republic of China had accepted this basic position without any reservation. This was confirmed by Premier Chou En-lai when he stated to the Indian Ambassador in Peking on March 16, 1956 "that the people of Kashmir had already expressed their will" on the issue of Kashmir's accession to India. The same impression was gained at the meeting between the Secretary General of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and the Chinese Prime Minister in July 1961. At that time it seemed that the Government of China still acknowledged the final accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to the Indian Union. The Government of India are, In view of this background surprised that the Government of the People's Republic of China should have suddenly decided to enter into an international agreement to negotiate the boundary of that part of the State of Jammu and Kashmir which is under the unlawful occupation of Pakistan with the Government of

---

<sup>168</sup> Note, 10 May 1962. From *White Paper VI*, pp. 96-97.

Pakistan. This is a reversal of the attitude of the Government of the People's Republic of China in regard to India's sovereignty over the entire State of Jammu and Kashmir and is obviously a step in furtherance of the aggressive aims that China has been pursuing towards India in recent years.

In lodging an emphatic protest with the Government of the People's Republic of China for this interference with the sovereignty of India over the State of Jammu and Kashmir, Government of India solemnly warns the Government of China that any change provisional or otherwise in the status of the State of Jammu and Kashmir brought about by third parties which seeks to submit certain parts of Indian territory to foreign jurisdiction will not be binding on the Government of India and that the Government of India firmly repudiate any agreements provisional or otherwise regarding her own territories arrived at between third parties who have no legal or constitutional locus standi of any kind.

It is clear that the Government of China are in this matter acting in furtherance of their aggressive designs and are seeking to exploit the troubled situation in Kashmir and India's differences with Pakistan for their advantage. The Government of India will hold the Government of China responsible for the consequences of their action.

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