

*Notes, Memoranda and letters Exchanged and
Agreements signed between the Governments
of India and China*

WHITE PAPER II

Extracts

September - November 1959

Ministry of External Affairs

Government of India

Ministry of External Affairs Government of India Note given to the Ambassador of India by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 1 September 1959

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply to the Embassy's Note of August 11 as follows: According to reports received by the Chinese Government, at 07.00 hours on August 7, seven Indian armed personnel were suddenly discovered to have intruded into Chinese territory at Shatze by Chinese frontier guards patrolling there on Chinese soil. At 10 30 hours on the same day, more than 10 Indian armed personnel again intruded into the above-mentioned place. In order to safeguard their territory against violation, the Chinese Frontier guards promptly advised them to withdraw from Chinese territory. The Indian armed personnel thereupon left the above place. But starting from August 9, Indian armed personnel again unlawfully intruded many times into Shatze and Khinzemane, both within Chinese territory. On August 14, when Chinese frontier guards patrolled to Khinzemane, they repeatedly warned the Indian armed personnel who had unlawfully intruded there to withdraw from Chinese territory, These Indian armed personnel however did not heed the solemn warnings of the Chinese frontier guards; they not only failed to withdraw from Chinese territory promptly, but even camped there and deployed forces to control the surrounding important positions to prevent the Chinese frontier guards from entering, in an attempt to seize by force the above-said Chinese territory. In addition, the Chinese Government has learnt that on June 28, 1959, more than 10 Indian armed personnel unlawfully intruded into Chinese territory at the Kechilang pasture-ground west of Shatze

and peremptorily set up so-called Sino-Indian boundary marks at Latze Pass which is within Chinese territory.

The Chinese Government wishes to point out solemnly that the above-mentioned places are undoubtedly parts of Chinese territory. The stationing and patrolling by Chinese frontier guards on their own soil by no-means involve so-called violation of the Indian border. The Chinese Government expresses great surprise and regret at the allegations made in the Indian Government's Note that the above-mentioned places belong to India that the boundary runs along Thangla Ridge north of Namkha Chuthangmu Valley, and that Chinese troops in this area violated the Indian border. The Chinese Government absolutely cannot agree to these allegations which are totally inconsistent with the facts. The Chinese Government must also point out that the unlawful intrusion into Chinese territory by the above-mentioned Indian armed personnel, their arbitrary setting up of boundary marks within Chinese territory, and especially their brazen camping and stationing on Chinese territory in defiance of the repeated warnings served by the Chinese frontier guards, in an attempt to seize Chinese territory indefinitely, constitute serious encroachments upon China's sovereignty and territorial integrity violations of the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence and direct threat to the peace of this area. Regarding this the Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government and, in view of the grave nature of the situation, demands that the Indian Government immediately order the above-mentioned Indian armed personnel who have intruded to withdraw from Chinese territory, and adopt effective measures to seriously ensure against the occurrence of similar incidents in-the future. The Chinese Government, out of considerations for the friendly relationship

between the two countries, has been trying its best to avoid any armed clashes. However, it cannot but point out with regret that, after the above-mentioned intrusion of Chinese territory by Indian armed personnel, the Indian Government, in its Note dated August 11, arbitrarily described the place within Chinese territory which has been intruded into by the Indian armed personnel as belonging to India, and declared in a threatening and provocative tone that the Indian security forces had instructions not to scruple using force to prevent Chinese troops from entering this place. The Chinese Government must point out that this decision of the Indian Government has already created an extremely dangerous situation in this area. Should the Indian Government fail to change this decision at once, to have the Indian armed forces promptly withdraw from Chinese territory which they have seized unlawfully, responsibility for all the serious consequences arising therefrom will necessarily rest with the Indian Government. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of India the assurances of its highest consideration.

* * *

Note given to the Ambassador of India by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 1 September 1959

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the people's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of the Republic of India in China and has the honour to state on instructions once again the following regarding Indian armed forces' unlawful violation of Chinese territory at Longju in the Migyitun area and Tamaden and their armed

provocation against Chinese troops in the Migyitun area: According to verified investigation conducted by the Chinese Government it is confirmed without any doubt that the armed clash between Chinese and Indian troops which occurred on August 25 1959 in the southern part of Migyitun in the Tibet Region of China was solely caused by Indian troops unlawful intrusion into the Migyitun area and their unwarranted provocative attack on Chinese troops. The facts pointed out in the Note of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs handed over to the Embassy on August 27 were true and established The Indian troops must bear full responsibility for this serious border incident. The actual fact was as follows: Around 06-00 hours on August 25, when Chinese troops were patrolling in the southern part of Migyitun, a group of Indian troops which had intruded into that area suddenly opened fire on the Chinese troops without giving any warning, discharging dozens of rounds of machine-gun and rifle shots. Only after the Chinese troops under compulsion fired back in self defense, did the Indian troops withdraw from the area of clash. The Chinese troops then neither arrested any Indian soldiers, nor outflanked any out-post of the Indian troops at Longju. But in the morning of the next day, that is, August 26, the Indian troops at the Longju out-post went further in carrying out new provocations, once again launching a violent attack on the Chinese troops in Migyitun discharging as many as several hundreds of rounds of rifle sten-gun and light and heavy machine-gun shots. On the same day, Indian aircraft many times violated China's air space over this area. At the time the Chinese troops merely held their own posts; they did not strike back against the Indian troops' provocation, not to speak of so-called encircling Indian troops' outpost at Longju. The Indian troops stationing at Longju withdrew subsequently on their own accord. Thus it can be seen that the

Chinese troops acted entirely in self defence and to preserve China's territorial integrity and throughout the incidents demonstrated the greatest toleration and self-restraint. Nevertheless, in its Note handed over to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on August 27 by the Indian Embassy in China, the Indian Government groundlessly accused Chinese troops of violating Indian border, opening "fire first on the Indian troops, out-flanking and encircling the Indian post at Longju and even arresting twelve Indian soldiers, etc.. etc.

These in no way correspond to the facts, the Chinese government categorically rejects the allegation made the Embassy's Note that the Chinese troops carried out deliberate aggression on India as well as the Indian Government's unwarranted protest and once again Government against loges its serious protest with the Indian Government against the violation of the above-mentioned Chinese territory and repeated'. armed provocations by the Indian troops.

2. Although the Chinese troops did not cross for a single step into Longju during the incidents on August 25 and 26, it must, however, be pointed out that Longju is indisputably part of Chinese territory, and that the invasion and occupation of that place and the setting up of outposts there by the Indian troops constitute a grave violation of China's territorial integrity. The Indian Government's claim that Longju be Indian territory as made in the Notes of the Indian. Embassy in China of June 27 and August 27 is entirely groundless: the Chinese Government absolutely cannot agree to this claim. Longju is part of the Migyitun area and has all along been under the jurisdiction of the Tibet Region of China. After the peaceful liberation of Tibet, the Chinese People's Liberation Army for long: stationed units there, and Chinese authorities took various administrative measures locally

including the issuance of agricultural loans. It was only not long ago that the place was unlawfully invaded and occupied by Indian troops taking advantage of an interval resulting from the shift of Chinese troops. As the Indian Government is aware, the Chinese Government has pointed out that no section of the Sino-Indian boundary has ever been formally delimited; the boundary between the two countries is yet to be settled through surveys and discussions between the two sides. The Chinese Government has also repeatedly pointed out that the so-called traditional boundary between India and the eastern part of the Tibet Region of China as referred to by the Indian Government, i.e., the so-called McMahon Line was set forth in the past by the British imperialists unilaterally and has never been accepted by the Chinese Government; it of course cannot be regarded as legal. Nevertheless, even by documents and maps related to this so-called traditional boundary as set forth by the British, Longju is unquestionably within Chinese territory. It can thus be seen that the Indian Government's claim that Longju belongs to India is devoid of any ground no matter viewed from what aspect. In Premier Chou En-lai's letter to Prime Minister Nehru dated January 23 1959, the Chinese Government, in order to avoid any border incidents so far as possible pending the formal delimitation of the boundary between the two countries, proposed to the Indian, Government that, as a provisional measure, each side temporarily maintain the status quo of the border areas under its administration and not go beyond them. To this proposal Prime Minister Nehru expressed his agreement in his reply dated March 22, 1959. Yet the Indian Government claimed Longju to be Indian territory and occupied it by troops. This was an attempt to change the status quo of Longju by force. The Chinese Government cannot but lodge a strong protest against this. Now that the Indian

troops have withdrawn from Longju of their own accord the Chinese Government emphatically urges the Indian Government to adopt measures at once to prevent Indian troops from committing any new violation against Longju. Otherwise the Indian side must bear full responsibility for all the serious consequences arising therefrom. The Chinese Government must also point out that some remnant Tibetan rebel bandits are still using areas under Indian administration as bases to carry out harassment against Migyitun, Luugju and other places. The Chinese Government asks the Indian Government to take effective measures also to put a stop to this.

3. In its Note dated June 27, 1959, the Indian Government also claimed Tamaden which is east of Mityitun to be Indian territory. After investigations the Chinese Government is in possession of reliable materials which prove that that place likewise has long been Chinese territory, and even by the so-called traditional boundary, i.e., the so-called MacMahon Line as set forth in the past by the British the place is located to the north of that line. The Chinese Government asks the Indian Government to order the Indian troops now still occupying the place to withdraw immediately and completely.

It is clear from the above that the fact is not; as alleged in the Indian Government's Notes, that Chinese troops have repeatedly violated Indian territory or that the Chinese Government has been asserting its territorial claims by force; quite contrary, it is the Indian troops that have repeatedly violated Chinese territory and the Indian Government that has been asserting its illegitimate territorial claims by force. In its Notes, the Indian Government more than once said that it had instructed its frontier troops to use force against Chinese troops. This action not only constitutes a deliberate intimidation against China but

has already led to serious consequences. The Chinese Government deems that the recent unwarranted provocations by Indian troops in Migyitun and Longju were by no means fortuitous, but were precisely the inevitable results of the Indian Government's above instructions. The Chinese Government, in the spirit of the Five Principles of peaceful coexistence and Sino-Indian friendship, has always adhered to the attitude of seeking a settlement of the question of boundary between China and India through diplomatic channels. At the same time, the Chinese Government wishes to reiterate: No violation of Chinese territory will be tolerated. All areas that have been invaded and occupied must be evacuated. Any armed provocation will certainly meet with Chinese frontier guard's firm rebuff. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

* * *

Note dated 3 September 1959 given by the Counselor of India, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China on 5 September 1959

The Embassy of India presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to communicate the following Note from the Government of India: The Government of India have seen the note from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China dated 27th August, 1959 on the incident south of Migyitun. The statements in the Chinese Government's Note are not in accordance with facts. The Government of India have now received first hand accounts of the incident from members of the detachment at Longju who had to leave the outpost

under Chinese fire. These reports confirm our previous information that the Chinese deliberately fired on our forward picket killing one person on the spot and seriously wounding another. Later the Chinese detachment opened fire on the main' outpost at Longju at 03.00 on 26th August and over-ran the surrounding area. Our personnel had to fire back in self defence. The Government of India emphatically protest against this unprovoked firing on a static post within Indian territory. They are always ready to discuss border disputes with the Government of the People's Republic of China but such discussions can be fruitful only if both sides agree to maintain the status quo and one side does not use force in the assertion of its supposed claim. The Government of India are therefore unable to accept the Chinese Government's protest. They request that the territory occupied by the Chinese troops, should be vacated immediately so that the Indian frontier outpost at Longju can be re-established. The Government of India will hold the Chinese responsible for the death of the Indian frontier guard. A further communication will follow as soon as the extent of Indian casualties has been ascertained. The Embassy of India avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

* * *

Note given to the Counselor of India by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 7 September 1959

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

personnel into the Wu-je area: According to reports received by the Government of the People's Republic of China from the local authorities, since June 1959 more than 20 Indian official personnel equipped with radio sets have entered China's Wu-je area and camped there and carried out illegal examination and registration of Chinese travelling about in that area. It must be pointed out that the above-mentioned actions of the Indian official personnel are obviously deliberate attempts to change the status quo of the Wu-je area and constitute an infringement on China's sovereignty and territorial integrity. The Chinese Government, therefore, cannot but lodge a protest with the Indian Government. The Chinese Government asks the Indian Government to immediately order those personnel to withdraw from the lace and adopt effective measures to prevent the occurrence of similar incidents in the future.

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

* * *

Note given by the Ambassador of India to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China 10 September 1959

The Embassy of India presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to convey the following from the Government of India: The Government of India have seen the two Notes which were received by the Indian Embassy in Peking from the Chinese Government, one relating to the India-China boundary in the neighbourhood of Khinzemane and the other relating to the boundary

in the Migyitun area. The Government of India would like to emphasize once more that the so-called McMahon Line definitely represents the boundary between India and the Tibet Region of China from the eastern border of Bhutan upto Burma and they stand firmly by it. The circumstances in which the McMahon Line was fixed as the boundary are given in detail in para 4 of the Prime Minister's letter of the 22nd March 1959 to Premier Chou En-lai. This line is by and large in accordance with the geographical features in that area and also with long-established usage. The McMahon Line however departs from well-recognised geographical features at a few places. For example, the international boundary departs from the watershed near Tsari in order to include in Tibet the pilgrimage route of Tsati Nyingpa which is used every year by a large number of Tibetans. Similarly, the village of Migyitun was included in Tibet in view of the fact that the Tibetans attached considerable importance to this village. The Government of India are prepared to discuss the exact alignment of the McMahon Line at places where it departs from the geographical features marking the international boundary. It would have been helpful if some indication had been given by the Chinese Government of where they think the exact boundary should be demarcated on the ground in the area of Migyitun. In this context the Government of India cannot but express their regret once more that large areas of Indian territory should continue to be shown in official maps as part of China. It is most extraordinary that the Government of the People's Republic of China should not have found time during the last ten years to withdraw these faulty maps. The continued circulation of these maps is a standing threat to India's integrity and evidence of unfriendliness towards India. Obviously no discussion of the India-China border in any sector can proceed on the basis of maps which have no relation to reality. The

position of the Government of India has been clarified in the Prime Minister's letter of the 22nd March 1959 to Premier-Chou En-lai.

2. In regard to the specific dispute raised by the Chinese Government about Khinzemane, the Government of India would like to point out that the boundary line in the particular area follows the crest of the highest mountain range. Khinzemane is south of this range and is obviously part of Indian territory. Reference has been made in the Chinese Government's Note to the alleged Chinese territory of "Kechilang" west of "Shatze". The Government of India are unable to identify either of these places in their maps. There is however a pasture known as the Droksar pasture which is owned by Lunppo village. Are within Chinese territory's of the other side of the Thangla ridge have been allowed to utilise these grazing pastures and for this privilege the Tibetan village of Le is paying rent in kind to the Indian village of Lumpo. In any case it is not uncommon for border villages on one side to use by mutual agreement pastures lying on the other side of the international boundary and the exercise of this privilege cannot be regarded as evidence in support of a territorial claim.

3. As regards the position at Longju as stated above the McMahon Line runs immediately south of the village of Migyitun which is in Chinese territory. The Government of India cannot accept the position that Longju is part of Migyitun. In fact it is entirely distinct from Migyitun. The Government of India are also surprised to learn that the Chinese authorities had exercised any administrative jurisdiction over Longju at any time in the past, obviously the Chinese Government have received wrong reports on the point. It is not a fact that our detachment first fired on Chinese troops. Our definite instruction was that the Indian personnel should use force only in self-defence and we have no reason

to think that they did not carry out this instruction. The instruction to the Indian patrol to resist trespassers could never be interpreted to mean that any person found on our territory was immediately to be fired at. Our personnel were to resist pressure brought to bear on them to vacate their position. The fate of all our personnel is not known even now but we are satisfied from the reports of those who have returned to base camp that the Chinese encircled and used overpowering force on the detachment at Longju and Indian personnel had to withdraw under this pressure. The Government of India have investigated the complaint of intrusion of Indian planes into Chinese territory. The facts are that when the Indian post at Longju was surrounded and attacked by a superior Chinese force some planes were dispatched to drop supplies to the post. Later after the post had been overrun and contact with our personnel had been lost, planes were dispatched to find the whereabouts of the personnel. We are satisfied that our lanes kept entirely on our side of the international border.

4. The Government of India are examining once more the exact alignment of the boundary in the Tamaden area They would like to assure the Chinese Government that if Tamaden is found not to be within Indian territory the Indian post will be withdrawn from there.

5. However the Government of India are prepared to discuss with the Chinese Government the exact alignment of the so-called McMahon Line at Khinzemane, the Longju area and the Tamaden area. They request that the status quo should be maintained at all these places and that the Chinese personnel should not alter the present position by crossing the Thangla ridge and trying to occupy any territory south

of the ridge. Similarly pending examination of the position at Tamaden force should not be used on the Indian post there. As far as Lon u is concerned the Government of India would be prepared not to send their personnel back to the area provided that the Chinese would also withdraw their forces. This would mean that neither side would have their personnel at Longju.

6. The Government of India attached the highest importance to peaceful coexistence and the continuance of Sino-Indian friendship. They are convinced that if this principle had been acted upon the Chinese authorities would not have sought to send armed personnel into Indian territory. The Chinese Government have stated in their notes that no violation of Chinese territory will be tolerated. The Government of India have not the remotest wish to trespass into other people's territory. Equally they cannot possibly withdraw under intimidation from areas which are part of India and will have to prevent illegal intrusion by foreign forces into their territory. There is no truth at all in the allegation that rebel Tibetan elements are operating from Indian territory. In no circumstances will the Government of India allow any foreign elements to operate against a friendly Government from their soil. More than 13,000 Tibetans have crossed into Indian territory during the last five months. They were disarmed immediately they crossed the international boundary. Those who refused to part with their arms were pushed back from Indian territory.

7. Should the Chinese Government accept the proposal for a discussion of the exact delimitation of the border at the places mentioned above the Government of India would like to know what

Procedure they would wish to follow. The Government of India agree pending further discussions the position as stated above should not be altered by either side.

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

* * *

Note given by the Counselor of India to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs at China, 13 September 1959

The Embassy of India presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to transmit the following reply from the Government of India in reply to the Note handed over to Mr. K. M. Kannampilly, Counselor of the Indian Embassy by the Deputy Director of the Asian Division of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, on 7th September 1959: The Government of India have seen the Note presented by the Chinese Foreign Office to the Embassy of India in Peking on the 7th September 1959 regarding Barahoti which the Chinese Government call Wu-je. The Government of India have to say with regret that they are surprised by the contents of this Note. As the Government of India have consistently maintained Barahoti, which lies south of the major watershed in the area, is part of Indian territory. Full discussions took place on the subject in the meetings held in Delhi in April-May 1958 between the Indian and the Chinese delegations. In the course of these discussions, the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India proposed that without prejudice to their

respective claims both sides should refrain from sending armed personnel to the disputed area. The Foreign Secretary further suggested that pending settlement of the dispute neither country should exercise civil jurisdiction over this territory or send its civil personnel. The Chinese delegation was agreeable to the suggestion not to send armed parties to the disputed area but they refused to agree to the proposal that neither side should endeavour to exercise civil jurisdiction over this area.

2. In the absence of agreement, the Government of India informed the Chinese delegation that India too would continue to send its civil administrative personnel to the territory. It would be unreasonable to expect that the Government should unilaterally refrain from sending their civil administrative personnel to an area which in their view is part of Indian territory, In the circumstances, the Government of India cannot accept the contention of the Chinese Government that this action of theirs constituted an infringement of Chinese sovereignty and territorial integrity. By the same reasoning the Government of India could bring the same charge against the Chinese Government who sent officials of the Tibetan region of China to Barahoti and sought to exercise civil jurisdiction over the area.

3. The Government of India would take this opportunity to invite the attention of the Government of the People's Republic of China to the Note which was presented by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Counselor of the Chinese Embassy on the 10th December 1958 and to earlier conversations with the Chinese Embassy on the subject, It was mentioned to the Chinese Counselor that according to information of the Government of India the Chinese Government had sent a large

armed party to the area in September 1958 apparently in an effort to change the status quo of the area. No Written reply to the Indian Note was received by the Counselor of the Indian Embassy in Peking was verbally informed that no armed personnel have been sent to Wuje in September 1958. Although reports subsequently received by the Government of India confirmed their earlier information they agreed to the suggestion of the Chinese Government not to send any armed personnel to Barahoti during the 1959 season. Accordingly the Indian Revenue Party sent this year to Barahoti did not carry any arms even for self protection.

4. The Government of India was also informed that the Chinese Government despatched a party to Barahoti during the winter of 1958-59 after the Indian civil party had withdrawn. This was unusual and contrary to the traditional practice and the Government of India could regard this action only as an attempt to establish effective control over the area unilaterally. For their own part Government of India have scrupulously adhered to the interim agreement reached in the 1958 discussions at Delhi not to send any armed personnel to Barahoti.

5. It is unfortunate that the discussions which took place in Delhi in 1958 have not been resumed till now. The Government of India are of the view that the dispute relating to Barahoti (Wu-je) should be settled peacefully and in mutual discussions. They would once more suggest that pending a settlement of the dispute neither of two Governments should send its civil administrative personnel to Barahoti or change the status quo in any other manner. If the Government of China are not agreeable to this suggestion the Government of India will continue as in previous years to send its civil jurisdiction over an area which the

Government of India has always considered as part of the Indian territory. Such personnel however will not carry any arms. The government of India will be glad if similar instructions are given to the Chinese personnel if any in the area. The Embassy of India takes this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of the People's Republic of China, the assurances of its highest consideration.

* * *

Memorandum given to the Ambassador of India by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 22 October 1959

The Chinese Government has received an urgent report from its frontier guards in Sinkiang to the effect that in the afternoon of 20th. October 1959 three men of the Indian armed forces carrying arms unlawfully intruded into Chinese territory south of the Kongka Pass. The Chinese frontier guards promptly advised them to leave Chinese territory immediately but were met with their refusal where upon the Chinese frontier guards could not but disarm them and put them under detention. At noon on 21st October a large number of Indian troops again intruded into Chinese territory in the same area and carried out provocation with superior force against the Chinese frontier guards patrolling there at the time In disregard of the advice of the Chinese frontier guards for them to withdraw from Chinese territory they twice unwarrantedly opened fire on the Chinese frontier guards and attempted to seize the Chinese frontier guards' horses by force. The Chinese frontier guards still tried their best to avoid a clash and did not fire back. The Indian troops however behaving even worse,

subsequently opened heavy fire on the Chinese frontier guards and launched armed attack. Under these conditions the Chinese frontier guards were compelled to fire back in self-defence. It was only after this that the Indian troops left the place of the incident.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest against the above-mentioned serious provocation by a large number of Indian troops deliberately violating Chinese frontiers and launching unwarranted' armed attack on the Chinese frontier guards and asks the Government of India to adopt measures at once to prevent the recurrence of violation of Chinese frontiers and provocation against Chinese frontier guards by Indian troops. The Chinese Government reserves the right to express itself further on this matter after receiving more detailed reports From the Chinese frontier guards.

* * *

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Ambassador of China in India, 23 October 1959

The Government of India have seen the memorandum which the Chinese Government handed to the Indian Ambassador in Peking on the 22nd October. They are greatly surprised by the narration of events in this memorandum, which, according to their information is not in accordance with the facts. The Government of India received information on the 21st October that an Indian police party had been subjected to sudden and aggressive firing by Chinese forces in the region of Kong Ka Pass about 16 miles from Tsogtsalu in Ladakh As a result of this, the Indian police party suffered severe casualties. As this was a matter of very grave consequence and a repetition for the

second time of a wholly unjustified attack by Chinese forces on Indian personnel. The Government of India waited for fuller details to be received by them before this was taken up with the Chinese Government. The reports thus far received by the Government of India entirely contradict the statements in the Chinese Government's memorandum. The facts are as follows.

2. On the 20th October, two members of an Indian Police Party went out on patrol duty in Indian territory in the neighbourhood of Kong Ka Pass in Ladakh. When they failed to return in the evening a Party was sent out in search of the missing persons. This search proved unavailing. On the following morning, another party under the direction of a senior officer went out to continue the search. It appears that this party was surprised by sudden fire from a Chinese armed force entrenched on a hill-top which used automatic weapons and hand grenades. Apparently, the Indian personnel fired back in self-defence, but were overwhelmed by the strategic situation and the superior strength and fire power of the Chinese troops. According to the latest report, as many as seventeen persons belonging to the Indian party, including the officer-in-charge, have lost their lives and some others have suffered severe injuries.

3. The Government of India strongly protest against this intrusion by Chinese troops into an area which is part of Indian territory. This area is about 40 to 50 miles west of the traditional Sino-Indian frontier which has been shown in official Indian maps. In connection with an earlier incident involving the arrest by the Chinese forces of another Indian party in the Chusul area in July this year the Government of India described in detail the traditional frontier for the greater part of

Ladakh in a note presented by the Embassy of India in Peking to the Chinese Foreign Office on the 13th August 1959. No answer has yet been received by the Government of India to this note. It was hoped that further confusion about the traditional frontier in the area would not arise. Instead, the Chinese authorities have entirely ignored this traditional frontier and our note on the subject and have come into Indian territory in considerable strength during the last few months. They have further fired at our police party and caused the death of a considerable number of persons belonging to this party.

4. The Government of India have had no troops in this area. Police parties have, however, discharged their normal functions of patrol duty and previously they have patrolled this entire area without hindrance. It is clear that Chinese troops have in recent months moved into this part of Indian territory.

5. The Chinese memorandum admits the arrest of Indian personnel. The suggestion that two or three Indian policemen challenged the large Chinese forces is, on the face of it, not credible. The arrest of Indian personnel on Indian territory by Chinese authorities was highly objectionable and the subsequent unprovoked fire on the Indian search party can only be construed as a deliberate and unprovoked attack by Chinese forces.

6. On the facts the Government of India do not accept the protest contained in the Chinese Government's memorandum of October 22. The Government of India reserve the right to claim adequate compensation from the Chinese Government when the precise extent of the losses is known. The Chinese authorities have no right to arrest

or detain Indian personnel who should immediately be released. Further, the Government of India ask the Chinese authorities to withdraw their forces from this area and to prevent their illegal entry into Indian territory and interference with Indian personnel.

* * *

Note given to the Ambassador of India by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, 25 October 1959

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the incident of Indian troops intrusion into Chinese territory and armed provocation against Chinese troops at a place south of the Kungka Pass, has the honour to say that the Chinese Government has received the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs handed to Ambassador Pan Tzu-li on 23rd October and seen the communiqué issued by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs. The Chinese Government deems it necessary to state as follows: The presentation of this incident in the Note and communiqué of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs is completely contrary to the facts. The Chinese Government absolutely cannot agree to the allegation of the Indian Government that Chinese troops intruded into Indian territory and attacked the Indian troops. The account of the outbreak and development of this extremely serious border clash given in the memorandum of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs handed to the Indian Ambassador to China on 22nd October is strictly based on facts. It clearly shows that this incident was a result of Indian troops' deliberate violation of Chinese frontiers and armed provocation against

the Chinese frontier guards. The Indian side must be held fully responsible for this incident. The Chinese Government therefore, categorically rejects the protest of the Indian Government and reiterates the serious protest and demand made in the memorandum of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs dated 22nd October.

The place where the Indian troops launched armed provocation is indisputably Chinese territory. The Kongka Pass near place of the incident is a border pass according to the Sino-Indian customary line between China's Sinkiang and Tibet regions on the one hand and Ladakh on the other. The places to the south, north and east of the Kongka Pass have always been Chinese territory respectively under the jurisdiction of the Chinese local authorities in Tibet and Sinkiang. Since the liberation of Sinkiang and Tibet, frontier guards of the Chinese People's liberation army have all along stationed and have been carrying out routine patrol in this area up to the Kongka Pass. The above-said customary line between China and Ladakh is clearly marked on maps published in China. In his letter to Prime Minister Nehru on 8th September 1959 Premier Chou En-lai further made a clear explanation about this section of the traditional boundary line. Even back at the time when Indian armed personnel, in September 1958 and July 1959, twice unlawfully intruded into Chinese territory to the east of the above-said customary boundary and were arrested by Chinese frontier guards the Chinese Government already solemnly pointed out to the Indian Government that where those Indian armed personnel intruded was undoubtedly within Chinese territory. The Indian Government, however, up to now still claims the area to the east of the Kongka Pass up to the Lanak Pass to the Indian territory and, in total disregard of the fact, suggests that Indian troops have in the past been patrolling this entire area without hindrance. All this

proves that it is the Indian Government that utterly pays no heed to the previous statements of the Chinese Government concerning this section of the boundary and ignores the Sino-Indian traditional customary boundary but not the Chinese Government that pays no heed to the Note of the Indian Government. The fact is thus perfectly clear. In the incident of October 20th and 21st it was not Chinese frontier guards that violated Indian territory but precisely Indian troops that violated Chinese territory thus breaching once again the long-existing status quo of the border between the two countries. Although the Indian troops deliberately violated the Chinese frontiers, the Chinese frontier guards with a view to maintaining the tranquility of the border, consistently took a reasonable attitude trying their best to avoid a clash. With regard to the three Indians who crossed the customary boundary and intruded into Chinese territory on 20th October it was only because they persisted in ignoring the advice and refusing to leave Chinese territory that the Chinese frontier guards could not but disarm them and put them under detention. Yet on 21st October, Indian troops, more than 70 in number again intruded into Chinese territory. The Indian troops not only disregarded the advice given by the Chinese frontier guards for them to withdraw, but even encircled and came with superior forces upon the Chinese frontier guard patrol, tried to seize their horses and opened fire. Even under these circumstances, the Chinese frontier guards still exercised the utmost self-restraint and did not fire back. They only gesticulated for the Indian troops to stop firing and withdraw. But the Indian troops paid no heed and continued to press forward and then opened heavy fire and launched armed attack on the Chinese frontier guards. Only then were the Chinese frontier guards compelled to fire back in self-defence. It is clear from the above-mentioned facts that it was the

Indian troops and not the Chinese frontier guards, who gave rise to this serious clash. Responsibility for all the serious consequences arising therefrom must rest with the Indian troops and can in no way be placed on the Chinese frontier guards. According to further reports received by the Chinese Government the clash on 21st October lasted about two hours, resulting in casualties on both sides. The Chinese frontier guards apart from capturing seven Indian soldiers during the clash, found on the spot the corpses of 9 Indian soldiers. The captured Indian soldiers are now still under detention, and the corpses have been properly buried. After the occurrence of the above-said incident of violation of Chinese frontiers and armed provocation against Chinese frontier guards by Indian troops the Chinese Government promptly handed a memorandum to the Indian Ambassador to China, hoping to secure a peaceful and reasonable settlement as soon as possible through diplomatic channels. However, before the Chinese Government received the reply from the Indian Government the Indian Government had made public the incident in a one-sided version which distorts the facts and even issued an official communiqué on it. The Chinese Government could not but feel extreme regret at this action which could only create an unfavourable atmosphere making it difficult for the two countries to solve the dispute cool-headedly it consequently had to make public the truth of the matter to ensure a correct understanding of the facts. In order to avoid the recurrence of similar grave incidents so as to maintain the tranquility of the border the Chinese Government once again asks the Indian Government to take immediate measures to prevent the violation of Chinese frontiers and provocation against Chinese frontier guards by Indian troops. The Chinese frontier guards are under the strict standing orders to refrain from crossing For one step the Sino-Indian traditional customary

boundary line, and to use peaceful means so far possible to advise those Indian military personnel who may have crossed into Chinese territory by mistake to withdraw immediately; but any violation of China's territory is absolutely impermissible and any armed provocation must be firmly rebuffed. The Chinese Government is prepared to release and send out of China the ten Indian military personnel captured on October 20th and 21st. It is also prepared at any time to let the Indian side take back the bodies of the 9 Indian soldiers already found. The concrete method for this can be decided upon separately through consultations between the two sides. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

* * *

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 4 November 1959

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the note which the Chinese Vice-Minister handed to the Indian Ambassador in Peking on October 25. The Government of India have also seen the statement issued by the Chinese Foreign Ministry at Peking on October 26. They have to state with regret that the account of the incidents given in the Chinese Government's note to the Indian Ambassador, and repeated in greater detail in the statement published by the Chinese Foreign Office, is completely at variance with facts and is a travesty of truth. The

Government of India have enquired into this matter fully and have received a detailed account of the events of October 20 and 21 from the officer who was second-in-command of the Indian police party when it was attacked by Chinese forces and who later returned to the nearest Indian outpost. The account of the officer is appended to this note. The gallant officer who was in command of the party lost his life during the clash.

2. The Government of India not only reject the, factual account given by the Chinese Government of this incident, but also repudiate certain assumptions underlying it. The suggestion made that the Indian police party armed with riffles only and in a disadvantageous position would attack a heavily armed Chinese force strongly entrenched on a hill top above them and equipped with mortars and hand-grenades, cannot be accepted by any reasonable person. All the circumstances concerning this incident as well as the detailed information that we possess contradict the version which has been supplied by the Chinese Government.

3. The attached note about the tragic incident in the Chang Chenmo Valley which gives a first-hand account by a responsible officer, clearly that at no time on the 20th or 21st October did the Indian personnel take any aggressive attitude. While they were engaged on patrol duty, they were suddenly subjected to ruthless attack by Chinese forces with riffles, mortar and hand-grenades. One contingent of the attacking force was apparently entrenched on a hill top and the other was across the Chang Chemmo river on the right. Although the Indian party fired in self-defence, they had no chance against the superior strength of the Chinese force which was aided by its strategic situation and the

superior arms that it possessed. The Chinese Government have not stated the exact casualties suffered by the attacking Chinese force, but have indicated that their casualties were much less than those of the Indian party. The Government of India entirely disagree with the extraordinary conclusion drawn by the Chinese Government from the heavy casualties suffered by the Indian personnel that the Indian party had taken the offensive. The obvious conclusion would be the opposite of this and would indicate that the Chinese forces were the attacking party as they were entrenched on a hill top and used mortars and hand-grenades.

4. This incident has to be viewed also in the context of other events preceding it as well as of the correspondence that has taken place between the Government of India and the Chinese Government. The Indian frontier, throughout its long extent, has been well known is a traditional frontier and has been shown with precision in official maps published by the Survey of India. There has been no doubt about this frontier. Repeatedly during the past few years, the Prime Minister of India has declared firmly and clearly what this frontier is. The Government of the People's Republic of China said nothing about this frontier for a number of years. When their attention was drawn to some vague Chinese maps appearing in magazines and showing large areas, without any precision, as part of the Chinese State, objection was taken to these by the Government of India. The answer given was that these maps were old maps produced by the previous regime in China and the present Government of China had been too busy with other activities to consider a revision of these maps. That answer itself indicated that the Chinese Government had no serious doubt about the correctness of the Indian maps, except perhaps for some minor

disputes. As has been previously brought to the notice of the Chinese Government, the Premier of the People's Republic of China himself stated to the Prime Minister of India that the Chinese Government was prepared to accept the north eastern frontier of India which has been referred to as the McMahon Line. No question of the frontier of the Tibet region with Ladakh was ever raised during all these years, although the Chinese Government must have known very well. both from Indian maps and statements made on behalf of India as well as from the facts of the situation, where this frontier is. The Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 purported to deal with all outstanding issues between India and the Tibet region of China inherited from the British days. But neither during the long and detailed discussions preceding the Agreement nor in the Agreement itself was any mention made by the Chinese Government of their claim to such large areas of Indian territory. It was only in the letter addressed by Premier Chou En-lai to the Prime Minister of India dated 8th September 1959 that for the first time the Chinese Government laid claim to the territories vaguely included in their maps. This statement was at variance with the previous statements on the subject of the Chinese maps. It is to be observed that at no time up till now has any precise statement been made by the Chinese'. Government as to where according to them, their frontier is. Even their own maps give completely different and varying frontiers.

5. So far as the Government of India are concerned, their position has been clear and precise from the beginning and indeed for a long period of years and there has been no doubt about it That position was described in detail in paragraphs 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the Indian Prime Minister's letter of September 26 to Premier Chou En-lai. In this

letter, the Prime Minister of India has given the historical background of the traditional Sino-Indian boundary and the basis of its delineation in different sectors in official Indian maps. Indeed any person with a knowledge of history not only of recent events, but of the past hundreds of years and more, would appreciate that this traditional and historical frontier of India has been associated with Indian culture and tradition for the last two thousand years or so, and has been an intimate part of India's life and thought.

6. The Government of India, therefore reject and repudiate the: assumptions underlying the note of the Chinese Government in regard to this long frontier. They reiterate that the area where the clash: took place is not only a part of Indian territory but is well within it.that the entire area, Kongka pass "has always been Chinese territory and under respective jurisdiction of the local authorities of Sinkiang and Tibet region". This statement is contrary to history and facts. The maps published by the Survey of India since 1867-68 have been showing the boundary between Ladakh on the one hand, and Sinkiang and the Tibet region on the other, as in the present-day official maps published by the Survey of India. From the Karakoram Pass this boundary proceeds north-east via the Qara Tagh Pass and the follows the Kuen Lin range from a point 15 miles north the Haji Langar to peak 21250 (Survey of India map) which lies Type 21

7. It will thus be seen that the international boundary has been shown for nearly a century in official Indian maps as it is today. In fact, detailed surveys of the area were undertaken from 1867-68, and the boundary as shown in our maps is not only in accordance with tradition and custom but is also based on the results of these surveys,

The area on the Indian side of this boundary was surveyed by Hayward, Shaw and Cayley in 1868, Bower in 1891 and Aurel Stein in 1900. Drew who was Governor of Ladakh under the Maharaja of Kashmir, officially inspected the area up to its northern border in 1871 and the maps appended to his book on Jammu and Kashmir Territories 1875 as also the maps attached to the Gazetteers of Jammu and Kashmir published from 1890 onwards and the Imperial Gazetteer of India of 1908 show the boundary more or less similar to the frontier shown in official Indian maps today. It is the Chinese maps of the area which have shown different lines at different times. Most official Chinese map of 1893 shows the Aksai Chin area as in India. The New Atlas of China published by Shun pao, 1935, shows a great part of the Chang Chenmo region in India. In fact the place where the recent clash took place is in Indian territory according to this map This map and the subsequent Chinese maps until 1951 showed the international boundary as running 10 to 30 miles east of and parallel to Shyok river It is only in 1951 that a few Chinese maps took the boundary within 10 to 30 miles east of and parallel to the Shyok river. Most of the Chinese maps as late as 1954, and one as late as 1956 depict the boundary in the Pangong lake as cutting the western extremity of the eastern half of Pangong Tso called Yaerhmu in Chinese maps. The few Chinese maps of 1951 referred to above show the line as cutting the western half of Pangong lake area in Tibet.

8 It is true that the Government of India did not open any border outposts right along the traditional frontier. This was because the area was inhabited very sparsely if at all and they had no reason to anticipate any aggressive intention on the part of the Chinese Government. They were therefore content with sending regular police

patrol parties to these areas in previous years. The Government of India cannot accept the statement in the press note issued by the Chinese Government on the 26th October that the frontier guards of the Chinese People's Liberation Army have all along been stationed and patrolled this entire area " Indian survey and reconnaissance parties, which went from Leh to Lanak La in 1954 and 1956, did not come across any evidence of Chinese occupation. For the first time in 1957 signs of intrusion by outsiders were noticed at Shinglung and some places further north. Obviously such intrusion must have occurred in these places for the first time in 1957. Other Indian reconnaissance parties went as far as Karakoram Pass without coming across any Chinese personnel. No Indian reconnaissance party was sent to the area in Aksai Chin where the Chinese authorities had built a new road. No adverse conclusion can however be drawn from the mere fact that the Chinese had constructed this road. This was done without the knowledge of the Government of India. As early as 1899, the then Government of India communicated to the authorities in Peking the international boundary in this area, which then was more or less as it is today. And as stated above, official Indian maps have shown the Aksai Chin area as part of India for nearly a century. This area is extremely difficult of access from inhabited areas in western and southern Ladakh, and the Government of India had no reason to suspect that the Government of China, with whom they had friendly relations, would trespass into the area and construct a road.

9. No answer has been received yet by the Government of India to the long and detailed letter of the Prime Minister of India to Premier Chou En-lai of September 26, 1959. Regardless of the facts stated in this letter, the forces of the Chinese Government have not! only committed

further aggression but have attacked an Indian police party engaged in its normal patrol duty. This was the second armed attack on an Indian party the previous one taking place at Longju where Chinese forces crossed the Indian frontier forcibly. These facts taken together with a continuance of aggressive attitudes in various parts of the frontier and the type of propaganda that is being conducted on behalf of the Chinese Government are reminiscent of the activities of the old imperialist powers against whom both India and China struggled in the past. It is a matter of deep regret that the Chinese Government, which has so often condemned imperialism, should act in a manner which is so contrary to their own assertions. It is a matter of even greater regret that the Five Principles as well as the Declaration of the Bandung Conference should thus be flouted by the Chinese Government.

10. The Government of India are surprised at the complaint in the Chinese Government's note about the publication of an official Indian communiqué on this incident. The Government of India would not have been justified in keeping the Indian people in the ... be aware not only of the strong feelings on India on the question of Indian frontiers but also and more especially, about this incident. As a matter of fact the Government of India published their communiqué only after they found from the Chinese Government's note handed to the Indian Ambassador on October 25 that the account given in that note was at complete variance with the facts.

11. The Government of India do not propose to discuss in detail other matters referred to in the statement issued by the Chinese Foreign Office on the 26th October. They repudiate emphatically the allegation

that the Indian forces have violated the status quo in several places on the Sino-Indian frontier or that they have occupied any place inside Chinese territory. The facts about the frontier have been given in detail in the Indian Prime Minister's letter of September 26. Paragraphs 12 to 16 of that letter deal with the traditional frontier in the north-east, which is sometimes referred to as the McMahon Line. It will be seen from these paragraphs that the Chinese claim to any territory south of this line is entirely baseless. Any trespass into this area by Chinese personnel would amount to deliberate violation of the territory of India.

12. The Government of India have always been willing to respect the traditional frontier between India and China and have indeed done so. They cannot however recognise any boundary, in the Ladakh region or elsewhere, which includes in China areas on the Indian side of the traditional frontier. For a long period of years this frontier has been peaceful. Trouble and conflict have arisen there recently because the Chinese forces, having advanced up to the frontier in many places, committed aggression by crossing it at some places.

13. The Chinese Government have rightly stressed the importance of maintaining the status quo. An essential prerequisite to the maintenance of the status quo is that neither side should seek to extend its occupation in assertion of a supposed right in disregard of the traditional frontier, and that in any event, there should be no resort to force except as a last resort in self-defence. The deplorable incident, which has resulted in such heavy casualties to the Indian personnel, would have been avoided if the Chinese force had paid regard to this basic fact.

14. It is recognized the world over that India stands for peace and is entirely opposed to the use of warlike methods for the settlement of international disputes. Even in their struggle for independence, the Indian people adhered to peaceful methods. In regard to the Government of China, India's attitude has always been friendly in consonance with India's well known policy, but was due to the desire of the people and the Government of India that it was essential in the interests of India and China as well as of peace in Asia and the world, that these two great countries of Asia should have friendly relations, even though they might differ in their internal structure of Government. To that end, the Government of India have laboured through these years. It is a matter, therefore, of great sorrow to them that their hopes have been belied and a situation created which endangers the peaceful and friendly relations which have existed and which, they hoped, would continue to exist, between these two great countries.

15. It is a matter of special regret to the Government of India that at a time when the world appears at last to be moving towards a peaceful settlement of the grave problems which have afflicted it during the last twelve years and when the two great nations the Soviet Union and the United States of America are striving to their utmost ability to put an end to the cold war there should be this relapse into violence and aggression on the frontiers of India. The countries of Asia have ardently advocated peace and have played not an insignificant part in the work for peace. At this critical moment in the history of the world, it would have been fitting for all the nations of Asia not only to stand for peace, but to further it by their own attitudes and activities.

16. In accordance with her firm policy, India will continue to endeavour to resolve all disputes by peaceful methods. But where aggression takes place the people of India inevitably have to resist by all means available to them. The independence and integrity of India are what the Indian people laboured for during their long struggle for freedom and they cannot permit any injury to or infringement of them. The Government of India therefore trust that the Chinese Government will remove their forces from Indian territory and seek to resolve minor frontier disputes by peaceful methods.

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

* * *

Annexure to the Note of the Indian Government (Chang Chenmo Valley), 4 November 1959

ACCOUNT RECEIVED FEOM THE SECOND-IN-COMMAND OF THE INDIAN POLICE PATROL PARTY

On the 19th October, the party reached Hot Springs and established a temporary camp there. Before proceeding further north the next morning (20th) the officer in charge, Karam Singh, sent two police constables and a porter on reconnaissance towards the east. Neither the constables nor the porter returned to the camp at the appointed time. A small patrol party was therefore sent out in the evening in search of the missing persons but it returned at 11 o'clock at night

without being able to find any of the missing personnel. On the 21st morning, the officer in charge decided to go out himself in search of the missing persons as it was possible that they had lost their way to these trackless hills. Accompanied by Tyagi, who was his second in command, some members of his staff and some police constables making a total of about 20, the officer in charge left the camp at about 10 o'clock in the morning on ponies. He left instruction for the rest of the party to follow behind on foot. At six miles east of Hot Springs, at a place overlooked by a hill to the left, Karam Singh noticed some hoof-prints. So he halted and waited for the main party to come up. When the main party arrived, he and Tyagi decided that the main party under Tyagi should halt at that place whilst Karam Singh with a small party would follow the tracks to see if there were any intruders in the vicinity. Karam Singh passed by this hill feature to the left without noticing anything unusual and went out of sight of the main party. A little later, Tyagi went forward to see how far Karam Singh's party had gone but he could not find them apparently because Karam Singh's party had by then gone down the river bed. At this time, suddenly fire was opened on Tyagi's party by a Chinese force which was entrenched on the hill feature. Karam Singh's party was also simultaneously fired upon by another Chinese party entrenched on the other side of the river as well as by the party on the hill-top. The attackers fired with mortars and automatic weapons. Subjected to this attack members of both Karam Singh's party and Tyagi's party tried to take cover and fire back, but they were in a very disadvantageous position having no proper cover and, therefore their firing was not effective. The Chinese on the hill-top effectively stopped Tyagi's party from going to the aid of Karam Singh's party which was being attacked from both sides. After some time the Chinese who were apparently in

some strength on the other side of the Chang Chenmo river and some of whom were mounted on horses, advanced Forward and overwhelmed Karam Singh's party with automatic fire and mortar. They moved further forward to attack Tyagy's party, which then had no other alternative but to retreat. Karam Singh's party was therefore decimated either by killing or by capture except for a few survivors who escaped along the river bed and over the high hills in the dark. At night, Tyagi's party attempted to go forward to ... the dead and the injured, but the Chinese were still in position on the hill feature and maintained that position even on 22nd. Tyagi then withdrew his entire force to Tsogstalu. 17 persons including Karam Singh were missing after the clash. Out of these, five including the officer in charge and the Jamadar were seen by the survivors to have been killed by Chinese fire.

* * *

Letter from the Prime Minister of China to the Prime Minister of India, 8 September 1959

Peking, the 8th September, 1959. DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER, I have carefully read Your Excellency's letter dated March 22 1959. I find from your letter that there is a fundamental difference between the positions of our two Governments on the Sino-Indian boundary question. This has made me somewhat surprised and also made it necessary for me to take a longer period of time to consider how to reply to your letter. The Sino-Indian boundary question is a complicated question left over by history. In tackling this question, one cannot but, first of all, take into account the historical background of British aggression on China when India was under British rule. From

the early days, Britain harboured aggressive ambition towards China's Tibet region. It continuously instigated Tibet to separate from China; in an attempt to put under its control a nominally independent Tibet. When this design failed, it applied all sorts of pressures on China, intending to make Tibet a British sphere of influence while allowing China to maintain so-called suzerainty over Tibet. In the meantime, using India as its base, Britain conducted extensive territorial expansion into China's Tibet region, and even the Sinkiang region. All this constitutes the fundamental reason for the long term disputes over and non-settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question.

China and India are both countries which were long subjected to imperialist aggression. This common experience should have naturally caused China and India to hold an identical view of the above-said historical background and to adopt an attitude of mutual sympathy; mutual understanding and fairness and reasonableness in dealing with the boundary question. The Chinese Government originally thought the Indian Government would take such an attitude. Unexpectedly to the Chinese Government, however, the Indian Government demanded that the Chinese Government give formal recognition to the situation created by the application of the British policy of aggression against China's Tibet region as the foundation for the settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. What more serious, the Indian Government has applied all sorts pressures on the Chinese Government, not even scrupling the use of force to support this demand. At this the Chinese Government cannot but feel a deep regret. The Chinese Government has consistently held that an over-all settlement of the boundary question should be sought by both sides, into account the historical background and existing actualities and adhering to the Five Principles, through friendly negotiations conducted in a well-prepared way step by

step. Pending this, as a provisional measure, the two sides should maintain the long-existing status quo of the border, and not seek to change it by unilateral action, even less by force as to some the provisional agreements concerning isolated places could be reached through negotiations to ensure the tranquility of the border areas and uphold the friendship of the two countries. This is exactly the basic idea expressed in my January 23, 1959 letter to you. The Chinese Government still considers this to be the way that should be followed by our two countries in settling the boundary question. Judging from Your Excellency's letter of March 22, 1959, it seems you are not completely against this principle. I would like now to further explain the position of the Chinese Government in connection with the questions raised in Your Excellency's letter and in conjunction with the recent situation along the Sino-Indian border.

1. In my letter to Your Excellency dated January 23, 1959, I pointed out that the Sino-Indian boundary has never been formally delimited. In your letter of March 22, 1959, Your Excellency expressed disagreement to this and tried energetically to prove that most parts of the Sino-Indian boundary had the sanction of specific international agreements between the past Government of India and the Central Government of China. In order to prove that the Sino-Indian boundary has never been formally delimited, I would like to furnish the following facts:

(i) Concerning the boundary separating China's Sinkiang and Tibet regions from Ladakh.

In 1842, a peace treaty was indeed concluded between the local authorities of China's Tibet and the Kashmir authorities. However the then Chinese Central Government did not send anybody to participate

in the conclusion of this treaty, nor did it ratify the treaty afterwards. Moreover, this treaty only mentioned in general terms that Ladakh and Tibet would each abide by its borders, and did not make any specific provisions or explanations regarding the location of this section of the boundary. It is clear that this treaty cannot be used to prove that this section of the boundary has been formally delimited by the two sides, even less can it be used as the foundation to ask the Chinese Government to accept the unilateral claim of the Indian Government regarding this section of the boundary. As to the Chinese Government official's statement made in 1847 to the British representative that this section of the boundary was clear, it can only show that the then Chinese Government had its own clear view regarding this section of the boundary and cannot be taken as the proof that the boundary between the two sides had already been formally delimited. As a matter of fact, down to 1899, the British Government still proposed to formally delimit this section of the boundary with the Chinese Government, but the Chinese Government did not agree. Your Excellency also said on August 28 this year in India's Lok Sabha: "This was the boundary of the old Kashmir State with Tibet and Chinese Turkestan. Nobody had marked it." It can thus be seen that this section of the boundary has never been delimited. Between China and Ladakh, however, there does exist a customary line derived from historical traditions, and Chinese maps have always drawn the boundary between China and Ladakh in accordance with this line. The marking of this section of the boundary on the map of "Punjab Western Himalaya and Adjoining Parts of Tibet" compiled by British John Walker by order of the Court of Directors of East India Company (which was attached to the British Major Alexander Cunningham's book "Ladakh" published in 1854) corresponded fairly close to the

Chinese maps. Later British and Indian maps included large tracts of Chinese territory into Ladakh. This was without any legal grounds, nor in conformity with the actual situation of administration by each side all the time.

(ii) Concerning the section of the boundary between the Ari Area of China's Tibet and India.

It can be seen from your letter that you also agree that this section of the boundary has not been formally delimited by the two countries. Not only so, there have in fact been historical disputes between the two sides over the right to many places in this area. For example, the area of Sang and Tsungsha, southwest of Tsaparang Dzong in Tibet, which had always belonged to China, was thirty to forty years back gradually invaded and occupied by the British. The local authorities of China's Tibet took up this matter several times with Britain, without any results. It has thus become an outstanding issue left over by history.

(iii) Concerning the Sino-Indian boundary east of Bhutan.

The Indian Government insists that this section of the boundary has long been clearly delimited, citing as its grounds that the so-called McMahon Line was jointly delineated by the representatives of the Chinese Government, the Tibet local authorities and the British Government at the 1913-1914 Simla Conference. As I have repeatedly made clear to Your Excellency, the Simla Conference was an important step taken by Britain in its design to detach Tibet from China. At the Conference were discussed the so-called boundary between Outer and Inner Tibet and that between Tibet and the rest of China. Contrary to what was said in your letter, the so-called McMahon Line was never discussed at the Simla Conference, but was determined by the British representative and the representative of the Tibet local

authorities behind the back of the representative of the Chinese Central Government through an exchange of secret notes at Delhi on March 24, 1914, that is, prior to the signing of the Simla treaty. This line was later marked on the map attached to the Simla treaty as part of the boundary between Tibet and the rest of China. The so-called McMahon Line was a product of the British policy of aggression against the Tibet Region of China -and has never been recognised by any Chinese Central Government and is therefore decidedly illegal. As to the Simla treaty, it was not formally signed by the representative of the then Chinese Central Government, and this is explicitly noted in the treaty. For quite a long time after the exchange of secret notes 'between Britain and the Tibet local authorities, Britain dared not make public the related documents, nor change the traditional way drawing this section of the boundary on maps. This illegal line aroused the great indignation of the Chinese people. The Tibet authorities themselves later also expressed their dissatisfaction with this line, and, following the independence of India in 1947, cabled Your Excellency asking India to return all the territory of Tibet region of China south of this illegal line. This piece of territory corresponds in size to the Chekiang Province of China ' and is as big as ninety thousand square kilometres. Mr. Prime Minister, how could China agree to accept under coercion such an illegal line which would have it relinquish its rights and disgrace itself by selling out its territory-and such a large piece of territory as that? The delineation of the Sino-Indian boundary east of Bhutan in all traditional Chinese maps is a true reflection of the actual situation of the customary boundary before the appearance of the so-called McMahon Line. Both the map of "Tibet and Adjacent Countries" published by the Indian Survey in 1919 and the map attached to the 1929 edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* drew this section of the

boundary in the same way as the Chinese maps. And it was only in the period around the peaceful liberation of China's Tibet region in 1951 that Indian troops advanced on a large scale into 'the area south of the so-called McMahon Line. Therefore, the assertion that this section of the boundary has long been clearly delimited is obviously untenable. In Your Excellency's letter, you also referred to the boundary between China and Sikkim. Like the boundary between China and Bhutan, this question does not fall within the scope of our present discussion. I would like, however, to take this opportunity to make clear once again that China is willing to live together in friendship with Sikkim and Bhutan, without committing aggression against each other, and has always' respected the proper relations between them and India. It can be seen from the above that the way the ' Sino-Indian boundary has always been drawn in maps published in China is not without grounds and that at first British and Indian maps also drew the Sino-Indian boundary roughly in the same way as the Chinese maps As a matter of fact, it was not Chinese maps, but British and Indian maps that later unilaterally altered the way the Sino-Indian boundary was drawn. Nevertheless, since China and India have not delimited their mutual boundary through friendly negotiations and joint surveys, China has not asked India to revise its maps. In 1954, I explained to Your Excellency for the same reason that it would be inappropriate for the Chinese Government to revise the old map right now. Some people in India, however, are raising a big uproar about the maps published in China, attempting to create a pressure of public opinion to force China to accept India s unilateral claims concerning the Sino-Indian boundary. Needless to say, this is neither wise nor worthy.

2. As stated above, the Chinese Government has all along adhered to

a clear-cut policy on the Sino-Indian border question: on the one hand, it affirms the fact that the entire Sino-Indian boundary has not been delimited, while on the other, it also faces reality, and, taking specially into consideration the friendly relationship between China and India, actively seeks for a settlement fair and reasonable to both sides, and never tries unilaterally to change the long-existing state of the border between the two countries pending the settlement of the boundary question. Regarding the eastern section of the Sino-Indian boundary, as I have stated above, the Chinese Government absolutely does not recognise the so-called McMahon Line, but Chinese troops have never crossed that line. This is for the sake of maintaining amity along the border to facilitate negotiations and settlement of the boundary question, and in no way implies that the Chinese Government has recognised that line. In view of the fact that my former explanation of this point to Your Excellency is obviously misunderstood in Your Excellency's latest two letters to me, I have deemed necessary once again to make the above explanation clearly. Regarding the western section of the Sino-Indian boundary, China has strictly abided by the traditional customary line and, with regard to Indian troops repeated intrusions into or occupation of Chinese territory, the Chinese Government, acting always in a friendly manner, has dealt with each case in a way befitting it. For example, regarding the invasion of Wu-je by Indian troops and administrative personnel, the Chinese Government has tried its best to seek a settlement of the question with the Indian Government through negotiations and to avoid a clash. Regarding the Indian troops who invaded the southwestern part of China's Sinkiang and the area of Lake Pankong in the Tibet Region of China, the Chinese frontier guard after disarming them according to international practice, adopted an attitude of

reasoning, asking them to leave Chinese territory and returning to them their arms. Regarding the Indian troops successive invasion and occupation of the areas of Shipki Pass, Parigas, Sang, Tsungsha, Puling-sumdo, Chuwa, Chuje, Sangcha and Lapthal, the Chinese Government, after discovering these happenings, invariably conducted thorough and detailed investigations rather than laying charges against the Indian Government immediately and temperamentally. These measures prove that the Chinese Government is exerting its greatest effort to uphold Sino-Indian friendship. Despite the above-mentioned border incidents caused wholly by the trespassing of Indian troops, until the beginning of this year, the atmosphere along the Sino-Indian border had on the whole been fairly good. The fact that no armed clashes had ever occurred along the 2,000 or so kilometres of the Sino-Indian boundary, which is wholly undelimited, is in itself a powerful proof that, given a friendly and reasonable attitude on both sides, amity can be maintained in the border areas and tension ruled out pending the delimitation of the boundary between the two countries.

3. Since the outbreak of the rebellion in Tibet, however, the border situation has become increasingly tense owing to reasons for which the Chinese side cannot be held responsible. Immediately after the fleeing of a large number of Tibetan rebels into India. Indian troops started pressing forward steadily across the eastern section of the Sino-Indian boundary. Changing unilaterally the long-existing state of the border between the two countries, they not only overstepped the so-called McMahon Line as indicated in the map attached to the secret notes exchanged between Britain and the Tibet local authorities, but

also exceeded the boundary drawn in current Indian maps which is alleged to represent the so-called McMahon Line, but which in many places' actually cuts even deeper into Chinese territory than the McMahon Line. Indian troops invaded and occupied Longju, intruded into Yashar, and are still in occupation of Shatze, Khinzemane and Tamaden-all of which are Chinese territory-shielding armed Tibetan rebel bandits in this area. Indian aircraft have also time and again violated China's territorial air near the Sino-Indian border. What is especially regrettable is that, not long ago, the Indian troops unlawfully occupying Longju launched armed attacks on the Chinese frontier guards stationing at Migyitun, leaving no room for the Chinese frontier guards but fire back in self-defence. This was the first instance of armed clash along the Sino-Indian border. It can be seen from the above that ' the tense situation recently arising on the Sino-Indian border was all caused by trespassing and provocations by Indian troops, and that for this the Indian side should be held fully responsible Nevertheless, the Indian Government has directed all sorts of groundless charges against the Chinese Government, clamouring that China has committed aggression against India and describing the Chinese frontier guards' act of self-defence in the Migyitun areas as armed provocation. Many political figures and propaganda organs in India have seized the occasion' to make a great deal of anti-Chinese utterances. The fact that India does not recognise the undelimited state of the Sino-Indian boundary and steps up bringing pressure to bear on China militarily, diplomatically and through public opinion cannot but make one suspect that it is the attempt of India to impose upon China its one-sided claims on the boundary question. It must be pointed out that this attempt will never succeed and 'such action cannot possibly yield any results other than impairing the friendship of

the two countries, further complicating the boundary question and making it more difficult to settle.

4. The friendly relations between China and India are based on the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence. The Chinese Government has consistently held that all differences between our two countries must and certainly can be resolved through peaceful consultations and should not be allowed to affect the friendly relationship between the two countries. China looks upon its southwestern border as a border of peace and friendship. I can assure Your Excellency that it is merely for the purpose of preventing remnant armed Tibetan rebels from crossing the border back and forth to carry out harassing activities that the Chinese Government has in recent months dispatched guard units to be stationed in the south-eastern part of the Tibet Region of China. This is obviously in the interest of ensuring the tranquility of the border and will in no way constitute a threat to India. Your Excellency is one of the initiators of the Five Principles and has made significant contributions to the consolidation and development of Sino-Indian friendship and constantly stressed the importance of this friendship. This has deeply impressed the Chinese Government and people. I have therefore given Your Excellency a systematic explanation of the whole picture of the Sino-Indian boundary. I hope that Your Excellency and the Indian Government will, in accordance with the Chinese Government's request, immediately adopt measures to withdraw the trespassing Indian troops and administrative personnel and restore the long existing state of the boundary between the two countries. Through this, the temporary tension on the Sino-Indian border would be eased at once and we are concerned for Sino-Indian friendly relations and dealing a blow to those who are sowing discord in the Sino-Indian

relations and creating tension.

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

* * *

**Letter from the Prime Minister of India to the Prime Minister of
China, 26 September 1959**

New Delhi; the 26th September, 1959.

Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

I have received your letter of September 8, 1959. I must say that I was greatly surprised and distressed to read it. You and I discussed the India-China border, and particularly the eastern sector, in 1954 in Peking and in 1956-57 in India. As you know; the boundary in the eastern sector is loosely referred to as the McMahon Line. I do not like this description, but for convenience I propose to refer to it as such. When I discussed this with you, I thought that we were confronted with the problem of reaching an agreement on where exactly the so-called McMahon Line in the eastern sector of the boundary lay. Even when I received your letter of January 23, 1959, I had no idea that the People's Republic of China would lay claim to about 40,000 square miles of what in our view has been indisputably Indian territory for decades and in some sectors for over a century. In your latest letter you have sought to make out a claim to large tracts of Indian territory and have even suggested that the independent Government of India are seeking to reap a benefit from the British aggression against China. Our Parliament and our people deeply resent this allegation.

The struggle of the Indian people against any form of imperialism both at home and abroad is known and recognised all over the world and we had thought that China also appreciated and recognised our struggle. It is true that the British occupied and ruled the Indian sub-continent against the wishes of the Indian people. The boundaries of India were, however, settled for centuries by history, geography, custom and tradition. Nowhere indeed has India's dislike of imperialist policies been more clearly shown than in her attitude towards Tibet. The Government of India voluntarily renounced all the extra-territorial rights enjoyed by Britain in Tibet before 1947 and recognised by Treaty that Tibet is a region of China. In the course of the long talks that we had during your last visit to India, you had told me that Tibet had been and was a part of China but that it was an autonomous region.

2. You have suggested in your letter that the Government of India have applied all sorts of pressure on the Chinese Government, including the use of force, to make the Chinese Government accept the Indian demand: This is the reverse of what the Government of India did. We did not release to the public the information which we had about the various border intrusions into our territory by Chinese personnel since 1954, the construction of a road across Indian territory in Ladakh, and the arrest of our personnel in the Aksai Chin area in 1958 and their detention. We did not give publicity to this in the hope that peaceful solutions of the disputes could be found by agreement by the two countries without public excitement on both sides. In fact our failure to do so has now resulted in sharp but legitimate criticism of the Government both in Parliament and in the press in our country. Far from using force, we sought the peaceful settlement of the

disputes. You must be aware of the prolonged negotiations between the Indian and Chinese representatives over Bara Hoti in 1958 and of the notes exchanged between our two Governments on the other disputes. I need hardly tell you ' that there is great resentment in India at the action of your troops in overpowering our outpost in Longju on our side of the McMahon Line, and although you have up till now not withdrawn your troops have not sought to reoccupy the post.

3. You have referred to the maintenance of the long existing status quo on the border. The Government of India have always been in favour of it. It is the Chinese Government who have violated it repeatedly in recent years. I can refer, for example, to the construction of a 100-mile road across what has traditionally been Indian territory in the Aksai Chin area, the entry of Chinese survey parties in the Lohit Frontier Division in 1957, the establishment of a camp at Spanggur in 1959; the despatch of armed personnel to Bara Hoti in 1958 and stationing them there in winter against customary practice and last, but not least, the use of force Longju.

4. It is true that the Sino-Indian boundary has not been formally delimited along its entire length. Indeed the terrain of the Sino- Indian border in many places makes such physical demarcation on y° the ground impossible. But the entire length of the border has been either defined by treaty or recognised by custom or by both and until now the Chinese Government have not protested against k the exercise of jurisdiction by the Government of India up to the customary border. You have yourself acknowledged the fact that k no armed clash ever occurred along our border until the beginning of this year. All Chinese Governments have respected the Indian border. The fact that previous

Chinese Governments were weak is no answer. Not even a protest was registered in accordance with y established state practice in this regard, as was done in the case of Burma between 1908 and 1937.

5. Concerning the boundary between Tibet and Ladakh, it is incorrect to say that the then Chineso Central Government did not send anybody to participate in the conclusion of the treaty between Tibet and Kashmir in 1842. The treaty was signed by the representatives of both the Dalai Lama and the Emperor of China. Kalon Sokon, one of the signatories, though by birth a Tibetan, had Chinese rank. Even the Tibetan version of the treaty makes it clear that China was a party to it. Thus, it asserts that "there will never be on any account in future till the world lasts, any deviation even by the hair's breadth and any breach in the alliance, friendship and unity between the King of the world Siri Khalsaji Sahib and Siri Maharaj Sahib Ra.ja-i-Rajagan Raja Sahib Bahadur, and the Khagan of China and the Lama Guru Sahib of Lhasa."

6 It is true that the 1842 treaty referred merely to the "old `established frontiers". This was because these frontiers were well-known and did not require any formal delimitation. Even the treaty of 1884 between Ladakh and Tibet stated that "the boundaries fixed in the beginning, when Skyid-Ida-ngeema-gon gave a kingdom to each of his three sons, shall still be maintained." References in the Ladakhi chronicles of the 17th century indicate that the boundary was well-established. Cunningham, whom Your Excellency has referred to with approval, toured the area in 1846. He stated in 1854 that the eastern boundary of Ladakh "is well-defined by piles of stones, which were set up after the last expulsion of the Sokpo or Mongol hordes in A.D. 1687

when the Ladakhis received considerable assistance from Kashmir." (Ladakh, 1854, page 261). Thus it is clear that for nearly two centuries the boundary between Ladakh and Tibet was well-known and recognized by both sides. There was a constant flow of trade between Ladakh and Tibet during these : centuries as provided for by these treaties, and no boundary conflicts ever arose.

7. It has been stated in your letter that China never ratified the 1842 treaty. That China recognised the treaty is clear from the fact that the Chinese official in 1847 informed the British Government: "Respecting the frontiers I beg to remark that the borders of those territories have been sufficiently and distinctly fixed, so that it will be best to adhere to this ancient arrangement and it will prove far more convenient to abstain from any additional measures for fixing them." There was no suggestion that the Chinese Government regarded the treaty as invalid. It is also clear from the statement quoted that not merely was the boundary known, but the boundary was distinctly and sufficiently fixed and there was no divergence of opinion as to where it lay.

8. Further evidence of Chinese acceptance of the 1842 treaty is provided by the fact that the other provisions of the treaty regarding exchange of goods and presents were in operation right up to 1946 without any hindrance from the Chinese Government.

9. It is incorrect to say that down to 1899 the British Government proposed formally to delimit this section of the boundary but that the Chinese Government did not agree. No proposals were made between 1847 and 1899 for any such formal delimitation. The proposal made in 1899 by the British Government referred not to the eastern

frontier of Ladakh with Tibet but to the northern frontier of Ladakh and Kashmir with Sinkiang. It was stated in that context that the northern boundary ran along the Kuen Lun range to a point east of 80° east longitude, where it met the eastern boundary of Ladakh. This signified beyond doubt that the whole of Aksai Chin area lay in Indian territory. The Government of China did not object to this proposal.

10. So Ladakh, Tibet and China had all accepted that the frontier between Ladakh and Tibet was the customary boundary. You have stated that the boundary as shown in the Chinese maps follows more or less, that shown in the map of "Punjab, Western Himalaya and adjoining parts of Tibet" compiled by Walker and attached to Cunningham's book published in 1854. Walker's Map states in the Compilation Index that the document used for this sector is the "Map of Ladakh and Nari Khorsum by Capt. H. Strachey". Now Strachey toured only a part of Ladakh in 1847-48. He knew little nothing about Aksai Chin, having never visited the area, and drew the boundary where he thought the main water-parting; which was the natural and old established frontier in this area, lay. Thereafter a number of exploration and survey parties were sent by the Government of India to this region. These parties ascertained the customary frontier on the basis of natural features and such local evidence as was available. Johnson visited the area in 1865 and Frederick Drew, an Englishman in the employ of the Maharaja of Kashmir as Governor of Ladakh, in 1869. Other survey parties in the nineteenth century were those of Hayward, Shaw and Cayley in 1868, Carey in 1885-87, Hamilton Bower in 1891, Littledale in 1895, Welby and Malcolm in 1896, Deasy and Pike in 1896, and Aurel Stein in 1900. Accurate maps of the whole Ladakh area thus became possible only from 1865, after the

afore-mentioned surveys had ascertained the exact lie of the watershed; and it is significant that most of the maps since that date show the customary boundary in accordance with the line shown by us in our map rather than that claimed by China. The later Map of Turkiestan of Walker himself published in 1867-68, Drew's map attached to this book *Jammoo & Kashmir Territories* (1875), Johnston's Atlas (1882), and maps attached to the Gazetteers of Kashmir published from 1890 onwards all showed boundary lines more or less similar to our present frontier. Even official Chinese maps of the late nineteenth century showed a boundary approximating to our line. It is only in official Chinese maps of the twentieth century that the Chinese Government included large parts of our territory. On the other hand, *The New Atlas and Commercial Gazetteer of China*, published in Shanghai sometime after 1917 by the *North China Daily News and Herald* on the basis of authoritative surveys, shows a boundary in the north-west similar to our alignment and a boundary in the north-east which approximates to what later became known as the McMahon Line. I may add that the Chinese maps do not follow even Walker's Map of 1854 where it does not support the assertion made on behalf of China. Thus Walker shows the areas north of Demchok and north of Pangong in India but recent Chinese maps have not followed Walker's map in regard to these areas.

11. You have referred to the sector of the boundary between what is known as the Ari area of Tibet and India. We are told that Ari, which is an abbreviated form of Ngari Khorsum, is south-western Tibet. This is the sector of the boundary between the Punjab, Himachal Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh in India and the Tibet region. You have stated that the boundary in this sector has never been formally delimited. In fact,

there should be little doubt about the boundary in this sector. Article IV of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement specifies six passes in this area. There was discussion of these passes between the Chinese and Indian representatives before the Agreement was concluded. Your original draft contained the following: "The Chinese Government agrees to open the following passes." On behalf of India, Mr. Kaul then said that these were Indian passes. After some discussion both sides agreed on the following text: Traders and pilgrims of both countries may travel by the following passes. Your Vice-Foreign Minister remarked in that context. "This was the fifth concession on our part". This was recognition of the passes as border passes. In fact the Government of India have always been in control of the Indian ends of the passes.

12. I am particularly surprised by your statement that "the so-called McMahon Line was a product of the British policy of aggression against the Tibet Region of China". You further state that the agreement in regard to the frontier between India and Tibet was concluded between the British representative and the representative of the Tibet local authorities and that it has never been recognized by any Chinese Central Government. From this you draw the conclusion that the agreement is illegal. The facts, however; are otherwise. The arrangements for the Simla Conference were made with the full knowledge and consent of the Government of China. The Foreign Minister of China wrote to the British representative on the 7th August 1913 that the Chinese plenipotentiary would proceed ' to India "to open negotiations for a treaty jointly with the Tibetan and British plenipotentiaries. It is clear from the proceedings of the conference that not only did the Chinese representative fully participate in the conference but that the Tibetan-representative took part in the

discussions on an equal footing with the Chinese and the then British Indian representatives. Not only were the frontiers of India with Tibet discussed at the conference, but also the boundaries between Inner Tibet and China, and Inner Tibet and Outer Tibet. At no stage, either then or subsequently, did the Chinese Government object to the discussions on the boundary between India and Tibet at the conference. In the circumstances the agreement which resulted from the conference in regard to the McMahon Line boundary between India and Tibet must, in accordance with accepted international practice, be regarded as binding on both China and Tibet. In fact this was not the first occasion when Tibet concluded an agreement with other countries. In 1856 Tibet concluded an agreement on its own with Nepal. The Convention signed by Britain and Tibet in 1904 was negotiated by the British and Tibetan representatives with the assistance of the Chinese Amban in Tibet.

13. You have stated that for a long time after the exchange of so-called secret notes between Britain and Tibet Britain did not dare to make public the related documents. You have also contended that the McMahon Line "was later marked on the map attached to the ' Simla Treaty". I am afraid I cannot agree either with your facts or your conclusion. . The Chinese representative at the Simla Conference was fully aware of the McMahon Line boundary between India and Tibet. This particular line was discussed between the Tibetan and British Indian representatives, but when the draft convention emerging from the conference was presented on the 22nd April 1914 for signature by the British Indian, Tibetan and Chinese representatives it had attached to it a map showing the McMahon Line boundary as well as the boundaries between Inner Tibet and China, and Inner ' Tibet and

Outer Tibet. Later, the Chinese Foreign Office in a memorandum, dated the 25th April 1914 listed a number: of objections to the boundaries between Inner Tibet and Outer Tibet and Inner Tibet and China. It did not raise any objection to the boundary between Tibet and India as shown in the map attached to the tripartite Simla Convention. Thereafter, on the 27th April, the Chinese representative initialed both the convention and the map without any objection. Subsequently, in their memorandum, dated the 13th June 1914, the Chinese made fresh proposals regarding the boundaries of Inner Tibet and Outer Tibet. It is significant that no mention was at all a made in this memorandum of the boundary between Tibet and India. Almost five years later, on the 30th May 1919, the Government of China again suggested some modifications of the Simla Convention with a view to reaching a final settlement. These modifications related only to the boundaries between Inner Tibet and China and Inner Tibet and Outer Tibet. No reference at all was made to the boundary between Tibet and India (McMahon Line). Looking into the old papers, we find that the British Government withheld the publication of the Simla Convention for several years in the hope that there would be an agreement about the status and boundary of Inner Tibet. The Simla Convention was published in the 1929 edition of Aitchison's Treaties and the McMahon Line was shown in the official maps from 1937 onwards. These maps were circulated widely but neither then nor subsequently was any objection raised by the Chinese authorities.

14. I entirely disagree with the inference drawn by you from the exchange of two communications between the Tibetan Bureau in Lhasa and the new Government of India in 1947. The facts are that our Mission in Lhasa forwarded to us a telegram, dated the 16th October

1947 from the Tibetan Bureau. The telegram asked for the return of alleged Tibetan territories on boundaries of India and Tibet "such as Sayul and Walong and in direction of Pemakoe, Lonag, Lopa, Mon, Bhutan; Sikkim, Darjeeling and others on this side of river Ganges and Lowo, Ladakh etc. up to boundary of Yarkhim." It will be seen that the areas claimed by Tibet had not been defined. If they were to be taken literally, the Tibetan boundary would come down to the line of the river Ganges. The Government of India could not possibly have entertained such a fantastic claim. If they had the faintest idea that this telegram would be made the basis of a subsequent claim to large areas of Indian territory, they would of course have immediately and unequivocally rejected the claim. Not having had such an impression, they sent a reply to the following effect: "The Government of India would be glad to have an assurance that it is the intention of the Tibetan Government to continue relations on the existing basis until new agreements are reached on matters that either party may wish to take up. This is the procedure adopted by all other countries with which India has inherited treaty relations from His Majesty's Government". It would be unfair to deduce from this reply that India undertook to negotiate fresh agreements with Tibet on the frontier question. When the British relinquished power and India attained freedom on the 15th August 1947, the new Government of India inherited the Treaty obligations of undivided India. They wished to assure all countries with which the British Government of undivided India had treaties and agreements that the new Government to India would abide by the obligations arising from them. All that the Government of India intended to do in the telegram mentioned in Your Excellency's letter was to convey an assurance to that effect to the Tibetan authorities. There could be no question, so far as India was

concerned, of reopening old treaties with Tibet with a view to entertaining, even for purposes of discussion, claims to large areas of Indian territory.

15. It is wrong to say that the frontier east of Bhutan as shown on Chinese maps is the traditional frontier. On the contrary, it is the McMahon Line which correctly represents the customary boundary in this area. The water-parting formed by the crest of the Himalayas is the natural frontier which was accepted for centuries as the boundary by the peoples on both sides. The tribes inhabiting the area south of the McMahon Line—the Monbas, Akas, Dafias, Miris, Abors, and Mfshmis are of the same ethnic stock as the other hill tribes of Assam and have no kinship with the Tibetans. The Tibetans themselves regard these tribes with contempt and group them all together as "Lopas". It is true that the boundary of two adjacent countries is not determined by the ethnic affiliations of the people living in these countries. Some sort of cultural intercourse between the peoples living on both sides of the frontier is also not uncommon. All the same it is significant that the tribes mentioned above have not been affected in the slightest degree by any Tibetan influence, cultural, political or other, and this can only be due to the fact that the Tibetan authorities have not exercised jurisdiction at any time in this area. On the other hand, Indian administration gradually moved up to these areas. Agreements were signed with the Akas in 1844 and 1888, the Abors in 1862-63 and 1866 and with the Monbas in 1844 and 1853, extending the authority of the Government of India over them. It was the British Government's policy generally to leave the tribes more or less to look after themselves and not seek to establish any detailed administration of these areas such as was to be found in the rest of British Indian

territory. All the same British Political Officers visited these areas for settling disputes and such like purposes. Finally, the Sadiya Frontier Tract, approximately 10,000 square miles in area, was formed in 1912, and the Balipara Frontier Tract also comprising about 10,000 square miles, was formed in 1913, i.e., before the Simla Conference met. The Atlas of the Chinese Empire, published in London by the Chinese Inland Mission in 1906, shows as the frontier in this area an alignment which is almost identical with what was settled at Simla in 1914. The area was extensively surveyed in 1911-13. The Lohit area was surveyed by the Mishmi Mission in 1911-12, the Dibhang Valley was surveyed in 1912-13 and the Abor area in 1913. Captain Bailey carried out extensive surveys of the southern limits of Tibetan jurisdiction in the whole area in 1913-14. It was on the basis of all the detailed information that the boundary was settled between India and Tibet in 1914. It is clear, therefore, that the McMahon Line was not an arbitrary imposition on a weak Tibet by the Government of India. It formalized the natural, traditional, ethnic and administrative boundary in the area.

16. Your Excellency has referred to a map published by the Survey of India in 1917 and a map in the 1929 edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. The Survey of India map shows the line claimed by China but on the same sheet, in the index map, the McMahon Line is also shown. The reason for this is that the British Indian Government were reluctant to issue new maps of India showing only the McMahon Line in the hope that China would accept the Simla Convention as a whole. As for the map in the 1929 edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, it is true that in the eastern sector it shows roughly the line now claimed by China But the same map shows the whole of Aksai Chin as part of

Ladakh. It would therefore be unfair to quote the authority of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* in support of the Chinese claim in one sector of the boundary and to reject it in respect of the other. In fact, if maps published privately in other countries are to be cited as evidence, we can refer to a large number of such maps in our support. For 'example, the map of *Asie Meridionale* published by Andriveau-Coujon in Paris in 1876 and the map of *Asie Orientale* published by the same firm in 1881 show the whole tribal area as outside Tibet. The Atlas of the Chinese Empire published by the China Inland Mission in 1906 shows a boundary which approximates to the McMahon Line. The British War Office Map of the Chinese Empire published in October 1907 shows almost the entire tribal territory 'in India. The map in Sir Francis Younghusband's volume *India and Tibet* published in London in 1910 shows the Tribal area in India; and so does the map in Sir Charles Bell's book *Tibet Past and Present* (Oxford 1924).

17. It is not clear to us what exactly is the implication of your statement that the boundaries of Sikkim and Bhutan do not fall' within the scope of the present discussion. In fact, Chinese maps show sizeable areas of Bhutan as part of Tibet. Under treaty relationships with Bhutan the Government of India are the only competent authority to take up with other Governments matters concerning Bhutan's external relations, and in fact we have taken up with your Government a number of matters on behalf of the Bhutan Government. The rectification of errors in Chinese maps regarding the boundary of Bhutan with Tibet is therefore a matter which has to be discussed along with the boundary of India with the Tibet region of China in the same sector. As regards Sikkim, the Chinese Government recognised as far back as 1890 that the Government of India "has direct and

exclusive control over the internal administration and foreign relations of that State". This Convention of 1890 also defined the boundary between Sikkim and Tibet; and the boundary was later, in 1895, demarcated. There is thus no dispute regarding the boundary of Sikkim with the Tibet region.

18. You have stated that the Sino-Indian boundary is about 2,000 kilometres in length, is wholly undelimited, and that it is not Chinese maps but British and Indian maps that have been unilaterally altering the Sino-Indian boundary. In fact the Sino-Indian boundary (apart from the boundary of Sikkim and Bhutan with Tibet) extends over 3,520 kilometres. It is wrong to say that this long boundary is wholly undelimited. The frontier east of Bhutan has been explicitly delineated on the 1914 treaty map. The frontier of Himachal Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh has been clarified by implication by the mention of six passes in the 1954 Agreement. As for the charge that British and Indian maps have been unilaterally altering the boundary, the fact is that early British maps showed the boundary roughly where the British thought the water-parting was at the time. Later, as more topographical as well as local information about the water-parting was obtained, the boundary was shown with greater precision on the subsequent maps. The discrepancies between the earlier and later maps are also explained in part by the fact that British cartographers as a rule showed in their maps the administrative boundaries irrespective of the actual alignment of the frontier. Therefore, as administration was gradually extended in the frontier areas, corresponding changes were made in the boundaries on the later maps. Thus the map of India published by the Survey of India in 1895 (1"-128 miles) showed the un-administered areas of northern Burma and north-eastern India

upto what subsequently came to be known as the McMahon Line by a light orange colour wash as distinct from the deeper colours used for the rest of the Indian territory. The Memorandum on Native States in India published by the Government of India in 1909 has a map in Volume II showing this whole tribal area as part of India. The fact is that the present frontiers of India have always been the historic frontiers but administration in the British period was only gradually extended up to these frontiers. Shortly after India attained independence' in 1947 the Government of India decided, as a matter of policy, to bring these frontier areas under more direct administrative control to enable them to share in the benefits of a welfare state subject to the protection of their distinct social and cultural patterns. It is not true to say that it was only after the recent Tibetan crisis and the entry into India of a large number of Tibetans that Indian troops started advancing steadily in the North-East Frontier Agency. In fact administrative personnel, civil and police had been functioning in these areas right up to the McMahon frontier for several years before the recent disturbances broke out in Tibet. However, we did not have any military force anywhere in the border areas. There was only an armed constabulary in support of the civil personnel and even the frontier posts were manned by this constabulary. It was only when our outpost at Longju was overpowered by : superior Chinese military force and our personnel elsewhere along the frontier were being intimidated by Chinese .forces that we decided to place the responsibility for the protection of the frontier on our army.

19. It should be clear from what has been stated in previous paragraphs that it is the Chinese maps that have altered the boundary alignments through the years to include large areas of Indian territory

in China. It should also be stated that Chinese maps published even after 1949 have not adhered to any definite frontier: Different maps show different alignments in the same sector.

20. I am sorry to have to say that it is the Chinese Government who have been trying unilaterally to change the long-existing state of the border. There is no other explanation for the presence of Chinese personnel in Bara Hoti and of Chinese troops in the Aksai Chin area, Khurnak Fort, Mandal, Spanggur, Khinzemane and Longju, and for Chinese intrusions in the Spiti area, Shipki pass, the Nilang-Jadhang area, Sangcha, Laphthal, and the Dichu Valley. Nor is it correct to say that Chinese troops have never crossed the McMahon Line. Both Khinzemane and Longju are south of this line.

21. The Government of India emphatically repudiate the allegation that in recent times they have "invaded and occupied" a number of places in the middle sector of the boundary. In fact it is the Chinese forces which have made persistent efforts in recent times to come into and occupy indisputably Indian territory. Details of intrusions and attempted intrusions by Chinese forces have been given in the attached note. These intrusions have been particularly marked in the Spanggur area, where Chinese forces have been pushing forward in an aggressive manner during the last year two in disregard of the traditional frontier. The Chinese have only recently established a new camp near the western extremity of the Spanggur lake at a point which even according to some official Chinese maps is in Indian territory. It is not for us to comment on the reports of large-scale movements of Chinese forces in the Tibetan frontier areas. We hope that these moves do not signify a new policy of actively probing into

Indian territory along the whole length of the Sino-Indian frontier.

22. Reports have reached us that some Chinese officers in Tibet have repeatedly proclaimed that the Chinese authorities will before long take possession of Sikkim Bhutan, Ladakh and our North-East Frontier Agency. I do not know what authority they had to make these remarks but I would like to draw Your Excellency's attention to them as these remarks have naturally added to the tension on the frontier.

23. Your Excellency has spoken of Indian parties having trespassed into Chinese territory. Nowhere have our personnel done so. Even if they had done so through an error of judgment at any point in the barren wastes of some far-flung frontier region, we would have expected that a friendly Government would promptly bring it to our notice for remedial action. Instead, last year when an Indian party was engaged on routine administrative patrol near Haji Langar in Ladakh, your forces arrested them and did not inform us of the arrest until we had enquired of you almost five weeks later. In the meantime our personnel were subjected to threats, harsh treatment and severe interrogation. Surely this is not the manner in which the personnel of a friendly Government should have been treated.

24. The charge that India has been shielding armed Tibetan rebels in the frontier areas in the north-east is wholly unfounded and we firmly reject it. On the contrary, our personnel disarmed the Tibetan rebels as soon as they crossed the frontier into Indian territory and insisted on their moving well away from the frontier areas. The few who showed disinclination to do so were told that they would not get asylum in India and made to leave our territory finally.

25. There is no truth in the allegation that Indian aircraft have repeatedly violated Chinese territorial air in this area. We have issued definite instruction to all our aircraft to avoid trespass into Chinese air space and we are assured that this instruction has been carefully observed. You will appreciate, however, that aircraft engaged in supply dropping missions to a frontier outpost may accidentally cross the international frontier or appear to do so even though it has not actually crossed the frontier. Our anxiety to respect the Chinese territorial air space would be clear from the fact that when in July last the officer in charge of our outpost at Longju fell seriously ill we informed your Government that we would be para-dropping a doctor. The object of our giving the information to your Government was to ensure that you would not misunderstand it if by error of judgment our aircraft should cross into Chinese territory in flying over a frontier outpost. For the same reason we also gave you information in advance that survey operations would be carried out from the air on our side of the border during the months from November 1959 to February 1960. Incidentally, the information that we gave you about Longju would disprove any suggestion that we had surreptitiously started an outpost on Chinese territory. Had we done so, we would not have given its location your Government.

26. I have looked into the allegation that the boundary drawn on Indian maps includes in many places even more territory than the McMahon Line, but have been unable to discover any basis for it: If you have in mind the Sino-Indian frontier shown in the Indian maps in the Migyitun area which differs slightly from the boundary shown in the Treaty map, the position can be easily explained. As settled

between the British and the Chinese representatives at the time of the Simla Conference, the boundary was to follow the natural features, but a reservation was made that Migyitun (and a few other places) would be within Tibetan territory. This was done in order to leave within Tibet the two sacred lakes of Tsari Sarpa and Tso Karpo which were places of pilgrimage for Tibetans and the village of Migyitun from which the pilgrimage started. At the time of the Simla Convention, the exact topographical features in this area were not known. Later after the topography of the area had been definitely ascertained, the actual boundary followed the geographical features except where a departure was necessary to leave Migyitun within Tibetan territory. The actual boundary as shown in the Indian maps, therefore, merely gave effect to the treaty map in the area based on definite topography. This was in accordance with established international practice.

27. I entirely disagree with your view that the tense situation that has arisen on the border has been caused by Indian trespassing and provocation. In fact, as the attached note will show, it is the Chinese who have trespassed into Indian territory across the traditional border at a number of places in recent years. You have mentioned that we in India have staged a second so-called anti-Chinese campaign. This, if I may say so, is the reverse of the actual position. Despite the regrettable happenings on the frontier of our two countries, we in India have conducted ourselves with great restraint and moderation. At a number of places your forces assumed a threatening attitude; at others they actually came into our territory. Such incidents concerning as they did the integrity of India were very serious, but in our anxiety not to create feelings against your Government we deliberately avoided giving publicity to them. Questions in Parliament had,

however, to be answered and the facts could not be withheld. When the facts thus became known the reaction both in Parliament and among the public was one of dismay and great resentment. There was criticism of our Government both in Parliament and the press for our failure to give publicity to these developments at an earlier stage. Under the Indian Constitution Parliament is supreme. India has also a free press and the Government could not restrain public criticism. In the circumstances, to allege that the Government of India built up pressure on China in any manner is a complete misreading of the facts of the situation. It is also based on complete misunderstanding of the constitutional procedures under which the Government, Parliament and the press function in India. Needless to say, such an allegation is entirely baseless.

28. I have stated before and wish to affirm once again that the Government of India attach great importance to the maintenance of friendly relations with China. They have hitherto sought to conduct their relations with China, as with other countries, in the spirit of Panch Sheel. This indeed had always been India's policy even before the five principles were enunciated. It is therefore all the more a matter of regret and surprise to us that China should now have put forth claims to large areas of Indian territory inhabited by hundreds of thousands of Indian nationals, which have been under the administrative jurisdiction of India for many years. No Government could possibly discuss the future of such large areas which are an integral part of their territory. We however recognise that the India-China frontier which extends over more than 3,500 kilometres has not been demarcated on the ground and disputes may therefore arise at some places along the traditional frontier as to whether these places

lie on the Indian or the Tibetan side of this traditional frontier. We agree therefore that the border disputes which have already arisen should be amicably and peacefully settled. We also agree that until a settlement has been reached the status quo should be maintained. In the meantime both sides should respect the traditional frontier and neither party should seek to alter the status quo in any manner. Further, if any party has trespassed into the other's territory across the traditional frontier, it should immediately withdraw to its side of the frontier. So far as the Government of India are concerned, at no places at present have they have any personnel, civil, police or military, on the Tibetan side of the traditional frontier. There was only one outpost, that at Tamaden established some months ago, which, subsequent enquiries showed, was somewhat north of the McMahon Line. In keeping with our earlier promise we have already withdrawn it to a point south of the Line. There can therefore be no question of withdrawing any Indian personnel at any other place. We would now request that in the same spirit your Government should withdraw their personnel from a number of posts which you have opened in recent months at Spanggur, Mandal and one or two other places in eastern Ladakh. Similarly, your forces should also withdraw from Longju which they forcibly occupied on the 26th August and which they still continue to occupy. No discussions can be fruitful unless the posts on the Indian side of the traditional frontier now held by the Chinese forces are first evacuated by them and further threats and intimidations immediately cease. Mr. Prime Minister, I regret that I have had to write to you, length and in such detail. But I must frankly say that your of the 8th September has come as a great shock to us. India was one of the first countries to extend recognition to the People's Republic of China and for the last ten years we have consistently sought to maintain and

strengthen our friendship with your country. When our two countries signed the 1954 Agreement in regard to the Tibet region I hoped that the main problems which history had bequeathed to us in the relations between India and China had been peacefully and finally settled. Five years later, you have now brought forward, with all insistence, a problem which dwarfs in importance all that we have discussed in recent years and, I thought settled. I appreciate your statement that China looks upon her south-western border as a border of peace and friendship. This hope is promise could be fulfilled only if China would not bring within the scope of what should essentially be a border dispute, claims to thousands of square miles of territory which have been end are integral part of the territory of India. With kind regards,
Yours sincerely, (Sd.) JAWAHARLAL NEHRU.

* * *

A NOTE ON THE BORDER DISPUTES Annexure to the letter from the Prime Minister of India to the Prime Minister of China, 26 September 1959

A. Aksai Chin,

As shown in the text of the letter, Aksai Chin is a part of Ladakh. The Chinese Government have now admitted that in 1956 they built a highway from Tibet to Sinkiang, running for about a hundred miles through this territory. In September 1957, it was announced that this road had been completed. The next year Indian personnel carrying out routine patrol duties were arrested near Haji Langar in north-east Aksai Chin, taken to Suget Karol and detained for five weeks. The leader of the Indian patrol was placed in solitary confinement, and all

documents were seized. When the Government of India protested at the serious and continuous occupation of our territory which road-building implied, and enquired whether the Chinese authorities had any knowledge of the Indian patrol, they admitted that they had detained the Indian party. Later the party was released at the Karakoram pass.

B. The Pangong area

The customary boundary between Ladakh and Tibet in this region lies from Lanak La (34° 24' North and 79° 34' East) along the eastern and southern watershed of the Chang Chenmo and the southern watershed of the Chumesang, and then along the southern bank of the Chumesang and the eastern bank of the Changlung Lungpa. Skirting the western extremity of the eastern half of Pangong Tso, the boundary thereafter follows the Ang watershed and cutting across Spanggur Tso, follows the north-eastern and northern watershed of the Indus. In recent years Chinese armed personnel have crossed this border in several places; fanned out and occupied Indian territory illegally. In July 1958 the Government of India protested against the Chinese occupation of Khurnak Fort, about 1.5 miles within the Indian frontier. This fort has from time immemorial been within Ladakh, and has never been the subject of dispute. Even at a conference on certain pasture grounds in this area, attended by the representatives of Tibet and Kashmir and a British Commissioner in 1924, the jurisdiction of India over this fort was not disputed. However, there has been no reply as yet to the note of the Government of India. In July 1959 it was learnt that a Chinese armed detachment had entered Indian territory in the Spanggur area south of the Pangong Lake, and had established a camp at Spanggur. When an Indian police party on its

way to Khurnak approached them, it was over-powered. The Government of India protested, but the Chinese Government in their reply asserted that this was Chinese territory. This statement is contradicted even by the boundary alignment in this sector shown on Chinese maps, for example, the Map of the Administrative Areas of the Chinese Republic (1948), in which the boundary cuts across the eastern extremity of the Spanggur Lake. Spanggur stands on the western edge of the lake. Though the Government of India would have been justified in dislodging this Chinese camp, they have refrained from doing so in the hope that the Chinese would themselves withdraw.

C. Demchok

Demchok or Parigas, is another area which India is supposed to have "invaded and occupied". This is part of the Hanle region in south-eastern Ladakh. Ladakhi chronicles of the 17th century and accounts of travellers of the 18th and 19th centuries all state that Demchok was a part of Ladakh. The Kailash range, which is the eastern watershed of the Indus, lies east of Demchok. Strachey, who visited this area in 1847, confirmed this position, and Walker on the authority of Strachey, showed the boundary in this region as running east of Demchok village. The pasture grounds between Demchok and the Kailash range have been used by Indian villagers for a long time past. All revenue records of this century prove that taxes were collected in this area by the Jammu and Kashmir Government, and a check-post has been maintained in this area for several decades. '

D. The Spiti area

Premier Chou-En-lai's letter alleges Indian "invasion" of Chauva .and

Chu-je, i.e. the Spiti area in the Punjab State. The Spiti valley is, however, traditional Indian territory. The frontier in this area is the major watershed between the Pare Chu and the Spiti systems. As far back as 1879 the "Map of Hundes or Ngari Khorsum and Monyol" issued by the Trigonometrical Survey of India showed the boundary along this watershed. In 1956 a Chinese survey party visited this area and sought to place boundary stones on Indian territory and in 1957 a Chinese patrol party was noticed there. The Government of India drew the attention of the Chinese Government to these violations of Indian territory. The Chinese authorities neither denied the charge nor claimed this territory to be a part of, 'Tibet. They did not appear even to have an exact knowledge of this terrain, for they asked India for details of latitude and longitude. A wall map of the People's Republic of China published in November 1953 (Ya Kuang Publishing Society) shows this area within India. To speak of Indian aggression in this area is, therefore, to say the least, astonishing.

E. Shipki pass

Shipki pass is the first of the six border passes mentioned in the 1954 agreement. This has always been the limit of Indian territory. All old maps indicated this as the border pass. The Government of India have constructed a road up to this point and have been maintaining it for many years; and in 1954 the words "Hindustan-Tibet" were engraved on a rock flanking the pass on the left. In the summer of 1956 a Chinese patrol was found on the Indian side of the pass and well within Indian territory. On being asked to withdraw the Chinese personnel threw stones and threatened to use hand grenades. The commander of the Chinese patrol contended that he had received instructions to patrol the area up to Hupsang Khud and if the Indian party went beyond Hupsang

Khud he "would oppose it with arms". Hupsang Khud is four miles from Shipki pass on the Indian side. Indian protests to the Government of China against this incursion remain unanswered.

F. The Nilang-Jadhang area

Premier Chou En-lai states that there have been historical disputes regarding many places in the sector of the boundary between Ladakh and Nepal, and gives as an example the area of Sang and Tsungsha, south-west of Tsaparang Dzong in Tibet. In fact this is the only area in regard to which the Chinese authorities have raised a dispute. Sang is Jadhang village, Tsungsha is Nilang village and Tsaparang Dzong is the district headquarters in this part of Tibet. The Chinese Premier accuses India of having invaded and occupied Puling-Sumdo, that is Pulam Sumda, a village in the Nilang-Jadhang area. It is not true that this area had always belonged to China and that the British occupied it only thirty to forty years ago. By the middle of the seventeenth century Nilang formed part of Bushahr state (now in Himachal Pradesh of India). A copper-plate inscription of 1667 A.D. records a treaty of mutual defence between Bushahr and Tehri and the cession to Tehri of Nilang. So clearly Nilang was then in India. Documents of the 18th century show that Tehri was administering the area. The inhabitants of this area are Garhwali by stock and not Tibetan. In 1804 Nepalese troops are said to have destroyed Nilang village but in 1850 the Tehri Durbar re-established the village of Nilang and a hamlet named Jadhang, further north. In 1914 the Tibetans tried to set up a boundary pillar at Gum Gum Nala south of Nilang, and four years later the Tehri Durbar in its turn erected three boundary pillars at the border pass of Tsangchok La. In 1926 a boundary commission consisting of Tibetan, Tehri and British representatives met at Nilang.

Considerable evidence was produced by the Tehri Government in their own favour. It included ownership rights in land, proof of construction of roads and buildings and collection of land revenues for centuries. The only evidence the Tibetans could produce was that their agents had occasionally collected a tax levied on trade with Tibet. The territory continued under the administration of the Tehri Durbar and, after the merger of Tehri State in Uttar Pradesh (India) in 1948, under the administration of the Government of Uttar Pradesh. Since 1951 no taxes at all have been paid by these villagers to Tibetans, as they have discontinued the practice of visiting Tibet for trade. The area of Nilang-Jadhang is situated south of the main watershed in this region, along which the six border passes mentioned in the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement are situated. In April 1956 it was found that some armed Chinese personnel had intruded into this area without securing the permission of the Indian authorities. A protest was lodged by the Government of India on 2nd May 1956, but till now there has been no reply to this protest from the Chinese Government.

G. Bara Hoti

Bara Hoti, which the Chinese call Wu-je and accuse the Government of India of having occupied, is a small area (about 1.5 square miles) in the State of Uttar Pradesh (India). The area lies between the main watershed of the Sutlej and the Alakhnanda, which is the boundary in this sector, and the highest range of the Himalayas further south. Revenue records and other official documents of the 19th century establish that the watershed is the traditional frontier between India and Tibet in this region. It has been shown in Indian maps since 1850, when maps of this region based on surveys were first drawn. Even Chinese maps up to 1958 show the watershed as the frontier. Bara

Hoti which is south of the watershed must, therefore, be regarded as within India. Till 1954 either the Tibetans nor the Chinese seriously challenged this position, but since then Chinese personnel have persistently visited this area. There was a conference in Delhi to consider this question in April-May 1958. The Indian representatives proposed that pending, a settlement of the dispute no armed personnel should be sent to the area. The Chinese Government agreed to this, but rejected the further proposal that neither side should send civilian personnel to the area. The Government of India, therefore, have continued to send civilian personnel to the area to exercise their long-established civil jurisdiction in this area. Bara Hoti has for centuries been under a patwari, and officials of Garhwal district have been touring it regularly. To describe the continuation of this administration as "aggression" is therefore, a distortion of facts. The accusation is more applicable to the Chinese Government, who sent not merely civilian officials but an armed party to the area in 1958 in contravention of the agreement at the Delhi conference. The Government of India have scrupulously adhered to the interim agreement not to send armed personnel and have not allowed even the revenue officials to carry arms for self-protection. Furthermore, the Chinese personnel stayed at Bara Hoti in 1958 for part of the winter also, contrary to normal practice. India's proposal at the conference that even civilian personnel should not be sent to the area shows the extent to which she was willing to go in the interest of a peaceful settlement. The only major argument that the Chinese side brought forward was that certain Tibetan agents called Sarjis came occasionally to this area to collect imposts. These men, however, were not regular officials of the Chinese Government but merely promoters of trade who came to declare Indo-Tibetan trade open and to inspect

the cattle which was coming from or going to Tibet to see if it was diseased. They collected taxes only from Tibetans who had come down to trade and not from local villagers. And even against these visits of the Tibetan Sarjis, the Government of India had always been making repeated protests. Indeed, it was revealed at the Conference at Delhi in 1958 that the Chinese did not even know what area they meant by Wu-je. They therefore, pressed for a local enquiry as that would enable them to know what area they were claiming. Two other places south-east of Bara Hoti also mentioned in Premier Chou En-lai's letter as "invaded and occupied" by India are Sangcha or Sangcha Malla, and Lapthal. They are situated in Almora District in Uttar Pradesh, on the Indian side of the Balcha Dhura pass. This pass is located on the water-parting which is the traditional boundary in this area between India and Tibet. This is confirmed by Edwin Atkinson in his volume *The Himalayan Districts of North-Western Provinces of India* (1886). Sangcha Malla is two miles south of the border and Lapthal six miles south. No Chinese map has ever shown these places within Tibet, and they have never before been claimed by either Tibet or China. It was only in October 1958, when the Indian check-posts retired as usual because of the onset of winter, that Chinese personnel entered Indian territory and established outposts at these two places. A protest of the Government of India on 10th December 1958 has elicited no reply.

H- Yasher, Khinzemane and Shatze

Premier Chou En-lai alleges that Indian troops intruded into Yasher and are still in occupation of Shatze and Khinzemane. The Government of India are aware of no such place or area as Yasher. Judging from its location on the small-scale maps recently published in Chinese newspapers, it is presumably a small area north-east of Height 15721

in the Simla Convention Map. Here the boundary runs due north and the territory that is marked as Yasher is inside India. Indian personnel, in this area have been given strict orders not to cross the boundary and they have scrupulously observed these orders. If the village Lung is being referred to as Yasher, then it can be categorically stated that Indian troops have never occupied it.

Khinzemane is south of the Thangla range which forms the international boundary in this area. In fact Chinese troops intruded into Khinzemane and tried to overawe Indian personnel there. Khinzemane and the Droksar pastures near it in the North East frontier Agency of India have for years belonged to the Indian village of Lumpo. The villages of Le and Timang in Tibet have been allowed to use these pastures on payment for pasture rights to the Indian village of Lumpo. There is no record of the Tibetan authorities ever having exercised jurisdiction in the region south of the Thangla range. As for Shatze, it is south of Khinzemane and within Indian territory. *I- Longju and Migyitun* Premier Chou En-lai says that Indian troops have not only over-stepped' the McMahon Line as indicated in the map attached to the notes exchanged between Britain and Tibet, but have also advanced across the boundary drawn on current Indian maps, and these maps are alleged in many places to cut even deeper into Chinese territory than the McMahon Line. It is alleged that Indian troops "invaded and occupied Longju and launched armed attacks on Chinese frontier guards stationed at Migyitun, leaving no option to the Chinese frontier guards but to fire back in self-defence. It has been stated in the text of the letter that the representation of the McMahon Line on Indian maps strictly conforms to the line shown in the Simla Convention Map. Indian troops have not crossed the boundary as drawn on current Indian maps. The Indo-Tibetan boundary drawn at

the Simla Conference departed from the watershed in the Subansiri area in order to leave in Tibet the sacred lakes of Tso Karpo and Tsari Tsarpa, the village of Migyitun to which Tibetans attach importance as the starting point of the twelve-year pilgrimage, the route from Migyitun to the lakes, and another shorter pilgrimage route known as Tsari Nyingpa. The alignment on current Indian maps carefully leaves these territories in Tibet. The international boundary here runs just south of the village of Migyitun. Longju which is entirely distinct from Migyitun lies 1.5 miles further south of the border. It cannot be part of Migyitun, which was a decaying village of twelve huts in 1913 and had further deteriorated to six huts and a monastic in 1935. The lands attached to Migyitun village were few extended to a very short distance from the village. Until Chinese troops recently trespassed into Longju no administrative control was ever exercised over this village by the Tibetan authorities. The detachment of Indian armed constabulary was instructed only to resist trespassers and to use force only in self-defence. It was the Chinese who first fired at the Indian forward picket and later overwhelmed by force the Indian outpost at Longju. This deliberate attack in superior numbers on an Indian outpost have no justification at all. However, even though Longju is undoubtedly Indian territory, the Government of India are prepared to discuss with the Chinese Government the exact alignment of the McMahon Line in the Longju area. The Government of India have also offered not to send their personnel back to Longju provided that the Chinese Government also would withdraw their forces. The Chinese Government have not so far replied to this offer.